The Bard of Our Time: Teaching Shakespeare in Urban Secondary Schools

A dissertation submitted to the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies

Drew University in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree,

Doctor of Letters

Evelyn Mamman

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

May 2018

ABSTRACT

The Bard of Our Time: Teaching Shakespeare in an Urban Secondary Classroom

Doctor of Letters Dissertation by

Evelyn Mamman

The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies
Drew University May 2018

This dissertation explores the importance of making Shakespeare accessible within a diverse learning environment and presents how secondary English teachers can create opportunities to make Shakespeare applicable to students' identities and lives. This study examines conventional practices of teaching Shakespeare given the challenges in urban public school systems today. In addition, this work explores how Shakespeare's plays, through dramatic inquiry, promote more complex understanding in students and extend and deepen their connection with core themes of a play.

This dissertation concludes that William Shakespeare's works have a place in urban secondary classrooms. The challenge of Shakespeare' s plays is the reason educators should be teaching his work particularly in urban public classrooms. His plays, and the lessons learned in reading and analyzing them, still provide an unparalleled preparation for lifelong learning for all students. The complexity of Shakespeare's plays gives students the opportunity to develop higher analytical skills as they ask and explore questions and engage in literacy practices that allow them to scrutinize and synthesize multiple views and conflicting perspectives. Shakespeare's plays provide ideal texts to challenge students' thinking and to help them develop not only the literacy skills necessary to compete successfully in the global community, but also to reflect on contemporary concerns and dilemmas.

DEDICATION

To the memory of my Mother, Dr. Agnes Ovayioza Enesi.

For giving me great joy, the gift of love, laughter, and faith.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ---------- vi

Chapter 1 ---------- 1

Chapter 2 ---------- 13

Chapter 3 ---------- 31

Chapter 4 ---------- 50

Chapter 5 ---------- 78

Chapter 6 ---------- 103

Epilogue ---------- 125

Works Cited and Consulted ----------128

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am profoundly grateful to my dissertation chair, Dr. Brian Merry, for his inspiration, guidance, encouragement, and feedback. His insight, support, and vast knowledge of Shakespeare made my dissertation experience an exciting and fulfilling journey. I am grateful to Dr. Frank Occhiogrosso for his wise and helpful comments. His expertise in the subject matter helped improve the level of my study. This dissertation also benefited from Gloria Rahn who offered thoughtful readings of the work at various stages. I also thank the Arts and Letters Department's Dissertation Support Group, especially Professor Virginia B. Phelan, for coordinating our Saturday dissertation workshops. The Research staff at Drew University's Library, especially Bruce Lancaster, also offered vital assistance with resources. I am forever indebted to them.

My family has been an unending source of love, inspiration, and care. My father's prayers and support are immeasurable. My brothers, Peter and Michael, and my sister Irene kept me laughing through the highs and lows of this process. Their prayers and encouragement kept me grounded. Mum would be so proud of our unity, love, and support of each other. My children, Hadiza and Khalid, are the best! They endured my unending conversations about Shakespeare and this dissertation when I read and wrote for hours, days, weeks, and months. I could not have completed this dissertation without their love and patience as I missed soccer games and family obligations. My husband and life partner, Saidu, has been my rock every step of the way. Unwavering in his belief in me, his love and devotion are beyond what I deserve. I am full of love and gratitude that he is in my life, so in the words of my favorite Bard in *All's Well That Ends Well*, "Thanks, sir; all the rest is mute.

Chapter One

Shakespeare and the English Language Classroom: An Introduction

William Shakespeare's plays have always been foundational to the United States' educational system. Many high school students study *Romeo and Juliet* in ninth grade, *Julius Caesar* in tenth grade, and *Macbeth* and/or *Hamlet* in twelfth grade. Although some teachers may exchange any one of these plays with *Othello* or *As You Like It*, English in high schools almost always means teaching works written by William Shakespeare. This staple of the English classroom is also depicted in many Hollywood films which contain scenes in schools. In these films, the English teachers ask students to write sonnets or recite passages from Shakespeare's plays. Jacqueline Bach says that, "these representations of the teaching of Shakespeare support the belief that his works are relevant to today's youth, and that students should read and study Shakespeare" (323). Many see Shakespeare as the greatest writer in the English language and central to the Western canon. Yet, many secondary teachers, especially in urban areas, question whether the material is too far above, or too far removed from, their students to have the same impact as more contemporary literature.

Teaching Shakespeare in urban public secondary schools has become more demanding. Many students who attend urban public schools come from low-income homes and a majority of them are minorities of ethnically diverse backgrounds with English as a second language. They have below average reading levels in an environment where high test scores have become the priority. These schools value reading only as

much as it raises students' test scores. Because of the emphasis on high-stakes testing, urban public school districts hold teachers to increasingly stringent standards that eliminate the richness of the curricula, so that more time can be spent on drills in reading and math. As a result, teachers are feeling pressure not to teach Shakespeare because they think that his plays are too difficult for students to understand.

Several Shakespearean scholars and educators agree that many high school students often have negative attitudes toward Shakespeare even before they start learning about his life, his poetry, or his plays. Scholars like David Bevington, Peggy O'Brien, Mary Ann Rygiel, and Maurice Charney, generally agree that vocabulary and the length of Shakespeare's plays create a challenge for students in today's secondary classrooms. Richard J. Mueller says that high school students often perceive Shakespeare as being "high-brow" or "intellectual." He argues that students' lack of interest and/or negative attitudes towards the Bard's plays is more about the ineffective teaching of his plays than it is about the value of studying his works. Unfortunately, the attitudes are still the same today with too many high school students, especially in urban public secondary schools, as they were in 1964 when Mueller made this claim. While countless studies have examined the significance of Shakespeare in secondary classrooms in general, very few have addressed the significance of Shakespeare's works specifically in urban public secondary classrooms.

Shakespeare's plays pose many problems in an urban classroom for various reasons even though his artistic worth is endless. Most students reading below grade level in urban public schools are often mainstreamed into regular English classes; therefore, Shakespeare is often eliminated from the curriculum or altered to suit the projected needs

of the students. To these struggling readers, Shakespearean text mimics a foreign language. In addition to learning English language, they are confronted with new vocabulary and syntax, word order, and the auxiliary problem of verse. Thus, what is often misconstrued as students' lack of interest in Shakespeare is usually a defensive reaction based on a form of linguistic insecurity. The teachers have to revise their approach and pace which is often problematic. Do they abridge Shakespeare's writings or take them out of the curriculum and replace them with more contemporary texts?

The Demographic Shift

Generally, the secondary English Language Arts (ELA) classroom can be seen as a highly dynamic place that Jim Burke describes as being in transition as it shifts curricular practices and policies to meet the changing social, economic, and demographic conditions of the 21st century (2). Urban school districts are frequently marked by higher concentrations of poverty, greater racial and ethnic diversity, larger concentrations of immigrant populations and linguistic diversity, and more frequent rates of student mobility. While socio economic demographics are not themselves the challenge of urban school systems, they speak to the broader social and economic inequities facing such populations that invariably frame the teaching of Shakespeare in urban public schools.

Despite the diverse needs of students in our urban public schools, the approach to teaching remains vastly the same. More often than not, the ELA classroom can be seen as a deeply conservative context, filled with history, highly resistant to change, and continuing to maintain at its core values, beliefs, and practices formed during the industrial age (Luke 84). Perhaps it is best described as "a complex context where the conflicting forces of tradition and reform play out in the everyday of classroom life"

(Applebee 45; Sperling & DiPardo 62). While this may be true for all school subjects, the dreams of the past, demands of the present, and possibilities for the future would seem to collide with particular force in the high school ELA classroom.

The nature of the student population is one of the most powerful and certainly most visible changes in the American educational context. Over the last 30 years, the student population has become more racially, culturally, and ethnically diverse. As noted in the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2017), between 1972 and 2007 the percentage of White students decreased from 78% to 56% while the minority population increased from 22% to 44%. In New Jersey increasing racial and ethnic diversity is particularly evident: as of 2015, minority enrollment is up to 43% from 41% in 2010 (NCES, 2016). The increase in minority enrollment mirrors changes in population in general. As of 2016, Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Pacific islanders/Native Americans made up 49% of the U.S. population with Hispanics the largest minority group at 23% (NCES, 2016). The increasing proportion of children with non-English backgrounds in urban locations has led to a greater proportion of children with difficulty speaking English in those locations.

An effect of increasing and changing immigration patterns is that large numbers of students speak a language other than English at home. According to NCES, 2008, the number of these students more than doubled from 3.8 to 10.8 million between 1979 and 2006. The vast majority of these students require English language instruction. Lee Gunderson, drawing on statistics from The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction, reports that the percentage of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the United States has risen by 57% since 1995 and that ELLs now

comprise over 10% of the total student population. This is important in relation to Shakespeare's place in urban classrooms because the key argument against teaching his plays is that many believe Shakespeare's texts may present difficulties for contemporary readers, particularly those who do not have English as a first language.

English language learning is becoming part of everyday life in most urban high school ELA classes. Of particular interest to secondary school English teachers is the fact that the greatest increase in the number of ELLs is occurring in grades 7–12 (Gunderson 185). This increase reflects only those students who are classified as ELL, but not the whole range of second language learners who may still require English language support during the five to seven years it takes to become proficient in academic English (Cummins 382). Changing immigrant patterns and increasing diversity suggests that more than ever a wider range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds and a wider range of English language proficiencies exist in the secondary school ELA classroom. More generally, growing awareness of the cultural, social, and linguistic diversity that exists across but also within groups, along with the acknowledgement of individual differences, makes it increasingly evident that variety rather than uniformity typifies the urban public secondary ELA classroom. Thus, teaching Shakespeare is challenging in this environment.

Shakespeare in the Common Core

The introduction of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers in 2010 reignited not only interest in the appropriateness of Shakespeare in secondary classrooms, but also specifically in the urban public school classroom. The

authors of the CCSS argue that the effects of low reading achievement are not the same across American schools. They found that students arriving at school from less-educated families are disproportionately represented in the statistics that state departments of education often use to make curricular decisions. Insufficient high level tasks and a lack of accountability for independent reading of complex texts in K-12 schooling have severe consequences for all students, but they are disproportionately so for students with little or no access to books before arriving at the schoolhouse door. This particular group of students is mostly found in urban public school classrooms in which Shakespeare is not a priority. However, Shakespeare seems inescapable. The two Common Core English Language Arts standards that specifically mandate the teaching of Shakespeare (CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.9-10.9 and CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.11-12.4 pose the question: How can we teach Shakespeare effectively and how can we make him relevant in the 21st century classroom? The Common Core generally avoids mandating texts in favor of promoting critical analysis and rigor. Hence, the fact that Shakespeare is the only author cited in the essentials is significant. His explicit inclusion offers a noteworthy opportunity for educators to rethink how to approach Shakespearean instruction.

Given the language diversity in urban public secondary classrooms, any effort to make the CCSS attainable for these and many other students must go beyond vocabulary, and should begin with an examination of teachers' beliefs about language, literacy and learning. Linguists and language analysts who have studied the language of academic texts have identified grammatical structures and devices for framing ideas, indicating relationships, and structuring arguments, that create substantial differences between spoken and written language (Fillmore & Fillmore 64). The problems English learners

and language minority students are experiencing stem at least partly from educators' failure to recognize the role played by language itself in literacy. To communicate complex ideas and information calls for the lexical and grammatical resources of mature discourse – students must master these if they are to succeed in school and career. Shakespeare is an essential part of this conversation because the language used in complex texts of the type students should be reading in school should be different in numerous ways from the language of non-academic talk. Differences in vocabulary make up only a part of it.

To Teach or Not to Teach

Researchers who oppose Shakespeare's works in secondary classrooms warn that having students study Shakespeare discourages them from reading other literature. For example, Gary Taylor, research professor, and general editor of the Oxford edition of *Shakespeare's Complete Works* (1986), describes Shakespeare as "dry" and claims schools should include more modern books in the curriculum to ensure that students develop a love of reading. Educators on Taylor's side of the argument believe that modern texts, such as *The Great Gatsby* and *Catcher in the Rye* will not only acquaint students with literature, but students will also find such books more accessible (and hence, students are more likely to read and contemplate the book).

Another argument against teaching Shakespeare in classrooms today is that some public school administrators focus on high test scores rather than authentic learning and engagement. The demands of high stakes testing in public schools represent one of the major pressures that teachers of English must negotiate when teaching Shakespeare in secondary classrooms. For example, new specifications of the Partnership for Assessment

of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) are unparalleled in the degree of prescriptivism they impose. The assessments give teachers much less scope than before to set tasks that are appropriate to the needs and abilities of their groups. In an increasingly results-oriented public school education system with budget constraints, teaching Shakespeare does not seem to equal better test results. The opposition reflects not so much Shakespeare's literary merit as it does the doubt surrounding Shakespeare's place in modern day secondary classrooms.

Some educators argue that Shakespeare's stories can be communicated to students without needing Shakespeare's works. Dana Dusbiber, a veteran teacher at Luther Burbank High School, the largest urban high school in Sacramento, California, does not want to assign Shakespeare any more to her students even though he is in the common core. She argues that there is really exciting literature out there that better speaks to the needs of her "very ethnically-diverse and wonderfully curious modern-day students." She and other educators like her claim that the story of *Romeo and Juliet* can be experienced through *West Side Story* or the many other contemporary stories of forbidden love. Others assert that student comprehension might be fostered if students are given user-friendly summaries of Shakespeare's plots.

Scholars, however, recognize the universality of Shakespeare and hence his relevance in urban public secondary classrooms. The late Rex Gibson asserts that Shakespeare's plays have endured the test of time because of the variety of interpretations possible and their infinite capacity for adaptation (xii). This is partly why Shakespeare's works are popular in many classrooms around the world. A 2010 survey by the Royal Shakespeare Company revealed that 50 percent of the world's students

study Shakespeare. The survey, based on responses from British Council offices in 43 countries, reported that 64 million students study Shakespeare every year. The survey also asked the important question: why do students around the globe study Shakespeare's works? Seventy percent of the responders believe students study Shakespeare's works because of the intrinsic value of the plays (the skillful telling of stories and universal human values). Fifty percent also believe students study Shakespeare's works because Shakespeare is relevant and useful in helping young people reflect on contemporary issues and dilemmas.

The skillful telling of stories is worth emphasizing, especially to counter the argument that Shakespeare's stories can be communicated to students without Shakespeare's works. While students can experience the story of *Romeo and Juliet* through *West Side Story* or the many other stories of forbidden love on the market, the use of language in these substitutes cannot compare to the richness of Shakespeare's language. The language students learn in the classroom is the tool they use to shape their thoughts and feelings. Language is more than a way of exchanging information and extending ideas; it is a means of reaching out and connecting with other people, which is vital for students who are new to this country. Mathew James in an article, "Why Storytelling in the Classroom Matters" credits skillful storytelling as a motivating reason for his English-language learners to speak and write English. James says that the single biggest factor to his students' progress in English has been their desire to become storytellers. This is particularly powerful considering that his school consists of 97 percent English-language learners, many of whom arrived speaking little or no English.

Cass Foster and Lynn G. Johnson contend that educators should resist allowing what they teach to be dictated by their immediate interests and/or those of their students. While they believe that students need to be engaged, they also stress that teachers should expose students to texts and ideas that are, to some degree, quite alien. They claim that students need to face concepts, and language, that they may find difficult, and teachers should give students the chance to recognize that what is strange and difficult can also be thought-provoking, or arresting, or even beautiful. In their opinion students also need the chance to encounter Shakespeare's world as presented in his plays, or elements of what Shakespeare has come to represent. If teachers want to promote analysis and the use of textual evidence effectively, students need to hear less about an "answer" and have more opportunities to ponder the meaning of a play or passage.

In addition, these scholars and educators emphasize that we can all think of ways in which Shakespeare still speaks to us very directly. They point to productions of *Macbeth* and *Richard III* and *The Merchant of Venice,* for example, that emphasize Shakespeare's relevance to the twenty-first century, and offer Baz Luhrman's *Romeo and Juliet* to show that Shakespeare can still speak to contemporary teenage concerns. As a result, Shakespeare is appropriate for students in secondary classrooms. What is missing in the discourse is how to teach Shakespeare in urban public school settings so that students find his works interesting and worth knowing.

Teaching Shakespeare

Conventional practices of teaching Shakespeare are less effective given the challenges in urban public school systems today. Laura Turchi and Ayanna Thompson assert that students will not meet Common Core goals if teachers continue simply to

distill the essence of characters, require plot summaries, and trivialities about a given play's universal themes. They believe that one good act of Shakespeare "read with purpose, spoken, embodied, and made relevant" can be more rigorous and lively for students than the entire canon taught as something detached, obsolete, and prearranged (32). Typical instructional methods for Shakespeare are inadequate for the 21st century if we want to strengthen the relevancy of Shakespeare's works in American secondary education.

Making Shakespeare accessible within a diverse learning environment is the key to keeping his works alive in urban public secondary schools. One way to do this is for secondary school English teachers to create varied opportunities to make Shakespeare applicable to students' identities and lives. According to Rygiel, reader-response theory leads to a practical approach which teachers find constructive and helpful in the classroom. Shakespeare's complexity gives teachers the unique opportunity to encourage their students to develop higher analytical skills to understand complexity in general through the students' attempts to understand specific parts of Shakespeare's complex works. When teachers simplify Shakespeare down to the level of students' current understanding or substitute modern equivalents, they deny students the opportunity to challenge themselves to understand complexity, which can handicap the students for life. Through thematic investigation by students across time focused by inquiry questions, Shakespeare promotes more complex understanding in students and extends and deepens their connection with core themes of a play. By engaging with a critical frame, students' minds shift off assumptions of difficulty about the text so they can focus on using extracts from the text to find possible answers to adult problems.

The following chapters seek to explore how Shakespeare is part of the fabric of our modern world, and therefore, closely connected and appropriate in our urban public classrooms. Chapter two considers Shakespeare's historical distinctiveness and influence on modern day culture and the English language. Chapter three argues that Shakespeare's works are essential and valuable to every student's learning experience using excerpts from *Julius Caesar* and *The Merchant of Venice* to build arguments, make claims, and explain thinking by exploring the effects of persuasion and manipulation through the use of rhetorical devices. Chapter four demonstrates that Shakespeare fully understood diversity and inclusiveness, the same issues that plague urban public school students. Chapter five presents Shakespeare's female protagonists as robust characters that have the potential for many different but justified interpretations which makes them extremely suitable for secondary classroom work in general and urban public schools in particular. Finally, chapter six investigates creative ways of teaching Shakespeare so that teachers provide unique opportunities for students to interact and engage with his plays.

Chapter Two

In *King Henry VI Part 2,* William Shakespeare wrote, "Ignorance is the curse of God; knowledge is the wing wherewith we fly to heaven" (4.7.73-74). Shakespeare's contributions to the English language alone have woven his works into our cultural fabric (McDonald 155). He is a cultural phenomenon and arguably the most renowned playwright in history. Shakespeare is more than just a literary hero as a playwright pioneer; a study of his works includes "literature in our culture, as well as a significant bit of ethics, politics, and religion" (Andreas 3). There are many references to Shakespearean plays around us, and many adaptations of his stories continue to be popular. Undoubtedly, Shakespeare has a historical distinctiveness and influence on modern day culture and the English language that all students should learn about, particularly urban secondary students.

Inspiration is a springboard for creativity, and Shakespeare's poetry and plays have inspired readers and audiences all over the world for centuries. The Bard is honored by statesmen and philosophers, as well as poets and critics. Great authors over the centuries have paid him homage. John Milton described how Shakespeare built for himself an immortal monument "in our wonder and astonishment" that would be the envy of kings. John Dryden observed, "when he describes anything, you more than see it, you feel it too." For T.S. Eliot, "Dante and Shakespeare divide the modern world between them, there is no third." Where Shakespeare was once optional – shall we go to the Globe this afternoon or not? – he is now, for many, mandatory around the world.

Students should know and understand that Shakespeare occupies a unique position in world literature. Other poets, such as Homer and Dante, and novelists, such as Leo Tolstoy and Charles Dickens, have transcended national barriers; but no writer's living reputation can compare to that of Shakespeare, whose plays, written in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, for a small repertory theatre, are now performed and read more often and in more countries than ever before. Even Shakespeare's great contemporary, the poet and dramatist, Ben Johnson, conceded that Shakespeare had no rival in the writing of comedy, even in the ancient Classical world, and that he equaled the ancients in tragedy as well. Johnson's prophecy that Shakespeare "was not of an age, but for all time," has been fulfilled. Bevington, Brown, and Spencer describe Shakespeare as "a writer of great intellectual rapidity, perceptiveness, and poetic power" (1). Though other writers have had these qualities, with Shakespeare the perceptiveness of mind was applied to human beings and their complete range of emotions and conflicts rather than to obscure or inaccessible topics.

Shakespeare's contributions to the English language are reason enough to keep his works in urban secondary classroom studies. Shakespeare was the greatest inventor of words in English or in any language. Most scholars agree that he coined somewhere from the vicinity of seventeen hundred words which is far more than any other writer in any language. According to Hephzibah Anderson, Victorian word expert F. Max Muller estimated that Shakespeare used 15,000 words in his plays, a portion of which he invented himself by merging existing words and anglicizing vocabulary from foreign languages. By contrast, John Milton, renowned English Poet, used a mere 8,000 and the Old Testament is made up of 5,642. Meanwhile, an unschooled agricultural worker of Shakespeare's day

would have said all that he had to say in fewer than 300 words. His writing has been translated into more than 100 languages, while the words he coined in English – from addiction to negotiate – still shape the way we think and speak today. He has been exported through soft and hard colonialism, his passage somewhat eased by the emergence of English as the world's lingua franca (Prescott 276).

Shakespeare's truest power is in our words, and his influence grows every time we speak. Students must know that Shakespeare's words are important because they give us the ability to communicate, give expression to the abstract, give us the full story: its context, background, beginning and ending, connect us to the other, and awaken our imagination. In his book, *How Shakespeare Changed Everything*, Stephen Marche makes a convincing case for Shakespeare's influence in today's everyday speech. Shakespeare is the reason we have words such as, "farmhouse and eyeball and softhearted and watchdog" (Marche 24). He also rewrote many of the rules of usage and grammar: he changed nouns into verbs, changed verbs into adjectives, connected words never before used together, added prefixes and suffixes, and devised completely new words. He made adverbs like tightly." He also used words to create "special-effects" with wild words like "buzzer and kickshaw and zany" (Marche 25). Some of the words that Shakespeare coined include everyday ones like "jaded" and "bandit" and "mountaineer." Shakespeare invented common words like "advertising" and "skim milk." He invented fancy words like "sanctimonious" and "lackluster" and "consanguineous." He invented ordinary words like "to dawn" and "glow" and "gnarled" and "gossip." The name Jessica was first used in *The Merchant of Venice* (Marche 26). The word "Bedazzled" comes from *The Taming of the Shrew*. Katherine describes studding her hem with plastic jewels,

by saying, “so bedazzled with the sun” (4.5.46). Shakespeare is his words and his words are ours.

Many of the common expressions now thought to be clichés were Shakespeare’s creations. Students use Shakespeare’s expressions all the time even though they may not know it is the Bard they are quoting. Detractors of teaching Shakespeare in urban public schools may think that fact is “neither here nor there,” but as coined by Shakespeare in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, “that is the short and the long of it.” The British journalist Bernard Levin said it best in the following quote about Shakespeare’s impact on our language:

> If you cannot understand my argument, and declare “It’s Greek to me,” you are quoting Shakespeare; … if you act more in sorrow than in anger... if your lost property has vanished into thin air, you are quoting Shakespeare; if you have ever refused to budge an inch or suffered from green-eyed jealousy, if you have played fast and loose, if you have been tongue-tied, a tower of strength, hoodwinked or in a pickle…laughed yourself into stitches, had short shrift, cold comfort or too much of a good thing, if you have seen better days or lived in a fool’s paradise - why, be that as it may, the more fool you, for it is a foregone conclusion that you are (as good luck would have it) quoting Shakespeare… without rhyme or reason, … you are quoting Shakespeare; even if you bid me good riddance and send me packing, if you wish I were dead as a door-nail, if you think I am an eyesore, a laughing stock, the devil incarnate… you are quoting Shakespeare. (*The Story of English,* 145)

Students should be able to recognize Shakespearean references and allusions, to process contextual information, share vocabulary, or understand key features of content and style. The ability to identify key words and phrases will facilitate urban students’ cultural competence, especially as the *ELLs* acclimate themselves to a new way of life, culture, and language.

