

Intertextualities in English Writing of EFL Learners in the Context of Chinese University

Yuanyan Hu

College of Foreign Studies, Nanjing Agricultural University, China

Abstract—When the writing subject is communicating with the addressee, their texts simultaneously communicate with the present and the past texts. The author carries out an empirical study to find out issues to be addressed in the context of Chinese university in EFL learners' English writing with respect to intertextuality. The study examines the manifestations of three types of intertextualities---material intertextuality, generic intertextuality and cultural intertextuality and finds out that there are obvious material intertextualities between students' individualized texts and exterior texts. Certain generic intertextualities manifesting in the repetition of specific structures are deficient. And in terms of cultural intertextuality, it is found that the exterior texts have exerted an obvious cultural intertextual influence on activating pertinent schema texts of participants, promoting the comprehension of the writing theme as well as further affecting the completions of their writings.

Index Terms—material intertextuality, generic intertextuality, cultural intertextuality, EFL learner, English writing

I. INTRODUCTION

As a modern literary and cultural theory, intertextuality is acknowledged as a theory stemming from the Saussurean linguistics. (Allen, 2011) French semiotician Julia Kristeva utilized the term intertextuality “to render the complexity and heterogeneity of discourse intersecting in particular textual productions by stating that the construction of every text is based upon the absorptions and transformations of other texts” (Thibault, 1994, p.1752). According to Kristeva, Intertextuality is a salient distinction of text implying that a text is made up of traces or memories of other texts. She sees reflection and interlacing of literary texts from the reflection and interlacing of words and phrases. On the basis of Bakhtin's (1981) view that considers “the literary word as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context” (Kristeva, 1986, p.36), the definition of literary text and the notion of intertextuality of Kristeva is endowed with a horizontal dimension and a vertical dimension as well. She defines literary text horizontally as it “belongs to both writing subject and addressee” (ibid, p.36-37), and vertically as it “is oriented towards an anterior or synchronic literary corpus”(ibid).

Intertextuality pays close attentions to the emergence of texts out of context as well as text's continuative existence and interaction within certain social and cultural texts. Kristeva (1969, 1980, 1986) believes that no literary text is written in a vacuum and text can never be cut apart from context, the larger cultural or social textuality where text is generated. When the writing subject is communicating with the addressee, their texts simultaneously communicate with the present and the past texts. With the development of researches on relationships among reader, writer and discourse, intertextuality theory has been widely used by many foreign scholars (Armstrong & Newman, 2011; Bloome, D. & A. Egan-Robertson, 1993; Hartman, 1995; Hartman, 2004; Holmes, 2004; Manak, 2011; Pantaleo, 2006; Short, 1992; Shuart-Faris, N. & D. Bloome, 2004) in the fields of linguistic studies and language teaching, especially in reading and writing teaching.

Ever since 2002 when YANG Hui and ZHANG Xinjun published the first article on the combination of intertextuality theory with teaching research in the core journal, the theory of intertextuality has been widely applied in the pedagogical researches in China by scholars especially in the study of writing teaching and learning. Taking SFL (Systemic functional linguistics) theory as the theoretical framework and intertextuality theory as a manner of integration, YANG Rufu (2009) has constructed a triple-faceted intertextual pattern consisting of co-presentational, co-orientational, and co-organizational intertextualities. YANG believes that applications of intertextuality strategy and the triple-faceted intertextual pattern can assist students' readings and writings and guide the discourse analysis in a more effective way. WANG Changmi (2010) attempts to reveal the intertextual nature of writing by regarding the construction of text as a dialogic course of multiple texts. He has developed an intertextual pattern of English writing, in which writer creates new texts from previous texts through referential intertextuality, functional intertextuality and generic intertextuality. He highlights that creating intertextual circumstance and cultivating awareness of intertextuality can be effective in increasing the efficiency of English writing and the quality of English writing teaching.

However, there are few studies exploring concrete embodiments of intertextualities in English writings of college students in China.

In this study, the author tries to find out whether or not intertextuality manifests in college students' writings and what are the issues to be addressed in students' writing processes with respect to intertextuality. Concrete embodiments of material, generic, and cultural intertextualities between students' compositions and other texts they have access to during the writing task such as classroom discourse and reading materials will be investigated.

II. CONCEPT AND CLASSIFICATION OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN WRITING

Intertextuality in this study underlines the ways and the extent that one text relates to another text or influences other texts by proposing that one text is composed of traces or memories of previous texts. It also focuses on the universal intertextual characteristics of text together with the dominant part intertextuality playing where a text is understood, interpreted and produced. Intertextuality can be seen, in a nutshell, both as a dynamic process of texts' absorptions and transformations of, and responses to other texts and an assembly of relationships that a text forms with other texts in the process of comprehension, interpretation and generation.

