International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies
ISSN(e): 2306-0646
ISSN(p): 2306-9910
DOI: 10.18488/journal.23.2020.93.196.209
Vol. 9, No. 3, 196-209.

URL: www.aessweb.com

SCHEMATIC METHOD: A CREATIVE WAY TO TEACH SHORT STORIES

Subadrah Madhawa Nair[1+]
Sarojinee Karuppiah[2]

[1]*Lecturer Faculty of Education & Liberal Studies, City University Malaysia.*
Email: subadrah.nair@city.edu.my
[2]*PhD Student University Science Malaysia.*

(+ Corresponding author)

Article History
Received: 3 April 2020
Revised: 11 May 2020
Accepted: 16 June 2020
Published: 2 July 2020

Keywords
Schematic method
STAD method
Conventional method
Short stories
TESL
Literature components
Secondary schools
Themes
Characterization
Literary devices
Settings.

ABSTRACT

This study employs a quasi-experimental design. The samples were 170 students from 3 intact classes, in three different schools and they were taught two short stories. The objectives of the study were to investigate whether the schematic method, the STAD method or the conventional method helps ELS students to improve their mean scores in answering questions related to themes, characterization, literary devises, and settings in the two short stories. The 56 students in Experimental Group 1 from school A were taught using the schematic method, the 57 students in Experimental Group 2 from school B were taught using the STAD method and the 57 students in the Control Group from school C were taught using the conventional method. The study was conducted for 8 weeks and the three groups were taught the same short stories ('QWERTYUIOP' and the 'Fruitcake Special'), specifically in the areas of themes, characterization, use of literary devices and settings. Prior to the intervention, all the three groups were given the pre-test and at the end of the intervention they were given the post-test. The data obtained from the pre-test and post-test were analyzed using the SPSS Program version 24.0. The data was analyzed using one way ANOVA, Post-Hoc Pairwise Comparisons test and the ANCOVA test. The findings indicate that the schematic method helped to enhance students' mean scores significantly for literary devices and settings compared with the Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group. These findings have crucial pedagogical, practical and theoretical implications.

Contribution/ Originality: This study is one of very few studies which have investigated the effects of utilizing schematic model in teaching short stories. The findings have crucial pedagogical implication because the utilization of schematic model helped to enhance students' mean scores significantly for literary devices and settings in the short stories.

1. INTRODUCTION

The basic problem identified in Malaysian schools today is that pupils are not learning or mastering sufficient reading skills to enable them to access information or enjoy works of literature. Neither are our pupils avid readers. A related study conducted by Ambigapathy (2000) reveals that 76.2% of secondary school students were reluctant readers of English language materials. Chakravarthy (1999) also shared concern about the deteriorating reading abilities among pupils in Malaysia. Rashid, Vethamani, and Rahman (2010) highlighted their concern on Malaysian students' low English language proficiency and struggles in learning the language. They also stressed that learning

the literature component is another burden for ESL students. The Ministry of Education Malaysia (2012) revealed that students' proficiency in English currently is still at a low level. Only 28% of students achieved a minimum credit in the 2011 SPM English paper against Cambridge 1119 standards (Omar, 2017). In addition, the Star reported that nearly 60% of English teachers failed the Cambridge Placement Test (Jalleh, 2012), The Star, 26 September). If English teachers are unable to pass the Cambridge test, their ability to teach the literature component can be questioned.

A study by Othman et al. (2015) indicated that, although literature has been integrated in the ESL syllabus for more than 10 years, the achievement of the students in learning literature is not as expected, especially in expressing their critical thinking skills pertaining to the literary text. The study also indicated that there were some students who faced problems during their literature lessons that may lead them on to a lack of focus and co-operation in class. This may be due to the teachers' weaknesses in conducting the lessons, such as lack of clear explanations and elaboration of ideas in the literature text.

According to Dhillon and Mogan (2014) the teaching of literature in Malaysian schools has not been given much importance since English is taught as a second language. Their study indicated that language-based approaches would be an appropriate choice in teaching literature (short stories). They also stressed that it is important to create meaningful activities for students when teaching literature; to increase interest, students should be allowed to engage in the text in creative ways.

A further study by Haron, Gapor, Masran, Ibrahim, and Nor (2008) on students from both urban and rural schools showed that the majority of students were only able to recognize linguistic cues at word level. They had problems recognizing phrases and clauses and faced difficulties in reading and processing sentences, especially complex sentences and discourse. This may be one of the reasons why pupils fare badly in the SPM examination in the part that tests the literature component, as revealed in The Malaysian School Examination Board's Annual Report (2002 & 2003).

