



































































English writing, he seem to learned academic writing in a smooth way and he received the highest grade from his take-home mid-term essays-96 out of 100.

**2 Learner-Related Difficulties Shown in Motivational Issues.** TF4 only motivational issues were time constraints because he was a double major in English and sociology. He developed his interest in literature in English department: however, he needed 5 or 6 hours per week for preparation only for the American literature course, because lecturer L design the course requirement for his students to “sustained reflection” Under time constraint, for TF4, the amount of time for each literature course depends on lecturers requirements, In the British literature (2) class, because he was not require to preview and review, he only studied just before the exams. The way he studied British literature (2) was similar to how he has studied British literature (1).

**What Did he Do When Encountering Difficulties.** This category is further divided into use of non-human resources and human resources. In used of non-human resources, TF4 used online information most often for historical background and “materials related to the text” (3<sup>rd</sup> int)”.He describe, things like study guide, study questions, etc. Well, I usually read summaries, and I seldom read analyses and study questions. After reading some summaries, I can read the text myself (3<sup>rd</sup> int). He said previously he had read information related with historical events or the author background before going to the text. Yet, what he said here indicated that after reading historical background, he usually read summaries before reading the text itself to study the text more smoothly. He try to read the original text himself, and he used translation to bypass the text only when he don’t have enough time to do the reading in English.

Material that he used often was online spark notes. He said, I usually read the summary, and I go to the text itself. But [laugh] if don’t read the original test and i don’t have time to read it any more before the exam, I read the analysis (3<sup>rd</sup>int). He didn’t tell me how often read the analysis without reading the original test though. He referred to secondary materials all the time....When I can’t understand the test, I look for secondary sources. With the help from secondary sources, I might be able to get it: otherwise, I’d wait for the lecturer interpretation in class (3<sup>rd</sup> int). What he said about his strategic use of non-human resources seems to indicate that her English proficiency allowed him to refer to more secondary sources for materials more than his classmates. Actually, he himself rated his ability in reading and writing English is high. He did not think it time consuming to read critical comment in English. I memorize the ideas and oh, how comes is time consuming? He said he only took the part he needed (3<sup>rd</sup> int). He seem more to be strategic than other students when using these critical opinions and seemed how to use it in

a correct way. As pointed out in TM2, critical comments did not work for British literature (2) exams for him. He received extremely low grade in the mid-term by writing points taken from literary critics. Moreover, TF4 also used short entry comments, preparing for the exam, He said.....i d look at books written in Africa, such book like: A collection of critical comment on English and American literature. In that kind of book, they say what status an author has in literature history...for example, I read a statement like, um, Whitman is a patriotic poet, and then, I reflect on what I've studied about Whitman and think about how come he is a patriotic poet? (3<sup>rd</sup> int) Those short passages about certain author not only saved him preparation time but also provided him angles to reflect upon as he read text.

In sum, he efficiently used secondary resources. In the beginning, historical background was used, and then a summary when it is available. Then, if could not get what the text is about, he referred to study guides, before classes, he relied on secondary materials and then waited for the lecturer interpretations in class; he did not reread the difficult passages.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

This session first presents summary of the research and then make a conclusion and then proffer recommendation based on the findings of the research further policy teaching and materials.

From a learning perspective, masterworks presented difficulties for studying and teaching as well. One possible source of help would be to replace or supplement them by other texts such as texts belonging to young to adult literature. Young adult literature may not necessarily be less difficult to read in terms of target culture knowledge and register exhibited in the text; however, it may present less difficulty because of less complex sentence structures and vocabulary and thus could provide more avenues for students to get entry into the. At least, young adult literature could be a major component of the preparatory literature courses such as Approaches to Literature for the first-year English majors so that students could gain knowledge for various genres as well as be exposed to more extensive reading. In fact, preparatory courses using young adult literature or children's literature might need to start earlier, even in senior high school, for students who intend to be English majors because most the student's information's in may study expressed that they lacked extensive reading experience of literature of any before university. Extensive reading for more literary texts should be a means to accumulating domain knowledge of literature, which might affect the students, study of masterworks of literature even though how much domain knowledge is necessary for such literature courses remains an open question.



## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, based on data from different data sources including classroom observation, interviews with students and instructor informants, and also the questionnaire study, my findings support the notion that the study of literature in a foreign language classroom is fraught with difficulty. In addition, the teaching of literature in English as a foreign language is difficult as well.

