Interactive Communication Strategies to Support the Implementation of Multidimensional Literacy and Language Education in Inclusive Settings for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Eva Amalia
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: evaamalia.2020@student.uny.ac.id

Edi Purwanta
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: edi_purwanta@uny.ac.id

Widyastuti Purbani
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: purbani@uny.ac.id

Nanda Veruna Enun Kharisma
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: nandakharisma@unesa.ac.id

Zulfin Rachma Mufidah
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: zulfinmufidah@unesa.ac.id

Abstract
This study aimed to investigate how interactive communication strategies facilitate the implementation of multidimensional literacy (encompassing linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental aspects) in inclusive classrooms, with a particular emphasis on language education and the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (i.e., Quality Education). A qualitative case study was conducted in an inclusive elementary school in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Data were collected through participatory observation, semi-structured interviews with teachers and students, and document analysis. Findings show that teachers applied adaptive strategies such as open-ended questions, paraphrasing, positive feedback, visual cues, and choice-based questioning, enabling both regular and special needs students to participate actively. These strategies enhanced sentence construction, reading comprehension, sociocultural awareness, and self-confidence by fostering meaningful dialogue and adaptive scaffolding. The study highlights that interactive communication is not merely supportive but central to equitable, holistic literacy

and language education in inclusive contexts, contributing to inclusive and transformative education practices aligned with SDGs.

Keywords: Interactive communication; strategies; multidimensional literacy; inclusive education.

Introduction

Inclusive education views learner diversity as a strength that enriches the learning process, where differences in abilities, social backgrounds, and special educational needs are addressed through adaptive teaching strategies (Mbua, 2023). Many reports regarding inclusive education have been well-documented (Table 1).

Table 1. Previous studies on inclusive education

No	Title	Reference
1	Formation of the methodology of the project-activity game in inclusive higher education.	Glushchenko (2025)
2	Social inclusive education project (SIEP) as a community for handling children with special needs in rural areas.	Azizah *et al*., (2022)
3	Availability and challenges of inclusive lower primary education schools.	Egbedeyi and Babalola (2023)
4	Managing visually impaired students: Factors that support and inhibit inclusive programs in elementary.	Al Shaban Radi and Hanafi (2024)
5	Development of Traluli program of family-resourced early intervention for multiple disability and visual impairment (MDVI) children with fine motor impairment in inclusive school.	Rizqita *et al*., (2024)
6	Managing the social development of students with disabilities in inclusive universities: A conceptual approach.	Glushchenko and Trubacheyev (2025)
7	Inclusive education for children with disabilities: Overcoming challenges and embracing benefits for a more equitable future.	Nurullayevna *et al*., (2025)
8	Pedagogical strategies for enhancing inclusive education in Uzbekistan: Challenges, interventions, and social impact.	Bayramalievna *et al*., (2025)
9	Inclusive education for children with disabilities: Overcoming barriers and unlocking opportunities.	Nurullayevna *et al*., (2026)
10	Literacy program for elementary school students about inclusive education in recognizing children with special needs.	Faddillah *et al*., (2022)
11	A digital accessibility and inclusive design-based e-module in higher education: Does it work in a classroom with a deaf student?	Musayaroh *et al*., (2023)
12	Teachers' perceived barriers to inclusive education.	Adesokan and Bojuwoye (2023)
13	Overcoming barriers and implementing best practices in inclusive higher education: Strategies for accessibility, equity, and student support.	Oktamovna and Ruslanovna (2024)
14	Pedagogical and psychological factors for ensuring the sustainability of inclusive education in Uzbekistan.	Khudayshukurovna *et al*., (2024)
15	Individualized assessment strategies for students with special needs in inclusive classrooms.	Yunusovna *et al*., (2024)
16	Designing an inclusive employer-disability interaction mechanism in post-industrial conditions.	Glushchenko (2025)
17	Overcoming barriers to inclusive education in new Uzbekistan: Challenges, strategies, and future directions.	Nurullayevna *et al*., (2025)

In this context, literacy development is a critical component (Bayramalievna *et al*.,, 2025;

Putri and Susilawati, 2025; Zukmadini *et al.,*, 2024; Farokhah *et al.,*, 2025), understood not only as the mechanical skills of reading and writing but also as a multidimensional competence encompassing linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental aspects (Kalantzis and Cope, 2025; Kucer, 2015; Rowe and Weisleder, 2020). In language education, literacy also involves the ability to use language for meaning-making, critical thinking, and intercultural interaction, which forms the foundation for lifelong learning.

