

A Study of the Effects of Intertextuality Awareness on Reading Literary Texts: The Case of Short Stories¹

Moussa Ahmadian

(Corresponding Author)

Associate Professor, Dept. of English Language and Literature,
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Arak University, Arak, 38156-8-8349, PO Box: 879, Iran
Tel: +988613135111, E-mail: M-ahmadian@araku.ac.ir; Moussa_ahmadian@yahoo.co.uk

Hooshang Yazdani

Assistant Professor, Dept. of English Language and Literature,
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Arak University, Arak, 38156-8349, PO Box: 879, Iran
Tel: +989124262201, E-mail: H-yazdani@araku.ac.ir

Doi:10.5901/jesr.2013.v3n2p155

Abstract

Intertextuality can be generally defined as the influence and presence of previous texts in the construction of the present one; it shows the internal relations of a text with all other relating texts (Booker, 1996; Halliday, 2003). The consensus is that no text is a complete creation of its author; rather, it is constructed through the process of interconnections of textual elements of the relating texts and the author's creativity. In literary texts, intertextuality plays crucial roles (Abrams, 1993: 185-6; Peck and Coyle, 2002: 143). The author, un/consciously appeals to intertextual elements, elaborates them in his artistic career and creativity to create the intended text—prose/poetry. Accordingly, in reading literature, being aware of intertextuality seems to be important in better understanding of the text. The present paper studies possible effects of intertextuality awareness on reading literary texts—short stories. To this end, a group of 25 homogeneous students of English literature at Arak University, Iran, were asked to take part in the study. Two short stories, as tasks of elicitation, were first given to them as pretest to read and answer the questions. Then, after 6 sessions of treatments relating to intertextuality, its features and examples, they were given the same stories, as posttest, to read and answer the questions. Their answers in both pre- and post tests were scored by two raters, and then compared. The results revealed strong effects of intertextuality awareness on reading the texts. Possible causes of the results along with the implications of the findings are discussed.

Key Words: *intertextuality, intertextuality awareness, intertextual elements, literary texts, short story, literary creativity*

1. Introduction

In Textology and Text Analysis, intertextuality is, generally, defined as the relating elements of the previous texts that influence and gather to construct (a part of) the present text. According to Kristeva (1980), no text is original and is made by itself isolated from those existing before it; such a text is influenced by the texts and textual elements relating to it. Bell (1993) and Halliday (2003) consider intertextuality as the history of a text, the cycles of the chain of texts which are connected to and have influences on the present particular text. It is also believed that no text is made without such intertextual elements, rather, all the (inter)textual elements of the relating texts inherently influence the intended text and are combined with the author's creativity to produce the whole and final construction of that text. Even the author's creativity in turn is (partly) because of his/her experiences of

1 - This research was financially supported by Dept. of Research of Arak University. The authors acknowledge and appreciate Arak University for the supports.

reading the previous texts and the influences s/he receives from them and their intertextual elements in the new creation, the new text.

Halliday (2003: 359-361) asserts that each text is a combination of intertextual cycles of the chain of texts which make the history of that text (See also Allen, 2000; Fairclough, 1999, 2003). Thus, it can be claimed that every (literary) text is the product of two levels: intertextuality and author's creativity. Such intertextual cycles/elements inherently connect the relating texts to the intended text through translation, adaptation, quotations, implications, allusions, recreations, etc. (Booker, 1996; Travers, 1998: 210, 225), and cause creative relations between the author of the text, the previous texts, and/or the influences s/he receives from them. Although intertextuality is part of all text types – journalistic, scientific, philosophical, historical, and religious texts (Bloor and Bloor, 2007: 51) –, most studies on textology and intertextuality have focused on literary texts and have seen the phenomenon in such texts, partly, at least, because of the nature of literary texts (Peck and Coley, 2002).

In literary texts, intertextuality refers to a series of texts – prose/poetry – created previously, which influence the present one and make “the predecessor” of it (Halliday, 2003). The influences may be traced via a number of intertextual elements such as semiotic elements, literary traditions and conventions, literary genres, literary allusions, figures of speech, quotations, implications, etc. that make the history and the cycles of the chain of that text; this text, in turn, develops the chain and adds one cycle to it (Abrams, 1993: 285-6; Peck and Coyle, 2002: 143). Being influenced by and relying on these, the author takes at least some parts of primary (and basic) elements of his/her text, elaborates them through his/her artistic career and creativity to produce a new literary text – prose or poem.

Reading, on the other hand, is a “language- and text-based” process and activity according to which the reader can get the meaning of what s/he reads (Bell, 1993: 31). The reader goes into the world of the text (Werth, 1997), analyses it based on the components, elements of its structure, generic features, etc. to get or make the meaning and a particular interpretation out of the reading. When so, intertextuality is and will be a part of such processes, both in the text to be read and the reader's reading experiences.

