

INTERACTING WITH SHAKESPEARE'S FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE  
A PROJECT IN MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT  
FOR THE L2 CLASSROOM

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Education  
of Rhodes University

by

PATRICK LENAHAN

November 1994

## ABSTRACT

This project arises from recent initiatives aimed at transforming Shakespeare studies in South African high schools, so as to make those studies more learner-centred and interactive, as well as a more useful communicative language-learning experience for second-language (L2) students.

It is this interactive methodology that the present project seeks to extend to the relatively neglected area of Shakespeare's figurative language. Drawing on schema theory and response-based approaches to literature teaching, the project shows that figurative language is especially conducive to interactive treatment, whereby students might be encouraged to make sense of metaphors and similes out of their "background knowledge". Guidelines are indicated for putting this into practice in the L2 classroom; and on the basis of these guidelines, materials are developed for an interactive approach to Shakespeare's figurative language. The central phase in this development process involves trying out the materials in five African high schools and then analysing the data collected from them.

The classroom try-outs were profitable in so far as they raised issues that had been overlooked in the earlier, theoretical, stage of the development process. A good overall response to the materials' learner-centred approach was indicated, although students experienced difficulties with certain essential tasks. Most seriously, while the materials were successful in accessing students' background knowledge in the form of associations, they were less successful in getting students to use this knowledge in interpreting metaphors for themselves. Reasons for this feature, and others, are considered and solutions posited. Recommendations for implementing the materials in a larger teaching programme are made.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements . . . . .	i
 <u>CHAPTER I:</u>	
THE CONTEXT AND AIMS OF THE RESEARCH . . . . .	1
 <u>CHAPTER II:</u>	
THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY . . . . .	12
1. R & D: A framework methodology for materials development . . . . .	12
2. Evaluation . . . . .	14
3. Data collection . . . . .	16
3.2. Schools . . . . .	16
3.3. Data type . . . . .	18
3.3.1. Classroom observation . . . . .	18
3.3.2. Judgements . . . . .	19
3.3.3. Students' products . . . . .	20
4. Constraints on the research . . . . .	21
 <u>CHAPTER III:</u>	
INTERACTIVE READING THEORY AND FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN THE L2 SHAKESPEARE CLASSROOM . . . . .	23
1. Interactive reading theory . . . . .	23
2. Figurative language from an interactive reading theory perspective . . . . .	28
3. Guidelines for an interactive approach to Shakespeare's figurative language . . . . .	33
3.1. Metaphor and "schema availability" . . . . .	36
3.2. Metaphor and "schema activation" . . . . .	39
3.3. A "formal" schema for figurative language . . . . .	43
 <u>CHAPTER IV:</u>	
DEVELOPING MATERIALS FOR AN INTERACTIVE APPROACH TO FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (NON-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS) . . . . .	47
Exercise 1: Practising basic associative thinking . . . . .	48
Exercise 2: Using associations to interpret non- figurative language . . . . .	54
Exercise 3: Using associations to interpret everyday figurative language . . . . .	58
Exercise 4: Interacting with figurative language in traditional African poetry . . . . .	66
Exercise 5: Using context clues to interpret figurative language . . . . .	73
Exercise 6: Interacting with figurative language in the poetry network . . . . .	73
Conclusion . . . . .	73

CHAPTER V:

DEVELOPING MATERIALS FOR AN INTERACTIVE APPROACH TO  
FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS) . . . . . 78

Exercise 7: Dealing with culturally familiar  
metaphors in Shakespeare . . . . . 79

Exercise 8: Dealing with culturally unfamiliar  
metaphors in Shakespeare . . . . . 89

Exercise 9: Dealing with extended passages of  
figurative language in Shakespeare . . . . . 98

Exercise 10: Miscellaneous activities with figurative  
language in Shakespeare . . . . . 108

Exercise 11: Performance activities with figurative  
language in Shakespeare . . . . . 111

Conclusion . . . . . 111

CHAPTER VI:

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 115

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 122

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: MATERIALS ON NON-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS . . . . . 127

APPENDIX B: MATERIALS ON SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS . . . . . 139

APPENDIX C: CLASSROOM TRY-OUTS: LESSON PLANS . . . . . 158

APPENDIX D: NOTE FOR TEACHERS . . . . . 160

APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRES . . . . . 161

APPENDIX F: ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO STUDENT  
QUESTIONNAIRES . . . . . 162

### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisors, Sarah Murray and Laurence Wright, as well as Jane Bursey, the editor of the seminal Julius Caesar in the ISEA / Macmillan Communicative Shakespeare series.

In undertaking even so small a piece of field research as this, one incurs considerable debts of gratitude. I wish to thank the following people who helped me in various ways: Elizabeth and John Boje; Molly Brown; Claire and Tim Kerry; Melanie and Jonathan Lancaster; Lusanda Mayikana; Koos Mhlongo; Mr S. Mkhize; Nana Mthimkhulu; Mr S.B. Nkabinde; Julia Rammalo; Froukje Welgens; Annette Wozniak (of USIS); Jackie Zwane.

I also wish to thank the students who so willingly participated in the classroom try-outs.

## CHAPTER I: THE CONTEXT AND AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

Over the last decade there have been significant local developments in the rethinking of Shakespeare teaching and learning in high schools, particularly for second-language (L2) students. Most notable, is the work that has been done under the auspices of the Institute for the Study of English in Africa by Lemmer (1988), which in its turn grew out of a broader ISEA study of literature teaching in black schools by Walters & England (1988). In terms of clarified assumptions and principles, these works have laid the groundwork from which further initiatives can proceed, and in fact are currently proceeding, in the form of editions of Shakespeare plays and study materials. The present project attempts to make a contribution to these initiatives by building on the foundations laid by the ISEA studies.

Two starting assumptions of the present project, in particular, rest on the empirical findings of the ISEA research into the attitudes and experiences of those involved in Shakespeare study in high schools. The first assumption is that Shakespeare will continue to be studied in black high schools for the foreseeable future, and not simply as the result of top-down decision making. There is, of course, a degree of opposition to Shakespeare in the curriculum, fuelled by the undeniable frustration that the networks often cause students. Nevertheless, there is also ample evidence, supplied by Lemmer's investigation (1988; 1993), of an abiding commitment to the idea of studying Shakespeare, and for a great range of reasons: his entertainment value, his prestige, his universal relevance, and so on (Lemmer 1988:48f; 87f). The African teachers and students who hold these views - and they seem to be a clear majority - will not accept the removal of Shakespeare from the syllabus, despite the difficulties involved in studying his work. Such difficulties arise partly from intrinsic features of the plays (language, cultural remoteness, and so on). But it seems they may have even more to do with the way the plays are taught and examined at present, which seems to cause more problems for students than it helps to overcome. This

brings us to the second, and principal, assumption of the present project: that the way Shakespeare is presently taught is seriously misconceived and needs to be changed, so as to make students' experience of Shakespeare less painful than it is and more a vindication of their overwhelming belief in him.

What is wrong, then, with literature teaching in schools, and the teaching of Shakespeare in particular? The short answer, for Walters & England and Lemmer, is precisely that literature is too much taught. Books are reduced to sets of facts, or pre-packaged themes and interpretations, imparted by teachers and memorised by pupils who are otherwise quite passive. In this respect, no doubt, the teaching of literature is simply in line with a general style of teaching, described in Ken Hartshorne's more global account of African education as "typified by authoritarian discipline, dependence upon the security of a single textbook, ... [with] very little time for questions, discussion, active participation ..." (1992:79). It is possible that what, in Hartshorne's view, is a powerful feeling of general insecurity on the part of teachers is heightened in the literature classroom, leading to a particularly strong reluctance to move away from the tried and tested. Thus Walters and England can assert that "literature teaching in black high schools is largely teacher-centred" (1988:291); and when it comes to Shakespeare, they report "an even greater centrality on the teachers' part" - a view supported by Lemmer's more detailed findings in this area (1988:28). Such an approach is partly foisted on teachers by an examination system which values what Lemmer calls "accumulated knowledge about the text" (1988:172-3). But ironically, it is also enforced by students themselves, who have been conditioned by "transmission-style" teaching and so expect everything to be explained to them, including works of fiction. And with Shakespeare, this means requiring from teachers not merely interpretations of a general nature, but also, because of the language, line-by-line exegesis. The result is that, from the level of individual words to that of general themes, there is no point at all at which students are encouraged to make contact

with the work for themselves.

Yet, Walters & England and Lemmer argue, as long as students are permitted to read literature in this way, with little or no imaginative or cognitive engagement, they are not "reading" at all, at least in the sense usually understood by the term. And, in fact, it is upon the clarification of how people do read and make sense of fiction, that the ISEA's revision of literature teaching is based. Underlying the present approach to literature teaching seems to be the assumption that reading involves finding a meaning that is simply inherent in a text, as if - in Lemmer's account of this view - "meaning and interpretation have an objective existence which we can possess (and then be tested on)" (1988:173). On this understanding, it is possible for a teacher or author of a study-guide to read a book "for" others, extracting and conveying its meaning to them. But increasingly this assumption has been rejected by reading theorists in favour of one that views meaning as having much more to do with the subjective experience each reader has with a text, so that sense is not simply found but is "made" by the reader (a suggestive common usage) - not unilaterally, but in co-operation with the text. Active engagement is the essence of profitable and pleasurable reading, and in discouraging pupils from personally engaging with books, current literature teaching denies pleasure and diminishes profit (no matter how much "knowledge" of themes, characters and moral concepts it imparts to pupils). As Walters & England and Lemmer insist, "meaningful learning ... in the literature classroom must include individual interaction with the text", and "if pupils are not given the opportunity to make meaning for themselves through interactive methodological processes, Shakespeare will never be genuinely responded to" (Walters & England 1988:216; Lemmer 1988:48; my emphases).

The model of the reading process which Walters & England believe should influence literature teaching - and which is summed up by the keyword "interactive" - derives from a synthesis of current theories of reading (1988:152-3) that attempt to define what

active engagement in reading involves. Although approaching the reading process from different perspectives, these interactive theories have in common a view of reading as an active and reciprocal relationship between readers and texts, whereby sense is made out of what the readers are able to contribute as much as from what comes out of the text itself. In the non-literary context, schema theory identifies as a key part of readers' contribution the "background" or "world" knowledge (structured in units or "schemata") which readers bring to the text, and to which that text must be matched if it is to be comprehended. For example, a text on the ivory trade will make sense only for the reader who brings to it some background knowledge, say, in the form of an "elephant" schema, a "jewellery" schema and an "ecology" schema. On its own, any text is at most suggestive of meaning rather than itself meaningful, needing the context of each reader's prior knowledge for those suggestions to be realised. And in literary contexts, according to reader-response theory, this realising of suggestions by readers goes on even more richly and intensively, since here it takes place not only on the cognitive level but on the emotional and imaginative levels as well. The text evokes scenes and characters, implies meanings and elicits reactions; but for its fulfilment all this requires a responsive reader, to fill out and embody the characters and scenes in the mind's eye, to infer, judge, question, sympathise (Walters & England 1988:164-5). And these responses to the text are shaped and informed by each reader's myriad of experiences, memories, information and preconceptions about the world - bringing us back to that "background knowledge" posited by schema theory. It is partly from all this reader input - some of it shared by communities of readers but much of it highly individual - that sense is made of texts by each reader.

It is not the intention of Walters & England - and less so of the present, more limited, project - to explore in detail the reader's role in fiction, as debated in current literary theory. Rather, the issue is in what way this broad conception of the reading process might influence our approach to the teaching of

fiction. For Walters & England and Lemmer, it would involve making the methodology more learner-centred: students should be encouraged to respond to a book using their own experiences, and in this way make sense of that book for themselves, rather than have it explained to them on the basis of the teacher's (or someone else's) responsive engagement. For guidelines on how such responses might be encouraged, Walters & England and Lemmer draw extensively on the work of "response-based" methodologists such as Rosenblatt (1938; 1978) and Protherough (1983), who have developed strategies for fostering in classrooms the kind of creative responses that commonly go on all the time in the non-academic reading of fiction. At the same time, however, Walters & England recognise that these response-based approaches have been developed with first-language pupils in mind. When it comes to the L2 literature classroom, there is often not the kind of background knowledge or experience that is needed to ensure pupils' interaction with books or to inform their responses. It is here, as Walters & England suggest, that we can make use of the pedagogically-oriented work of schema theorists such as Carrell (1984a; 1988) who suggest methods for overcoming problems that L2 learners generally have with the background knowledge or schemata needed in reading English texts.

Because there are methods in schema theory for handling the problems of L2 students in this respect, Walters & England do not accept that a more student-centred, response-based approach to the study of literature is inappropriate in African high schools. Conversely, basic language problems should not be used as a justification for keeping up a teacher-centred, transmission style of literature instruction. What Walters & England explicitly recommend (1988:183-4) is a realistic solution, integrating the response-based approach with an application of schema theory, in a methodology for the literature classroom "which would take account of the difficulties inherent in the teaching of second- and foreign-language reading without ignoring the importance of the individual reader's response to the text and the development of that response". And it is within the

framework of this methodology - discussed in more detail in later chapters - that the present study has been conceived, as part of a wider effort to develop an interactive approach to the study of Shakespeare in the L2 literature classroom.