The multidimensional literacy model emphasizes that literacy is an interactive process shaped by language, meaning, experience, and sociocultural context (Kucer, 2015). This perspective aligns with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which highlight the importance of inclusive and equitable quality education for all. Achieving SDG 4 requires teaching approaches that integrate language education into literacy instruction so that all learners, regardless of their needs, can achieve academic success and active social participation.

Interactive communication plays an essential role in supporting this integration because it enables the exchange of meaning, the construction of understanding, and the connection of personal experiences to texts (Koul and Nayar, 2021). For learners with special educational needs, adaptive strategies such as simplified language, extended wait time, and multimodal support have been shown to enhance engagement and comprehension (Zagona *et al.,*, 2021). However, many inclusive classrooms still rely on one-way delivery of content, limiting opportunities for holistic literacy development (Lazou and Tsinakos, 2023).

The purpose of this study is to identify the forms, adaptive strategies, and impacts of interactive communication in supporting the implementation of multidimensional literacy in inclusive elementary school settings. The novelty of this study lies in positioning interactive communication as a core pedagogical component that integrates language education and inclusive practice while producing a context-specific model in Indonesia that can serve as practical guidance for achieving SDG 4 through equitable and transformative literacy instruction.

Literature review
Conceptualizing interactive communication

Interactive communication is a two-way communication process characterized by the active exchange of messages between two or more participants, in which each participant not only conveys messages but also responds, co-constructs meaning, and engages in ongoing negotiation within a social context (Abdullah, 2023). In educational contexts, particularly in inclusive learning environments, interactive communication refers to the dialogic, participatory, and responsive communication that occurs between teachers and students (and among students), tailored to their individual needs (Lapidot-Leffler, 2025).

Table 2 identifies five key elements in an interactive communication strategy that are essential to support the implementation of multidimensional literacy. These elements include: (1) two-way communication, where both parties take turns as sender and receiver of messages (Soler, 2021; Rogers, 1995); (2) feedback as an immediate or delayed response to a message received (Bretz and Dimock, 1983; Vargas *et al.,*, 2017); (3) active involvement that requires conscious participation in the dialogue process (Anderson, 1994; Cvetkovic, 2019); (4) socio-pragmatic aspects, namely the ability to understand social context and communicative intent in verbal and nonverbal forms (Vargas *et al.,*, 2017); and (5) control over content and media, which reflects the capacity of participants to manage or manipulate the form and content of communication media (Cvetkovic, 2019; Koolsra, 2009). These five elements complement each other in creating dialogical, reflective, and contextual communication, thus becoming an important basis for developing holistic and future-oriented literacy.

Table 2. Elements of interactive communication

Element	Explanation	Source
Two-way	Both parties alternately take roles as sender and receiver of the message.	Soler, 2021; Rogers, 1995
Feedback	Immediate or delayed response as a form of reaction to the message received.	Bretz and dimock, 1983; Vargas *et al.,,* 2017
Active Engagement	Participants are consciously involved in the dialogue process; not passive.	Anderson, 1994; Cvetkovic, 2019
Social-Pragmatic Aspect	The ability to understand social context and communicative intent in both verbal and nonverbal forms.	Vargas *et al.,,* 2017
Control over Content/Media	Participants can manage, direct, or manipulate the content and form of the communication media.	Cvetkovic, 2019; Koolstra, 2009

The multidimensional literacy

Multidimensional literacy, as conceptualized by literacy expert Kucer, suggests that for literacy instruction to be effective, it must be understood as dynamic, interconnected, and multidimensional (Kucer, 2015). According to Kucer, literacy involves the integration of key dimensions, which aligns with Alexander's multidimensional perspective theory. Other scholars support the view that literacy requires synergy between key dimensions, including linguistic, cognitive, and social aspects. Kucer's multidimensional literacy framework offers a holistic perspective on literacy. Kucer argues that rather than adhering strictly to curriculum standards, the focus should be on activating various dimensions of literacy to make it more meaningful (Kucer, 2015). Schools need to recognize that they may not yet have a clear approach to addressing students' diverse literacy needs. Kucer emphasizes that effective literacy teaching begins with understanding the child's cultural context. By incorporating the cultural (sociocultural) dimension, multidimensional literacy is expected to bring about positive change in addressing literacy challenges in inclusive schools (Pardo, 2004; Ferris, 2014; Kern, 2018).