Based on a more open and broader conception of text, the manifestation of intertextuality can be seen as text rewriting. Every author in writing rewrites other texts intentionally or unintentionally. No text no matter how unique it is can escape from the constraints of the intertextuality rules. Text rewrites other texts through the following five ways:

(1) **Quoting:** One text directly or indirectly quotes other texts with intertextual marks such as quotation marks, direct or indirect indications of the original sources.

(2) **Appropriating example and allusion:** One text adopts the allusions and prototype, or draws on stories, cases and examples from other texts like myths, fairy tales, folk legends, historical stories, religious stories and classic literatures, etc.

(3) **Collaging and rewriting:** One text remolds, transforms other texts, or splits other texts and combines them with the present text into a harmoniously blended new text.

(4) **Imitating and rewriting of genre/structure:** One text deliberately employs, imitates or transforms a certain style or genre of some other texts in order to respond to a similar or the same situation.

(5) **Rewriting of texts whose source cannot be traced:** This rewriting is not confined to the borrowing of certain specific texts but implies the omnipresent influence from knowledge framework, ideology or cultural traditions. During the observation of reality, the writer looks through the vision that is inevitably affected by or even created from other texts, and adopts the subsistent text forms to keep a record of matters and experiences. Even the most updated text forms are the descendants of what already existed instead of being fabricated out of thin air.

The first four types of text rewriting (manifestations of intertextuality) can be regarded as the conscious rewriting, whereas the last type belongs to the unconscious rewriting (YIN Qiping, 1994).

Three Types of Intertextualities

On the basis of diversified classifications of intertextuality by both domestic and foreign scholars (Fairclough, 1992, p.118; Devitt, 1991; YANG Hui & ZHANG Xinjun, 2002; LOU Qi, 2005; LI Guangcai, 2011) and the view held by Goldman (2004) that intertextual connections can simultaneously take place on the surface layer, the meaning layer and the situational layer, the author in the present study divides the intertextuality during writing process into three types as follows: material intertextuality, generic intertextuality and cultural intertextuality.

Material intertextuality stands for a text directly referring to another text with evident intertextual relations including three kinds of conscious rewritings, that is, quoting, collaging /rewriting, and appropriating examples and allusion. It is a kind of intertextuality taking place on the language and content layer of discourse. As the most immediately visible and relatively superficial type of intertextuality, material intertextuality is similar to the referential intertextuality (Devitt, 1991) and the manifest intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992, p.118).

Generic intertextuality, which is based on the deep structure of text, refers to the reiteration of certain text's generic features in another text. It is the outcome of employing certain genres of other texts to respond to a similar situation. Since genre is the response to the context of situation and the context of culture, the generic intertextual relationship with other texts reflects in three metafunctions on the semantic stratum as well as three register variables of situational context during the generation and comprehension of texts. In writing practice, the generic intertextuality primarily manifests by the application, imitation or rewriting of structural characteristics, or the appropriation of certain logicity and meaning construction pattern after being refined and summarized, etc.

Cultural intertextuality can be classified as the untraceable rewriting of text consisting of thematic intertextuality and conventional intertextuality. **Thematic intertextuality** means that pertinent texts in reader-writer's brain such as background information, experience are informed and aroused by the accesses to certain texts instead of being drawn a complete blank. Text itself possesses signification together with tensile force, by which it is able to activate corresponding socio-cultural background, knowledge, memory, experience, cognitive psychology, worldviews, values, in another word, schema text from the reader-writer of it, and also update and enhance itself under the influence from other texts. Thematic intertextuality belongs to the unconscious rewriting and the category of cultural intertextuality in that text echoes with specific cultural context synchronously during the process of arousing schema text. **Conventional intertextuality** is the intertextual relationship on discourse type convention between text and other texts; text and speech community; or various speech communities. Discourse type convention, standing for the discourse mode and the ideology of certain groups, will leave influence on how reader and writer comprehend the text, and the way how text is

comprehended. For instance, the comprehension of meaning and the reader's reaction would be widely divergent according to whether a text is read as an advertisement discourse or an academic essay.

III. METHODOLOGY

Research question:

1. How intertextuality manifests in EFL learners' English writings?
2. What are the issues to be addressed in students' writing processes with respect to intertextuality?

Research subjects:

In this study, the research subjects are thirty-nine English major junior students in two natural classes of a Chinese university and their English writing teacher.

Sources of evidence

In the study, three types of data were gathered including marked and underscored reading materials; students' compositions; and finished questionnaires. By analyzing those data, the author tries to figure out whether intertextuality manifests in college students' writings and what are the specific embodiments of intertextualities in their writings.

The sources of evidence are listed as follows:

Direct observations of writing task: The researcher observed the participants' performances in the writing class.

- (1) Questionnaires
- (2) Written materials contain writing themes, learning and reading materials that are acquired from the Internet or excerpted from reference books listed below.