However, I would caution my audience, as I pointed out in various parts of Chapter 4 and chapter 5, findings from the questionnaire could differ from what the respondents to it **reported** in the face-to-face interviews because of various reasons. In addition to all other reasons, different respondents. Fraught with difficulty. In addition, the teaching of literature in English as a foreign language is difficult as well. However, I would caution my audience, as I point out in various parts of chapter 4 and chapter 5, findings from the questionnaire could differ from what the reported in the face-to-face interviews because of various reasons. In addition to all other reasons, different respondents might perceive the question items differently even though as a researcher I had tried what I could to ensure that items were reliable, as explained in chapter 3. The findings of my study contribute to the expansion of our knowledge about difficulties in studying and teaching literature in English departments in Sierra Leone universities, to a certain extent other EFL or FL content as well. My findings that students lacked the ability to generate a literary response to test that were too difficult for them could be used as a starting point to rectify instructors' expectations that of students and their teaching practices. In addition, my findings that institutional or expectations factors such as their such as curriculum requirements, course requirements, and course objectives directly influence students' difficulties and successes in literature study calls for a need for curriculum makers and literature instructors in English departments seriously to consider their assumptions or objectives so that better decisions can be made for test selection, and course objectives. At the same time, they should attention to student' interests or aptitudes, significant factors in their literature study, as shown in this study. More importantly, they should also make teaching and study of literature in English departments in Sierra Leone successful to avoid the diminished role of literature as experienced by universities and foreign –language institute. As shown in my study, the lecturers assigned a different focus on the role of culture in literature study; their different foci led to different teaching approaches. How much culture information should be included in a literature course should be an open question to be pondered. In the current study, lecturer I made an effort to link literature and

history whereas lecturer M emphasized literature itself. In turn, their different foci and approaches directly affected the kinds of successes that their students reported. For instance, lecture Ls' students showed far more Consciousness about cultural understanding in literature classes. The finding call for a reconsideration of curriculum objectives, especially of the role of culture in literature study. Nevertheless, as sell's (1995) caveat put it well, "literature is by no means the only manifestation of the target" (p. 4). Relevant to this is a consideration of what the study and teaching of literature written in English has to offer for the curriculum in the English department in Sierra Leone. In English department the rift between literature and Language skill classes (Bay Petersen, 1990) and that Between literature and linguistics areas (Rau, 1994) has often been described. Rau (1990) even suggested how British and American literature teaching could be converged with linguistics. She discussed how stylistics, pragmatics, and semiotic could be applied to the study of literature and further proposed that a course in which linguistics was used to analyses and appreciate literature be offered for English majors in addition to the required introduction to linguistics and to English and American literature courses. However, what she proposed remains to be actualized in the future. Littman (1999) argued that to pull together the Trinity in a foreign language department, literature, culture, and the target language, practical questions should focus on first, appropriate content, and second, the relationship between content and language instruction. How to form a "coherent curriculum" in a foreign language department, as Pitman's (1999) article title suggests, requires curriculum makers to think carefully about those related question's.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In of the paucity of empirical research regarding difficulties in teaching and studying literature, I would consider the following for future research. First, a study of the policy makers' and also literature instructors' assumption would be helpful to lay the ground for modifications of curriculum and pedagogy. Based on the result of such a study, proper decision about literature courses can be made. Second, a longitudinal study lasting for a longer period of time might contribute to a better understanding of students' difficulties in literature study in an EFL context. I would suggest such LASTS FOR at least two school years when the students take the required British and American literature courses. Third, issues regarding literary understanding remain a topic to be the very few undergraduate students who are more proficient in English can be persuaded to participate in such a study, m

*English can be persuaded to participate in such a study might be useful in providing a window on how thunder standing of literary text in a foreign language could evolve if EFL student are more linguistically proficient. Another way to approach foreign literature understanding can involve predate student using learner interviews and thank \_around protocols.*

The sharing of ideas among professionals is necessary as a future pedagogical effort. Gaff (1992) nag

