

# The Effect of Employing Fairclough's Model on Developing EFL Students' Literary Awareness

Ban Shihab Ahmed & prof. Dr. Nagham  
Q.Yahya

Garmian University

Tikrit University

اثر توظيف انموذج فيركلوف في تنمية الوعي الأدبي لدى الطلاب متعلمي اللغة  
الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية

د. نغم يحيى قدوري

كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية جامعة تكريت

بان شهاب احمد

كلية اللغات والعلوم الانسانية جامعة كرميان

□

□

□

□

□

□

□

□

□

□

The present study aims to find out the role of teaching by a strategy adopted from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model by Fairclough on EFL student's literary awareness. It was attempted to explore any change in the students' awareness in revealing the implied meaning of the texts after critical instruction through CDA techniques. The participants were 60 undergraduate students of college of education for human sciences, fourth year at University of Diyala. They were assigned into two groups of 30 students. It hypothesized that there is no statistically significant differences between the mean score of the achievement of the experimental group and the control one. The results revealed that the experimental group outperformed the control group after being instructed through CDA.

**Keywords:; Fairclough's Model, Critical discourse Analysis , literary awareness**

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى معرفة دور التدريس بإستراتيجية معتمدة من نموذج التحليل النقدي للخطاب CDA لفيركلاف في الوعي الأدبي لطلبة اللغة الإنكليزية كلغة أجنبية. وقد تمت محاولة استكشاف أي تغيير في وعي الطلاب في الكشف عن المعنى الضمني للنصوص بعد التدريس النقدي من خلال تقنيات CDA. بلغ عدد المشاركين ٦٠ طالباً وطالبة من كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية السنة الرابعة في جامعة ديالى. تم تقسيمهم إلى مجموعتين من ٣٠ طالبا. وافترضت أنه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات تحصيل المجموعة التجريبية والضابطة. وأظهرت النتائج تفوق المجموعة التجريبية على المجموعة الضابطة بعد تلقياها التعليمات من خلال CDA.

## 1. Introduction

**1.1 The Problem and its Significance** Higher education has never been free from drawbacks, and the situation today is no exception. One of the major problems of modern universities in a large number of different countries is the lack of students' ability to successfully interpret different kinds of literary texts their through Literary awareness .It is necessary for students to be aware of the use of language in order to get the meaning in the text. Literary works help them develop their language skills, awareness of language and culture, even critical thinking. This is done in order to make them aware that language does not consist of rules and formulas only, but it has meaning, function and purpose. Besides, reading literary text is never simply a matter of receiving or absorbing the meaning of the text. As it is mentioned earlier, Fairclough's three dimensional framework to CDA has been known for its application on political speeches, advertisements and literary works( Fairclough, 2010). Despite this model is devoted to analyse the discourse of literary genre such as political novels, yet, most of researchers still apply literary tools in analysing literary texts, for instance: content analysis, structure analysis, analysis of the elements of the story and rhetorical analysis. For this reason, the present study selects the novel of George Orwell Animal Farm to illustrate this problem because most of researchers analyze its language and themes by CDA .However ,they do not apply Fairclough's approach as a methodological tool to reveal the connection between language, power and ideology that are clearly manipulated in the literary discourse of the selected novel.

**1.2 The Aims** The study aims to find out:

1. The role of a CDA model as a teaching strategy in the study sample literary awareness.
2. Students' level in literary awareness by comparing among students' levels in the five elements literary awareness (exposure, production,adjustment, reference build up, and linking cross up).
3. Students' level in literary awareness by comparing among students' levels in the three domains of literary awareness ( knowledge , emotional ,and skilful ).

## 1.3 The Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that Hypotheses

1. There is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group's mean scores and the control group's mean scores in the literary awareness post-test.
2. There are no statistically significant differences among mean scores of students in the literary awareness elements (exposure ,production, adjustment , reference build up, and linking cross up) in the post-test of the experimental group.
3. There are no statistically significant differences among mean scores of students in the literary awareness domains (knowledge , emotional ,and skilful) in the post-test of the experimental group.

## 1.4 The Value of the Study

The study will be valuable to EFL teachers who are expected to get benefit from this study since it will identify the strategies of CDA to help students to understand the ideologies and the hidden meaning of the text. theoretically, the study will be of value to linguists and students of linguistics.