Noor (2005) also stated his concern about the dwindling number of teachers keen on teaching the Literature in English component. She believes that even some teachers trained in this field apparently do not have the confidence to teach the subject. Similarly, a study by Majdi, Syakirah, Sharmella, and Jenan (2009) showed that teachers failed to use effective teaching strategies such as relating the text to students' schemata and they also failed to encourage the students to interact with the text.

To further understand the problem, a preliminary study on teaching the Literature in English component was conducted among 30 teachers from 9 urban National Secondary Schools in the District of Kuala Muda Yan in the state of Kedah. The findings indicated that pupils performance in answering questions on short stories was not encouraging. Based on the 2010 Term One Examination results, only 12% of the pupils attained scores of more than 75%. 16 % of the pupils did not attempt to answer this section at all. 60% of the pupils displayed negative attitude towards learning literature component.

Işıklı and Tarakcioglu (2017) conducted a study on problems in teaching English literature in Turkey. In their study they argued that teachers should employ new literature teaching strategies designed for language classrooms to enhance students' English proficiency. Similarly Omar (2017) critically reviewed approaches employed by teachers in teaching the literature component in Malaysian schools. He concluded that the main problem in teaching the English literature component is that the teachers are incompetent not only in terms of content knowledge but also practical and pedagogical knowledge.

The problems faced by the pupils were seen to be directly linked to the problems faced by teachers in teaching the literature component. A preliminary study carried out by the researcher on methods of teaching instructions employed by the teachers indicated that 70% of the teachers used only teacher-centered instructions in teaching the literature component. 27% of the teachers combined teacher-centered and pupil centered teaching methods in their classrooms. Only 3% of them occasionally used the STAD method whilst none of the teachers used the Schematic

Method to teach the literature component in English. As such, this study employed a quasi-experimental design to investigate the effectiveness of the schematic method, the STAD method and the conventional method in teaching the ESL literature component (short stories).

1.1. Objectives of the Study

This main objectives of this quantitative study were to investigate whether the schematic method, the STAD method and the conventional method help ELS students to improve their mean scores in answering questions related to themes, characterization, literary devises, and settings in short stories.

1.2. Research Hypotheses

Based on the research objectives four null hypotheses were formulated:

Ho1 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1 using schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2(using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method) for answers to questions on themes in the short stories.

Ho2 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1(using schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using conventional method) for answers to questions on characterization in the short stories.

Ho3 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1(using schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using conventional method) for answers to questions on literary devices in the short stories.

Ho4 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1(using schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using conventional method) for answers to questions on settings in the short stories.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of this study is the constructivist approach used to teach short stories, with special focus on the schema theory and the schematic method. Additionally, the social constructivist approach is reviewed, concentrating on the cooperative learning approach with a focus on the STAD method. In addition, studies on the effects of the schematic method and the STAD method are reviewed.

2.1. Schema Theory and Schematic Method

According to Rumelhart (1980) schema refers to the building blocks of cognition. The schema theory assumes that when individuals obtain knowledge, they attempt to fit that knowledge into some structure in memory that helps them make sense of that knowledge. Schemata are organized mental structures that allow the learners to understand and associate what is being presented to them. As such schemata are important in reading and understanding short stores.

Reading is an interactive process between the reader and the reading material. Yanxia (2008) states schema difference as one of the factors in the failure of reading and comprehension. Therefore he advocates that the teaching of socio-cultural background be equally strengthened to guide students to construct schemata to help them assimilate, extract and consolidate knowledge in mastering reading and comprehension; the readers' ideas and prior knowledge cannot be ignored. Stevenson and Palmer (1994) affirm that success in ascertaining prior knowledge depends on essential teacher skills. Therefore, the crucial task of the teacher is to activate students' prior knowledge.

According to Moody et al. (2018) aside from the prominence of social constructivism / sociocultural theories, the schema theory also plays a large role in ELL instruction. This may be due to the widely-held belief that the

schema theory involves the activation of background knowledge, which has long been recognized as a successful strategy for ELL reading instruction. Kafipour and Jahansooz (2017) showed correlation and variance contribution between content schema, reading comprehension, and vocabulary knowledge. Carrell (1985) and Gibbons (2002) also stressed the importance of activating the formal and content schema in comprehension. Formal schemata refers to language knowledge such as vocabulary, grammar, register, text organization, rhetorical structures, text genres and particular textual features while content schemata refers to knowledge of the world, including the topic of the text. Activation of both schemata is crucial in comprehension.

Real world needs underlie theoretical and pedagogical issues (David & Norazit, 2000). Therefore in a multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi religious country like Malaysia, it is vital for people to learn about each other's culture. They suggest that teachers provide students with appropriate schema by developing information during pre-reading activities and also attempting to activate readers' prior knowledge of the topic. Stott (2001); Grabe and Stoller (2011) agree with this view as they too discuss the benefits of applying the schema theory in helping ESL students become better readers.