Illustrated that the “disjunction of the curriculum “(P. 106) and the” insularity of the class room” (p.107) were taken for granted in literature teaching; different instructors are interpreting and assuming different theories in different classroom .My finding that most students on campus did not have successful contacts with masterworks of literature in English calls for an exchange of ideas among literature instructors. That is, in addition to other things regarding of literature teaching and literary understanding, instructors with different voices and teaching styles should hear from each other so that their students can be further helped. Harper(1988) urged ‘‘ a need to develop approaches that systematically prepare an guide student development of the skills necessary for interacting with the literary text and provide opportunities check for the student to express, negotiate, and revise personal interpretations’’ (p.407) in foreign literature classes. As shown in my findings, this need still urgent and the word ‘‘systematic’’ is key. As my findings indicate, most students were not conscious about strategies they could have used to deal with texts; the explicit teaching of strategies or skills would be necessary to, decrease students ‘reliance on the instructors’ interpretation. Only one student (TF4) seemed to acquire, without explicit instruction, strategies about how to interpret a poem from lecturer L, s lectures. Act, when provided suggestions about how to preview, e.g. visualizing what the text is presented and self –questioning, student knew how to try to experience the text before a class meeting. ‘ learning to learn’’ could be a more significant goal of the foreign literature classroom, and may help rectify the current tendency in the classroom of having an instructor explain just how one meaning is possible.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, M (1990). To read.Cambride,MA: Press.Aikman, C.C. (1995). Ideas in practice : Picture books and developmental Education, 19(1), 28-30, 32. Akyle, A.,and Yalcin, E. (1990). EFL class: A study of goal – achievement incongruence. ELT Journal, 44, 174-180. Alderson, J. C., and A. H. Urquhart. (1985). The effect of students’ academic discipline on their performance on ESP reading tests. Language Testing, 2(2), 192-204. Bader, Y.(1992). Curricula and teaching strategies in university English Departments: Benseler, D. P.( 1991). The upper division curriculum in foreign language and literature: Obstacles to the realization of promise. In E. S. Silber (E D), Criticalissues in foreign language instruction (pp. 186-199). New York: Garland. Berg, Berg, B. L. ( 2001). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (4<sup>th</sup> ed). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon. Bernhardt, E. B. (1990). A model of L2 Text reconstruction:The recall of literary text by learners of German.In A. Labaraca and L. M.Bailey

(Eds.), *Issues in L2: Theory as Brooks, M. (1989). Literature in the EFL classroom. English Teaching Forum, 27(2), 10- 12. Brown., and Haynes, M. (1985). Literacy background and reading development in a second language. In T. H. carry [Ed.], the development of reading skills (pp. 19-34) . san Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.*

Carr, P. L. (1981). Culture-specific schemata in L2 comprehension. In R.A. orem & J. F. Haskell

(Eds.), *Selected papers from the Ninth Illinois TESOL/BE Annual Convention and the first Midwest*

*TESOL Conference (pp.123-132). Chicago: Illinois TESOL/ BE.*

Carrell, P.L.(1983a ). Three Components of background knowledge in reading Comprehension. *Language Learning, 33, 183-207.*

Carter, R. (1989). *Directions in the teaching and study of English Stylistics. M. Short (Ed.), Reading, analyzing and teaching literature (pp.10-21). Essex, England: Longman.*

Chang S. Y. (1993). Introduction. In *Modernism and the nativist resistance:*

*Contemporary Chinese fiction from Taiwan (pp. 1-22).Durham & London: Duke University press.*

Marco.; in J. Selzer (Ed.), *Understanding scientific prose (pp. 203-231). Madison, University of Wisconsin press .*

Cohen, A. D. (1993). *Reading for comprehension .In Language learning: Insights for learners, Teachers, and researchers (pp.73-101). Boston: Heinle&Heinle.*

Davis, J. N. (1992). *Reading literature in the foreign language: the comprehension/respone connection. The French Review, 65,359-370.*

Devine, J.(1987). *General language competence and adult second language reading In J. Devine, P.*

L. Carrell, &D.E. Eskey (Eds.), *Research in reading English as asecond language(pp. 73-87). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.*

Du,R(1986).*Literature in english: An integral part of the EFL curriculum. English Teaching Forum,24(4),23-26.*

Earthman,E.A.(1992).*Creating the virtual work: Readers process in understanding literary texts. Research in the Teaching of English,26,351-348.*

- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Fowler, F. J., Jr. (2002). Designing Questions to be good measures. In *survey research methods* (3rd ed.) (pp. 76-103). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Gilroy-Scott, N. (1983). Introduction. In C. J. Brumfit (Ed), *Teaching Literature overseas: Language base approaches* (pp 1-5). Oxford, England, Pergamon press.
- Glaser, B. G & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies of qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goodman K. S., (1967). Reading: a psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the reading specialist*, 4, 126-135.
- Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. (1979). Learning to read is natural. In L. B. Resnick & P. V. Weaver (Eds), *Theory of practice of early reading* (Vol. I, pp. 137-154). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TEASOL Quarterly*, 25, 375-406.
- Harper, S. N. (1988). Strategies for teaching literature at the undergraduate level. *Modern language journal*, 72, 402-408.
- Haas, C. (1993). Beyond "just some fact": Reading as rhetorical action. In A. M. Penrose & B. M. Sitko (Eds), *Hearing ourselves think: Cognitive research in the college writing classroom* (pp 19-32). New York: Oxford University press.
- Haas, C. (1994). Learning to read biology: One student rhetorical development in college. *Written communication*, 11, 43-83.
- Harper, S. N. (1988). Strategies for teaching literature at the undergraduate level. *The modern language journal*, 72, 402-408.
- Harris, R. (1981). The language myth. London: Duckworth. In the proceedings of seventh international symposium in teaching English (pp 431-439). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.
- Hung, J. L. (1988). Teaching vocabularies to nonnative speakers at three levels. In *selected papers from the fifth conference on English teaching and learning in the Republic of China* (pp 155-171). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.
- Hung, D. L., & Tzeng, O. J. L. (1981). Orthographic variation and visual information processing. *Psychological bulletin*, 90, 377-414.

