



ORAL TRADITION AS A LEARNING RESOURCE FOR STRENGTHENING STUDENTS' LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL LITERACY IN SCHOOLS

Khairil Hadi^{1*}

Universitas Cipta Mandiri, Aceh, Indonesia

khairil.hadi@ucm.ac.id

Dazrullisa²

Universitas Cipta Mandiri, Aceh, Indonesia

dazrullisa@ucm.ac.id

Ali Salim Ali Razaq³

Ali Ibn Abi Talib Elementary School, Tripoli, Libya

alisalim21@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: khairil.hadi@ucm.ac.id

Article History	Received: January 19, 2025	Revised: March 17, 2025	Accepted: April 21, 2025	Published: May 15, 2025
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Abstract

Oral tradition is a valuable learning resource because it contains language expressions, narrative structures, cultural values, local wisdom, collective memory, and community identity. However, language learning in schools often relies on textbook-based materials and gives limited attention to students' local cultural resources. This study aims to examine the effectiveness of oral tradition-based learning resources in strengthening students' language and cultural literacy and to explore students' learning experiences during implementation. The study employed a mixed-method design using a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group approach supported by classroom observations, student interviews, reflective journals, and document analysis. The participants were 88 junior secondary school students divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group learned language and cultural literacy through selected oral traditions, including folktales, proverbs, local songs, riddles, and community narratives, while the control group received conventional textbook-based instruction. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, paired-sample t-tests, independent-sample t-tests, normalized gain scores, and effect size analysis. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically. The findings showed that oral tradition-based learning resources significantly improved students' language literacy and cultural literacy. Students demonstrated stronger reading comprehension, vocabulary interpretation, narrative understanding, oral retelling, cultural value identification, and reflective response. The study concludes that oral tradition can become an effective learning resource when integrated through contextual text analysis, storytelling, discussion, retelling, value reflection, and culturally responsive pedagogy.

Keywords: *oral tradition; cultural literacy; language literacy; storytelling; learning resource*

A. Introduction

Language learning is not only a process of mastering vocabulary, grammar, and text structure. It is also a process of understanding how language carries cultural meaning, social values, identity, and collective memory. In every community, language is used to transmit knowledge, tell stories, preserve local wisdom, express moral values, and connect generations. Therefore, language education should not be separated from culture. Students need to learn language through meaningful texts and contexts that are close to their lives, communities, and cultural heritage.

Oral tradition is one of the most important cultural resources that can support language and cultural literacy. Oral tradition includes folktales, legends, myths, proverbs, riddles, chants, local songs, advice, rituals, and community narratives transmitted orally across generations. UNESCO (2003) explains that oral traditions and expressions include spoken forms such as proverbs, riddles, tales, legends, myths, songs, poems, and dramatic performances that transmit knowledge, cultural values, and collective memory. This means that oral tradition is not merely entertainment. It is a cultural archive that stores language, history, values, imagination, and ways of thinking.

The integration of oral tradition into language learning is supported by culturally responsive pedagogy. Gay (2002) argues that culturally responsive teaching uses students' cultural knowledge, prior experiences, and performance styles to make learning more relevant and effective. Ladson-Billings (1995) also emphasizes that culturally relevant pedagogy should support academic success, cultural competence, and critical consciousness. In this sense, oral tradition can help students learn language while strengthening their cultural identity and interpretive awareness.

Oral tradition also aligns with sociocultural perspectives on literacy. Literacy is not simply an individual cognitive skill; it is a social practice shaped by cultural contexts, community values, and patterns of communication. Street (2003) argues that literacy should be understood as situated social practice. This perspective suggests that language and literacy learning should include texts and practices that are meaningful in students' cultural environments. Oral tradition provides such meaningful literacy practices because it connects storytelling, listening, speaking, interpreting, and reflecting.

That tradition begins with Ong (1982), whose account of orality and literacy established that oral cultures organise memory, narrative, and argument differently from written ones, so that oral material is not simply written material delivered aloud. The New Literacy Studies developed the pedagogical consequence: Heath (1982, 1983) showed that the narrative practices children bring from home differ across communities and that schools reward some and penalise others; Barton and Hamilton (2000) and Gee (2015) reframed literacy as a set of socially situated practices rather than a single portable skill; and Mills (2010) reviews how the field has since extended to digital environments. Rogoff (1990) and Au (1998) supply the developmental and classroom counterpart, showing that learning is apprenticeship into a community's ways of meaning, which is precisely what reciting, retelling, and discussing a local story asks students to do.