## 1.5 The Limits

This study is limited to :

- 1- The investigation of Iraqi fourth year college students' literary awareness.
- 2- CDA model which is chosen by the researcher is Fairclough ( 1995) three dimensions (description, interpretation and explanation ) model.
2. Students are chosen from English department, college of education, university of Garminan for the pilot study and from Diyala university for the experimental design.
- 3.The subjects that are chosen to be taught include novel subject (Animal Farm by George Orwell) at the second semester.
- 4- The experiment was conducted during the academic year (2022- 2023).

## 1.6 The Procedures

The following procedures are used in this study:

1. Presenting an overview
2. The control and experimental groups students will be selected randomly from EFL fourth year classes of the college of Education , Garmian University.
3. A pretest is designed for equalization between the experimental and control group.
4. The adopted Novel (Animal Farm) is taught to both groups as literary texts.
5. The experimental group is taught according CDA Model, while the control group is taught according to the traditional method.
6. After the administration of the post-test and collecting data will be statistically analyzed and interpreted.
7. Conclusions will be drawn according to the findings of the results.

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1 The Concept of Discourse

According to Hodge and Kress (1993), discourse is a form of knowledge, so the term discourse is then an umbrella term for all the supra-sentential study of language. On the other hand , Carter(1993 cited in Drid , 2010 ) claims each of the terms refers to different things :the word text refers to the written form , while the word discourse refers to the spoken one while Schmitt (2010) states that discourse is the use of language in variety of context. Thus it is impossible to imagine human world without discourse because imagining life without discourse is like imagining it without language and humans , in the course of their lives exchange various oral and written languages (Arnonff and Rees-Miller2001:446). In other approaches, discourse is defined as "language use as social practice". In other words, it moves back and forth in shaping and being shaped by the social world (Rogers et al., 2005, p.369) On a similar vein, Hoey (1991) relates discourse to all aspects of language organization (whether structured or not) that operate above the level of grammar. The term is also used to underlie the communicative purpose of a text in that it consists of "meaningful combinations of language units which serve various communicative purposes and perform various acts in different contexts" (Steel 2002).

### 2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Wetherell et al. (2001 ) view CDA as the study of spoken and written language. It is a collection of methods and theories for studying language in use as well as language in social context. Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) has originated in the 20th century. CDA has developed rapidly over the last seven or eight years, and it is still rapidly revolving. For researchers, scholars, and teachers of speaking, CDA is believed to offer a rich form of critical speech analysis that builds on techniques and concepts already familiar to most sociolinguistics. But it offers new things as well, and blends them all together in a way that is unique and fruitful. It investigates language use from a social perspective; that means "language is conceived as one element of the social process dialectically interconnected with others" (Fairclough & Graham, 2002, p. 188). Instances of social interaction in one's real life which take partial or complete linguistic forms are analyzed by CDA with the intention of making clear "the ideological loading of particular ways of using language and the relations of power" which are hidden under them (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.258). Social practices are included within CDA and these practices are based on their own discourse moments (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999)CDA appears from the school of "critical linguistics" ( Fowler et al., 1979), which originated from the work of Halliday's functional linguistics (1978, 1985), systemic and also theoretical ideologies

(Fairclough, 1993; Roger, 2003). Ideology and power are highlighted in CDA and intentions to "recover the social meanings expressed in discourse by analyzing the linguistic structures in the light of their interest and wider social context" (Fowler et al., 1979, pp. 195-196). CDA is also affected by Althusser's (1971) Marxist theory of ideology, which shows "ideologies not as a nebulous realm of "ideas" but as tied to material practices embedded in social institutions (how teaching is organized in classrooms, for instance)" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.261) Two influential approaches affect the emerging of CDA: the former one is the Hallidayan Linguistics which combines the functions of social semiotics into a theory of grammar which helps examine the relationships between society and discourse (Blommaert, 2005, p. 22); the second one is the British Cultural Studies: The Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies which is found by Stuart Hall and this approach includes cultural, social and political issues (Blommaert, 2005 ) Besides, CDA is understood to be critical in a number of different ways: its commitment to the analysis of social wrongs such as prejudice, or unequal access to power, privileges, and material and symbolic resources, (Fairclough, 2003), its interest in discerning which prevailing hegemonic social practices have caused such social wrongs, in developing methods that can be applied to their study. (Bloor and Bloor, 2007) According to Van Dijk( 1993a, p.250) CDA is a method which is used to examine texts to find out what "structures, strategies, or other properties of texts, talk, verbal instruction, or communicative events play a role" in the production of the relations of power. Wetherell et al. (2001, p. i) view CDA as: The study of spoken and written language. It is a collection of methods and theories for studying language in use as well as language in social context. Fairclough (1995b, p.97) mentions that his approach to DA is critical to the intention to make visible through analysis, and to criticize ,connections between properties of texts and social processes and relations ( ideologies, power relations) which are generally not obvious to people who produce and interpret those texts, and whose effectiveness depends upon this opacity. CDA's starting point "lies in Rhetoric Science, Text Linguistics, Anthropology, Socio-psychology, Cognitive Science, Literary Studies, and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p.1).

