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Abstract
This study aims at developing Egyptian English majors’ literary analysis competence through a teaching model, developed by the researcher, based on intertextuality. The researcher’s own experience, the previous studies and the pilot study conducted on a group of third year English majors proved that they lack the competence of analyzing literary texts and they rely on their instructors and the online notes to tackle literary works. Hence, the researcher designed an intertextual teaching model to overcome this lack in literary analysis competence. The design of the study was one group pre–posttest design where the researcher developed two instruments: a pre–post literary analysis test, and a scoring rubric for the students’ answers. Participants were 30 third year English majors, educational section. T–test was used to measure the differences between students’ performance before and after the treatment. Results proved that the model had a positive effect on developing students’ literary analysis competences, namely; analyzing the different points of view in the text, analyzing features and types of characterization, reflecting on the title and the symbolic features in the text, comparing and contrasting two literary works to identify the intertextual elements, recognizing evidences proving
a universal truth, philosophy or debate, relating the story to their lives and identifying the relevance of plot structure to self-
formation/ self-awareness.
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مستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية لتمييز كفاءات تحليل النص الأدبي من خلال نموذج تدريسي قائمًا على استخدام النصوص من إعداد الباحثة. ومن خلال خبرة الباحثة والدراسات السابقة والتجربة الاستطلاعية التي أجريت على مجموعة من الطلبة المعلمين بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية وجد أنهم يفتقرون إلى كفاءات تحليل النص الأدبي ويعتمدون على أساتذتهم وكذلك المخصصات المنشورة على الإنترنت دون إداني جهد منهن. بناءً على ذلك قامت الباحثة بتصميم النموذج التدريسي لتمييز تلك الكفاءات. و تكونت عينة البحث من 30 طالبًا معلمًا بالفرقة الثالثة قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية البنات جامعه عين شمس. أتت الدراسة تصميم المجموعة الواحدة وتم تطبيق اختبار قبلي – بعدي لقياس تلك الكفاءات و كذلك استخدم مقياس متدرج لتصحيح اجابة (من تصميم الباحثة). أثبتت المعالج الإحصائي للنتائج قبل وبعد التطبيق فعالية النموذج التدريس لتمييز كفاءات تحليل النص الأدبي و هي كالآتي: تحليل الرؤى السردية للشخصيات - تحيل العنوان و ملامح الرمزية في النص - أدرك ملامح الشخصيات المختلفة - مقارنة نصين لاستخراج عناصر التناص بينهما - ربط أحداث العمل بواقع الطالبات - تحديد مدى ارتباط تطور الأحداث في الحبكة القصصيه بادراك الذات/ تحقيق الذات لدى الشخصيات و اخيرا استكشاف أدلل نصية للحقائق و الفلسفات و القضايا الجدلية في النص و علاقتها بالواقع.
1. Introduction

Teaching/learning literature is an inseparable and indispensable part of any EFL curriculum in English Departments at both Faculties of Arts and Faculties of Education. A learner of a foreign language would never be able to understand the foreign language and interact with its people without being aware of its culture, traditions, customs, and history. Learning any language out of its social, political and economic contexts does not mean that the learner has actually acquired it. Language acquisition does not mean the mastery of language usage solely; understanding the context of the language is as important and essential as the mastery of its linguistic aspects. Literature is the art of life, the presentation of language in its real context; in its cultural, historical and psychological real representation. In short, literature is the reflection of the life of any nation.

Besides the social, political and cultural factors, the study of literature has a remarkable value for those who study it as it provides an accurate representation of the human experience with all its virtues, evils, motives, aspirations and failures. A student of literature is supposed to have the ability to accept and tolerate the differences between the self and the others. Therefore, a student of literature is supposed to have an intellectual depth, the
ability to analyze, criticize, and filter whatever presented to him/her from different sources by examining it and determining its values, accuracy and validity.

Linguistically, the language of literature not only encourages students to study language in terms of form, but they also study a more complex and sophisticated language that students cannot encounter in any other texts designed for educational purposes. Literary materials are more effective and attractive than boring ones often developed for strict grammatical and syntactic purposes and used mechanically in language classrooms. In this case, literature can evoke learners’ interest in language learning, helping them to overcome boredom in dry language learning lessons. They learn the rhetoric, the ethics and the literariness of the language and thus acquire the essential step for literary appreciation skills. In short, students should master the literary analysis competences to be able to understand and appreciate literature.

Among the recent trends in teaching literature is the critical literary approach “intertextuality”. It refers to the way meaning is constructed across communication between author, reader and networks of texts (Barthes, 1977; Kristeva, 1980; Harris & McKenzie, 2005). The making of meaning depends on
relationships to previous textual experiences on which readers can draw (Kristeva, 1980), and readers move within and across texts to present their own insight in order to interpret.

Tackling texts through this way of meaning-making where a relation between the text and the reader is established, would develop students’ imagination, enhance their previous experiences and reading and relate literature to their personal life and cultural context. If the aim of English Departments at Faculties of Art and Faculties of Education is to encourage students to read varied literary texts to develop their literary competences, intertextuality would be one of the successful approaches to do effectively this task. It encourages them to read, connect, evaluate and compare and contrast various literary texts.

1.2 Review of Literature

Simply speaking, literature is language in a meaningful context. It touches the reader’s mind and soul; and thus enjoyment of reading sparks. It provides different styles of writing, which, in turn, fosters reader’s skills of evaluation and literary appreciation. It also increases the reader’s knowledge of the world around. Literature in this way, plays multiple roles: a) the spiritual role where it arises reader’s feelings of sympathy, love, hate, pain and happiness, isolation, nostalgia, loneliness. b) the
linguistic role where it improves the reader’s language proficiency, 
c) the role of self-development where it affects the reader’s 
character and his/her behavioural and intellectual development, 
and d) finally, the reasoning and the interpretational role where 
the reader examines, analyzes, and justifies whatever s/he reads 
and interprets whatever read relying on her/his schema.