Narrative theory also supports the use of oral tradition in learning. Bruner (1991) explains that narrative is a fundamental mode through which humans organize experience and construct reality. In classroom learning, narrative helps students understand sequence, causality, character motivation, moral conflict, and social meaning. Oral stories can therefore strengthen both language comprehension and cultural interpretation. When students listen to, analyze, retell, and rewrite oral traditions, they practice multiple literacy skills simultaneously.

Previous studies have shown that storytelling and oral tradition can support literacy development. Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, and Lowrance (2004) found that storytelling and story reading influenced children's oral language complexity and story comprehension. Hibbin (2016) showed that oral storytelling in school can support psychosocial and literacy development. Satriani (2019) also reported that storytelling can benefit literacy learning by improving students' engagement, comprehension, and language use. These studies suggest that oral tradition has pedagogical value for literacy development when used systematically.

Despite its potential, oral tradition is not automatically effective as a learning resource. Teachers need to select appropriate materials, adapt oral texts into classroom activities, guide students in cultural interpretation, avoid romanticizing culture, and connect oral tradition with learning objectives. Oral tradition should not be used only as decorative cultural content. It should become a structured learning resource for reading, listening, speaking, writing, vocabulary development, critical thinking, and cultural reflection.

This study examines oral tradition as a learning resource for language and cultural literacy. It investigates whether oral tradition-based learning improves students' literacy outcomes and how students

experience learning through local oral tradition. The research questions are: (1) Does oral tradition-based learning significantly improve students' language and cultural literacy compared with conventional textbook-based instruction? (2) Which components of language and cultural literacy improve after the implementation of oral tradition-based learning resources? (3) How do students experience learning language and cultural literacy through oral tradition? (4) What challenges emerge during the implementation of oral tradition-based learning resources?

B. Method

This study employed a mixed-method research design. The quantitative component used a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design to examine the effectiveness of oral tradition-based learning resources in improving students' language and cultural literacy. The qualitative component used classroom observations, student interviews, reflective journals, and document analysis to explore students' learning experiences and implementation challenges. A mixed-method design was selected because the study aimed to measure literacy improvement and explain how oral tradition supported students' learning process.

The participants were 88 Grade VIII students from a junior secondary school. Two intact classes were selected. One class was assigned as the experimental group, consisting of 44 students, while the other class was assigned as the control group, also consisting of 44 students. The two classes had comparable language achievement based on previous semester scores and preliminary literacy tests. One language teacher taught both groups to maintain instructional consistency.

The experimental group received oral tradition-based language and cultural literacy instruction for eight meetings. The oral tradition materials consisted of selected folktales, local proverbs, riddles, local songs, and community narratives. The materials were selected based on five criteria: relevance to students' cultural environment, appropriateness for junior secondary level, richness of language features, presence of cultural values, and potential for classroom discussion. Community elders and local cultural informants were consulted to ensure that the selected oral traditions were culturally appropriate and accurately represented.

The learning activities in the experimental group followed six stages. First, students activated prior knowledge by discussing local stories, sayings, or cultural expressions familiar to them. Second,

students listened to or read oral tradition texts prepared by the teacher. Third, students analyzed language features, including vocabulary, figurative expressions, narrative sequence, character traits, and moral messages. Fourth, students discussed cultural values embedded in the oral tradition. Fifth, students retold, dramatized, or rewrote the oral tradition in their own language. Sixth, students wrote reflective responses connecting the oral tradition with contemporary life.

The control group received conventional textbook-based instruction. Students read textbook texts, answered comprehension questions, discussed vocabulary, and completed written exercises. The control group learned similar literacy skills, including reading comprehension, vocabulary interpretation, narrative structure, and reflective response, but without the use of oral tradition-based materials.

The main quantitative instrument was a Language and Cultural Literacy Test. The test consisted of 40 items and two performance tasks. The test measured five components: reading comprehension, vocabulary interpretation, narrative understanding, cultural value identification, and reflective response. Reading comprehension measured students' ability to understand explicit and implicit information. Vocabulary interpretation measured students' ability to infer meanings of words, proverbs, and figurative expressions. Narrative understanding measured students' ability to identify plot, setting, character, conflict, and resolution. Cultural value identification measured students' ability to recognize values, norms, and local wisdom. Reflective response measured students' ability to connect oral tradition with personal and social contexts. The reliability coefficient of the test was 0.88, indicating acceptable reliability.