\*

Applying the interactive method in the teaching of Shakespeare is perhaps easier than it might be in other parts of the traditional curriculum, because there already exists a congenial tradition of encouraging personal involvement in the plays. As early as the eighteenth century, Dr Johnson was recommending that the inexperienced reader of Shakespeare "who desires to feel the highest pleasure that the drama can give" should ignore outside aids and the explanatory notes of editors, and simply throw himself into the work: "when his attention is strongly engaged, let it disdain alike to turn aside to the name of Theobald and of Pope....let him preserve his comprehension of the dialogue and his interest in the fable" (in Raleigh 1908:61-2). Johnson was relying on the sheer appeal of the stories in Shakespeare to involve the reader; but in the more recent past it has been the potential of the works as drama that interactive methodologists have focussed on. In the 1970s this took the form of the performance-based approach, or "play way", which engaged pupils in the plays in the most physical way, by making them enact the characters and thus literally bring them to life off the page. Such performance-based ideas became de rigueur in the 1980s and continue to influence overseas Shakespeare methodology, although they do so now in a more flexible way (Cohen 1990). In a recent account of the new approach in America, it is reported that "teachers encourage active student involvement in different ways.... One should not merely explain the plays; one must experience the plays. And how one experiences them can assume a variety of forms" (Holmes 1990:187). And in fact a wide range of just such pupil-centred approaches to Shakespeare is currently being developed and used in Britain, for example, under the auspices of the "Shakespeare and Schools Project" which has been

directly influenced by "interactive", response-based methodology. While making clear the "active" and "collaborative" aspects of its methods, the Project stresses that its main aim is "enhancing the quality of pupils' personal response to the plays" (Gibson 1989:3). And the materials that have grown out of this research (in the form of the Cambridge School Shakespeare editions) are full of suggestions and activities which encourage precisely this kind of personal response from pupils as the primary way of making sense of the works, "rather than having someone else's interpretation handed down to [them]" (Seward 1992: Preface).

It is along very similar lines that materials for a reformed approach to Shakespeare teaching in South African schools have begun to be developed - at once in touch with these overseas initiatives and also aware of local conditions and the needs of South African pupils and teachers (Lemmer 1988). Crucially, there has begun to emerge from the ISEA a series of editions of plays which put the new methods into practice in the Shakespeare classroom (Wright 1987; Bursey 1992; Wright & Bursey 1994). Among their key features is the down-playing of anything that might overly encourage a transmission-style, teacher-centred approach to such aspects as the plays' historical background, themes and characterisation. Rather, the editions encourage pupils to make sense of the play for themselves, through the extensive use of questions that elicit and sharpen pupils' responses while leaving interpretation open to individual variation. At the same time, the editors recognise that if such ideas and responses are produced it will have to be not so much out of an abstract or intellectual engagement with the play, as a personal identification with characters and events; and hence they seek, in their own words, to "encourage imaginative interaction with the text in relation to the students' own life-worlds" (Bursey 1992: Preface). In line with this, pupils' "world knowledge" and experience, of whatever cultural provenance, is foregrounded by various activities, in order to serve as the familiar context in which sense can be made individually by students in multi-cultural classrooms. Students feed their own lives into the

plays, and the plays into their lives, in order to generate their own tentative opinions, preferences and interpretations concerning the characters and their predicaments, instead of having meanings handed out to them which are remote, authoritative and final.

The principle of not giving explanations, but getting students to work them out using their own ideas could, however, be extended to areas of the Shakespeare text other than character and situation. On the lexical level, the present ISEA editions hand out meanings of unfamiliar words and phrases along traditional lines, and they do this quite deliberately (Wright & Bursey 1991:52). It may be argued that they are taking into account the linguistic limitations of L2 students (as Walters & England advise), and decoding words for them so as to facilitate interactive reading of larger aspects of the play - character, plot, etc. And yet, specific attention to language need not be totally excluded from the general interaction, by means of which pupils make their own meanings. Although not suitable at every stage of the reading, there may be opportunities when the detail of language might also be treated interactively, and not simply decoded for students. Is it not possible, indeed, that some kinds of language resist such simple decoding, since not all words may have fixed or objectively established referents, any more than characters or situations in a play have fixed interpretations?

From the post-structuralist point of view, of course, no aspect of language is fixed in a stable system of one-to-one correspondences between signifiers and signifieds: language is instead, in Eagleton's account of the view, "a sprawling limitless web where there is a constant interchange and circulation of elements, where none of the elements is absolutely definable". Eagleton goes on to say that this view "strikes a serious blow at certain traditional theories of meaning" (1983:129). But even traditional theories of meaning (to which the present project for the most part adheres) readily accept the semantic indeterminacy of some kinds of language use. And the

most obvious example is the use of connotative meaning in figurative language. Because connotations are not fixed, but vary from individual to individual, figurative language has always been recognised as open, variable and far from "absolutely definable", since it is influenced by the contexts in which it is read and who is reading it. Readers draw on the connotations, or associations, that certain words have for them (through the experience and memories that make up their "world knowledge" or "schemata") and it is by feeding these aspects of themselves into the work, that readers make sense of the figurative language. It is possible, therefore, that in figurative language we have a small-scale version of what goes on in the interactive reading of character and situation, which also requires personal input from readers to be grasped. If this is the case, it may also be true that metaphor and simile could be treated in an appropriate way, and opened up to the kind of individual responsiveness that is the hallmark of the ISEA's interactive and multi-cultural approach. There are doubtless aspects of the plays that are best treated according to the transmission mode; but to use that mode here may be unnecessary if there really is opportunity for something quite different.

It is the aim of this study to investigate the possibility of expanding the interactive approach to Shakespeare one relatively small stage further, so that it covers an aspect of the plays that is still under the sway of the old transmission approach which explains the literal meaning of metaphors and similes for students, rather than requiring them to come up with their own interpretations. This aspect of figurative language is a minor one in comparison with the large areas already dealt with interactively in the ISEA's pioneering work; but it is still an important aspect. Lemmer's study of the problems students experience with Shakespeare singles out figurative language (1988:86), and Walters & England specifically indicate as a literary subskill needing attention, "understanding information conveyed through figurative language" (1988:295). But as might be expected from Walters & England, their reference to figurative

language is directly subsumed under the general recommendation that "all approaches which foster pupils' active engagement with the text [are] to be encouraged". (1988:295). The question confronted in this study is whether these things can be brought together, so that Shakespeare's figurative language is dealt with in a way that "actively engages" pupils in the interpretation of that language. To what extent are metaphor and simile in themselves, conducive to interactive treatment, employing learners' background knowledge or schemata? Do Shakespeare's metaphors entail special problems for L2 students that might hamper an interactive treatment of them? If so could these difficulties be sorted out by following the suggestions of Walters & England and using the reading strategies developed by pedagogic schema theory? At the same time as tackling these issues, however, it is noted that the project is not altogether unique in exploring the possibility of more learner-centred approaches to figurative language. Valuable materials on figurative language are to be found in the Cambridge School Shakespeare Series, although these are mainly aimed at first-language students. Another resource in this area, and one more specifically aimed at L2 learners, are the ELTIC manuals that are produced locally and which contain some (limited) materials on Shakespeare's figurative language (1990a:13-14). But in other respects their emphases, too, are substantially different from those of the present project, which are reflected in the set of questions posed above.

Questions of this general and theoretical nature will be addressed in Chapter III of this study which attempts to bring together figurative language and interactive reading theory. Drawing on the findings discussed there, the study then takes the matter to a more practical level, and in Chapters IV and V discusses the development, through a process of trial and revision, of learning materials that apply an interactive method to the figurative language in Shakespeare. Such materials exemplify what might be an additional resource for the interactive teaching of Shakespeare in general. The present

project does not explore the further issue of how such a resource might be integrated with larger teaching programmes and teaching editions. In the project the materials are developed in isolation: could room be made for them amongst the other priorities of such programmes or editions, and if so in what ways? Questions about implementation are important, and are in fact briefly raised at the end of the project (Chapter-VI), which seems their appropriate place. For they properly arise only after the approach itself has been considered, in itself and on its own merits, with other considerations for the moment set aside. The present project attempts to give just such a preliminary, narrowly focused consideration of figurative language as suitable material for an interactive approach, with special reference to the study of Shakespeare.

## CHAPTER II: THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. R & D: A framework methodology for materials development

From the investigations by Walters & England (1988) and Lemmer (1988) cited in the last chapter, there stem a set of general recommendations for a response-based, interactive approach to the teaching of literature in secondary schools. These are informed by the literature of interactive reading theory and response-based teaching methodology developed overseas in the last few decades. Following the recommendations of Walters & England and Lemmer, and drawing on the same body of theory and methodology, the present research aims to develop for the L2 Shakespeare classroom a set of study materials that extends the interactive approach to figurative language.

Materials development, as Borg & Gall point out (1983:772), differs from most other kinds of educational research, where the aim is either "to discover new knowledge (through basic research) or to answer specific questions about practical problems (through applied research)". While being of the greatest value, "basic" and "applied" research have their limitations: most notably, they have little directly to do with the production of materials that may have a practical impact on education, and hence are "generally poor methodologies for developing new products" (Borg & Gall 1983:772). Yet there is another branch of research that makes new materials development its central concern; in Borg & Gall's summary (1983:773), it "takes the findings generated by basic and applied research and uses them to build tested products that are ready for operational use in the schools". This is educational research and development (R & D), and it provides the methodology for materials development that will be used in this project. (On educational R & D, see also Gay 1987:8. For a more critical view, which stresses the origins of R & D in science and technology and the problems inherent in transferring a methodology from that field to the social sciences, see Husen 1988:173, 176-7.)

Essentially, educational R & D is a process through which materials are developed and evaluated, step-by-step. The steps in the developmental process are reasonably well-established, and are broadly outlined by Borg & Gall (1988:772) as follows:

studying research findings pertinent to the product to be developed, developing the product based on these findings, field testing it in the setting where it will be used eventually, and revising it to correct the deficiencies found in the field-testing stage.

Although in institutional and large-scale development programmes, the R & D process can involve multiple field test and evaluation cycles ("preliminary", "main" and "operational" field testing), such elaboration is not essential to R & D methodology, which makes allowance for small-scale applications. Thus Borg & Gall stress that, where research goals and resources are limited, it is permissible to "limit development to just a few steps of the R & D cycle" (1988:792). What this means in effect is that, in addition to the literature survey and initial materials production, the process may consist of a single field test and evaluation cycle.

The present undertaking, to produce materials for an interactive reading of figurative language, comprises just such a limited R & D programme, that may be outlined in the following way. Step 1 is a survey of theory and research in the fields of figurative language and interactive reading instruction, which is used as the basis for the development, in Step 2, of pilot materials that apply interactive strategies to the figurative language in Julius Caesar, the DET Shakespeare network (1993). Step 3 of the process involves trying out these materials over a number of lessons, from which data is collected. Step 4 involves the evaluation of the materials on the basis of this analysed data.

In Borg & Gall's terms, therefore, the process of trial and evaluation in this project is restricted to the "preliminary field test". This needs to be stressed, because it carries with

it implications with regard to what kind of materials evaluation is undertaken in this project (and, just as importantly, what kind is not), as well as what kind of instrumentation is used in the field test.

## 2. Evaluation

Evaluation is central in educational R & D, not only because materials have to be validated through field tests, but because it is principally by means of evaluative feedback that the materials are developed at all, through trial and revision. For this reason there is substantial overlap, in methodology, between R & D and evaluation research, "although evaluation is also used for other purposes in education" (Borg & Gall 1983:773). In line with evaluation methodology in general (Scriven 1966), educational materials evaluation indicates different roles for evaluation at different stages of the development process (Lewy 1977:29): the two main roles are commonly known as summative and formative evaluation. Whereas summative evaluation is made at the end of the process, when the materials are fully developed and have to be judged, usually by independent evaluators, formative evaluation is an integral part of the on-going development process where "evaluative data can be used by developers to 'form' and modify the program .... In fact, during the program development process, some members of the team may perform a dual function, being both developers and [formative] evaluators" (Borg & Gall 1983:758).

It is generally agreed that formative evaluation is most appropriate at the stage of the development process called the "preliminary field test" by Borg & Gall (1983:758), or "try-out" (as opposed to the large-scale "field test") by Lewy (1977:29). And because the present project is limited to that stage, it is purely in this formative role that its evaluation is carried out. The materials to be tried out in classrooms are drawn up in the first stage of development largely on the basis of theoretical input and untested assumptions about pupils and their responses; it is the purpose of the formative evaluation of classroom

feedback to adjust the materials in the light of practical insights provided by the try-outs. Thus the evaluation is simply another facet of the development. (For this reason, the write-up of Stages 2, 3 and 4 is conflated into a single account of the development process which combines original design, classroom trial and formative evaluation/revision as aspects of the same process.) Because of the limitations of this R & D project, no final or objective judgement of the materials developed in this project is offered.