Reference book: *“English Writing Course 3”* (YU Dongming & LI Huadong, 2011)

Research Process

Taking three types of intertextualities, i.e., material intertextuality, generic intertextuality, and cultural intertextuality as the focal points, this study aims to find out the manifestations of three types of intertextualities in college students' writings and the existing problems to be addressed in terms of intertextualities during the writing task.

Material intertextuality in the forms of quoting; collaging and rewriting; and appropriating examples and allusions will be underscored. As for generic intertextuality, intertextual relationships between generic features of structures in students' compositions, reading materials and classroom discourses will be analyzed. Cultural intertextuality, as it embodies principally as influence on personal experience, socio-culture and ideology, can hardly be presented comprehensively through the analyses on written materials collected in the study. Therefore, the author attempts to solely investigate thematic intertextuality in the category of cultural intertextuality by focusing on the extent of students' comprehensions towards the writing theme as well as the influence from exterior texts on students' understandings on theme. Other aspects of cultural intertextuality will not be discussed in this study due to the limitation of the collected data.

This study was conducted simply for the academic purpose of intertextuality research and involved no assessment towards the effects of writing teaching or the qualities of students' compositions.

Design of the Writing Task

Students enrolled in the study used the textbook *“English Writing Course 3”* (YU Dongming & LI Huadong, 2011) and had learnt before participating the writing task unit 13 in the textbook-----Argumentation (3), of which the teaching objective is about making students have some ideas on how to use language and logic effectively in constructing an argument and how to support the arguments in different ways; and making students become familiar with the developing skills in maintaining argumentative focuses and writing a whole argumentative essay (ibid, p.177).

In Unit 13, students were provided with an article *“The Declaration of Independence”* and were required to read it themselves and discuss the strategies and structure of it by answering several after-text questions. The proposition of the writing task, which is excerpted from the after-class assignment task 16 of unit 13, related closely to the article mentioned above. (Details are presented as follows)

Prompt:

“Jefferson lists ‘the pursuit of Happiness’ in *The Declaration of Independence* as one of our basic rights. [“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”]

Construct an argument urging that this promise was unwise, that happiness cannot be guaranteed, and, therefore, that Americans have been set up for inevitable disappointment by the founding fathers. Your argument will have to anticipate the objection that the Declaration protects the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself.” (ibid, p.204)

In the writing task, four reading materials together with a questionnaire were handed out to all students before their writings and collected after the completion of the writing task. Students were required to write an argumentative essay about this topic and complete the writing task by following the seven procedures listed below.

- (1) Read four reading materials provided before writing;
- (2) Underline unfamiliar words in the reading materials and comprehend the meanings;
- (3) Underline good expressions and well-turned phrases;
- (4) List all the enlightening points in the reading materials;
- (5) Draw up an outline;

(6) Write an article;

(7) Finish the post-writing questionnaire.

Four reading materials, which were prepared by the author with information collected from both reference books and the Internet, have their respective emphases and purposes as follows:

Reading material 1: definitions of certain concepts and background knowledge;

Reading material 2: background knowledge and information expansion;

Reading material 3: generic structure of argumentation;

Reading material 4: relevant examples and corresponding values.

IV. DISCUSSION

Material Intertextuality

Material intertextuality is the most immediately visible and relatively superficial form of intertextuality residing on the surface structure of text. In this study, the author intends to examine students' writings for the manifest references to texts such as topic text, reading materials provided and other texts. Three forms of material intertextuality-----quoting; collaging and rewriting; appropriating examples and allusions in students' writings will be highlighted.

TABLE 1
EMBODIMENTS OF MATERIAL INTERTEXTUALITY IN PARTICIPANTS' WRITINGS

Student	Quoting	Collaging and Rewriting	Examples and Allusions
1		T	
2	M1	T	
3	T/other	M3	
4	T	M3/M4	M2
5	T/M4	M4	
6	T/M3		
7		M3	
8	T/M1	M3	
9	T/M1	M1/M2	M2
10		T	other
11	M2/M4	T	
12	T	T/M1/M2	
13	T	T/M2/M4	
14	T/M1	M3	
15	T/M1/M4	M4	M4
16	M1/M2/M3/M4	M1/M2/M4	
17	T/M4	M1/M2/M4	
18	T/other	M2/M4	
19	other	T/M1/M2/other	
20	T	T	other
21	T/M1/M3/M4		
22			other
23		T/M1	
24	M3	M3	
25	M2	M3/M4	
26		M1/M2/M3/M4	
27	M2	T/M2/M3	
28		T/M1/M2/M3	
29	M1/M3/M4	M1/M3/M4	
30	M1	T	
31	M1	T/M1/M2/M3	
32	T/M1/M2	M1/M2	
33	M1/M3	M1/M3	other
34	M1/other	T/M1/M2	other
35	M3	T/M2/M4/other	M2/other
36	T/M2/M3	T	
37		T/M2	other
38	M3	T	other
39	T/M2	T/M2	
Times	57	74	12