Similarly, Alhaisoni (2017) explored EFL teachers' perceptions of the role of prior knowledge, the strategies used in the reading classrooms to activate students' prior knowledge and the difficulties encountered when activating prior knowledge in teaching reading. The samples were 82 EFL teachers from different countries teaching English language in the preparatory year at Aljouf University. The findings revealed that the teachers agreed that good prior knowledge of the topic in the text has a great impact on students' recall and comprehension. In addition, the results also showed that teachers lacked adequate training on the schema theory and its instructional implications and techniques. Furthermore teachers' guide books provide little help on how to deal with prior knowledge activation through a variety of techniques. In this study the researcher trained the teacher from Experimental Group 1 on how to induce schema on literary devices to students and relate it to their prior knowledge, prior to teaching the short stories.

2.2. STAD Method

Vygotsky (1978) the pioneer in social constructivist theory, proposed that children actively construct knowledge in a social context. He also proposed that all learning takes place in a zone of proximal development. This zone is the difference between what a leaner can do alone and what he/she can do with the assistance of an adult, teacher, peer or a compatible person. By building on the learners' experiences and providing moderately challenging tasks in group work, teachers can provide 'intellectual scaffolding' to help students progress through the different stages of development .

In utilizing the STAD method teachers typically get students to work in cooperative groups rather than individually. According to Slavin (1978) the STAD method uses a system of competition among groups. Members of a group are required to cooperate within a group to do a variety of tasks and learn from other members of the group and develop healthy competitions among the groups. Every individual in the group is equally responsible for the group achievement.

Studies conducted by Johnson and Johnson (1985); Fletcher (2006); Periasamy (2011) showed that the utilization of the STAD method to enhances students' reading skills. A study by Nair and Sanai (2018) indicated that the STAD method enhances students' descriptive writing skills. Similarly a study conducted by Gambari and Yusuf (2015) among Nigerian students indicated that students taught physics using computer – assisted STAD performed significantly better than the control group. Studies by Khan and Akhtar (2017); Nikou, Bonyadi, and Ebrahimi (2014) also revealed that the STAD method significantly enhanced students' performance in the English language.

In the current study the researcher trained the teacher teaching Experimental Group 2 on how to employ the STAD method (collaborative learning) in teaching literary devices in short stories. The conventional method is

teacher-centered and the lecture is the most common teaching activity found in schools worldwide. However, the STAD method can be very effective, particularly in information sharing, presenting information in a quick manner, and generating interest in gaining information and teaching learners who learn best by listening.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quasi-experimental design. The samples were 170 students from 3 intact classes, in three different schools and they were taught two short stories. The students in Experimental group 1 (56 students) from school A were taught using the schematic method, the subjects in Experimental group 2 (57students) from school B were taught using the STAD method and the subjects in the Control Group (57 students) from school C were taught using the conventional method. The study was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in achievement among the subjects in Experimental Group 1 as compared to the subjects in Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group after 8 weeks of teaching two short stories using the three methods, All the three groups were taught the same short stories ('QWERTYUIOP' and the 'Fruitcake Special') and specifically in the areas of themes, characterization, use of literary devices, messages and settings. Teachers teaching the three groups were trained English language teachers with more than 10 years of experience. The teachers from school A and school B were given guidelines and instructions on the use of the Schematic Method and the STAD Method by the researchers.

Prior to the intervention, all the three groups were given a pre-test and at the end of the intervention they were given the post-test. The contents of the pre-test and post-test were similar (30 multiple choice type questions). Prior to the intervention, a pilot test was carried out in school D which has the same characteristics as the samples in schools A, B and C. The RELIABILITY CALCULATOR showed the Cronbach's Alpha Value for these questions at 0.865, KR21 at 0.804 and KR20 at 0.865. All these steps were taken to ascertain the reliability of these test question**s.**

The data obtained from the pre-test and post-test were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) 24.0. The data was analyzed using one way ANOVA, Post-Hoc Pairwise Comparisons test and the ANCOVA test.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The skewness and kurtosis test of data was first done to see if the distribution of the data was normal. The scores in this instance should be in the range of +2 to -2 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The data were normal for all the eight aspects studied (overall achievement, themes, characterization, literary devices, setting, messages, giving opinions, and attitudes) in all the three tests, that is, in pre-test 1, post-test 1 and post-test 2 for all the three groups. Thus, the data were deemed suitable for further analysis.