At the same time, it is recognised that formative evaluation involves some implicit judgement regarding the success or otherwise of the materials - even if such judgement is only part of the process of revision, rather than an end in itself. What underlies such judgements needs to be made reasonably clear, in terms of "success criteria" and "performance indicators", though evaluation methodology does not prescribe their form: they "may be specified in a fairly 'soft' or subjective way", rather than in "hard" or quantitative terms (Aspinwall et al. 1992:139 ff). In the present project it is the former that is opted for as the more fitting. The chief "success criterion" used in evaluating the materials developed in this project is whether they achieve the purpose for which they are designed - which may in very general terms be expressed here as the fostering of an interactive reading of figurative language. However, it seems more appropriate for the project to specify the purpose of each exercise separately in the write-up of the development process. It is then against these specific statements of purpose that the students' performances of the exercises are analysed to see to what extent the exercises succeed (i.e. achieve their purpose), and in so far as they do not, to consider why not, and how the materials might be improved. The "performance indicators" used to establish this are the details of the students' responses to the exercises. Once again, the different exercises expect slightly different responses which are specified in the write-up; but there are certain general indicators: how fully and actively students understand the tasks and participate in them, how richly

and appropriately they access their background knowledge, and how they use that knowledge to make sense of the language for themselves. The way in which this performance is gauged in the classroom try-outs is dealt with next.

### 3. Data collection

The method of data collection for the evaluation stage of any R & D cycle depends on the nature of that evaluation, since the formative and summative types differ significantly (Borg & Gall 1983:759). In summative evaluation data is collected with standardised instruments having validity and reliability, and research control and generalisability of results are included in the project design. In formative evaluation, however, these "are not major concerns" (Borg & Gall 1983:759), although the methods for collecting data in the try-out stage are nonetheless clearly stipulated, and it is these that are followed in the present project, as indicated below.

#### 3.1. Schools

Following the recommendation of educational R & D methodology that only a very limited number of schools be used in the try-out stage (Lewy 1977:18; Borg & Gall 1983:775), five schools were selected for this project. No claim is made as to the representativeness of this sample, but it does reflect something of the range of high schools operating under the DET. (On the necessity for this variety in try-outs, see Lewy 1977:18; Borg & Gall 1983:782.) For purposes of research anonymity, the names of these schools have been withheld; the following designations are used throughout the write-up.

\* SCHOOL N is a large high school in an urban township in the PWV, with an average matric record for DET schools. The classes contain roughly 40 students; the English teacher has studied at post-graduate level, and is actively involved in innovative teaching projects.

\* SCHOOL O is an over-crowded rural school in the Drakensberg foothills, in KwaZulu-Natal; it has a below-average matric

record, mainly for socio-economic reasons beyond the control of its highly-motivated Principal. Each class contains roughly 60 students; the English teacher has not been involved in any projects or research beyond his basic professional training.

\* SCHOOL R is a large but well-equipped and highly efficient school also situated in rural KwaZulu-Natal; it has an above-average matric record. The classes contain roughly 40 students; the English teacher is the Principal, who is a dynamic administrator though he has not undertaken post-graduate study or specific English-teaching initiatives.

\* SCHOOL W is a private "community" school in a formerly white suburb in the PWV; it has an entirely African student body, and follows the DET curriculum. Each class contains roughly 30 students; the two English teachers are young and motivated, one of them having travelled to the USA on a USIS-sponsored study trip.

\* SCHOOL Y is in fact a class in the "outreach" programme of a private school in the PWV, which takes above-average Std 10 students from township schools and supplies enrichment tuition after hours, in groups of about 25, using the staff and equipment of the host-school. (This last venue for the try-outs was chosen as a substitute for SCHOOL Z, a large, and at the time somewhat troubled township school in the PWV, which had to withdraw at the last minute - see p.21.)

The sample of schools thus includes a variety of urban, rural, government and private schools of differing standards. The total number of pupils involved in the try-out was approximately 230.

Six teachers were involved in the try-outs. Walters & England, in the report of their classroom research into literature study in black high schools, recommend with hindsight that effort be made to provide "opportunities for building up working relationships with the teachers which could be based on greater personal trust" (1988:76-7). In an attempt to follow this advice, relations were established with the teachers some months before the actual try-outs; several visits were made to the schools,

to discuss new approaches to the teaching of Shakespeare and introduce teachers to the ISEA edition of Julius Caesar. Copies of this edition were given to the teachers, for their own general benefit, but also because that edition follows the principles which inform the materials developed in the present project; it was hoped that if the ISEA edition was used by the teachers they might establish in the classes a familiarity with learner-centred approaches and group work that would facilitate the try-outs held later in the year. The teachers' response was enthusiastic, and in one case a workshop on the ISEA edition was organised by the teachers from Schools Q and R, so that other teachers in the rural district might benefit (some feedback from this workshop on the materials developed in this project is included in the following chapters). Equally on the teachers' initiative, sessions were arranged in the schools for pupils to raise and discuss their general problems with the Shakespeare network. These did not have a direct bearing on the research, and, narrowly viewed, actually interfered with the try-out programme; but they were valued as a chance, not only to give something back to the pupils and teachers who were assisting in the research, but also to integrate the research project more closely into the working life of the schools, as the teachers themselves saw fit.

### 3.2. Data type

R & D methodology indicates the use of a variety of data types in classroom try-outs. Lewy (1977:21) lists the three most common types as observational evidence, judgmental evidence and student's products; these closely correspond to the types specified by Cohen & Manion under "multi-method approaches" (1989:281 ff). In the present research, all three were used.

3.2.1. Classroom observation. A combination of participant and non-participant observation was undertaken. Generally, where the materials were tried out with the same class over two days, the researcher taught the first lesson, in order to get as "close" as possible to the materials in action and to the pupils' responses. In subsequent lessons, the teacher took over, and the

researcher observed. (Teachers were prepared for their turns at teaching the materials by prior discussions with the researcher, as well as by a printed explanation of the rationale and methodology of the materials. This is included in Appendix D.) For the participant observation, audio-recording was used and transcriptions made, and notes were made immediately after the lesson. During non-participant observation, in addition to these techniques, notes were made during the lesson, and transcriptions made of the chalkboard. All this material is used in the analysis of the classroom performance.

One further feature needs to be stressed. Regardless of who was teaching, each lesson was roughly divided into two parts, the first consisting of oral interaction between the teachers and pupils using the materials, and the second of group work centred on the materials, in which the teacher played a peripheral role. Most of the observational evidence (both participant and non-participant) records the first part of each lesson, since in the second part the researcher was reluctant to intrude too closely on the group discussions for fear of inhibiting pupils. Only general impressions of group work were recorded, focussing on individuals' participation in discussion, hints from behaviour as to students' attitude to the tasks (boredom, distraction, engagement), signs of puzzlement, requests for assistance. (More extensive data from group discussions fall under the third data type, students' products: see 3.2.3.)

3.2.2. Judgements. Direct feedback on the materials was sought from a variety of sources, following the guidelines in Lewy who recommends eliciting the opinion of "experts" as well as "the consumers or would-be consumers of the program" (1977:26, 88 ff). Very informally, and before the materials were tried out in classrooms, responses were elicited from Ms Jane Bursey and Professor Laurence Wright of the ISEA, who have developed editions of Shakespeare's plays that are based on precisely the interactive principles that inform the materials developed in this research. More formally, opinions were elicited from the

teachers participating in the classroom try-outs, by means of "research journals" in which they were requested to note down their responses to seeing the materials taught by the researcher as well as to teaching the materials themselves. They were also given an open-ended questionnaire which sought to direct their attention to certain aspects of the materials-in-action that particularly concerned the researcher. (This questionnaire is included in Appendix E.) Finally, the pupils themselves were asked to fill in very brief open-ended questionnaires at the close of the final lesson, focusing on their interaction with the materials. (This questionnaire is included in Appendix E.)

It is noted, however, that Borg & Gall caution against placing too much stress on such feedback in materials evaluation, as respondents tend to be over-generous, and their comments can be misleading as a result (1983:782-3). Since the main purpose of this data, as with all the other types in the try-out stage, is to get insight into the practical deficiencies of the materials, a point was made in this project of stressing to the respondents the desirability of critical feedback (pupils were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality). It is following from this, and with the caution recommended by Borg & Gall, that such feedback has been used in evaluations in the present project.

3.2.3. Students' products. These are regarded as the most significant data produced in the classroom try-outs in this project, upon which much of the analysis, evaluation and materials revision was centred. Student's products took the form of work-sheets based on the materials designed in the initial stages of the project. In that part of every lesson given up to group work, each group was given a work-sheet which required the pupils to work collectively on a task and use the ideas they generated to answer questions. Each group elected its own "scribe" to write down the answers arrived at by the group as a whole. These completed work-sheets were collected at the end of each exercise. The advantage of this arrangement was, firstly, that students could be left to work on their own, without the

inhibiting influence of teacher or researcher - and yet there remained a record of their discussion afterwards in the form of the work-sheet. Secondly, a substantial amount of written work was produced from which to draw conclusions about the materials - without that amount becoming unmanageably large, as it might if every single pupil had completed a work-sheet.

#### 4. Constraints on the research

As originally conceived, the overall design of the try-out stage of the R & D process undertaken by this project may be summarised as follows. In each of five DET high schools, the pilot materials would be used in a Std 10 class over three consecutive double periods. In each case, the first lesson would be taught by the researcher and the remaining lessons by the teacher. Each lesson would be roughly divided between oral teacher/student interaction in the first part, and in the second (longer) part, group discussion based on work-sheets.

In the event, however, this design was not scrupulously adhered to. At precisely the time when the try-outs were scheduled to commence in schools in the PWV area (in late April, 1993) the political situation deteriorated following the assassination of Chris Hani. The disruption that this caused in schools was subsequently exacerbated by the events of May: protests over the payment of matric exam fees, the Sadtu strike, and stayaways organised by Cosas. On the Reef, school attendance dropped to negligible figures amid warnings that the crisis in education had brought the country "to the brink of a bloody replay of the turmoil which gripped the country during the mid-1970s and 1980s" (Weekly Mail, May 7-13, 1993).

In the general context of such disruption, the original research design could not avoid being disrupted itself. As mentioned above, School Z had to be excluded - on the advice of the teacher there who could not guarantee the safety of the researcher. (The teacher did however volunteer to try out the materials on her own, and in fact later sent her observations and students'

products to the researcher). The replacement that was found for this school at short notice (School Y) was in many respects not ideal, since the class did not have a regular teacher who could be observed using the materials. The element of inconsistency which this introduced into the try-outs became a feature across the schools. Because of the stayaways and general class disruption, teachers found themselves behind in their own schedules, and so were not able to give up the three double periods originally envisaged for the try-outs in each school. At most, two double periods were actually given, and in two schools only one double period was given; here the teachers took the class, precluding the possibility of participant observation, while in yet other schools there was no non-participant observation. (For details of the lessons, see Appendix C.)

As they were undertaken, then, considerable discrepancies characterised the try-outs: conditions in which the data were gathered could not be kept uniform from school to school and neither could the instruments. And because of the reduction in the amount of time permitted by the teachers, the thoroughness of the trials was undermined. As planned, they would have covered all the materials developed in the initial stages of the R & D process, with each unit being tried out more than once, in different schools. In the event, some materials were not tried out at all (these are indicated in the Appendices); and others were tried out only in a very limited way. These constraining factors, which were largely beyond the researcher's control, are nevertheless recorded so that they can be taken into account in the overall interpretation of the results of the try-outs.

### CHAPTER III: INTERACTIVE READING THEORY AND FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN THE L2 SHAKESPEARE CLASSROOM

As the first stage in the process of developing materials for an interactive approach to figurative language, this chapter attempts to establish, on a theoretical level, the relevance to figurative language of the interactive reading model posited by schema theorists and response-based methodologists alike. Then, using the guidelines for interactive reading instruction supplied by these theorists and methodologists, broad suggestions are made about ways of encouraging an interactive reading of figurative language in the L2 Shakespeare classroom. These suggestions form the theoretical basis for the materials actually devised and tried out in classrooms - as reported in the following chapters.

#### 1. Interactive reading theory

Reading research over the last two decades, initially in first language contexts but subsequently extended to ESL, has radically changed the way we understand the process of reading and comprehension. Traditionally, reading has been thought of as a linguistic process of recognising words and piecing together the meaning encoded in them. In this view, efficient reading boils down to simple language proficiency; and conversely, as Carrell and Eisterhold point out, "failures to comprehend ... are always attributed to language-specific deficits - perhaps a word was not in the reader's vocabulary, a rule of grammar was misapplied ..." (1988:73). It is now widely accepted, however, that this language-based model inadequately represents what is in fact a much more complex process. The process does indeed involve lower-order linguistic decoding, but only in conjunction with higher-order non-linguistic input from readers. This two-part process is summarised by Carrell:

Top-down processing is the making of predictions about the text based on prior experience or background knowledge, and then checking the text for confirmation or refutation of those predictions. Bottom-up processing is decoding individual linguistic units (e.g. phonemes, graphemes, words) and building textual meaning from the

smallest units to the largest, and then modifying pre-existing background knowledge and current predictions on the basis of information encountered in the text.

A key tenet of the cognitive model of reading is that "the most efficient processing of text is interactive - a combination of top-down and bottom-up processing modes" (Carrell 1988a:101).