The application of this approach is expected to improve the literacy skills of students with special needs. Multidimensional literacy offers a way to prevent the fragmentation of literacy into isolated disciplines, which could be detrimental if seen merely as a new "subject area" (Coelho, 2006). The strength of multidimensional literacy lies in the simplicity of its dimensions, which can be applied across various forms of literacy, avoiding the limitation of viewing literacy from a singular perspective. This approach aligns with elementary education, which emphasizes integration across disciplines (Sukartiningsih, 2016). Multidimensional literacy, in essence, revives John Dewey's idea of creating a continuity of experience between school and home. Such a literacy paradigm can be realized through the development of concrete learning models that explicitly help educators and stakeholders address literacy challenges in inclusive schools.

Research method

The research applied the qualitative case study. This qualitative research was conducted to explore in depth the practice of interactive communication in supporting the implementation of multidimensional literacy in inclusive classes. This approach was chosen because it allows researchers to understand contextually and holistically the phenomenon of communication between teachers and students in real learning situations in inclusive classes. Detailed information regarding this method is explained elsewhere (Susilawati *et al.,,* 2025).

In qualitative research, researchers have the autonomy to select participants who can be varied based on the depth of information needed and the nature of the investigation, ranging from one to twenty or more participants with justification (Subedi, 2021). This research was conducted in one of the state-inclusive elementary schools in the Special Region of Yogyakarta Province, Indonesia, with the following justifications: (i) implementing inclusive education, (ii) having students with special needs integrated into regular classes, and (iii) having teachers who actively implement literacy strategies in learning.

Table 3 presents the profile of the participants involved in this study, consisting of a total of 20 individuals with diverse educational backgrounds. Participants included 2 classroom teachers, 3 students with special needs, and 15 regular students. This composition reflects the context of inclusive learning, allowing for the analysis of educational interactions between teachers, regular students, and students with special needs in heterogeneous classroom situations, which are relevant for the study of multidimensional literacy and interactive communication strategies.

The main instrument in this study is the researcher himself, who acts as the key instrument, equipped with an observation guide, interview guide, and document analysis format. Data collection was carried out through (1) participatory observation, conducted for three months in literacy learning sessions that focused on verbal and nonverbal interactions between teachers and students, (2) semi-structured interviews, conducted with teachers and students to obtain data on perceptions and experiences related to Interactive communication practices during the learning process, (3) documentation, in the form of teacher diaries, student assignment portfolios, media and teaching materials used to support data triangulation.

Table 3. Participant's profile

Subjects	Numbers
Classroom teacher	2
Special needs students	3
Regular students	15

Data were analyzed using the Miles and Huberman (2014) model, through stages. Data reduction, compiling, and simplifying important data from field notes, interview results, and documentation. Data presentation, compiling data in the form of thematic and chronological matrices to facilitate understanding of relationships between categories. Conclusion drawing and verification, interpreting communication interaction patterns that support linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental literacy dimensions. Data validity is strengthened by source and technique triangulation techniques and member checks of research subjects.

Results

This study found that interactive communication carried out by teachers in inclusive classes contributed significantly to the development of four dimensions of literacy according to Stephen B. Kucer: linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental. The findings were categorized into three main themes:
   (i)   forms of interactive communication
   (ii)   adaptive communication strategies, and
   (iii)   their impact on students' literacy dimensions.

Forms of interactive communication applied by teachers

Observations during 8 learning sessions showed that teachers consistently used various forms of interactive communication, such as open-ended questions, paraphrasing, positive reinforcement, and two-way dialogue. Teachers also adjusted intonation, pauses, and the use of simple language when interacting with students with special needs.