Shakespeare’s impact endures because his words have made us feel emotions we may not have identified otherwise. He has scripted many of the ideas that we think of as

"naturally" our own (Prescott 269). Had Shakespeare not given us the words, would we truly feel "bedazzled" (*The Taming of the Shrew*)? Had he not taught us the word "gloomy" (*Titus Andronicus*), would it be a feeling we recognized in ourselves? And could we "grovel" effectively (*Henry VI, Part II*) or be properly "sanctimonious" (*The Tempest*) had he not shown us how? In addition, the word "Shakespearean" today has taken on its own set of connotations and has become an all-purpose adjective that is "applied to events, people, and emotions whether or not they have any real relevance to Shakespeare" (Garber 5). There is a good chance that students or someone else they know will express themselves through the language of Shakespeare.

Shakespeare references are scattered throughout our culture in many forms. He has influenced "plays, operas, ballets, movies, musicals, sculptures, songs, paintings, symphonies, storybooks, novels, comic books, and more" (Anderson 5). References to his works are vast in cultural venues, such as art museums and the opera, but are also very much present in modern pop culture as well. Shakespeare has been quoted on the Simpsons, Scooby Doo and numerous other TV shows (Hopkins 1; Dakin xiv). Not only did Kevin Spacey play "Richard III" on Broadway, but his "House of Cards" role as Frank Underwood is strongly inspired by the famed play. Frank, like Richard, speaks directly to the audience, and he murderously plots his way through power while pretending to be a modest man of the people. "Sons of Anarchy," a saga about a biker gang leader haunted by his father's death and his power hungry stepfather, owes much of its plotline to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. It has been called "Hamlet on Harleys." The viewers see Jax, (Charlie Hunnam), as Prince Hamlet whose own father died at the hands of his mother and her lover, do his own mental tricks as he wrestles with how that

knowledge affects his life. Even Spock shares his opinion of, “Very bad poetry, Captain,” when a version of *Macbeth*’s witches appears in the *Star Trek* episode, “Catspaw.” Shakespeare’s plays are driving the plot of many television shows.

Entire movies are based on Shakespeare’s plays, many of them geared toward teenage audiences. According to the Guinness Book of Records, there are over four hundred movies based on Shakespeare’s plays, more than any other author in history. Jax of “Sons of Anarchy” was hardly the first fictional character forced to live out the plot of *Hamlet*. It happened to Simba of Disney’s 1994 *The Lion King* too. Simba’s royal father is murdered by his evil uncle, who then takes his crown. *The Planet of the Apes* series was rebooted in 2011 with *Rise of the Planet of the Apes,* and its sequel, *Dawn of the Planet of the Apes* in 2014. In *Rise,* Alzheimer’s disease-affected Charles Rodman (John Lithgow), holds a young chimp and feels moved to quote Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar,* saying, “But as for Caesar, kneel down, kneel down, and wonder.” They name the young chimp Caesar, and like his counterpart, he goes on to lead an empire at a pivotal time. Then, there is *Shakespeare in Love* in 1998, when Gwyneth Paltrow plays a woman in love with Shakespeare while he was writing *Romeo and Juliet*. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* contains a choir rendition of “Double double toil and trouble” from *Macbeth.* However, *Beauty and the Beast* takes it back to the main characters when Gaston appropriates Lady Macbeth’s line, “Screw your courage to the sticking place” while riling up the villagers. *10 Things I Hate About You* is an adaptation of *The Taming of the Shrew. She’s the Man* is based on *Twelfth Night. Also,* the movie *“O”* is a modern interpretation of *Othello* and *Scotland, Pa.* is a modernized retelling of *Macbeth.* With

these many Shakespeare inspired movies, students ought to know that Shakespeare's plays still exhibit a strong influence on our modern culture.

Students can connect with the problems and struggles of the characters in the Elizabethan and Jacobean era in these modernized Shakespearean plays. Themes such as betrayal, infidelity, love, passion, romance, death and manipulation are all problems that students are faced with in our world today. Therefore, these modernized versions are often applicable and relatable to their lives when the setting and cultural restraints of the Renaissance era is removed. Modernized renditions allow many of us to understand the complex writings of the greatest English playwright in history without the tedious and arduous process of interpreting them ourselves.

Many young students may be impacted to learn of the reverential place that Shakespeare has for the Hollywood actors that they adore. Many acclaimed actors have expressed their utmost respect for his plays and define Shakespeare roles to be the ultimate challenge and triumph. Ethan Hawke, Patrick Stewart, Denzel Washington, Emma Thompson, Claire Danes, Kate Winslet and many more have performed Shakespeare. Leonardo DiCaprio became well known from his role as Romeo in Baz Luhrman's *Romeo and Juliet*. In the documentary, *The Comedies* (aired January 28, 2013) from the PBS series called *Shakespeare Uncovered*, actress Joely Richardson shares how influential Shakespeare is in the minds of actors today: "I personally feel that Shakespeare, in some ways for us, he is a bible; for all actors…male and female…if you think about it, within every Shakespearean heroin role are the seeds for any performance of an actress that we've ever seen in any role." Many of Shakespeare's characters have been plucked from their plays to become free-standing cultural stereotypes of

amorousness (Romeo), indecision (Hamlet) or steely ‘un-feminine’ ambition (Lady Macbeth).

Shakespeare runs deep in our cultural make-up; he is everywhere in contemporary culture. Because his presence is not confined to the ‘official’ locations of classrooms, but permeates popular mass media, Shakespeare provides urban secondary students an incredibly engaging pathway for fostering the foundational skills that are essential for tackling more complex texts**.** Students are essentially building bridges between popular culture and the content teachers want them to learn about the plays. This is student engagement at its highest: authenticity, motivation, and relatability.

With the ever evolving demographics of our urban secondary schools, teaching Shakespeare is an important piece of providing culturally responsive instruction for students. Culturally responsive (or relevant) teaching has been described as “a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings 382). This means that teachers make standards-based content and curricula accessible to students and teach in a way that students can understand. Teachers must incorporate relatable aspects of students’ daily lives into the curriculum. Such familiar aspects include language (which may include jargon or slang), prior knowledge, and extracurricular interests such as music and sports. Students can become better educated about the world around them if they can relate to the curriculum.

Urban secondary public school students should know that Shakespeare is a central feature of the American psyche, in which the mirror of his great dramas gets held up to a society permanently in search of itself. When former president Bill Clinton says “our

engagement with Shakespeare has been long and sustained: generation after generations of Americans has fallen under his spell," he is acknowledging that Shakespeare's afterlife as the greatest playwright is now as much an American as a British phenomenon, integral to American culture and society. According to Paul Prescott, "Shakespeare's face sells products and is familiar to millions, many of whom may never have read or seen his work; any bald-headed, bearded man need only don a ruff and grab a quill to be instantly recognizable as 'Shakespeare.' Shakespeare's words are quoted and misquoted (intentionally or otherwise) to amuse, persuade and impress" (269). If our students are expected to experience and process the world around them, then they should be able to make these connections.

As well as giving the English language a kick-start, William Shakespeare also invented unforgettable characters. He has populated our imagination like no other writer: Hamlet, Cleopatra, Macbeth, Rosalind, Lear, Othello, Shylock, Portia, Prospero, and Falstaff. They are also a part of cultural literacy. These are a cast of characters that can be more real to urban students than any others in our literature. Barbara Prillaman of the Yale National Initiative to strengthen teaching in public schools talks about the effect that analyzing Shakespeare's characters has had on her students. Her students are English Language Learners (ELLs) who share Hispanic ethnicity. As recent immigrants or migrants, they are simultaneously acclimating themselves to a new school system, country, culture, and way of life. Her students improved their ability to read Shakespeare over the course of a year as they read *Hamlet, Julius Caesar,* and *King Lear*. By reading the plays aloud, her students were better able to understand the language as they specifically focused on Shakespeare's characters. There is depth to the main characters in

the three plays as Shakespeare seems to breathe life into them, and inner turmoil, passion, rage, among other emotions that are common and essential to who his characters are. All three are considered tragedies and include history, murder, madness, and bad family dynamics, among other themes – all relevant topics for teenagers.

In addition to his characters, a large part of the power of Shakespeare's writing lies in his archetypal stories. One of Shakespeare's most celebrated qualities is his ability to craft characters we feel automatically familiar with and situations we have lived in some form. Robert McCrum states, "the plays, often rooted in ancient myth, in which these theatrical legends appear, have become archetypal stories, too." For instance, *Romeo and Juliet* is arguably the most archetypal love story in the English language. It portrays only a very specific type of love: young, irrational, passionate love. The play tells the story of forbidden love and is the first example of archetypal star-crossed lovers. Other Shakespearean plays are littered with character archetypes. Iago in *Othello* and Edmund in *King Lear* are examples of villain archetypes. Because Shakespeare's stories are "archetypal," they tell the stories that cross countries and cultures. Studying Shakespeare can lead students to the sources of their own power because they find a language which expresses the depths of their own experience more fully, more completely than their own words can (Linklater 195).

Shakespeare has great appeal beyond the English-speaking world; he is popular everywhere. Marche proclaims that one can see a Shakespeare performance in any major city in the world and most of the minor ones in every continent (120). His work has been translated into more than 100 languages. According to "Fun international facts about Shakespeare" compiled for the British Council, there have been publications and

productions of *Hamlet* in more than 75 languages since 1960, and versions of *Romeo and Juliet* have been performed in at least 24 countries in the last decade. In *A Night in the Emperor's Garden*, published in 2015, Qais Akbar Omar describes his experience with an acting troupe in Kabul that put on a production of *Love's Labor's Lost* in Dari in 2005, the first public performance of Shakespeare in Afghanistan in 35 years. In Shakespeare and World Cinema, Mark Thornton Burnett identifies over 70 films in languages other than English that were inspired by Shakespeare's plays, including a Romany version of *Hamlet* from Serbia and a Malagasy *Macbeth*, Makibefo. These films give us an opportunity to experience the universality of Shakespeare's themes in a new cultural and linguistic context, a powerful demonstration that Shakespeare lives not only at the Globe but in many of the countries from which our students and/or their parents emigrated.

Just as Shakespeare's dramatic words, written for stage performance in early modern England, have had a formative relation to the English language, so in these times, Shakespeare on screen has both reflected and formed the contemporary consciousness of audiences around the globe. In 19th-century Germany, *unser* Shakespeare ("our Shakespeare") was acclaimed as the fledgling nation's most important poet after Goethe and Schiller; the German Shakespeare Society in Weimar is the oldest organization of its kind anywhere in the world (Dickson 3). Even after years of war, one of the final projects to cross the Reichsminister's desk in 1944 was a lavish movie of *The Merchant of Venice* directed by Veit Harlan.

Such is Shakespeare's reputation in Germany that scholars estimate his works have been staged more often there than anywhere else in the world, more than any single

German author (Wilhelm 13). In Germany as elsewhere, productions of Shakespeare's plays often reflect topical problems. Postwar productions of *Hamlet* in West Germany, for example, emphasized the hero's rebellion against authority and his struggle with the legacy of past crimes. In East Germany, Communist censors closed down one production of *Hamlet* after deciding that the director was trying to make a political point by emphasizing the line "Denmark's a prison." One could truly say that the plays performed in London's Globe Theatre went on to capture the entire globe, except, it seems, for America's urban public secondary schools. The Bard, who is the birthright of the English speaking world, should have a seat of honor in urban public secondary classrooms.

Many prominent non-white leaders and organizations in Africa have found inspiration from Shakespeare's plays. According to Chris Turman, editor of Shakespeare in Southern Africa, the engagement of African and Caribbean writers such as Frantz Fanon and Aime Césaire with *The Tempest* influenced the Negritude movement, associated with poet and first leader of Senegal, Leopold Senghor. The Negritude movement is the revolutionary black aesthetic that rallied French-speaking intellectuals in the Caribbean and Africa in the 1930s. Césaire's post-colonial adaptation *Une Tempête* was first performed in Tunisia. In Zimbabwe, despite occasional posturing, Shakespeare is a common and largely unproblematic reference point in political speeches, newspaper articles and daily conversation. Author, journalist and founding member of the African National Congress (ANC) Sol Plaatje translated several of Shakespeare's works into his language, Setswana, at the turn of the twentieth century.

Shakespeare was one of Nelson Mandela's favorites, and a copy of the Collected Works was circulated among prisoners on Robben Island. A mass-produced edition of a

text once owned by Mandela inked with his pen attracted much attention in 2012 when it was put on display by the British library. Mandela had kept this volume by his bedside for more than 20 years, and it had sustained him through his darkest hours on Robben Island. Sometimes he had read aloud from it to his cellmates. Even though it was not scripture, its characters – from Hamlet to Prospero – were sacred to him and had often been a source of inspiration. Mandela, son of a Xhosa chief, was born and grew up in Transkei, 6,000 miles from Britain. English was never his mother tongue. But, speaking about the *Collected Works of William Shakespeare*, he once said: "Shakespeare always seems to have something to say to us." Shakespeare and his words permeate the lives of millions of people.

Japan has embraced Shakespeare with sustained passion over time. Akira Kurosawa's Shakespeare films transfixed western audiences. His films synthesized his vast knowledge both of Asian and Western literature, art, and culture, fusing the main action of Shakespeare's plays with the vocabularies of Noh drama, Japanese scroll painting, Buddhist philosophy, Japanese history, and Samurai action films. *Macbeth* inspired Kurosawa's mid- twentieth century masterpiece, *Throne of Blood* (1957); *Hamlet* inspired *The Bad Sleep Well* in 1960; and *Ran* followed later in 1985, inspired by *King Lear*. Shoyo Tsubouchi, the great literary theorist, made the first translation of the complete works of Shakespeare between 1909 and 1928 (Gallimore 6). Since then there have been many new translations from many eminent scholars, translators and writers. Professor Yushi Odashima, an eminent Japanese Shakespearean scholar who has translated all the Bard's plays into Japanese, considers him to be the most popular playwright in Japan. Perhaps the best testimony to Shakespeare's appeal to the Japanese

is the lavish Tokyo Globe theatre, modeled on the second London Globe Theatre and built in 1988 in the heart of the country's capital to showcase both local and international Shakespeare productions. Since then, Japanese audiences have enjoyed Shakespeare's plays performed by companies from across the globe, as well as their own (Chan 4). Adaptations of Shakespeare's works in local theatrical forms such as kabuki and bunraku also abound, which all contribute to his sustained popularity and reputation since the first Shakespeare play was staged there in 1885.

Shakespeare is known by name to the Japanese general public. Many, because of their interest in theatre or reading, know the famous plays. Marche is right when he claims that Shakespeare's "power spreads seemingly of its own accord, even without institutional support, without imperial patronage or readers, with or without schools to plant his works in the soil of young minds" (120). What Japanese students know of Shakespeare is from world history textbooks in which he is briefly mentioned as a famous British playwright of the 17th century credited with writing such plays as *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet, The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. These are plays which most people would have heard of as they have been often performed in Japan in various renderings over the years. Damian Flanagan, in his article to commemorate four hundred years of Shakespeare's death, said the most interesting and least known aspect of Shakespeare's pervasive influence in Japan is the impact he had on some of the classic modern works of Japanese literature, including novels and short stories by Naoya Shiga, Osamu Dazai and Shohei Ooka. Even, the greatest literary figure of modern Japan, Natsume Soseki became a writer because of Shakespeare. Japan and other parts of Asia continue to be inspired by the Bard.

Shakespeare came to India with colonialism but has been absorbed into the Indian imagination. In her article "Why Shakespeare Is ... Indian," Poonam Trivedi asserts, "while the study of the English language and Shakespeare was an imperial imposition, the performance of Shakespeare was not, and the stage forms a vital part of this long history of intercultural engagement." Every February a theatre festival called Hamara Shakespeare - Our Shakespeare - is held to explore how Indians continue to interpret Shakespeare in their own languages and theatre. A rich spread of Shakespeare's plays and poems can be found in India, with 22 major languages and some minor ones too having translated and performed Shakespeare. Today, the overexposure of many young Indian people to digital media has made the accessibility of Shakespeare's language and verse more challenging. Yet, the fascination with his worlds, which often seem foreign and exotic to the Indian awareness, remains as strong as before, motivating writers, directors and actors to adapt and domesticate him. Vishal Bhardwaj's Shakespearean trilogy provides only the most conspicuous example: Maqbool, Omkara, Haider which draw on *Macbeth, Othello* and *Hamlet* respectively.

As different parts of the world experience Shakespeare, they make his plays new, fresh and belonging completely to the cultures that are making them. Shakespeare's work continues to resonate with people around the world because he reveals a different face to different cultures and different people at different times. His plays speak directly to the politics and situations that those people find themselves in in their own countries today. Plays like *The Merchant of Vembley* adapts *The Merchant of Venice* to a contemporary Indian setting. The growing presence of Indian diaspora personnel in the arts in Britain has produced significant Indian-inspired and Indian-inflected work in the

mainstream Shakespearean theatre, including Tim Supple's Dash Arts/RSC *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2006), and Iqbal Khan's 2012 RSC *Much Ado About Nothing* set in a version of Messina based on present-day Delhi. Shakespeare offers contemporary connections that open pathways to learning for some of society's most marginalized, hence, the importance of keeping Shakespeare's works in urban public secondary classrooms.

Just like Asia, Latin America has a strong relationship with Shakespeare, but he is appropriated in many ways. "The meanings of Shakespeare's works (and of Shakespeare the author) can constantly respond to the needs, fantasies, preoccupations, and conflicts of the moment" (Lanier 230). This is the case in Latin America because of its multiple cultural identities. Latin American intellectuals have responded passionately to the colonial subtext in *The Tempest* because Prospero's relationship with his two servants, Ariel and Caliban, resonates with their own colonial subjugation by the imperialism of Europe, and currently, of the United States. In a series celebrating the World Shakespeare festival in collaboration with the Royal Shakespeare Company, director Renato Rocha explains why there is no one like the Bard when it comes to analyzing Brazilian politics. Rocha said, "Richard III may have been an English king from the Middle Ages, but anyone who sees contemporary Brazilian politics will notice parallels" especially because it is possible to hear something about corruption for power or money. Shakespeare enthusiasts appreciate Shakespeare's ability to look at the world around him, his society, and without judgment or preconception – manage to connect with it. Thus, Shakespeare is open to a multitude of interpretations.

The fact remains that the Bard has a universal appeal around the world because his themes still resonate today. Something very peculiar happens when communities from different cultures and theater makers from different traditions do Shakespeare. His plays delve into the issues of love, loss, treachery, honor, tenderness, anger, despair, jealousy, contempt, fear, courage, and wonder. They raise questions of morality, politics, war, wealth, and death. We begin to understand that there are nuances, differences and ways that different cultures and communities bring their own ideas to bear in Shakespeare, who has so much to offer us about our understanding of the world and of ourselves. By exploring what is dearest to our hearts and most important to our souls, Shakespeare helps us better appreciate life. Even John Keats is quoted as saying, "I have good reason to be content, for thank God I can read and perhaps understand Shakespeare to his depths."

The vastness and quality of Shakespeare's works allow for a wide and deep exploration of "dilemmas" that go straight to the heart of such issues as ambition, love, and power for students to consider. Students should be empowered to find out for themselves what has made Shakespeare great through four centuries of an ever-changing world by exploring these themes. Rex Gibson most effectively summarizes the argument for Shakespeare for all students when he states that, "Every student is entitled to make the acquaintance of genius. Shakespeare remains a genius of outstanding significance in the development of the English language, literature and drama. All students should have opportunities through practical experience, to make up their own minds about what Shakespeare might hold for them" (6). Given Shakespeare's unparalleled value in the

arts, his influence on modern language, his universality, and his skilled poetry, students should be given the opportunity to study his work

Chapter Three

Shakespeare's plays provide ideal texts to challenge students' thinking and to help them develop literacy skills necessary to compete successfully in the global community. Students need to develop the skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening that are the foundation for any creative and purposeful expression in language in order to be considered literate. They should be able to undertake the close, attentive reading that is at the heart of comprehension. The study of complex works such as Shakespeare helps students to develop higher language skills, both through the study and the emulation of great writers' use of language (Hill and Welles 468). In educational circles a *complex text* contains good material well worth reading but requiring certain skills to unravel what may seem overwhelming at first. Text of this sort necessitates analytical reading: an intense endeavor required for challenging material. The complexity of Shakespeare's plays gives teachers the unique opportunity to help their students develop strong analytical skills.

The development of literacy skills is more than the mechanics of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Ultimately, the goal of literacy instruction is for students to be able to process texts at the level of evaluation, synthesis, analysis, and interpretation. Once students have learned to read, teachers spend most of their time from third grade on trying to help them develop their thinking skills. As Donna E. Alvermann and Stephen F. Phelps tell us, "The curriculum must expand to include information and activities that explicitly support students in learning to think well. The emphasis is less on the mastery of information measured by a recall-based assessment and more on learning how to use

one's mind well, to synthesize and analyze skillfully" (69). Put plainly, students need these higher order skills to succeed in their lives and careers. A good critical thinker should be able to analyze issues, acquire and process information, and engage effectively in problem solving.

Students have to think critically and interact with complex texts in order to develop higher order thinking skills. Higher order thinking skills include critical, logical, reflective, metacognitive, and creative thinking. These thinking skills are activated when students encounter unfamiliar problems, uncertainties, questions, or dilemmas. According to Tankersley, students who engage in higher-order thinking go beyond the basic levels of comprehension because they can analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and interpret the text they are reading at complex levels. Also, they can process text at deep levels, make judgments and critical interpretations, detect shades of meaning, and demonstrate high levels of insight and sophistication in their thinking. They are able to make inferences, draw relevant and insightful conclusions, use their knowledge in new situations, and relate their thinking to other situations and to their own background knowledge (56). Successful applications of higher thinking skills result in explanations, decisions, performances, and products that are valid within the context of available knowledge and experience and that promote continued growth in these and other intellectual skills.

Shakespeare's plays are complex because they require deep reading, which is "the array of sophisticated processes that propel comprehension and that include inferential and deductive reasoning, analogical skills, critical analysis, reflection, and insight" (Wolfe & Barzillai 32). Analyzing is a higher order thinking skill that involves breaking information down into parts and different forms, and drawing comparisons between a text

and background knowledge information. For example, after studying the construction of racial identity and prejudice in *Othello*, students are better equipped for analyzing the motivations and strategies of racist thought in contemporary society. Shakespeare does not provide easy answers. He does not tell us what to think; he teaches us how to think. His characters and the situations they find themselves in are complex enough to warrant continued investigation four centuries later.

Shakespeare offers contemporary connections that open pathways to learning for urban secondary school students because they can inject their own spin on Shakespeare's words as they process his plays at deep levels, make judgments, and detect shades of meaning. Students can make critical interpretations and demonstrate high levels of insight and sophistication in their thinking. Because of their universality, Shakespeare's plays can be set anywhere, and in any era. For example, studying *Othello* gives students a rich literary vehicle for developing their critical thinking and analytical reading skills. It is a play about passion and reason. Hence, the characters exhibit intense feelings: love, hate, jealousy, envy, even lust. Teenagers struggling with their own passions can empathize with both Roderigo's and Othello's plight. It is also a play that examines, as do Shakespeare's other works, human relationships and interactions. For teenagers in the first rush of attempting to understand how romantic relationships work and when and why they might fail, this text provides much to ponder. *Othello* allows students to review high school courtship patterns and the insecurities on which they thrive. Ms. Rahn, a former New Brunswick High School teacher, says that her English language learners, who are constantly internalizing their translating, are quick to paraphrase the most complex of excerpts from *Othello*. The closer they examine this work, the richer they find

it. Shakespeare's words open up doors to literature and analysis and confidence for all levels of students.

In addition, Shakespeare's plays can get students thinking about topics in new ways. Were Romeo and Juliet's parents cruel, or were they being responsible and pragmatic in looking after their children's long-term interests? Should Hamlet have trusted his instinct and acted decisively, or was he wise to delay until he thought he had proof? And was King Lear's decision to divide his land but retain the crown prompts us to consider: Does power reside in a title or in actions? The questions of identity, race, terror, sex, violence, religion and gender raised by Shakespeare's plays continue to be hotly debated in contemporary culture. In wrestling with the provocative questions and scenarios Shakespeare created, we question our own assumptions and beliefs, clarify our own thoughts, and become better thinkers.

