# Evaluation of Methods Teachers Use in Teaching Shakespearean Drama in Senior Secondary Schools in Edo State

**Regina B. Danner[1] and Roselyn. J. Musa[2]**

[1,2]*Department of Curriculum and Instructional Technology, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria*

**Abstract:** Shakespeare continues to take the pride of place in the teaching of classical literature in English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom. Despite this, many students and even some teachers flinch at the thought of reading Shakespeare plays and this has had adverse consequences on students' enrolment and achievement in Literature-in-English. Thus, this study aimed to identify the methods and strategies employed by teachers in teaching Shakespeare plays in senior secondary schools in Edo State, Nigeria. The study was conducted in public secondary schools in Benin Metropolis. A questionnaire was used as the primary means of data collection. The findings show that the discussion and lecture method is popularly employed by teachers, followed by the reading the play method. The findings indicate that the performance-based and technology enhanced teaching methods are not popular with the teachers. The implication is that teachers still prefer to teach Shakespeare in the "traditional way" which has not been beneficial for the students. The findings also reveal that demographic and study related variables (gender, teaching experience, type of training and number of periods) did not influence teachers' use of teaching methods. To this end, it is recommended that teachers should adopt more active performance-based and technology enhanced teaching strategies that can greatly enhance their classroom presentation of Shakespeare's plays.

**Keywords:** Shakespeare plays, Methods, Strategies, Performance-based, Technology Enhanced Teaching, Reading the play, Discussion and lecture.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The use of literature in language teaching is very significant. It is an ally of language as it represents language in discourse. Literary language is useful in language learning. According to Khan and Alasmari (2018) "Literary texts are rich sources of figurative language, beautiful sentences, idiomatic expressions, interesting proverbs, and suitable vocabulary items filled with connotative meanings. In addition, range of vocabulary, grammatical structures and style of writing woven into a gripping narration enthrall the readers." (p. 171).

The literary reasons for teaching Shakespeare's plays in language classrooms revolve around the richness of the language in his works and the cultural heritage that his plays embody. Shakespeare plays have always been appreciated because of their universal themes such as love, hatred, betrayal or disappointment. Though the plays are hundreds of years old, what still makes them appealing is that their subject matter never gets old. These plays deal with basic human emotions and themes

and for this reason they still apply to the present times. For many teachers, Shakespeare continues to be popular because of his plays' "universal, timeless greatness and relevance" (McEvoy, 2003, p.101). It is for this reason that Shakespeare's works are appreciated beyond that of any other English writer (Blocksidge, 2003).

However, literature written in older forms of English, such as Shakespeare's, is often difficult to understand. The gap between old and modern English has become too vast and Shakespeare's language is almost incomprehensible and therefore tedious. The difficulty in Shakespeare's plays is often in the language and syntax of the text. Haddon (2009) asserts that this difficulty is further heightened by students' profile and the background knowledge of the teacher who is teaching the Shakespearean play. This struggle with classical literature, especially, Shakespeare's works may be one of the factors responsible for the low enrolment figure for Literature-in-English and poor performance of students in Senior Secondary School Certificate Examinations (SSCE) conducted by public examination bodies: West

*E-mail address: gdanner58@gmail.com , roselynmusa@yahoo.com*

African Examination Council (WAEC), National Examination Council (NECO), and National Business and Technical Examination Board (NABTEB) in Nigeria.

The teaching of Literature-in-English has been part of the secondary school curriculum since the inception of Western education in Nigeria. Within the classic literature taught in senior secondary schools in Nigeria, Shakespeare holds a primary place. Some of the famous Shakespearean plays such as *Julius Caesar, Romeo* and Juliet, *As You Like It*. *Macbeth, Hamlet* and so on have been popular and students are expected to have developed an understanding of these Shakespearean plays. However, this has not been the case.  Despite the long history of the teaching of Literature-in-English in the country, it has been observed that students' enrolment and performance in the subject has been on the decline over the years. Could the methods adopted by teachers be responsible for this?

Classical literature poses unique challenges for students and teachers, and most especially in the Nigerian situation, where teachers have limited or no background knowledge and training in the teaching of literature in general, and teaching Shakespearean plays in particular. This is mainly because Literature-in-English teachers in Nigeria are usually the graduates of the following programmes: 1) B.A (Ed)/B.Ed. English language and Literature, who have been exposed to some plays written by Shakespeare with limited or no emphasis on how to teach them, (2) B.A English Language and Literature, who have been exposed to some Shakespeare's plays with no emphasis on how to teach them, and (3) B.A in other Arts subjects (e.g. History), who have not been exposed to any Shakespeare's play during their undergraduate training, expect what they have read during their secondary school days. Could this deficiency in the training of teachers teaching Literature-in-English in secondary schools be the reason for students' low enrolment and poor performance in the subject?

There is limited empirical research detailing the type of strategies senior secondary school teachers use in teaching Shakespearean plays in Benin Metropolis. Shakespearean plays are particularly challenging due to the difficulty level of the language, the script format in which the plays are written, and students unfamiliarity with the Shakespearean time period. Thus, there is the need to examine the type of instructional methods senior secondary school teachers use in teaching Shakespearean plays. A study such as this one will help to fill the gap in literature and provide teachers with a guide they can use to be more effective. It will also provide professional development for literature-in-English teachers. The purpose of the present study was to examine the instructional methods teachers of literature-in-English in Benin Metropolis currently use in teaching

Shakespearean drama in senior secondary schools. Thus, the paper's main research objectives are:

- To describe how teachers approach the teaching of Shakespearean drama in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis.
- To identify the teaching methods teachers use in the teaching of Shakespearean drama in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis.
- To determine whether there were significant differences in the teaching methods teachers use for Literature-in-English according to demographic and study related factors (gender, years of teaching experience, qualification and number of periods)