Within the general framework of this interactive model, however, it is really the recognition given to top-down processing that has done most to change the approach to reading instruction. Carrell has called its impact on L2 classrooms "profound", and Eskey refers to the "'top-down' revolution" as having resulted in "major improvements in both our understanding of what good and many not so good readers do, and in the methods and materials that we now employ" (Carrell et al 1988:4; Eskey 1988: 93). Central to all these is the importance attached to readers' contribution to the reading process in the form of their background knowledge. Without underestimating the role of linguistic skills (especially in L2 contexts), theorists have stressed the "pervasiveness" and "power" of this extra-textual element in understanding texts (Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:75). "More information is contributed by the reader" according to Clarke and Silberstein "than by the print on the page" (1977: 136). In relation to any one item given on the page, the reader has to supply a whole dense context of prior background knowledge in order to make sense of that item. A text is never totally complete in itself, or totally self-explanatory: just enough is given to enable the reader to fill in the gaps, to infer the fuller but unwritten meaning. In the words of Carrell and Eisterhold, "a text only provides directions for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their own previously acquired knowledge" (1988:74). If this is not there, to be "directed" by the text, then, no matter how efficient the decoding, little sense will be made of the text. From the perspective of schema theory, therefore, reading is "interactive" not simply in its combination of bottom-up and top-down processing modes, but, in a further sense, because it

involves a give-and-take relationship between the reader and the text: what readers get out of a text is commensurate with what they bring to it, in terms of this prior knowledge.

Schema theory, however, does not merely assert the importance of the reader's background knowledge in reading, but has given a reasonably detailed model of that knowledge. Principally, schema theory gives structure to the concept of background knowledge by showing it not as an amorphous mass, but organised or "parcelled" into schemata, which may in their turn contain sub-schemata (Rumelhart in Spiro 1980:34,37). Everything we know is grouped under one or other schema. By the same token, the background knowledge a reader is required to have in order to grasp a given text can be contained and identified as a limited number of schemata. So the concept of schemata allows us to think more precisely about the background knowledge involved in any reading, and thus (as instructors) to insure that readers are equipped with the knowledge that a text may require (an aspect particularly pertinent to L2 contexts, to be dealt with later).

But what, more precisely, is the "everything we know" that schemata parcel in this way: what is background knowledge? In the definitions offered by schema theory, it is usually the conceptual that is emphasised: the mass of information that readers gradually accumulate and apply in their readings. Thus, for Rumelhart, schemata represent "our knowledge about all concepts: those underlying objects, situations, events, sequences of events, actions .." (1980:34). Along with this, schema theory does recognise a subjective element as making up readers' schemata: not only facts, but "attitudes and beliefs" (Clarke & Silberstein 1977:137). On the whole, however, it is not to schema theorists that we must look for treatment of this aspect, but rather to like-minded theorists of literary reading who have, perhaps inevitably, tended to focus more closely on the non-cognitive element in the reader's "background knowledge". Echoing schema theorists, a leader in the field of pedagogic reader-response theory, Louise Rosenblatt, can thus state that "the

finding of meaning involves both the author's text and what the reader brings to it" (1978:14) - but what it is that is "brought" to the text is seen as predominantly affective: "the reader brings to the work personality traits, memories of past events, present needs and preoccupations ..." (1938: 30). Such accounts can become somewhat vague and impressionistic, in contrast to those of schema theory: Rosenblatt refers to the reader's input as "the stream of his life", his or her "life-material" (1938:11; 121). But this is perhaps only the result of an effort to express the diverse totality of what makes up the reader's share so that it does not seem as limited as the rather misleadingly labelled "background knowledge" implies. By stressing the subjective and experiential alongside the more factual, the literary perspective helps to expand and deepen our sense of the contents of schemata, and of what it is - especially in literary reading - that readers need to contribute (and teachers to encourage) as the readers' share of a fruitful interaction with the text itself.

No matter how rich and vital the reader's background knowledge is, however, it is only in close co-operation with the details of the text itself that it has any role in the reading process, as it is conceived by both schema theory and response-based literature methodologists. In schema theory it is the text that triggers the schemata and it is against the details of the text that the reader's input is constantly checked, as the bottom-up (or "text-based") aspect of the reading process (Carrell 1988a:101). And similarly for Rosenblatt, dealing with literary reading, no matter how vital the contribution from the reader is, it is dependent on the detail of the text: "the text is a stimulus activating elements of the reader's past experience ... [and] a guide for the selecting, rejecting and ordering of what is being called forth" (1978:11). If anything, Rosenblatt's whole conception of interactive literary reading is angled from the perspective of the text, rather than from the background knowledge. For the dense mass of ideas, memories, information (schematic knowledge) that readers bring with them are, for Rosenblatt, clustered around the words themselves - are

essentially word-associations. Such associations or units of background knowledge tied to specific words develop out of all the past encounters the reader has had with those words "in life situations and in reading" (Rosenblatt 1978:53). And these associations are both of the widely shared or "public" variety, as well as those of more private significance: "there will be a common reference for 'home'," Rosenblatt maintains, "but the individual will have learned this in specific life-situations and in specific verbal contexts ... [and] hence the general usage will be embedded for each in a personal matrix" (1978:53). (On the problems that such a view of word-based background knowledge might imply for L2 readers, see p.40.)

Thus, the text is at the centre of the reading process: attention to linguistic detail is what sets everything off and keeps it going, not merely through basic decoding, but through the chain of associations that the decoding itself triggers, leading to a "more than literal understanding of the individual words" (Rosenblatt 1978:88). Literary reading involves more than a decoding of denotative meanings: it involves the "personal matrix" with which words have become associated in the mind of the reader: it is only through the "top-down" application of this matrix that the fullest sense of texts can be grasped by the reader. And, finally, that these associations or connotations have less to do with basic linguistic knowledge than with each reader's life knowledge is emphasised by the semanticist, Geoffery Leech, in his treatment of connotative meaning which is strikingly close to the views of reading focused on in the foregoing.

For Leech, connotations, unlike denotative meanings, are not fixed but vary considerably, "according to culture, historical period and the experience of the individual"; they derive from specific life-situations and develop as part of a particular world-view (1974:15). Thus, he insists, "in talking about connotations, [one is] in fact talking about the 'real world' experience one associates with an expression when one uses or

hears it". "The boundary between conceptual and connotative meaning," he suggests, "is concomitant with that nebulous but crucial boundary between 'language' and the 'real world'" (1974:15). In making sense of the connotative meaning of language, readers use what Leech calls their "knowledge of the 'real world'" (1974:9) - just as, in the view of schema theory, readers employ their world knowledge or schemata in the top-down processing of text. In fact, even if such top-down processing is going on in all reading, as schema theory maintains, it is in connotative interpretation that we find perhaps its most easily recognisable case - in which from common experience we accept that in order to make sense of a text we need to supply, not simply dictionary definitions for words, but associations from our own "real world knowledge", or schemata.

## 2. Figurative language from an interactive theory perspective

If "reading by connotations" is a particularly vivid instance of the importance of background knowledge, then such reading is perhaps most obvious where connotations are used most intensively - in figurative language. Here connotations are used not simply to supply additional dimensions to what may make adequate sense on a literal level, but as the only way of making any sense at all. A reading that restricts us to what is literally on the page in a metaphor such as "man is a wolf" is clearly inadequate. As Winifred Nowotny says of metaphor, echoing schema theory, the words on the page are merely "a set of linguistic directions for supplying the sense of an unwritten literal term"; and extending the parallel with the interactive reading model, she makes it clear where the source of that meaning lies: "the reader pieces out the metaphor by something supplied or constructed from his own experience" (1962:59; my emphasis). The "something" supplied by readers is of course the range of associations that derive from their schema, or world knowledge. This link between metaphor reading and schema theory is further suggested by the account given of these associations by the metaphor theorist, Max Black. Black's key term, for our purposes, is "system of associated

commonplaces". Taking as an example the metaphor "man is a wolf", he has this to say (1962:40-41):

Imagine some layman required to say, without taking special thought, those things he held to be true about wolves; the set of statements resulting would approximate to what I am here calling the system of commonplaces associated with the word "wolf"....From the expert's standpoint, the system of commonplaces may include half-truths or downright mistakes ... but the important thing for the metaphor's effectiveness is not that the commonplaces shall be true, but that they should be readily and freely evoked....The effect, then, of (metaphorically) calling a man a "wolf" is to evoke the wolf-system of related commonplaces.

This "system" constituted by the reader's associations seems very similar to the notion of a schema, held by schema theorists to be brought by readers to texts. Like schemata, the association-systems are a mixture of facts and pseudo-facts and, perhaps more importantly, non-facts. Black does not stress this latter aspect, but others such as Nowotny do, in a way that ties metaphor in not only with schema theory (which accepts the subjectivity of schemata: see Clarke & Silberstein above, p.25), but also reader-response theory and its emphasis on the "life experience" brought by readers to texts. Thus Nowotny says about the processing of metaphor: "what a word brings with it depends for each individual reader on his ... word associations and his associations in the actual experience of his own life" (1962:64; my emphasis).

And the precise way in which these "schematic" associations are used in metaphor interpretation also corresponds closely with the schema-theoretic model of interactive reading. In terms of this model, the vehicle of a metaphor like "man is a wolf" may be said to activate the reader's wolf-schema ('wild - predatory - dangerous - packs - four-legged - tundra - Red Riding Hood'). These schematic associations of the reader, triggered by the textual detail as a form of bottom-up processing, are then transferred to the topic ("man") to make sense of the statement: thus, 'man is predatory and dangerous'. This transference of

associations from vehicle to topic is at the heart of metaphor (for the "rules of transference" see Leech 1969:148), but it also closely corresponds to the schema-theoretic model of top-down processing where the reader "brings to" the text the background knowledge necessary to comprehend it. A standard account by Max Black of this process in metaphor-reading holds that "metaphor works by applying to the principle subject [or topic] a system of associated implications characteristic of the subsidiary subject [or vehicle]" (1962:44; my emphasis). And as Black makes clear in the passage quoted in the previous paragraph, the "associated implications" that are thus "applied", "transferred" or "brought to" the topic come directly out of the reader's store of "commonplace" or "background" knowledge.

However, it is possible to take this parallel with schema theory a vital stage further. The interactive model sees reading as more than the simple and unilateral application of readers' background knowledge to the text, for the text itself is properly a check and control on the readers' input. Similarly, the interpretation of metaphor as traditionally modelled involves more than a simple or unilateral application of schematic associations from vehicle to topic. For the topic itself is active in controlling and guiding the reader's input triggered by the vehicle; in Black's account of this (in Winer 1988:22-3), "the nature of the topic determines which of the vehicle's associated implications can be applied to the topic". (Hence in the reading of "man is a wolf" certain elements in the reader's wolf-schema will be discarded: 'four-legged - furry - tundras'). There is in the metaphor's tiny mechanism, then, also an interaction between the application of the readers' associations (or "knowledge-based" processing) and the "text-based" control exerted over the readers' input by the topic. And, in fact, metaphor theorists such as Black and I.A.Richards themselves use the term "interaction" (Hawkes 1972:60; Black 1962:44) to describe this process going on in metaphor, between topic and vehicle, between textual detail and the input of the reader, which allows the latter a freedom within the constraints of the former. It is out of this interaction,

combining freedom and constraint, that meaning is made of metaphors.

Metaphor reading is in fact perhaps a case par excellence of that creative freedom that reader-response theorists see as the essence of literary reading. Even in literature where, as Rosenblatt says, "openness of the text takes on especial importance" (1978:88), metaphor confers an unusual freedom on the reader, who is expected to range widely through an individual set of associations in order to arrive at an interpretation. And this may well take him or her far from the immediate world of the text and its author: as Lakoff and Johnson assert, "the meaning a metaphor will have for me will be partly culturally determined and partly tied to my past experiences" (1980:142-3). In theory at least, interpretations of metaphors may be as heterogenous as the readers doing the interpreting: a small object lesson in multiple readings in multi-cultural settings. But at the same time, this diversity is constrained - and some compatibility between interpretations guaranteed - by the text itself, or those contextual details of each metaphor, which in a properly interactive reading exert a uniform control over all reader input. In Nowotny's summary of this textual control, the meaning of a metaphor is "constructed from [the reader's] own experience according to the specifications given linguistically by the utterance in which the metaphor occurs" (1962:59; my emphasis).

As this last reference usefully reminds us, for all its complex range of reference, metaphor is at base a linguistic entity. Christina Brooke-Rose, in trying to get away from what she considers the obsessive attention given by critics to the content of metaphor - the "domains" on which it draws - focuses on this linguistic side: "metaphor is expressed in words, and a metaphorical word reacts on other words to which it is syntactically and grammatically related" (1958:1). This grammatical highlighting is a helpful reminder that we should not ignore the linguistic element in figurative language, or the

bottom-up skills needed to decode words and unravel syntax in order to trigger the top-down process of associating - which especially in L2 contexts cannot be taken for granted (Eskey 1988). Yet while recognising this, the present concern remains primarily with the top-down aspect of metaphor. And in this respect it is possible to juxtapose Brooke-Rose with Winifred Nowotny's assertion that if there are complexifieds to be processed in figurative language, they are generally not of a linguistic sort, but intellectual or emotional: "metaphor need not involve itself in complex syntax, because its form, permitting allusion to be unspecified, enables it to leave much to inference and implication" (1962:62). If there is complexity in metaphor it lies in the system of associations called up, which may be rich, far-ranging and contradictory. And because it has to do with the reader's life-knowledge, it is not a complexity that requires specialist training - as linguistic complexity does. So possibly readers whose language is weak are less disadvantaged by the reading of figurative language than they are by other aspects. What such readers would need as a high priority would thus not be advanced decoding skills, but ready access to the world knowledge or schema invoked by a metaphor.