In reading literature, understanding the nature of literary text depends, to a large extent, on understanding the nature of the elements constructing it such as intertextuality (which is of prime and crucial importance) and all its elements, components, features, as well as the subject and style of the text. Cultural elements, literary allusions, quotations, etc. are examples of intertextuality (Webster, 1993: 98-9, Halliday, 2003; Bloor and Bloor, 2007: 52-4). It is believed that in the process of reading, to the extent that factors such as reader's creativity, his/her literary taste, career and style, and textual elements are important, to the same extent intertextuality is, or can be, important and play roles too.

Based on what was mentioned above, it can be assumed that the reader's awareness of intertextuality and its underlying elements and components in a literary text may help him/her to produce a more reliable and acceptable meaning and interpretation of that text. Although studies on literature in general, and reading literary text in particular, have taken many aspects of the phenomenon into consideration, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have been reported to focus on the role of intertextuality awareness in reading literary text to date. Thus, this paper attempts to shed some light on this point. Its aim is to find out whether the reader's intertextuality awareness – awareness of intertextual elements and their functions – of a literary text may have any effects on his/her reading and interpretation of that text.

2. Background

2.1. Intertextuality: concept and types

As mentioned above, intertextuality is a part of textology and text analysis (Fairclough, 1999; Widdowson, 2004). As such, it is a framework to study both text relations and text constructions as well as the interactions between the author of the text and the reader, because it is, at least partially, based on intertextuality framework that both creation (on behalf of the author) and comprehension and interpretation (on the part of the reader) of the text become possible.

As a result of the developments in literary theories, text linguistics, literary criticism, text analysis, and even translatology in the late 20th century, understanding the relations between text and all the factors influencing

text construction became of prime importance among scholars in these fields (Booker, 1996; Bloor and Bloor, 2007). It was, consequently, suggested that a text somehow embraces a kind of complicated network of texts, or chain of texts, without which no text can be constructed and understood. This network was termed **intertextuality**.

The term intertextuality was coined by Kristeva (1980), though some believe that the very origins of the concept go back to Ferdinand de Saussure's and Bakhtin's ideas (Barthes, 1981; Booker, 1996: 58, 104). Thence, it has ever proved itself as one of the seminal and influential frameworks in studies on texts of different types, art and literature. According to Kristeva (1980), no text is independent of other relating texts existing before it; '... any text is an intertext – the site of an intersection of numberless other texts' (in Abrams, 1993: 285). Barthes (1988) also imposes that '... a text is not a line of words releasing a single "theological" meaning ... but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash' (p. 149). Thus, reading, analysing, understanding, and interpreting each text depend on being aware of other relating texts (Short, 1989), because the textual elements of them influence and are present in that text. That is, a text is a combination of those elements taken/borrowed from and/or influenced by other texts in the chain of texts (Fairclough, 1999; Widdowson, 2004) and the author's creative power. It is because of such intertextuality and the realisation and understanding of such inter/textual elements that the author of a text is able to create the present text and the reader is able to discover the (new) meanings and come to new interpretation/s of the text (Barthes, 1981; Allen, 2000). In other words, the author, in making the text, (un)consciously appeals to the network of codes, references, structures, and other features of other relating texts existing before through intrusions, quotations, allusions, hybridisations, implications, etc., and the reader appealing to these as well as his/her experience of reading the related texts gets or makes the meanings out of the text. In this way, the author and the reader can share some common codes and parts of the meanings through the text.

From this view point and because of this nature and function of intertextuality, the concept is believed to be of two types: intertextuality of text/author and intertextuality of reader. The former focuses on the text itself and analyses it to find out the textual elements of other texts influencing the present one; the latter considers the reader's reading experiences and prior knowledge and focuses on the same or other chains of texts affecting his/her reading, understanding, interpretation, his/her meaning-making and meaning discovery. In other words, the former refers to text constructions and those elements of other texts which influence, implicitly or explicitly, in the structure of that text and are hence parts of the nature of the text. These can be traced, identified, and classified via text analysis, understanding text units and their functions in the text, and text synthesis. For these to be studied more possibly and systematically, a model or inventory of intertextuality (intertextual components and elements) is needed, which will be discussed below. The latter, intertextuality of reader, refers to the reader her/himself, her/his prior and conceptual knowledge, experiences of reading, and the influences s/he receives from previous reading experiences in reading the present text. How novice or experience, for example, the reader is in getting, or making, the meaning of the text s/he reads. Needless to say, the former is the intention of this paper. On this ground, one may claim that to the extent that according to Kristeva, Barthes, and other 'intertextualists' no text is found independent of other relating texts in the network, to the same extent no meaning or interpretation of text is possible on behalf of the reader without his/her understanding of and taking into account other texts (the same or different from the author's) in the intertextual chain. Thus, both types are important in dealing with literature and literary texts. By the same token, the two types are of prime importance in literary reading, because, on the one hand, the reader is, primarily, a reader of the text to read and interpret it and, on the other, s/he, as a the reader, has to understand the text with all its (inter)textual elements and components to make the meaning and interpretation. Although both types seem to be crucially and significantly influential and critical in reading literary text, the former, intertextuality of text, is the focus of this paper.