Many scholars identified the reasons behind teaching 
literature such as Tarakcioglu (2003), Floris (2004), Hismanouglu 
(2005), Sell (2005), Yılmaz (2012), Rahimi (4014) and Yimwailhi 
(2015). These reasons could be summarized in the following four 
features: Language enrichment, Cultural enrichment, Authentic 
enrichment and Personal involvement.

*Language enrichment:* literature helps students to improve 
their linguistic skill because they are exposed to different linguistic 
structures of texts. It provides the readers with the possibility to 
experience a genuine language context through a variety of 
different styles of writing. It develops their language acquisition, 
vocabulary, syntactic and linguistic uses of the language.

*Cultural enrichment:* students are exposed to different cultures 
with wide range of points of views, customs and traditions. By 
studying literature students add another world to their own world.

*Authentic enrichment:* one can ensure that literature
provides students (readers) with life–like presentations of human experiences. Students can visualize the imaginary characters, dramatic situations in a literary work into their own real world. Writers can use their literary devices and techniques skillfully to create a semi–real world i.e. literalize the world.

*Personal involvement/ personal growth:* the student should become engrossed in the literary work and be able to maintain a distance at the same time. S/he should constitute human contact with the text by interacting with its vivid pages; that is what is meant by involvement. While personal growth refers to the improvement of student’s awareness of the other as well as the self. The reading experience develops her/his social skills; feelings and emotions about the self and the other. Hence, literature does not only develop student’s own interpretation of the literary work but also enable them express their own feelings and ideas. It also develops their creativity and critical analysis skills.

That is why the study of literature is compulsory for those who study at the departments of English language at the university level. Among the various objectives determined by these departments, is that of developing students’ literary competence.
Brumfit and Carter (2000:15) mentioned that literary texts provide the reader with language resources to be examined and the reader should be active to make sense of the text to exploit it to develop his literary competence. In order to achieve such aim, they added, students need to build a relationship with the text by correlating the events of the text to their own experiences, to relate the characters to real people they once met, know or heard about. For Culler (2002: 132) literary competence is the awareness of language conventions as well as the knowledge of the conventions by which the literary work is written. The reader who acquires language conventions well can understand the language of the text and understand the meaning of the sentences, but can never grasp the implied meanings, and never be able to interpret the text and appreciate its aesthetics without mastering the knowledge of literary devices.

The literary competence is also referred to as the ability to experience, evaluate and critically analyze the text, and the ability to “create and re–create literature”, to experience its cognitive, ethical and aesthetic effects, “fictionality, and literariness”. It is a combination of reading, discovering, questing and re–creating (Zbogar (2015:122). It also is as the ability to perceive and evaluate one’s own worth as well as the other’s, to evaluate the
devices of the literary work and grasp its meaning (Magulod: 2018). Other critics (Brumfit and Carter: 1986, Torell: 2001 and Willand: 2016) specify the literary competence as students’ ability to interpret and evaluate texts where interpretation depends on:

i) Synthesizing the parts to draw interpretation. The sub–skills under this heading are: to draw inferences, to make generalizations, to be able to anticipate outcomes, to make comparisons, to sense motives and to discover new relationships.

ii) Responding to the tone, attitude and personality of the writer grasping suggestions and implications.

iii) Responding to the features of language through which the artistic expression had been achieved.

iv) Grasping the structure of the language.

While evaluation involves the following sub–skills

i) The ability to read critically and evaluate the writer’s success in affecting the reader; his own philosophy of life and the techniques used for this.

ii) The ability to express a pattern of preference

iii) The ability of creative writing which activates the reader’s own imagination.

Based on the previously mentioned survey, one can indicate that the literary competence is a complex one that
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consists of two elements; poetics and hermeneutics. Poetics deals with literary meaning where the reader can identify the plot, themes, visualize characters through the given details, evaluate events and situations, detect the significance of the title and recognize symbolism (Culler: 2002 and Hapasari: 2016); whereas, hermeneutics deals with the form of the text, the cultural features provided such as values, social structure, traditions, beliefs, as well as the use of idioms and proverbs which necessarily affect the poetic detection (Misson and Morgan: 2006). Thus, literature instructors should take into account both elements because each affects the understanding of the other.

There are two main approaches to tackle literature. One is directed towards gaining information; this is referred to as “Efferent mode” where the content that gives the reader information is the important one. The other approach is the “Aesthetic mode”, where what the reader experiences during the reading process is important, what s/he brings to the text and what the text brings to her/him is the most important (Rosemblatt: 1995). Therefore, developing this competence is not an easy task and needs an approach that challenges the students’ abilities and encourages them to be more involved in the text. The approach that should be implemented to the
Egyptian students should follow the aesthetic mode, which is in the same line with the poetics element from on the one hand and takes into consideration also the hermeneutics element, on the other.

The basic concept and the origin of intertextuality may be traced back to the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913). For Saussure language is a generalized and abstract system. This system is based on linguistic signs which are comprised of signified (concepts) and signifiers (sound–image). He explains that signs do not exist by their own. They exist within a system and produce meaning through similarity to and difference with other signs. Thus, all signs are “differential” and they are shadowed by a vast number of “relations” (Zengin:2016).