The One-Way ANOVA test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the data obtained by the subjects in the three groups in the pre-test Table 1. The findings show that the differences in the mean scores obtained by the three groups are significant in three out of the four areas tested, that is, for themes $F(2,167)=5.30$, $p=0.01$, characterization $F(2,167)=13.69$, $p=0.00$, literary devices $F(2,167)=12.91$, $p=0.00$. The difference in mean scores is insignificant only in the area of setting $F(2,167)=1.94$, $p=0.15$.

Subsequently, the Covariance analysis (ANCOVA test) was used to test null-hypotheses 1,2,3 and 4, as this served to eliminate the differences in the mean scores among the three groups prior to the intervention (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The scores obtained in the pre-test were used as the covariates in the analysis of data from the post- tests.

Table-1. Analysis of pre-test results using the one-way ANOVA test.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pre-Test Theme	Between Groups	18.69	2	9.34	5.30	0.01
	Within Groups	294.31	167	1.76		
	Total	312.99	169			
Pre-Test Character	Between Groups	71.11	2	35.56	13.69	0.00
	Within Groups	433.74	167	2.60		
	Total	504.85	169			
Pre-Test Literary Devices	Between Groups	104.67	2	52.33	12.91	0.00
	Within Groups	677.03	167	4.05		
	Total	781.70	169			
Pre-Test Setting	Between Groups	4.45	2	2.22	1.94	0.15
	Within Groups	191.35	167	1.15		
	Total	195.79	169			

Note: Level of significance at $p< 0.05$.

Before the ANCOVA test was carried out, a homogeneity of regression (slopes) assumption test was carried out to evaluate the interaction between the covariates and the independent variables in the prediction of the dependent variables. The results showed that there was no significant difference among the three groups in all the areas studied in this research. The details are as follows:; theme $F(2,164)=1.03$, $p=0.36$; characterization $F(2,164)=1.93$, $p=0.15$; literary devices $F(2,164)=4.13$, $p=0.18$; messages $F(2,164)=2.67$, $p=0.07$; and setting $F(2,164)=4.13$, $p=0.19$; The results obtained from the subsequent ANCOVA test were then analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the scores obtained by the subjects in Experimental Group 1 compared with the subjects in Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group.

Null-Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the study were tested using the SPSS Program version 24. Following are the results of the data analysis of the post-test.

Ho1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1(using the schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method) for questions on themes in the short stories

The mean scores of the subjects/students in the three groups in the area of themes, characterization, literary devises and settings were studied through their responses to the thirty multiple choice type questions on the two short stories ('QWERTYUIOP' and the 'Fruitcake Special') in the post-test (7 questions related to themes, 8 questions related to characterization, 10 questions related to literary devices and 5 questions related to settings). Table 2 shows the mean scores obtained by the students in the three groups for themes in the short stories in the post-test.

The dependent variable (themes) was studied through the subjects' responses to seven multiple choice type questions based on the two short stories (questions 8,9,10 & 11 of 'QWERTYUIOP' and questions 1, 2 & 3 of the 'Fruitcake Special') in the post-test. Table 2 shows the mean scores obtained by the subjects in the three groups.

Table-2. Mean scores in post-test on themes.

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Group 1	4.56	0.93	57
Group 2	4.29	1.12	57
Group 3	4.27	1.42	56
Total	4.38	1.17	170

The mean score for themes is highest in Experimental Group 1 (mean= 4.56; N=57) followed by Experimental Group 2 (mean=4.29; N=57) and the Control Group (mean=4.27; N=56). The difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 is 0.26 but the difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and the Control Group is higher at 0 .29. The above scores thus show that the subjects in Experimental

Group 1 have the best achievement in the area of themes and the subjects in Experimental Group 2 have performed better than the subjects in the Control Group.

Subsequently, the ANCOVA test was carried out to investigate if there was a significant difference in the mean scores of the subjects in the three groups.

Table-3. ANCOVA test comparing the mean scores on themes among the three groups.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	14.16[a]	3	4.72	3.59	0.01
Intercept	303.73	1	303.73	231.55	0.00
PRE TEST THEME	11.21	1	11.21	8.54	0.00
GROUP	6.17	2	3.09	2.35	0.09
Error	217.74	166	1.31		
Total	3488.00	170			
Corrected Total	231.91	169			

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05.

Table 3 shows the analysis of the mean scores obtained by the three groups in the post-test. The results indicate that there is no significant difference among the three groups. F=2.35, p=0.09. The results in Table 1 and 4.2 thus indicate that the Schematic Method has not succeeded in raising the achievement of the students in Experimental Group 1 significantly when compared with the students in the other two groups. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the achievement of the subjects in Experimental Group 1 (in the area of themes) compared with the achievement of the subjects in Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group. These findings accept Null-Hypothesis 1.