Notes: Examples and Allusions=appropriating examples and allusions

T= topic text

M1-4= reading material 1-4

Other=texts including other exterior texts and schema text

Times= times of intertextuality with exterior texts

As illustrated in table 1, as many as 36 students "collaged and rewrote" other texts including topic text, reading materials, or other exterior texts in their writings. 31 students adopted direct or indirect "quotations" in their writings and 11 writings contain "examples and allusions" excerpted from other texts. Among 39 writings, 8 of them present all three kinds of embodiments of materials intertextuality, 23 writings present only two kinds while 8 writings present only one kind.

According to the statistics, “collaging and rewriting” occurring in up to 92.3% of students’ writings is the most frequently used form of material intertextuality. Material intertextualities in the form of collaging and rewriting have appeared 74 times. “Quoting”, which has occurred 57 times in 79.5% of students’ writings, is prevailing as well. However, material intertextualities embodying in the form of “employing allusions and examples” from other texts are relatively less than the preceding two forms, which have occurred only 12 times in 28.2% of students’ writings.

Hereinafter, the author will elucidate respectively three types of material intertextualities and draw some specific examples from students’ writings in order to have a direct view about how material intertextuality manifests in students’ writings.

Quoting

As a form of material intertextuality, quoting, according to its definition, is characterized by possessing intertextual markers that can directly or indirectly indicate and trace back to the original resources. It can be seen through the following examples excerpted from students’ writings that evident indicators will distinguish the original text from the writing and help readers trace back to the source text straightforwardly, e.g.:

- 1) As an old saying goes: One man’s meat is another man’s poison. (From M3)
- 2) ...like a sentence I’ve ever read in an article: The essence of happiness is in the pursuit itself, in the pursuit of what is engaging and life-changing, which is to say, in the idea of believing. (From other exterior texts)
- 3) When we refer to dictionaries, we may find this “right” here means the right to enjoy doing any activity as long as it is legal and does not infringe on the rights of others. (From other exterior texts)
- 4) Just as the old saying goes, God help those who help themselves. (From other exterior texts)

In this writing task, the author finds that there are pervasive irregularities in students’ quotations, for instance, copying the whole paragraphs and sentences directly from other texts without evident indicators or any acknowledgement. According to the statistics, only 48.4% of students in the study applied intertextual markers in their quotations. As for those students who used intertextual markers, however, they failed to mark every quotation in their writings normatively either. The rest of students made quotations with utterly no awareness of marking. There are only 18 out of 57 times of quotations in total in students’ writings with intertextual markers. It is a commonplace that students referenced directly and turned other people’s discourses into their own without any quotation marks, citation indicators or paraphrasing.

Collaging and Rewriting

Collaging and rewriting, the most frequently used form of material intertextuality in students’ writings as mentioned above, refers to paraphrasing, and transforming the source texts or splicing part of them with the present text into a blended new text. The author finds that collaging and rewriting primarily occur in two ways. Firstly, students employed the meanings from the source texts for reference using different wording, for example:

- 1) People regard happiness differently, so one man’s happiness maybe another man’s misfortune.
(Source text in M3: “Happiness may fall into different categories. An old saying goes like this: ‘One man’s meat is another man’s poison.’”)
- 2) Happiness is a kind of emotion just like love, anger and sadness.
(Source text in M4: “Happiness is an emotion. So is sadness, love, hate, curiosity, revulsion, excitement, jealousy, contentment, depression, anxiety, fear, guilt and anger.”)

Secondly, compared to the first way, students in the study tended to split the original texts into several fragments, and then spliced them in a different order into a new text, as shown in the following example:

- 1) At the same time, happiness is not merely a life lived by accumulating moments of pleasure. It is not caused simply by entertaining your whims.
(Source text in M4: “All emotions have causes, causes which can be understood and controlled. The emotion of happiness is not caused simply by entertaining your whims... Happiness is not merely a life lived by accumulating moments of pleasure.”)

Appropriating Examples and Allusions

This type of material intertextuality stands for adopting allusions or prototypes, or drawing on stories, cases and examples from other texts like historical stories or classic literatures etc. It is the least prevalent one among three forms of material intertextualities in students’ writings in this study. Only 28.2% of students used this form. Here presents a sample excerpted from a student’s article:

- 1) A man who won the lottery was unhappy since then. Because of abuse of money, he was arrested for drunk driving, resisting arrest and having drugs in his car. The excitement of winning did not grow into a lifelong happiness.
(Source text in M4: “Billy won the lottery. A cool \$25 million! He appeared to be a good man with a good character. Of the many types of people who might have won, his friends were happy it was Billy. But two years later he was arrested for drunk driving, resisting arrest, soliciting a prostitute, and having drugs in his car. The arrests continued over the next few years. The excitement of winning did not grow into a lifelong happiness.”)