Moving from linguistic sign to literary sign, it is argued that authors of literary works do not choose their words from the language system only but from previous literary texts and traditions such as the plot, characters, images, manner of narration, phrases and sentences, either intentionally or accidentally. Thus, the literary text could be understood in relation with vast amount of other texts in a comparative way (differential and referential) (Haberer:2007).
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Bakhtin (1980), a major post-structuralist theorist, highlighted, in his book “The Dialogic Imagination” which was first published 1975, the social context in which words are exchanged. He argued that the language has its special meaning from the context it belongs to; social, cultural and the moment of utterance and reception. Hence, Bakhtin coined the term “Dialogism”, where dialogic speech involves multiple speakers with multiple voices, perspectives, and points of view. In a fictional work the “double-voiced” word may refer to irony, parody where the reader can interpret the meaning through two manners: the dictionary meaning and the implicit meaning (Bakhtin:1980, Allen:2000). For Bakhtin, relying on “double-voiced” term, all utterances depend on other utterances where no utterance is singular by itself but “Shot through with other, competing and conflicting ones”. Thus, for Bakhtin language is never one’s own, and there is no absolute interpretation because every utterance is a response to previous utterances and “elicits” further utterances (Bakhtin: 1980).

Later, the French post-structuralist, Kristeva coined the term intertextuality. She was influenced by both Saussure’s “theory of sign” and Bakhtin’s “Dialogism”. She differed from Saussure in the sense that Saussure neglected the human
subject known as “human agency”, while she agreed with Bakhtin who gave human subject great importance because language is a social aspect (Kristeva: 1980). For Kristeva, a text does not have exact clear and stable meaning because it embodies social and cultural elements that affect its meaning. In Kristeva’s view the term intertextuality refers to the dialogic nature of literary language. The literary text is a product of pre-existing codes, discourses and texts. The meaning of the text may be either “inside the text” which is the reader’s view or “outside the text” which is the society’s influence (Kristeva, 1980).

Thus, intertextuality is the interaction of the text with texts. Kristeva identified two intertextual dimensions: the horizontal one and the vertical one. Horizontal intertextuality refers to a dialogic relation between a text and those which precede and follow it. The horizontal dimension involves concrete reference to and straight quotation from other texts. While the vertical dimension refers to the relation between the text and the other texts from the historical, social and cultural relations on the one hand and the contemporary context on the other (Allen: 2000, Bazerman: 2003 & 2004, Haberer: 2007 and Zengin: 2016).
Intertextuality as an instructional approach

Though intertextuality is a linguistic and literary concept, it could be utilized as an instructional approach in the EFL classroom; basically in classes studying literature where instructors can benefit from it to achieve several objectives. Reading literary texts in light of intertextuality, students would be able to:

- Make connections between what they read and what they have already read previously or what they should read to fill in some gaps in the existing text.
- Develop their schemata. Intertextuality is closely related to the schema theory where students have to activate their prior knowledge to grasp the meaning of the text and be able to interpret it. They have to activate their linguistic, social, and cultural prior knowledge to be able to build upon and process new knowledge.
- Develop their interpretation skill of meaning–making by being exposed to multiple texts through exploring, analyzing, comparing and evaluating these texts.
- Develop critical reading and creative reading skills where they present new ideas, points of views, and their own meaning–making interpretations through the interaction suggested by intertextuality between the reader, the author and the text.
• Develop their literary competence. Intertextuality is somehow related to literary competence where literary competence consists of two dimensions: the hermeneutics, and the poetics. Intertextuality, as presented by Kristeva and her postmodern successors, relies on both linguistic element (the concept of signs) and the literary, social interpretive element (Dialogism). The text interpretation, therefore, depends on understanding it on the word and sentence level, cultural and social level, and the aesthetic level putting much emphasis on the reader’s role (human agency) of this interpretation. This means that the interpretation of the text as an accumulation of several, previous texts (intertextual vision) needs students who master the literary competences with its two dimensions: analyzing characters, tone, language structure and style, motives, as well as discovering new relations, making comparisons, evaluating and reflecting on social and cultural circumstances etc.
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(2011), Gregory (2007), Jameson (2006), Zhang (2000) and Hartman (1995). The present study differs from the previously mentioned studies in that it is conducted on Egyptian English majors with the aim of developing their literary competences. Although some of these studies suggested models of teaching but none of them has provided specific teaching procedures following certain phases or steps. As a result, the researcher of the present study suggested three procedural phases specifically designed to develop literary competences.

1.3 Context of the problem

In the case of the Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University, most of the students who join English Language and its Literature Department (Educational section) are graduated from governmental schools where they have never studied literature except at their secondary stage. They approached literature from the angle of studying a simplified short story. The type of questions they were trained to answer were mostly (Wh) questions. The quotations’ questions were answered at the surface level where they were required to identify the situation of this quotation, said by who to whom, then explain the situation. When they join the English Department they are shocked that they have to read critically lengthy original texts, analyzing,
evaluating and presenting their own points of view.

Lacking in the literary competences, required to tackle such literary works, students rely entirely on their instructors’ analysis and evaluation, and on the internet and simplified study guides. Students’ role is to takenotes and memorize the others’ evaluation.

For more documentation of the problem, namely, students’ lack of literary analysis competences,, the researcher examined tw factors, previous studies and a short pilot study implemented on the sample of third–year English majors’ (educational section), Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University.

1.3.1. Previous studies

Studies conducted on samples of Egyptian students enrolled in English Departments at Faculties of Education such as those of Abusafi (2015), Sheir, Soltan & El–Hilaly (2014), Soliman (2011), Soltan (2010), Soliman & Gaballah (2006), Soliman (2006), Badawi (2004), Al–Alami (2003) indicated that:
1) English majors suffer considerable weakness in their ability to analyze literary texts.
2) They usually depend on their instructors to provide them with their own points of view and their own analysis. On their part, students adopt their instructors’ explanation and interpretation.
3) Students rely on simplified notes where character analysis, events evaluation are presented without doing any effort.

1.3.2. Pilot Study

A test based on the short story “The Dinner Party” by Mona Gardner (see appendix 1) has been conducted by the researcher for a sample of 20 third Year English Language Majors, Educational section, to critically analyze the text and answer 5 questions testing the competences of reflecting on the significance of the title, analyzing features and types of characterization, recognizing evidence proving universal truth, philosophy, or debate, comparing and contrasting two literary texts to identify the intertextual elements and relating the story to their life. Table 1 below presents the results of the pilot study.