## 2.   REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### *The Importance of Teaching Literature-in-English in English as a Second Language (ESL) Classes*

Literature is the critical study of literary texts. A literary text is a piece of written material, such as a book, play or poem, which has the purpose of telling a story or entertaining. Its primary function as a text is usually aesthetic, but it may also contain political messages or beliefs.  Literary texts play an important role in learning English language, especially enhancing communication competence, raising cultural awareness and generating motivation among students (Khan & Alasmari, 2018). Central to the teaching of literature is the critical analysis of how language is purposefully and creatively used in order to create meaning and explore issues of themes. Through literary skills of reading and responding critically to literary texts, students actively construct meaning and in the process make connections between the texts, their lives and the world. The study of literature encourages students to enter imaginary worlds and explore, examine and reflect on both current and timeless issues as well as their individuality and humanity.

Khatib (2011) maintains that literature provides students with a variety of language skills and personal benefits; authenticity, motivation, cultural and intercultural awareness, intensive and extensive reading practice, sociolinguistic and pragmatic knowledge, grammar and vocabulary knowledge, emotional intelligence and critical thinking. The study of literary texts both sharpens and broadens students' minds. The critical skills uniquely offered by the study of literature includes among others; cultivating a questioning mind, exploring personal and social issues and interrogating and managing ambiguities and multiple perspectives. Literature also builds in student's socio-cultural sensitivity and awareness, as well as global outlook, by offering opportunities for them to explore a wide range of literary texts written in different contexts and from various parts of the world, connecting them to other ages and cultures. It develops empathy and stimulates thinking

about beliefs and values. Kramsch and Kramsch (2000) are of the view that literature not only develops reading strategies, it also provides the opportunity of developing vocabulary acquisition. These characteristics of literature teaching are aptly suited to the 21st century learning requirements. The 21st century is a time of rapid development and shifting perspectives in many areas. The knowledge, skills and dispositions acquired and opportunities grasped in the study of Literature will stand students in a better stead as active citizens of Nigeria and the world. As students are exposed to literature for language learning purposes, they will have the potential to achieve more (Van, 2009). At the secondary school level, Literature focuses on the study of whole and sustained literary texts from the three main genre; prose, poetry and drama.

### The Reasons and Difficulties of Teaching Shakespearean Plays

The main reasons for teaching Shakespearean plays in ESL classes are because of the richness of his language and for its literary knowledge (Yen, 2010). Shakespeare's language abounds with literary devices that every language student should learn at some point in order to understand the target language. Shakespeare's plays have also always been appreciated because of their universal themes such as love, hatred, betrayal or disappointment. Though the plays are hundreds of years old, what still makes them appealing is that their subject matter never gets old. These plays deal with basic human emotions and themes and for this reason they continue to remain popular, as McEvoy (2003) aptly asserts that Shakespeare's plays are "universal, timeless, greatness and relevance" (p 101).

Despite the popularity of Shakespeare's plays, teachers' greatest difficulty of teaching it stems from the fact that Shakespearean language is old. The plays are written in Elizabethan English, which is very different from contemporary English. Haddon (2009) points out that the difficulties of Shakespeare's language are at the levels of lexis, syntax and discourse organization. Besides these levels, Shakespeare's use of metaphors, allusions and cultural references are particularly difficult for learners of English as a second/foreign language to understand (Haddon, 2009). Such literary devices require students to read as much as possible to truly grasp the literary piece, but since all these difficulties listed above are encountered almost simultaneously in a Shakespeare's play, students and teachers often find it difficult to identify the focal points of the plays. Crystal (2003) claims that it is this particular difficulty that makes Shakespeare's play unique. O'Hanlon (2008) affirms that no one can dispute the fact that Shakespeare's language is extraordinary; with its increasing monosyllabic culture, the opportunity to play with words, phrases and metaphors that challenge and

intrigue becomes even more precious and important. In line with this view Metzger (2002) opines that Shakespeare plays provides avenues for students to explore ways in which language and the context in which they are used helps in opening up the questions of lifelong import.

Another barrier to reading Shakespeare is prejudice. Although, this is not as serious as the difficulty of language, it affects the entire learning and teaching process of a Shakespeare's work. As Metzger (2004) asserted, "students rarely came to his work (Shakespeare) free of preconceptions, even if they have never read a word the Bard wrote…" (p100). Especially in English as Second Language (ESL) contexts, preconceptions can be largely negative as the work may be entirely strange to the learners. For this reason, it is necessary to overcome negative preconceptions before reading and teaching Shakespeare's plays. Besides, there are also those who oppose Shakespeare's relevance to the contemporary world. For this group the role of kings and nobles as in Shakespeare's time is not common.

### Methods of Teaching Shakespearean Plays

There are many methods of teaching Shakespeare drama in secondary schools. These methods adopt different techniques and strategies which help to make Shakespeare's work understandable for students. Some methods focus on literary analysis, others on performance, while others focus on a mixture of both literary analysis and performance. For this study four methods used by teachers over the years are discussed.

- *Reading the Play*

Despite the myriad of teaching methods which exist, many teachers still prefer to teach Shakespeare in the "traditional way." That is, 'Reading the Play' method. In this method, students read the play at home, come to class, and either discuss the content, or have the teacher tell them what different passages mean. Pierce (1997) states that "practically all teachers of Shakespeare's plays believe in reading aloud in class, having students walk through scene using the actual bodies and voices of the students as ways of exploring and coming to understand the dramatic richness of Shakespeare's language (p. 43). The strategies used in this method include: reading the text, oral reading by students, teacher reading scenes aloud, silent reading by students and choral speaking of lines. There is however no consensus on the manner in which the plays should be read. Another option is to have the teacher read aloud the text to the students. Each of these strategies also comes with its own set of disadvantages, notable among which is the reduced independence and responsibility for learning as well as an increased likelihood of boredom and lack of attention.