\*

What has been argued in the previous pages is that metaphor reading is a textbook case of interactive reading as it is represented by schema theory, and, if anything, an intensified version of what reader-response theory sees in literary reading. Of metaphor it is especially true that, as Rosenblatt says, "the finding of meaning involves both the author's text and what the reader brings to it" (1978:14). And it is metaphor reading, more vividly perhaps than most other kinds, that is evoked by this schema-theoretic view of reading: "the text, then does not contain a static or inviolable meaning; it provides readers with directions for constructing meaning from their own cognitive frameworks, which are formed by previously acquired knowledge,

feelings, personality, and culture" (Carrell & Eisterhold summarised by Spack 1985:706). Metaphors do offer striking insights, but these are not to be found embedded "statically" in the metaphor, so much as made available to readers who are prepared to play their part, use their own background knowledge, and apply the associations from this to "construct the meaning" implicit in the words. It seems to be just this view of metaphor reading that Hawkes stresses (1972:49) when he describes Coleridge's view of metaphor in Shakespeare:

Instead ... of being confronted by clever comparisons, whose precisely worked-out relations we passively contemplate, this metaphor gives us work to do. The pattern of thought it proposes ... requires our participation to "complete" it. It draws us in, involves us in its own process, gives us the responsibility for the creative act of closure with itself...As Coleridge says, in one of his many brilliantly illuminating comments on Shakespeare, "You feel him to be a poet, inasmuch as for a time he has made you one - an active creative being".

### 3. Guidelines for an interactive approach to Shakespeare's figurative language

If the Shakespeare metaphor is so susceptible to interactive reading, how can this be encouraged in the L2 classroom? In the first place, we can stop interpreting metaphor for students: in Hawkes's terms, stop doing their share of the "work". In this respect we would be applying to metaphor the pedagogic guidelines suggested by response-based methodologists. The key idea here is for teachers to "struggle against handing down ready-made judgements, values and interpretations" (Protherough quoted in Walters & England 1988:168) and instead get pupils to work out meaning through their personal engagement with the text. In the case of metaphor this would involve foregrounding students' responses - their own associations called up from their own background knowledge by the vehicles of metaphors - and then getting them to use these in making sense of the topics, rather

than simply being given an interpretation which comes from someone else's responses and associations.

It is true, nevertheless, that the temptation to give students interpretations of figurative language is very strong - possibly because it seems so inevitable an extension of other kinds of help that students (and L2 students in particular) need with Shakespeare's language. In school editions of Shakespeare, for instance, extensive help is customarily given in decoding difficult words and phrases, so that a kind of all-purpose strategy for dealing with textual complexity is set up. Thus it is perhaps not surprising that when it arises, the complexity of figurative language should be treated in the same - or at least in a superficially similar - manner.

An example of how this happens is taken from a school edition of Romeo and Juliet in the Stratford Series (MacLennan 1983). Its glosses for Act III, scene iii give useful and necessary assistance in basic decoding: of "fond" (1.53 = 'foolish'), and "prevails not" (1.61 = 'is not effective'), and "old" (1.94 = 'real, dyed-in-the-wool'). Then, in an apparently similar way, editorial attention moves directly from these to explain a metaphor which Romeo uses in a question to the Nurse (11.93-4):

Doth not [Juliet] think me an old murderer,  
Now I have stained the childhood of our joy ...

The explanation given in the notes - that Romeo has 'spoilt the fresh beauty of our happiness' - is arrived at by "decoding" the key word childhood (= 'fresh beauty'). But despite its resemblance to the other glosses, what is given here is not the denotative meaning of or even a synonym for "childhood", along the lines of the other notes; what we are given instead are the connotations of childhood - freshness and beauty - that have arisen in the editor's mind. And, to follow Leech's distinction, the part of the editor's mind in which they have arisen is not that storing his linguistic knowledge, but rather his "real world" knowledge. The editor has drawn on a set of associations

called up from his childhood-schema, and then, through the usual process of transference from vehicle to topic, he has used these to interpret the line. But is it in fact necessary for the editor to supply such "real world" knowledge? While in other places students may well be in need of linguistic help (as with "fond" and "prevails not"), here perhaps they may be assumed already to have what is required: their own childhood-schemata with associations enough to illuminate the former love of Romeo and Juliet. Such a gloss suggests how easy it is, out of an acute sensitivity to ESL students' language weaknesses, to overlook the distinction between different kinds of textual complexity - that which requires linguistic input as opposed to that which requires "real world" input. The result is that we may be over-compensating for the students' weaknesses by supplying both kinds of information, whereas the "real world" knowledge needed for figurative language might just as well (in fact, better) be supplied by themselves.

In distinguishing those cases of language complexity which certainly need decoding, from figurative language which often may not, there is no suggestion that an alternative approach should automatically be used for all figurative language, but simply that our resources for dealing with figurative language might include an alternative to "decoding". More crucially, with regard to that alternative, there is no implication that less direct "decoding" by teacher or editor means less intervention of any form, or that students should be left entirely to their own devices when it comes to something like the "childhood" metaphor in Romeo and Juliet. Responsiveness has to be facilitated and developed, and this is the instructor's role. Response-based editions like those pioneered by the ISEA (see Chapter I), provide tasks and questions to foreground students' life-knowledge and responses; and the editions give different kinds of scaffolding enabling students to construct their own interpretations out of that material. Such supports and encouragements would be no less necessary for interactive metaphor reading. But at the same time, this response-based

approach has to be made within the reality of our L2 context. According to schema theory, L2 students often experience difficulties in top-down processing that requires the use of background knowledge (Carrell 1983:200; Carrell 1988a:109). However, schema theory also offers pedagogic guidelines that help teachers to deal with these. What is crucial is that students have the appropriate background knowledge to begin with; and that it is activated (Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:80). It is principally in these terms - of "schema availability" and "schema activation" - that the question of encouraging interactive reading of metaphor will be covered, in combination with suggestions from response-based methodology.

### 3.1. Metaphor and "schema availability"

If students are to make sense of metaphor for themselves by using their own world knowledge, they must have the relevant knowledge. Research into the processing of metaphor by children has highlighted knowledge of the metaphor's "domain" as the key factor determining success or failure in comprehension. As Winer (1988:59-60) has suggested,

what develops and enables metaphor comprehension is not anything inherent to metaphor ability but rather something extrinsic to it. Metaphor ability may be present at the outset of language acquisition and may reveal itself whenever the child has enough knowledge of the elements being linked ....

From the perspective of schema theory, we may say that for a metaphor to be grasped, its "domain" must be matched by an appropriate schema in the reader. In this respect, of course, metaphor processing is no different from reading in general, as represented by schema theory: thus Carrell has asserted that the most obvious cause of reading difficulties "is the absence of relevant knowledge structures to utilize in top-down processing; if the schema do not exist for the reader they cannot be used" (Carrell 1988a:103). And for Carrell, the most common reason for the absence of a schema in L2 readers is that it is not part of their cultural background: the schema is culture-specific

(Carrell 1988a: 105; Carrell 1988b:245; Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:80). That many metaphors in Western literature may evoke culture-specific schemata which black students are not equipped with is entirely likely. As Hawkes, for one, has stressed (1989:89), metaphors are rooted in "the 'way of life' from which they spring. They are in short, culturally determined..." (cp Winer: the domains of metaphor are "in part culturally determined" 1988:142-3). Thus the primary task in encouraging interactive reading of Shakespeare's metaphors among African students would be to determine the degree of cultural specificity involved.

In those cases where a Shakespeare metaphor does involve a domain for which there may not be a matching schema in many African students, special intervention would be needed. The strategy most commonly advocated by schema theory in these cases is "schema building" (Carrell 1988b:244; Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:87) where through prereading activities readers are acquainted with the knowledge assumed by the text. An approach like this is probably best suited to reading which involves a limited number of schemata over a sustained stretch of text: schemata, for instance, that relate to a dominant theme or subject matter. Only in such a case would the prereading work be worth the trouble. In cases such as one- or two-line metaphors, where a schema is momentarily evoked and then left behind, there would be less justification for prereading work aimed at building that schema in students.

What is possibly a more effective strategy for dealing with isolated metaphors for which students have no schema, may be termed schema adaptation. Here, rather than being built from scratch with all the time and effort that involves, a new schema is developed out of an existing one. Rumelhart refers to this as "patterned generation" which "involves the creation of a new schema by copying an old one with a few modifications. Such learning is, in essence, learning by analogy. We learn that a new concept is like an old one except for a few differences" (in

Spiro 1980:54; see also Floyd & Carrell:92). Students might be encouraged to see the unfamiliar domain of the metaphor in terms of an analogous existing schema, and thus call up, in relation to the metaphor, associations linked to the existing schema. In a sense the existing schema would act as a "surrogate schema" in supplying the associations that will help the student to make sense of the metaphor. The advantages of this technique are not only that it would take less time than schema building, but that it would be richer in its effects. A student's newly built schema might consist of a few raw facts, but it would not carry the range of associations and private resonances that metaphor reading requires. A student's analogous schema developed over years, on the other hand, would carry these resonances which could be transferred to the new topic. Thus, if there is a borrowing of associations (from the analogous schema) it is self-borrowing and not reliant on the instructor's input: it remains the student's own interaction.

The assumption so far has been that Shakespearean metaphors are narrowly culture-specific, to the extent that African students lack the necessary schema for interpretation. Like metaphors generally, Shakespeare's emerge from a particular setting, and "way of life"; but not every aspect of any setting will be unique to it, and it seems to be the case, as might reasonably be expected of any writer, that Shakespeare's metaphors draw both on what is peculiar to his setting, and what is not. Thus it may be cautiously assumed that some of his figurative language involves domains that are familiar in Southern African contexts. These would be domains the nature of which does not vary radically across periods and cultures: the elements, the natural world, bodily features, postures and sensations, certain non-physical and inter-personal experiences (emotions, dreams, memory, antagonisms, affections), certain fundamentals in human settlements (roads, doors, roofs, furniture). One has only to refer to an index of the domains of Shakespeare's figurative language (in a work such as Spurgeon 1935) to realise the extent to which the schemata assumed by that language may coincide with

the broad schemata likely to be possessed by African students. In the details of those broad schemata, of course, there are bound to be differences, giving rise to possibly divergent associations; but these might easily be accommodated by an approach that is explicitly designed for multi-cultural classrooms. And, in any case, such differences are likely to be found between individuals of the same culture as well, since no two readers have identical schemata: "the schemata by which people attempt to assimilate text will vary according to age, subculture, experience, education ..." (quoted in Hudson 1988:185). (The issue of divergent associations and appropriateness will be dealt with more fully below.)

Yet even while suggesting that students may in fact possess the right schemata for many Shakespeare metaphors, it is recognised that this, in itself, is not a guarantee of anything. The major difficulty in getting African students to interpret metaphor for themselves may not be that they don't have the appropriate schemata, but that they don't properly use what they do have: it is not activated (Carrell 1988a).

### 3.2. Metaphor and "schema activation"

Schema theorists have suggested that one reason why L2 readers often do not use their background knowledge has to do with their misconception of reading. Students "suffer from what has been called a 'meaning in the text' fallacy" (Carrell 1988a:109), often instilled by teachers, leading them to believe that it is wrong to incorporate or apply anything from outside the text. And this is particularly true of background knowledge that derives from outside the classroom: personal experience, but also more broadly what we might think of in terms of Geertz's concept of "local knowledge" (Geertz 1983). Especially where the L2 students belong to subordinate cultures which have little status in school curricula, their "local knowledge" is likely to be actively stigmatised. This means that an attempt to encourage any kind of interactive reading (especially of literature, which relies heavily on just such life-knowledge) must be part of a wider

attempt to change an attitude to reading per se and even to classroom learning in general, which currently draws so firm a line between appropriate and inappropriate knowledge. In this respect the Vygotskian model of "scientific" as opposed to "everyday" concepts is pertinent, since it powerfully argues for the incorporation into classroom learning of that "living knowledge" brought from beyond the classroom walls (Moll 1990: 10). (See also Au 1979:679, on an approach to reading that maximises this: communicating "to the children the fact that they have knowledge that can help them deal with otherwise strange school situations".)

But there are more specific reasons why L2 students may not have their schemata activated by metaphors. The most obvious is a problem with basic word-recognition, so that triggering signals in the text are not picked up (Carrell 1988a:105; Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:80). The reader has the knowledge, but it is not activated by the particular word used; for example, a L2 reader's "sun" schema is unlikely to be triggered by an Elizabethan periphrasis such as "fiery orb". A more familiar synonym for the term would have to be found. Importantly, however, this would not mean explaining the metaphor itself for the reader: linguistic help is supplied, but only to facilitate the interpretation of the figure by the reader, able now to supply his or her own background knowledge.

Another kind of intervention might be used for a closely related problem with top-down processing of metaphors by L2 readers. Where a familiar word in a metaphor (as in "Juliet is the sun") may cause the L2 reader no problems on the level of denotation (he or she would not need a definition or synonym), it may cause problems on the connotative level. Rosenblatt, in a passage cited above (p.28), refers to the rich cluster of associations that gather around words through years of experience of those words, to the extent that the mere mention of a word calls up this array of associations. But is the same true of L2 readers? They will have developed an array of associations around words in their

first language through constant use of them, but not necessarily in their second language which is not used to the same extent. So there will be a rich range of "sun" associations available - they make up the reader's "sun" schema - but they will not be activated with anything like the same intensity or variety by the English word. (On this issue see Romaine 1989: 85-6).