Table (1) English majors’ performance in the pilot study literary analysis skills test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Analysis Skills</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the significance of the title</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze features and types of characterization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize evidence of a universal truth, philosophy, or debate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare and contrast two literary works to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Results of the pilot study indicated that: (see appendix 2)

1. Students were unable to evaluate the title where 75% choose the author’s title without sound justification, while only 25% = 5 students chose the other two choices providing poor justification for their choices.

2. Students’ evaluation of the character of the colonel could not exceed the surface level where 65% could not elaborate on his character; they could not go deeply in his mind; exploring much of his inner thoughts. Only 35% = 7 students managed to reveal some characteristics of the colonel’s character though they could not elaborate more.

3. Concerning the skill dealing with providing evidence of universal truth, philosophy or debate 80% of the students could not find this relation while only 20 % = 4 students approached the debate.

4. Most of the students (90%) could not find any relation between the overall idea of the short story and any work of art they know except for only 10% = 2 students only.

5. Relating the story to their life, 40% = 8 of the students managed to narrate a situation resembling one of the ideas
presented in the short story, while 60% could not find the relation between the story and their life.

Based on the previous studies and the pilot study, the researcher can ensure the existence of a problem concerning literary analysis skills required for English majors.

Statement of the Problem

The study problem can be identified in the poor mastery of the necessary literary analysis skills of third year English majors at Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University. This may be attributed to many factors such as the traditional methods of teaching adopted in teaching literature. Therefore, the current study attempted to develop English Language majors’ literary analysis skills through a suggested teaching model based on intertextuality.

1.4 Study questions and Hypotheses

The study sought to provide answers to the following main question:
What is the effect of a suggested teaching model based on intertextuality to develop English majors’ literary analysis competence?

From this main question, the following sub-questions emerged:

1- What is the theoretical base of the suggested teaching
model based on intertextuality to develop English majors’ literary analysis competence?

2– What are the features of the suggested teaching model based on intertextuality to develop English majors’ literary analysis competence?

3– What are the literary analysis competences suitable for third year English majors (Educational section)?

4– How far will the suggested teaching model based on intertextuality help to develop third year English majors’ literary analysis competence?

Based on the previous surveyed, it was hypothesized that:

1) There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of third year English majors’ (English section) performance on the pre–post overall literary analysis competence test at 0.01 level of significance in favour of the post test.

2) There will be statistically significant differences between the mean scores of third year English majors’ (English section) performance on the pre–post literary analysis sub–competences test at 0.01 level of significance in favour of the post –test.

2– Delimitations of the study

The present study is limited to:
1) Third year English majors, educational section, Faculty of Girls for Arts, Science and Education, Ain Shams University.

2) Literary analysis competences namely: analyzing the different points of view in the text, analyzing features and types of characterization, reflecting on the title and the symbolic features in the text, comparing and contrasting two literary works to identify the intertextual elements, citing evidenced proving a universal truth, philosophy or debate, relating the story to their lives, identifying the relevance of plot structure to the self-formation/self-awareness.

3) Two films representing the literary texts provided by BBC which are *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte and *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens (the BBC versions are chosen because they follow the exact printed text events and the exact words uttered by the characters as presented by the novelists without any modifications neither by adding nor by omitting).

4) Extracts from the two novels *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte and *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens to be read for in depth analysis.
3– Definition of terms

Intertextuality

Intertextuality, for Kristeva, refers to the construction of the text from the existent texts or discourses. She argued that authors’ texts do not generate from a vacuum but constructed from pre–existent texts. The meaning of the text springs from the socially and culturally pre–existent meanings. Therefore, the meaning of a text can be derived from both ‘inside’ or ‘Reader’s view’ and ‘outside’ or ‘social and cultural milieu’ of the text. Thus, Kristeva (1980: 36) defines intertextuality as “A permutation of texts, intertextuality in the space of a given text,’ in which ‘several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another.”

Bazerman (2014: 86) defines intertextuality as “The explicit and implicit relations that a text or utterance has to prior, contemporary and potential future texts. Through such relations a text evokes a representation of the discourse situation, the textual resources that bear on the situation, and how the current text positions itself and draws on other texts”.

Operational definition of intertextuality

In the present research intertextuality refers to the third year English majors’ ability to find a textual relation between two
literary texts; namely, the novel *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte and the novel *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens where students identify the explicit and implicit features that exist in both texts. Besides, students’ ability to interpret the texts relying on their social and cultural contexts with the aim of developing their literary analytic competences.

**Literary analysis competences**

For Torell (2001: 378) literary competences do not only refer to answering literary questions or finding information or opinion, but to search for and understand the self as well as understanding the other. This could be achieved through what the text brings to the reader as well as what readers bring to the text relying on their own social and cultural context.

For Kucer (2005) literary competence does not logically mean unfolding the text but rather, interacting with it. It refers to the readers’ ability to understand and interact with the text linguistically and utilize the literary conventions to comment on it. As Kucer (2005:5) explains, it is “the desire of the language user to explore, discover, construct and share meaning”.

**Operational definition of literary analysis competences**

In the present research, literary analysis competences refer to the ability of third year English majors (educational
section, Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University) to approach two literary texts with the aim of constructing meanings of both texts by correlating the text “Great Expectations” with the other text “Jane Eyre” to explore the ‘inside’ meaning where they produce their points of views as well as the ‘outside’ meaning or the social and cultural meaning. Thus, this in–depth reading of the two texts aims at developing the following competences which are: analyzing the different points of view in the text, analyzing features and types of characterization, reflecting on the title and the symbolic features in the text, comparing and contrasting literary works to identify the intertextual elements, citing a universal truth, philosophy or debate, relating the story to students’ lives and identifying the relevance of plot structure to the theme of self–formation/self–awareness.