A pedagogy focused on higher-order thinking is an important step towards ensuring that students are ready for college and career. What students read, in terms of its complexity, is at least as important as what they could do with what they read. The focus should be on the development of lively, appropriate, energizing close reading skills that bring teachers and students directly into language and text structure. This is why Shakespeare is a better choice than other authors. His plays allow teachers to get students right into the text, actively and joyfully wrestling with complexity and rigor immediately. When students read closely, they investigate, interrogate, and explore the deep meanings of a text. They form opinions and arguments based on a range of texts that have been examined and can defend their positions as a result. It is the kind of reading that college professors expect of students — not to mention the type of reading necessary for jobs in

the information age. Thus, close examination of complex texts can result in higher levels of learning.

Through close reading, students can discover how Hamlet uses puns to articulate his true feelings, while appearing to be the obedient prince on the surface. Puns are a popular form of wordplay in which one word is replaced by a similar word for humorous effect. For example, the following scene from *Hamlet* shows puns on the words "sun" and "son" and on "kin" and "kind":

> King: Take thy fair hour, Laertes. Time be thine,
> And thy best graces spend it at thy will.—
> But now my cousin Hamlet and my **son**—
> Hamlet: [Aside] A little more than **kin** and less than **kind**.
> King: How is it that the clouds still hang on you?
> Hamlet: No so, my lord; I am too much in the **sun**.
> Gertrude: Good Hamlet, cast thy knighted color off,
> And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark. (1.2.62-69)

Through the act of repeated and close reading, students can uncover these double meanings throughout the play and are able to unearth these interesting uses of language and get to the core of Hamlet's feelings and emotions. Students can see the play on the word "sun," where Hamlet appears to be telling Claudius that he is fine, yet at the same time admitting that he is not because he is too much his father's son. The point of the exchange is that it lets the audience see immediately that Hamlet is not fond of his uncle. He is now literally Claudius' stepson and nephew, more kin than he wished! In examining this scene with the students, teachers can discuss whether line 65 is said as an aside to the audience. What difference would this make? Is Hamlet speaking to the audience in a conspiratorial tone or to the whole court in a bold tone? Is there bitterness in his words or sarcasm? Does Gertrude intervene to keep Claudius from getting too upset? These are the types of questions to be discussed with the students as they analyze

the text. Students can learn that while Shakespeare uses puns for some comic relief, puns are part of a wider strategy of creative language use.

Shakespeare's plays provide the best opportunity for teachers to focus on the practice of close, analytic reading. Close reading is an instructional routine in which students critically examine a text, especially through repeated readings. Close reading invites students to examine the deep structures of a piece of text, or, as Alder and Van Doren described it, to "x-ray the book… [for] the skeleton hidden between the covers" (75). These deep structures include the way the text is organized, the precision of its vocabulary to advance concepts, and its key details, arguments, and inferential meanings. Importantly, these deep structures must also include consideration of the author's purpose, how these ideas connect to other texts, and the ways the reader can combine this information to formulate opinions. The primary objective of a close reading is to afford students with the opportunity to assimilate new textual information with their existing background knowledge and prior experiences to expand their schema.

Consequently, close reading of Shakespeare's plays slows down students' thinking, thereby encouraging critical thinking and insight. Students will not have adequate access to a complex text unless they are taught to read it carefully and purposefully. Reading a text closely means reading it multiple times; repeated readings allow students to gain new insights and investigate different aspects of the text to satisfy different purposes. Shakespeare's poetic language and imagery can help students create new analogies and new connections to Shakespeare's plays. After all, "Wisely and slow. They stumble that run fast" (Romeo and Juliet, 2.3.94–95). Shakespeare's work, in particular, requires a slower approach, several re-readings, because his text is rich in

word plays, double meanings, and seeming contradictions. We see an example of seeming contradiction as Hamlet interrogates his mother, Gertrude, in Act 3 Scene 4 of *Hamlet*, after mistakenly killing Polonius. He uses a paradox – a figure of speech that seems to contradict itself, but which, upon further examination, contains some grain of truth or reason - to explain why he has committed such violent actions and why he has been berating his mother for remarrying Claudius (the brother of Hamlet's father). With this paradoxical statement, Hamlet is attempting to persuade his frightened mother that although he seems wicked in this moment, his intentions are good. Hamlet's phrase, "I must be cruel, only to be kind," sums up a wider paradox at play that students can investigate, and/or wrestle with the question: Is it okay to commit acts that seem morally wrong, in support of causes that seem morally right? This is a compelling way to involve students in analysis which can be extremely productive and confidence-boosting for the struggling reader and the advanced reader alike in urban secondary public schools.

In addition to close reading, Shakespeare's complex language fosters critical thinking. This means students can apply wise judgment or produce a reasoned critique of ideas. The goal of teaching is then to prepare students to be wise by guiding them towards how to make sound decisions and exercise reasoned judgment. Shakespeare's *Hamlet, for instance* is an ideal teaching tool: Not only is it an exemplar of Shakespeare's unique use of language, character development, multifaceted dramatic themes, and knowledge of human nature, but also there are many questions in the text. How better to teach a complex text than having students strive to answer these questions themselves? Reading complex texts to uncover deep meaning is an expectation across standard documents for all grade levels. A close reading of Shakespeare's plays prepares students

with necessary skills that position them well in whatever endeavor they pursue after high school. Various interpretative and critical reading skills are in play when learning to read a variety of complex texts intently, so students need practice with a wide assortment of strategies to acquire and apply what they learn to new situations. Close reading and critical thinking are the keys to future academic success for new students of English.

Shakespeare's plays can help students improve how they consume and produce information. This era of excess information requires students to gain new skills in handling it. They encounter information from both professionals and amateurs; some of which are reliable, but much is not. Students must take on the role of the editor, checking and cross-checking information, watching for signs of bias, datedness, and errors. Students must be able to look at a problem or controversy, take it apart, and find out what makes sense and what does not, what is true and what is not. The main tool in that form of critical thinking is logic, the ability to take a fact and connect it with other facts, the ability to separate fact from fiction, and fact from opinion. Thus, critical thinking must involve analysis and judgment; there are no better texts on which to hone these skills than Shakespeare's.

Students used to be mostly consumers of information. When they produced information, it was a purely academic activity. Now writing is one of the main ways students communicate, and it has real-world applications and consequences. Students need to understand that what they write can do great good or great harm in the real world and that how they write determines how powerful their words are. Students need to take on the role of professional writers, learning to be effective and ethical producers of information. Through Shakespeare's plays, Students can learn to write about the play

clearly and concisely, recognizing that even choosing one wrong word could change their argument completely. They can even learn how to talk about their thoughts, whether in a discussion or as a presentation when teachers emphasize using evidence from texts to present careful analyses, well-defended claims, and clear information. All of these are important information literacy skills.

Teaching Shakespeare's plays can improve students' writing skills. Scholarly studies of Shakespeare teach students "to critically interpret and analyze Shakespeare's writing and language" (Dienstfrey 8). When students do this, it improves their analytical thinking skills, and students spot patterns quicker while improving their general knowledge. This in turn benefits their writing because they recognize patterns in grammar, punctuation, and organization which helps them improve these aspects of their own writing as they may recognize flaws in what they read or in their own work. Also, Shakespeare's unique style of language and choice of words encourage students, especially linguistically diverse students, to increase their vocabulary base in order to interpret and discuss possible multiple meanings that Shakespeare is famous for. Expanding vocabulary helps students convey their ideas better in their writing.

Shakespearean speeches can be useful for teachers in teaching elements of classical rhetoric. They provide opportunities for students to focus entirely on close reading and make observations and opinions about what they read based solely on the text. Speeches are especially important for English Language Learners because they are immediate in connecting speaker and listener, and provide good illustrations of how rhetorical relationships work (Roskelly 10). Students can use excerpts from *Julius Caesar* to build arguments, make claims, or explain thinking by exploring the effects of

persuasion and manipulation through the use of rhetorical devices. It is important for students to recognize how figures of speech affect readers and be able to use them effectively to persuade and communicate

Julius Caesar is a play that hinges upon rhetoric—both as the art of persuasion and a ploy used to veil intent. *Julius Caesar*'s famous and important scene (Act III, Scene 2), offers students an avenue to read Brutus's and Antony's funeral speeches closely to determine what they say explicitly, to make logical inferences from them, and to cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the speeches. The play addresses the concepts of ambition and honor, and the crafting of rhetoric through the experiences of Brutus, who struggles with his loyalties to Caesar and to Rome, and ultimately becomes a major player in the assassination of his friend. In defending the decision to kill Caesar, Brutus argues that killing Caesar is best for Rome, while Antony turns the crowd against him in an emotional tribute to his dead friend. Students can analyze the speeches by focusing on the speaking style of each character – Brutus's straightforward appeal to logic and reason versus Antony's appeal to emotion through the use of irony, sarcasm, reiteration, and figurative language.

Teachers can show students how Shakespeare's use of style was not simply to create beautiful language, but that his style also strengthened the power of the arguments he made in his works. For instance, teachers can emphasize how both speeches are examples of rhetoric, as Brutus and Marc Antony use their words to persuade the crowd with their points of view. Brutus tells the crowd that he loved Caesar more than any of them, but that he killed Caesar because he loved Rome more. He says, "As Caesar loved me, I weep for him./ As he was fortunate, I rejoice at it./ As he was valiant, I honor him./

But as he was ambitious, I slew him" (3.2.23-25). Shakespeare's use of parallelism provides symmetry, and the symmetry creates a rhythm and repetition which makes the phrases more compelling. Brutus then asks them if they wish him to die for his actions, to which the crowd replies, "Live, Brutus, live, live!" (3.2.44). Brutus' speech is quick, simple, and succinct. He suggests that Caesar became ambitious and, therefore, had to be killed. Although his oratory is much less wordy than Antony's, Brutus does offer a reasonable argument, as when he asks, "Have you rather Caesar were living and die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live all free men?" (3.2.22). Knowing the context of his argument (that the Senate could declare Caesar king thus effectively putting an end to the Roman Republic) offers weight to Brutus' defense of Caesar's murder.

Using Marc Antony's speech, teachers can guide students towards an appreciation of how appeals intertwine, how a speaker's persona is established, and how aim or purpose controls examples, and Antony's funeral oration for Caesar is a strong example. Antony progressively hits upon the notes of *ambition* and *honourable* in a rhythm that sets the scene for dissent using rhetorical irony:

> For Brutus is an honourable man;
> So are they all, all honourable men – (3.2.77 –78)
> But Brutus says he was ambitious;
> And Brutus is an honourable man (3.2.81-82)
> Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
> And Brutus is an honourable man (3.2.88-89)
> Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
> And, sure, he is an honourable man (3.2.93-94)

Antony's use of irony through the constant, deliberate repetition of "ambitious" and "honourable" calls both terms into question. His speech continually praises Brutus as "an honourable man" who has killed Caesar for being ambitious yet also describes Caesar as the most generous of men. In this way, Antony appears to praise his friend while

respecting the men who murdered him, when in fact, Antony is inciting the crowd against Brutus, Cassius and the conspirators. Students can see here that the art of persuasion is not far removed from the craft of manipulation.

Students could observe how communication happens in both speeches and use that understanding to develop sound and convincing arguments. Students will learn that every act of communication attempts to persuade a particular audience to understand an idea or point of view put forth by the communicator. One thing to note is that Brutus' speech is written in prose, whereas Antony's is written in iambic pentameter. Iambic pentameter is commonly associated with high class or virtuous characters in Shakespeare's plays, and thus the decision to have Antony speak in this form, gives his speech a greater sense of authority and virtue. It also shows that Antony has put in more thought to what he says, because it takes more effort to speak in a specific meter than simply to speak prosaically. Antony is already using style to his own persuasive purposes, by suggesting he is a more virtuous and noble source of knowledge than his opponent. Thus, argument is the process of persuading an audience to understand and/or behave in an intended manner.

Secondary teachers can help students develop and/or shape their values by giving them learning experiences where they can become more reflective and analytical in their thinking. *The Merchant of Venice* provides countless opportunities for students to examine character and motivation deeply. Shylock is a complex character who appears only in four scenes, but his mark is unforgettable. Shylock may conjure complex feelings within the reader because he is clearly a villain in the sense that he repeatedly takes advantage of people in vulnerable economic situations and makes a handsome living in

this way. He is not an inherently likeable character throughout the play; he avoids friendships, he is irritable, and he is unwavering in his beliefs to the point of being unyielding. In a character analysis of Shylock, students could note his tendency for selfish behavior and thinking. For example, Shylock receives news from Solanio and Salarino, in Act 3, Scene 1, that they could not find his daughter Jessica who had left him for love. Shylock moans about his loss, especially about the diamonds and ducats she stole. He wishes his daughter were dead: "I would my daughter \ were dead at my foot, and the jewels in her ear! \ would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in \ her coffin!" (81-83). Because Shylock is the villain of this play, justice can only be served if Shakespeare's Shylock is punished in a manner that is congruent with his infringements of social norms and laws. At the same time, though, his punishment is problematic for it seems to mimic the very crime of which Shylock is really being accused, and that crime is absolutism.

Students who can identify and describe a character's motivation in a text are able to understand and respond to literary texts in meaningful and personal ways. Shylock is a man who is hardly likeable. Already a marginalized member of Venetian society because he is a Jew and occupies the stereotypical profession of the money-grubbing guarantor, Shylock ensures that his peers and the audience will not like him because of his unreasonableness and unwillingness to let go of his tendencies to be greedy, even in a situation that seems to warrant mercy and pity. In several instances in the play, he takes an obstinate pleasure in what he refers to as "a merry sport" of demanding "an equal pound/Of…fair flesh to be cut off and taken/In what part of [the] body pleaseth me" as the terms of a loan agreement (1.3.147-149), terms which he refuses to justify. At the

same time, though, the students, when performing a character analysis of Shylock, can feel a curious compassion for this character, who is so clearly disliked.

Analyzing Shakespeare's characters will help students develop accurate and rich representations of the characters involved, and to consider the ways in which the character's traits and interactions help to shape and give significance to the story. According to Cris Tovani, when students write down what they think about what they have read, it allows them to clarify their thinking, and it is an opportunity to reflect (53). For instance, although Shylock has imposed isolation on himself by declaring that he will not "eat/ with you, drink with you, nor pray with you." (1.3. 34-35), students begin to understand why he has withdrawn from social life when Shylock, who is the victim of racism, asks, "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions?" (3.1.54-56). The students could recognize how Shylock has never been understood because no one has ever seen him for anything other than his Jewishness. Again, this complicates the student's relationship with his character and the subsequent punishment he receives because although he is not likable, one cannot help but sympathize with his plight as an outcast. It is Shylock himself who teaches the student and his own peers the most about Christian love and mercy in *The Merchant of Venice*. This kind of analysis essentially guides students slowly through the process of critical thinking and appreciating literature.

A general analysis of Shakespeare's plays can help students realize that there is no right or wrong answer, and empowers them to be passionate about their topics and, most importantly, encourages them to look beyond the words on the page. As Shylock continues his speech in Act III, he muses about the similarities between Jews and

Christians in one of the meaningful quotes, saying, “Fed… the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means… as a Christian is….," and then confronts his Christian accusers and judges with three profound questions that invoke these themes in the play: “If you prick us, do we not bleed?" If you tickle us do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die?" (3.1.56-61). The cycle of strange violence that Shylock has set into motion will not end once his punishment has been meted out to him, as he goes on to warn in the remainder of the speech. Rather than learn this lesson—namely, that revenge in the guise of justice will never result in anything other than more revenge—Shylock receives his punishment. While Shylock is unarguably an anti-Semitic portrayal of a Jew, students will realize that he is far more than that: He is a human being. The “Hath not a Jew” speech is meant not to redeem Shylock, but to humanize him. All villains are not completely bad, just as all heroes are not completely good, and human life is considerably more complex than that, as Shakespeare knew better than anyone. Students can easily see the same kinds of issues played out in society, proving that we have learned little about what Shakespeare hoped to teach us through Shylock.

Through Shakespeare’s plays teachers can teach students how to draw inferences and cite evidence. Inference is a prerequisite for higher-order thinking and 21st century skills, and many teachers identify inference as one of the most challenging of all academic skills to teach (Marzano 2010). They note that inference feels abstract and difficult to model, design lessons around, and assess. Students can learn how to draw inferences and cite textual evidence through oxymora, figures of speech in which apparently contradictory terms appear in conjunction. Shakespeare used many oxymoron

examples in his works, and his famous tragic play *Romeo and Juliet* contains several oxymora. They make the reader think more deeply about the multiple meanings of experience.

Analyzing the examples of oxymoron could help the students understand how oxymora work within the prologue and the play. Following the prologue in the beginning of *Romeo and Juliet*, there is a brawl between the Montague and Capulet servants. After the fight, Benvolio, Romeo's cousin, looks for Romeo who has been pining over the unrequited love he feels for a Capulet named Rosaline. In conversation with Benvolio, Romeo says:

> Here's much to do with hate, but more with love.
> Why, then, O brawling love, O loving hate,
> O anything of nothing first create!
> O heavy lightness, serious vanity,
> Misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms,
> Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health
> Still-waking sleep, that is not what it is!
> This love feel I, that feel no love in this. (I.1.180-7)

This speech contains multiple examples of oxymoron. For example, how can there be a "heavy lightness?" Something cannot be light and heavy simultaneously. These two words are opposites. Similarly, how can fire be described as cold? Romeo reveals his conflicting emotions regarding life, the feud between the Montagues and Capulets, and his unrequited love for Rosaline. He uses contradictory terms to relate his pain regarding his love for a woman who will never love him back. The interesting function of these many oxymora is to illustrate the difficult dualities of love and the extremes that a person may feel when in love. The theme of *Romeo and Juliet* is, of course, that of tragic love and the very relationship of the two lovers is an oxymoron, as Juliet states, "My only love sprung from my only hate" (1.5.).

Another example of oxymoron is in this excerpt when Juliet finds out that Romeo has killed her cousin, Tybalt:

> O serpent heart, hid with a flow'ring face!
> Did ever dragon keep so fair a cave?
> Beautiful tyrant, fiend angelical!
> Dove-feathered raven, wolvish-ravening lamb!
> Despised substance of divinest show!
> Just opposite to what thou justly seem'st,
> A damnèd saint, an honorable villain!
> O nature, what hadst thou to do in hell
> When thou didst bower the spirit of a fiend
> In moral paradise of such sweet flesh?
> Was ever book containing such vile matter
> So fairly bound? O, that deceit should dwell
> In such a gorgeous palace! (III.2.79-91)

Shakespeare uses a series of oxymora to describe the terrible act the man Juliet loves has done. Clearly, Juliet is experiencing some mixed emotions. She wonders how the love of her life, the man she thought was so wonderful, could be a killer. Juliet's use of oxymora here gives expression to her turmoil – her cousin whom she loved dearly is dead at the hands of Romeo.

When students cite textual evidence to support analysis and draw inferences from the text, they are being strategic. Strategic readers create meaning from text as their interaction with text provokes thinking and response. Oxymoron produces a dramatic effect in both prose examples. For instance, after the Capulet's party, Romeo sneaks into the Capulet's courtyard and finds Juliet talking to herself. After a blissful conversation in the famous balcony scene, Juliet says: "Good night, good night. Parting is such sweet sorrow…" (2.2.199-200). The famous oxymoron, "sweet sorrow," crafted by Shakespeare, appeals to us instantly. It provokes our thoughts and makes us ponder on the meaning of contradicting ideas. How can something be sweet and sorrowful? This apparently confusing phrase expresses a complex nature of love that could never be

expressed through any other simple expression. Even if in everyday conversation, students do not use oxymoron to make some deep statement like the one mentioned above, they can do it to show wit. The use of figurative language, such as an oxymoron, does not only add flavor to speech and serve to clarify our descriptions of the world around us, but also cultivates strategic reading.

Teaching Shakespeare's plays is particularly important in urban public secondary schools because they meet the expectations required by departments of education in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language. The federally imposed English requirements, named the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), state that Shakespeare's plays must be taught in grades 11 and 12, (recommended in grades 9 and 10), because the plays support the development of literacy skills. The Common Core State Standards are a clear set of shared goals and expectations for the knowledge and skills that students need in English language arts at each grade level so they can be prepared to succeed in college, career, and life. The key literacy skills that students will need include: citing strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what a text says explicitly, as well as inferences drawn from the text; determining a theme or central idea of a text and analyzing in detail its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; providing an objective summary of the text; determining the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; and analyzing the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone.

Shakespeare's plays are essential and valuable to every student's learning experience to develop literacy skills. Teaching the connections between the texts they

work with in the classroom and the world outside can challenge and engage new students of English in powerful ways. Shakespeare's artistic communication within his plays has the potential to augment student learning. Studying Shakespeare is appropriate in urban secondary public schools because students could achieve improved higher order thinking skills. Critical examinations of Shakespeare's works could help students select and use appropriate language to communicate ideas vividly, and accurately. William Shakespeare's plays have thrived because of his vivid language. Therefore, by studying the language of several key Shakespeare's plays, students could learn by way of example how to communicate their ideas better.

Chapter Four

William Shakespeare's plays address some of the social justice issues that plague urban public school students. Students need to face the conversation happening in our world right now with openness. However, students sometimes do not have the words for the injustices that they witness, but Shakespeare had them and he generously offers them in his plays. Students are not just keen observers of the outside world; they experientially learn from struggles around power and privilege every day. With the help of Shakespeare's plays, teachers can: help students of color navigate the murky waters of a system not built for them, give students who do come from cultures of power the impetus and means to navigate their advantage so they can align with the disempowered, teach students to look at the world around them and figure out the problems and solutions with perspective and empathy, teach them to tell their stories, and listen with open minds to the stories of others. Teaching social justice using Shakespeare's plays should occur not simply because it is relevant, but so that students can explore how their stories fit into the larger tapestry of a national and global story.

Shakespeare's treatment of diversity issues in his plays can be a successful way to engage what Shakespeare's chorus in *Henry V* calls the "flat unraisèd spirits" in the classroom so that students discover value and relevance in Shakespeare's stories. Many of Shakespeare's plays highlight specific elements of social justice like freedom, equality, diversity and inclusiveness and justice. Our world today is necessarily preoccupied with inclusion and exclusion. The news is constantly about who we want in

our communities and who we do not, who is 'one of us' and who is "the other" or, as Lear on his way to prison, that symbolic place of exclusion, says, "who loses and who wins; who's in, who's out" (5.3.15). His plays, with their moral subtexts, their strong women and portrayal of social values and relationships, have stood the test of time and are as equally appropriate and timely in our urban public schools today as they were when the Bard first wrote them. Shakespeare's plays have a place in our classrooms because they offer viewpoints from groups that historically have been minimized. Studying his plays can help students recognize that often awareness is shaped through discussion and collaboration amid different perspectives. It is hard to find a point of view that Shakespeare has not already anticipated and represented, whether it is racism in *Othello,* anti-Semitism in *The Merchant of Venice* or colonialism in *The Tempest*, to name a few.

Shakespeare's plays can be effective in teaching timely topics that resonate with students. He is once again not just speaking to the ills of his Elizabethan society but ours as well. Exclusion through islamophobia, racism, fanatic thoughts, violence, among others, is prevalent in our world. As citizens of the global and multicultural world we are expected to celebrate the humanistic values of his plays, to learn from the tragic errors of his characters, to go beyond the cultural and religious barriers of the rigid societies and characters he explored, to recognize "the other" as a citizen of the multicultural community. Teachers have a moral obligation to teach this! While some teachers are uncomfortable tackling these topics, many others contend that to avoid such topics in the classroom because they may be controversial represents both a disservice and a detriment

not only to the implementation of a successful Shakespeare study, but also to the education of young adults today (MacDonald 184).

The teaching of social issues through Shakespeare is valuable and necessary for all children but even more so for new immigrants. The National Council of Teachers of English in 1992 commissioned a similar study in America and published a similar work to that of the British scholars: *Shakespeare among Schoolchildren* by Mary Ann Rygiel. She specifically looks at the teaching of Shakespeare in contemporary American classrooms in this book, including teaching new immigrants. Rygiel firmly placed her research and findings in today's secondary classrooms, and she claims that teaching secondary students these works is quite different from teaching other audiences. Sometimes the information that a teacher relegates to a footnote might actually be more interesting to a young student of Shakespeare than a dry, abstract, and more seemingly relevant concept (1). In addition, Rygiel looked at particular sub-groups in the contemporary American classroom. She described what she called the new immigrants: students from the Caribbean, Latin America, and the Philippines who speak Spanish as their first language and Asians from Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand, where the language is very different from English. She set up the assumption that minority readers' interpretations and deductions from Shakespeare may not be the same as the teacher's rhapsodic appreciation or rather fixed, unchallenged view of the text's meaning (103). She emphasized that while non-native readers' responses to some of the plays' prejudices and attitudes may make a traditional teacher uncomfortable, it is not a reason not to teach Shakespeare's plays. It may, in fact, be a way for an uncomfortable teacher to discuss controversial topics.