For L2 readers, then, no single English word is likely to have the evocative power equal to the fullness of their corresponding schemata. And this may mean that, in encouraging students to use their richest associations, we should not rely totally on the text to do the activating. To activate the schema in its fullest form we might use an equivalent word in the students' vernacular. Or we might use extra-linguistic means; Leech says about connotative meaning that it "is not specific to language, but is shared by other communicative systems, such as visual art ..." and points to advertising as the most obvious example of "the overlap between linguistic and visual connotation" (1974:15). Following from this, we might introduce pictures to work in combination with the figurative language in activating associations from students' schemata. But a preferable, English-language-based, strategy here might be to supplement the single word by constructing around it something like a vivid or emotive verbal picture or scenario (for example, when encouraging response to the metaphor, "a flood of mutiny", a flood-scenario might be outlined: a small child seen playing on the banks of a mountain river coming down in flood ...). A brief but suggestive "real life" context would be created, into which students might project themselves, thus triggering further life associations of their own.

In all of this, what is being encouraged is the fullest range of a reader's associations evoked or activated by the terms of a metaphor. Protherough, in the closely related context of response-based methodology, refers to the teacher's task as being "to help students to develop and refine the responses which they make" (quoted in Walters & England 1988:167). His suggested

procedure for developing responses is "first to leave space for individual responses" and then move on to a "sharing of responses ... in pairs or small groups" (ibid:168). In metaphor reading, where the quality of the interpretation relies largely on the richness of associations fed into it, the principle of a sharing of personal schemata must be appropriate. (One good reason for editors or teachers not handing down their own interpretations is that, coming from only one schema, they are regrettably limited things: see, for instance the "childhood" metaphor above.) Inevitably, the chains of association from each student - in response to "childhood" in the metaphor quoted above, for example - will show associations in common: factual or objective aspects, conventional or institutional connotations. But there should also be differences, deriving from the individuality (and cultural orientation?) of each student's schema which may be seen as comprising not only the objective but also the non-empirical and deeply subjective: group and private myths, memories, experiences, desires, what Rosenblatt calls "special personal feeling-tones and significances" (1978:53). Yet at the same time as these associations are being "developed", in the sense of accumulated from individuals, they have to be extended, and "refined" by teacher intervention. There will always be limitations to the associations students are able spontaneously to call up, or blind spots (Winer 1988:35-6). Furthermore, taking our cue from Rosenblatt's dictum for response-based teaching in general (1938:105-6), there should be encouragement of students beyond stock responses and reflex associations, which, no matter how necessary they are as a starting point, can be limited and dogmatic; but more seriously, they can be distracting and misleading.

And here we have the final aspect of schema activation in metaphor reading: not only must associations be triggered, but they must also be guided and controlled by a process of selection and rejection. To encourage the contribution of personal associations is not to imply that each single association is useful. Response-based methodology is insistent that there are

curbs placed on the subjectivity of response (Protherough 1983:26), and that, in Rosenblatt's words, reading is not a "train of free associations" (1978:29). The whole purpose of the associations called up by the vehicle of a metaphor is to illuminate the topic of that metaphor; and so they can never be allowed to develop quite independently of it. If, as explained above, associations are controlled by the topic and by the more general context of the metaphor, teaching intervention could supplement this control. By means of questions students could be guided towards the more appropriate areas - or subschemata - of their schemata. Intervention should thus aim at encouraging both breadth and narrowness of associations - an apparent paradox that is best summed up by the phrase "precise elaboration" applied generally to interactive reading (Alderson & Urquhart 1984:40).

### 3.3. A "formal" schema for figurative language

Implicit in this general approach to metaphor in the Shakespeare classroom is a certain conception of metaphor itself and how we commonly go about processing it. Derived from a standard view of metaphor outlined earlier in this chapter, this approach assumes that any metaphor will consist of two elements. In the first place, the vehicle elicits or activates a set of associations drawn from the reader's background knowledge, a selection partly controlled by the topic; in the second place, these schematic associations are applied to the topic in order to illuminate it. Each metaphor has its own "domain" - that particular aspect of the world evoked by its vehicle - which must be matched by the reader with a corresponding schema, or unit of knowledge relating to that particular aspect of the world. To such a unit of general "world" knowledge involved in any metaphor reading, it is at this point useful to apply a more precise term from schema theory: "content" schema. In the preceding sections on encouraging interactive reading of metaphor it has been the availability, triggering and application of content schemata specifically that concerned us.

Schema theory refers to units of general world knowledge as

"content" schemata in order to distinguish them from other kinds of schematic knowledge that readers bring to texts. In the case of metaphor reading, for meaning to be made, the reader needs to know not only the metaphor's "domain", but also something about how metaphors work - they must have a conception of the rhetorical figure itself, such as that briefly outlined above. This is not part of their world knowledge, but of something narrower, yet equally vital to the reading process: the reader's knowledge of textual structure and modes of interpretation. In schema theory such knowledge is distinguished as "formal" or "rhetorical" schemata, and commonly cited examples are stories, scientific texts, poems, etc (Carrell & Eisterhold 1988:79; see also Carrell 1983; Carrell 1984b; Carrell 1987).

Rhetorical figures such as metaphor do not seem to have been considered in terms of formal schemata, which are mainly exemplified in the literature by larger structures and genres, as Carrell's list suggests. But it is possible that a metaphor may be represented in practised readers' minds by such a schema, which involves some sense of its two-part structure (topic and vehicle) and of the interpretative process of association and transference. Thus in the practised reader's encounter with any particular metaphor there will always be two sorts of schemata activated: firstly the formal metaphor-schema, indicating the relevant mode of textual processing, which in its turn will involve activating the relevant content schema. For example, in the case of the lines from Romeo and Juliet cited above (p. 34) ("I have stained the childhood of our joy"), what enabled the editor of the Stratford Series edition to arrive at an interpretation was not simply the activation of his (content) childhood-schema, but also, almost as a precondition for this, the activation of his (formal) metaphor-schema which set everything else in motion.

The purpose of this chapter, of course, has been to suggest alternatives to the sort of handling of metaphor seen in the episode from the Stratford Romeo and Juliet in which students are

supplied with interpretations. But what is also problematic about such handling is that, in supplying the ready-made interpretation, the editor conceals the process by which it was arrived at. Students remain uninvolved in the rhetorical processes of metaphor per se. And so they are unable to learn anything from their reading about metaphor itself, or to develop a formal metaphor-schema of their own. In the alternative approach suggested above, however, where students are encouraged to use their own background knowledge to arrive at their own interpretations, they are necessarily being involved in the process. Every time instructors encourage students through structured exercises firstly to activate, and secondly to apply, their content schemata to make sense of a particular metaphor, they are also building a formal schema for metaphor.

Of course, it is possible that students actually bring into the classroom quite sophisticated rhetorical skills. As metaphor theorists now commonly remark, metaphor is ubiquitous in everyday language use, and is, in fact, acquired as a language skill at a very early age, at least in first-language English contexts (Winer 1988:109). And it may be that L2 students are no different in this respect. While schema theorists maintain that formal schemata, like content schemata, are often culture-specific (Carrell 1984b:88-9), they also acknowledge that some formal schemata are "cross-cultural" (ibid.). That this might be the case with metaphor is strongly upheld by metaphor theorists who variously assert that "all languages contain deeply embedded metaphorical structures" (Hawkes 1972:60), and that "the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:6). Whether this is borne out by the indigenous languages and cultures of Southern Africa is not certain, but if their traditional poetry is any indication, metaphor is a pervasive habit here too (Cope 1968; Kunene 1971; Kunene 1972; Opland 1983).

If this is so, it might be used in the building and/or activating of a suitable schema for dealing with Shakespeare's figurative

language. Indeed, a more appropriate view of the task might be not so much a building of a formal schema as a reminding students of the rhetorical knowledge they already have acquired from their own language and culture (as well as from their experience of everyday uses of English), but which they might not wish or even think to use in a Shakespeare class. As with certain kinds of content schemata, what might be necessary, at most, is a refining of what Carrell terms a "naive schema": "the beginnings of appropriate schemata, but ... not sufficiently developed to allow full comprehension" (1984a:340). The further development of a formal metaphor-schema would not at this level require any kind of meta-critical sophistication. Fitting in with an interactive study of Shakespeare in general such a formal schema would represent metaphor reading as a process which maximises personal involvement in the form of controlled associations that are then used to make sense of the text. And although it would be developed within the scaffolding of such study, the formal schema for figurative language would constitute something learnt which is of value in itself as a reading skill, to be used independently by students outside of any structured exercises, and beyond the Shakespeare setwork.

## CHAPTER IV: DEVELOPING MATERIALS FOR AN INTERACTIVE APPROACH TO FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (NON-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS)

The main purpose of the remainder of this work is to put into practice the ideas raised in the earlier chapters, so as to encourage in the L2 literature classroom interactive reading of figurative language. The materials developed for this purpose are sequenced in two major parts. They start, in this chapter, with exercises that give basic practice in the relevant skills, with the focus on comparatively accessible passages (i.e. non-Shakespearean); then they move to more demanding tasks that involve the same approach, but focussed on passages from Shakespeare, and these are dealt with in the following chapter.

\*

Following the model set up in Chapter III, interpreting figurative language is seen as involving two skills. Firstly, it requires the activation of background knowledge - or schemata - triggered in the form of associations by the vehicle of the metaphor. One purpose of these exercises is thus simply to foreground the process of associating, while at the same time possibly reminding students that they do, in fact, have a considerable body of "life" knowledge to draw on in the form of these associations. Importantly, in formulating the exercises thought has been given to the nature of the background knowledge each involves. As has been noted, schemata are often culture-specific; the intention behind the exercises in this chapter is to ensure as far as possible that the schemata used are ones which are current across the broad Southern African setting.

The second skill involved in reading metaphor is using these schematic associations. It is not enough simply to get students calling up their background knowledge in relation to certain words: these associations must be transferred to the topic of the metaphor to make sense of it. At this stage, the meanings to be

inferred will be kept relatively simple and accessible by restricting the exercises either to non-literary metaphors drawn from everyday language, or in the final exercises, using literary metaphors drawn from indigenous poetry. Also in the interests of accessibility, as well as because the intention is to stress the communicative function of figurative language rather than to impart technical or literary-critical knowledge of metaphors as such, all unfamiliar terminology is avoided in these exercises.

Note. All the exercises discussed in this chapter may be found in Appendix A: page references are given in square brackets.

**EXERCISE 1: Practising basic associative thinking [p.127]**

1.1. The purpose of this exercise type is to get students into the habit of allowing particular words to activate their own background knowledge in the form of associations. The use of associations to activate schemata is recommended by schema theorists as a pre-reading activity for reading in general (Carrell 1988b:246); it is in fact the basis of one particular programme, the PreReading Plan (PreP), which has students activate their existing knowledge on a topic by calling up and reflecting on their individual word-associations: "Tell anything that comes to mind, when ..." (Langer 1981:154). However, whereas in prereading strategies like PreP, associations are a tool for accessing background knowledge and are of little importance otherwise, in figurative language they are crucial as the form which the background knowledge must take in order to be used in interpretation. At this stage in the sequence of exercises, though, it is enough simply for the background knowledge to be activated through associations, and not applied.

Several variations on the basic exercise type were devised and tried out. In each class, they were used at the beginning of the lesson, as "warm-up" exercises; and as such they were performed quickly and with minimum formality. To facilitate this, they were presented as an oral activity involving the whole class.

1.2. The simplest version, Exercise 1(a) [p.127] was used by the

researcher at School Q on the first day, with poor results. The response here, as in other try-outs, was doubtless influenced to some degree by contextual factors (the students in this rural area lack fluency, are unfamiliar with learner-centred methods, are reserved in front of a white teacher whose accent might also cause problems, etc.). The poor response might even be taken as confirmation of the underlying assumption of these exercises that the practice of conscious associating in English is unfamiliar to students. However, the manner in which the exercise was presented may also have played a part. An excerpt from the transcript of this part of the lesson reads as follows:

PL: ....Here are some games we can play, to get associations going. One way of doing it is to just start thinking of things. If I were to say the word water what would you think of? What immediately comes into your mind?  
Water.

[Silence]

S: Liquid substance.

That this was the only suggestion offered may have been the result of simple confusion as to what was wanted, since, on reflection, the description is vague ("just start thinking"), and there are no examples given to clarify it. That there may have been a problem over instructions here is borne out by a comment made in his report by the teacher at School Q: "When pupils think, they should know what to think through explanation. This will help them not to be scared". (This issue of guiding students more explicitly into association making will be dealt with below: see 1.4.). And finally, although the exercise was described as a "game", there is little else to dispel what is probably an inbred belief that there are right and wrong answers to all questions asked in class and penalties for those who don't give what is wanted. The very nature of the single response ("liquid substance") seems to suggest that the exercise was viewed in just such an academic way, as something requiring a formal definition derived from the science lab, rather than casual associations derived from students' life-knowledge. Again, an example might clarify this, but so might some explicit reminder that there are

no wrong answers in such exercises.

1.3. Another version of this activity, Exercise 1(b) [p.127], was used at School Q by the researcher on the second day, with slightly better results (which may be ascribed to an increased ease both with the teacher and the skills involved), though responses were still very limited and slow to emerge. In response to Exercise 1(b) which asks for associations based on colour words, students gave for "blue": "sky - pen"; and for "red": "blood - fire - danger"; there was no addition made to these lists even after the students were given the Zulu equivalents for these words, suggesting that the use of vernacular synonyms may not necessarily assist word-association. (In connection with this issue, see Chapter III.)