4. Method

4.1 Design of the Study

A quantitative methodology was useful for describing the difference between the variables. Through the analysis of numerical data representing the variables in this study, it was possible to address the research question. The quantitative design chosen for this study involved obtaining pretest as well as posttest measures. A quasi–experimental pre–post one group
design was used to examine the change between the pretest and posttest scores.

4.2 Participant

The participants of this study included 30 third year English majors, educational section, Faculty of Girls for Arts, Science and Education, Ain Shams University. The study group had similar student demographics where their age ranged between 19–21, all of them were awarded the governmental Thanawia Ama (High School) where school subjects were in Arabic. They studied English as a foreign language all through their school life since the primary stage. The program was administered in the first term of the academic year 2019/2020. It is worthy to mention that the study participants represented the whole academic cohort of the academic year 2019–2020 enrolled at the Faculty of Girls’ Ain Shams University (English Department).

4.3.1. Measures and Covariates

In accordance with the research aim, the researcher developed research instruments for collecting data needed for answering research questions and hypotheses:

4.3.1.1) Literary analysis competence pre–posttest.

4.3.1.2) Literary analysis competence scoring rubric
4.3.1.1) Literary analysis competence pre–posttest

The pre–posttest was designed to test English majors’ literary analysis competence. It was based on the short story “A Clean, Well–Lighted Place” by Ernest Hemingway. Students were asked to read the short story then answer the 11 questions that followed. The questions were open questions testing the eight competences. They are classified as follows:

_Table (2) classification of the competences and the numbers of questions reflecting each_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Competences covered in question</th>
<th>Marks for each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the different points of view in the text</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the significance of title and the symbolic features in the text</td>
<td>1 and 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze features and types of characterization</td>
<td>2 and 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare and contrast two works to identify the intertextual elements</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite evidences proving a universal truth, philosophy or debate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate the story to their personal experience and lives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time of the test was estimated by calculating the means of time taken by each student to finish the test divided by their number. The calculation proved that the time of the test = 150 minutes.

4.3.1.1.1.2. Pre–posttest reliability

To estimate the reliability of the test and measure the internal consistency of it, Cronbach’s Alfa method as well as Spearman’s formula were used. Spearman’s formula indicated a high reliability level of 0.744. Similarly, Cronbach Alpha’s value of the literary analysis competence pre–posttest was 0.871. Also, Inter–rater reliability was established by correcting students’ answers (30 students) on the pre–test and the post–test by the researcher, then another rater was used to recorrect students’ answers (30 students) on the pre–test and the post–test. Pearson Correlation was calculated to confirm consistency and accuracy of the correlation, which indicated high correlation level which is 0.88.

4.3.1.1.1.3. Pre–posttest validity

The pre–posttest proved to be valied as it was approved by an Associate Professor of TEFL specialisits and an Assisstent Professor of literature.
4.3.1.2) Literary analysis scoring rubric

4) The scoring rubric is designed to be used as a criterion for the raters of the pre–posttest to be objective while correcting students’ answers. The rubric is divided into four numerical scores levels. Level (1) is the weakest performance while (4) is the best performance. Under each level, a description of the quality of the answer that deserves that score for each competence. (Appendix 3). There were 7 literary analysis competences: analyzing the different points of view in the text, analyzing features and types of characterization, comparing and contrasting two texts to identify the intertextual elements, providing evidences proving a universal truth, philosophy or debate, relating the story to their personal experience and lives, identifying the relevance of plot structure to the self–formation/self–awareness and reflecting on the title and the symbolic features in the text.

4.3.1.3) The Intervention: The intertextual teaching model
The following description represents the phases developed by the researcher to introduce an intertextual teaching model taking into consideration the seven competences as well as the principles and philosophical background of the intertextuality approach. The researcher was in direct contact with these students because she
was teaching them “Methods of Teaching English course”. The researcher presented the teaching model based on intertextuality as part of the course entitled “Creative methods for teaching literature”.

- **Rationale:**

  The essence of the model stems from the fact that the ultimate goal of teaching literature for English majors is to develop their literary analysis competence and literary appreciation skills. The intertextuality approach relies on making connections between two or more literary/ artistic works with building an ability of appreciative awareness of similarities and differences within texts based on the reader’s schemata.

  The main principles of the model, as gleaned from the previously reviewed literature and related studies, are that learners should:

  - Have the opportunity to appreciate the similarities and differences between texts from one hand and between the foreign text and those related to the mother language texts.
  - Be given the opportunity to express their own feelings, ideas and provide their own interpretations of the texts.
  - Develop and widen their schema to have the ability to approach literary texts accurately and to be able to make the
required meaning of making connections.

- Present different interpretations of texts to disclose alternative ways of seeing things. Variety of responses are accepted to illustrate differences in perception.

- Be provided with guidance by instructor who should never impose his point of view. This means that learning depends on intertextuality is a student–centered learning where the reader has the right to interpret the text from his/her point of view and schema. The learner is required, in this case, to provide logical justification for his/her interpretation.

The model was designed in light of intertextuality to develop the assigned literary analysis competence. The two texts that the model is based on are *Jane Eyre* by Jane Austen and *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens. The model was completely prepared by the researcher where three phases were developed; phase one: read, note, write, phase two: explore, interpret, contextualize, and phase three: intertextually Connect, react, evaluate. BBC films were used to present both stories as well as extracts from both novels. Tasks, activities and materials were either adapted or designed by the researcher.
Objectives of the model

By the end of the treatment, students would be able to:

1) analyze the different points of view in both novels *Jane Eyre* and *Great Expectations*.

2) analyze features and types of characterization in both novels.

3) reflect on the significance of the title and the symbolic features in both *Jane Eyre* and *Great Expectations*.