Apart from the appropriation of examples and stories from reading materials, students made references to other exterior texts as well including classroom discourses; literary works; and also schema texts like memories, self-experiences and background knowledge. Only 33.3% of examples and allusions appeared in students’ writings are excerpted from the reading materials provided by the researcher, while 66.7% of them are from some other sources. See

examples as follows:

- 1) Take the Chinese pop star Jet Li for example... (Schema text: background knowledge)
- 2) When I am forced to face the graduation, to face the so-called “the beginning of real life out of the campus”, I am extremely hesitated and scared. But somehow I know that it is merely the beginning of the pursuit of happiness. (Schema text: self-experiences)
- 3) For example, one person is so hungry that he steals a piece of bread from a store. For him, eating a piece of bread is the happiest thing in the world. However, do other people admit he owns the right to pursue happiness in this way? Of course not! What he did violates the law and infringes other people's benefits, which is totally prohibited. (Schema text: fabricated story based on knowledge framework)
- 4) We still can remember the old Grandet's shiny eyes when he sees the gold, and his expression shows gold is his fountain of happiness... When read the famous *Walden* written by Thoreau, we can acquire a feeling that living a simple life and accompanied by the purified nature is also a kind of happiness. (Other exterior texts: literary works-----*Walden* by Thoreau; *Eugénie Grandet* by Balzac)
- 5) Take the little prince who is the hero in the famous book *The Little Prince* for example. The rose is the whole world to him because he has spent much time looking after her and he sees her with his heart. It is happy enough for him to live with her. Other people, however, see the rose with eyes, considering it as an ordinary flower, and therefore, think there is no reason for the little prince to be happy. (Other exterior texts: literary works-----*The Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry)

Students did not employ the form of appropriating examples or allusions frequently during their writings. In spite of several reading materials provided beforehand, students made limited use of them in the aspect of content. The author believes that such phenomena are in larger part attributed to the traditional writing habits and inclination of Chinese students that they are more apt to preach rather than present facts or specific instances in writing. Especially in writing argumentative essay, Chinese students are liable to put forward points without setting forth any convincing evidences.

Generic Intertextuality

Based on the deep structure of text, generic intertextuality is the repetition of other text's generic features in certain text manifesting in the form of imitation or rewriting of genre and structure. In the next part, certain intertextual connections on features of genre and structure between students' compositions, and exterior texts including reading materials and textbook will be analyzed.

Structure of Argumentation in Textbook and Reading Materials

Before the writing task, all students in two classes have been taught the important contents about writing an argumentative essay in unit 13 of the textbook “*English Writing Course 3*”. Three alternative patterns are provided for students as references in writing an argumentative essay: (YU Dongming & LI Huadong, 2011, p.184-187)

Pattern 1

- a. open with the introduction
- b. refute the strongest opposition points
- c. state the case
- d. confirm our proposition
- e. refute the weaker opposition points
- f. end with the conclusion

Pattern 2

- a. open with the introduction
- b. offer our proposition as an open question
- c. state the case
- d. examine and refute the opposition
- e. examine and confirm our proposition
- f. conclude that our proposition should be accepted

Pattern3

- a. open with the introduction
- b. offer a rival proposition
- c. offer our own proposition
- d. confirm our proposition
- e. refute the opposition
- f. end with the conclusion

Apart from information in the textbook, the author also afforded students with certain reading material, which employs almost an identical constructing pattern with the pattern two in the textbook. From textbook and reading materials students had access to before writing, the author summarizes that an integral generic structure of an argumentation should be composed of the following elements:

- Element 1(E1) introduction
- Element 2(E2) an opposite point
- Element 2.1(E2.2) offering an opposite point

- Element 2.2(E2.1) refuting an opposite point
- Element 3(E3) your own proposition
- Element 3.1(E3.1) offering your own proposition
- Element 3.2(E3.2) confirming your own proposition
- Element 4(E4) conclusion

Embodiments of Generic Intertextuality in Students’ Writings

Except for the introduction and the conclusion part that should always be posited at the beginning and the end of essay respectively, the order of the rest of those elements can be comparatively flexible. By using matching methods, the author analyzes the structures of students’ articles and seeks to find out generic intertextualities manifesting between generic elements in the structures of their writings and those in the standard one presented above. (See table 2 for detailed information)

TABLE 2
REFERENCES TO GENERIC ELEMENTS IN PARTICIPANTS’ WRITINGS

Generic Elements	E1	E2		E3		E4
		E2.1	E2.2	E3.1	E3.2	
Percentage	100%	53.8%	38.5%	100%	97.4%	97.4%

On the one hand, it is indisputable that 39 students were all aware of the four fundamental components of argumentation, i.e., introduction, offering a point, reinforcing the point, and conclusion. According to table 2, element 1 and element 3.1 present in 100% of students’ writings; and the occurrence rate of element 3.2 and element 4 is 97.4%. On the other hand, they did not bear enough cognitions in anticipating an opposition in argumentation writing. Although 21 students, as many as 53.8% of all participants, mentioned an opposing point in their essays, only 15 of them took a further step to argue and dispute the opposing points proposed.