Table 4 summarizes five adaptive communication strategies teachers used to support student interactions in inclusive classrooms, with adjustments to diverse learning needs. These strategies included simplified language (18 times), extended response time (12 times), repetition and paraphrasing (16 times), multimodal support (14 times), and choice-based questioning (10 times). Each strategy was targeted to a specific group of students (such as students with intellectual disabilities or communication delays) and supported multiple dimensions of literacy, including linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental. Examples of classroom interactions demonstrate how these strategies enhanced comprehension, encouraged participation, and built meaningful literacy engagement for all students.

Table 4. An interactive form of communication

Interactive Form of Communication	Frequency in 8 Sessions	Supported Literacy Dimension	Example in an Inclusive Classroom
Open-ended questions	27 times	Cognitive, Linguistic	Teacher: "Why do you think the main character didn't go home after school?" Student: "Maybe she was waiting for her friend or scared to go home alone."
Positive feedback	19 times	Development	Teacher: "Great job, using your own words to tell that story! I can see you're getting more confident."
Paraphrasing and reformulation	14 times	Linguistic, Sociocultural	Student: "He goes to the shop." Teacher: "Yes, he goes to the shop. What did he do there?"
Use of visuals/gestures	10 times	Sociocultural, Development	Teacher points to a picture of a market while signing 'buy': "What do you think she's buying here?" Student: "Fruit!"
Giving a choice of answers	12 times	Cognitive, Development	Teacher: "Did the girl run because she was scared, happy, or angry?" Student (with cognitive delay): "Scared!"

Adaptive communication strategy in teacher-student interaction

Teachers showed high flexibility in adjusting their speaking style to suit students' characteristics. For students with mild intellectual disabilities, teachers slow down their speaking tempo, simplify their sentences, and give students more wait time to respond. Meanwhile, for regular students, teachers encourage the exploration of ideas through open dialogue.

Table 5 shows that teachers consistently implemented various forms of interactive communication in inclusive classrooms, such as open-ended questions, positive feedback, paraphrasing, use of visuals/gestures, and providing answer choices. The most frequently used strategy was open-ended questions (27 times), followed by positive feedback (19 times), paraphrasing (14 times), providing answer choices (12 times), and visuals/gestures (10 times). All of these strategies support various dimensions of literacy, especially cognitive, linguistic,

sociocultural, and developmental, and help create responsive interactions and support the active engagement of all students.

Table 5. Interactive communication table

Strategy	Description	Target Group	Frequency (8 sessions)	Supported Literacy Dimensions	Classroom Interaction Example
Simplified Language	The teacher simplifies sentence structures and vocabulary to enhance understanding.	Students with intellectual delays	18 times	Linguistic, Cognitive	Teacher: "Now we read. First, what do we see?" Student: "A house."Teacher: "Yes, this is a house. Let's say it together: This is a house."
Wait Time Extension	The teacher allows a longer response time after asking questions to support thinking.	All students, especially SEN	12 times	Cognitive, Developmental	Teacher: "Why did the boy cry in the story?" (pauses for 6 seconds) Student: "Because he lost his toy." Teacher: "Yes, very thoughtful answer!"
Repetition and Rephrasing	The teacher repeats or paraphrases questions and student responses for clarity.	Both regular and SEN students	16 times	Linguistic, Sociocultural	Student: "She goes to school." Teacher: "She goes to school. Good try! Can you say it again with me?"
Multimodal Support	The teacher uses visuals, gestures, and facial expressions alongside verbal input.	Students with communication delays	14 times	Sociocultural, Developmental	The teacher holds a picture of a rainy cloud and uses their hand to mimic falling rain: "What is the weather like?"Student: "Rainy!"
Choice-Based Questioning	The teacher provides options to help students select an appropriate response.	Students with verbal limitations	10 times	Cognitive, Linguistic	Teacher: "Was the girl happy, sad, or angry?" (points to emoticons)Student: "Sad."Teacher: "Yes! She was sad because she lost her book."

Impact of interactive communication on literacy dimensions

Analysis of student documents and learning records shows that interactive communication supports student progress in various dimensions of literacy. Improvements are seen especially in the ability to construct simple sentences (linguistic dimension), understand reading context (cognitive), relate personal experiences to texts (sociocultural), and increase self-confidence when speaking (development).