- *Lecture and Discussion Method*

Another method used for teaching Shakespeare's plays is the 'Lecture and Discussion' method. This is method is a bit old-fashioned, however, most teachers feel at home with lecturing. Lecture method is a process of teaching whereby the teacher tells the students his or her planned facts. The students listen and take notes. It is one of the oldest methods in use. It is used to convey critical information, history, and background and probably the best teaching method for teaching and analyzing themes, characters, plot, setting, Lecture can also take the form of questions and answer, with the teacher leading students in the analysis of Shakespeare's complexity. Lecture-based method according to Omatseye (2007) imposes an obvious gulf or barriers between the teacher and students. This makes it difficult for less experienced teachers to maintain control of their classrooms.

Discussion-based teaching methods closely resembles our natural way of communicating in every other social environment – work, home, taking to friends – that we engage in (Wilen, 2004). It makes instruction personal thus, removing barriers between teacher and students. VanDeWeghe (2007) is of the view that classroom discussion helps students make sense of literary texts. Omatseye (2007) sees discussion-based teaching as an interactive strategy which helps students to come to terms with literary texts no matter how difficult they maybe.  Discussion requires experience and confidence on the part of the teacher to allow for his or her ideas, questions and comments to be openly examined by students. Discussion can take the form of teacher-led discussion, whole class discussion, or small group discussion. However, this method is characterised by messy uncontrolled discussions which usually develop into rowdy sessions. Using this method all the time would become boring and monotonous for secondary school students, and students may likely lose attention, so the approach should be used in conjunction with other methods.

- *Performance Method*

Performance has, for a long time, been thought of as an important teaching method for Shakespeare's plays. Performance method is an interactive approach to the study of literature, particularly Shakespeare's plays and poems, in which students participate in close reading of text through intellectual, physical and vocal engagement (Folger Shakespeare Library, 2013). This method can mean several things such as implementing student-centred activities that get students active in the class, dramatizing scripts from the text on their feet, teaching theatrical performance history of Shakespeare's plays and watching or visiting theatrical performances (Wood, 2010). Performance method includes strategies such as reading aloud, staged reading, memorization, improvisation and role-playing (Strom, 2011).

Several studies have revealed the benefits of perform method compared to traditional methods in their findings (Cheng & Winston, 2011; Heller, 2005; Strom, 2011). The benefits included in the studies include:

- Positive overall response towards learning Shakespeare,
- Stronger sense of mastery of the subject,
- Greater sense of accomplishment and intellectual competence,
- Understanding Shakespeare's language easily,
- Perception of study of Shakespeare as a positive experience,
- Greater engagement, less dependence on teacher,
- Thinking abstractly, understanding causality, and
- Use of logic to draw conclusions, greater gain in evaluation skills.

These findings show that the use of performance method enhances virtually every aspect of learning, from affective measure such as engagement and self-confidence to cognitive skills by interpreting different characters and using logic to draw conclusions.

However, this method does little on its own to help students develop higher analytical skills in regards to character, theme, imagery, motif, and so on. However, a brief discussion of these literary terms in regards to the scenes and passages performed could solve this problem. Another problem with this method that is the number of periods allotted for the teaching of Literature. Omans (2003) admits that it may take several periods just to enact a few lines, not to talk of enacting a full play. Another drawback to the use of performance method in teaching Shakespeare's plays is the general lack or non-inclusion of stage directions. With the exception of cues for trumpets, cannons, and specific character entrances and exits, Shakespeare did not write down exactly how a specific scene was to be performed. This lack of direction leads to some elements of some scenes being open to several interpretations. Despite these shortcomings, however, the performance method is certainly a worthwhile method, as Shakespeare did indeed write his plays as scripts for performance, not novels for silent reading.

- *Technology-enhanced Methods*

The use of technology has permeated every aspect of education, especially with Shakespeare teaching. One way of incorporating technology is to include filmed productions of Shakespeare within the classroom. Film can easily be used in cases where students are unable to see professional productions of staged Shakespeare plays. Other technologies may also be used in the teaching of

Shakespeare plays, including incorporating podcasts, blogs, Facebook, and YouTube (Dunn, 2014). YouTube provides a myriad of sources (varying in interpretation of the text, quality, and cultural adaptation) of productions of Shakespeare's plays. Social media sites and blogs allow students to make comments and discuss Shakespeare plays online, whether inside or outside of the classroom. The use of technology according to Shamburg and Craighead (2009) is not only useful, but also natural. Students nowadays are digital savvy and are familiar with the use of these kinds of technologies. Therefore, incorporating technology into their learning will be natural for students and will connect them through familiar methods to possibly unfamiliar territory.

One major drawback in the use of technology is linked to how recently many of these technologies have been developed and how quickly technological platforms change; older teachers may not feel comfortable using new technologies (Robertson & Burton, 2016). In addition, they may not be trained in the use of social media platforms or video-based websites. Also linked to this is the fact that teaching methods for incorporating technology are not yet well established. These notwithstanding, teachers have found them helpful in different ways.

### Teacher Background and Experiences

Research strongly suggest that teachers make the most difference in students' achievement (Boonen, Van Damme & Onghena, 2013; Carey, 2004; Fong-Yee & Normore, 2013) this is particularly true in the case of the teaching of Shakespearean plays as Haddon (2009) asserts, that the difficulty in teaching Shakespeare's play is heightened by the background knowledge of the teacher. According to Breitsprecher (2009), teacher's background in Shakespeare, undergraduate and graduate courses taken, participation in short term or intensive workshops, attendance of three or more theatrical events per year, and years of experience on teaching Shakespeare influenced how a teacher taught Shakespeare. Breitsprecher's (2009) study revealed that teachers with more experience had a more variety of teaching methods in their "educational toolboxes" and, therefore, had greater flexibility adapting these methods to different years, classes or even students.