4) compare and contrast the two films *Jane Eyre* and *Great Expectations* to identify the intertextual elements.

5) recognize evidences proving a universal truth, philosophy or debate in both novels.

6) relate the story of both *Jane Eyre* and *Great Expectations* to their personal experience and lives.

7) identify the relevance of plot structure of each novel to the self-formation/self-awareness.
### Table (3) Summary of the Literary Analysis Model Based on Intertextuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Duration/Session</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>material</th>
<th>Activities &amp;tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warming up</td>
<td>Introductory session: 2 hours</td>
<td>By the end of this session, students would be able to: 1. Discuss the elements of the short story presented 2. Identify the literary analysis competence included in the model 3. Discuss the model’s objectives,</td>
<td>The short story “The Dinner Party” By Mona Gardener</td>
<td>*Handouts</td>
<td>*group works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase one: watch/read, note, write</td>
<td>Two sessions</td>
<td>By the end of this session, students would be able to:</td>
<td>The novel “Jane Eyre”</td>
<td>*extracts from the novel Jane Eyre</td>
<td>*group works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1: two hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. related the presented part to their personal experiences and lives</td>
<td></td>
<td>*watch the film Jane Eyre (BBC version) at home, then specific scenes at the</td>
<td>*Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2: two hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. comment, temporarily, on the characters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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that appear in the presented part.
By the end of this session, students would be able to:
1. related the presented part to their personal experiences and lives
2. comment, temporarily, on the characters that appear in the presented part.

“Great Expectations” classroom because of time limits.
*Extracts from the novel Great Expectations
*watch the film Great Expectations (BBC version), then specific scenes at the classroom because

*Discussions *worksheets *critical incident reflection journal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase two:</th>
<th>Three sessions:</th>
<th>By the end of this session, students would be able to:</th>
<th>The two novels: *the same extracts used in the previous two sessions *repeating the same scenes from both films.</th>
<th>*group works *Discussions *worksheets *critical incident reflection journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3:</strong> two hours</td>
<td><strong>Session 4:</strong> two hours</td>
<td>1. compare the first two parts presented in the two films concerning events, character ...etc. 2. explore the historical and cultural background of both novels</td>
<td>The two novels: <em>Jane Eyre</em> and <em>Great Expectations</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Session 5: two hours | **3. reflect on the different points of view of the characters (recognizing the presented parts).**
By the end of this session, students would be able to:
1. reflect on the development of the characters in both novels
2. relate the events of both novels to their own |
| | **Eyre and Great Expectations**
| | *extracts from the two novels*  
| | *the next selected scenes from both films*  
| | *Discussions*  
| | *worksheets*  
| | *critical incident reflection journal* |

| | The two novels:  
| | *group works*  
| | *Discussions*  
| | *worksheets*  
| | *critical incident reflection journal* |
context (Own life and experiences).
3. Interpret the significance of certain incidents. By the end of this session, students would be able to:
1. Reflect on the development of the points of view in the next presented parts.

<p>| | | selected scenes from both films |
| Phase three: intertextually connect, react, evaluate | Three sessions: Session 6: two hours | By the end of this session, students would be able to: 1. compare and contrast the previously | The two novels: <em>Jane Eyre</em> and <em>Great Expectations</em> | *extract s from the two novels *the next selected scenes from | *group works *Discussions *worksheets *critical incident reflection journal |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 7: two hours</th>
<th>presented scenes from both film and extracts to identify the intertextual elements. 2. relate the previously presented parts to their personal experiences and lives. 3. recognize evidence providing a universal truth, philosophy, or debate in both novels</th>
<th>The two novels: <em>Jane Eyre</em> and <em>Great Expectations</em></th>
<th>both films</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Session 8: two hours | | | *group works  
*Discussions  
*worksheets  
*critical incident reflection journal |
By the end of this session, students would be able to:

1. present their own reactions on decisions taken by the characters and put themselves in their shoes.
2. identify the relevance of the plot structure of each novel separately to the self-formation/selections of ideas.

The two novels: *Jane Eyre* and *Great Expectations*

- *Handouts* selected scenes from the films covering the whole stories
- *selecte* d quotations from both novels

*whole class discussions*
*critical incident reflection* journal
*general implications* on both novels
If awareness.
3. evaluate both texts from their own point of view and according to their own interpretation.

By the end of this session, students would be able to:
1. compare and contrast both film and extracts to identify the intertextual elements.
2. compare and contrast each novel with other novels, films, series etc...
(English or Arabic Works) to identify intertextual elements.
3. recognize evidence providing a universal truth, philosophy, or debate in both novels.
4. Analyse the significance of the title
5. Results.

3.1 Statistics and Data Analysis

Having analyzed the data collected from the test and rubrics
of the study statistically, a detailed presentation of the results in relation to the hypotheses and the questions of the study will be displayed. To determine the extent of change in the participants’ performance in the literary analysis competence test due to the implementation of the program, the t–test was used. For further emphasis on the effect of the program, effect size for non-parametric samples was calculated using the following formula:

\[ r = \frac{z}{\sqrt{n}} \]

table (4) The referential framework for identifying whether effect size is small, medium or large is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 0.2 till less than 0.5</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 0.5 till less than 0.8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 0.8 or more</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1:
There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of third year English majors’ (English section) performance on the pre–post overall literary analysis skills test at 0.01 level of significance in favour of the post test.

Table (5) The pre–post overall literary analysis competence result
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-</th>
<th>Si g.</th>
<th>Size effect ( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.8667</td>
<td>3.49120</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.19 0**</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.94 Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.2667</td>
<td>4.71193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (5) shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the experimental group’s performance before and after the treatment in favour of the post–test where the t–value = 22.190**, which is significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of confidence. Thus, it can be safely said that the t–test result proved to be statistically consistent with the hypothesis. In other words, the first hypothesis was confirmed. Furthermore, the estimated effect size value = 0.94 shown in table (5) indicates that the model had a large effect on the experimental group students’ overall performance on the post–test as compared to their overall performance on the pre literary analysis competence test. This result has been illustrated in figure (1).
Figure (1) The pre–post overall literary analysis competence result

Hypothesis 2:

There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of third year English majors’ (educational section) performance on the pre–post literary analysis Sub–competences test at 0.01 level of significance in favour of the post–test.