Table 6 presents the literacy development of students in inclusive classes based on four dimensions of multidimensional literacy (linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental),

taking into account each individual's learning conditions. The data show that P1, a regular student, experienced significant improvements in writing short narratives, answering inferential questions, relating stories to family experiences, and actively participating in discussions. P2, a student with mild intellectual disabilities, demonstrated a basic understanding of the text, used simple phrases, related stories to familiar places, and showed increased self-confidence. P3, who had mild concentration difficulties, experienced improvements in oral expression, understood simple storylines, began to share personal experiences, and showed a reduction in passive behavior. P4, who had verbal communication difficulties, was helped through visual support and was able to recognize objects in the story, understand the social context (such as home, market, and school), and express her understanding through pictures. These findings suggest that interactive communication strategies in inclusive learning contribute significantly to students' literacy development across all dimensions, with observable progress even in students with diverse learning needs.

Table 6. Student literacy progress

Student	Learning Conditions	Linguistic Dimension	Cognitive Dimension	Sociocultural Dimension	Developmental Dimension
P1	Regular student	Improved (able to write a short narrative)	Improved (able to answer inference questions from reading)	Able to relate the story to family experiences	Actively participates in discussions
P2	Mild intellectual disability	Fair (uses simple phrases)	Basic (understands the basic meaning of texts)	Relates the story to familiar places	More self-confident
P3	Mild concentration difficulties	Improved (able to complete oral sentences)	Understands a simple story plot	Starts to mention personal experiences	Reduced passive behavior
P4	Verbal communication difficulties	Helped with visual support	Helped in understanding objects in the story	Recognizes social contexts (market, home, school)	Expressive with drawings

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that interactive communication strategies implemented by teachers in inclusive classes contribute significantly to the development of multidimensional literacy as formulated by Kucer (2014, 2015). Linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental dimensions develop simultaneously through meaningful interaction practices between teachers and students. Kucer (2014) emphasized that literacy is a dynamic and multidimensional process, involving the integration of language, meaning, social context, and individual development. This finding is reinforced by the findings which emphasize the importance of active involvement and feedback in building shared meaning. In this study, the use of open-ended questions, paraphrasing, and simplified language enabled students, including those with special needs, to understand the text and participate in learning meaningfully (Anderson, 1994; Vargas *et al*.,, 2017).

Following the interactive communication model of two-way communication and control over learning media are essential. Teachers in this study demonstrated flexibility by using multimodal strategies (visual, gesture, symbol) as which allowed students with communication

disabilities to still express their understanding (Soler-Adillon, 2021; Rogers,1995; Cvetkovic, 2019; Bretz and Dimock,1983). This strategy also supports the socio-pragmatic aspect, namely understanding the purpose of communication in a social context (Vargas *et al*., 2017). Emphasized the importance of the degree of interactivity in communication, which is reflected in the provision of answer choices and additional waiting time by the teacher (Koolstra, 2009). This supports students' cognitive engagement, that a holistic learning environment emphasizes adaptation to the individual needs of students (Koul and Nayar, 2021).

The emphasis on teacher responsiveness in communication practices is interactive communication does not only function as a medium for conveying information, but as an instrument for building student confidence, relationships, and empowerment in an inclusive environment (Abdullah, 2023; Lapidot-Leffler, 2025). Finally, the critical immersive-triggered literacy theory is emphasizes the importance of emotional and experiential involvement in the literacy process. In this study, developmental dimensions such as increasing students' self-confidence and self-expression are evidence that interactive communication supports learning that is not only cognitive, but also socially and affectively transformative (Lazou and Tsinako, 2023).

For further research, this study recommends strengthening teacher competencies in interactive communication strategies to support equitable multidimensional literacy in inclusive classrooms. Further research can explore how these strategies are implemented in various student needs and diverse learning contexts. It is also important to examine how teacher education programs integrate interactive communication in inclusive pedagogy. In addition, student engagement and learning outcomes in response to adaptive communication techniques can provide valuable insights.