### 2.3 Applying Fairclough Model in Classroom

Fairclough applies the concept of discourse in three different ways. Firstly, discourse refers to language use as social practice, secondly , discourse is understood as the kind of language used within a specific field, such as political or scientific discourse. And thirdly, in the most concrete usage, discourse is used as a count noun (a discourse, the discourse, the discourses, discourses) referring to a way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective. In this last sense, the concept refers to any discourse that can be distinguished from other discourses such as, for example, a feminist discourse, a neoliberal discourse, a Marxist discourse, a consumer discourse, or an environmentalist discourse (Fairclough 1993 Here, Fairclough draws on Halliday's multifunctional approach (1994) to language. In any analysis, two dimensions of discourse are important focal points:

1- The communicative event –such as a newspaper article, a film, a video, an interview or a political speech (Fairclough 1995b).

2- The order of discourse –all discourse types which are used within a social institution or a social field. Discourse types consist of discourses and genres. Within an order of discourse, there are specific discursive practices through which text and talk are produced and consumed or interpreted (Fairclough 1998) In every discursive practice, every instance of language use is a communicative event consisting of three dimensions:

- It is a text (speech, writing, visual image or a combination of these), The description level.
- It is a discursive practice which involves the production and consumption of texts. The interpretation level.
- It is a social practice. The explanation level. The general purpose of the three-dimensional model is, then, to provide an analytical framework for discourse analysis. The model is based on, and promotes, the principle that texts can never be understood or analysed in isolation – they can only be understood in relation to webs of other texts and in relation to the social context. All three dimensions should be covered in a specific discourse analysis of a communicative event. The analysis should focus, then, on (1) the linguistic features of the text (text), (2) processes relating to the production and consumption of the text (discursive practice); and (3) the wider social practice to which the communicative event belongs (social practice). (Fairclough, 1992b).

In Fairclough's three-dimensional model for critical discourse analysis ,text analysis concentrates on the formal features (such as vocabulary, grammar, syntax and sentence coherence) from which discourses and genres are realised linguistically. The relationship between texts and social practice is mediated by discursive practice (Collier ,1994) Fairclough's (2001) framework provides the opportunity to pursue a wide variety of practical learning and teaching activities. This discourse approach to language learning removes language



from the confines of textbooks and makes it tangible, so that students can explore language as interaction rather than as grammatical units. The following are only a few examples:

-Teachers could develop in students an attitude that promotes the exploration and discovery of (1) basic text types (2) the structure of the values linguistically encoded, and (3) their social function, that will lead to develop comprehension and production skills. - A major theory on which Fairclough's CDA approach is Halliday's SFG. The teaching of SFG will be worthwhile as it is different from traditional grammar, permitting learners to gain knowledge of English grammar from another perspective . More importantly, is learning how to apply it within a CDA framework.

-As the aim of CDA is to stimulate critical thinking- such as texts dealing with issues related to sex stereotypes, racism, immigrant policies, ethnic prejudice, power conflicts, discriminatory practices, and so on.

- Students can be encouraged to build a 'mini-corpus' of data and, for example, to collect and analyse examples of a particular discourse type constructed in an array of diverse contexts: e.g. the language of political speeches, campaigns, and debates.

- Students benefit from the opportunity to undertake a comparative analysis. To illustrate cultural bias in all its media manifestations, It is recommended to use of texts from all forms of the mass media: newspapers, magazines, broadcast radio and television, and the Internet.