As You Like It is one of Shakespeare's most famous comedies. Its love of nature, love of falling in love, and love of families make it easily accessible to students that read or see it. The main setting is a forest where people go to escape the dishonesty and politics of court life. The forest represents the purity of Mother Nature and anyone who goes near it seems to absorb this purity to some extent. Duke Senior is shown to be the better of the two Dukes. He and his supporters decide to leave the deception of the court and reside in the forest. When Rosalind is banished, she and Celia, both shown to be good people, go there as well. Lastly, Duke Frederick goes to the forest to hunt Duke Senior, and when he reaches the edge he is converted and gives up his title. *As You Like It* is a love story as well. It tells the amusing courtship and the eventual marriage of Rosalind, the daughter of a duke, and Orlando, the son of a knight. At the end of the play, there are four different couples getting married. However, unlike the times in which it was written, the main person directing the courtship is the woman, Rosalind. Dressed as Ganymede, Rosalind is able to take advantage of her disguise by helping two pastoral characters unite, and also by planning her own wedding. Finally, the play focuses on issues between brothers. As often happened at that time, one child received more inheritance than another. This causes tension between the family members such as Duke Senior and Duke Frederick, along with Oliver and Orlando. Duke Frederick and Oliver both want to destroy their brothers so they will not have to share the portion of wealth they received upon their father's death. The play works itself out however, when Orlando saves his brother's life earning his love and gratitude. When the forest brings Duke Frederick back to his honesty, Duke Senior solves the boy's land dispute. The play

may be thought of as a wishful exploration of another, freer world, in which people coexist with nature, fall in love, and marry each other of their own volition.

Shakespeare's comedies endorse what feels like our contemporary struggle to create a society of acknowledged and unacknowledged diversity. There are examples of how outcasts and exiles struggling with new homelands persevere in *As You Like It*. The theme of exile is everywhere in this play; outside of a few beginning scenes early in the play that are set at court, the characters are all people cast out from their homes, living in the Forest of Arden in a community that is temporary and strange, in a sort of suspension from the world and from normal society. Students can recognize that almost everyone in the play is, at least temporarily, a refugee. This lens of exile adds a genuinely moving layer of consequence to the play and a poignancy to the interactions among the characters and how important it is to build affiliation. This take away is especially important for immigrant students.

In *As You Like It* Rosalind resourcefully uses her exile to the Forest of Arden as an opportunity to take control of her own destiny in very much the same way that immigrants often do. Rosalind, who "promised to make all this matter even" (5.4.18), stands out as a strong example for students of how to face adversity. She navigates her own personal traumas of exile, banishment and disguise with tenacity, patience and good humor. Not content just to walk in another man's shoes, she takes on the persona of Ganymede and walks in another man's clothes and character. She brings her unique understanding of everyone's particular situation and interests to bear with patient preparation and negotiation, extracting commitments from all parties to an acceptable end game. Then, she decides to "weary you, then, no longer with idle talking" (5.2.49) and succeeds in bringing about a resolution, creating couples from singletons and marriages

from love affairs. As she brings unity through her force of personality, the triumph of a disconnected society restored is Rosalind's triumph. In this play, she epitomizes the vital power of personal relationships in diverse settings. Rosalind's success in the play demonstrates to students just how important building personal rapport can be.

As You Like It points to grounds for hope rather than pessimism for students in a world that has serious problems. Just like in America today, there may be a jaundiced view of politics in the play – a sense that the court is prone to corruption and intrigue: "There's no news at the court, sir, but the old news" (1.1.94-95). Yet, there is also an examination of how to fix it. The government of Duke Senior is exiled to the forest where they find a "… life more sweet Than that of painted pomp" (2.1.2-3). There, they have freedom, that founding principle of the United States and a goal common to all humanity. With that freedom, they discover a place of transformative learning, a questioning of assumptions about what matters and what does not, and experimentation with new, more imaginative government. This is where the optimism and modernity of *As You Like It* truly shines. Each character has met and conquered adversity, or has become accustomed to it. Touchstone has married, but not well; Jaques has joined Duke Frederick in a religious retreat. Oliver has been conquered by gratitude and by love for Celia. Order is restored through the reinstatement of Duke Senior, and all can leave the romance of the forest to return to an improved court.

Shakespeare's *As You Like It* is appropriate in urban public secondary classrooms because it explores some of the changes in attitudes that affect students' lives. The play deals with questions of social diversity in its handling of the distinction between the rural, urban, and courtly folk. It recognizes that force is not the answer to all situations, that,

"… gentleness shall force More than your force move us to gentleness" (2.7.101-102). By contrasting the treacherous French court with the idealized Forest of Arden, the play asks: is urban life with courtly folks better than rural life? On the one side, the court is a ruthless place where corruption and family deceit are all too common, while the forest is a place of freedom, minimalism, and self-discovery for the exiles seeking its refuge. However, despite its charm, the forest is only a temporary refuge for the exiles. In the end, most of the cast rapidly retreats back to court, where seemingly, they will make it a better place. In its setting in the Forest of Arden, the play encompasses what may be the crucial challenge of our age: the sustainability of the very environment in which we all live. If we are to preserve our world for future generations, we can be guided by the image that, "… this our life… Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, Sermons in stones, and good in everything" (2.1.16-17).

The play's theme of the importance of love, loyalty, and trust clearly shows the strands that bind us as human beings to each other. The virtues that make our world work, that give people hope are embodied in the characters Shakespeare has left for us: in Oliver, a man filled with hate who is transformed by human kindness and the experience of falling in love; in Celia, the true friend who will abdicate anything to seal her friendship; and in Adam and Orlando, both loyal and loving "of all sorts enchantingly beloved, and indeed so much in the heart of the world" (1.1.156-157). *As You Like It* is surely one of Shakespeare's most idealistic and uplifting plays that can have a positive impact on students. The exiles form a diverse community much like immigrants to the United States. The play conceives a universe where authentic happiness, through tolerance and acceptance, diversity, understanding, and cooperation, can lead to a

fulfilled and harmonious life. By recognizing the universal appeal and opportunity of such values, it can provide a vision of a truly "golden world" an enduring source of insight, enjoyment, and inspiration for students.

Questions concerning diversity are vibrant and violent in some, if not all, of Shakespeare's tragedies, but to our students, they might serve as a tragic reminder of the loss and conflict ethnocentrism could produce even in our contemporary society. In *Antony & Cleopatra*, for instance, Shakespeare navigates the diversity of ethnicity as he bounds Middle Eastern and classical European cultures in a story of love and power. While racism is subtly pervasive in *Antony and Cleopatra*, racial consciousness does exist when Antony calls Cleopatra "Egypt," or "this foul Egyptian"; when Cleopatra refrains from talking about complexion in trying to compare herself with Octavia in many other respects; when Philo mentions Cleopatra's "tawny front" or "a gipsy's lust"; when Enobarbus refers to Antony's "Egyptian dish"; and when Pompey refers to "the lap of Egypt's widow" (1.1.6 & 9, 2.1.37, 2.7.123, 3.3.11-33, 3.11.56, 4.12.10). And racial pride does exist when Octavius tries to get the Queen of Egypt to Rome and lead her in triumph. Here students may see, as did Shakespeare, that racism need not take any obvious act to reveal itself. The lesson here is that racism does correspond with designation.

In *Othello* 'black lives matter' in what has come to be an iconic narrative, and students can explore the fact that Shakespeare is an impartial, humanitarian dramatist preaching interracial liberty, equality, and fraternity. Othello is a racial outsider, yet he is the title character of the play. Shakespeare renders the issue of Othello's skin color complex. Othello's skin color is ambiguous. For instance, Brabantio refers to his 'sooty

bosom' and Emilia calls him the 'blacker devil' (5.2.140). In addition to literal blackness, it is possible to see these allegations metaphorically: Brabantio sees him as evil (so, 'black') for winning his daughter's favors against his will, Emilia sees him as the cause of Desdemona's death. We know for certain that he is a Moor, who, by the mark of his natural merit, has risen to the heights of Venetian society. He possesses valor, great military ability and effective rhetorical skills.

In both plays, students can find a sympathetic view of the racial "other." The figures of Cleopatra and Othello are not limited to being characters whose qualities and inadequacies are judged solely by the yardstick of their racial identity. Rather, the characterization is far more nuanced. The seeming racism and bias against Othello is that he is not represented in either text as completely fitting the villainous or negative stereotypes in which other characters wish to put him. Othello is presented as sympathetic to varying degrees, and although he possesses several character flaws that some of the white and Christian characters wish to attribute to his race (Moors as savage and barbarous), Shakespeare does not completely rely on these stereotypes to draw his characters of him. Othello, most notably at the end of the play commits a savage act, but throughout the rest of the text, he is shown to be mild-mannered and exceptionally "civilized" as a general and aristocrat. This softening allows the character to be represented as more rounded, but the fact still remains that racial bias and outright racism and prejudice are present in the text.

In *Antony and Cleopatra,* the "black" queen, Cleopatra, poses a strong threat to the white race of Romans. Because some characters hold on to the Egyptian value system with unwavering earnestness and some are uncompromisingly Roman, while some others

seem to alter allegiances, Cleopatra is a racial outsider who threatens the established status-quo. Octavius' unquestioned dominance depends on his ability to define and establish the difference of Roman virtues from Cleopatra's system of values. The reader also notices the prejudice that is involved in the Roman descriptions of Cleopatra. Though references to her insatiable sexual appetite and wanton nature are endless, her political acumen is entirely omitted. Not once does the reader encounter an acknowledgement of the fact that she is a supremely powerful queen and perhaps the greatest political resistance to the imperial glory of Rome. Cleopatra and Othello transcend their Egyptian and Moorish identity, and appear as essentially human, with their fair share of virtues and vices. Teachers can use both plays to challenge students to outgrow their conditioned response to racial difference (where they entirely reject or wholly support the prejudice) and analyze the subtleties of their human nature.

John Salway, a British scholar, sought to examine and justify the teaching of Shakespeare in public schools. In *Shakespeare in the Changing Curriculum*, a collection of essays that examined different aspects of teaching Shakespeare, Salway looked at racial disturbances in the plays. He naturally concentrated on *Othello*, the single Shakespearean play with an African main character. He pointed out that earlier critics often ignored the racial issues in the play, writing: "Coleridge's now common-place remark about Iago's action as 'the motive-hunting of a motiveless malignity' ignores the fact that now stares us in the face: Iago is patently driven by a deep racist antipathy" (109). On the surface the play appears as a racist perspective so there is the aspect of social commentary that for a diverse group of students can still ring true. Iago is able to convince one and all that he is, as he is constantly called, *"honest Iago"* because of his

skillful manipulation of rhetorical skills. A puppeteer of the psyche, Iago pulls the strings of those who should know better with a battery of verbal weapons. In his soliloquies and dialogues he reveals himself to the audience to be a master of connotative and metaphoric language, inflammatory imagery, emotional appeals, well-placed silences, dubious hesitations, leading questions, meaningful repetition, and sly hints. Indeed, Iago is so good at lying that he is able to convince even himself that he has the soundest of reasons to destroy Othello, Desdemona, and Cassio. Students can explore the basis of Iago's convincing power by analyzing his astonishing command of rhetoric and figurative language.

Urban secondary school students can readily relate to the race issues in *Othello*. Using his theory that race is central to the play and should not be ignored, Salway presented a Theatre-in-Education program to thirty-four secondary school students. They specifically looked at racial epithets and references, especially those in Act I before the main conflict of the play emerges. His objective was to make the racist implications fully visible and audible. Although anticipating heated discussion, Salway did not predict some of the reactions this type of instruction produced with teenage students. In addition to giggling at the "old black ram is tupping his white ewe" line, "One of them had suggested in a small group discussion … that Othello ought to return to the rainforest" (112). Salway concluded that modern reading of *Othello* complete with racial implications is not only appropriate, but also stimulating to teenage audiences and perhaps might lead to necessary discussions about race in general. He admitted that discussions with readers this age and with this focus may produce somewhat unpredictable remarks, but concluded

this is one way to keep Shakespeare relevant and interesting to many different groups of readers.

In many ways, *Othello* has never been more relevant in urban secondary classrooms than it is right now because it can lead to more contemporary discussions of race. We live in a time when fatal confrontations with law enforcement displayed simmering racial tensions across the country, and economic conditions along with terrorist attacks have spawned fear against immigrants and Muslims, in particular. Blind racism is powerfully portrayed in the vengeful Iago when he expresses his hatred of Othello's African and Muslim heritage. *Othello* is about some of the issues that are still so troubling in this country and the suspicion of people who we decide are "the other." Also, *Othello* has modern lessons in a time when reputation has become so fragile in an online world.

In *King Lear* the king grows to understand the commanding meaning of class and equality when we are all reduced to poor forked animals (3.4.108). Lear's path takes him from the height of power and influence to the most wretched of states. *The play* is full of displaced people, from Lear himself, Gloucester, and most visibly, Edgar who uses the poverty of a beggar as a disguise. Lear, driven to madness, comes face to face with the plight of the poor and homeless when finding Edgar on the stormy heath. "None does offend, none, I say none" (4.6.168) as the king, the beggar, the outcast, the fool, the blind man, the insane huddle together in a storm and in defiance of the gilded butterflies who seize the power, the money and the authority. Lear's point here is that justice is bound up inextricably with the violence of hierarchy and that because of this, justice is merely arbitrary. Lear gains an awareness and empathy for the plight of the poor. Students might

well ask whether they are supposed to trust Lear's assessment at this moment, given that, as Edgar remarks, Lear has lost his mind: "O matter and impertinency mixed, / Reason in madness" (4.6.170–71). Yet the play's final scenes seem to bear out Lear's observations in act 4, scene 6. Confronted with evidence of her betrayal in the final act, Goneril reasserts Lear's case for the arbitrary nature of justice when she tells Albany, "the laws are mine, not thine. / Who can arraign me for't?" (5.3.161). But the real proof of Lear's proposition comes in this response to the obvious injustice of Goneril's concept of law. Those students who find something positive arising at the end of the play might focus particularly on the triumph of Edgar as an agent capable of returning justice to an unjust world order. Also, the issue of law relates to modern issues with the criminal justice system. The tragic events of the plays and their cathartic effect should raise students' consciousness to the gains of intercultural dialog in the global and multicultural environment in which they belong.

After his daughters cast him out, and Lear begins to lose his mind, he still has enough perception of the world around him to see and sympathize with the plight of the poor, whom he ignored in his earlier years. It is this perception, an epiphany and turning point in his life, that starts him on the road to redemption from his selfish past. The key moment comes during the thunderstorm, when he says:

> Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are,
> That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
> How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
> Your loop'd and window'd raggedness, defend you
> From seasons such as these? O! I have ta'en
> Too little care of this. Take physic, pomp;
> Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
> That thou mayst shake the superflux to them,
> And show the heavens more just. (3.4.33-41)

What he is saying is this: I must remedy my indifference to the poor. So should everyone else who is wealthy and powerful. One must take time to expose himself to what wretches feel so that he or she may realize how important it is to share wealth with them. Paying attention to the needy will demonstrate that the world and the heavens care about them.

There are many evident themes in *King Lear*, but perhaps one of the most prevalent that students can examine relates to power and authority. Shakespeare has developed a tragedy that allows us to see man's decent into chaos. Although Lear is perceived as "a man more sinned against than sinning", the treatment of the main characters encourages the reader to reflect on the presence or lack of justice in this world. The altercation at the conclusion of *King Lear* can serve to point out some of the varied issues at work in this play's conceptualization of power and authority:

> Goneril: This is practice, Gloucester:
> By th'law of war thou wast not bound to answer
> An unknown opposite: thou art not vanquished,
> But cozened and beguiled.
> Albany: Shut your mouth, dame,
> Or with this paper shall I stop it. . .
> Thou worse than any name, read thine own evil.
> Shows her the letter
> No tearing, lady: I perceive you know it.
> Goneril: Say, if I do, the laws are mine, not thine:
> Who can arraign me for't. (5.3.160-691)

Goneril evokes her legal authority by arguing that she possesses the power to ignore others in society because no law can punish her; this has echoes of authority-as-command. However, Albany reveals that she has lost her moral authority and her right to his allegiance as her husband and partner in rule. He will therefore use his power to oust

her, which he can easily do since her co-conspirator Edmund, the new Duke of Gloucester, has lost his trial by combat and with it the possibility of their linked claim to power and authority. Goneril's command, like that of Lear earlier in the play, is reduced to nothing: she lacks the power that would make her as invulnerable as her defiant statement regarding the laws suggests. Even so, her insistence on her legal authority and her following suicide, which prevents those laws from being used against her, uphold the image of her authority as an abstract, enduring quality not to be outdone by Albany's power. Many of King Lear's uses of power and authority are evoked in this short passage.

The play conveys an important idea about human justice that students will find worthy of debate: when humans exercise justice, there is no guarantee that it will be fair, proper or right. Alisa Manninen explains that this exercise of authority coaxes a response of respect from the subject, making it seem a matter of nature or divine law, not force, that Goneril, as the royal individual, is set above the others (2). This works towards a belief of lawfulness that persuades the powerful that their power is to be deployed only as the individual in authority wills it and that authority binds the common man to obey. These are major issues in our current criminal justice system and are largely determined by socio-economic status. Thus power is immediate while authority wins people over; one is able to dispense with consent while the other depends on it and in the process prepares against future need for the use of force. This is a major social justice issue of our moment.

Shakespeare wrote complex characters who fight for their individual truths and beliefs, and experience conflict between, "good and bad, courage and cowardice, fear and

security" issues that students can relate to their own lives. Brian Lighthill argues that Shakespeare's body of work constitutes sociological and psychological case studies for students to analyze in parallel with their own lives (40). The relatable characters, relationships, and emotions, such as: "love, hate, jealousy, quarrelling, awe, despair, contempt, and wonder" that students experience constantly may strengthen their identification with Shakespeare (41). English teachers might use Shakespeare's plays to facilitate discussions on moral issues and to exercise judgment and choices on the various dilemmas that beset many of the characters. Hence, students have opportunities to explore important moral and ethical questions that Shakespeare's plays provide.

Whether it is the ambition-spoiled Lord and Lady Macbeth or the revenge-consumed Hamlet who, despite committing the worst sins, compel us all "to be or not to be," students can learn to inform their ethical vision largely through Shakespeare's characters who offend our ethical vision of what goodness is. Students are neither reading the story of a king nor of a queen in his plays; rather, they are confronting an ordinary person with the mask of a monarch; behind the mask is a person like them, full of passions, weaknesses, and shortcomings; inconsistent, indecisive, and arrogant. For Beyad & Salami, reading and rereading Shakespeare's plays are like the rotations of prisms, and every rotation gives a new spectrum. Every reading and analysis of his plays offers diverse views to individual readers; critics in all the different ages have presented new glimpses of his plays (1-2). When students encounter Shakespeare's plays, they can find themselves reflected in people and places so seemingly unfamiliar, so foreign and removed from modern life that their power is magnified. This is social empathy, which is rooted in a deep understanding of those who are different from us through contextual

understanding and macro perspective-taking. Using Shakespeare's plays to teach for social justice can help students to develop democratic habits, alleviate suffering, cultivate critical consciousness, sustain diversity, and create more humane social relationships.

Shakespeare's plays are relevant in urban public schools today because they offer a framework for teaching social justice that promote students' understanding of the vital relationship between morality and social justice, between individual and social decision making. Secondary English teachers can use *Macbeth* to explore questions of morality, personal responsibility, and conscience, which are important topics for students today. In *Macbeth*, justice is served on different levels depending on the character's integrity and desire to do immoral deeds. For instance, it is easy for students to conclude that Macbeth murders Duncan because of ambition. This is only another way of saying that he wants to be King, a desire not in itself disastrous; the real question is why he believes he must commit a murder to be so, and how, knowing all the time that his action is morally indefensible, he can believe there is any sense in which he is justified. No doubt it would be easier for us (and for him) to accept his crime, if it could be felt that some external, irresistible power of evil compelled him to the deed, but that solace is withheld, even though there are some such suggestions: the witches perhaps, or even Lady Macbeth herself, as an agent of the powers of darkness. In the end, though, we and Macbeth himself must face the fact that he is morally responsible for his actions. Evil is real, but, as always in Shakespeare's plays, it resides in human appetites, and/or human frailty. Macbeth makes the choices that destroy him. Shakespeare's characters which are neither good nor bad move across life's stage to their reward or ruin in the play. They are men and women whose experiences correspond with our own. Students learn that habits and

passions do influence the individual choice, but each character is permitted to acquire his own virtues or vices. Each character has enough goodness in him or her to show what one might have been had his and/or her baser impulses not caused their destruction. Each virtue or vice shapes the destiny of him who permits it to dominate his life. Ultimately, the choice to be inclusive is ours.

Shakespeare helps students imagine positive and negative effects of choices/behavior, but also gives them a language with which to talk about their ideas/emotions around issues of diversity. In a unit of study similar to Salway's, Carey-Webb asked students to interrogate recent and historical perspectives that surround world colonization and racism with the situation and characters presented in *The Tempest*. In this study, he encouraged students to consider various instances of foreign occupation and racial subordination throughout history. *The Tempest* explores the complex and problematic relationship between the European colonizer and the native colonized peoples through the relationship between Prospero and Caliban. Many urban secondary students and/or their families are immigrants from colonized countries, and they can relate to the issues addressed in this play. Prospero, the ousted Duke of Milan, views Caliban, the island's only native, as a lesser being than himself. As such, Prospero believes that Caliban should be grateful to him for educating Caliban and lifting him out of "savagery." It simply does not occur to Prospero that he has stolen leadership of the island from Caliban, because Prospero cannot imagine Caliban as being fit to rule anything. In contrast, Caliban soon realizes that Prospero views him as a second-class citizen fit only to serve and that by giving up his rulership of the island in return for his education, he has allowed himself to be robbed. As a result, Caliban turns bitter and

violent, which only reinforces Prospero's view of him as a "savage." Shakespeare uses Prospero and Caliban's relationship to show how the misunderstandings between the colonizer and the colonized led to hatred and conflict, with each side thinking that the other is at fault.

In addition to the relationship between the colonizer and colonized, *The Tempest* can captivate urban secondary students in its exploration of the fears and opportunities that colonization creates. Exposure to new and different peoples leads to racism and intolerance, as seen when Sebastian criticizes Alonso for allowing his daughter to marry an African. Exploration and colonization led directly to slavery and the conquering of native peoples. Stephano and Trinculo both consider capturing Caliban to sell back at home, while Stephano eventually begins to see himself as a probable king of the island. At the same time, the expanded territories established by colonization created new places in which to experiment with alternative societies. Shakespeare conveys this idea in Gonzalo's musings about the perfect civilization he would establish if he could acquire a territory of his own. Of all the plays of William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* speaks most clearly to urban public students from Latin America and the Caribbean. It speaks the language of its colonialism and it evokes the magical reality of both regions. Colonialism and continental identity remain central to the understanding of both cultures. Consequently, the play is important because of its potential to engage students and it complements history classes covering colonization and slavery.

Students can determine that the relationship between Prospero and his two servants, Caliban and Ariel, fall squarely into the pattern of typical and traditional master-slave relations. Prospero's so-called "servants" are more properly described as his

slaves, complete with the connotations, both old and modern, which the term carries. Servants are waged laborers with rights, sometimes those of citizenship and sometimes of access to the legal system. The relationship between Caliban and Prospero can be seen as one between the oppressor and the oppressed. Caliban, who comes off as a slave to Prospero, rants on about his and Prospero's past relationship, "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou takest from me. When thou camest / first, / Thou strok'st me and made much of me;" (1. 2. 331-333). Caliban establishes himself as a native of the island, one who inhabited the island far before Prospero set foot on this island. Like the natives, who were exploited under European colonizers, Caliban who is native to this island is now exploited by Prospero to do his dirty work, forced to work under Prospero due to his magic. Ariel immediately establishes his character as that of a submissive, respectful subject in his first appearance. His language is that of a slave who ties himself to his master without question:

> All hail, great master! Grave sir, hail! I come
> To answer thy best pleasure; be't to fly,
> To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
> On the curled clouds. To thy strong bidding task
> Ariel and all his quality. (1.2.189-194)

Prospero's relationship towards Ariel is different from his relationship towards Caliban. Whereas Prospero uses his magic in order to conquer Caliban, he uses it in order to free Ariel from the curse of Sycorax. The submissive attitude of Ariel in his relationship with Prospero comes from the debt that this creates in him towards his master. When Ariel becomes so bold as to ask Prospero when he is to be set free from his authority, Prospero has only to remind him of this debt and Ariel's submissive attitude is restored:

"Ariel: Is there more toil? Since thou dost give me pains,

> Let me remember thee what thou hast promised,
> Which is not yet performed me ...
> ... My liberty.
>
> Prospero:
> If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak
> And peg thee in his knotty entrails till
> Thou hast howled away twelve winters.
> Ariel:
> Pardon, master.
> I will be correspondent to command
> And do my spriting gently. (1. 2. 242-45; 294-98)

Ariel is content to serve his master only to the extent to which it ensures his future release. In a sense, he is repaying the debt he owes to Prospero by willingly subjugating himself to him. Caliban is quite different from Ariel in this respect because Caliban does not feel any debt towards Prospero. Whereas Ariel has a motive for remaining submissive to Prospero, Caliban lacks any such motive. Regardless of the differences in Prospero's relationship towards both, students can conclude that Caliban and Ariel experience the process of enslavement.