Qualitative data were collected through eight classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with 16 students, reflective journals, and learning document analysis. Interview participants were selected purposively to represent students with high, moderate, and low literacy gains. Classroom observations focused on participation, storytelling response, discussion quality, cultural interpretation, oral retelling, and written reflection. Learning documents included students' worksheets, retelling notes, rewritten stories, cultural value maps, and reflective journals.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, paired-sample t-tests, independent-sample t-tests, normalized gain scores, and Cohen's d effect size. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically through data familiarization, coding, theme development, theme review, and interpretation. Data triangulation was conducted by comparing test results, observation notes, interview transcripts,

reflective journals, and student documents. Ethical procedures were applied by obtaining school permission, student consent, and community approval for the use of oral tradition materials. Student identities and community informants were anonymized.

Instrument quality was verified before the intervention. The Language and Cultural Literacy Test was reviewed by two lecturers of language education and one expert in local oral tradition, and the content validity index reached 0.89. In a pilot with 32 students outside the sample, item difficulty ranged from 0.29 to 0.78, item discrimination from 0.31 to 0.64, and the reliability coefficient reached a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86. Because the cultural literacy items required interpretation, all open responses were scored by two independent raters whose agreement reached an intraclass correlation of 0.87. The two classes were equivalent before the treatment, $F(1, 86) = 0.38$, $p = .540$ for homogeneity of variance and $t(86) = 0.55$, $p = .584$ on the pretest. In the qualitative strand, observation, interview, and journal data were triangulated, member checking was carried out with ten students and two community storytellers, and 30% of the data was double coded, producing a Cohen's kappa of 0.84.

C. Finding and Discussion

1. Finding

The findings are presented in four parts. The first part reports students' language and cultural literacy before and after the intervention. The second part explains improvement across literacy components. The third part presents students' experiences during oral tradition-based learning. The fourth part describes implementation challenges.

Students' Language and Cultural Literacy before and after the Intervention

The pretest results showed that the experimental and control groups had comparable initial literacy scores. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 59.34 with a standard deviation of 7.28, while the control group obtained a mean score of 58.91 with a standard deviation of 7.35. The independent-sample t-test showed no significant difference between the two groups before the intervention, $t(86) = 0.28$, $p = .781$. This indicates that both groups had similar initial language and cultural literacy.

After eight meetings, the posttest results showed a clear difference between the groups. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 82.45 with a standard deviation of 6.17, while the control group

obtained a mean score of 70.12 with a standard deviation of 7.04. The independent-sample t-test showed a significant difference between the groups, $t(86) = 8.74$, $p < .001$. The effect size was Cohen's $d = 1.86$, indicating a large effect.

Table 1 Language and Cultural Literacy Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Test	N	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Experimental	Pretest	44	59.34	7.28	Moderate
Experimental	Posttest	44	82.45	6.17	High
Control	Pretest	44	58.91	7.35	Moderate
Control	Posttest	44	70.12	7.04	Moderate to high

Source: Processed from language and cultural literacy test data.

The paired-sample t-test showed that the experimental group improved significantly from pretest to posttest, $t(43) = 18.93$, $p < .001$. The control group also improved significantly, $t(43) = 8.67$, $p < .001$, but the improvement was smaller. The experimental group achieved a mean gain of 23.11, while the control group achieved a mean gain of 11.21. The normalized gain score of the experimental group was 0.57, categorized as moderate to high, while the control group obtained a normalized gain of 0.27, categorized as low to moderate.

Table 2 Gain Scores and Statistical Comparison

Indicator	Experimental Group	Control Group	Statistical Result
Mean gain	23.11	11.21	Experimental group higher
Normalized gain	0.57	0.27	Moderate-to-high vs. low-to-moderate
Posttest comparison	82.45	70.12	$t(86) = 8.74$; $p < .001$
Effect size	-	-	Cohen's $d = 1.86$; large effect

Source: Processed from pretest and posttest data.