- Moreover CDA helps students become better, more active and critical readers. It makes broader use of context than other approaches, and it encourages students to analyze texts in ways that bring their hidden meanings to the surface (Wallace 1992). Furthermore it allows teachers to focus on a variety of textual features and show students how they have real significance for reading comprehension. Concepts like, metaphor, presupposition, and so on can be taught not just as abstract terms but as important features in the interpretation of real-world texts. In this way, students are introduced to important ideas and concepts which they find difficult to understand in the abstract: presupposition, nominalization and intertextuality, for example are made more accessible by being grounded in students' own experience of collecting, analysing and interpreting discourse data.

## 2.4 Literary Awareness

In LitAw, readers first become aware of patterns and are then given the opportunity to appropriate themselves of these patterns, opening new possibilities for language play. Appropriation is in line with Pope's (1995) suggestion that "the best way to understand how a text works is to change it: to play around with it, to intervene in it in some way (large or small), and then to try to account for the exact effect of what you have done Schmidt (1990) states that based on the recent developments in stylistics and in Language Awareness in Britain, an emergence of a new discipline( Literary Awareness ) shows how it can be beneficial to EFL students at tertiary level, especially as an introductory course to literary studies. The interest in Language Awareness grew from the evidence that many students go through university acquiring a rather transient knowledge about literature. Textbooks and syllabuses will normally specify the exact language which is to be taught at each level but literature can play a key role in helping to develop awareness, something which must be the first step towards gaining grammatical control . Lewis, 1993 and Fotos, 1994 show how explicit consciousness raising, form-focussed tasks can lead to enhanced grammatical and lexical awareness.(cited in Farahian, and Rezaee, 2015). Literary awareness is necessary for students to be aware of the use of language in order to get the meaning in the text. Literary works help them develop their language skills, awareness of language and culture, even critical thinking. This is done in order to make them aware that language does not consist of rules and formulas only, but it has meaning, function and purpose. Besides, reading literary text is never simply a matter of receiving or absorbing the meaning of the text. Maria Kostelnikova (2001.p.84) Awareness of powerful linguistic patterns, their effects on the reader, the fascination of a well written piece, the possibility of being changed by the reading experience, these are aspects that still remain foreign to many classrooms. (Bolitho, et al. 2003). Literary works are different from scientific texts. Fenner (2006) cited in Kostelnikova (2001.p.84 ) mentions that literary text has certain characteristics such as language, content, and cultural aspects, that requires interpretation, an active encounter with potential meanings of the text. Then reading literary text according to Kostelnikova differs fundamentally from reading other text types since the relation between the text and reality is non-existent: it is gradually created by the writer and the reader, the readers create the relationship for themselves.

## 2.5 Elements in literary awareness

Zyngier, et.al (2007) explain five elements for LitAw which involve: exposure, cross-linking, reference build up, adjustment, and productivity:

## 1. Exposure

Hoey (1991) cited in Zyngier, (2002) illustrates that Exposure occurs through direct contact of a reader with a text. From childhood, individuals develop a notion of literary forms and function from experience with rhyme and rhythm through poems, songs, narratives, etc. described how sensitization to rhythmical forms and poetic patterns begins very early in life, with a mother's monologue with her baby. So, contact with a text later on necessarily triggers unique and individual responses according to each reader's background, resulting in interpretations of distinct and variable complexities. Practice is also important, the more reading is done, the more practice is obtained. But alone it may not guarantee sensitization. Exposure depends on at least four factors: setting, duration, intensity, and type of reading.

## 2. Cross-linking

It refers to the ability of learners to build relations between different parts when they are in the process of meaning construction. They have to read with the 'eye of the mind'. This process is called cross-linking, which can be carried out backwards and forwards and is served by three sub-elements: **projection, inference, and intentionality.**

## 3. Reference Build-up

According to Chase and Simon (1973) cited in Zyngier, et.al (2007), Reference build-up explains that frames, schemata and 'repertoires' are relevant to LitAw. They demonstrate that the brain does not store isolated definitions but sets of relations. Once the reader builds a backbone network of reference, new relations can be more easily added. Moreover, this network will serve as a springboard into experimentation. The more connections readers can make, the more complex their understanding of the text.

Like cross-linking, reference build-up depends on integration and sequentiality and varies according to difference in background.

## 4. Adjustment

This element relates to the ability of readers to reject, accept, or revise the information they gain from the text. Rejection may occur when connections cannot be made for some reason. Adjustment involves *matching* what is expected of the text to a body of knowledge and *assimilating the new*. Much of the fascination of a literary text depends on the newness of the experience. Zyngier (et.al, 2007).