Shakespeare is a conduit for discussing issues of sexuality. Elaine Hobby examined the Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) issues, particularly the queering of *As You Like It*. She incorporated society's view of homosexuality with the teaching of Shakespeare and used it to introduce what some would view as unsafe or unsavory ideas. She first offered the play to her students as one centrally concerned with problems of order and disorder. She then moved the discussion to the character of Rosalind and the juxtaposition of her as a typical young woman to her behavior when she dons the role of Ganymede. This led her to a discussion of gender roles in society, which included a description of the patriarchal family structure in Elizabethan England and a comparison to the societal structure of today. Hobby reassures her readers that one does

not have to be a radical feminist or gay activist to approach these topics in the secondary classroom, stating: "It isn't necessary for a play to present these issues in an entirely liberal or progressive fashion to enable classroom discussion of the questions of gender roles and social structure…. The very fact of this closing down of options can in itself be a stimulating point of analysis" (137). Through their classroom practices, teachers can use Shakespeare's plays to help students make their own choices about LGBT issues.

Students can explore Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* to understand the issues surrounding sexuality. Teachers will have to consider not only Shakespeare's words, but what they imply to modern readers. It is not as important that one character believes another is a he or a she. The audience is privy to all of the deceit that is occurring onstage, and this is an important concept to consider when discussing gender roles and sexuality in *Twelfth Night*. To the audience, the lines between "just friends" and "lovers" seem to be repeatedly crossed. What are those boundaries and how have we developed ideas of where they lie? Is this important to our individual ideas of identity? These are all questions that students can study. The LGBT content of the play is largely a result of interpretation. Literary theorists have recognized for years that readers/viewers play an important role in the creation of the meaning of the text and that authorial intent is not necessarily a central issue when reading a text. While some students (and teachers) may be reluctant to raise these issues, teachers can point out that if questions of sexuality, gender, and sexual orientation are important in our time (as they certainly are) and if the play raises questions about these issues in the minds of some readers, then they are fair issues to raise and discuss.

In studying *Twelfth Night*, students could notice that some of the female characters exercise a rather great deal of subtle forms of power and influence, and often do so in unusual and even subversive ways that challenge traditional gender roles. The confusion unleashed by disguise in *Twelfth Night* creates a space in which social boundaries are suspended. With identities disguised, there is an unparalleled freedom for female characters to test the limits of their power in courtship. Shakespeare complicates the gender roles of the relationship between Viola and Olivia by cloaking Viola as male. Disguised as Cesario, Viola's identity almost throughout is double-gendered, and the romantic frustrations she feels as Viola in longing for Count Orsino leak into her audiences with Olivia. The respect and friendship she feels for Olivia as a woman fuse with the latent desires of her heart to create in Olivia's eyes the irresistible illusion of an admirer. The fact that she plays both a male and a female part allows Shakespeare to test the limits of the female role in courtship. Orsino is unaware that Cesario is really Viola as he finds himself attracted to the "male" Viola. He professes his love immediately after findinding out Viola's true gender. Students have an opportunity to explore nuanced illustration of the interaction between the sexes in love that the play gives.

The Merchant of Venice is a remarkable dramatic vehicle for students to discover issues of race, religion, and prejudice. The play primarily probes the theme of diversity by illustrating the relationship between the Jewish community and the Christian community in Venice. More specifically, Shakespeare depicts the tension between these two communities, showing how Shylock, who is Jewish, is oppressed by the Christian majority. Because of its presentation of Shylock, a Jewish moneylender, this play is arguably Shakespeare's most controversial. In Shylock, Shakespeare created one of the

most memorable, timeless characters in theatrical history. The great question about *The Merchant of Venice* that students can examine is whether it is an anti-Semitic play or a play about anti-Semitism. The play and its questions about religious prejudice transcend Elizabethan England. The way it is interpreted offers a glimpse into the collective psyche of each era in which it is produced. In the anti-Semitic worlds of eighteenth-century England or Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, it was a play for deriding Jews and presenting them as monsters. In gentler times, it has been a play that reveals the pain and conflict caused by intolerance and shows how such prejudice can plant the seeds of hate. This ambiguity is a part of the play's greatness and is why it remains among the most frequently performed and most heatedly debated of Shakespeare's plays.

While Social justice concerns are commonly restricted to issues of race/ethnicity, class, gender, disability and geographic location, students can study the relationship between Bassanio and Antonio in relation to sexual orientation. As a social justice issue, sexual orientation receives little attention despite evidence that gay, lesbian and bisexual students constitute a disadvantaged group in school systems. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Antonio pledges his life to Bassanio, as one would in one's wedding vows. Bassanio does not exactly reciprocate, but he does accept the sacrifice. He later gives his ring to the disguised Portia as a repayment for saving Antonio's life. This can be noted for the fact that he has given his ring, a sign of his heterosexual commitment, to someone he believes to be a man and gives this ring in repayment/exchange for Antonio's life, as if committing to Antonio as a husband. Students can scrutinize Bassanio's sexuality despite his seemingly heteronormative actions and intentions. The homoerotic undertone of Antonio and Bassanio's relationship is easily discussed by analyzing the dedication and

declarations of love by Antonio because he does not have a heterosexual romantic relationship to counteract against his love for Bassanio. Bassanio's commitment to Portia, however, does not dictate his sexuality or establish his heterosexuality. Remembering that Bassanio's relationships take place during a time when homosexuality is a sin and a punishable crime, students can translate Bassanio's actions as the actions of one who is assumed heterosexual by societal default. Students can discuss the idea of same-sex love bisexuality or a fluid sexuality. Much of how we understand ourselves is culturally and historically specific; it is possible that people in Elizabethan England understood sexuality in a more fluid, uncategorized way than we do today. This is an opportunity for students to think about, question, and discuss issues related to relationships, gender, sexual identities, sexual orientation, and societal messages.

Although class, race and culture are still very much in evidence, *The Merchant of Venice* explores other slightly different themes that are of great importance to urban students. For instance, it comments on the power of women. We cannot help but understand that although Portia's father has sought to control her destiny, she resolves differently and not only marries the man of her choice but also defends**,** in an intelligent and scholarly way**,** his kinsman Antonio in court against the Jewish merchant, while she is disguised as a man. Similarly, Shylock's daughter disowns him to run off with her Christian suitor. This allows us to ponder the autonomy of women in society as well as deliberating the age old question of whether children should follow their own hearts or the wishes of their parents - still a contentious issue in many cultures represented in the urban secondary classroom.

A Midsummer Night's Dream offers another opportunity for students to explore gender tensions that arise from complicated familial and romantic relationships. Egeus' daughter, Hermia, refuses to marry the man her father has chosen for her, Demetrius. She prefers Lysander, who is also in love with her. In one pivotal scene, the king declares that Hermia is her father's property and that he can dispose of her as he sees fit (1.1.22-45). Generally, high school students will most likely ask why Hermia should follow this declaration. Some urban high school students might sympathize as some of them come from cultures where fathers dictate who their daughters marry. The male characters in this play reign supreme, exerting their dominance over the female characters, and through their acts of violence maintaining control over the fairer sex. Theseus indicates that he has used his superior strength in addition to some barbaric warrior-minded tactics in order to secure himself a bride. This play offers some areas for discussion regarding sexism, gender roles, and inequality.

Even though the next chapter examines the suitability of Shakespeare's female character in the urban secondary classroom, the discussion around social justice in Shakespeare's plays will be incomplete without addressing his treatment of gender roles. Social justice advocates hope to build a society in which individuals have equal access to resources and receive equitable treatment regardless of their gender. Shakespeare's plays offer a fertile base for gender study especially in public schools where studies have shown that gender stereotype has significant influence on students' self-concept. Shakespeare seems to have been raising questions about the standard images of males and females, about what the characteristics of each gender are, about what is defined as masculine and feminine, about how each gender possesses both masculine and feminine

qualities and behaviors, about the nature and power of a dominant patriarchy, and about the roles women and men should play in acting out the stories of their lives. Since feminist criticism today focuses on many of these same issues, teachers can bring such critical inquiry into the classroom by asking straightforward questions of and about Shakespeare's stories. This will encourage diverse thought about sexually defined roles of modern young adults.

Despite the tension of the issues addressed in his plays, studying Shakespeare's plays encourages students to think critically about their world, as well as raise profound, moral and ethical questions. Hadley argues that when students are asked to consider Shakespeare's works outside the context of the Elizabethan era, Shakespeare becomes a contemporary voice that inspires them to think critically about their world (74). The dialogue, the soliloquies, and the philosophical meanings behind Shakespeare's plays are undoubtedly thought-provoking, and in most instances, a mirror held up to reality. Shakespeare keeps being reinvented and rediscovered because the issues he explores are our issues today. Shakespeare study should continue to have a place in the curriculum because his plays provide a powerful pedagogic tool for deep and meaningful exploration of issues which are relevant to young learners. Without being didactic or instructive, without being critical and offensive, Shakespeare is able to bring to our attention those flaws and weaknesses that otherwise may go unnoticed, even by ourselves. In examining Shakespeare's plays, students are rightly alert to the many questions of diversity which challenge the inclusiveness of our societies and the cohesion of our communities.

Equality, diversity, inclusion are the crowning social virtues of the multiple worlds Shakespeare created ultimately out of our will to sympathy, compassion, tolerance

and love. Issues of race, immigration, economic inequality and political polarization challenge Shakespeare's characters, as they continue to test us today. Shakespeare can effectively facilitate and promote freedom, equality and justice within the classroom. The oversimplification of complex, adult topics is not only rampant in the media today but, also, it can be potentially dangerous to impressionable teenage students. Consequently, Shakespeare's unflinching, insightful handling of timeless adult themes and difficult, hot-button topics in his plays is vital to the education and personal development of twenty first century students, particularly urban secondary public school students.

Chapter Five

Shakespeare's female protagonists are robust characters who have the potential for many different, but justified, interpretations, which make them extremely suitable for secondary classroom work in general and urban public schools in particular. Issues relating to gender in Shakespeare's dramas have inspired critical interest for centuries, but in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, gender has become of great importance to many Shakespearean scholars. Modern commentary has focused on a variety of issues related to gender, including relations and conflicts between the sexes, the notion of what it means to be masculine or feminine, and the ambiguous ground where distinction between the sexes blurs. Although Shakespeare reflects and, at times, supports the English Renaissance stereotypes of gender, their various roles, and responsibilities in society, he is also a writer who questions, challenges, and modifies those representations. These female characters are not just assets, but individual human beings with wit and intelligence. By exploiting the never-ending war between the sexes without bitterness, Shakespeare humanizes the gender struggle to make it a clash of equal personalities, raising it to a level of intellectual subtlety. Shakespeare's plays often represent women as independent entities, and his plays should be used in secondary classrooms to afford students opportunities not only to understand Renaissance culture better, but also to confront their own contemporary generalizations about gender.

As I noted in Chapter one, the U.S. immigrant population is growing and coming from more differing cultures, enriching America's diversity, but also adding to and creating more minority communities. Many of our urban public school students' families

have home cultures significantly different from mainstream America's that may not share religious, cultural, or social norms with broader American society, especially regarding male and female roles and gender equality. For example, immigrant students from rural Mexico see gender roles of men and women reflected in spatial distinctions of *la calle* (the street) and *la casa* (the home). According to Hirsch, women are largely expected to be amas de la casa (homemakers), ensuring that the home and children are adequately cared for while men work outside of the home (100). Some of Shakespeare's female characters are relevant focus of study for students as some of his plays scrutinize the change in the perception of women within the plays and propose a subtle critique of society's attitudes toward women.

American society impacts males and females differently, but possibly more so within many minority and immigrant communities. In *Made in America: Immigrant Students in Our Public Schools*, Laurie Olsen found that female immigrant students faced different and often more difficult situations than males, in part due to American culture's focus on individual desires and romantic love as bases for marriage and relationships. This often conflicted with, though differently between males and females, stricter rules within many minority and immigrant homes about dating, gender interactions, and duty to family over self. Family expectations, particularly for females, may be in conflict with the value in the U.S. that school can and should be viewed as a place to engage in social activities and interactions, including between genders.

Shakespeare began his career under a female monarch, Queen Elizabeth I. Despite the fact that England was ruled by a female monarch for over four decades, most women had little power over the direction of their lives. Historical and Literary scholars confirm

that women did not possess political, economic, or social equality with men during Shakespeare's time. According to Stephen Greenblatt, the majority of women had very limited rights in England. Most writings about the life of the family during this time in history centered around the traditional patriarchal paradigm--that of "domination and submission." Just as the kingdom was ruled by a monarch, the father and head of the household ruled over his wife and children. Women were denied formal educations and the opportunity to hold office; they also guarded against speaking out too freely in fear of repercussions. Such women were considered a threat to the public, and were corrected with such punishments as public humiliation and abuse. Although women did endure such limits on their political and social rights, they did have extended to them greater economic freedom. Single women, whether widowed or unmarried could "inherit and administer land, make a will, sign a contract, possess property, sue and be sued, without a male guardian or proxy. But married women had no such rights under the common law" (Greenblatt 9-10). Unfortunately, such rights dissolved with marriage. History shows as well that many daughters were heirs to a father's property, if there were no male heir, despite the tradition of primogeniture. Wives as well could find themselves in charge of a large estate after the death of a husband, until an eldest son was old enough to do so.

This historical reality is important to keep in mind when analyzing the variety of female characters in the plays of Shakespeare. By creating complex and nuanced characters who were both compelling and likeable and, at times, morally questionable, Shakespeare challenged his audience to come to his or her own conclusions. The female characters examined here (Portia, Emilia, Kate, Olivia, and Viola) contest gender norms

and open new possibilities for themselves by appropriating subversive strategies and insisting upon their right to determine their own futures.

Shakespeare's female characters are some of the main driving forces of action in his plays, and students cannot help but be aware of them. Because gender is one of the most fundamental ways we categorize people, whether consciously or subconsciously, gender expectations or stereotypes shape our thoughts and interactions with others in subtle yet perceptible ways. Therefore, it is striking for the reader to see female characters have significant roles in plays set in the Elizabethan period. Shakespeare himself might not have been "aware of the dissonances he create [d]" (Lindheim 679). When teachers carefully guide their students through Shakespeare's plays, they may observe that many of the female characters exercise a great deal of power and influence, and often do so in unusual and even subversive ways that challenge traditional gender roles.

Students can benefit from an examination of Elizabethan and modern American cultures through Shakespeare's treatment of gender roles. In *Literature and lives: a response-based, cultural studies approach to teaching English,* Allen Carey-Webb engaged his students in a comparative study of morality and gender roles as presented in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. His unit of study included analysis of both current and historical perspectives on Elizabethan and modern American gender constructions and associated moralities; he encouraged his students to compare pervasive cultural norms with situations and characters presented in the two comedies. Both plays dramatize gender tensions that arise from complicated familial and romantic relationships. Shakespeare was not afraid to poke fun at the absurdity of gender

roles so many years ago. In both comedies, students learn that romantic comedy is a celebration of youth, love, laughter, poetic justice, and happy endings. However, students get to face the reality that youth can be egotistical and insensitive; that love can be overbearing, compulsive, or self-destructive; that laughter can be cruel or foolish; that what goes by the name of justice can be duplicitous, self-righteous, or spiteful; and that happy endings can be pointless, or a matter of perspective. These are all relevant issues for students today.

Shakespeare's female characters are worthy of examination in a secondary classroom because of the authority they exert as they seemingly break free from their restrictive positions. Characters like Portia in *The Merchant of Venice,* Olivia and Viola in *Twelfth Night,* Katherine in *Taming of the Shrew,* and Emilia in *Othello* find themselves in different social positions and challenging situations, but they employ unique strategies for coping with their problems and contesting gender roles. Students can learn that regardless of their differences, these women are similar in that they all insist upon their right to direct their own destinies and in some cases the destinies of others as well. There is a constant tension between gender and power in many of these works, where women are at once employing a great deal of control and authority while often being set back or marginalized at other points.

The Merchant of Venice is an important play to teach secondary school students because there are few female protagonists in literature as strong as Portia. Shakespeare was ahead of his time in creating such an independent, intelligent, witty female character. Portia exhibits the intellect of modern women who can wield many of the tools which have been previously used by men. Her ability to use these tools without sacrificing her

femininity demonstrates her intelligence, strength, and free will. These are traits that both male and female students can find attractive.

Portia reveals her most appealing trait, a gift for making enlightened exceptions, in the casket-choice, the pound-of-flesh trial, and the ring-trick. In Portia's home in Belmont suitors have to choose between metal caskets of gold, silver or lead in order to win Portia in marriage. Portia's father devised the casket plan to ensure she would marry a decent man, not a man who is a gold digger or a fool. Portia is unhappy with the lottery devised by her father, and she is unhappy that her power of choice has been stripped. The suitor who chooses the casket containing a picture of Portia will be able to marry her. Each casket has a riddle inscribed on its back. These riddles and the materials of the caskets are symbolic and allow a deep insight into the character of the suitors. Portia's use of antithetical rhetoric appears in the scene when Bassanio chooses the correct casket. She sings the song where the ending words all rhymed with "lead" to give Bassanio hints as to the correct casket. She uses the caskets to marry a man of her choice.

The casket plot is a clear example of a patriarch's legal posthumous authority. Portia's father took away her ability to choose her own spouse. Her father's will includes not only the three caskets, but also sexual and economic control over her from the grave. The caskets perpetuate heterosexual relationship and abstinence until marriage. This contributes to the familial reverence and patriarchal supremacy. Because her father selected the lead casket as the right answer, he is essentially selecting a suitor that will be like himself. In doing this, Portia will have a husband and eventually heir that is like her father. From the beginning, Portia has not been a woman who has sat idly while under the constraints of her father's will. She questions her freedom of choice when she says, "…so

is the will of a living daughter curbed / by the will of a dead father" (1.2.23-24). Her independence despite being restricted by her father's patriarchal supremacy makes Portia's subversion even more powerful.

As Portia offers herself to her soon-to-be husband, she counterbalances contrasting ideas, leaving audiences – and perhaps Bassanio himself – wondering if she is actually submitting or not. In Act 3, Scene 2, Portia refers to herself as "an unlessoned girl, unschooled, unpracticed; …she is not bred so dull but she can learn*"* (159-162). She continues a few lines later with "But now I was the lord/Of this fair mansion, master of my servants,/Queen o'er myself" (167-169). "Through this skillful balancing of polarities, Portia plays coyly with Bassanio, even as she adeptly lets him know who remains in charge" (Van Pelt 35). Portia is not an "unlessoned girl;" she is clearly a woman in charge of herself and her domain, servants and all. According to Van Pelt, "This rhetorical fox hunt leaves Bassanio (and audiences) in a dither, and just as Elizabeth Tudor was no "weak and feeble woman" but the anointed sovereign of England, Portia remains queen over herself and everyone else" (35). Students have the opportunity to see Portia graciously juggle odd-ball suitors while maintaining fidelity to her father's will.

Portia exercises her power with the ring, a token she gives to Bassanio following the casket episode. Bassanio swears never to part with the ring. After her triumph at the tribunal, a disguised Portia demands the ring from him, as payment for her successful performance at the trial. Not knowing that the lawyer is Portia, he does give him the ring to express his gratitude for having saved his friend Antonio. When she meets Bassanio at home, she accuses him of not having valued her love-token. Bassanio asks for pardon and

swears eternal devotion: “Pardon this fault, and by my soul I swear/ I never more will break an oath with thee” (5.1.247-8). Antonio, who was saved by Portia, feels it is his moral obligation to justify his friend Bassanio and ratify his oath. With this victory over her rival in her husband’s affection, Portia shows that she is in possession of the ring, which he recognizes to be the same he had given to the lawyer. Portia engages in a provocation, saying “I had it of him. Pardon me, Bassanio, /For by this ring the doctor lay with me” (5.1.258-9). This speech contains an implicit threat of treason in case of another break of promise. Although in the end all misunderstandings are clarified as in a comedy of errors, the performance of this episode, in which again Portia assumes the role of scriptwriter and director, establishes the priority of her position as wife, and her power is reassured with Bassanio’s fear of cuckoldry, a cultural anxiety of all times.

The ring plot is a real example of Portia’s exertion of authority in the play. As a visual sign of Portia’s vow of love and submission to Bassanio, the ring seems to represent Portia’s acceptance of Elizabethan marriage which was exemplified by women’s subjection, their loss of legal rights, and their status as goods or chattel (Newman, 25). The ring does appear to signify her place in a rigidly defined hierarchy of male power and privilege; and her declaration of love at first seems to show her acquiescence to woman's place in such a system. Yet, the ring also seems to symbolize much more. Portia puts herself in a position of power when she gives Bassanio the ring because it is more than he can give her in return. In giving more than can be reciprocated, Newman says that, “Portia short-circuits the system of exchange and the male bonds it creates, winning her husband away from the arms of Antonio” (26).

Teachers can help students see Portia as an intellectual because she exhibits the intellect of modern women who can wield many of the tools which many Elizabethans considered within the realm of men. Her ability to use these tools without sacrificing her femininity demonstrates her intelligence, strength, and freewill. She vindicates Venice's foundation on law by using the law itself to redeem Antonio. Her impressive rhetorical skills within the trial scene show that she is an intelligent Renaissance woman, even though she is only able to do this by dressing up as a man. Portia employs dialectic and logic to erode Shylock's claim to the bond, elements of language that only a woman (or man) of high intellect would know. She uses repetition to underscore her theme of mercy as she systematically dissects Shylock's claim to the bond. From her opening line "Which is the merchant here, and which the Jew?" (4.1.172), to her final statement, "Clerk, draw a deed of gift" (392), Portia utters the word "mercy" or its derivative ten times. Moreover, as she implores Shylock to be merciful, she employs "comparisons of contraries" first to give Shylock what he wants and then to strip him of his prize. Portia is the heroine when all the men in the play have failed by the law and by their own vengeful behavior.

Portia begins by noting that Shylock's suit is of a "strange nature" but that Venetian law "cannot impugn" him in seeking it (4.1.175-177). Portia continues by cautioning Shylock to show mercy: he holds the power, and the decision to excise a pound of flesh from Antonio rests solely in his hands. However, by the end of the scene, Portia finds a loophole in the contract and has rhetorically turned the tables, stripping Shylock of his power and his pride: "Down therefore, and beg mercy of the Duke" (4.1.361). Through cunning argumentation, Portia reverses the agent and beneficiary of

power. By Portia's allowing the terms of the bond, she negates Shylock's claim, stating that Shylock may have his pound of flesh, but that he cannot spill "one drop of Christian blood" (4.1.308). This physical impossibility, this combination of contraries – *"*take your pound of flesh, but do not spill any blood" – alters the tempo of the trial and places Shylock on the defensive: "Is that the law?" (312), a baffled and deflated Shylock mutters as the scene moves toward its close. Through Portia's brilliant legal defense of Antonio, the play shows that women can out-argue and out-think even the sliest of men; indeed, no other character in the play employs a thesis-antithesis pattern of argument, and no other character's speeches achieve the level of rhetorical skill that Portia's demonstrate. Portia, as a representative of the modern woman, exemplifies the typically masculine elements of rhetoric and dialectic in the use of language as opposed to the typically feminine element of grammar. Students would realize that Portia is not "unschooled," as evident in her display of knowledge of law, logic, and reasoning in the trial scene.