These findings indicate that oral tradition-based learning resources produced stronger improvement in language and cultural literacy than conventional textbook-based instruction. The result suggests that culturally meaningful texts can support deeper literacy engagement.

Improvement across Literacy Components

The literacy test measured five components: reading comprehension, vocabulary interpretation, narrative understanding, cultural value identification, and reflective response. The experimental group improved across all components. The strongest improvement

occurred in cultural value identification and narrative understanding, followed by vocabulary interpretation, reading comprehension, and reflective response.

Table 3 Improvement across Language and Cultural Literacy Components

Component	Maximum Score	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Gain	Interpretation
Reading comprehension	20	11.82	16.32	4.50	Strong improvement
Vocabulary interpretation	20	11.41	16.48	5.07	Strong improvement
Narrative understanding	20	12.06	17.56	5.50	Very strong improvement
Cultural value identification	20	11.38	17.21	5.83	Very strong improvement
Reflective response	20	12.67	14.88	2.21	Moderate improvement

Source: Processed from component analysis of literacy test.

Cultural value identification improved strongly because students repeatedly discussed values embedded in oral traditions, such as respect for elders, cooperation, honesty, courage, patience, responsibility, and harmony with nature. Students learned to identify not only the moral message of a text but also its cultural meaning.

Reading comprehension improved because students became more engaged with texts that were culturally familiar. Familiar cultural content helped students activate prior knowledge and understand implied meaning. Reflective response improved moderately because students still needed more practice in writing extended reflections and connecting oral tradition with contemporary issues.

Students' Experiences during Oral Tradition-Based Learning

Qualitative findings showed that students experienced oral tradition-based learning as meaningful, engaging, identity-affirming, and reflective. Five major themes emerged: cultural familiarity, active storytelling participation, vocabulary discovery, value reflection, and intergenerational connection.

Table 4 Qualitative Themes on Students' Learning Experiences

Theme	Evidence from Learning Practice	Pedagogical Meaning
Cultural familiarity	Students recognized stories, sayings, or values from home and community	Familiarity increased engagement
Active storytelling	Students retold, dramatized, and discussed oral traditions	Oral practice strengthened

participation		language use
Vocabulary discovery	Students interpreted proverbs, figurative expressions, and local terms	Oral tradition enriched vocabulary learning
Value reflection	Students connected cultural messages with daily life	Cultural literacy became reflective
Intergenerational connection	Students asked parents or elders about oral traditions	Learning extended beyond classroom

Source: Synthesized from observations, interviews, journals, and student documents.

Observation data showed that students were more active when learning materials came from familiar cultural contexts. Several students recognized certain proverbs or stories from family conversations. This recognition made them more willing to participate in discussion. Students who were usually quiet became more active when asked to share oral traditions from their families.

Storytelling activities encouraged oral language practice. Students retold stories in groups, performed short dramatizations, and compared different versions of the same story. This helped students practice speaking, sequencing ideas, and using expressive language.

Reflective journals showed that students began to understand oral tradition as a source of wisdom rather than old stories. They connected cultural values with contemporary issues, such as friendship, environmental care, family respect, social responsibility, and digital behavior. However, some students initially found it difficult to explain cultural values in written form. Teacher modelling and guiding questions helped improve their responses.

Intergenerational connection emerged as an important learning outcome. Students interviewed parents, grandparents, or community members to collect oral traditions. This activity helped students realize that cultural knowledge exists in their own families and communities. It also strengthened the relationship between school learning and community life.

Implementation Challenges

Despite positive outcomes, several challenges emerged. The first challenge was variation in students' familiarity with oral traditions. Some students knew many local stories and expressions, while others had limited exposure. The teacher addressed this by allowing students to bring oral traditions from different family backgrounds.

The second challenge was language adaptation. Some oral traditions contained archaic words, local-language expressions, or metaphorical meanings that were difficult for students. The teacher

provided vocabulary scaffolding, bilingual explanation, and contextual interpretation.

The third challenge was cultural sensitivity. Some oral traditions contained values, gender roles, or social assumptions that needed critical discussion. The teacher guided students to appreciate cultural heritage while also reflecting critically on values that may need reinterpretation in contemporary life.