2. 2. *Intertextuality in Reading Literary Text*

Reading literary texts, as a "language- and text-based" process, deals with both a particular form of language (style) in which the text is written, and the text itself with all its elements of structure including intertextual elements. From this perspective, it is the "text" that makes, at list partially, the essence of reading. In the same line, intertextuality is an inseparable part of the text, as discussed before, and, thus, is an inseparable concern of reading.

To explain the intertextual relations of the two texts, intertextuality in reading can be seen at two levels: local or intralingual intertextuality, and global or interlingual intertextuality. The former, local intertextuality, holds that the text is connected to all existing texts relating to it which influence the construction of that text, while global intertextuality refers to the intertextual elements of the text, as a whole and, therefore, are common to all texts, as they are texts.

Webster (1993), Peck and Coyle (2002), Bloor and Bloor (2007), and Ahmadian (2010) assert that intertextuality awareness can help readers of texts understand the text better, sharpen and deepen their minds to go into the world of the text, discover different layers of meanings of the text, and, consequently, make better meanings and interpretations of the text. All these can influence reading literary texts because no reading and interpretation are complete without taking all these into consideration; the reader should pass through all the above processes to be able to get a better meaning of the intended text based on which to make a valid and more meaningful interpretation out of his/her reading.

What is clear is that in reading literary texts, the entire text should be seen and analysed, and not its parts. That is, the text should be seen as a whole, with all its elements, features, and generic nature, including its intertextuality. Reading literature, by definition, is creating the meaning out of the intended text (Barthes, 1988; Peck and Coyle, 2002); the text with all its textual features and elements including intertextuality. Thus, the assumption is to the extent that the reader of a literary text is aware and conscious of these processes of text construction, s/he may use this awareness in reading, analysing and interpreting the intended text. This is what the present study aims to investigate.

3- Models of Intertextuality Analysis

Since the aim of the study is to investigate the effects of intertextuality awareness on reading literary texts, first and foremost a model and taxonomy for identifying intertextual elements, their examples, and classifications in literary texts is crucially needed. This model helps us not to see intertextuality only in theoretical and subjective definitions, but also to have criteria to determine elements and examples of intertextuality in practice, based on the aims of the study. In what follows, some of the models that can be drawn from theoretical studies are briefly reviewed and evaluated. Then, the model used in this study, as a more practical one, will be suggested.

3.1. Halliday's Model

Halliday (2002; 2003) considers intertextuality as a part of the history and archeology of the text; to him, intertextuality is the chain of cycles of text generation. Each text is made in the history, and each previous text is a part of the history of that text. Therefore, history is not only the past of an event (text), but also a chain of text production; the past of a sentence or discourse is not its grammar or linguistics, but the instantiations of it. Fairclough (2003) calls this process the past of connected texts or the network of texts.

In Halliday's (2003) view, intertextuality in literature shows itself in allusions. "Intertextuality is ... the set of acts of meaning to which the given act of meaning makes allusion. This is familiar in literature and philology as **allusion** and in semiotics as **intertextuality** (emphasis original)..." (p.361). He considers the history of a text having four "strands or dimensions": intertextual, developmental, systemic, and intratextual. In other words, these strands make the past/history of text (pp.360-61).

As seen, Halliday provides only some general and theoretical considerations of intertextuality. His model does not suggest a practical framework for determining the elements and examples of intertextuality. He sees only allusions as intertextuality in literary text, and this is too inadequate to help understanding the examples of intertextual elements in literary texts.

3.2 Widdowson's Model

Widdowson (2004) sees intertextuality from a linguistic viewpoint. However, he considers Halliday's model inadequate for intertextual analysis of texts, but like Halliday believes that intertextuality is significant and important in (literary) text analysis (2004: 26-7, 140, 148). To him, determining the exact elements of intertextuality and what elements of previous texts are present in the intended text is not an easy task (p. 147).

However, what is clear is that all texts are combinations of textual units/elements of previous and related texts; that is, all texts have intertextual elements and construction within themselves (91-2; 147-8). But, for determining intertextual elements, we need clear and practical means and measures, without which understanding intertextuality in texts is problematic (148). Despite these, Widdowson does not suggest any practical framework for tracing intertextuality elements and examples in literary texts.

3.3. Fairclough's Model

Fairclough (1992, 2003) believes that a text is a combination of a number of elements such as functional, lexical, grammatical, coherence, and textual structure, which should be considered in text analysis. The relations between these elements are hierarchical, beginning from single words going up to clauses, sentences, and finally the text itself. Another significant element working in the construction of the text is 'intertextuality' (1992: 75). Accordingly, the researcher adds three more important elements incorporating in the construction of text and discourse: Force of utterance, coherence of text, and intertextuality. "... Force of utterance is the intension and impulse of the text (promising, request, etc...) that discourse has within itself, coherence of text, causes inherent and coherent relations between internal components of the text, and intertextuality of the text determines the relations between the text and all other related texts (ibid, 75-6). As seen, Fairclough only emphasises the importance of intertextuality in text construction. In his view point, intertextuality is the reconstruction of the chain of texts or network of texts (Fairclough, 2003) in the new text. This understanding of intertextuality is too broad and general to suggest any practical framework for analysis.