The evidence strongly suggests that within the world of the play, Portia represents the learned Renaissance woman. Not only does Portia interpret law and argue logically during the trial in which she saves a man's life, but also she picks the aristocrat and Venetian Bassanio as her lifelong partner, cunningly letting him know that she runs the household. Portia maintains control over Bassanio and Antonio by logically arguing for the value of her ring. Portia gives the play's final order, declaring in Act 5, Scene 1, "Let us go in;/And charge us there upon inter'gatories/And we will answer all things faithfully" (297-299). These lines do not indicate Bassanio's control over his wife, and although Gratiano may indeed end the play with a sexual pun, Portia commands the language of the play from start to finish. "Certainly Shylock lusts after his bond, but

Portia steers the double plot: she secures her marriage to a companionate partner; she intervenes in the trial to save Antonio's life (and to preserve her marriage); she punishes Shylock;" and she announces the survival of Antonio's ships (Van Pelt 40). Portia's decisive actions prove significant because no character in the play drives the drama forward as she does. Students get to see that Portia represents the ideal of the independent, intelligent learned woman, and it is within this context that she should be interpreted in the urban secondary classroom.

Teachers have many opportunities to engage students in a debate or argument over who has the advantage, the boys or the girls in this play. They can cite examples in literature and history to enhance their position. Portia and Nerissa's assumption of the male form to move unnoticed between Belmont and Venice allowed them a glimpse into the world of feministic ideals. When Portia and Nerissa push the boundaries of their disguise, they have the upper hand in the age-old theme of the battle of the sexes. In the courtroom scene in act 4, Portia manages to disguise herself so that even her husband does not recognize her. Nerissa is also disguised by dressing as a law clerk. Important facts to share with the class include the fact that there were no female actors in the sixteenth century, and there were no female lawyers or law clerks. This can start a discussion on what the roles of women were during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Portia is also knowledgeable enough in the law to convince everyone in the courtroom that she is indeed the Duke. This suspension of reality and the theme of reality versus illusion are common in Shakespeare's plays.

In *Twelfth Night*, the students meet two female characters who are different from Portia in many ways, but who are affected similarly by the constrictions of the dominant

social norms that determined how women should act and what they could reasonably expect from life. First, it is important to point out that both Olivia and Viola are women who enjoy certain social privileges relative to other women as a benefit of their social class. Although being of the aristocratic class permits both women some freedoms that poorer women did not enjoy, it also imposes an extra set of gender expectations upon them. In examining the characters of Olivia and Viola, students will see Shakespeare's attempt to shift the roles that men and women play in society and his mocking how we, as individuals, regard social class. This can lead into many of the arguments of today with respect to class and gender.

Like Portia, it is important for the women in *Twelfth Night*, especially Olivia, to marry within their class so as to protect and sustain their social position. Also like Portia, Olivia is determined to love whom she wants and on her own terms; for this reason, she invents the excuse that she is mourning her deceased brother when gentlemen callers come to woo her. To Malvolio, she orders that when suitors come to call, he inform them that "I am sick, or not at home" (1.5.120), as she wants nothing to do with the foolish men who try to curry her favor. The fact that Olivia uses her power as the lady of the house to compel a servant to lie on her behalf so that she can make her romantic and sexual decisions for herself is an affirmation of her agency and the subversive techniques that she uses to achieve it. Later in the play, the reader sees how Olivia bided time so that she could choose her own lover, and in a bold move, she asks Cesario to marry her.

Viola, also a woman of privilege, uses similar tactics to achieve similar ends. When the ship she is traveling on with her brother is wrecked, she believes him dead and resolutely decides that she must support herself by finding a job. What makes this detail

particularly interesting and important is that most women in Shakespeare's day did not work outside the home, particularly if they were women of the upper class. Viola's pursuit of a profession becomes even more compelling when the reader learns that she, like Olivia, compels a man to collude with her in the promotion of the plan she has concocted to direct her own destiny. Identifying a job opportunity working in the house of Orsino, Viola convinces the captain to "conceal me what I am [,] …present me as an eunuch to him [,] … and shape thou thy silence to my wit" (1.2.50-60). Without requiring much convincing on Viola's part, the captain agrees. Viola adopts her strategy and plays her part as a male page flawlessly.

Worthy of exploration by students is the perception that Shakespeare sought to change, namely that women were to be passive. While students might criticize Olivia and Viola's morally questionable tactics to advance and protect their own interests, they have to consider the fact that the only real strategies for women to assert and achieve some measure of autonomy and authority were subversive and not sanctioned by society. Olivia lies and cajoles others to collude with her by supporting her fabrications in order to assert her autonomy and what she believes is her right to make decisions about love and marriage on her own terms. Viola, for her part, denies her gender in order to seek gainful employment, which allows her to pass as a man and enjoy some of the advantages of masculine power and privilege. The fact that both women are to be married at the play's end does not negate their agency especially since each chooses her husband in a way. The teacher must note that at the time, there were no other alternatives that were open to women who wanted desperately to try to forge their own identity, their own path,

and their own lives. Had there been other alternatives, society would have conceded authority to women openly and more easily.

Katherine in *The Taming of the Shrew,* in portraying female subjugation, questions the values of society and challenges an audience's expectations of how a woman is supposed to behave. Katherine is passionate, strong-willed, and stubborn. It seems that her shrewish behavior is a by-product of mistreatment by her sister and father. Baptista, Katherine's father, humiliates her publicly when he informed her sister's suitors that he will not allow either of them to marry his younger daughter until a husband is found for Katherine. In effect Baptista is announcing he first wants to have Katherine off his hands. He then offers her to either of Bianca's suitors. To reveal her mortification to her father, Katherine says "I pray you, sir, is it your will/To make a stale of me amongst these mates?" (57-58). Hortensio scolds Kate for her infamous temper when he hears what she says to her father. Katherine replies that if she cared enough about him to bother, she would hit him on the head with a stool. This is nothing more than a defense of her pride as she reacts with haughtiness to cover her embarrassment to being humiliated in public. She is hurt and humiliated by her father so she hides behind a noisy, shrewish temper.

The only character who truly understands Kate and is able to appreciate her uniqueness is Petruchio; and, although it seems like marrying him is the worst possible thing for her at first, it turns out the two are perfectly matched and are able to live a life set apart from the traditional boundaries which the social order has put in place for husbands and wives. After Petruchio has seemingly "tamed" Kate, they form a true partnership which is made manifest in the play's happy ending. Her long, final speech in

which she details a wife's duties to her husband is often particularly troubling to modern readers uncomfortable with her sudden acceptance of sexism. However, Katherine's sincerity in this transformation is debatable, and students could argue that Katherine is merely pretending to submit to Petruchio and that her final speech is so over the top that it becomes sarcastic and a parody of wifely obedience.

Katherine demonstrates her intelligence through discourse and ability to foresee the reaction of others. Her linguistic ability allows her to say things to convince others without the others actually realizing that they have been convinced. When Petruchio barges into Katherine's home, he begins his first conversation by calling her "Kate." This familiarity subjugates Katherine to Petruchio, and she retorts angrily to him, with equal tone and ability. After Petruchio dehumanizes Katherine to the level of a bird and a cat, she responds in kind by calling him a "moveable," which is a piece of furniture, specifically a three-legged stool (2.1.197). She continues by calling him an ass, a buzzard, a craven, and a crab apple. An ass is a beast of burden, and many men treated women as such. A craven is a cock that will not fight, so she emasculates him with this sexual insult. Buzzard has the connotation of a fool, and by using this term, she discounts Petruchio's intellect. Kate implies that Petruchio's lined face is like that of the crab apple's shriveled skin. Kate is strong-willed and not afraid to say whatever is on her mind, as exemplified in act 1 scene 1 when she rejects potential suitors: "I' faith sir, you shall never need to fear. I wish it is not halfway to her heart. But if it were, doubt not her care should be to comb your noddle with a three-legged stool and paint your face and use you like a fool" (1.1.61-65). Kate makes use of double meaning so as to be able to insult those who attack her personally and preserve her self-respect. She also uses her linguistic

wit in order to argue with men so that she can attract one who is an equal in the realm of intelligence and self-respect. She is adaptable, intelligent and self-aware. She behaved in a demeanor that dissuaded any suitor from pursuing her except the one that she chose for herself. She does so in her dialogue by constantly walking the thin line of insolence, but being careful not to cross it.

Students can be inspired by Kate's aggressive rejection of societal constraints. She sees the foolishness involved with blindly accepting what others force upon you and refuses to settle for whatever comes along first, and she behaves rudely until she is shunned by the suitor. She is looking for a partnership without domination and will submit to no man who does not fit the description (Almasy, Daniel & Gerlach 1996). Kate is forgiven for her previous insolence because she ends up married and, by all *outward* appearances, conforming to society's expectations. However, her marriage is more of a declaration of a tie between her and Petruchio. If one cannot be proved wittier than the other, they might as well be married and live happily ever after. By Act 4, Scene 5, the audience recognizes their playful banter as Katherine sees Petruchio somewhat as a kindred spirit. Petruchio's seemingly ridiculous behavior is again accompanied by a plain explanation, "Now, by my mother's son, and that's myself/It shall be moon, or star, or what I list,/Or ere I journey to your father's house-/Everyone cross'd and cross'd; nothing but/cross'd!" She will not be given peace until she makes herself a pleasant companion to him. At this point, Katherine understands the meaning of Petruchio's farce and she responds suitably, "…be it moon, or sun, or what you please./An if you please to call it a rush-candle,/Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me" (13-15). It is the moment at which the shrew is "tamed."

Katherine is able to ward off her suitors until she meets a man who could appreciate her wit and would be able to respect her as an individual. It can also be understood that the social order accepted these women's refusals of societal expectations because, in the end, the problems were all resolved by the acceptance and protection of men. It seems that Petruchio wants a woman of wit and spirit and sees beneath Kate's apparent shrewish ways to the warm, high spirited woman who has consciously or unconsciously adopted shrewish behavior out of sheer frustration: a reaction against the strictures laid on her by a repressive society and a father guilty of favoritism.

Secondary students will find *Othello*'s Emilia complex, and students' feelings towards her will fluctuate throughout the play as she goes from straight talking girlfriend to thief to loyal friend. She is very much a modern woman in her displays of intelligence and freewill. She is able to judge each character accurately and is the realist to Desdemona's boring romantic, and this makes their relationship all the more touching. She says what we are thinking. In her groundbreaking essay "Women and Men in Othello," Carol Neely investigates the powerful principles of gender conflict at work in Shakespeare's text, and asserts that Othello's "central theme is love… Within Othello, it is Emilia who most explicitly speaks to this theme, recognizes the central conflict, and inherits from the heroines of comedy the role of potential mediator. She is dramatically and symbolically the play's fulcrum" (Neely 213). The fact that Iago underestimates her makes Emilia a noteworthy character for students because she holds the knowledge that will eventually undo all of Iago's schemes and lies.

Emilia's years have made her wise to the details of male jealousy. She quickly notices that jealousy is the cause of Othello's strange behavior towards Desdemona.

Charolette Lennox says, “Yet [Emilia] is the first who perceives Othello to be jealous” (387). While other characters believe matters of state to be what causes Othello’s mood changes, Emilia understands immediately what has made him change so. When speaking to Desdemona about jealousy, Emilia notes, “But jealous souls will not be answered so. / They are not ever jealous for the cause, / But jealous for they’re jealous. It is a monster / Begot upon itself, born on itself” (3. 4.180-183). Though Emilia is speaking of Othello to Desdemona, she also notes Iago’s raging jealousy. Both Othello and Iago are consumed by jealousy to the point of madness without real evidence of a reason to be jealous.

Emilia’s insight into the nature of jealousy is something that Iago, himself caught first in the clutches of unrelenting suspicion, described in his second soliloquy. Unlike the other characters who never suspect Iago of being anything but honest, Emilia notices his jealousy pertaining to both Cassio’s rank and her supposed infidelity with Othello. When confronted by Iago, she says, “Some such squire he was / That turned your wit the seamy side without / And made you to suspect me with the Moor” (4.3. 172-174). Though Othello, Roderigo, Cassio, and Desdemona have been deceived by Iago, Emilia is able to see through his guise of honesty to a certain degree. She sees his irrational jealousy at the suspicion that she is cheating on him with Othello. Also, she verbalizes these observations while Iago stands beside her so that he can see that she knows what is happening and why.

Iago praises Desdemona as being fair and wise, and Emilia asks snidely instead, “How if fair and foolish?” (2.1.150). She seems to consider her mistress foolish for marrying Othello, who is given to extreme jealousy because of his insecurities. She

does not support the marriage of Othello and Desdemona because of the basis upon which it was founded. Her judgment of the marriage is accurate, as Othello becomes verbally and physically abusive to his faithful wife, and finally kills her. As Emilia talks to Desdemona at the end of Act IV, she is fairly critical in her opinion of men. In a speech reminiscent of Shylock's "Hath not a Jew eyes?" Emilia argues that women are physically not different from men: "Let husbands know/ Their wives have sense like them; they see and smell/ And have their palates both for sweet and Sour/ As husbands have" (4.3.92-5). It is an impassioned lecture on sexual realism and the rights of wives. Emilia goes on to say that in addition to sharing some identical physicalities, they also suffer from the same "…affections, /Desires for sport, and frailty" (4.3.100) as men. The only difference, Emilia implies, is that men are mentally weaker: It is "frailty that thus errs" (4.3.98). This links to her earlier description of the appetite of mankind, that "They [men]eat us hungerly, and when they are full, /They belch us" (3.4.101-2).

Emilia suggests that men are brutish and simplistic, unable to control their desires with logical thought. It is perhaps ironic that the actions of Iago and Othello in this play confirm her arguments. Emilia is a character who exhibits some of the emotions to which the modern reader can relate. For instance, when she suggests that some villain has poisoned Othello's mind, she says what we long to say. Iago answers, "Fie, there is no such man; it is impossible"; and Desdemona answers, "If any such there be, Heaven pardon him;" Emilia's retort, "A halter pardon him, and Hell gnaw his bones." This is very much a modern response to Desdemona's naiveté. Emilia's contribution to the play's last scene is an unceasing attempt to tell the truth and to make clear just how

monstrous a liar Iago is. It is this final determination to speak which leads to her death at the hands of her husband: “so speaking as I think, alas, I die” (5.2. 249).

Dramatically, Emilia drives the plot of the play and students can explore the many ways she does this. While Iago schemes, pours poison in Othello’s ear and sets in motion his little aggressions with Cassio and Roderigo, it is Emilia who oversees the fulfillment of his wishes, without knowing his intent. It is Emilia who convinces Desdemona to plead so wholeheartedly for Cassio; it is Emilia who comes through for Iago by retrieving the handkerchief and delivering it to him, allowing Iago to give Othello his “ocular proof” and solidify that monster jealousy within him; it is Emilia who concludes the play, damning those men around her for their murderous foolishness. Neely acknowledges Emilia’s crucial role: “Emilia, stealing the handkerchief, is the catalyst for the play’s crisis; revealing its theft, she is the catalyst for the play’s denouement” (231).

Emilia’s unintentional complicity in the handkerchief plot adds depth to her character. It is strange that Emilia gives Iago the handkerchief. Her words and actions in that very scene do not match up. She says Iago keeps asking her to steal the handkerchief, and then she says that Desdemona loves that thing so much because it is a token from Othello, and then she says she will just make a copy of the pattern to make her husband happy. But in the next scene, she gives that very handkerchief to Iago! When Emilia begins speaking about his role in her taking the handkerchief, she calls him “wayward”. This indicates that Emilia is somewhat aware of Iago’s true villainous character. And then, even when she does decide to steal the handkerchief, she says she is doing it to “…please his fantasy” (3.3.299). This is an interesting part of the play that students can scrutinize. She knows that her mistress loves the handkerchief, and does not want to lose

it. She knows that Iago is not a pleasant person, and yet she says she will give him the handkerchief anyway. Iago calls her foolish, and she is doing this without Desdemona's knowledge. Yet, she does not seem like a villain. Iago could not have known about the handkerchief dropping accidentally. She had no real incentive to take it, so it is possible that her intentions were to sate her own curiosity. And when Desdemona realizes that it is missing, Emilia lies about it saying she does not know where it is. Emilia does not know the truth about Iago's intentions with the handkerchief. Nevertheless, she is remorseful once Othello mentions that his suspicions were proven true when he saw the handkerchief. Emilia vehemently affirms Desdemona's honesty when questioned, and chastises Othello's suspicion of her: "remove your thought, it doth abuse your bosom" (4.2.14). She is shocked and outraged and reveals that she gave it to her husband. In the words of Harold Bloom, Emilia is "no better than she should be" (441).

Merchant of Venice, *Twelfth Night*, *Taming of the Shrew*, and *Othello* remain compelling plays to the contemporary student because, among other reasons, they portray women in their full human complexity. By confronting difficult social circumstances and challenges, Shakespeare permits many of his female characters to be elevated to heroic figures, even though as heroes, the women do have significant flaws. Shakespeare empowers the women to struggle within and against inflexible social expectations in an effort to determine their own destiny and, in the process, shape the ways in which other people's power and influence are affected. This is a strong and inspiring takeaway for students. Some of the women, such as the five who are considered in this chapter, are successful in challenging those expectations and traditional gender roles. Others, however, are not. Shakespeare avoids an overly glib approach to solving women's

problems, and he similarly avoids reducing women to one-dimensional characters. As Ehnenn asserts, gender roles in the environments that Shakespeare established were neither "stable nor essential" (319); rather, they were dynamic, and their stability was challenged using a variety of creative and subversive strategies that were unique to each woman and her particular circumstances.

Students can view the actions of the women in the plays addressed in this chapter as examples of the modern woman: a woman of wit, independence, and intelligence. Through their discourse, these women often show a mental capacity that is not only equal to that of a man's, but at times, it can also be shown as superior. Shakespeare's representation of the female characters was very much contrary to that of Elizabethan society in that they believed women were not only inferior to men, but also property of men. The women's intelligence, as represented in these plays, lies not only in their ability to discern what was going on around them but also in the manner in which they get what they want.

Ultimately, how can students come to an understanding of Shakespeare's women and their significance? Interestingly, Ehnenn proposes that one answer to this question may be found by examining how the women who played Shakespeare's female characters in nineteenth century Britain used their roles to "become critics of morality, writing character analyses that simultaneously legitimized their heroine's behavior and their own questionably public position" (316). Shakespeare's work, then, when understood in the context of his own era, was even more radical than one might understand or consider it to be. As Ehnenn writes, "female performance becomes performative, problematic, and threatens the dominant discourse when women's actions reveal an ontological dislinkage

from that discourse; it becomes unfixed, and threatens to expose and challenge the hegemony that previously sanctioned and enabled it" (317). The result was a curious combination of suppression of some aspects of femininity and the elevation of others (Ehnnen 318), not only in the plays as Shakespeare wrote them, but in the ways they have been performed and interpreted in the centuries that have followed. This can be an effective approach for students to understand Shakespeare's women and their significance.

Shakespeare challenges the reader to come to his or her own conclusions by creating complex and nuanced female characters who were both compelling and likeable and, at times, morally questionable. Shakespeare, by reflecting upon the limitations and opportunities available to all people in the time during which he lived and wrote, was able to create casts of female characters who were authentic in their search for personal power and meaning, as well as authentic in their struggles to achieve such power and purpose. The Bard did not, however, resort to didacticism to impress his own beliefs and opinions. The five characters who are examined here contested gender norms and opened new possibilities for themselves by appropriating subversive strategies and insisting upon their right to determine their own futures.

Using Shakespeare's strong female characters, teachers can teach lessons in gender equality while accommodating and/or respecting many traditional gender roles and values. Teachers can help students to understand that gender equality and norms continue to evolve, and that there is a certain continuum that may allow such pursuit of ideals while not calling for wholesale or immediate rejection of traditional or alternative roles, norms, and gender values. Any approach to teaching students to understand current

American norms should incorporate a tolerance and respect for the traditional values that many minority or immigrant populations may hold, despite their divergence with twenty first century American norms. For example, arranged marriages need not be expressed or criticized as necessarily contrary to American gender equality.

Teachers need to bring issues of gender roles into the classroom because there is clear argument for the validity of this line of study in a secondary school setting. In the twenty first century, teaching expectations on gender equality is a part of providing the necessary exposure, basic understanding, and efficacy with broader American society's norms and beliefs that students will need in order to make choices and succeed beyond school. It can be observed that students themselves are concerned about their roles as male or female as they make educational and vocational choices which will affect the rest of their lives. It is important that all students be given a sense of pride in who they are, regardless of their gender. Researchers have shown that it is essential that students examine male and female role models to assist them in better understanding themselves and in making unrestricted decisions about their future. Literature which appears to stereotype them sexually and, consequently, to limit their options for further education and career choices can be very detrimental to these students. Females, especially, have been subject to these kinds of limiting roles. The study of gender roles in Shakespeare's plays provides an excellent vehicle for that discussion.

It is the responsibility of public school districts to show, clarify, and impart a working understanding of historic and current customs, norms, general laws, social standards, and cultural trends of the United States to students. Educators cannot, out of a respect for minority or immigrant cultures, simply ignore and not teach minority or

immigrant students the current standards, norms, and legal and societal expectations regarding something like gender equality in American society.

Shakespeare's women exhibit modern sensibilities that students can appreciate. They know what society expects, but they also know their own minds. They are made to change genders and speak in riddles in order to preserve their right to decide their own fate. They know who they really are and what they really want. Even though it is clear that Shakespeare believed that women were able to be the equals of men, he was unable to express it in a realistic context. He was subtly subversive in that he allowed his strong female characters to be the center of the action in his comedies. Shakespeare allowed them lengthy speeches and numerous lines of dialogue, but only in a certain context. His futuristic ideas were so advanced that they are still applicable to the gender issue confronting our world today.

Chapter Six

This work has established that Shakespeare's plays have an infinite capacity for adaptation because of the meanings and values found in the plays. The plays can be taught and experienced in very different forms so that students can engage in dramatic inquiry of the plays. A dramatic inquiry promotes understanding and provides students with opportunities to argue the moral issues and to exercise judgment and choices. Creating classroom learning environments where students can see themselves as having something to say to an author like Shakespeare is itself an empowering act that has ramifications not only for future readings of Shakespeare but for future engagements with any texts that have undeniable quality or ultimate authority. If we want to inspire our students to value education, we should believe even those who struggle the most can study great literature. The questions here are: how can teachers move their students from appreciation to independent capability with complex texts? If those students have an appreciation for Shakespeare, how can we build their skills in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing and creating? How can we combine the pleasure of socially collaborative activities with heightened expectations for individual critical analysis? Students cannot appreciate the essence of Shakespeare if all they do is read and discuss a play. Teaching of Shakespeare's plays should be in a student-centered environment, with a performance-based approach, and differentiated so that the plays are accessible to all learners. Teaching Shakespeare effectively requires a student-centered approach to teaching where each student seeks to create his or her own meaning. Student-centered teaching approaches shift the focus of activity from the teacher to the learners. These methods include: active learning, in which students solve problems, answer questions, formulate questions of their own, discuss, explain, debate, or brainstorm during

class; collaborative learning, in which students work in teams on problems and projects under conditions that assure both positive interdependence and individual accountability; and inductive teaching and learning, in which students are first presented with challenges (questions or problems) and learn the material in the context of addressing the challenges. Inductive methods include inquiry-based learning, case-based instruction, problem-based learning, project-based learning, discovery learning, and just-in-time teaching (Prince & Felder, 14). Student-centered approaches have repeatedly been shown to be superior to the traditional teacher-centered approach to instruction, a conclusion that applies whether the assessed outcome is short-term mastery, long-term retention, or depth of understanding of the material, acquisition of critical thinking or creative problem-solving skills, formation of positive attitudes toward the subject being taught, or level of self-confidence in knowledge and skills.

Student-centeredness is not about leaving students to whatever interests them, discarding Shakespeare's text at the periphery. Instead, teachers work to connect what students *need* to know to what they *want* to know. Part of the design work for student-centered classrooms is in creating both a physical and an emotional environment that promotes and values collaborations (Thompson & Turchi 18). If we value such collaboration, the emotional environment of the classroom needs to be one in which the teacher models listening as well as speaking. There should be an orderliness to discussion that does not depend on rigid turn-taking rules, such as ones in which only the teacher can determine who will speak and what kind of answer will be allowed.

In a student-centered approach, cooperative learning groups do not happen naturally in the beginning. The teacher has to plan strategically for the kinds of small

learning groups that he/she can create and manage. “The teacher’s design for collaboration can mean that the difficulties are surmountable, the puzzle-solving is pleasurable (especially in the context of collaboration) and what is discovered about Shakespeare’s plays is meaningful and has value to twenty-first-century learners” (Thompson & Turchi 3). The teacher should set student activities into motion and coach them to explore texts together. The teacher facilitates instruction as students explore the text to focus them on aspects of a scene or act that they may have missed. As discussed in previous chapters, the complexity of Shakespeare’s texts requires explicit teaching of new skills. Therefore, the teacher is not just standing by but rather modeling close reading moves.