Table (6) the pre–post literary analysis sub–competence results

| Variable                      | Group     | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | df | T     | Sig.  | Size effect | 2
|-------------------------------|-----------|----|--------|----------------|----|-------|-------|-------------|---
| Competence 1– self–formation and awareness | Pre. Ex   | 30 | 1.866  | 7              | 1.27937 | 29  | 5.8   | .00 0        | .54 medium
|                               | post. Ex  | 30 | 3.333  | 3              | 1.09334 |     | 0.99  | .00 8        |              
| Competence 2–                 | Pre. Ex   | 30 | 1.066  | 7              | 1.25762 | 29  | 10.09 | .00 8        |              
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<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cite universal truth</td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.3.666</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.75810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence 3 intertextual elements</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.7333</td>
<td>1.22990</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>1.24291</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence 4= point of view</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.8333</td>
<td>1.28877</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.233</td>
<td>1.50134</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence 5= significance of title and symbolism</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>.30513</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>1.31131</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence 6= relate to life</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>.30513</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>1.38298</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence 7= characterization</td>
<td>Pre. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.1667</td>
<td>.74664</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post. Ex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>1.53466</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (6) confirms the previous results as it shows that there are statistically significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of confidence between the mean scores of the experimental group’s performance on the pretest and post–test in each literary analysis sub–competences in favour of the posttest. The estimated t–values are reasonable due to time constraints. The effect size values are medium which are acceptable and reasonable too. This means that the differences in the progress before and after the treatment are due to the literary analysis intertextual model. Procedurally, these results seem to be true and consistent, since the experimental group students had the opportunity to experience and practice these competences and got the chance to discuss each in detail. Accordingly, they recognized the importance of these competences for those who study literature. The improvement has been illustrated by figure (2)
Finally, testing the two hypotheses of the study revealed that they were supported by the results. Statistical analysis of the data indicated that the experimental group’s performance on the posttest was better than their own performance on the pretest due to the implementation of the literary analysis intertextual model.

6. Discussion

Based on the results of the study, literary analysis intertextual model showed its effectiveness in developing the experimental group’s literary analysis competences. The results of the current study agree with that of Ahmadian (2013) and Sheils (2012) where both studies found that participants utilized unique meaning-making processes. The intertextual analysis enables students to extract and gain greater depth of understanding and meaning from texts. It could be claimed that intertextuality provides students with the confidence to make meaning and explore the various possibilities to interpret texts. Also, intertextuality instructions lead to intertextuality awareness and consciousness raising in reading literary texts. It is proved that when students read a text they first analyse it in different ways to make the meaning relying on their own schema and understanding of the nature of texts. Thus, the more knowledge
they gain about the text, the better analysis and understanding and, consequently, the better meanings they can reach.

Through the model exercises, students were expected to show their responses supported by logic or evidence from the text. Such a stance enabled students to think more critically and analytically in order to support their arguments. Students were requested to look for evidences to reach sound and proper critical evaluation. For example, looking at the activities of the main characters, they would naturally, or critically, lead to the question why certain characters behave in certain ways. Consequently, the group discussion may well lead to more discussions on some other realistic, intellectual and philosophical issues of society. This result supports that of Weippert, Domke & Apol (2018) who suggested that pairing texts with similar themes allows students to begin to discover implicit ideologies and reevaluate their stances both toward the literature and to their own ideological beliefs.

To be more accurate, it is found that this development in students’ performance can be attributed to different factors that will be discussed as follows:

**Student–centered classroom:** as described in the model’s procedures, the classroom was not teacher–based instruction. In
the contrary, students were the center of the learning process. They were working through small groups. Each member in the group has her own responsibility and the achievement of each group depends on the achievements of the individuals. This shift from teacher–centered classroom to student–centered classroom encouraged students to exert more effort in reading extracts, viewing the scenes and analyzing the elements to be able to participate in the negotiations held while presenting their own work. The teacher was a guide and a facilitator rather than being the only one who knew everything. Empirically, this result goes in line with the results presented by Duggan (2003) and Burke (2011) who emphasized that working in groups independently to analyze literary texts, improves trainees critical reading and literary skills.

**The effect of the introductory session:** the introductory session in the model played an effective role in enhancing the students’ understanding of the model. It also broke the ice between the students and their instructor where they played games while being divided into groups. The handouts given to them clarified what was meant by “literary analysis competences” and what was meant by “intertextuality”. The training they encountered through the short story studied in the introductory session helped them
understand and practice the model and understand how to work through the stages of the model. This introductory session saved much time for the next sessions where students engaged immediately in the assigned short story.

**Self–evaluation and group–evaluation:** working in groups where each group was completely responsible for their work, gave them the sense of responsibility. Therefore, they were requested to discuss together the achievement of each individual in the group and evaluate their own interpretations to apply the necessary modifications before presenting their answers to the whole class. Also, group–evaluation or whole class evaluation trained them to respect others viewpoints, turn taking discussions and think rationally to be able to evaluate what was presented before them. Self–evaluation and group–evaluation helped the participants to discover their own weaknesses and strengths, correct themselves by themselves, search for clarifications and suggest modifications and give alternatives.