3.4. Genette's Model

Genette (1992, 1997) sees all textual relations in what he calls "Transtextuality", and puts it into five categories, one of which is intertextuality. The other four are: Architextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, and hypertextuality. Of these, he believes intertextuality and hypertextuality show the textual relations between (literary) texts, while other parts of transtextuality refer to between-text relations and the related text-like relations.

Genette sees intertextuality in three types: explicit and formal intertextuality, the explicit presence of elements of texts in the text like quotations, particularly direct quotations; non-explicit hidden intertextuality, such as plagiarism used in the construction of a particular text; and implicit intertextuality, like those hidden elements of other texts in which the writer gives some clues, like references and allusions.

Although in theoretical analyses this model may be working, in practice it shows some inadequacy and therefore is not valid enough to be used for intertextual analysis and study of texts. First, it limits intertextuality to only three types; this does prevent us of comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon. Explicit intertextuality, for example, is not and cannot be limited to quotations only, insertions, references and additions are also of this kind of intertextuality. Second, hidden intertextuality cannot be limited to plagiarism only, because it is immoral in text production, and therefore is not and cannot be a part of intertextuality, on the assumption that intertextuality is an inseparable part of text, while plagiarism is not.

3.5 Bloor and Bloor's Model

Bloor and Bloor (2007) see intertextuality in all text types: literary texts, Journalism, scientific texts (pp. 52-4, 58), though intertextuality shows itself at best and at large in literary texts (pp 58-9). From their view point, intertextuality is rather intrusion or adaptation in text; that is, the intrusion of elements of previous texts in the new text in the form of quotations, direct or indirect, hybridisation, or mixing one genre into another. As such, in text analysis, intertextual elements can be of two categories/ levels: linguistic elements, making the surface structure of the text, or lexical and grammatical units; and textual or intertextual level. The former refer to linguistic development, style and stylistic features of the text, while the latter refers to elements and examples of internal structure of the text.

This model seems to be more realistic than the previous ones and shows better examples of intertextual elements. Using this model, the researcher can trace intertextuality in text analysis and text study. However, the

model proves some shortcomings, and thus, is inadequate to be used for intertextual analysis of the text. For example, the model overlooks (literary) allusions and cultural features/grounds in the structure of the text; both of them are significant, particularly in literary text analysis.

3.6. Model of Intertextuality Analysis used in this research: Towards a more Comprehensive Model

The models reviewed above, though they give some good guides for literary text analysis, they are not adequately working enough to help researchers determine intertextuality and identify its elements and features in texts. Thus, regarding the need for a more practical model, and focusing on the positive and working aspects of the above-analysed models, the following model of intertextual analysis was developed and used.

Generally speaking, for each text two intertextual strata can be assumed: the linear, more surface or the horizontal stratum (level), and the vertical/hierarchical level. The former refers to the totality of the text; its total and whole structure and the effects it receives from other (previous) texts. We call this level *Macro-intertextuality*. The latter refers to the intertextuality of the internal structure of the text; that is, those elements of other texts which are explicitly or implicitly present in the internal construction of the intended text and are hidden in its internal layers. These do not show themselves explicitly in the surface levels of the text, but can be traced through analysis of the text, their features, etc. We call this level *Micro-intertextuality*. The sketch of each is briefly elaborated as follows.

3.6.1. Macro-intertextuality

The total structure of text may be adaptation, imitation of, or references to, related existing texts or textual components of them, and are explicit in the present text; the reader comes to the whole text and can realise the intertextual elements of the text from its totality. For example, William Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* (1848) is generally an adaptation of and inspired by John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), in which the pilgrim Christian in his progress comes to Vanity Fair (an imagined town), which lasts all the year around and sells all worldly properties (see Lass et al., 1987: 177, 229; Evans, 1989: 1143). Bunyan himself, in turn, takes the concept of vanity from the Bible (Old Testament), speaking of the vanity of life (Ec, 11:10), and the vanity of everything: "... everything is vanity ..." (Ec, 1: 2; 19, 2: 2). Or in William Faulkner's *The Sound and Fury*, the title has been taken from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, in which, Macbeth in the form of interior monologue and self-expression speaks of them. His *Absalom, Absalom* has been taken from the Bible (II Samuel, 18: 24-33) in which when Absalom, King David's son, rebelled against him and was killed by Joab, David mourned for him.