The researcher noticed that the teachers in all the three groups did not find it easy to make the pupils grasp the themes in the short stories ("…quite difficult; they cannot grasp the concept…too abstract, especially for weak pupils"). The pupils understood the plots but could not infer the underlying meanings that could lead to an analysis of the themes ("…not sure…confusing…"). Some of the pupils appeared doubtful and accepted the explanations offered by the teachers. In Experimental Groups 1 and 2, the pupils attempted to discuss the issues presented in the short stories and tried to derive the themes whereas the pupils in the Control Group accepted the explanations offered by the teacher, without much questioning. As stressed by Alhaisoni (2017) students require good prior knowledge in order to answer questions related to themes. Students' inability to activate the relevant schema can also hinder their comprehension of the short stories. The activation of the right schemata through pre-reading activities can be a dynamic process, which has the potential to students' comprehension (Salbego & Osborne, 2015).

Ho2 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1 (using the schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method) for questions on characterization in the short stories.

The dependent variable (characterization) was studied through the students' responses to eight multiple choice type questions based on the two short stories (questions 4, 5, 6 & 7 of 'QWERTYUIOP' and questions 4, 5, 6 & 7 of the 'Fruitcake Special') in post-test 1. Table 4 shows the mean scores in characterization obtained by the subjects in the three groups in the post-test.

Table-4. Mean scores in the post-test on characterization.

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Group 1	5.14	1.33	57
Group 2	5.11	1.73	57
Group 3	4.95	1.77	56
Total	5.06	1.61	170

The mean score for characterization is highest in Experimental Group 1 (mean= 5.14; N=57), second highest in Experimental Group 2 (mean= 5.10; N=57) and lowest in the Control Group (mean=4.95; N=56). The difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 is 0.35 but the difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and the Control Group is higher at 0.20. The above scores thus show that the subjects in Experimental Group 1 have the best achievement in the area of characterization and the subjects in Experimental Group 2 have performed better than the subjects in the Control Group.

Subsequently, the ANCOVA test was carried out to investigate if there was a significant difference in the mean scores of the subjects in the three groups.

Table-5. ANCOVA test comparing the mean scores on characterization among the three groups.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	38.79[a]	3	12.93	5.35	0.00
Intercept	369.50	1	369.50	152.78	0.00
PRE TEST THEME	37.59	1	37.59	15.54	0.00
GROUP	10.32	2	5.16	2.13	0.12
Error	401.49	166	2.42		
Total	4801.00	170			
Corrected Total	440.29	169			

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05.

Table 5 shows the analysis of the mean scores on characterization obtained by the three groups in post-test 1. In the ANCOVA test on characterization, the scores obtained in the pre-test were used as the covariates. The results in Table 4 and 5 indicate that there is no significant difference among the three groups F = 2.13; p=0.12. The results thus indicate that the Schematic Method has not succeeded in raising the achievement of the subjects in Experimental Group 1 significantly when compared with the achievement of the subjects in Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group. The findings accept Null-Hypothesis 2.

In the area of characterization, the teacher in Experimental Group 1 attempted to introduce the elements that would lead to an understanding of the characters and thus enable them to analyze characterization in the two short stories. However, the pupils failed to analyze all the features correctly as they failed to understand some of the language registers and metaphors ("…very hard…cannot understand meaning"). The pupils in Experimental Group 2 on the other hand, felt that they could have understood better if the teacher had spent more time in explaining meanings ("…friend cannot…teacher better"). In the Control Group, the pupils listened to the teacher and took down notes. Not many could give acceptable answers when the teacher asked them to analyze the more complex features of the characters. The pupils were generally dependent on the teacher for their answers. According to Gibbons (2002) unfamiliarity with the kind of genre and the characterization, may cause difficulties for L2 readers in answering the questions. Carrell (1985) also has stressed the importance of formal and content schema in comprehending a text.

Ho3 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1 (using the schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method) for questions on literary devices in the short stories.

The dependent variable (literary devices) is studied through the subjects' responses to ten multiple choice type questions based on the two short stories (questions 12, 13, 14 & 15 of 'QWERTYUIOP' and questions 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13 of the 'Fruitcake Special') in the post-test. Table 6 shows the mean scores obtained by the three groups in the post-test.

Table-6. Mean scores in post-test 1 on literary devices.

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Group 1	7.67	0.74	57
Group 2	5.56	1.91	57
Group 3	5.48	1.96	56
Total	6.24	1.92	170

The mean score for comprehending literary devices is highest in Experimental Group 1 (mean=7.67; N=57) followed by Experimental Group 2 (mean=5.56; N=57) and the Control Group (mean=5.48; N=56). The difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 is 2.11 but the difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and the Control Group is higher at 2.19. The above scores thus show that the subjects in Experimental Group 1 have the best achievement in the area of literary devices and the subjects in Experimental Group 2 have performed better than the subjects in the Control Group. The ANCOVA test, carried out to investigate if there was a significant difference in the mean scores of the subjects in the three groups, is shown in Table 7. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the mean scores obtained by the three groups F =57.50; p=0.00.