The teacher provides students with opportunities to learn independently and from one another and coaches them in the skills they need to do so effectively in a student-centered approach to teaching a Shakespearean play. In *Teaching Shakespeare*, Rex Gibson believes that students should treat a Shakespearean play as a script and not as a work to be passively read. A script allows the student to approach Shakespeare as something that is to be “played with, explored, actively and imaginatively brought to life by acting out” (8). When students do this, they develop a genuine sense of ownership in the play by active expression: asking questions, creating and justifying their own meanings. For decades, the student-centered teaching approach, with its conceptual framework based on the constructivist learning theory has been popular among many educators. Teachers at various grade levels have been applying the student-centered teaching approach for a variety of reasons: to increase student participation, to develop confidence in students, to foster the intellectual development of students, to enable

students to build multiple historical perspectives, to improve students' understandings of historical ideas and concepts, and to shift the learning responsibility to students.

A student-centered Shakespeare classroom should be built on the expectation that students' ideas matter, that the ideas that a group cooperatively creates are valuable, and that searching for reasonable explanations or informative details always leads to new questions as well as new insights to a text. Because students in our secondary classrooms today have always had the internet and expect to find answers through surfing, the complexity of a Shakespeare play offers students many starting places for exploration and discovery. Grounded in the text and with resonances in literary, historical, contemporary, cultural, political and artistic worlds, activities should focus students on ideas to be explored in the text as they develop increased facility and independent thinking beyond simply completing a task for the teacher.

A successful teaching of Shakespeare should be a social-cooperative activity, with students working together to produce a scene. The language of the play provides the actors or students with "built-in cues for physical action" (16). Gibson suggests that the teacher demonstrate this concept by first enacting a short scene showing the accompanying gestures and body movements that are indicated in the language. A perfect example from *Hamlet* is the description by Ophelia of Hamlet's behavior (2.1.99-112). The classroom should be student-centered so that the student can create his or her own meaning of the text and a sense of ownership. Students should also draw on their own cultural diversity for such things as costuming, setting, movement, and music in a student performance (7-25). Teaching Shakespeare in the urban secondary classroom should offer students the ability to focus, to work together as a team, to communicate

expressively, to be in contact with their emotions, to combine discipline with creative inspiration, to problem-solve individually and as part of a group, to celebrate victories, and learn from mistakes.

Shakespeare should be taught with a performance-based approach because it promotes student engagement. While the plays are written down, published, and hand-delivered to students in their seats, this is hardly the vehicle in which Shakespeare imagined audiences to receive them. Plays, in fact, are not meant to be read at all, except by actors preparing to deliver performances. While it is essential that we continually emphasize reading skills, there are other highly beneficial aspects of theater that should not be overlooked. Both Paquette and Robbins agree that the alteration of learning activities to include an increased emphasis on performance and play in the secondary classroom is necessary to increase enjoyment and comprehension of required texts; include students' various learning styles; and address the inconsistency that exists between methods used in primary and secondary grades. In discussion of the importance of play in traditional literary studies, Hadley writes, "Through playful disruptions, it is possible to begin transforming canonical texts into tales that empower and entertain children at the same time" (77). Similarly, performance and play methods interrupt the necessarily verbal-linguistic emphasis of the secondary English classroom to address the visual-spatial, interpersonal, and kinesthetic needs of the intellectually diverse, modern student (Gardner, 1993).

Student performance is crucial to any authentic study of Shakespeare's plays because it

increases student interest. Bruce Robbins, an English teacher, used performance based activities designed to help students pay close attention to structure and individual words. This teaching method, that simulates the experience of the actors of the Elizabethan stage, helped his students to find cues from the text to enhance their understanding of the nuances of: language, characterization, conflict, and mood. Robbins asked students to give impromptu, interpretive performances of assigned scenes. He conducted mini lessons in which students learned to read the textual cues available in poetic verse to support recital and interpretation. Students read and prepared only their own lines based on the character they were assigned, but performed in groups of two; they learned that Elizabethan actors frequently gave impromptu performances and read only their own lines, so as to react spontaneously to the action of the play. Robbins observed that this activity allowed students to interpret and react to Shakespeare's language, as if engaged in spontaneous dialogue. Class discussion and revised performances followed each initial performance, so that students could apply and present what they had learned. According to Robbins, this activity was effective because it encouraged self-directed inference and interpretation; students began to grasp important aspects of the play in situations where the precise meaning of the language may have been unclear. Also, this activity encouraged visualization, which is an important tool for reading comprehension.

In similar activities, both Joe Bucolo and Jennifer D. Morrison modify teaching strategies to facilitate academic achievement among students from diverse groups. They asked students to form small acting companies and choose one scene to perform, video record, and present to the class. In each of these activities, they encouraged students to provide fifteen interpretive adaptations of their piece. Some students recreated the context

of their scene through costume and setting changes; some explored nuances of theme through surprising casting choices or role reversal. For example, Morrison reported that in a recreation of *Othello,* one group opted to switch the sex and race of the main couple halfway through the performance; this was done in an effort to complicate and explore racial and gender constructions presented in the piece. Because her students filmed scenes with nontraditional casting, she suggests that such activities help students to see themselves in Shakespeare's stories. Bucolo reported that a group of young men filmed their theatrical recreation, adapted from the eavesdropping scene in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in the men's bathroom; this was done in an effort to modernize the context of the piece, so as to make it more relevant and accessible to their peers. Students are more likely to connect to the scene set in a bathroom rather than the woods. Both Bucolo and Morrison observed that students explored fascinating themes and made surprising personal connections when they engaged in this activity. Also, most students were excited by the prospect of classroom based performances with their peers.

Eric Hadley creatively realigns Shakespeare with the popular forms which influence the social world of students as he abandons prescription in teaching Shakespeare. In an activity designed to increase student understanding of the characters and internal relationships depicted in *The Tempest*, Hadley used an unconventional form of role play in which individual students took on a specific character's persona, without reading from the text. Rather than recreate scenes from the play, Hadley asked his students to conduct character interviews and whole class panel discussions with those assigned specific roles. Students who did not portray one of Shakespeare's characters during the course of the activity asked questions and made comments as either

interviewers or audience members. On occasion, roles shifted so that each student would have an opportunity to take on a character persona, as well as ask questions of the panel, or conduct an interview. Hadley reported that these activities fueled profound discussion of not only characters and relationships internal to the text, but also its major thematic questions.

Alternatively, in an effort to increase comprehension of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, Mary Ellen Paquette reveals the excitement and learning that can occur when high school students are presented with multiple opportunities to play. Paquette used role play and performance activities designed to engage students in an active study of the play's figurative language. Students were assigned roles and physically acted out the language; they became the "thick night" or Macbeth's "mind full of scorpions" (40). Paquette reported that this activity effectively engaged students in a close study of the language; through role play, students accurately began to interpret difficult metaphors, as well as make predictions about the play's characters, mood and action. She suggests that performance activities may reduce students' resistance to figurative language and increase their interpretive abilities. Activities that employ playful language and the whole body allow students to embody, name, and identify with complicated emotions and situations in Shakespeare's plays.

Part of justifying the teaching of Shakespeare to urban secondary public school students, is taking a broader look at making his plays more accessible for all learners. One of the most popular topics of the past decade has been the theory of differentiated instruction, pioneered by Carol Ann Tomlinson, the author of more than 200 books, articles, book chapters, and other professional development material that focuses on

education. In *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of all Learners* Tomlinson brought the term "differentiated learning" into the vocabulary of public school teachers. She stressed that "students can take different roads to the same destination" in education (Mapping, par. 1). According to Tomlinson, teachers find it increasingly difficult to ignore the diversity of learners who populate their classrooms. Culture, race, language, economics, gender, experience, motivation to achieve, disability, advanced ability, personal interests, learning preferences, and presence or absence of an adult support system are just some of the factors that students bring to school with them in almost stunning variety (Integrating 1).

Differentiation, according to Tomlinson, is "student-aware teaching. It is guided by the premise that schools should maximize student potential, not simply bring students to an externally established norm on a test" (Goals, par. 3). Therefore, differentiated instruction involves adapting lesson plans, instruction, and assessment to accommodate different learning styles, different levels of learning readiness, and different learning backgrounds, as well as interest levels of the students. The differentiated classroom looks quite different from the traditional secondary classroom. The image of the teacher lecturing every class period while the students take notes is not one seen in a classroom that practices differentiation. Differentiated classrooms are often louder, more active, and more outwardly chaotic than the typical classrooms. Tomlinson wrote: In a differentiated classroom, teachers begin where students are, not with the front of a curriculum guide. They accept and build upon the premise that learners differ in important ways. Thus, they also accept and act on the premise that teachers must be ready to engage students in instruction through different learning modalities, by

appealing to differing interests, and by using varied rates of instruction along with varied degrees of complexity (Differentiated Classroom 2). This supports the student centered approach.

All students should have access to Shakespeare, and differentiation can make this possible. Differentiated instruction includes those teaching strategies that respond to differences in students' readiness level, interests, and learning styles. In *Teaching Romeo and Juliet: A Differentiated Approach*, DeCourcy, Fairchild, and Follet ask, "What's different about differentiation? Why differentiate the Bard's plays?" (1). The authors believe that the answers to these questions lie in the fact that higher achievement is possible for all students. A teacher can harness pre-, mid-, and post assessment to identify a student's prior, current, and ultimate knowledge and then help a student evolve beyond the initial diagnosis. As students discuss, analyze, interpret, and act Shakespeare's plays, they construct meaning, and hence their understanding of the plays. Implementing a variety of pedagogical approaches, as differentiation calls for, maximizes student retention and increases understanding, thus addressing fundamental competencies demanded of students.

Some teachers probably already employ strategies that fit perfectly within the tall order that differentiation sometimes appears to be. These strategies include: multiple-intelligence activities, project based learning, complex-instruction group work, and backwards planning for enduring understanding and essential questions. No matter how intriguing the differentiation theory is to many teachers of Shakespeare, the questions remains: How much should we change the classics, including the works of William Shakespeare? Adapting to different learning styles is great, but should teachers change

the text of the Bard? Should they offer bilingual texts to their students, or is it imperative that the classics be read in their original, intended format? Obviously, plays are meant to be acted, but how far should this go? Is it necessary to keep to the strict, traditional interpretation when staging Shakespeare's plays or is it permissible to set *Hamlet* in the jazz age, for example?

Most dedicated teachers of Shakespeare recognize that the insistence of Shakespearean "purists" that the Bard should be taught only in its original form is detrimental to the argument that Shakespeare is still relevant for today's schools. These teachers realize that the image of Shakespeare as "highbrow" must and can be fought in many different ways, and that the battle begins in their classroom—and their assumptions are backed by research. Maurice Gilmour said that the teaching of William Shakespeare was a way to "break out of what might be called a cultural ghetto" (89) and combated the image of the Bard as a "highbrow" form of literature and therefore somehow inappropriate for some students. While many teachers view the use of differentiated instruction in the teaching of Shakespeare as a perfect fit, some educators continue to argue against a traditional liberal arts education. These people say that "learning for learning's sake" does not help raise standardized tests scores and also does not benefit students in the "real world." These people argue it is more important for students to know how to read technical materials ("How to program a DVD player") and learn "life skills" than to study Hamlet's insanity or Lady Macbeth's ambition. Lovers of the classics have been searching for justification to continue teaching what they love in the age of "make it or break it" tests. Differentiated learning may be "just the ticket" for those teachers—and may also help less enthusiastic literature teachers embrace

Shakespeare as a way to reach their district's educational goals, while still exposing students to the universality of fine writing.

In examining possible changes to instructional methods, some educators have looked at the text itself. One method of differentiating learning is to offer different texts to different students. Some examples of this are abridged editions, film, modern language, synopsis of the text, audiotapes, graphic novels, and bilingual or split-page versions (where the Shakespearean language is printed on one side of the book and the modern translation is on the other). Some purists insist that the only way to teach Shakespeare is with the original iambic pentameter, and this may certainly be one method (or even perhaps the primary method) of instruction for Shakespearean units. However, struggling readers will also have to be given alternatives to reading English if they are going to have any chance at success.

The use of drama and/or staging when teaching Shakespeare's plays can help teachers differentiate in their classrooms. It is useful for different types of learners. Auditory learners benefit from hearing the play read to them, while oral learners benefit from reading the play aloud themselves. Some visual learners might benefit most from making posters and/or visual representations of the Capulets' and Montagues' feud, while others might learn best by comparing several film versions of the same story. In *Teaching A Midsummer Night's Dream, Romeo and Juliet, and Macbeth,* Peggy O'Brien stresses that the study of Shakespeare should actively involve the use of drama: It is about doing. Students get his language in their mouths, take on the work of actors and directors, get to know a play from the inside out. Learning Shakespeare through doing Shakespeare involves the very best kind of close reading, the most exacting sort of literary analysis.

O'Brien not only strongly encourages the use of drama in all classrooms that teach Shakespeare, but also directly confronts critics, calling them "stodgy." Diverse dramatic activities such as staging scenes, designing costumes and tableaus, acting and directing, evaluating performances, and even charades are all vital ways to incorporate drama into the classroom study of Shakespeare.

Film is yet another way to bring drama into the classroom, albeit a quite different form of drama than student-produced scenes advocated by O'Brien. The Folger Shakespeare Library offers commentary on this teaching technique in an essay by Michael T. Collins entitled "Using Films to Teach Shakespeare." Collins discusses how he combined the theories of O'Brien − that students need to be "doing" Shakespeare themselves - with his appreciation for and use of film. He stated, "To enable students to experience for themselves the openness of the plays to interpretation by actors and directors, I ordinarily begin my Shakespeare course with a short workshop that integrates films of the plays with practical exercises" (par. 1). Collins describes a popular method of bringing film into a literature classroom: using movie adaptations in conjunction with reading the script. He then broadens this approach and encourages using non-Shakespearean films when teaching the Bard. For example, he has shown scenes from the movie Fatal Attraction when teaching *King Lear* and has assigned students to watch Richard Nixon's resignation speech while studying *Othello*. This method not only brings in film, but other genres such as non-fiction and oration.

Film versions of Shakespeare are one of the most popular instructional tools available, as most secondary school English teachers believe that using film in the teaching of Shakespeare is valuable. According to Sarah Martindale, "86% of the 138

teachers who were surveyed think that film adaptations of Shakespeare can definitely play a useful role in teaching his works. The figure rises to 98.5% if those who think that film adaptations of Shakespeare can play some role in teaching his works are included." (par. 3). For example, students can examine the interpretation of Hamlet's soliloquy, "To be or not to be, that is the question" by a variety of actors. The most common interpretation of the speech is that Hamlet is contemplating escaping his complicated life by committing suicide, or at least thinking about the possibility. Students can compare how Kenneth Branagh and David Tennant convey this meaning through their different deliveries of the iconic lines. Through Branagh's mad and eerie interpretation and Tennant's quiet and depressed delivery of the soliloquy, teachers can show one of the many great aspects of Shakespearean plays: speeches like this can be interpreted in a variety of ways, and none of them is necessarily "wrong." It is obvious by the sheer amount of research and discussion in educational communities that film plays an active part in the Shakespearean classroom. Differentiated instruction is not an either/or proposition. All of these methods can be used in a standard classroom to benefit the learning of all students.

According to Thompson and Turchi, when Shakespeare is the vehicle for an increased facility with complex texts, then writing assignments need to offer learners challenging creative and critical tasks (66). Teachers can support a student's exploration of complex texts through useful write-to-learn assignments where student writing serves as the tool for communicating ideas that may not be fully formed or that will need revision. Writing-to-learn means including multiple forms, including explication (summaries, paraphrases, personal responses), annotation (notes to be used later in more

extended analyses) and rehearsal (shorter writings that build to more extended analyses). For example, in what Thompson and Turchi call Translation/Imitation exercise, students are asked to imitate Shakespeare's poetry offering them an opportunity to untangle not only its complexity, but also its poetic craft. Students are asked to replace the nouns and adjectives in this verse in the beginning of *Julius Caesar* as a way to prompt close reading:

> Let me have men about me that are fat,
> Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep a-nights.
> Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look:
> He thinks too much: such men are dangerous.
> (1.2.191–4)

Maintaining the structure, students are asked to explore how a different topic generates new words. Potential topics include pets, Facebook friends, professional athletes, etc. The exercise is meant to enable students to play with poetic lines and diction.

> Let me have _____ about me that are _____,
> _____, and _____.
> Yond _____ has a _____ look:
> S/he thinks _____: such _____ are _____.

In another use of imitation, Thompson and Turchi say that teachers can ask students to explore extended metaphor. For example, in the fourth act of *Julius Caesar* Brutus speaks using an extended metaphor describing opportunity.

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune:
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat,
> And we must take the current when it serves,

Or lose our ventures.

(4.3.216–22)

To facilitate close reading, students should be asked to identify what abstract concept is being described. Then the students should be asked to enumerate the details of the metaphor so that they can identify and recognize the facets of the comparison. Requiring students to attempt to imitate or recreate an extended metaphor encourages them to recognize the component parts of the comparison. The writing-to-learn prompt will give them an abstract concept, such as ethical decisions, loyalty, honor or justice, and ask them to generate a series of comparisons. The form of the speech may provide a useful constraint for their thinking and creation (67).

According to Rick Wormeli, in differentiated classes, grading focuses on clear and consistent evidence of mastery, not on the medium through which the student demonstrates that mastery. For example, we give students five different choices for showing what they know about the rise of democracy: writing a report, designing a Web site, building a library display, transcribing a "live" interview with a historical figure, or creating a series of podcasts simulating a discussion between John Locke and Thomas Jefferson about where governments get their authority. We can grade all the projects using a common scoring rubric that contains the universal standards for which we are holding students accountable (par. 18). Wormeli showed many ways that the same outcomes can be reached by different students with different abilities using different methods.

In teaching *Romeo and Juliet*, DeCourcy, Fairchild, and Follet echo the research of Howard Gardner and present their readers with various methods to try with different types of learners. For example, a lesson entitled "Present the Prologue" begins with the

instruction: “Use your preferred learning style to introduce your class to the meaning and tone (feeling or mood) of Shakespeare’s prologue” (26). The authors provide different projects for each of the four learning styles: (visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, logical mathematical, and verbal-linguistic). The groups are instructed to work together and then report their findings back to the class at large. Once again, the same outcome is reached through different avenues, benefiting all learners—the goal of differentiated instruction. An example of an outcome could be that students use their preferred learning style to introduce the meaning and tone (the feeling or mood) of Shakespeare’s Prologue to *Romeo and Juliet*. The different avenues could include:

- Visual-Spatial Task - Drawing literal pictures and symbolic and decorative words to represent the most important parts of the Prologue.
- Bodily-Kinesthetic Task – Using bodies to represent the most important lines of the Prologue with pantomime, freeze frame, gesture, and other movements, performing the excerpt of the Prologue like a chorus.
- Logical-Mathematical Task: Using the syllables, repetition, rhyme, and other patterns in the Prologue to present the most important lines of the Prologue like a chorus, with percussive instruments, or present the excerpt of the Prologue like a teacher’s lecture, with a pointer or PowerPoint to demonstrate the patterns.
- Verbal-Linguistic Task: Identifying the connotations of key words to predict key themes established by the Prologue, and presenting the Prologue like a teacher’s lecture. Creating a poster for their lecture that highlights words they will explicate and/or illustrate.

In “The Goals of Differentiation,” Tomlinson points out what she calls the “dual goal” of differentiated instruction: Differentiation, fully understood, is concerned with developing not only content mastery, but also student efficacy and ownership of learning” (par. 28). For the secondary English teacher, differentiation is not only a way to reach all learners in the classroom, but a method to justify teaching classic texts to concerned administrators, parents, and school board members. Teachers can confidently avow that if a student can understand Shakespeare, he or she can tackle anything. Learning how to execute a close reading of classic works will certainly help students when they have to do similar close readings on any assessments. Teachers can prove with research-based evidence that being able to translate and rephrase Elizabethan English into modern vernacular feeds directly into the vocabulary sections of standardized assessments where utilizing context clues is a necessary skill for success.

There is no limit to different ways of incorporating learning methods while teaching a play to students. As teachers consider specific plays, the areas of strength and weakness for their students, the preferences of their class, the goal of their curriculum, and other important pedagogical decisions, they may decide to incorporate several of the following methods for teaching plays. These methods enhance student learning by teaching plays as plays and break outside of the conventionally restricted approach to merely reading them.

Read plays aloud. Reading Shakespeare aloud is a tremendous pedagogical tool. Shakespeare was a master at crafting text. Through Shakespeare’s use of punctuation, his verse and prose guide the speaker in the appropriate execution of the words, and his monologues and dialogues are set up to garner specific physical reactions from the

speaker. A basic and easy way to go through a play is to assign different roles to different students and have them read their parts aloud. The focus can be on students reading fluidly and with personality. For example, in *Romeo and Juliet,* Act II Scene v, Juliet is most anxiously awaiting her nurse to come back and let her know what Romeo has said.

Juliet:

> The clock struck nine when I did send the Nurse,
> In half an hour she promis'd to return.
> Perchance she cannot meet him. That's not so.
> O, she is lame. Love's heralds should be thoughts
> Which ten times faster glides than the sun's beams
> Driving back shadows over lowering hills.
> Therefore do nimble-pinion'd doves draw Love,
> And therefore hath the wind-swift Cupid wings.
> Now is the sun upon the highmost hill
> Of this day's journey, and from nine till twelve
> Is three long hours, yet she is not come.
> Had she affections and warm youthful blood
> She would be as swift in motion as a ball:
> My words would bandy her to my sweet love,
> And his to me.
> But old folks, many feign as they were dead--
> Unwieldy, slow, heavy, and pale as lead.

Juliet's first two lines are said easily, as she is thinking about how tardy the nurse is. We have a period (.) after "Perchance she cannot meet him." She is stopped in her speech at such a dreadful thought, then she decides that is not so. Reassured and displeased at her decision that the nurse is simply incompetent, she speaks for almost three full lines without taking a breath. The lack of commas and periods, which are opportunities for breath, cause a speaker to start to speak more quickly, and mirrors the strong sense of anticipation and impatience that Juliet is feeling as she rambles on about her nurse. Two more lines with a breath, and then almost another three. Perhaps the speaker is out of breath, as she rushes through these lines of excitement, rushing to catch her breath. Juliet,

too, would be out of breath as she works herself up into a frenzy over the tardiness of her nurse. Finally, we get to a colon after “ball," and we know to emphasize “My words would bandy her to my sweet love…” Then, in disgust, Juliet describes old people as slow and heavy. The student must briefly stop to breathe after each comma: “Unwieldy, slow, heavy, and pale as lead.” This slows the student down, actually demonstrating the slowness Juliet is talking about. Paying attention to and obeying the punctuation in Shakespeare’s text give students wonderful clues about how to portray these characters. When students read Shakespeare out loud, it is important to follow these rules so that we can better understand what the character is saying and feeling.

Listen to and watch different performances and interpret. Instead of having students read, find recordings of performances and have students listen to them. What is especially beneficial is to find different actors performing the same scene. Have students listen to their voices and interpretations, and discuss the interpretive implications of the differences. Like listening to different actors, teachers can find multiple performances of the same scene. Ask students what differences they saw, and what interpretations those differences could lead to. For example, there have been many performances of *The Merchant of Venice* with different actors playing Shylock. There is Peter O’Toole in 1960, Laurence Olivier in 1970, Anthony Sher in 1987, and Patrick Stewart in 2011. Students might get the impression that many of these performances of *The Merchant of Venice* reveal the sociology of the actors’, directors’, and producers’ own culture, politics and historical moment.

Act out scenes. Get students on their feet by acting out a scene as they read. This can be done with one set of students in front of the class. What could be even more fun is to

have students in groups creating performances of the same scene; when each performs his or her scene, there will be plenty of differences to discuss.

Act out the same scene different ways. Have student volunteers in front of the class, performing whatever their classmates suggest. Guide students to interpret a scene one way, then add other actions or tones that get them understanding the scene in a different way.

Read to one another several times, trading roles. Have students read lines to one another in small groups. If a scene has two people speaking to one another, have the students read the scene twice: once as one character and once as the other. Teachers can even increase the number of times they read: the more times they read a scene, the better they understand it.

Create a performance as a group and discuss. Have students choose a scene from the play and create a performance for it. Then, after they perform, have them hold a conversation with their classmates about the decisions that they made about it.