Relevance to sustainable development goals (SDGs)

The findings of this study demonstrate that interactive communication strategies in inclusive classrooms directly support the realization of SDGs, which emphasize inclusive and equitable quality education and the promotion of lifelong learning opportunities for all. By implementing adaptive communication techniques such as open-ended questioning, paraphrasing, visual cues, and choice-based responses, teachers created an equitable learning environment that enabled both regular students and those with special educational needs to actively participate in literacy learning.

Students demonstrated measurable progress in linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental dimensions, with improved sentence construction, contextual comprehension, personal experience integration, and self-confidence. These outcomes align with the SDG 4 target of ensuring that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including through inclusive pedagogical practices. The emphasis on language education within multidimensional literacy further reinforces the SDG principle that quality education must be accessible, relevant, and adaptable to diverse learning needs.

Furthermore, the integration of interactive communication into classroom practice reflects the SDGs' focus on reducing educational disparities. The strategies observed in this study not only addressed academic competencies but also supported social participation and emotional growth, which are crucial for holistic development in diverse educational contexts. This suggests that embedding interactive communication into teacher training programs could serve as a scalable approach for advancing SDG 4 in other inclusive learning environments. Finally, this adds new information regarding SDGs as reported elsewhere (**Table 7**).

Table 7. Previous studies on SDGs

No	Title	Reference
1	Low-carbon food consumption for solving climate change mitigation: Literature review with bibliometric and simple calculation application for cultivating sustainability consciousness in facing sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Nurramadhani *et al*., (2024)
2	Towards sustainable wind energy: A systematic review of airfoil and blade technologies over the past 25 years for supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Krishnan *et al*., (2024)
3	Assessment of student awareness and application of eco-friendly curriculum and technologies in Indonesian higher education for supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs): A case study on environmental challenges.	Djirong *et al*., (2024)
4	A study on sustainable eggshell-derived hydroxyapatite/CMC membranes: Enhancing flexibility and thermal stability for sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Waardhani *et al*., (2025)
5	Integrating multi-stakeholder governance, engineering approaches, and bibliometric literature review insights for sustainable regional road maintenance: Contribution to sustainable development goals (SDGs) 9, 11, and 16.	Yustiarini *et al*., (2025)
6	Innovative nanofluid encapsulation in solar stills: Boosting water yield and efficiency under extreme climate, supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Namoussa *et al*., (2025)
7	Modernization of Submersible Pump Designs for Sustainable Irrigation: A Bibliometric and Experimental Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	Glovatskii *et al*., (2025)
8	Sustainable development goals (SDGs) in engineering education: Definitions, research trends, bibliometric insights, and strategic approaches.	Ragadhita *et al*., (2026)
9	Effect of substrate and water on cultivation of Sumba seaworm (nyale) and experimental practicum design for improving critical and creative thinking skills of prospective science teacher in biology and supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Kerans *et al*., (2024)
10	Characteristics of jengkol peel (Pithecellobium jiringa) biochar produced at various pyrolysis temperatures for enhanced agricultural waste management and supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Rahmat *et al*., (2025)
11	Contributing factors to greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture for supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs): Insights from a systematic literature review completed by computational bibliometric analysis.	Soegoto *et al*., (2025)
12	Sustainable packaging: Bioplastics as a low-carbon future step for the sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Basnur *et al*., (2024)
13	Production of wet organic waste ecoenzymes as an alternative solution for environmental conservation supporting sustainable development goals (SDGs): A techno-economic and bibliometric analysis.	Sesrita *et al*., (2025)
14	Hazard identification, risk assessment, and determining control (HIRADC) for workplace safety in manufacturing industry: A risk-control framework complete with bibliometric literature review analysis to support sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Henny *et al*., (2025)
15	Techno-economic analysis of production ecobrick from plastic waste to support sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Syahrudin *et al*., (2026)
16	Techno-economic analysis of sawdust-based trash cans and their contribution to Indonesia's green tourism policy and the sustainable development goals (SDGs).	Apriliani *et al*., (2026)

Conclusion

This study concludes that interactive communication is a fundamental component in implementing multidimensional literacy in inclusive classrooms, integrating linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental dimensions. Strategies such as open-ended questions, paraphrasing, positive feedback, visual cues, and choice-based responses enabled both regular and special needs students to participate actively and develop essential language and literacy skills. These practices contribute to achieving SDGs by promoting inclusive, equitable, and high-quality education. Strengthening teacher competence in adaptive and responsive communication is essential for ensuring that all learners benefit from transformative literacy instruction in diverse educational settings.