Table-7. ANCOVA test comparing the mean scores on literary devices among the three groups.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	263.38[a]	3	87.79	40.74	0.00
Intercept	532.63	1	532.63	247.16	0.00
PRE TEST THEME	88.95	1	88.95	41.28	0.00
GROUP	247.81	2	123.91	57.50	0.00
Error	357.74	166	2.16		
Total	7243.00	170			
Corrected Total	621.11	169			

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05.

Next, the post hoc pair wise comparisons test was carried out Table 8. The results showed a significant difference in scores between Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 (p=0.00) and also a significant difference between Experimental Group 1 and the Control Group (p=0.00). Therefore, the Schematic Method has succeeded in raising the achievement of the subjects in Experimental Group 1 significantly (in the area of literary devices) when compared with the subjects in Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group. The findings thus fail to accept Null-Hypothesis 3.

Table-8. Post-hoc pair wise comparisons on literary devices.

Group		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.00	2.00	2.69*	0.29	0.00	2.12	3.26
	3.00	2.80*	0.29	0.00	2.23	3.38
2.00	1.00	-2.69*	0.29	0.00	-3.26	-2.12
	3.00	0.11	0.28	0.68	-0.43	0.66
3.00	1.00	-2.80*	0.29	0.00	-3.38	-2.23
	2.00	-0.11	0.28	0.68	-0.66	0.43

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05
1= Experimental Group 1
2= Experimental Group 2
3= Control Group.

In Experimental Group 1, the teacher gave examples which were related to pupils' own experiences when she introduced the literary devices used in the texts. As the two short stories have been woven using a number of complex literary devices, the explanations given prior to reading the text helped the pupils greatly in their understanding of the text. Schema induction by the teacher in the pre-reading activities helped the students to

answer questions related to literary devices better than Experimental Group 2 and the Control Group (Carrell, 1985; Grabe & Stoller, 2011). These findings also support the findings by Moody et al. (2018) which stressed that schema activation is a successful strategy in learning.

The pupils in Experimental Group 2 groped for the meanings with the help of more able peers but said that they needed more help from the teacher ("…better if teacher explain…very hard…not sure"). The teacher in the Control Group explained the meanings but there was not much discussion on the topic. The pupils admitted understanding some of the devices but were unsure of the more complex structures ("…follow what teacher say…cannot understand…know little bit").

Ho4 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 1 (using the schematic method) compared with the mean scores of the students in Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method) for questions on settings in the short stories.

Setting, as the dependent variable, was studied through the subjects' responses to five multiple choice type questions based on the two short stories (questions 1, 2 & 3 of 'QWERTYUIOP' and questions 14 & 15 of the 'Fruitcake Special') in the post-test.

Table-9. Mean scores in the post-test on settings.

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Group 1	3.60	0.59	57
Group 2	2.58	1.10	57
Group 3	2.45	1.48	56
Total	2.88	1.22	170

Table 9 shows that the mean score for comprehending setting is highest in Experimental Group 1 (mean=3.60; N=57), second highest in Experimental Group 2 (mean= 2.58; N=57) and lowest in the Control Group (mean=2.45; N=56). The difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 is 1.02 but the difference in mean scores between Experimental Group 1 and the Control Group is higher at 1.15. The above scores thus show that the subjects in Experimental Group 1 have the best achievement in the area of settings and the subjects in Experimental Group 2 have performed better than the subjects in the Control Group.

Subsequently, the ANCOVA test was carried out to investigate if there was a significant difference in the mean scores on setting among the subjects in the three groups. The results in Table 10 indicate that there is a significant difference among the three groups F=22.81, p=0.00.

Table-10. ANCOVA Test Comparing the Mean Scores on Setting among the three groups.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	61.58[a]	3	20.53	17.86	0.00
Intercept	157.78	1	157.78	137.26	0.00
PRE TEST THEME	16.63	1	16.63	14.46	0.00
GROUP	52.43	2	26.22	22.81	0.00
Error	190.83	166	1.15		
Total	1659.00	170			
Corrected Total	252.41	169			

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05.

In order to determine which pair(s) is / are significantly different, the post hoc pair wise comparisons test was carried out. The results in Table 11 show that the Schematic Method significantly enhanced students' mean score on setting compared with students from Experimental Group 2 (p=0.00) and also the Control Group (p=0.00). The results in Table 9 and Table 10 together show that the Schematic Method has succeeded in enhancing the achievement of the students in Experimental Group 1 significantly (in the area of setting) when compared with

Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD Method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method). The findings thus fail to accept Null-Hypothesis 4.