Another good example is Forster's short story "*The Road from Colonus*". First, the very title of the story and the word Colonus refer to Greek mythology, the city of Colonus, Sophocles's birth place, and particularly his tragedy "*Oedipus in Colonus*". Secondly, it alludes to Mythologism in the 20th century, indicating the escape of man of this age from industrialization and technocracy to the pure world of mythology because of some psychological and spiritual problems. Thirdly, it refers to the setting of the story, England of the beginning of the century, industrial revolution, and the coming of machinism, all leading to individualism, loneliness, isolation, generation gap, and destruction of nature, which are the problems of man and human society of our time.

3.6.2. Micro-intertextuality

There are also intertextual elements of the vertical/hierarchical construction of the text; those elements which influence the internal structure of the text. They are hidden in different layers of the text and constitute a part of its meaning. This kind of intertextuality can be seen in the forms of adaptation, quotation, allusions, indicators, etc. (Booker, 1996; Travers, 1989: 210, 225).

- (i) **Allusion** is a reference, without explicit identification, to a person, place, or event, or to another literary work (Abrams, 1993: 8; also Peck and Coyle, 2002: 143). For example, in Forster's short story, Ethel, Mr. Locus's daughter, one of the major characters, is an allusion to Antigone, Oedipus's daughter, in Sophocles's *Oedipus in Colonus*, who when Oedipus finds himself guilty of killing his father and getting marriage with his mother gives up the kingdom, leaves Thebes, and goes to Colonus in search of forgiveness and salvation, she accompanies her father.

- (ii) **Adaptation** can be simply defined as taking a part of something (ideas, notions, ...) of a work and using for making another thing. For example, when Dryden in his poem *A Song for Saint Cecilia's Day*, speaks of four basic elements: cold, hot, moist, and dry (or earth, fire, water, and air) being united by music, "heavenly harmony", and the "tuneful voice heard from high" to show how the nature was created and ordered by the Divine Wisdom out of chaos, he "adapts the physics of the great philosopher Epicurus" to describe the composition (Abrams et al, 1986: 1831).
- (iii) **Indication** is to suggest an idea, concept, meaning ... by showing something relating to it. For instance, in the same poem, Dryden speaks of "heavenly harmony" as the major cause of unification of the basic elements to form the primary "universal frame", he indicates to religious view point to music and cosmic order by God (ibid: 1831).
- (iv) **Quotation**. This means quoting some expressions and ideas from others in a literary text either directly or indirectly.

It should be mentioned that in Micro-intertextuality each sample may have some subdivisions. For instance, allusions undertake subdivisions like mythological, historical, social, religious, ... allusions. Or indications may be either explicit or implicit; so are quotations, direct and indirect quotations. Based on this model, intertextual elements were traced, identified, classified, and applied to the present study.

4. The Study

4.1. Research question and Hypothesis

As mentioned before, the present study attempts to investigate possible effects of intertextuality awareness on reading literary texts, here short stories. In this regard, the research intended to answer the following question:

-- Does intertextuality awareness have any positive effects on reading literary texts—short stories?

To provide a more objective answer to the question, the following hypothesis was constructed to be tested out:

-- Intertextuality awareness will have positive effects on reading literary texts—short stories.

4.2. Participants, Materials and procedure

To test the hypothesis, an intact group of 25 homogeneous male and female Persian speaking Iranian university students majoring English literature at Arak University, Iran, aged 21-24, were asked to participate in the study. Their homogeneity in language was measured via the Michigan Test of Language Proficiency (1997), and in literary competence through a test of English literature. Two short stories: Hawthorne's *Young Goodman Brown* and Forster's *The Road from Colonus*, as tasks of elicitation, were selected and given to them to read and answer the questions. These were used because based on their structures and themes they were found to be capable enough for intertextual analysis and thus relevant to the purposes of the study. The tasks were used twice, first as the pretest and latter as the post test. After the pretest, two raters were asked to score the subjects' answers (from 0-50). Neither the subjects nor the raters were told that the post test was to come. Then using the model of intertextuality analysis, the subjects received treatments on intertextuality: its nature, elements and functions in literary text structure for 6 weeks, each week in one two-hour session. In the treatment sessions, some texts other than those used in the pre-posttests were referred to, in whole or fragments, analysed based on the model of intertextuality, with special focuses on intertextual elements of the texts and their roles in text construction and text meaning. After the treatment period, which was at the same time a 6 week interval, the same texts (short stories) were given to the subjects as the posttest to read and answer the questions. Again, the same raters scored the subjects' performance. The average scores that each subject received from the raters in the pretest and in the posttest were considered as the main score of that subject and used for comparisons. Then, using t-tests and tests of correlation, the subjects' scores in reading the given texts in the pre- and posttests were statistically compared to see the possible effects and or differences.

4.3. The Pilot Study

To examine the testability of the research hypothesis and the validity of reading tasks, first a pilot study was conducted with a small group of 6 homogeneous students of English literature. In the pilot study, fractions of Hawthorne’s *Young Goodman Brown* and James Joyce’s *The Dead* were selected and given to the participants first as the pretest, then after 4 sessions/weeks of treatments according to the model of intertextual analysis, as the posttest. The average scores each subject received from the two raters were taken as the final scores for analysis and comparison. The results of the t-test (table 1) showed that the subjects’ reading of the given texts in the posttest (after treatments) was significantly better ($p < .001$) than their reading in the pretest (before treatments).