However, not much research have been carried out in the country to determine how secondary school teachers teach Shakespeare's plays, particularly the strategies they use in order to ascertain whether this is a major contributing factor to students' poor performance. Access to such data would provide valuable information for teachers' use and help to develop and implement these strategies in their classrooms. According to Pearson (2006) "If we are ever going to achieve research-based practice, then more than anything we need rich and detailed accounts that link important research to classroom practice and that show what that practice looks like when teachers do it well" (p. 6). It is on this basis, that the study sought to obtain information from senior secondary school teachers on the strategies they use in teaching Shakespearean plays. Expanding teachers' knowledge of these strategies will help teachers develop how to motivate students' interests in literature and invariably improves their performance.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

**Research Design**

The study utilized a descriptive survey design focused on examining the instructional methods used by teachers for teaching Shakespearean drama. To address the objective posited in the study, relevant data were gathered using a well-designed questionnaire which was administered to randomly selected sample of Literature-in- English teachers in Senior Secondary Schools in Benin Metropolis. The teachers were teaching Literature-in-English at the Senior Secondary classes 1 to 3.

**Population and Sample for the Study**

The population of the study consisted of all the one hundred and seventy-five Senior Secondary School Literature-in-English teachers in Benin Metropolis as listed in the 2017-2018 *Edo Year Book*. A sample of 112 teachers took part in the survey. In order to have a reliable representative group of teachers the random sampling procedures was adopted. First, schools were randomly selected, and due to the dearth of English language/Literature-in-English teachers in Edo state all the available Literature-in-English teachers in the sampled schools took part in the survey.

**Research Instrument**

A questionnaire was developed to identify the instructional methods Senior Secondary School teachers use in teaching Shakespearean drama. The instrument consisted of two sections, A and B. Section B: was designed to elicit the demographic data such as gender, years of teaching experience, highest qualification and area of specialization of the respondents, Section B: was made up of three parts; Part I: deals with general questions on class size, number of classes taught, and the Shakespearean drama taught, Part II: contained six narrative statements, which sought to find out the amount of time teachers spend on teaching a variety of introductory topics and activities on Shakespeare's plays. The last and third part; Part III: sought to find out the methods teachers use in teaching Literature-in-English in Senior Secondary Schools. The instructional methods have been divided into four generic categories (Reading, Lecture and Discussion, Performance and Technology Enhanced). In Part III a scale ranging from 1 to 4 was

selected for use in the study; 1 indicating 'never', 2 for 'rarely', 3 for 'occasionally' and 4 for 'frequently'.

### Data Collection

One hundred and twenty (120) copies of the questionnaire were produced and personally distributed to teachers in the sampled schools. A cover letter explaining the purpose and importance of the study and a copy of the statement of confidentiality were included in the questionnaire. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaires while the researchers waited to collect the filled questionnaires. In the few cases were the participants were unable to fill the questionnaires immediately, the researchers returned to collect them within two weeks. At the end, one hundred and twelve (112) of the filled questionnaires were useable.

## 4.   RESULTS

The research findings are presented in three sub-sections corresponding to the three research questions raised for the study. Analysis of Section A, showed that eighty-six (86) representing seventy-seven percent (77%) of the sampled teachers were females; while twenty-six (26) representing twenty-three percent (23%) were males. Fifty-seven (57) representing 51% had Bachelor's Degree, 53 (47%) had Masters Degree, while only 2 (2%) had NCE. Sixty-seven (67) representing sixty percent (60%) of the respondents indicated that they were professionally trained English Language and Literature teachers with NCE, BA(Ed)/B.Ed. and MA(Ed)/Med, 28 (25%) indicated that they had B.A English, while 17 (15%) had B.A in other Arts subjects (History and CRS).

### Teachers Approach to the Teaching of Shakespearean Drama in Senior Secondary Schools

To answer the research question "*How do teachers approach the teaching of Shakespearean drama in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis?*" some variables such as class size, number of students taught, number periods allotted for teaching literature and how the introductory aspect of Shakespeare's drama was handled.
- *Class Size:* In order to get a general idea of the size of classes with which teachers work, respondents were asked to indicate the average number of students in the classes they taught. Of all responses, the smallest class

taught consisted of twenty-five (25) students, while the largest class had fifty-five (55) students. The average class size for those teachers who responded was forty-five (45) students.
- *Number of Classes Taught:* The respondents were asked to indicate the number of classes they taught. The analysis of data revealed that the minimum number of classes taught was one (1) while the maximum was five (5). The average number of classes taught per teacher was three (3). Thus means that on the average a teacher had an average number of one hundred and thirty-five (135) students. The maximum number of students per teacher was two hundred and twenty-five (225), while the minimum was forty-five (45).
- *Shakespearean Play Taught for the Session:* Teachers were asked to state which Shakespearean play(s) they were teaching in the 2017/2018 academic year. All the respondents indicated that they were teaching only one of the recommended Shakespearean plays. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the respondents indicated that they were teaching *Macbeth,* forty-six percent (46%) were teaching *Othello*, while seven percent (7%) were teaching *Romeo and Juliet.* Teachers were also asked to indicate the term in the school calendar when they teach Shakespearean plays. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the respondents reported teaching the Shakespeare's play in the second term, 18% teach it in the third term 14% teach it throughout the school year, while 13% teach it in the first term.
- *Teaching of Introductory Lessons to Shakespearean Drama:* teachers were asked to indicate how they introduce the recommended Shakespearean play to their students. They were asked to indicate the approximate amount of time they spend on a variety of introductory topics and activities. Six introductory topics (historical background to the play, historical overview of Elizabethan times, the Elizabethan theatre and theatrical conventions, the life of Shakespeare, examination of Elizabethan language and the study of Shakespeare's poetry) were listed in the questionnaire. The responses of the teachers are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Time Spent on Introductory Topics**