Be a "director" for a scene. Ask each student to select a scene and annotate for stage directions, tones, props, and other directorial decisions.

Build a stage, set, scenery, etc. For those hands-on students, they can actually construct the items needed to make an effective performance.

Ask lots and lots of questions. Students can take a scene, or even a narrow set of lines, and compose a long list of questions regarding possible ways the scene might be understood, discussed, and performed.

Compare different scenes. Examine the structure of a play and discuss, perform, and observe how certain scenes are meant to parallel, contrast, or develop off one another

Re-write and/or re-tell scenes. Re-write the end or a specific scene of the play to show that students understand the original version enough to change an element of it and apply a cause and effect relationship. Or, form a theory of how a play's plot would be different if the setting were changed, and then write a short story re-telling of the scene or play in it.

Engaging students through some of these methods provides the students with more opportunities to interact and make connections with the text. And this is how Shakespeare can be communicated effectively to students.

Many scholars and educators struggle to balance teacher guidance and student freedom, or order and chaos, especially in diverse classrooms. Teachers should create frames - a delimited, intentional and focused approach to the multiplicity of interpretive lenses available - so that students discover and explore multiple plays of Shakespeare, as texts, performances, history and cultural artifacts (Thompson and Turchi 28). As a result, students are empowered to participate with complex text as readers, writers, speakers, listeners and viewers in the world beyond their classroom. Without a twenty-first-century approach, Shakespeare in schools really will cease to matter and will be replaced by texts that are "relevant" and easily accessible, like *The Hunger Games*. This is not meant to disparage young adult literature, but to recognize the value in continuing to explore and challenge the relevance of Shakespeare's works. Students can thoroughly enjoy reading Shakespeare if teachers adopt an active approach to teaching it. A committed, confident, and supportive teacher can guide students from numerous backgrounds to engage with and benefit from reading the works of Shakespeare.

Epilogue

In commemorating the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's death, the first folio arrived at Drew University just as I was beginning my dissertation process. It was in Mead hall in a glass case under the watchful eye of a security guard. *Macbeth, As You Like It* and *The Tempest*, all dramas that I talk about in this dissertation, were published for the first time in this edition. Naturally, I was excited to visit the exhibition! The folio was opened to one of Shakespeare's famous soliloquys: *Hamlet*'s "To Be or Not to Be."

There was a series of events surrounding the first folio's exhibition at Drew including a lecture by Frank Occhiogrosso, a second reader for my dissertation. I did not know that I would be so fortunate to have him as part of my committee; after all, "All the world is a stage/ And all the men and women merely players…" The thought that without the first folio, the world might have not had the privilege of Shakespeare was overwhelming! I would have no dissertation. How timely that at this point in the world with all the tension around issues of diversity and inclusiveness, we get to celebrate the Bard, 400 years later.

Shakespeare is relevant in our urban public secondary classrooms today because his plays touch on so many issues- race, immigration, economic inequality, gender inequality and political polarization. These are all matters that we are grappling with today. In a time when public discourse has become so sullied, Shakespeare urges us to a more vivid, witty, and intelligent use of language. It is fascinating that Shakespeare's plays always seem to coincide with the times in which they are read and discussed. There is prophetic truth to Ben Johnson's words, memorializing his greatest contemporary: "He was not of an age, but for all time!

Shakespeare's plays clearly possess the potential to captivate and absorb students in diverse secondary classrooms. The true value in studying Shakespeare is that it boosts students own growing inner selves. When we create an environment where students can connect and react personally to his plays, the benefit to students' analytical and critical thinking skills, as well as their creativity, is irrefutable. It is true that teaching Shakespeare's plays can be a daunting challenge for both teachers and students, but it is not an excuse not to teach them. We cannot afford to lose rigor because we want to make the curriculum "relevant." Students can relate to Shakespeare's plays if teachers help them negotiate.

Urban secondary school students offer a powerful resource for everyone to learn more because of the array of experiences and perspectives they bring to schools. The growing diversity in secondary classrooms demands and inspires educators to develop and use various teaching strategies devised to respond to each student as an individual. These classrooms are the ideal laboratory in which to learn the multiple perspectives required by a global society. Students who learn to work together with peers from different cultures are better prepared for the world they face now and the world they will face in the future. Teaching and learning strategies that draw on the social history and the everyday lives of students and their cultures can only assist this learning process. In "Diverse Teaching Strategies for Diverse Learners," Marietta Saravia-Shore explains that immigrant students bring opportunities to be explored and treasures to be appreciated, so adopting a truly global perspective allows us to view culturally and linguistically diverse students and their parents or guardians as resources who provide unparalleled

opportunities for enrichment (28). The complexity of a Shakespeare play offers students many starting places for exploration and discovery, grounded in the text and with resonances in literary, historical, contemporary, cultural, political and artistic worlds at least.

The key to teaching Shakespeare effectively lies in the approach. There is no one approach that covers everything that needs to be taught, so teachers should use a variety of ways to teach Shakespeare in diverse secondary classrooms. Because each approach has its own unique qualities, it is important that teachers use a variety of methodologies that teach multiple sets of skills and help students understand many kinds of complexity. It is imperative that the approach a teacher uses fits his or her teaching style as well as that of his or her students. A Shakespeare classroom should be built on the expectation that students' ideas matter, that the ideas that a group collectively generates are valuable and that searching for reasonable explanations or revealing details always leads to new questions as well as new insights to a text. Ultimately, an active approach to teaching and learning about Shakespeare has the potential to transform and increase students' cognitive engagement.

Finally, Shakespeare's literary status is unmatched, and thus his works are both relevant and beneficial for students. The themes and emotions that run through the pages of the plays are timeless, surpassing barriers of sex, race, and class. Hence, it is not the irrelevancy of Shakespeare that bores students, but the outdated pedagogical practices that teachers sometimes employ. The pedagogical approaches need to allow for a more explorative, more meaningful experience in the classroom where all students are offered the opportunity to fully engage with the works of the Shakespeare.

Works Cited and Consulted

Adler, Mortimer Jerome, and Charles Lincoln Van Doren. *How to Read a Book*. Simon & Schuster, 2014.

Almasy, Rudolph, Rebecca Daniel, and Jeanne Gerlach. "Revisiting Shakespeare and Gender." *National Council of Teachers of English*. Fall, 1996, https://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/old-WILLA/fall96/gerlach.html

Anderson, Hephzibah. "How Shakespeare Influences the Way We Speak Now." *BBC*. BBC, 21 Oct. 2014.

Andreas, James R. "Silencing the Vulgar and Voicing the Other." *Bread Loaf News*. Vol. 4, no. 3, 1991, pp. 30-32.

Applebee, Arthur N. *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: a History*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1976.

Bach, Jacqueline. "One Size Does Not Fit All: Cinematic Approaches to the Teaching of Shakespeare." *Changing English*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2009, pp. 323-31.

Bevington, David, et al. "William Shakespeare." *Britannica*, Encyclopedia Britannica, pp. 1–15, www.britannica.com/biography/William-Shakespeare#ref232300.

Beyad, Maryam, and Ali Salami. *Culture-Blind Shakespeare: Multiculturalism and Diversity*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.

Biber, Douglas, et al. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman, 2002.

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. Riverhead Books, 1998.

Bohannan, Laura. "Shakespeare in the Bush." *Natural History Magazine*, 1966, www.naturalhistorymag.com/editors_pick/1966_08-09_pick.html?page=4.

Brown, Sheila, and Lee Kappes. "Implementing the Common Core State Standards: A Primer on 'Close Reading of Text." *ERIC [EBSCO]*, Oct. 2012, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED541433.

Bucolo, Joe. "The Bard in the Bathroom: Literary Analysis, Filmmaking, and ShakespeareThe Bard in the Bathroom: Literary Analysis, Filmmaking, and Shakespeare." *ERIC [EBSCO]*, July 2007, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ776552.

Burke, Jim. *The English Teacher's Companion: a Completely New Guide to Classroom, Curriculum, and the Profession*. Heinemann, 2013.

Carey-Webb, Allen. *Literature and Lives: A Response-Based, Cultural Studies Approach to Teaching English*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Carrell, Jennifer Lee. "How the Bard Won the West." *Jennifer Lee Carrell*, Smithsonian Magazine, Aug. 1998, www.jenniferleecarrell.com/how-the-bard-won-the-west-smithsonian-magazine-august-1998/.

Carter, Dennis. *SHAKESPEARE AND CLASSIC WORKS IN THE CLASSROOM: Teaching Pre-20th Century Literature at ks2 and... ks3*. ROUTLEDGE, 2016.

Chan, Kenneth K.P, and Daniel Gallimore. "Teaching Shakespeare to College Students." *British Shakespeare Association*. British Shakespeare Association, Autumn 2014.

Chafe, Wallace, and Deborah Tannen. "The Relation between Written and Spoken Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Annual Review, 1987, www.jstor.org/stable/2155877?origin=JSTOR-pdf.

Chute, Marchette. *Stories from Shakespeare*. Bookman Books, 1997.

"Common Core State Standards." *Common Core State Standards Initiative*, Council of Chief State School Officers & National Governors Association, 2009, www.corestandards.org/.

Cummins, Jim. "Literacy and English-Language Learners: A shifting landscape for students, teachers, researchers, and policy makers." *Educational Researcher, vol.* 38, no. 5, 2009, pp. 382-384.

Dakin, Mary Ellen. *Reading Shakespeare with young adults*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2009.

DeCourcy, Delia, et al. *Teaching Romeo and Juliet: A Differentiated Approach*. National Council of English Teachers, 2007.

Dickson, Andrew. *Worlds Elsewhere: Journeys Around Shakespeare's Globe.* Bodley Head, 2016.

Dienstfrey, Sherri. "Creative Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare in High School." *ERIC [EBSCO]*, 1991, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED331096.

Duncan-Andrade, Jeffrey M., and Ernest Morrell. "Critical Pedagogy in an Urban High School English Classroom." *Counterpoints*, vol. 285, 2008, pp. 49–67. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/42979869.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from His Life*. Arden Shakespeare, 2002.

Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women.* MacMillan Press, 1975.

Eason, Sarah "Where Two Raging Fires Meet Together": Constructed Gender Performances of Kate and Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew." CCTE Studies vol.* 79, 2014, pp. 38-47

Ehnenn, Jill. "'An Attractive Dramatic Exhibition?': Female Friendship, Shakespeare's Women, and Female Performativity in 19th-Century Britain." *Women's Studies*, vol. 26, 12 July 2010, pp. 315–341., https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.1997.9979169.

Evans, Robert O. *The Osier Cage: Rhetorical Devices in Romeo and Juliet*. University Press of Kentucky, 1966. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt130jht7.

Fillmore, Lily Wong, and Charles J Fillmore. "What Does Text Complexity Mean for English Learners and Language Minority Students?" *Language, Literacy, and Learning in the Content Areas*, 5 Apr. 2012, pp. 64–74., https://mes.sccoe.org/resources/ALI%202012/11_KenjiUL%20Stanford%20Final%205-9-12%20w%20cover.pdf.

Fisher, Douglas, and Nancy Frey. "Close Reading as an Intervention for Struggling Middle School Readers." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, vol. 57, no. 5, 2014, pp. 367–376., https://doi:10.1002/jaal.266.

Flanagan, Damian. "In Search of Japan's Own Shakespeare." *The Japan Times*, Apr. 2016, https://www.japantimes.co.jp/culture/2016/04/23/books/book-reviews/search-japans-shakespeare/#.WpU-uqinFPZ

Flower, Linda. "The Role of Task Representation in Reading-to-Write." *Reading-to-Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process*, University of California, 1987, pp. 35–74.

Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare and Modern Culture*. Pantheon, 2008.

Gardner, Howard. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice.* Basic Books. 1993

Gay, Penny. "THE TAMING OF THE SHREW: Avoiding the Feminist Challenge." *As She Likes It: Shakespeare's Unruly Women*, Routledge, 1994, pp. 86-119.

Gibson, Rex. *Teaching Shakespeare: A Handbook for Teachers*. Cambridge UP, 1998.

Gilmore, Barry. "Worthy Texts: Who Decides?" *ERIC [EBSCO]*, Mar. 2011, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ972167

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. The Bodley Head, 2016.

Gunderson, Lee. "The State of the Art of Secondary ESL Teaching and Learning." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, vol. 52, no. 3, 2008, pp. 184–188. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/30250081.

Hadley, Eric. "Bill Shakespeare's Blind Date." *Literacy (Formerly Reading)*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2002, pp. 75–79. *ERIC [EBSCO]*, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ653532.

Halliday, M. A. K. "Toward a language-based theory of learning." *Linguistics and Education*, vol. 5 no. 2, 1993, pp. 93-116.

Hancock, Emily. *The Girl Within.* Ballantine, 1996.

Hapgood, Robert. "Portia and The Merchant of Venice: The Gentle Bond." *Modern Language Quarterly 28.* 1967, pp 19-32.

Heilmer, Deborah. "Teaching Shakespeare in the 21St Century: A Guide for Secondary Educators." *All Regis University*, 2009.

Hirsch, Jennifer. *A Courtship Before Marriage*. University of California Press, 2003.

Hopkins, Lisa. *Beginning Shakespeare*. Manchester University Press; Distributed exclusively in the USA by Palgrave, 2005.

Hortmann, Wilhelm. *Shakespeare on the German Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

Howard, Jean E. "Crossdressing, The Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 4, 1988, pp. 418-40.

Hunt, Maurice. "The Voices of A Midsummer Night's Dream." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language,* vol. 34, no. 2, 1992, pp. 218-239.

Huston, Lorna. "On Not Being Deceived: Rhetoric and the Body in Twelfth Night." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1996, pp. 140-175.

Jolley, Susan Arpajian. "Connecting to Conscience: Shakespeare and Woody Allen." *The English Journal*, vol. 98, no. 3, 2009, pp. 73–79. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40503512.

Kincheloe, Joe. L. "Why a book on urban education?" *19 urban questions: Teaching in the city*, 2004, Peter Lang Publishing, pp. 1-32.

Kliman, Bernice W. and Rick J. Santos. *Latin American Shakespeares*. Fairleigh

Dickinson Press, 2005.

Kleypas, K. L. “Instructional: Engaging Shakespeare through Translation.” *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2004, pp. 174-177.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. “Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching.” *Theory into Practice*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1992, pp. 312-320.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers for African American Children*. Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Lanier, Douglas. “Shakespeare and Cultural Studies: An Overview.” *Shakespeare*, vol. 2, no .2, 2006, pp. 228–48.

Lennox, Charolette. *Shakespearean Criticism*, Vol. 4. Ed. Mark Scott. Gale Research, Inc., 1987.

Lenz, Carolyn Ruth Swift., et al. “‘The Women’s Part: Female Sexuality as Power in Shakespeare’s Plays.” *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, University of Illinois Press, 1983, pp. 17–34.

Levin, Bernard. Quoted in *The Story of English.* Robert McCrum, William Cran and Robert MacNeil. Viking, 1986.

Lindheim, Nancy. “Rethinking Sexuality and Class in Twelfth Night.” *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. 76, no. 2, 2007, pp. 679-713.

Lighthill, Brian. “Shakespeare – an endangered species?” *English in Education*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2011, pp. 36-51.

Linklater, Kristin. *Freeing Shakespeare's Voice*. Nick Hern, 2010.

Luke, A. The trouble with English. *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 39, no.1, 2004, pp. 85-95.

Magnus, Laury. “Shakespeare on Film and Television.” *Oxford Handbooks Online*, Edited by Arthur F Kinney, 22 Dec. 2011, pp. 1–24., https://doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566105.013.0027.

MacDonald, Angela. *Considerations of Identity in Teachers’ Attitudes Toward Teaching Controversial Issues under Conditions of Globalization*. University of Toronto, 2013, pp. 105-221.

Manninen, Alisa. *Royal Power and Authority in Shakespeare's Late Tragedies*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Marche, Stephen. *How Shakespeare Changed Everything*. Harper Perrenial, 2012.

Martin, M.W. "Shakespeare in Today's Classroom." *The English Journal*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1955, pp. 228-229.

Marzano, Robert J. "The Art and Science of Teaching / Teaching Inference." *Educational Leadership*, vol. 67, no. 7, Apr. 2010, www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr10/vol67/num07/Teaching-Inference.aspx.

McCrum, Robert. "Ten Ways in Which Shakespeare Changed the World." *The Guardian*. Apr. 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2016/apr/17/ten-ways-shakespeare-changed-the-world

McCrum, Robert, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil. *The Story of English.* Penguin Books, 2003.

McDonald, Russ. "Shakespeare Goes to High School: Some Current Practices in the American Classroom." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 2, 1995, pp. 145-156. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2871042&gt

Morrison, Jennifer D. "Using student generated film to create a culturally relevant community." *The English Journal*, vol. 92, no. 1, 2002, pp. 47-52.

Mueller, Richard J. "A Groundling's Approach to Shakespeare." *The English Journal*, vol. 53, no. 8, 1964, pp. 584–588., www.jstor.org/stable/810856.

Neely, Carol Thomas Neely. "Women and Men in *Othello*." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Othello.* Ed. Harold Bloom. Chelsea House Publishers, 1987, pp. 79-104.

Neely, Carol Thomas. "Women and Men in Othello: 'What should such a fool/Do with so good a woman.'" *The Woman's Part*. Ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gale Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely. University of Illinois Press, 1980, pp. 211-239.

Newman, Karen. "Portia's Ring: Unruly Women and Structures of Exchange in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1987, pp. 19–33, www.jstor.org/stable/2870399.

Norris, Stephen P., and Robert Hugh Ennis. *Evaluating Critical Thinking DC*. Midwest Publications, 1989.

O 'Brien, Peggy. "The Shrew and Me: What I Learned at Taming School." *Shakespeare*. Spring, 1998, pp. 14-15.

Paquette, Maryellen G. "Sex and Violence: Words at Play in the Shakespeare

Classroom." *English Journal*, vol. 96, no. 3, 2007, pp. 40-45, http://www.jstor.org/stable/30047293>.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. "Critical thinking… and the Art of Close Reading (Part 1). *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2003, pp. 36–39.

Paziotopoulos, A. & Kroll, M. (2004). "Hooked on thinking." *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 57, no. 7, 2004, pp. 672-677.

Pequigney, Joseph. "The Two Antonios and Same-Sex Love in Twelfth Night and The Merchant of Venice." *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 22, no. 2, 1992, pp. 201-21.

Pilonieta, P, and A Medina. "Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners in Middle and Secondary Classroom." *Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: Research-Based Practice*, Guilford Press, 2009, pp. 125–143.

Prefaces and Prologues. Vol. XXXIX. The Harvard Classics. P.F. Collier & Son, 2001, pp. 1909–14, www.bartleby.com/39/.

Prescott Paul. "Shakespeare and Popular Culture." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, Cambridge U, 2015, pp. 269-84.

Prince, Michael, and Felder, Richard. "The Many Faces of Inductive Teaching and Learning." *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 2007, pp. 14–20.

Robbins, Bruce. "Using the original approach to teach Shakespeare." *The English Journal*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2005, pp. 64-68. 2005.

Roskelly, Hepzibah. "What Do Students Need to Know About Rhetoric?" *Special Focus in English Language and Composition: Rhetoric*. University of North Carolina Press, pp. 1-8.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation.* Routledge, 2006.

Saravia-Shore, Marietta. "Diverse Teaching Strategies for Diverse Learners." *Educating Everybody's Children Diverse Teaching Strategies for Diverse Learners*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2008, www.ascd.org/publications/books/107003.aspx.

Schleppergrel, M. *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. Routledge, 2004.

Schmitz, Connie C. and Judy Galbraith. *Managing the Social and Emotional Needs of the*

Gifted: A Teacher's Survival Guide. Free Spirit Publishing Company, 1985, pp. 32-33.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by Stephen Orgel, and A. R. Braunmuller. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by Frances E. Dolan. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Edited by A. R. Braunmuller. Penguin, 2001.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Edited by Stephen Orgel, and A. R. Braunmuller. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. Edited by Stephen Orgel, and A. R. Braunmuller. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *Much Ado About Nothing*. Edited by Peter Holland. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Edited by Alan Durband. Barron's, 1985.

Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. Edited by Stephen Orgel, and A. R. Braunmuller. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Edited by Stephen Orgel. Penguin, 2001.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Peter Holland. Penguin, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Washington Square Press, 2005.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Othello*. Edited by Russ McDonald. Penguin, 2001.

Shakespeare, William. *Twelfth Night*. Edited by Jonathan Crewe. Penguin, 2001

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream. The Norton Shakespeare Anthology: Essential Plays and Sonnets*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, et all, W.W. Norton & Company, 2016, 209-268.

Smith, Paul. "Equality, Diversity, Inclusion: The Social Values of Shakespeare." *The Huffington Post*. 21 Jan. 2016, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/paulsmith/equality-diversity-inclusion_b_9037078.html

Sperling, M., & DiPardo, A. "English Education research and classroom practice: New directions for new times." *Review of research in education*, vol. 32, 2008, pp. 62-108.

Stiller, James, Daniel Nettle, and Robin I. M. Dunbar. "The Small World of Shakespeare's Plays." *Human Nature*, Vol. 14, no. 4, 2003, pp. 397-408.

Tankersley, Karen. *Literacy Strategies for Grades 4-12: Reinforcing the Threads of Reading*. Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005.

Teaching Shakespeare: Lesson Plans. The Folger Shakespeare Library, 2018. http://www.folger.edu.

"Thanks To Summer Camp at K-State, Kansas High School Teachers Are Heading To Classrooms This Fall with New Techniques to Bring Shakespeare to Students." *Kansas State University News*, 2009 http://www.k-state.edu/media/newsreleases/aug09/shkspre81409.html

Thompson, Ayanna, and Laura Turchi. *Teaching Shakespeare with Purpose: a Student-Centred Approach*. Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2016.

Thurman, Chris." Should Shakespeare be taught in Africa?" *The Guardian*. Aug. 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/06/shakespeare-africa-schools-universities-south-africa

Tomlinson, Carol Ann. T*he Differentiated Classroom Responding to the Needs of All Learners* (ASCD). Prentice Hall, 2004.

Tomlinson, Carol Ann. "The Goals of Differentiation," *Educational Leadership*, vol. 66, no. 5, 2008, p. 26.

Tomlinson, Carol A. *Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design Connecting Content and Kids*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2006.

Tomlinson, Carol Ann. "Mapping a Route Towards Differentiated Instruction," *Educational Leadership*, vol. 51, no. 1, 1999, pp. 12 –16.

Tovani, Cris. *I Read It, but I Don't Get It: Comprehension Strategies for Adolescent Readers*. Stenhouse, 2000.

Trivedi, Poonam. "Why Shakespeare Is ... Indian." *The Guardian*. May 2012, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/may/04/why-shakespeare-is-indian

Twelfth Night. The Norton Shakespeare Anthology: Essential Plays and Sonnets,

edited by Stephen Greenblatt, et all, W.W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 487-541.

United States Bureau of Statistics. Department of Educational Statistics. 2009, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary and Secondary Education," 1990-91 through 2013-14, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372

Van Pelt, Deborah, ""I stand for sovereignty": Reading Portia in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice"*. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 2009. http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/65

Vaughn Alden T. and Vaughan Virginia Mason. *Shakespeare in America*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Warner, Diane. "Shakespeare and Racial Diversity for Primary Children: Exploring Ways to Develop Student Teacher Confidence." *University of Cumbria*, Tean Journal, 2011.

Welles, Orson, and Roger Hill. "On the Teaching of Shakespeare and Other Great Literature." *The English Journal*, vol. 27, no. 6, 1938, pp. 464–468.

Wolfe, Maryanne, and Mirit Barzillai. "The Importance of Deep Reading." *Educational Leadership, vol.* 66. no. 6, 2009, pp. 32-37.

Wormeli, Rick. *Meet me in the Middle*. Stenhouse Publishers, 2001.

Wortham, Stanton. "Ventriloquating Shakespeare: Ethical positioning in classroom literature discussions." *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, vol. 17, 2001, pp 46-64.

VITA

Full name: Evelyn Onyinoyi Mamman

Place and date of birth: Kainji, Nigeria December 15, 1970

Parents' names: Paul and Agnes Enesi

Educational Institutions:

School	Place	Degree	Date
Secondary: Our Lady's High School	Kaduna, Nigeria	HS diploma	June 1998
Collegiate: Ahmadu Bello University	Zaria, Nigeria	BA English Education	May 1994
Graduate: New York University	New York, NY	MA English Education	May 1997
Drew University	Madison, NJ	D.Litt.	May 2018