However, Exercise 1 (b) was also used at School Y by the researcher in the second lesson, with somewhat better results. The following excerpt from the lesson transcript may give a sense of these students' response:

PL: Now students, let me give you some words and see if you can come up with some associations. Look at this one [writes on blackboard] blue. Any ideas? What does it make you think of?  
 S: Sky!  
 PL: What else?  
 S: Colour.  
 PL: Colour?  
 Ss: Ja!!  
 PL: Okay, colour. Colour! What else?  
 [Silence]  
 S: Sea.  
 [Silence]  
 PL: [Writes] Green. What?  
 Ss: Grass! Chalkboard! Trees! Plants! Leaves!

The more energetic response here might have something to do with the fact that the key words were written down (cp 1.2. above) but most probably it is factors extrinsic to the exercise that are most influential: the fact that these are urban students, reasonably fluent in English, academically above average and used to white teachers. But also significant is the fact that, by the

second lesson, the students were probably getting used to the exercises; it is observable in the short extract given above that the students warm up even in the space of a single exercise, so that the responses to the second word are richer than those to the first. Thus slowly accumulated and possibly meagre clusters of associations in these early exercises do not necessarily indicate weaknesses in the exercises themselves; because of their stress on free and personal contributions, the very nature of the exercises perhaps makes them more reliant than other kinds on the general conditions in which they are used, which must be conducive to such contributions (where pupils feel secure and are cooperative, the teacher is facilitating, etc.).

1.4. Nevertheless, it is possible that there is a weakness in association-tasks that baldly ask students to "say what this word makes you think of", without giving any of the focus or structures that such thinking requires, especially in immature learners. The vague instruction "think about water", simply by implying so much, is as likely to make one think of nothing specific at all, as to produce a wealth of associations. In anticipation of such problems, some variations on the basic type of association exercise were devised. Exercise 1(c) [p.127] thus attempts to focus thinking by narrowing the range of associations specifically to emotions suggested by certain words, while Exercise 1(d) [p.127] focuses on activities suggested by other words. It was also hoped that by focusing on these particular kinds of association, these exercises would encourage students to see that word-associations in general can incorporate more than the merely physical attributes which usually come first to mind (see Winer, cited in Chapter III).

At School Q, Exercise 1(c) was used by the researcher on the second day, with reasonable results. To the word "funeral", students responded with "crying - sadness - sorrow", and to the word "examination" with "worrying - papers - pass - fail". Compared to the first day's exercises the associations were more plentiful, which might be because of the sharper focus of the

exercise. Clearly in the case of "funeral", students were responding to the directions that focused on emotions, although in the case of "examinations" the focus was quickly lost. Even here, however, it may be the case that some initial focus is enough to get the activating process working more generally, which, in a sense, is preferable to an entirely specialised set of responses, and is what the exercise is intended to achieve. Similar results were produced for Exercise 1(d) which was used not in a classroom but at a teachers' workshop (see Appendix C). The associations produced were richer than at School Q (no doubt because of the nature of the respondents), but show the same pattern of allowing thought to be focused to a certain extent on the given aspect (here, activities), but also ranging beyond it, possibly once the focus had more fully set the association process in motion. So the word "doctors" produced: "prescribing - healing - injections - smart cars"; and "shopkeepers": "selling - profits - stocktaking - exploiting - worrying - thieves - taxes".

1.5. As another alternative to the rather artificial association-task that asks students to say what a word "brings to mind", Exercise 1(e) [p.128] attempts to provide a simple real-life context and purpose for the association-task. Here the activity of calling up background knowledge is presented in terms of remembering. As noted in Chapter III, memories are a part of schemata, and students might find the activity of using their memories a more congenial form of activating schematic associations. The transcript of the exercise used at School Y in the second lesson is as follows:

PL: Students, you've gone blind. Let us pretend you've gone blind - and I mention something and you try to remember what it looked like.... For instance this [writes]: tree - say you'd gone blind and you were trying to remember trees. What would you think of?

S: Green colour.

S: Fruits.

PL: What else? Someone says to you, tree, and years before, you remember when you could see: what would you remember?

S: Leaves.

S: Stems.

PL: What did you used to do with trees?

S: Shade - plant for shade!  
S: What else?  
S: Oxygen.

There is unfortunately no way of telling whether the same or more or fewer associations might not have been produced if these students had been simply asked to say what the word "tree" made them think of; but certainly this exercise produced more associations than any other tried with this class.

It is possible that the exercise would have been more fruitful if it had been slightly further elaborated on: physically enacting blindness by closing eyes, directions to recall particular trees in their lives. What the latter in particular might do is encourage a greater use of the students' own life experience as a source of associations, which seems to be missing from the materials produced throughout the exercises covered above. There is a tendency to produce stock associations, which seem to bear out the point made by Rosenblatt, Protherough and other response-based methodologists, that students need to have their spontaneous responses developed and extended (see Chapter III). But the associations also seem bookish, as if derived from the classroom (for instance, "oxygen" above). These are of course legitimate constituents of the relevant schemata, but their limitations show in a vivid way how, after years of a certain kind of schooling, these students instinctively shun the use in classrooms of their local knowledge that is acquired outside those classrooms (see Chapter III).

1.6. The chief task in such exercises as those devised above is to encourage students to access their background knowledge as richly as possible: either directly ("think about ..."), or indirectly. It is possible that the latter is the more effective method, and that exercises, instead of artificially foregrounding the association process, should devise ways of encouraging students to associate as a way of performing some more congenial task. Memory games may be one kind; other versions were devised but untried in classrooms (Exercises 1 (f), (g), and (h))

[p.128]).

\*

EXERCISE 2: Using associations to make sense of non-figurative language [p.129]

2.1. The idea behind this exercise type is to make students aware of the communicative function of associations: that associations stirred up out of their background knowledge such as those in Exercise 1 are important, not in themselves, but as a means of making sense of certain kinds of messages. This foregrounding of associations in use is crucial in the lead-up to dealing with figurative language. At this point, though, we are concerned with the way associations are used in everyday situations, so that students will not see associating as something new, but be reminded of what they themselves do instinctively.

An everyday use of associations that is focused on in Exercise 2 concerns names, and the associations they are meant to elicit (the names of pets, ships and sports teams, brand names, nicknames, and so on). Such names are often intended to convey some kind of message, and they do this through their associations. In the three variations of Exercise 2 students are asked to make sense of the message conveyed through certain names, by using their associations in this way. To give each exercise a stronger sense of everyday purpose it is formulated as a problem-solving activity, where association-use holds the key. In the first part of the exercise, a choice is made through the unconscious use of associations, as happens in everyday practice. It is only secondly that students are asked to explain why they made the choice they did: this should now focus their attention on the actual associations stirred up by the names, and encourage them to see in a simple form the process which underlies daily uses of association.

The variations of this exercise were used in three classes by the researcher, at the beginning of the respective lessons. They were performed quickly and with minimum formality, as an oral activity involving the whole class.

2.2. There was an enthusiastic reception of these variations in all the classes. The responses at School Q and School R, where the students were given Exercise 2(a) [p.129], may be gauged from the following transcript from the School Q lesson:

PL: You want a dog to guard your property - you're reading a newspaper looking for dogs on sale. Here are the names of the dogs - it just gives you the names. Here they are: the one dog is called [writes] Warrior - soldier. The other dog is called [writes] Rose Flower. Which dog are you going to choose for your guard dog?

Ss: Warrior! Warrior! Rose Flower! Warrior!

PL: Who said Rose Flower?

Ss: Warrior!!

PL: Why? Why not Rose Flower? I think Rose Flower would be an excellent guard dog. [Laughter] Why not? What does rose make you think of? [Silence] Does it make you think of: wild, strong, fighting?

Ss: No.

S: Soft.

In both schools participation was spontaneous, and the choice of Warrior was automatic and almost unanimous (at School R there was some light-hearted mockery of those few who chose Rose Flower). Clearly, the students were making the right associations, and using them to make their choice. However, in the second part of the exercise where they were asked to articulate the associations they had used ("What does rose make you think of?"), the response was far less enthusiastic (closely following the experience of Exercise 1, which also involves articulating associations). In a sense, this is predictable: reflection on our own thought processes is always difficult, as is putting those reflections into words - and how much more so when this is done in a second language? Perhaps too much should not be expected from students in this regard. (At the same time, what this exercise may alert us to, with regard to later exercises on figurative language, is that where there do seem to be difficulties, they may not be to do with a shortage of associations as such, but an inability to articulate those associations in English: and the one should not be confused with the other.)

When Exercise 2(a) was used at School Y there was a similar response to the first part: an enthusiastic choice of "Warrior"

as the most appropriately named guard dog. However, when it came to the second part, the response here differed somewhat from that found in the other classes, suggesting that not all students have the same difficulty in reflecting on and articulating their associations. The transcript of the second part of this exercise, after the class had made their unanimous choice, reads as follows:

PL: Why Warrior? What are the associations?  
 Ss: Brave. Vicious.  
 PL: What else? Come up with words [...].  
 Ss: Strong. Dangerous.  
 PL: And Rose Flower?  
 Ss: Sweet. Nice. Nice smell. Soft. Cute. Delicate.

Once they had been encouraged, these students were very forthcoming with their associations - more so than they were in connection with the simpler association-tasks of Exercise 1.

2.3. A similar response was recorded for Exercise 2(b) [p.129] at School Y, for which the transcript reads as follows:

PL: [...] we want to put our money on one of these horses - all we know is their names - which horse will we bet on? Here are their names. One is called this [writes]: Rocket. And the other is called this [writes]: Old Granny.  
 [Laughter]  
 PL: Which horse are you going to put your money on?  
 Ss: Rocket! Rocket! Rocket! [Shouts, laughter]  
 PL: Okay, students. Now explain to me why. You don't know anything about these horses - you've never seen them. How do you know?  
 S: We immediately think of rockets.  
 PL: What do you think of?  
 Ss: Its fast - speed!  
 PL: And what about Old Granny?  
 Ss: Ohhhhh! Noooo! Slow!

This almost textbook performance shows even more clearly how well some students can deal with the task of first using their associations spontaneously and then reflecting on them ("We immediately think of rockets"). When it comes to articulating their responses, the contributions are limited ("fast - speed"), but nevertheless quite adequate. The everyday use of figurative

language never requires a wealth of association for full sense to be made of it (this is how it differs from literary usage); so if these introductory exercises, where the emphasis is on everyday use are to be reasonably authentic, we should adjust our expectations accordingly. (From this point of view, perhaps, the encouragement of students in the immediately preceding exercise to produce extra associations was not appropriate.)

2.4. A further variation, Exercise 2(c) [p.129] involving the names of soccer teams, was used at School Q and School Y with mixed results. In connection with the making of choices based on name-association and the subsequent articulation of those associations, the responses from both classes was in line with their respective performances in the earlier versions of the exercise. At School Y, for instance, the students opted with one voice for the team name of Cheetahs over Happy Dreamers. Why?

Ss: Fast! Strong!

PL: What about Happy Dreamers?

Ss: Ooooh! Always dreaming! Lazy!

However, when it came to the next part of the exercise - finding an alternative to both the given names, which introduced a new creative aspect into the exercises - the response in both classes was poor. At School Q no suggestions were made, and at School Y all that was voiced openly were the names of well-known soccer teams ("Chiefs! Sundowns!") - although there was a good deal of covert discussion and laughter which may suggest that as group work this exercise might have produced better results.

2.5. If in nothing else, this naming exercise was successful in so far as it produced a lively response from students, and worked as something of an ice-breaker (more efficiently than Exercise 1). As pointed out, the exercise was not consistently successful in getting students to articulate the process by which they had made their choices; here, as in other areas throughout these exercises, performance was determined to a great degree by the nature of the students and their context. Nevertheless the exercise did demonstrably engage the students in the activity of

making associations and using them in real-life situations, and even if this was not fully reflected on, the very fact of its being practised as a preliminary to further work, may be enough to justify the exercise.

\*

EXERCISE 3: Using associations to make sense of everyday figurative language [p.130]

3.1. This exercise type focuses on using associations in meaning-making, but it reverses the procedure of Exercise 2, where students first use their associations to make sense of a message and afterwards work out what those associations were. In Exercise 3 students are made first to call up word associations, and secondly to use them to interpret a metaphor. In this way it follows the basic model of metaphor interpretation set out in Chapter III, which involves the process of activating background knowledge in the form of associations called up by the vehicle of the metaphor, and then applying these to the topic of the metaphor. The simple two-part process which is introduced to students here will form the basic structure of most of the exercises on Shakespearean figurative language.

Two versions of this exercise were devised. The first (Exercise 3(a) and (b)) involves a first stage in which a word is given in isolation for students to associate on (resembling the association gathering activities of Exercise 1); in the second stage a metaphor is given in which the same word is used figuratively: students now have to apply the associations gathered in the first part, in order to make sense of the statement. By separately foregrounding the two stages of associating and applying, it is intended to instil a sense of the importance of each, as a basis for later exercises. In the second version (Exercise 3(c)), a metaphor is given, and students are asked to interpret it by first calling up associations on the key word (the vehicle), and then by applying them to the topic. Thus the exercise follows the two-stage process of the other version,

but instead of prior or "decontextualised" associating in the first stage, all associations are stirred up in the context of the whole metaphor: in this way, it may be seen as a more "authentic" exercise in metaphor reading which, as the theorists cited in Chapter III stress, involves the calling up of connotations not in any general way, but in relation to the whole context of the metaphor.