Declaration of conflicting interest
The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this work.

References
Adesokan, A., and Bojuwoye, O. (2023). Teachers' perceived barriers to inclusive education. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 2*(2), 91-96.

Al Shaban Radi, H.M., and Hanafi, Z. (2024). Managing visually impaired students: Factors that support and inhibit inclusive programs in elementary. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 4*(1), 19-28.

Anderson, L. E. (1994). A new look at an old construct: Cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*(3), 293-328.

Azizah, N., Prasetyo, A.C., Dini, N., Wulandari, V., and Kruesa, M. (2022). Social inclusive education project (SIEP) as a community for handling children with special needs in rural areas. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 2*(2), 89-98.

Bayramalievna, T.G., Komila, S., and Makhliyo, A. (2025). Information and media literacy in education: Enhancing learning, thinking, and values in the digital age. *Indonesian Journal of Multidiciplinary Research, 5*(2), 255-260.

Bayramalievna, T.G., Marjona, A., and Guljakhon, M. (2025). Pedagogical strategies for enhancing inclusive education in Uzbekistan: Challenges, interventions, and social impact. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 5*(1), 41-46.

Bin Abdullah, T. B. A. (2023). The effectiveness of interactive communication channels in facilitating two-way communication between employees at STC. *Egyptian Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22*(3), 197-232.

Bretz, D. D., and Dimock Jr, R. V. (1983). Behaviorally important characteristics of the mucous trail of the marine gastropod Ilyanassa obsoleta (Say). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 71*(2), 181-191.

Coelho, E. (2006). Beyond the Beginnings: Literacy Interventions for Upper Elementary English Language Learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 62*(3), 471-473.

Egbedeyi, T.F., and Babalola, A.E. (2023). Availability and challenges of inclusive lower primary education schools. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 3*(2), 93-102.

Faddillah, R.N., Nandiyanto, A.B.D., and Bilad, M.R. (2022). Literacy program for elementary school students about inclusive education in recognizing children with special needs. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 1*(1), 1-8.

Farokhah, L., Herman, T., Wahyudin, W., Khasanah, L.A.I.U., Zulfadhli, M., Abidin, Z., Huda, M.M., and Ariffiando, N.F. (2025). How to teach fraction for empowering student mathematics literacy: Definition, bibliometric, and application using digital module. *ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering, 5*(1), 77-102.

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing, 19*, 6-23.

Glushchenko, V.V. (2025). Designing an inclusive employer-disability interaction mechanism in post-industrial conditions. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 4*(1), 11-16.

Glushchenko, V.V. (2025). Formation of the methodology of the project-activity game in inclusive higher education. *Indonesian Journal of Multidiciplinary Research, 5*(1), 53-58.

Glushchenko, V.V., and Trubacheyev, E.V. (2025). Managing the social development of students with disabilities in inclusive universities: A conceptual approach. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 5*(1), 1-6.

Kalantzis, M., and Cope, B. (2025). Literacy in the time of Artificial Intelligence. *Reading Research Quarterly, 60*(1), e591.

Kern, R. (2018). Five Principles of a Relational Pedagogy: Integrating Social, Individual, and Material Dimensions of Language Use. *Journal of Technology & Chinese Language Teaching, 9*(2).

Khudayshukurovna, K.S., Asror, S.F., Nusrat, N.M., and Adamboy, M.K. (2024). Pedagogical and psychological factors for ensuring the sustainability of inclusive education in Uzbekistan. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 3*(2), 115-126.

Koolstra, C. M., and Bos, M. J. (2009). The development of an instrument to determine different levels of interactivity. *International Communication Gazette, 71*(5), 373-391.

Koul, S., and Nayar, B. (2021). The holistic learning educational ecosystem: A classroom 4.0 perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly, 75*(1), 98-112.

Kucer, S. B. (2015). Literacy: Varied, dynamic, and multidimensional. Journal of Family Strengths, 15(2), 1.