| Topics | Number of Period(s) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | None | ½ | 1 | 2 | 3 | Continuous |
| Historical background to the study. | 2 (1.8%) | 40 (35.7%) | 31 (27.7%) | 31 (27.7%) | 8   (7.1%) | – |
| Overview of Elizabethan times. | 15 (13.4%) | 32 (28.6%) | 33 (29.5%) | 26 (23.2%) | 2   (1.8%) | 4   (3.6%) |
| Elizabethan theatre and conventions. | 11 (9.6%) | 26 (23.2%) | 33 (29.5%) | 26 (23.2%) | 7   (6.3%) | 9   (8%) |
| Life of William Shakespeare. | 10 (8.9%) | 28   (25%) | 45 (40.2%) | 16 (14.3%) | 2   (1.8%) | 11   (9.6%) |
| Examination of Elizabethan language. | 5   (4.5%) | 33 (29.5%) | 39 (34.8%) | 24 (21.4%) | 2   (1.8%) | 9   (8%) |
| Study of Shakespeare's poetry. | 10 (8.9%) | 8   (7.1%) | 10   (8.9%) | 26 (23.2%) | 24 (21.4%) | 34   (30.4%) |

Table 1 shows that fifty-five percent (55%) of the respondents spend between 1 and 2 lesson periods teaching the historical background to the study, fifty-three percent (53%) spend between 1 and 2 lesson periods teaching the overview of the Elizabethan times, theatre and conventions. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the respondents spend between 1 and 2 lesson periods teaching the life of William Shakespeare, fifty-six percent (56%) spend between 1 and 2 lesson periods examining Elizabethan language. This is very crucial because the language of Shakespeare is an area of difficulty for students, especially ESL students. Fifty-two percent (52%) of the respondents either spend 3 lesson periods or study Shakespeare's poetry continuously.

### Teaching Methods Teachers Use for Literature-in-English in Senior Secondary Schools

To answer research question, "*What teaching methods do teachers use in the teaching of Shakespearean drama in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis?*" teachers were asked to indicate the frequency with which they employed a variety of strategies associated with different methods of teaching Shakespeare's plays. In Table 2, the teaching strategies associated with the different methods have been grouped under four generic categories (Reading, Lecture and Discussion, Performance and Technology Enhanced Teaching) for the purpose of discussion in this section. In the questionnaire, however, these strategies were listed in a relatively random fashion in an effort to encourage the respondents to give each strategy equal consideration without weighing them against other strategies. The analysis of the data is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2 Teaching Methods teachers Use in Teaching Shakespeare's Play**

| s/n | Strategies associated with the different methods of teaching drama | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely | Never | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | **Reading** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Reading of related texts. | 48 (42.9%) | 41 (36.6%) | 23 (20.5%) | – | 3.22 | .76 |
| 2 | Oral reading – students taking parts. | 52 (46.4%) | 44 (39.3%) | 9 (8%) | 7 (6.3%) | 2.41 | .84 |
| 3 | Teacher reading scenes aloud. | 40 (35.7%) | 29 (25.9%) | 29 (25.9%) | 14 (12.5%) | 2.85 | 1.05 |
| 4 | Students read scenes silently. | 20 (17.9%) | 48 (41.1%) | 32 (28.6%) | 14 (12.5%) | 2.64 | .92 |
| 5 | Choral speaking of lines | 10 (8.9%) | 55 (49.1%) | 18 (16.1%) | – | 2.67 | .63 |
| | **Total** | | | | | **2.92** | **.47** |
| **B** | **Lecture & Discussion** | | | | | | |
| 6 | Teacher-led whole class discussion. | 19 (17%) | 64 (57.1%) | 29 (25.9%) | – | 2.91 | .65 |
| 7 | Small group discussions. | 31 (27.7%) | 54 (48.2%) | 27 (24.1%) | – | 3.04 | .72 |
| 8 | Lecture on concepts (theme, plot etc.) | 37 (33%) | 57 (49.1%) | 18 (16.1%) | – | 3.17 | .68 |
| 9 | Debate | 39 (34.8%) | 49 (43.8%) | 24 (21.4%) | – | 3.13 | .74 |
| 10 | Students copy blackboard summaries. | 87 (77.7%) | 13 (11.6%) | 12 (10.7%) | – | 3.67 | .66 |
| | **Total** | | | | | **3.18** | **.40** |
| **C** | **Performance** | | | | | | |
| 11 | Acting scenes/walk throughs (with text) | 18 (16.1%) | 43 (38.4%) | 34 (30.4%) | 17 (15.2%) | 2.55 | .93 |
| 12 | Role play | 10 (8.9%) | 42 (37.5%) | 44 (39.3%) | 16 (14.3%) | 2.41 | .84 |
| 13 | Students' improvisation of scenes. | – | 53 (47.3%) | 37 (33%) | 22 (19.6%) | 2.28 | .77 |
| 14 | Using pictures/images to represent scenes. | 26 (23.2%) | 31 (27.7%) | 24 921.4%) | 31 (27.7%) | 2.46 | 1.13 |
| 15 | Prepare dress rehearsal for scenes. | – | 22 (19.6%) | 57 (50.9%) | 33 (29.5%) | 1.90 | .70 |
| | **Total** | | | | | **2.32** | **.63** |
| **D** | **Technology Enhanced Teaching** | | | | | | |
| 16 | Listening to scenes on audiotape. | 21 (18.6%) | 29 (25.9%) | 31 (27.7%) | 31 (27.7%) | 2.36 | 1.08 |
| 17 | Watching scenes on videotape. | – | 5 (4.5%) | 48 (42.9%) | 59 (52.7%) | 1.52 | .59 |
| 18 | Live streaming of scenes on YouTube | – | – | 48 (42.9%) | 64 (57.1%) | 1.43 | .50 |
| 19 | Video recording of students' scene presentations. | 13 (11.6%) | 39 (34.8%) | 31 (27.7%) | 29 (25.9%) | 2.32 | .99 |
| 20 | Create a social media platform for students and teacher's discussion on the play | – | – | 34 (30.4%) | 78 (69.6%) | 1.30 | .46 |
| | **Total** | | | | | **1.79** | **.45** |