Table 1: comparison of the subjects’ performance in reading texts 1 and 2 in the pilot study

Groups Texts	Pretest		posttest		t-value
	\bar{X}_1	SD ₁	\bar{X}_2	SD ₂	
Text 1	24/7	4/ 55	13 / 3	34.06	8/12 ***
Text 2		4/4 21/5	29/6	4/1	9/09 ***
$n = 6$ $df = 10$ $* = p < 0/05$ $** = p < 0/01$ $*** = p < 0/001$					

Text 1: fractions from *The Road from Colonus* **Text 2:** Fractions from Joyce’s *The Dead*

The pilot study proved: (i) based on the model of intertextuality suggested in this research, intertextual features and elements can be determined and highlighted in literary texts and can be used for research purposes of this type. (ii) The methods of treatment and comparisons are working enough for a larger scale study. It was thus that the study was designed with 25 subjects.

5. Data Analysis and Results

Based on the results of the pilot study and the aims of the research, two short stories, Hawthorne’s *Young Goodman Brown* and Forster’s *The Road from Colonus*, were used for pre-and posttests. Then the average scores each subject received from the raters doing each task were calculated in both pre-and posttests for statistical analyses. Table 2 shows the summary of calculations of the scores, the mean scores, and standard deviation of the scores.

Table 2: The subjects’ mean scores and standard deviation (Std.) in the pre-and posttests

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Text 1 pretest Average	25	13.00	29.25	20.44	4.84	.192	.464
Text 2 pretest Average	25	12.00	30.50	21.12	4.40	.111	.464
Text 1 posttest Average	25	23.50	40.75	31.39	5.00	.032	.464
Text 2 posttest average	25	23.00	41.75	31.67	5.67	.173	.464
Valid N (listwise)	25						

Text 1: Young Goodman Brown

Text 2: the Road from Colonus

To be sure of the correlation coefficient between the raters in scoring the pre-posttests and their scores to the texts, the correlation was measured through Pearson's correlation formula. The results showed high degree of correlation between the two raters, at .01 level (table 3).

Table 3: Correlation between the raters' score for the subjects' reading in pre-post tests

	Young Goodman Brown pretest rater 2	Road From Colonus pretest rater 2	Young Goodman Brown posttest rater2	Road From Colonus posttest rater 2
Text 1 pretest rater 1	.907**			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
Text 2 pretest rater 1		.805**		
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000		
Text 1 posttest rater 1			.967**	
Sig. (2-tailed)			.000	
Text 2 posttest rater 1				.936**
Sig. (2-tailed)				.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Text1: Young Goodman Brown; **Text2,** The Road from Colonus

The correction tests between the subjects' scores in the pre-posttests based on Pearson's paired sample test also showed strong correlations between the treatments (intertextuality awareness) and the subjects' reading literary texts (table 4).

Table 4: Correlation test between the subjects scores in pretest and posttest

Paired Samples T-tests between subjects' scores in pre- and post tests

Pair	Paired Differences					df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
1 Text 1 pretest rater 1 – Text1 pretest rater 2	2.30	2.29	.45	4.35	6.24	11.56	24	.000
2 Text 2 pretest rater 1 – Text 2 pretest rater 2	1.88	3.05	.61	.61	3.14	3.07	24	.005
3 Text 1 posttest rater 1 – Text 2 posttest rater 2	4.26	1.47	.29	3.65	4.86	14.46	24	.000
4 Text 2 posttest rater 1 - Text 2 posttest rater 2	4.20	2.16	.43	3.30	5.09	9.69	24	.000

Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)

Text 1: Young Goodman Brown; **Text 2:** The Road from Colonus

As the above table shows, the mean scores (based on average scores) increased in subjects' reading of the texts from the pretest (2.30 for text 1 and 1.88 for text 2) to the post test (4.26 for text1 and 4.20 for text 2). These increases and differences prove the effects of treatments and the subjects' consciousness raising and awareness of intertextuality in their reading after treatments. The paired sample test used to compare the subjects' average scores for text1 and text 2 in the pretest and post test also illustrates the effects of treatments (table 5).

Table 5: Comparison between scores in reading texts in the pretest and reading each text in pre-post tests**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
Pair					Lower	Upper			
1	Text 1 pretest Average Text 2 pretest Average	-.68	5.35	1.07	-2.89	1.53	-.63	24	.53
2	Text 1 posttest Average Text 2 posttest average	-.28	3.22	.64	-1.61	1.05	-.43	24	.66
3	Text 1 pretest Average – Text 1 posttest Average	-10.95	4.63	.92	-12.86	-9.03	-11.82	24	.000
4	Text 2 pretest Average Text 2 posttest average	-10.55	5.01	1.00	-12.62	-8.47	-10.51	24	.000

Correlation is significant at the .001 level (two-tailed).