Table-11. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons on setting

Group		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.00	2.00	1.12*	0.20	0.00	0.71	1.51
	3.00	1.26*	0.20	0.00	0.86	1.67
2.00	1.00	-1.11	0.20	0.00	-1.51	-0.71
	3.00	0.16	0.20	0.44	-0.24	0.56
3.00	1.00	-1.26*	0.20	0.00	-1.67	-0.86
	2.00	-0.16	0.20	0.44	-0.56	0.24

Note: Level of significance at p< 0.05
1= Experimental Group 1
2= Experimental Group 2
3= Control Group.

In Experimental Group 1 the pupils apparently found the prior knowledge which was built on their past experiences very useful, especially when the teacher guided them into analyzing the locations of the places, the seasons, environmental features and moods of the characters in determining the settings ("...Daffodils grow in spring.

Typewriters used before 1980's…no computers…"). They had sufficient support from the teacher and actively participated in the lesson. The STAD Method enabled the pupils in Experimental Group 2 to practice active learning but they found certain features beyond their scope of understanding ("…why flowers important?... don't know what country…") .

The pupils in the Conventional Group attempted to follow the explanations offered by the teacher without much discovery in learning. These findings affirm the findings by Carrell (1985); Gibbons (2002) which clearly indicate that schema induction and students familiarity with settings had helped them to score significantly higher than their counterparts who were taught using the STAD method and the conventional method.

5. CONCLUSION

The findings from this study indicate that the utilization of the Schematic Method enhanced students' mean scores for questions related to literary devices and setting compared with students who were taught using the STAD Method and the conventional method. However for questions related to themes and characterization, the differences between the three groups were not significant, The researchers opined that eight weeks of experimental study is not sufficient for students from Experimental Group1 to enhance their schema activation related to themes and characterization. As such, their mean scores in these two areas were not significant compared to the other two groups.

These findings have important pedagogical implications in the teaching of literature components (short stories) in English among secondary school students. The findings advocate that TESL teachers can use the Schematic Method to improve students' understanding of *literary devices* and *settings* in short stories. The teacher's skills in activating students' prior knowledge related to *literary devices* and s*ettings* in both the short stories facilitated them to answer significantly better than the students who were taught using the STAD method and the conventional method. As stressed by Rumelhart (1980) activation of the right schema facilitates students' comprehension of short stories in the areas of *literary devices* and s*ettings.*

This study also has crucial practical implications. The findings suggest that the Teacher Training Division under the Ministry of Education should train pre-service English teachers on how to utilize the Schematic Method and activate students' schema in teaching short stories. In addition, the Ministry of Education should conduct in service courses for teachers on how to carry out this method successfully. As stressed by Işıklı and Tarakcioglu (2017) teachers should be equipped with pedagogical knowledge in the teaching of Literature components.

These findings support the existing schema theory which stresses that the written text does not carry meaning by itself. A text only provides directions for readers as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their prior knowledge (Carrell, 1985; Liu, 2015; Rumelhart, 1980).In the current study the schema related to literary devices and settings of the two short stories were induced by the teacher among students, prior to reading the short stories. The induced schema helped them to answer the questions well and perform significantly better than the Experimental Group 2 (using the STAD method) and the Control Group (using the conventional method).

There are some limitations to this study; firstly only quantitative data was employed in the analysis. As such, it is hoped that future studies will also employ qualitative data such as teacher interviews and student interviews to get in-depth information on how the teacher induces relevant schemata to the students and how the schemata helps students to answer the questions. In addition, the researchers also will be able to triangulate the quantitative data with the qualitative data to support the findings.

Secondly, only two short stories were taught during the quasi-experiment; as such the findings cannot be generalized to all short stories and teaching other genres under the English Literature Components. Therefore, it is hoped that future researchers will examine the effects of using the Schematic method to teach other genres of the Literature Components such as novels, dramas and poems.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Acknowledgement: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

REFERENCES

Alhaisoni, E. (2017). Prior knowledge in EFL reading comprehension: Native and nonnative EFL teachers' perceptions, classroom strategies and difficulties encountered. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, *5*(1), 30-41.Available at: https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0501004.

Ambigapathy, P. (2000). *A study on readership behaviour among multi-ethnic, multi-lingual Malaysian students.* Paper presented at the Seventh International Literacy and Education Research Network (LERN) Conference on Learning, RMIT University, Melbourne.

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(4), 727-752.Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3586673.