Table 2 presents the strategies associated with the teaching methods used by teachers in teaching Shakespeare's plays. The analysis of the use of these strategies under the four teaching methods listed, revealed that the use of strategies in two of the methods was above the average mean of 2.50. These are Lecture and Discussion method which has the highest (Mean = 3.18; SD = .47) and the Reading method with (Mean = 2.92; SD = .40). The use of strategies in the other two methods was below the average mean of 2.50. These are the Performance method (Mean = 2.32; SD = .63), while the least was the Technology Enhanced Teaching method (Mean = 1.79; .45).

Under the Lecture and Discussion method, teachers' use of the five strategies listed was above the mean of 2.50. The highest (Mean = 3.67; SD = .66) was for the strategy "Students copy blackboard summaries". This is followed by the strategy "Lecture on concepts (theme, plot etc." The third among this group was "Debate" (Mean = 3.13; SD = .74), which is followed by "Small group discussions" (Mean = 3.04; SD = .72. The least used in this group is "(Teacher-led whole class discussion" (Mean = 2.92; SD = .65). These five strategies appear to be quite fundamental and popular strategies, at least for the majority of the respondents to this survey.

The next set of strategies used by the respondents was those listed under the Reading method. The strategy "Reading of related texts" was the highest used strategy (Mean = 3.22; SD = .76. This is followed by "Teacher reading scenes aloud" (Mean = 2.85; SD = 1.05) "Choral speaking of lines" (Mean = 2.67; SD = .63) came next, closely followed by "Students reading scenes silently" (Mean = 2.64; SD = .92).  "Oral reading – students taking parts" was the least used strategy (Mean = 2.41; SD = .84), in fact lower than the average mean of 2.50.

Five strategies were also listed under the Performance teaching method, only one of these strategies "Acting scenes/walk through (with text)" has a mean above the average 2.50 (Mean = 2.55; SD = .93). The remaining four strategies have means below the 2.50 average. These are "Using pictures/images to represent scenes" (Mean = 2.46; SD = 1.13), followed by "Role play" (Mean = 2.41; SD = .84). The use of "Students' improvisation of scenes" comes next (Mean = 2.28; SD = .77) the least used strategy in this group is "Prepare dress rehearsal for scenes" (Mean = 1.90; SD = .70).

Strategies listed under the Technology Enhanced Teaching method were the least used strategies in the survey. All the five strategies have a mean below the average mean of 2.50. Their mean range from (Mean = 2.36; SD = 1.08) for "Listening to scenes on audiotape", (Mean = 2. 32; SD = .99) for "Video recording of students' scene presentations", (Mean = 1.52; SD = .59) for "Watching scenes on videotape", (Mean = 1.43; SD = .50) for "Live streaming of scenes on YouTube". The least used strategy is "Create a social media platform for students and teacher's discussion of the play" (Mean = 1.30; SD = .46).

### *The Effects of Demographic and Study Related Characteristics on Teaching Methods Teachers Use for Literature-in-English*

A third issue investigated in the study is the differences in the teaching methods teachers use for Literature-in-English in senior secondary school in relationship to gender, years of teaching experience, type of training, class size and number of class(es) taught. For this purpose ANOVA was conducted, using an overall score for teachers' use of teaching methods which was calculated by summing the individual scores for each teaching method listed in Table 2. The descriptive statistics of the differences in teachers' use of teaching methods in relation to demographic and study related variables are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation of Differences in Teaching Methods Teachers Use in Relation to Demographic and Study Related Variables**

| Demographic/Study Related Variables | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| GENDER | | | |
| Male | 26 | 10.68 | 1.38 |
| Female | 86 | 10.07 | 1.15 |
| | | | |
| YEARS OF TEACHING | | | |
| 1 – 5 years | 18 | 10.14 | .72 |
| 6 – 10 years | 23 | 10.04 | 1.33 |
| 11 – 15 years | 38 | 10.23 | 1.39 |
| 16+ years | 33 | 10.36 | 1.23 |
| TYPE OF TRAINING | | | |
| B.A(Ed)/B.Ed English | 67 | 10.30 | 1.42 |
| B.A English | 28 | 10.19 | .96 |
| B.A Arts Subject (e.g. Histroy) | 17 | 10.04 | .79 |
| CLASS SIZE | | | |
| Small | 28 | 10.41 | 1.51 |
| Medium | 81 | 10.17 | 1.14 |
| Fairly Large | 3 | 9.73 | .61 |
| NUMBER OF CLASSES TAUGHT | | | |
| 1 –2 | 35 | 10.50 | 1.62 |
| 3 – 4 | 54 | 10.17 | .91 |
| 5 and Above | 23 | 9.91 | 1.17 |