The major aim of an argumentative essay is to defend a position or a viewpoint with solid reasons. By offering a controversial point, writer’s own proposition can be strengthened in several ways. First of all, offering an opposite point will leave readers an impression that writer of this argumentation is a reasonable person willing to examine an issue comprehensively from all angles. Moreover, a differing viewpoint helps writers spot flaws both in the opposite part as well as in their own propositions. Thus, the strength and reliability of the argument can be reinforced. Therefore, besides making a point and supporting it afterwards as all essay do in a general way, an argumentation should advance a differing viewpoint. Acknowledging a controversial point and then rebutting it by providing reasonable evidences and pointing out problems can be regarded as the most important generic features of argumentative essay.

As was remarked above, generic intertextuality means the reiteration of certain generic features in a text in order to respond to a similar situation. However, only 15 students managed to offer a differing point in their essays and employed the holistic structure of argumentation constituted by E1, E2.1, E2.2, E3.1, E3.2, and E4. Fine generic intertextualities with exterior texts such as textbook and reading materials are reflected in their writings, while for the rest 24 students, there is not enough generic intertextuality showing in their argumentations in the aspect of generic features. Instead of writing an argumentative essay, some students wrote an exposition by comparison and contrast comparing the differences between happiness and the pursuit of happiness, or between spiritual happiness and materialistic happiness. Some students even wrote an exposition by definition that solely defines what is happiness or what is the pursuit of happiness.

Cultural Intertextuality

Cultural Intertextuality is an untraceable rewriting of text containing both conventional intertextuality and thematic intertextuality. Conventional intertextuality, which refers to the intertextual relationship on diversified discourse type conventions-----discourse modes and ideologies-----between texts and speech groups, can hardly be revealed through certain analyses on written materials. Thematic intertextuality, which stands for an arousal of pertinent schema texts after the access to a certain text during writing, will undoubtedly exert influence on the comprehension and generation of new texts. Therefore, thematic intertextuality can be revealed somehow through analyses on text’s comprehension and generation.

In respect of manifestations of cultural intertextuality, on account of the limitation of data mainly composing of written discourse and questionnaire results in the study, the author plans to explore thematic intertextualities by analyzing students’ digests of the writing theme as well as the relevancy of their compositions to the topic.

In this study, the proposition of the writing task is close to neither the cultural background nor life experience of students. Therefore students would inevitably encounter certain cross-culture barriers when they tried to comprehend the writing theme. The less relevant socio-cultural and historical background knowledge students possess, the less schema texts they can redeploy and activate. Although a passage “*The Declaration of Independence*” is provided in the textbook with the purpose of complementing in some measure the shortage of necessary background information and overcome the cultural barrier, unfortunately, neither has the teacher explained it in classroom instruction, nor the students have attached much weight to it. According to the questionnaire, only 2.4% of students considered their understandings towards the proposition an excellent one, 42.8% of students considered their understandings as a good one, 50% as an average one, while the rest 4.8% as a poor one. Most students believed that they could understand the

topic, which means that certain thematic intertextuality occurs and pertinent schema texts have been aroused.

According to the writing theme, the thesis of this writing should be: "Jefferson's promise was unwise because happiness cannot be guaranteed. And as a result, the Americans have been set up for inevitable disappointment by Jefferson." In addition, the writing theme requires students to anticipate the opposing point, which argues that "the Declaration" protects the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself.

When assigning the writing task, the teacher interpreted the writing theme with a misleading information in class A that: "The title and the thesis statement of this argumentative essay should be 'Jefferson's promise is misunderstood'", while in class B, no guidance or explanation about the topic was provided for students. Due to such conspicuous difference between the classroom discourses in two classes, prominent dissimilarities occur in thematic intertextuality, which primarily embody during writing in students' digests of the writing theme and the relevancy of their writings to the topic. (See table 3 for the overall statistics of the accordance with the topic in students' writings in two classes)

TABLE 3
ACCORDANCE WITH THE TOPIC

Accordance with the topic	Class A	Class B
Digression	18	8
Vagueness	1	4
Relevancy	1	7

In two classes, the percentages of theme relevancy in students' writings are widely divergent. As for class A, in which the teacher provided the explication on the writing theme beforehand, the overall percentage of writings relevant to the theme is as low as 5%; whereas in class B, the number is 36.8%. Only one student's composition in class A is relevant to the thesis and one student presents vagueness by merely arguing that happiness cannot be guaranteed. For the remaining eighteen students, their writings are all excursive from the thesis of the topic by offering an entirely opposite proposition that Jefferson's promise is misunderstood because of the Declaration protects the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself. They all refuted instead of defending the point that the topic required them to argue for, that is, Jefferson made an unwise promise and set up the Americans for an inevitable disappointment since happiness cannot be guaranteed. On the contrary, class B, in which no guidance has been provided before students' writings, has a much higher relevancy than class A. In class B, seven students' writings show good relevancies to the writing theme, while four students' writings show vagueness. Digressions from the theme occur in eight students' writings.