This is the process known as foregrounding (Sklovsky, 1917, 1965). The more experienced the readers, the more they will be in a position to pick out smaller details and respond to more delicate subtleties. In this process, the reader will be able to create what Bruner (1990) calls a "link between the exceptional and the ordinary", that is, s/he will be able to find a reason that makes the unusual comprehensible, mitigating the departure from a canonical cultural pattern.

## 4. Productivity

It refers to the ability to pick and play with stylistic patterns in order to create effects. Encouraging learners' personal expression and the use of it is considered to be a strong component of LitAw. The objective is not the production of stunning literary pieces but the development of the ability to choose and be explicit about the choices. Participation in verbal art helps students choose, describe, identify, and discuss stylistic patterns (Carter *et al.*, 1997) cited in Zyngier, et.al (2007). LitAw, therefore, results from a process in which the reader awakens to and takes cognizance of the verbal artistry of a literary text. Becoming aware of its elements which are involved in the language of imaginative texts, therefore, it is a complex phenomenon which needs further investigation and refinement. At this point, the elements described above can be verified to be used in an educational setting. (Miall, 1996: 1).

## 3. Procedures

### 3.1 Design of the Experiment

The experimental design has a major position since it supports the researcher with the right way to get persistent results that may assist the researcher to solve the problem of the study and to verify the proposed hypotheses, and to obtain valid and appropriate answers to the study questions (Kerlinger, 1978:275). As far as the educational experimental design is concerned, it is important for any researcher to control the whole variables as precisely as possible. Since the present study aims to assess the effect of an independent variable on the students' achievement, the researcher has used qualitative, quantitative research design which is widely used in such educational research (Best and Khan, 2010). The design used in this study is Quasi Experimental Control Group Design, concerning the experimental group (EG) which is treated by independent variable will be taught by applying CDA model steps 'description', 'interpretation and

'explanation'. On the other hand the control group (CG) is treated by the traditional method of teaching (i.e. lecturing method and some interactional discussions), as shown in table (1).

**Table (1) The Study Experimental Design**

Group	Treatment	Instrument
EG	CDA model steps	Achievement Test and Questionnaire
CG	Traditional way of Teaching (lecturing)	

### 3.2 Population and Sampling

A population consists of all of the individuals who are involved in a study for particular purpose. While the smaller group which is chosen from the population to present it is called a sample (Bachman,2006& Best and Khan,2006). The population of the present study includes the fourth year students in Garmian and Dayala for the academic year 2022/2023. The total number of the population is a 327 students. The chosen sample for the experiment is 60 students from Garmian university. Whereas, the students chosen for the pilot study are from Dayala University, as mentioned in table (2).

**Table (2) The Population and Sample**

Population		level	percentage	Sample	Pilot study
Garmian University	360	Fourth year	5.3%	/	25
Diyala	767			60	/
<b>Total</b>	<b>1127</b>				

### 2.8 The Discrimination Power of the LA

The extreme group's method, in which the two groups from the extremes (the upper and lower (27%) are compared, is used to estimate item discrimination. The significance of the variance between the two groups is determined using the t-test for two independent samples after calculating the mean score and standard deviation of the two groups. The calculated t-value of all the items is higher than the critical one (2.07) at a degree of freedom (23) and level of significance (0.05) which shows that all the items are statistically significant.

### 3.4 Reliability of the Test

To achieve the aim, Thus, the same achievement test has been administered to the pilot sample of (25) students. Chronbach's Alpha, which statistically measures the internal consistency, has been used to find out the reliability of the achievement test. Chronbach's coefficient is 0.83 which indicates that the test is highly reliable. The following table ( 3.15)is the level of internal consistency of Cronbach Alpha

**Table (3) Internal Consistency by Using Cronbach Alpha Formula**

Cronbach Alpha	Internal Consistency
> 0.90	very highly reliable
0.80–0.90	highly reliable
0.70–0.79	Reliable
0.60–0.69	marginally/minimally reliable
< 0.60	unacceptably low reliability

**3.10. Analysis of the Test Items** The test items are required to be analyzed in order to determine two important features: difficulty level, and discrimination power, as follows.