**The effect of the model on enhancing literary analysis sub–competences:**

It seemed that the experimental group’s literary analysis competences were developed because of the effective use of teaching model based on intertextuality.
As for the skill of reflecting on the title and the symbolic features in the text, students recognized that the surface reading of any text did not reflect the implied meaning intended by the author. The practice of this skill enhanced their interpretation ability to read between the lines and suggest other meanings behind the direct meaning presented, and this was achieved through being aware of the literary elements and conventions taught to the students. This finding agrees with what was developed by Kispal (2008) who argued that in reading texts, readers rely on the presence of conventional features and the familiar structure centered around setting, theme, plot and resolution. Familiarity with the structure is part of the background knowledge that the reader brings to the text which allow reasonable interpretations to be made.

Moving to analyzing the features and types of characterization competence, students recognized that studying literature was concerned with asking the ‘whys’ and ‘hows’, not the ‘whats’. This means being analytical, not just descriptive. Through the activities they went through, they recognized that they needed to consider how valid and reliable the characters were. They needed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the characters. Being involved in the evaluation and analysis of
the characters in each literary work, the students achieved positive engagement with the text that helped in mastering this competence.

Dealing with the skill of forming an opinion, working independently and having the opportunity to interpret the text depending on their schema, students had the chance to express themselves freely. They used to adopt their professors’ point of view. This time, they were asked to express their own opinions about the characters, events and situations. They were asked to justify their opinions and respect others’ opinions at the same time. The free, spontaneous atmosphere encouraged students to express their ideas with confidence and that is reflected in the statistical results.

Regarding the competence of recognizing evidence providing a universal truth, philosophy or debate, it was recognized that students interacted positively with this skill. They mentioned in their discussions that they used to wonder why they study literature. They said that this skill helped them to understand that literature is universal. The model’s stages helped in highlighting the relations between the situations and events that might happen to all humans all over the universe with their different cultures.
This skill helped them to appreciate their own culture and respect the cultures of others as well. This finding aligns with that of Chandrasoma. & Ananda (2017) who stressed that in their study, students managed to reveal universal ideas and issues of debate such as women’s rights, and equality.

Concerning the competence of comparing and contrasting two literary works to identify the intertextual elements, it improved comprehension by highlighting important details, making abstract ideas more concrete, and reducing the confusion between related concepts. Therefore, when students were asked to compare and contrast characters, events, situations, ideas; they understood the text deeply and recognized the minor details that might affect decisions taken by characters in certain situations. This skill helped them to delve deeply not only into the appearances but in the psychic elements dominating the behavior of the characters. Moreover, comparing two texts helped them to understand some universal ideas one might find them in different texts from different perspectives through different ages. Thus, the practice of this skill had its statistical significance on the post–test. This conclusion agrees with Silver (2010) who indicated that Compare & Contrast competence acted as a practical and easy–to–use introduction to higher–order thinking. It improved comprehension by highlighting
important details, making abstract ideas more concrete, and reducing the confusion between related concepts. Using It in the classroom help students develop these habits of mind: thinking flexibly; thinking about thinking (metacognition); striving for accuracy; applying past knowledge to new situations; and thinking and communicating with clarity and precision. It is also in line with that of Larsen (2018) who argued that the identification of intertextual references helped the students and served as scaffolding in the reading process. An enhanced knowledge of such intertextual traits facilitated the development of metacognitive strategies for reading and raised awareness among them about the phenomenon of intertextuality.

Moving to the competence of relating the story to their life, students recognized the close relation between fictional world and their own life. They recognized that literature is a reflection of the human experience. Asking them to relate the events and situations to their lives, this task helped them to reflect on their memories and compare the situations, events, feelings with those they experienced in some way or another. Sometimes this comparison make people re-evaluate their decisions and points of view. This result is in line with that of Yaqoob (2011) who indicated that learning strategies based on literary theories
promote discussion, encourage students to tell personal narratives, share real life experiences, and also train students to generate new and innovative meaning of the texts by utilizing their real world experiences and their beliefs.

Finally, concerning the competence of identifying the relevance of plot structure to the self-formation/self-awareness, students found themselves confronting with new idea of “recognizing the self”. They indicated that they revised the plot several times to reach the meaning of this concept. They were asked to find out whether the protagonists of both texts managed to reach their self-awareness of self-formation or not, and whether they develop with the progress of the events and circumstances and find their identity or not. While discussing these ideas, students declared that they were asking themselves the same questions. Who am I? what I want? Do I learn from my mistakes and improve or commit the same mistake again and again? …etc. this result aligns with that of Chandrasoma& Ananda (2017) where they indicated that reading text from an intertextual prespective helped students to understand the concept of self-realization and identity.
7. Conclusion

The literary analysis intertextual model was found to be effective in developing the seven literary analysis skills. The intertextual model and reading a literary text provided learners with opportunities to explore the message of the text, and consider their own ideas about the concepts discussed in the text. The activities practiced allowed learners to think independently and perceive the text in the context of their social knowledge of their immediate world.

8. Recommendation

Based on the study results, the following recommendations are made:

- Literature instructors are recommended to train English Majors to be analytic readers, help them to understand the meaning between the lines and intentions of author. They need to train them to question the authority and validity of the author’s views by questioning and exploring the writer’s style. Such training enabled students to analyze the language used and the skill of the writer to portray characters realistically in stead of relying on the instructor’s analysis.
• Instructors are recommended to rely on the student-centered classroom which urges the students to be independent and to think for themselves instead of relying on their instructors’ spoon feeding knowledge.

• English majors are recommended to read original texts to understand the text fully and try to make connections between the text and other text either printed or visual.

• Literature instructors are recommended to develop teaching models in light of literary theories to stimulate students’ imagination and the sense of meaning-making.

9. Suggestions for further researches

Researchers are advised to conduct studies and researches in the following areas

• A suggested program based on intertextuality to develop secondary stage students critical reading skills.

• Suggesting programs to develop other language skills in light of intertextuality.

• Developing teaching models based on literary theories to develop literary appreciation skills.
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