It can be concluded that there is obvious thematic intertextuality among the classroom discourses, students' understandings towards the topic as well as their individualized texts. Among the 18 students in class A whose writings are excursive from the theme, 14 of them present in their writings the keywords like "misunderstand, misunderstood, or misinterpretation" that have distinct intertextual relationships with the classroom discourses-----the teacher's interpretation on the topic. Hereinto, 11 students directly used or paraphrased the teacher's words of explication: "Jefferson's promise is understood" as their titles of writings, for instance: "Jefferson's Promise Be Misunderstood; or Have You Ever Misunderstood Thomas Jefferson?" And yet, in class B, there is no student adopting any correlative keywords as "misunderstand, misunderstood, or misinterpretation".

Apart from classroom discourses, other exterior texts such as reading materials provided by the researcher also perform a role in updating writing subjects' schema texts. For example, in reading material 1, the definition of the three basic rights in "the Declaration of Independence" as well as the explanation of the right to the pursuit of happiness would enrich students' knowledge reserves about the topic and in some measure assist them in overcoming cross-cultural barriers and understanding proposition correctly.

V. CONCLUSION

In respect of manifestation of three types of intertextualities in students' writings, the author finds that between students' individualized texts and exterior texts there are obvious material intertextualities, among which collaging and rewriting is the most notable form, quotation ranks the second, while adopting allusions and examples the least. This reveals a ubiquitous situation largely influenced by Chinese writing habits that in Chinese students' English writings there are very few specific examples or facts supporting the major points; or if there are any supporting facts, it is very likely that correlations between evidences and proposition are limited. Especially in the argumentation writing, when Chinese students are proposing a thesis, they scarcely provide sufficient and detailed grounds of arguments. They, in some cases, even construct supporting paragraphs that have nothing to do with the thesis statement.

Problems that occur in the application of material intertextuality should be taken much account of in order to avoid plagiarism. As shown in this study, many students who were incapable of paraphrasing a text into their own individualized texts failed to obey to the prescriptive steps containing using quotation marks or evident indicators in their quotations, collaging and rewritings. Students were liable to copy directly large segments from the source texts that sometimes have very little relevance to the point without proper integration or paraphrasing.

In addition, it is worth noting that although there are obvious manifestations of material intertextualities in students' writings, i.e., quoting, collaging and rewriting, a large portion of students did not have the initiatives in information searching and integration. The material intertextualities occur mostly between students' writings and the exterior texts

provided in class such as the topic text and reading materials. (See table 4) As shown in table 1, only eleven students have searched and utilized other exterior texts apart from those texts provided by the researcher.

TABLE 4
MATERIAL INTERTEXTUALITIES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALIZED TEXTS AND EXTERIOR TEXTS

	Quoting	Collaging and Rewriting	Examples and Allusions	Total
Topic text	17	19		36
Material 1	13	13		26
Material 2	7	16	3	26
Material 3	9	13		22
Material 4	7	11	1	29
Other exterior texts	4	2	8	14

It can be concluded from the foregoing discussions that not only the initiatives in searching useful materials and information for writings, but also the active thinking and the consciousness of originality of participants in this writing task are scarce.

Moreover, students are devoid of the abilities in resolving information during the intertextual processes. Allowing themselves led by the nose by the reading materials, on which they barely have their own analyses and decipherments, most of the students in this study could hardly distinguish the useful information from the unnecessary one.

Notwithstanding certain generic intertextualities manifesting in the repetition of specific structures such as introduction, offering own proposition, and conclusion between students' articles, textbook texts and reading materials, intertextualities in the aspect of generic features of argumentative essay are deficient. As high as 61.5% of students in this study failed to offer an opposing point-----an indispensable generic feature of argumentation-----in their argumentations. Therefore, students' consciousness of generic intertextualities, which are of singular importance in the course of reading and writing, should be reinforced in order to promote better grasps towards specific genres and achieve more effective responses to a similar situation.