**3.10.1 Discriminating Power and Difficulty Level** The difficulty level is defined as the ratio of the students who answered each item correctly (Rosas, 2000:). The items whose difficulty level ranges between 0.20 and 0.80 are acceptable (Madson,1983) The most suitable test item will have item difficulty varying between 0.15 and 0.85 (Brown, 2010). It was found that the current test items' DL ranges from (0.28) to (0.78), as shown in Table (3.18) Discrimination power means " measuring the extent to which the results of an individual item correlate with the results of the whole test" (Alderson, 1999). This means that an object is deemed to have weak power of discrimination if it is correctly scored by high-skilled students as well as low-skilled students. Item discrimination refers to the degree to which an object makes a difference between good and poor test. An object has the good power of discrimination if it collects the right answers from the good students and the wrong answers from the weak students. It is worth noting that the high power of discrimination will be close to 1.0, and no power of discrimination will be nil at all (Brown, 2010). The results obtained indicate that the test item DP ranges from 0.28-0.85.

## 4. Data Analysis

### 4.1 Data Analysis Related to the First Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the First hypothesis namely: **There is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group's mean scores and the control group's mean scores in the literary awareness post-test**, the T-test formula of one independent sample has been used. Consequently, the first aim of the study undoubtedly: **finding out role of a CDA model as a teaching strategy in the study sample literary awareness**, will be achieved. In order to achieve the third aim, the test is applied for (120) students (the experimental 60 students and the control 60 students). Then, the calculated t-value and the tabulated t-value is achieved by using the T-Test formula for independent sample test to estimate student's performance. According to the following results in table (4.1), the mean scores of the experimental group is (66.13) and standard deviation is (5.894). While the mean scores of the control group is (38.60) and the standard deviation is (7.356). The calculated t-value (15.99) is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). Observing the values of T-calculated above, it is found that the calculated T-value (66.13) is much greater than the tabulated T-value (2.00), and from this it can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control group, who are taught according to the conventional method and the mean scores of the experimental group, who are taught by CDA model as a teaching strategy in the post- test. So, the first hypothesis is rejected and the first aim is achieved. **Table (4) Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups Performance in Post Test**

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	66.13	5.894	15.99	2.00	58	0.05
Control	30	38.60	7.356				

### 4.2. Data Analysis for the Second Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the second aim the second hypothesis is given namely: **'There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the males and females in the literary awareness post-test of the experimental group'**, the independent samples T-test statistics have been used. Consequently, the related aim of the study namely: **The role of a CDA model as a teaching strategy in the study sample literary awareness according to sex variable (male-female) in the experimental group**, will be achieved. For achieving the second aim, an achievement test is applied on (30) male and female students of the experimental group. Then, t-value is calculated and compared to the tabulated by using the T-Test formula for two independent samples to estimate student's performance. The obtained results show that females mean scores at is found to be (64.77) and male mean scores is found to be (68.16). The t-test formula for independent samples is used to show that the calculated t-value is (1.852) and the tabulated t-value is (1.70) at the degree of freedom (28) and level of significance (0.05), as shown in table (4.4). It can be inferred that there is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the males and females students in the literary awareness post-test of the experimental group for the behalf of male students. So the third hypothesis is rejected and the third aim is achieved. **Table (4.4) Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of Male and Female in Literary Awareness**

	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Female	18	64.77	5.620	1.852	1.70	28	0.05
Male	12	68.16	5.936				

### 4.4. Data Analysis for the Third Hypothesis



To analyze the data related to the fourth hypothesis namely: **There are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and that of the control group in literary awareness elements in the post-test**, the T-test formula of one independent sample has been used. Consequently, the fourth aim of the study undoubtedly: **finding out role of a CDA model as a teaching strategy in the study sample literary awareness elements**, will be achieved. In order to achieve the fourth aim, an achievement is applied for (60) experimental and control students (the experimental 30 students and the control 30 students). Then, the calculated t-value and the tabulated t-value is achieved by using the T-Test formula for independent sample test to estimate student's performance in literary awareness elements. There are five elements:

**1. Production** According to the following results in table (4.5), the mean scores of the experimental group in the production is (11.07) and standard deviation is (3.667). While the mean scores of the control group is (11.00) and the standard deviation is (3.922). The calculated t-value (0.068) is lower than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that there is no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group in the literary awareness elements "Production".