Text1: Young Goodman Brown **Text2:** The Road from Colonus

According to the above table, when the subjects' scores in reading of the texts before treatments (pretest) are compared, no significant differences are seen between them reading texts 1 and 2 ($t = -.63$ for text 1 and $t = -.43$ for text 2). But the comparisons between their reading of each text in the pre-posttests, indicate substantially significant differences ($t = -11.82$ for text 1 and $t = -10.51$ for text 2); thus, again, showing significant effects of intertextuality awareness on reading literary texts of this type.

6. Discussion

It was the aim of this study to see if intertextuality awareness affects reading literary texts. If so, those readers who are/become aware or conscious of intertextuality and its elements in text construction are expected to do better reading than those without any intertextuality awareness. It seems that literary text readers coming to read and comprehend a text, analyse it into smaller units, extract the meanings of the units, then come to think of the meaning of the whole text. This kind of analysis is done both at the external/linguistic structure and internal or inter/textual structure of text (Nord, 1995; Poyatos, 2008). Depending on their reading experiences and abilities, the readers analyse the text to get the meaning and to make their interpretations out of the reading. The observations of the subjects doing the tasks and processing the texts, particularly after the treatments, and the results of the comparisons all seem to be in line with and support the claims made by the above researchers. The results indicated considerable increase in subjects' scores in the posttest compared to those in the pretest. Such increases may be because of the treatments the subjects received and, hence, because of the increase of their knowledge and awareness of intertextuality and the roles and functions of treatments in their reading and understanding of the texts. These signify the importance of text analysis as well as the importance and effects of intertextuality knowledge in text reading and interpretation. In this study, those readers who received treatments were more aware and conscious of the nature of textual constructions and elements, particularly intertextuality. This may be because in reading and understanding the (literary) text, the reader's mind is engaged in two processes: text components and the context; that is, as the reader analyses the text, s/he discovers text elements including intertextuality and the place and role of them in text construction and, as such, text meaning. Moreover, these lead the reader to see the text in the context of use and consequently see the text as a whole (see Mwansoko, 2003).

The analysis of text, thus, requires understanding the components and elements of text, or the discursive, textual, and structural elements of the text (Werth, 1997; Fairclough, 2003; Widdowson, 2004; Bloor and Bloor, 2007). However, as seen before, identifying and understanding intertextual elements seem to be of crucial

importance in text construction and text analysis, and thus effective and influential in reading and interpretation of the text. For these to be achieved, a practical model, or inventory of intertextuality is required. The results showed that the model developed here seems to be practical enough for research purposes of this type.

The comparison between two readings (pretest and posttest) in one of which the readers were not aware of intertextuality and in the other, which was done after treatments and the readers' awareness of intertextuality, suggests significant differences ($p < .001$, table 5). Such differences indicate that the treatment, that is, intertextuality awareness, plays an important role and thus is effective in reading literary text, short stories.

The treatments and intertextual awareness the subjects received seem to be consciousness-raising (Ellis, 1991, cited in Ellis, 1994: 643) for them to draw their attention toward the text, analyse it based on intertextual elements, think of the meanings of the elements as major parts of the text, and consequently, come to better understanding and interpretation of it compared with before they received the treatment and became intertextually aware/conscious of the existence and importance of those elements in literary texts and reading them. Thus, all these are evidence to support the hypothesis and answer the research question; that is, intertextuality awareness affects reading literary texts—short stories.

The results, however, did not show any difference of the effect of intertextuality awareness in reading different literary texts, since the effects of treatments were observed in subjects' reading of both short stories. That is, although the reading tasks were different—two short stories of two writers of two different ages—the readers' intertextuality awareness proved to be closely effective in both (table 5). This shows, although texts are different and each text has its own intertextuality and intertextual elements (Barthes, 1981; Allen, 2000; Webster, 1991; Travers, 1998), it seems that the process of intertextuality awareness is similar in reading even different texts and thus may have the same/similar effects. However, more research is needed for further generalisation.

7. Conclusion and Implications

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of intertextuality awareness on reading literary texts, short stories. To detect intertextuality in texts and to raise such awareness in the readers, a model (inventory) of intertextuality was needed. As such, because of the inadequacy of some of the existing models/inventories, a new model was developed and used for treatments to evoke the readers' awareness of intertextuality. The results and findings of this piece of research now provide some answer to the research question. First, through the models of intertextuality analysis developed in this paper, intertextual elements of literary texts can be traced, identified, and classified for possible studies of intertextuality in text analysis and reading. The results providing evidence in support of the research hypothesis signify that when readers of literary texts, short stories, receive instructions on some particular components of text/s, particularly intertextuality, they become conscious and more experienced of the nature, structure and content of the text to do a better reading and to come to better understanding. Thus, it can be concluded that intertextuality instructions lead to intertextuality awareness and consciousness raising in reading literary texts, which in turn lead to better understanding and interpretation of those texts. The findings show that text readers first analyse the text in different ways to get or make the meaning depending on their own experiences and understanding of the nature of texts. Thus, the more knowledge they have of and about the text, the better analysis and understanding and, consequently, the better meanings they can come to in their reading. One such understanding is intertextuality awareness, based on which, the readers can analyse the text better, delve and deepen into it to uncover its underlying stratum, and discover deeper meanings out of their reading. Therefore, this awareness of the intertextuality underlying and hidden in the text is working and effective in their reading and understanding of the text.