Lapidot-Lefler, N. (2025). Teacher responsiveness in inclusive education: A participatory study of pedagogical practice, well-being, and sustainability. *Sustainability, 17*(7), 2919.

Lazou, C., and Tsinakos, A. (2023). Critical immersive-triggered literacy as a key component for inclusive digital education. *Education Sciences, 13*(7), 696.

Mbua, E. M. (2023). Inclusive Education. *Principal Leadership, 7*(1), 1-25.

Musayaroh, S., Asmiati, N., Utami, Y.T., Mulia, D., Sidik, S.A., Abadi, R.F., Pratama, T.Y., Maslahah, S., and Pramudyo, A.S. (2023). A digital accessibility and inclusive design-based e-module in higher education: Does it work in a classroom with a deaf student?. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 2*(1), 55-60.

Nurullayevna, I.S., Elyorali, B.S., and Yusubjamol, A.O. (2025). Overcoming barriers to inclusive education in new Uzbekistan: Challenges, strategies, and future directions. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 4*(1), 63-72.

Nurullayevna, I.S., Ismatjon, N.S., and Musulmonqul, P.M. (2026). Inclusive education for children with disabilities: Overcoming barriers and unlocking opportunities. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 5*(2), 1-8.

Nurullayevna, I.S., Maxmud, X.Z., and Jaloliddin, M.S. (2025). Inclusive education for children with disabilities: Overcoming challenges and embracing benefits for a more equitable future. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 5*(1), 27-32.

Oktamovna, K.M., and Ruslanovna, K.T.A.M.B. (2024). Overcoming barriers and implementing best practices in inclusive higher education: Strategies for accessibility, equity, and student support. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 3*(2), 105-114.

Pardo, L. S. (2004). What every teacher needs to know about comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(3), 272-280.

Pocaan, J. (2022). Exploring teaching strategies and challenges towards a holistic context-based special education teaching strategies program. *The Normal Lights, 16*(1).

Putri, D.J.H., and Susilawati, E. (2025). The influence of digital literacy and product innovation on the competitive advantage of modern beverage businesses. *Indonesian Journal of Multidiciplinary Research, 5(*2), 349-358.

Rizqita, A.J., Sunardi, S., and Bela, M.R.W.A.T. (2024). Development of Traluli program of family-resourced early intervention for multiple disability and visual impairment (MDVI) children with fine motor impairment in inclusive school. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 4*(1), 65-74.

Rowe, M. L., and Weisleder, A. (2020). Language development in context. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 2*(1), 201-223.

Soler-Adillon, J. (2021). Espais que parlen: The Smallest of Worlds. *Mosaic*, (195), 6. https://doi.org/10.7238/m.n195.2132.

Subedi, K. R. (2021). Determining the sample in qualitative research. Online Submission, 4, 1-13.

Sukartiningsih, W., and Subroto, W. T. (2016). Need Analysis Integrative Collaboration Learning in Indonesian Education Course. *Man In India, 96*(11), 4715-4727.

Susilawati, A., Al-Obaidi, A.S.M., Abduh, A., Irwansyah, F.S., and Nandiyanto, A.B.D. (2025). How to do research methodology: From literature review, bibliometric, step-by-step research stages, to practical examples in science and engineering education. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Technology, 10*(1), 1-40.

Yunusovna, F.U., Bakhromjon, M.S., and Akhmadali, A.U. (2024). Individualized assessment strategies for students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. *ASEAN Journal of Community and Special Needs Education, 3*(2), 127-136.

Zagona, A. L., Lansey, K. R., Kurth, J. A., and Kuhlemeier, A. (2021). Fostering participation during literacy instruction in inclusive classrooms for students with complex support needs: Educators' strategies and perspectives. *The Journal of Special Education, 55*(1), 34-44.

Zukmadini, A.Y., Rohman, F., Dharmawan, A., Sari, M.S., Rochman, S., and Razak, S.A. (2024). Potential biodiversity from ethnozoology of Enggano Island: Utilization, a quantitative analysis, list of animals conserved by local people, and application of research findings empowering species literacy in biology student teachers. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Technology, 9*(2), 463-496.