### Relation to Demographic/Study Related Variables

Table 3 reveals that the means of the males (10.68) is higher than that of the females (10.07). While for teaching experience, teachers who have taught for sixteen (16) years and above have the highest means (10.36) followed by those who have taught for between eleven and fifteen years (10.23). The third in this group was teachers who were new in the system and have not spent more than five (5) years (10.14). The least were teachers who have spent between six and ten years (10.04). In the type of training, the means of teachers who have undergone the B.A(Ed)/B. Ed English language programme is the highest (10.30), followed by those who trained for B.A. English. The least in this group is teachers with Bachelor's degree in other Arts subject (10.04). For the study related variables, underclass size, teachers who have small class size have the highest mean (10.41), this is followed by those with medium class size (10.17), while the least was teachers with fairly large classes (9.73). For the number of classes taught, teachers who teach between one and two classes have the highest mean (10.50), followed by those who teach between three and four classes (10.17). The least are teachers who teach five and above classes (9.91). To determine if the differences in means were significant, multiple Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Table 4 presents the ANOVA results. There were no significant differences in teachers use of teaching methods based on demographic and study related variables.

**Table 4. ANOVA Summary of Differences in Teachers' use of Teaching Methods Based on Demographic and Study Related Variables**

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 24.835[a] | 33 | .753 | .408 | .997 |
| Intercept | 4997.463 | 1 | 4997.463 | 2706.168 | .000 |
| Sex | 2.819 | 1 | 2.819 | 1.527 | .220 |
| Years of Teaching | 4.249 | 3 | 1.416 | .767 | .516 |
| Area of Specialization | .638 | 2 | .319 | .173 | .842 |
| Class Size | 2.004 | 2 | 1.002 | .543 | .583 |
| Number of Classes Taught | .359 | 2 | .179 | .097 | .907 |
| Error | 144.042 | 78 | 1.847 | | |
| Total | 11866.280 | 112 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 168.877 | 111 | | | |
| a. R Squared = .147 (Adjusted R Squared = -.214) | | | | | |

*Gender:*

The F – value for gender in Table 4 is 1.527 with df = (1, 78) significant at .220. This is not significant when tested at 0.05 level of significance. It therefore indicates that the is no significant gender difference in teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English in senior secondary schools in Benin metropolis. As presented in Table 3, the means of male teachers' (M = 10.68) is higher than that of the females (M = 10.07). However, this difference is not significant enough to conclude that male teachers make use of different teaching methods more than the female teachers.

*Years of Teaching:*

The F – value for years of teaching in Table 4 is .767 with df = (3, 78) significant at .516. This is not significant when tested at 0.05 level of significance. It therefore indicates that there is no significant difference in teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English based on years of teaching in senior secondary schools in Benin metropolis.

*Type of Training:*

The F – value for type of training in Table 4 is .173 with df = (2, 78) significant at .842. This is not significant when tested at 0.05 level of significance. It therefore indicates that there is no significant difference in teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English based on type of training in senior secondary schools in Benin metropolis.

*Class Size:*

The F – value for class size in Table 4 is .543 with df = (2, 78) significant at .516. This is not significant when tested at 0.05 level of significance. It therefore indicates that there is no significant difference in teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English based on class size in senior secondary schools in Benin metropolis.

*Number of Classes Taught:*

The F – value for the number of classes taught in Table 4 is .097 with df = (2, 78) significant at .907. This is not significant when tested at 0.05 level of significance. It therefore indicates that there is no significant difference in teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English based on the number of classes taught in senior secondary schools in Benin metropolis. It can therefore be concluded that demographic and study related variables do not have significant difference on teachers' use of teaching methods for Literature-in-English in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The results revealed that the largest class size was 54 students; smallest class size was 25 students, while the mean class size was 45 students. Majority of the teachers taught 3 to 4 classes. This finding to a large extent confirms the fact that students' enrolment for Literature-in-English was on the decline. The results also showed that most teachers spend one or two class periods teaching introductory materials on Shakespeare's drama before the commencement of the teaching of the play. This conforms with Wilson's (1993) view on the need for teachers to introduce students to Shakespeare's works, as without this preparation, students will have difficulty

grasping the growing sophistication with which this 'consummate playwright used his tools' (p. 49).

The analysis revealed that most teachers favoured the use of the strategies listed under the Lecture and Discussion and the Reading the Play methods, which are generally teacher-centred methods. This may be as a result of the fact that the Lecture and Discussion method according to Wilen (2004) closely resembles the natural way of communicating. This endears it to teachers as confirmed by VanDeWeghe (2007). This method makes instruction personal and removes the barrier between the teacher and students. Reading the Play method's popularity with the teachers sampled can be attributed to the use of reading aloud in class that Pierce (1997) asserted is the favourite with majority of teachers. Using these methods all the time would become boring and monotonous.

The findings revealed that Performance and Technology Enhanced Teaching methods were not popular with teachers sampled. These are student-centred methods and are of immense benefits. Studies (Cheng & Winston, 2011; Heller, 2005; Strom, 2011) have revealed that the Performance method enhances virtually all aspects of learning. Dunn (2014) and Shamburg and Craighead (2009) have equally advocated for the use of technology in teaching as students take naturally to new technologies particularly social media. Teachers' non-use of these methods may not be far-fetched as Omans (2003) noted that to enact just a few lines, teachers would require several hours talkless of enacting the full play. As for the use of technology, Robertson and Burton (2016) assert that teachers, especially older ones are put off from using technology and this may be the reason why teachers in this sample used the Technology Enhanced Teaching method the least.

With respect to differences in teachers' use of teaching methods based on demographic and study related variables the findings indicated no significant differences. This shows that the observed differences in the means of the participants based on demographic and study related variables were not significant enough to influence teachers' use of teaching methods.

## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the teaching methods teachers use for Literature-in-English in senior secondary schools in Benin Metropolis. Another important issue was to determine whether there were differences in teachers' use of teaching methods based on demographic and study related variables. Respondents were asked questions relating to teachers' approach to the teaching of Shakespeare's plays and the teaching methods they adopted.

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made, despite the existence of different teaching methods; many teachers still prefer to teach Shakespeare in the "traditional way." That is, students read the play in the class or while at home and either discuss the content, or have the teacher tell them what different passages mean. It can also be concluded that demographic and study related variables do not influence teachers' use of teaching methods for Shakespeare plays.

From the foregoing analyses, discussion and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations emerge. Teachers should be encouraged to use approaches to teaching Shakespeare which incorporate student's performance, and modern technologies. Revamp Literature-in-English pedagogy, especially drama with particular reference to Shakespeare in teacher preparation programmes in the Universities and Colleges of Education in Nigeria. Workshops and seminars should be organised for Literature-in-English teachers to discuss the best approaches, methods and strategies to teach Shakespeare plays. Schools should be provided with ICT facilities for both teachers and students' use. Teachers should also be encouraged to upgrade themselves in the use of technologies in learning, as this will reduce their heavy reliance on traditional teaching methods, which are mainly teacher-centred.

## REFERENCES

Blocksidge, M. (2003). *Shakespeare in education*. London: Continuum.

Boonen, T., Van Damme, J., Onghena, P. (2014). Teacher effects on student achievement in first grade: Which aspects matter most? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(1), 126-152.

Breitsprecher, K.D. (2009). *Is love ever enough: Teaching Shakespeare at the secondary level* Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1473186)

Carey, K. (2004). The real value of teachers: Using new information about teacher effectiveness to close the achievement gap. *The Education Trust: Thinking K-12,* 8(1), 1-42.

Cheng, A., & Winston, J. (2011). Shakespeare as a second language: Playfulness, power and pedagogy in the ESL classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16* (4), 541-556.

Crystal, D. (2003). The language of Shakespeare. In S. Wells & L. Cowen (Eds.), *Shakespeare: An Oxford guide* (pp. 67-78). Oxford: OUP.

Dunn, A. (2014). *Teaching Shakespeare's Macbeth.* Retrieved 25th January 2019 from: www.slideshare.net/alyssadunn543/teaching-shakespearesmacbeth?

Folger Shakespeare Library (2013). *Performance-based teaching.* Retrieved 25th January 2019 from: http://www.folger.edu/template.cfm?cid=2661.

Fong-Yee, D., & Normore, A. H. (2013). *The impact of quality teachers on student achievement.* Paper presented at the 3rd Annual College of Education Research Conference, Miami, FL.

Haddon, J. (2009). *Teaching reading Shakespeare.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Heller, W. (2005). *Teaching Shakespeare in the inner-city fifth-grade classroom using drama-in-education, theatrical production, and technology integration: An action research-based case study.* New York University, Ann Arbor.

Khan, M. S. R. & Alasmari, A. M. (2018). Literary texts in the EFL classrooms: Applications benefits and approaches. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(5), 167-179.

Khatib, M. (2011). Literature in EFL/ESL classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 201-208

Kramsch, C. & Kramsch, O. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *The Modern Language Journal* 84 (1), 553-573.

McEvoy, S. (2003). Shakespeare at 16-19. In M. Blocksidge (Ed.), *Shakespeare in education* (pp. 96-119). London: Continuum

Metzger, M. J. (2002). The villainy you teach me…" Shakespeare and AP English literature. *English Journal,* 92(1), 22-28

O' Hanlon, J. (2008). *Shakespeare's labour must not be lost in schools.* Retrieved 25th January 2019 from: htpp://www.guardian.co.uk.

Omans, S. (2003). Stand up, listen, whisper, whistle, and shout your way to Shakespeare: An approach to a three-dimensional read-through." In S. Omans & M. O'Sullivan (Eds). *Shakespeare plays in the classroom.* (pp. 30-39). Sarasota: Pineapple Press.

Omatseye, B. O. (2007). *The discussion teaching method: An interactive strategy in tertiary learning* Retrieved 25th January 2019 from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_1_128/ai

Robertson, I. & Burton, G. (2016). *A synthesis of Shakespeare teaching method: Technology and performance.* Retrieved 25th January 2019 from: https://scholararchieve.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?

Pierce, R. B. (1997). Teaching the sonnets with performance techniques. In R. E. Salomone & 1. E. Davis (Eds.), *Teaching Shakespeare into the twenty-first century* (pp. 43-49). Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Shamburg, C., & Craighead, C. (2009). Shakespeare, our digital native. *The English Journal*, 99(1), 74–77.

Strom, B. (2011). *The strawberry grows under the nettle" how an integrated performance- based approach to the teaching of Shakespeare at the secondary level affects critical thinking skills as measured by the California critical thinking skills test.* Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.3456085)

Van, T. (2009). The relevance of literary analysis to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 3, 2-9.

VanDeWeghe, R. (2007). Research maters: What kinds of classroom discussion promote reading comprehension? *English Journal,* 96(3), 86-91. Retrieved 10th February 2019 from: http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resjan07/EJ0963Research.pdf

Wilen, W. (2004). Refuting misconceptions about classroom discussion. *The Social Studies* 95 (1), 33–40.

Wilson, R. F. (Jr.) (1993). Toward a teachable Shakespeare syllabus. In J. E. Davis & R. E. Salmone (Eds.), *Teaching Shakespeare today: Practical approaches and productive strategies* (pp. 48-60). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Wood, T. H. (2010). *Teaching Shakespeare in performance: Recent trends and annotated bibliography. Traumatic Stress in Macbeth and Shylock.* Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.3407293)

Yen, A. C. (2010). Our languages clicked: Shakespeare in EFL classes. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(4), 33-50.