In terms of cultural intertextuality, due to the limitation of data collected in this study, the author only focuses on thematic intertextuality by analyzing students' understandings towards the writing topic and the topic relevancy of their writings. It is found that the exterior texts including the topic, classroom discourses and reading materials have exerted an obvious cultural intertextual influence on activating pertinent schema texts of participants, promoting the comprehension of the writing theme as well as further affecting the completions of their writings. First of all, certain thematic intertextualities occurred when students were reading the writing theme. Secondly, differences in the classroom discourses conveyed and received in two classes lead to a conspicuous divergence in the comprehension of theme and the relevancy to the topic of students' writings. Besides, reading exterior materials during writing process could to some degree help students overcome some cultural barriers, achieve better understandings towards the thesis together with update their schema texts through cultural intertextuality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Liping CHEN in Nanjing Normal University for offering patient instructions and kind encouragement. Also, I am grateful to anonymous referees and journal editors for their careful readings of the paper and insightful comments that helped me improve the paper.

This work is supported by Guided Project of Philosophy and Social Science Research in Colleges and Universities in Jiangsu Province (Grant No.: 2016SJD740003), by Education Project of Humanities and Social Sciences Foundation of Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No.: SKYC2017004), and by Exploration Project of Humanities and Social Sciences Foundation of Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No.: SKTS2017025).

REFERENCES

- [1] Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality*. New York: Routledge.
- [2] Armstrong, S. & M, Newman. (2011). Teaching Textual Conversations: Intertextuality in the College Reading Classroom. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 41(2), 6-21.
- [3] Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Holquist, M. (ed.), Emerson, C. & M, Holquist (trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- [4] Bloome, D. & A. Egan-Robertson. (1993). The Social Construction of Intertextuality in Classroom Reading and Writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28 (4), 304-33.
- [5] Devitt, A. J. (1991). Intertextuality in Tax Accounting: Generic, Referential, and Functional. In Bazerman, C. & J. Paradis. (eds.). *Textual Dynamics of the Professions*. Madison: U of Wisconsin, 336-57.
- [6] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [7] Goldman, S. R. (2004). Cognitive Aspects of Constructing Meaning Through and Across Multiple Texts. In Shuart-Faris N, & D, Bloome (eds.). *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 317-51.
- [8] Hartman, D. K. (1995). Eight Readers Reading: The Intertextual Links of Proficient Readers Reading Multiple Passages. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30 (3), 520-561.

- [9] Hartman, D. K. (2004). Deconstructing the Reader, the Text, the Author, and the Context. In Shuart-Faris, N. & D. Bloome (eds.). *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 353-71.
- [10] Holmes, J. (2004). Intertextuality in EAP: An African context. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(1), 73- 88.
- [11] Kristeva, J. (1969). *Σέν έότικ έ Recherches pour une Σένanalyse*. Paris: Seuil.
- [12] Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language*. Roudiez, L. S. et al. (eds.). Gora, T. (trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- [13] Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Moi, T. (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [14] LI Guangcai. (2011). Courseware Design in College English Teaching under the Perspective of Intertextuality. *Education and Vocation*, 26, 106-107.
- [15] LOU Qi. (2005). Intertextuality of Text and Foreign Language Teaching. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, 2, 18-20.
- [16] Manak, J. (2011). The Social Construction of Intertextuality and Literary Understanding: the Impact of Interactive Read-alouds on the Writing of Third Graders during Writing Workshop. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 46 (4), 309-311.
- [17] Pantaleo, S. (2006). Readers and Writers as Intertexts: Exploring the Intertextualities in Student Writing. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 29 (2), 163–181.
- [18] Short, K. G. (2004). Researching Intertextuality within Collaborative Classroom Learning Environments. In Shuart-Faris, N. & D, Bloome. (eds.). *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 373-395.
- [19] Shuart-Faris, N. & D, Bloome. (2004). *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- [20] Thibault, P. J. (1994). Intertextuality. In Asher, R. E. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1751-1754.
- [21] WANG Changmi. (2010). Intertextuality and Its Application in the Designing of English Writing Tasks. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 2, 69-73.
- [22] YANG Hui & ZHANG Xinjun. (2002). English Language Teaching in an Intertextual Perspective. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 2, 43-45
- [23] YANG Rufu. (2009). An Integrated Model of Intertextuality for College English Writing Pedagogy. *Foreign Languages in China*, 06 (4): 79-84.
- [24] YIN Qiping. (1994). On Intertextuality. *Foreign Literature Review*, 2, 39-46
- [25] YU Dongming & LI Huadong. (2011). *Successful Writing*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.



Yuanyan Hu was born in Nanjing, Chia in 1984. She received her master of science degree in education from the University of Edinburgh, UK in 2008, and received her PH.D. degree in applied linguistics from Nanjing Normal University, China in 2015. She is currently a lecturer in the College of Foreign Studies, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing, China. His research interests include the theory of intertextuality, writing teaching and research, discourse analysis and systemic functional linguistics. Dr. Hu is a member of the Jiangsu Foreign Languages & Linguistics Society.