The findings also suggest some practical implications for instructive purposes, which may be insightful for syllabus designers, curriculum planners, and teacher of literature to prepare appropriate materials to help students and readers of literature develop their "literary competence" (Carter, 1989: 15) and hence to develop their experiences in reading literature. The findings also stipulate the importance and significance of instruction of intertextuality in teaching literature. The treatments used in this study caused better understanding of reading the texts. This leads us to conclude that such instructions can help increase readers' awareness of the nature and componential elements of the text and all elements that give textuality to it, including and probably more importantly, intertextuality (Bretens, 2001). If so, these may be practiced in teaching courses in classroom activities. Thus, teachers are expected to be themselves fully competent of the nature of these textual realities,

particularly intertextuality, in their teaching tasks, and try to draw their students' attentions toward them, and thereby help them do better reading and understanding of the literary texts they read.

However, to compensate for the limitations of this case study and to increase our knowledge and understanding of intertextuality and its functions in literary texts further research is strongly needed. The findings of the future studies in the same or similar line with the present paper and other literary genres, poetry and/or drama, for example, will hopefully provide more evidence for more generalisations.

References

- Abrams, M. H. A. (1993) *Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th edition. Harcourt Brace Collage Publishers, London.
- (General Editor), 1986. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, vol. 1.
- Ahmadian, M. 2010. *The Effects of Intertextuality Awareness on Literary Text Translation: A Case Study*. Paper presented at the 3rd Conference on Linguistics, Language, and Literature. Athens, 12-15 July, 2010.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London, Routledge, UK.
- Barthes, R. (1981). 'Theory of Text'. In R. Young (ed.), *Untying the Text: a post-structuralist reader*, 1981, 31-47. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- (1968/1988). 'The Death of the Author'. In D. Lodge. & N. Wood (eds.) (1988). *Modern Criticism and Theory: A reader*, 1988, 146-150. Pearson Education Ltd..
- Bell, R. (1993). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. Longman, London and New York.
- Bertens, H. (2001). *Literary Theory: The Basic*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Bloor M. & T. Bloor (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Holdder Arnold Education, London, UK.
- Booker, M. K. (1996). *A Practical Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism*. Longman Publishers, USA.
- Carter, R. 1989 *Directions in the Teaching and Study of English stylistics*. In Short, M. (ed.), *Reading, Analysing and Teaching Literature*, pp. 10-21, London, Longman.
- Ellis, R. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. OUP, Oxford, UK.
- Evans, I. H., 1989. *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*. Cassell Publisher Ltd. London (14th Edition).
- Fairclough, N. (1999). 'Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis'. In Jaworski, N & N. Coupland (eds.) *The Discourse Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Genette, G. 1992. *The Architect: An Introduction*. Jane E. Lewin (Trans.), Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Jane E. Levin (trans.), Lincoln NE and London University: University of Nebraska Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *On Texts and Discourse*, vol.2, Edited by Webster, J. Continuum. London and New York.
- 2003. *On Language and Linguistics*, vol. 3. Edited by Webster, J., Continuum, London and New York.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to literature and Art*. Gora, T., J. Alice and L. S. Roudiez (trans.) in L. S. Roudiez (ed.), *Columbia University Press*, New York.
- Lass, A. H., Kiremidjian, and Ruth M. Goldstein, 1987. *The Wordsworth Dictionary of Classical and Literary Allusion*. Wordsworth Editions Ltd, New York, USA.
- Mwansoko, J. 2003. *Translation Work at the Institute for Kiswahili Reserarch, Dares Salam Procedures, Problems and Solutions*. In *Bable*, 49, 4: 327-338.
- Nord, C., 1995. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Applications of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Armsterdam: Rodopi, reprinted, 2005.
- Peck, J. & M. Coyle (2002). *Literary Terms and Criticism*. 3rd edition. Pargrave Mc Milan, New York, USA.
- Poyatos, F. 2008. *Textual Translation and Live Translation*. Bermins Publishing Company, Philadelphia.
- Short, M. (ed.), 1989. *Reading, Analysing, and teaching Literature*. London, Longman.
- Travers, M. (1998). *An Introduction to Modern European Literature: From Romanticism to Postmodernism*. Mc Milan Press Ltd., London.
- Webster, R. (1993). *Studying Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Werth, P., 1997. *Text World: Representing Conceptual Spaces in Discourse*. London, Longman.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, UK.