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	11.07	3.667	0.068	2.00	58	0.05
Control	30	11.00	3.922				

**2. Adjustment** According to the following results in table (4.6), the mean scores of the experimental group in the adjustment (13.87) and standard deviation is (2.224). While the mean scores of the control group is (7.53) and the standard deviation is (3.309). The calculated t-value (8.701) is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group in the literary awareness elements "Adjustment". In favor for the experimental group.

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	13.87	2.224	8.701	2.00	58	0.05
Control	30	7.53	3.309				

**3. Reference buildup** According to the following results in table (4.7), the mean scores of the experimental group in the reference build up is (12.53) and standard deviation is (2.345). While the mean scores of the control group is (8.20) and the standard deviation is (2.797). The calculated t-value (6.503) is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group in the literary awareness elements "Reference build up". In favor for the experimental group. So the fourth hypothesis is rejected and the fourth aim is achieved.

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		

Experimental	30	12.53	2.345	<b>6.503</b>	<b>2.00</b>	58	0.05
Control	30	8.20	2.797				

## 4. Linking Cross up

According to the following results in table (4.8), the mean scores of the experimental group in the Linking cross up is (14.67) and standard deviation is (2.368). While the mean scores of the control group is (7.07) and the standard deviation is (3.667). The calculated t-value (9.537) is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group in the literary awareness elements " Linking Cross up ".In favor for the experimental group.**Table (4.8)Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups Performance in Literary Awareness Elements " Linking Cross up "**

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	14.67	2.368	<b>9.537</b>	<b>2.00</b>	58	0.05
Control	30	7.07	3.667				

## 5. Exposure

According to the following results in table (4.9), the mean scores of the experimental group in exposure is (14.00) and standard deviation is (2.407). While the mean scores of the control group is (7.93) and the standard deviation is (4.533). The calculated t-value (6.474) is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) with a degree of freedom (58) at a level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group in the literary awareness elements " Exposure ".In favor for the experimental group.

**Table (4.9) Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups Performance in Literary Awareness Elements " Exposure "**

Group	N.	Mean	S.D.	T-Value		DF	Level of Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Experimental	30	14.00	2.407	<b>6.474</b>	<b>2.00</b>	58	0.05
Control	30	7.93	4.533				

To verify the Comparison Between (Production, Reference build up, Adjustment, exposure, and Linking cross up ). For the students' performance, the one Way ANOVA is used to see whether there are any significant differences in the mean scores of Production, Reference build up, Adjustment, exposure, and Linking cross up, as shown in table (4.10) below:**Table (4.10)One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Production, Reference build up, Adjustment, exposure, and Linking cross up**

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
Between Groups	246.827	4	61.707	8.742	3.1	0.05
Within Groups	1023.467	145	7.058			

Total	1270.293	149				
-------	----------	-----	--	--	--	--

Table (4.3) shows that the computed F-value value is 8.742 higher than the tabulated F-value (3.1) at the 0.05 level of significance and DF = 440. This indicates that there are statistically significant differences between students' mean scores Production, Reference build up, Adjustment, Exposure and Linking cross up, as show in the following table ( 4.11 ). **Table (4.11) Comparisons among the Four Variables (Scheffe<sup>a</sup>)**

Groups	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Production	30		11.0667
Reference build up	30		12.5333
Adjustment	30		13.8667
Exposure	30		14.0000
Linking cross up	30		14.6667
Sig.		.339	.051
Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.			
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size =30.000			

According to the table (4.11), the comparisons of means showed that the sheffee's scores of the Production 11.0667, Reference buildup 12.5333, Adjustment 13.8667, Exposure 14.0000 and Linking cross up 14.6667, at level of significant (0.05) and all the calculated Sheffee scores are more than the tabulated one which is (3.1). These results indicate that students response in Linking cross up has the highest mean score.

#### 4.4 Discussion of Results

Students can promote their literary awareness through different activities and tasks but under particular classroom management because the literary texts has different genres and need to be interpreted under the main thematic procedures. Critical Discourse Analysis proved its role in enhancing learners ability to acquire best quality of literary awareness. Fairclough procedures or steps enable students to interprets and understand text and context of any discourse whether its political or literary.