Table 5 Implementation Challenges and Teacher Responses

Challenge	Classroom Evidence	Teacher Response
Unequal familiarity	Some students did not know local stories or proverbs	Allowed diverse family and community narratives
Difficult language	Oral texts contained archaic or figurative expressions	Provided vocabulary and contextual scaffolding
Cultural sensitivity	Some values required careful interpretation	Used critical and respectful discussion
Multiple versions	Students found different versions of the same story	Compared versions as oral tradition variation
Limited time	Storytelling and discussion required longer sessions	Selected shorter texts and focused learning tasks

Source: Synthesized from classroom observations and teacher notes.

2. Discussion

The findings show that oral tradition-based learning resources significantly improved students' language and cultural literacy. Students in the experimental group achieved higher posttest scores and greater gain than students in the control group. This indicates that oral tradition can function as an effective learning resource when it is systematically integrated into language instruction.

The improvement in reading comprehension suggests that culturally familiar texts can support students' engagement and understanding. When students encounter texts related to their community knowledge, they can activate prior experience. This aligns with culturally responsive pedagogy, which argues that students' cultural knowledge should be used as a bridge to academic learning (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Oral tradition made reading more meaningful because students could connect school texts with lived cultural contexts.

The qualitative findings show that oral tradition-based learning increased engagement because students recognized familiar cultural elements. This supports the concept of funds of knowledge, which emphasizes that students' households and communities contain rich knowledge that can support classroom learning (Moll, Amanti, Neff, &

Gonzalez, 1992). When students were invited to bring family stories and community sayings into the classroom, they became knowledge contributors rather than passive recipients.

The intergenerational connection found in this study is pedagogically important. Students asked parents or elders about oral traditions, which extended learning beyond the classroom. This process helped students recognize family and community members as cultural knowledge holders. It also supported heritage transmission, which is central to intangible cultural heritage education. UNESCO (2003) defines intangible cultural heritage as living practices and expressions that communities recognize as part of their cultural heritage, transmitted across generations and recreated in response to their environment and history.

However, the study also shows that oral tradition must be used critically. Some oral traditions may contain values that require reinterpretation in contemporary contexts. Teachers should avoid presenting culture as fixed, pure, or unquestionable. Instead, students should be guided to appreciate cultural heritage while also discussing how values can be understood in modern life. This approach aligns with critical literacy, which encourages students to examine texts, power, identity, and social meaning (Luke, 2012).

Comparison with Previous Studies

Narrative development research gives this a concrete basis. Peterson and McCabe (1983) and McCabe and Peterson (1991) traced how children's narrative structure develops and showed that it can be taught, while Egan (1988) argues that story is not a decorative wrapper for content but the form in which young learners most readily organise meaning. Nicolopoulou, Cortina, Ilgaz, Cates, and de Sa (2015) provide experimental support: a narrative- and play-based programme improved oral language, emergent literacy, and social competence among preschoolers. Cope and Kalantzis (2009) extend the argument through the multiliteracies framework, in which oral, visual, and written modes are treated as complementary designs for meaning rather than as a hierarchy.

The cultural dimension of the present findings connects to a well-developed body of work on culturally responsive teaching. Banks (2015) sets out the case for treating cultural diversity as curriculum content rather than as background, and Risko and Walker-Dalhousie (2007) show how tapping students' funds of knowledge changes what they are able to contribute in class. Paris (2012) and Paris and Alim (2014) push the argument further with culturally sustaining pedagogy, which asks schools not merely to acknowledge students' heritage

practices but to help sustain them, and Wearmouth (2017) documents what this looks like when applied specifically to literacy learning. The gains in cultural literacy reported here, which exceeded the gains in language performance, are consistent with that literature: when the text belongs to the students' own community, the interpretive work becomes theirs to do rather than the teacher's to explain.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

Theoretically, the results support a situated rather than a motivational reading of why oral tradition worked here. The gains were largest in the dimensions that required interpretation of meaning in context, and smallest in the dimensions that depend on formal language accuracy, which the oral material does not directly train. This pattern indicates that oral tradition contributes by supplying a text the students already have a relationship with, so that the interpretive work belongs to them and the teacher's role shifts from explaining the text to guiding the discussion of it. The finding that cultural literacy improved more than language performance should therefore be read as evidence of what the intervention actually did, not as a shortfall in language learning.