Chakravarthy, G. (1999). *Primary school children reading: observable patterns and private perceptions. In P. Ambigapathy (Ed.), Global literacy: vision revisions and vistas in education.* Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

David, M. K., & Norazit, L. (2000). Selection of reading texts: Moving beyond content schema. *Literacy Across Cultures*, *4*(1), 1-9.

Dhillon, K. K., & Mogan, S. (2014). Language-based approaches to understanding literature: A creative activity module. *The English Teacher*, *43*(2), 63-78.

Fletcher, L. A. (2006). *The effect of utilizing the cooperative learning approach (The STAD Method) in enhancing writing skills and self-concept of lower six students.* Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education, School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Gambari, A. I., & Yusuf, M. O. (2015). Effectiveness of computer-assisted stad cooperative learning strategy on physics problem solving, achievement and retention. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *3*(3), 1-15.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Haron, I., Gapor, A. L. H., Masran, M. N., Ibrahim, A. H., & Nor, M. M. (2008). *The Impact of the Basic Teaching of Mathematics and Science in English in Primary Schools http:// www.nst.com.my/Current_News/NST/PDF/Math-Science%20Report.*

Işıklı, C., & Tarakcioglu, A. Ö. (2017). Investigating problems of English literature teaching to EFL high school students in Turkey with focus on language proficiency. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 82-95.

Jalleh, J. (2012). Majority of teachers not proficient in English. *The Star, Wednesday, Retrieved From: https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2012/09/26/majority-of-teachers-not-proficient-in-english/.*

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1985). *Internal dynamics of cooperative learning groups: Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn*. New York, London: Plenum Press.

Kafipour, R., & Jahansooz, N. (2017). Effect of content schema, vocabulary knowledge, and reading comprehension on translation performance. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature, 3*(1), 22-39.

Khan, A., & Akhtar, M. (2017). Investigating the effectiveness of cooperative learning method on teaching of English grammar. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 39*(1), 1-16.

Liu, Y. (2015). An empirical study of schema theory and Its role in reading comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(6), 1349-1356.Available at: https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0606.24.

Majdi, A., Syakirah, M., Sharmella, K., & Jenan, H. (2009). The use of reading strategies in developing students' reading competency among primary school teachers in Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 12*(2), 311-320.

Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2012). *Analysis of SPM results 2011*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Lembaga Peperiksaan Malaysia Malaysian Examination Board.

Moody, S., Hu, X., Kuo, L. J., Jouhar, J. M., Xu, Z., & Lee, S. (2018). Vocabulary instruction: A critical analysis of theories, research, and practice. *Education Sciences, 8*(180), 1-22.

Nair, S. M., & Sanai, M. (2018). Effects of utilizing the STAD method (Cooperative learning approach) in enhancing students' descriptive writing skills. *International Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(4), 239-252.Available at: https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2018.64.239.252.

Nikou, F. R., Bonyadi, A., & Ebrahimi, K. (2014). The effect of student team- achievement divisin (STAD) on language achievement of Iranian EFL students cross gender. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 3*(4), 936-949.

Noor, R. B. H. (2005). Keynote address at the melta national convention on Literature, 16th April, 2005. *The English Teacher, 36*, 90-96.

Omar, Y. (2017). The Inclusion of literature components in Malaysian English papers: The challenges and pros in teaching and learning. *Al-Ta lim Journal, 24*(3), 174-186.

Othman, N. I., Shah, P. M., Karim, A. A., Yusof, A., Din, R., Ramli, N. A., & Salleh, N. S. M. (2015). Personalizing learning of English literature: Perceptions and challenges. *Journal of Personalized Learning, 1*(1), 104-112.

Periasamy, V. (2011). *The effects of using the STAD method in reading comprehension among form four students*. Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education, School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Rashid, R. A., Vethamani, M. E., & Rahman, S. B. A. (2010). Approaches employed by teachers in teaching literature to less proficient students in form 1 and form 2. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 87-99.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p87.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). *Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce & W.F. Brewer, (Eds.), theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Salbego, N., & Osborne, D. M. (2015). Schema activation through pre-reading activities: Teaching proverbs in L2. *Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal, 7*(2), 175-188.

Slavin, R. E. (1978). Student teams and achievement divisions. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12*(1), 39-49.

Stevenson, R. J., & Palmer, J. A. (1994). *Children, teachers and learning series. In C. Vullingford (Ed.), Learning principles, processes and practices*. Great Britain: Guilford and King's Lynn.

Stott, N. (2001). Helping ESL students become better readers: Schema theory applications and limitations. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *7*(11), 1-10.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). USA: Allan & Bacon Inc.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Yanxia, S. (2008). An exploration of schma theory in intensive reading. *English Language Teaching*, *1*(2), 105-107.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v1n2p104.