#### 5. Conclusions

The present study has reached to the following conclusions:

- 1- CDA Model practical steps can improve in understanding literary texts in advanced level,
- 2- Students' level in linking cross up is higher the other four components of literary awareness.
- 3- It has been found out that Fairclough's criteria are effective through increasing learning literary awareness,
- 4- Connections of events and different kinds of themes are better analyzed and criticized through using CDA.
- 5- CDA model promote students cognitive ability and increase their confidence to enlarge their ideas illustrations concerning any topic they can scan.
- 6- Literary awareness improvement is something really significant for college students and it needs specific strategies and models, for this reasons CDA is found out that has the major and appropriate bases for such kind of skills concerning teaching literary texts.

#### References

- Al-Azzawi.N .B Huda and Hassan A.A. Qusay ,(2023).The link between students' knowledge of literature and their success of literature in basic education institutions.Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences 10(3S) 5110-5119 .2023
- Alderson, C. (1995) Dictionary of Language Testing. London :Cambridge University Press.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In L. Althusser (Ed.), Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays. London: New Left Books.
- Aronoff, M. and Rees-Miller, J. (2001) The Handbook of Linguistics. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, Beijing.
- Bachman, L. F. (2006). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Best and Khan (2010) Research in education. London: Routledge
- Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanic, R, Matsuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten Questions about Language Awareness. English language Teaching Journal 57/3, pp.251-259.

- Bloomaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. (2000). *Critical Discourse analysis*. Annual Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610295>
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2013). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. 1-207. 10.4324/9780203775660.
- Brown (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*: Pearson Education White Plains, NY.
- Chase, W. G., & Simon, H. A. (1973). Perception in Chess. *Cognitive Psychology*, 4, 55-81.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(73\)90004-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(73)90004-2)
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Collier, A. (1994). *Critical Realism*. London: Verso.
- Drid, T. (2010). *Discourse Analysis: Key Concepts and Perspectives*. Alathar journal. 09. 20-25.
- Fairclough, N. (ed). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London: Harlow. Longman. (pp.1-29).
- Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993a). *Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities*. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2): 133-68.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1998) *Political discourse in the media: an analytical framework*, in A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds), *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *The discourse of New Labour: critical discourse analysis*. in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. Yates (eds). *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809068.ch1>
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies 2 (A Multidisciplinary Introduction)* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Graham, P. (2002). *Marx as Critical Discourse Analyst: The Genesis of a Critical Method and its Relevance to the Critique of Global Capital*. *Estdios de Sociolinguistica*, 3 (1), 185-229.
- Farahian, Majid & Rezaee, Mehrdad. (2015). *Language Awareness in EFL Context: An Overview*. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*. 2. 19-21.
- Fowler, R., B. Hodge, G. Kress, and T. Trew (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1977). *Text as semantic choice in social contexts*. In T.A. van Dijk & J.S. Petofi (Eds.), *Grammars and descriptions (Studies in text theory and text analysis)* (pp. 176-225). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (1st ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hodge, R. and Kress, G.R. (1993). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1978). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*. Surject Publications, Delhi.
- Kostelnikova, Maria 2001. *Raising Language Awareness and Cultural Awareness by using literary text in the process of foreign language in Slovaki*. European Centre for Modern Languages. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Madsen, H.S. (1983). *Techniques in testing*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miall, D. S. (1996). *Empowering the Reader: Literary Response and Classroom Learning*. In Roger J. Pope, R. (1995). *Textual intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Rogers, R. (2003). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices: Power In and Out of Print*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. (2005). *Critical discourse analysis in education: A Review of the Literature*. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365-416. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003365>



- Rosas, M. (2000). The level of difficulty and discrimination power of the basic knowledge and skills examinations.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 17-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230293977>.
- Shklovsky, V. (1917) (1965). Art as Technique. In L.T. Lemon and M. Reis (eds), *Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, pp. 3–24.
- Steel, H. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Available : <http://www.er/baum.cam/books/searchintro/bookDetailscvr.cfm>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, (4) 2, 249–283.
- Wallace, C. (1992). Critical Literacy Awareness in the EFL Classroom. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical Language Awareness* (pp. 59-92). London: Longman.
- Wetherell, M., Talor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>.
- Zyngier S. (2002). *Developing Awareness in Literature*. – Rio de Janeiro: Setor de Publicações da Faculdade de Letras da UFRJ.
- Zyngier, S., Fialho, O., do Prado Rios, P.A. (2007). Revisiting Literary Awareness. In: Watson, G., Zyngier, S. (eds) *Literature and Stylistics for Language Learners*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230624856\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230624856_15)