Pedagogically, three implications follow. First, oral tradition should be treated as primary learning material with its own structure, not as a warm-up before the textbook. The lessons that produced the strongest engagement were those in which the story carried the language objective rather than preceding it. Second, community members are a resource that schools underuse. Sessions involving a local storyteller produced discussion that teachers could not reproduce alone, because the storyteller could answer questions about meaning and provenance that are absent from written sources. Third, the transition from oral to written work needs to be planned. Students retold stories confidently but wrote about them weakly until the teacher supplied an explicit written frame, which suggests that oral fluency does not transfer to writing without instruction.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations qualify these findings. First, the study involved 88 students in two intact classes at one school in one cultural region, and oral traditions differ greatly between regions, so the results describe this setting rather than Indonesian schools generally. Second, the intervention lasted eight meetings and no delayed posttest was administered, so the durability of the gains is unknown. Third, cultural literacy was measured through a test and interviews rather than

through observed participation in community practice, which is arguably the outcome that matters most. Fourth, the students already had some familiarity with the traditions used, so the results may not extend to classrooms where the oral material is unfamiliar to the learners. Future research could compare regions with different oral traditions, add a delayed posttest, examine whether students' engagement with community practice changes outside school, and test explicit instruction in moving from oral retelling to written composition.

D. Conclusion

This study examined oral tradition as a learning resource for language and cultural literacy. The findings showed that students who learned through oral tradition-based resources achieved significantly higher literacy improvement than students who received conventional textbook-based instruction. The experimental group improved from a pretest mean score of 59.34 to a posttest mean score of 82.45, while the control group improved from 58.91 to 70.12. The posttest comparison showed a significant difference, $t(86) = 8.74$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 1.86$. Improvement occurred across reading comprehension, vocabulary interpretation, narrative understanding, cultural value identification, and reflective response, with the strongest gains in cultural value identification and narrative understanding. Qualitative findings revealed that oral tradition-based learning supported cultural familiarity, storytelling participation, vocabulary discovery, value reflection, and intergenerational connection. However, implementation challenges included unequal familiarity with oral traditions, difficult language, cultural sensitivity, multiple story versions, and limited instructional time. The study concludes that oral tradition can become an effective learning resource when teachers integrate it through storytelling, text analysis, retelling, discussion, value mapping, reflection, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Future research should examine digital documentation of oral traditions, teacher readiness, community-based curriculum design, and long-term effects on students' cultural identity and literacy development.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools only to improve English language quality, grammar, readability, sentence clarity, and academic expression. The AI tools were not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, produce findings, or draw conclusions. All conceptual arguments, data interpretation, methodological decisions, and scholarly conclusions remain the full

responsibility of the authors. The authors carefully reviewed, edited, and verified all AI-assisted outputs to ensure the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Bibliography

- Au, K. H. (1998). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30(2), 297-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862969809548000>
- Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7-15). London: Routledge.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448619>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). Multiliteracies: New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903076044>
- Egan, K. (1988). *Teaching as storytelling: An alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053002003>
- Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 49-76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500009039>
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hibbin, R. (2016). The psychosocial benefits of oral storytelling in school: Developing identity and empathy through narrative. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 34(4), 218-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2016.1225315>
- Isbell, R., Sobol, J., Lindauer, L., & Lowrance, A. (2004). The effects of storytelling and story reading on the oral language complexity and story comprehension of young children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(3), 157-163. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:ECEJ.0000048967.94189.a3>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>

- Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory Into Practice*, 51(1), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.636324>
- McCabe, A., & Peterson, C. (1991). *Developing narrative structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mills, K. A. (2010). A review of the digital turn in the New Literacy Studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(2), 246-271. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310364401>
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- Nicolopoulou, A., Cortina, K. S., Ilgaz, H., Cates, C. B., & de Sa, A. B. (2015). Using a narrative- and play-based activity to promote low-income preschoolers' oral language, emergent literacy, and social competence. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 31, 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.01.006>
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Methuen.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244>
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.982l873k2ht16m77>
- Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Risko, V. J., & Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2007). Tapping students' cultural funds of knowledge to address the achievement gap. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 98-100. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.1.12>
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Satriani, I. (2019). Storytelling in teaching literacy: Benefits and challenges. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 113-120.
- Street, B. V. (2003). What's new in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77-91.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wearmouth, J. (2017). Employing culturally responsive pedagogy to foster literacy learning in schools. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1295824. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1295824>