- Jakobsen. A. L. (1993). Translation as textual (Re) production. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology*, 2, 155-165.
- Jennings, J. (1995). From student to tutor: Learning in literature. In P .Preston (Ed), *literature in adult education* (pp. 13-33), Nottingham, Great Britain: Antony Rowe.
- John, L. (1986). Language versus literature in University English Department. *English teaching forum*, 24(4), 18-22.
- Johnson. D. M. (1992). Survey research. In *approaches to research in second language learning* (pp, 104-131). New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Lantolf, J.P. (1999). Second culture acquisition: Cognitive consideration. In E. Hinkle (Ed), *culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 28-46). New York: Cambridge university press.
- Lesgold, A. M., & perfetti, C. A. (Eds) (1981). *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, N. J. Erlbaum.
- Maley, A. (1989). Down from the pedestal: Literature as resource. In R. Carter, R. Walker, & C. Brumfit (Eds), *Literature and the learner: Methodological approaches* (PP. 10-24). Basingstoke/London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Milkulecky, B.S. (1990). part : reading and literacy : some connections. In *a short course in teaching reading* Albany
- Mittman, E. (1999). In search of a coherent curriculum: integrating the third-year foreign language classroom. *foreign language annals*, 32, 480-493.
- Moody, H.L.B. (1978). *literature in education. in the teaching of literature with special reference to developing countries* (pp. 6-31). London: Longman.
- Nash, T., & Uan, Y-P. (winter 1992/1993). extensive reading for learning and enjoyment. *TESOL journal*, 2(2), 27-31.
- Obeidat, M.M. (1997). Language vs. literature in English departments in the Arab world. *English teaching forum*, 35(1), 30-36.
- POLLIO, H., & Smith, M. (1979) sense and nonsense in thinking about anomaly and metaphor. *bulletin of the Psychonomic society*, 13, 323-326.
- Purves, A.C. (Ed.) 199 *the idea of difficulty in literature* N.Y. university of New York press

Schallert, d.l 1981. Thought and language, content and structure in language communication. In the dynamics of language learning; research in reading and english pp.65-79. urbana, il: National conference on research in english, ERIC clearing house on reading and communication skills. Schulz R A (1981). Literature and readability: Bridging the gap in foreign language reading. *Modern language journal*, 65, 43-53. Seidman, I. (1998) Interviewing as qualitative research: A guard for researchers in education and the social science (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York: Teachers college press. Sell, R D (1995). Why is literature central? In R D. sell (ED), literature throughout foreign language education: The implication of pragmatic (pp.4-20. London: Phonix ELT. Simpson M L., Nist, S L & Kirby, K. (1987). Ideas in practice: Vocabulary strategies designed for college students. *Journal of developmental education*, 11(2), 20-24. Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 703-725. STEFFENSON, M. S., Joag-dev, C., & Anderson, R. C. (1979) A cross-culture perspective on reading comprehension. *Reading research Quaterly*, 15(1), 10-29. Sung M H. (1995). Dian-lu-guan-nianyujiao-xue: Yi ying -guo-wen-xuewei-li (The idea of cannon and teaching: Using english literature as an example). In T.J. Chen & Swaffer, J. (2001). German studies as studies of culture discourses. In D.P Benselar, C. W. Nickisch, & C LNollendorfs (EDS), *Teaching German in the twentieth-century America* (pp.230-246). Mdison: University of Wisconsin Press. Widdowson, H. G. (1983). The deviant language of poetry. In C. J. Brumfit (ED), *Teaching literature overseas: Language based approaches* (pp. 7-16). Oxford, England: Pergamon. Wolcott, H. F. (1990). On seeking and rejecting validity in qualitative research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (EDs), *Qualitative enquiry in education* (pp. 121-152). New York: Teachers college press. Yan, Y. S. (1970). *Wen-xue-pi-ping san-lun* (also available in english: *Essays in literature criticism*). Taipie: Jing-Sheng. Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage. Yin, Q., & Chen, S. (2002). Teaching English literature in China: Importance, and countermeasures. *World Englishes*, 21, 317-324. Zughoul, M. R. (1985). Formulating objectives for the English department in Arab university. *Dirasat: A Researchers publication of the university Jordan*. 12, 3. Zoughoul, M. R. (1986). English departments in Third World Universities: Language, linguistic, or literature? *English Teaching Forum*, 24(4), 10-17.