3.2. At School N, Exercise 3(a) [p.130] was taught at the very start of the lesson by the teacher (not the researcher). The teacher presented the exercise in two parts; the transcript of the first - association - part is worth quoting at some length.

T: If you hear someone talking about [writes] a church, someone talks about church, and someone talks about [writes] a battlefield - what comes into your mind, if someone says church, and someone says battlefield? What do you associate to church? What do you think.

S: Peace.

T: Okay [writes] - next one.

S: Love.

T: Love, yes [writes]. Some more? Quick, lets be fast about this!

Ss: Minister. Congregation. Hymn.

T: Hymn, yes [writes] - does it have an "n" at the end?

Ss: Yes!

Ss: Prayer. Psalm. Pulpit. Choir. Sunday school.

T: Alright, lets cross over to battlefield - if someone says battlefield what do you see? Yes?

Ss: Guns. Soldiers. Hatred.

T: [writing] Hey! You have a lot [laughter] - you are the soldiers I think! [laughter]

S: Blood.

T: Hooo! Dear God - people are dying! What else?

S: Trenches.

T: Trenches [writes]. [...] Another one? This is a very pregnant word - not pregnant this way [gestures, laughter], but "full of"!

Ss: Ammunition. Anger. Terror.

T: Terror [writes] - that's a lovely word - can you explain what "terror" could be ... because "terror" seems more heavy than "anger", "hatred"....

By the end of this interaction there were over 20 items on the board relating to the two key words; in her comments on the exercise, the teacher says, significantly: "Once a teacher taps the everyday knowledge of the students, the students just want

to talk endlessly". But clearly, the teacher here was especially facilitating, using her rapport with her class to generate a wealth of material, in a way which supports the suggestion made earlier that such exercises are peculiarly dependent for their success on such external factors as the nature of the presentation itself. It may be noted, for instance, how the teacher was able to make the most of this exercise by going beyond the generation of associations, and exploiting its potential as a tool of language teaching. She did this by getting students not only to express their associations, but also to reflect on this accumulating vocabulary: "that's a lovely word ... can you explain what 'terror' could be?". The teacher says in her report, "as I accepted this word 'terror' as an unusual word, I wanted the students to pay attention to it .... Part of this lesson then became a vocabulary one".

Once the associations on key words had been gathered in the first part of the exercise, they were applied in the second part to make sense of the same words used figuratively. In connection with "battlefield" ("guns, soldiers, hatred, blood, trenches, ammunition, anger, terror"), the following is recorded:

T: Alright, now we are going to have a sentence about church and battlefield.... Lets look at: "Her home is like a battlefield". Ooh! How is her home, if it looks like a battlefield?

Ss: No peace. Always fighting. Quarrelsome. Blood falling.

T: You mean there's a lot of blood? Full of blood - yes?

Ss: Enemies. Unhappiness. No respect. Uncouth.

This response exemplifies the performance of this class generally in the interpretation of the metaphors in these exercises. On the one hand, their interpretations are perfectly adequate, and often very good. On the other hand what surprised the researcher, who expected students simply to transfer their prior associations directly into the interpretation, is that there is in fact very little transference. What appears strange is that students by and large avoided the obvious strategy of using their ideas - even though many of them were ideally suitable. When the exercises

were used, by the researcher, at School R, almost exactly the same response was recorded. When students were asked to come up with associations for the word "knife" (Exercise 3(b) [p.130], there was an enthusiastic response, a forest of students' raised hands, though only a reasonably small selection was written on the board: "dangerous, kills, fear, hurt". Yet when it came to interpreting the sentence "His words were like knives thrown at me", what the students produced was: "his words were unacceptable and they were hurting", "they were causing pain", they were "sharp".

3.3. On first reflection, it may seem that the results suggest that students saw the exercise as two quite independent activities: having come up with one set of associations for the word in isolation (eg "battlefield"), they come up with a new set of associations for the same word when read in the context of a metaphor or simile; this new set might be an extension of the other (as in "enemies" above), or it might be quite different, and wholly influenced by the new context (as in the above excerpt: "quarrelsome", "unhappiness", "no respect", "uncouth" - all fitted to the domestic context of the simile). Of course, it is in the nature of metaphor, as recalled above, that associations triggered by its vehicle will be influenced by the particular context of the vehicle and not be of an unspecified nature - and in allowing this to happen, students may be thought to have responded in the appropriate way. This is seen in the way students at School N responded to Exercise 3(b): after collecting associations linked to "medicine" ("cure, wound, sick, injured"), they interpreted the sentence "Her words were like medicine to me" as meaning the words were "soothing, consoling, bringing relief". The new associations are better than the prior associations, because they arise from the context; and to insist that they should have used the prior ones would be foolish.

If it is the case that students are making little use of their accumulated associations, because such "decontextualised" associating is irrelevant to the actual process of metaphor

interpretation, then there may be reason to question the usefulness of foregrounding prior or "decontextualised" associations at all. However, further data suggest that the response witnessed in Exercise 3(a) and (b) is not necessarily connected to the use of "decontextualised" associations. When Exercise 3 (c) [p.130] was used at School Q, exactly the same tendency was shown. Students were given the statement "Susie's life is one long party" and when asked to come up with associations for "party", produced: "good things, ceremony, joy, dancing, happiness, delicious food". On being asked to use these associations to explain what Susie's life is like, the response was: "she leads a sweet life". Despite the fact that here the associations gathered in the first part of the exercise were stirred up in the context of the metaphor, they were not utilised in any obvious way when it came to interpreting the metaphor: once again, the process seemed to be re-started in the second part of the exercise. In other words, if it is true to say that students ignore the associations accumulated in the first part of the exercise in favour of a new process, when making sense of a metaphor, this is regardless of whether those accumulated associations sprang from a "decontextualised" word, or a word in its metaphorical context. But whether or not the associations are being ignored (and this will be considered next), what seems clear, and usefully learned from these try-outs, is that whatever form the associating stage takes in an exercise, it is impossible to contain the association process itself to that stage (as the exercise somewhat simplistically assumed); it will always be re-started or extended or redirected at the moment of interpretation.

3.4. However, we do not necessarily have to conclude that it is pointless to have a preliminary association stage in these exercises; for it is far from evident that their prior associations are of no use to the students when it comes to interpreting the metaphors. Indeed, the very fact that in the try-outs the interpretations were so good is possibly evidence that the students were using those prior associations, although

not in the direct way that had been anticipated. Judging from those responses, it seems that prior associations might be used in a number of indirect ways. It is quite likely that the prior associating on "decontextualised" words functions as the best kind of general schematic activation, precisely because it is so unconstrained by a particular context. Even if the items themselves are not used in the second stage, the schema which they have triggered is available to supply the more precisely appropriate items which the metaphorical context requires; so there is in the second stage a contextualised refinement of the prior associations, not a substitution of them. (An example of this is the case cited in 3.3. above, concerning the use of "medicine" at School N.) Another way in which it is possible to see indirect use being made of the prior associations by these students, and in quite a sophisticated manner, is best illustrated by the case at School Q cited also in 3.3. Here the application of the prior associations does not involve simply reiterating them but inferring something from them ("sweet" from "good things, ceremony, joy, dancing, happiness, delicious food"). Of such an interpretation it is possible to say that, although it does not derive directly from the list of accumulated associations, it might have been unavailable without them.

Thus, whereas the students' performance of these exercises was first thought to show a failure to apply their associations, it may be that what is actually going on is that they are instinctively following these more indirect techniques of application. And in doing so, they expose as something of an over-simplification the assumption underlying this part of the exercise, that the "application" of their associations would only involve the direct transfer of those associations into the interpretation, and that this is the most we can anticipate from students' performance. So these lessons properly complicate the notion of what application entails, and alert us to what is in fact a far more problematic area than was originally thought: the relationship between the associations called up in connection with a metaphor and the use of those associations in making sense

of the metaphor.

3.5. Despite all this, however - or, possibly even because of this revealed complexity - it may still be seen as a necessary part of these early exercises to stress the simpler, more direct use of accumulated association in making sense of metaphors. However else one interprets the students' responses cited above, it remains noteworthy that their performances show remarkably little direct borrowing from their accumulated prior associations when it comes to interpreting the metaphors. While it is good that students do not mechanically apply their associations (many are not strictly appropriate), it would be better if they applied some, where it could be done beneficially. A central tenet of these preliminary exercises is that students be made aware that they have their own resources, in the form of associations, which should be used to make sense of figurative language. And this is best done by encouraging them to put those associations to use in a fairly obvious and direct way.

It is clear from the students' performance that the exercises in their present form are not conveying this direct usefulness of their prior association. The vague instruction to students to "use" their association might be replaced with other strategies that focus their attention on the specific words: for example, from a list of prior associations, circling those which could be used in the interpretation. Another might be to make the list of prior associations an explicitly styled "dictionary", to be consulted formally when it comes to the interpretation of metaphors - except it is a self-consultation, and hence independent of outside assistance. In fact, something like this was tried in classes at School Q and School R: the researcher made on the chalkboard formal-looking tables of associations, and by frequently pointing to these items, encouraged the students to use them in their interpretations. Importantly, the researcher could then show the students that it was, quite visibly, their own ideas that had been used in understanding the sentence, and not reference to anyone or anything else. (For examples of

exercises that have this "dictionary" element built-in, see Appendix A, Exercises 3 (d), (e) and (f) [p.131].)

3.6. This particular aspect of the teaching of the material apparently impressed the teacher at School Q, who in his report makes this comment: "your exercises help pupils to have independent thinking by not consulting dictionaries now and then". But perhaps a more persuasive endorsement from the same teacher, not only of Exercise 3 itself, but of this particular approach to it, was offered in the form of his own, unscheduled, try-out of the material.

This teacher, although at first reluctant to teach the exercises himself, volunteered to do so quite spontaneously at the start of the second lesson. What seems especially suggestive, however, is the way he adapted the materials, so that what were given to him as simple associative activities (Exercise 1), he wanted to extend into activities in which associations are put to use (as in Exercise 3). Apparently seeing associations (of "black", for instance, and "funeral") as of little value in themselves, he turned each activity into an exercise in making sense of metaphors involving those words, which he devised himself, off the cuff. The following are excerpts from the transcript of his lesson:

T: Lets look at this word [writes]: black. Right, when you see a black cat, what suddenly comes into your mind? What do you associate with black? Yes?

S: Unlucky.

T: Yes, unlucky [writes]. What else?

S: Not attractive.

T: Yes, in some cases [writes].

Ss: Sadness. Sunset.

. . . . .  
T: [...] When the word black is used in the form of a metaphor or simile ... for instance, if I say [writes]: "His life is always black" - what do I mean? What kind of life does that person lead?"

Ss: His life is unlucky. It is sad.

T: Yes, it is full of sadness. What else? The things on the board [my emphasis].

S: It is not attractive.

. . . . .

T: Lets have the last one [writes]: Funeral. What comes into your mind?

Ss: Crying. Sadness. Sorrow. Death. Prayer. Fear.

T: [....] Right: [writes] "His life is a funeral". This person's life is regarded as a funeral. What kind of life does this person lead, when it is regarded as a funeral?

Ss: There is sadness. His life is full of crying. Full of sorrow.

T: Full of sorrow! You see, we are using all these words [points to the board] that we have associated with a funeral - in order to understand what kind of life this person leads. Which is to say, by using these associations, we can understand figurative speech.

Following the example of the researcher from the previous lesson (but eliciting better responses), the teacher was very careful to foreground the students' own prior associations when it came to the interpretation stage, with the result that those associations were directly applied: the two parts of the exercise are clearly linked, and the idea of self-reliance made manifest. Admittedly, in keeping to the list of prior associations, the students' interpretation may seem somewhat limited and mechanical - but at this preliminary stage of introducing the process, there is no reason why it should not be. Furthermore, the fact that this performance was the result of the teacher's own initiative and devising (modeled, of course, on the general method of the materials), suggests the extent to which the idea behind the materials may be both accessible and congenial to teachers. And finally, the teacher's spontaneous adjustment of the exercise so as to emphasise the communicative aspect of associations suggests that it may be this aspect in particular that teachers might perceive to be the most important aspect of these exercises - which is of course the conviction that underlies Exercise 3 and all subsequent exercises in this project.

\*

#### EXERCISE 4: Interacting with figurative language in traditional African poetry [p.133]

4.1. These exercises deal with the interpretation of metaphor in literary contexts, which in comparison with everyday figurative

language is more demanding: both richer and more innovative in its use of associations. At the same time, in order to make this introductory treatment of literary metaphor as accessible as possible, use is made of literary sources that are thought to be relatively familiar to black students. Thus examples are drawn from traditional Southern African praise poetry, which has been shown to be rich in figurative language, and therefore ideally suitable for present purposes (see, eg. Finnegan 1970:117ff; Kunene 1971:37ff; Kunene 1972; Opland 1983:12, 15, 17, 22, 34, 66, 110, 113, 246-7). Furthermore, it is reasonably safe to assume that the background knowledge evoked by such figurative language in the form of associations would be possessed by African students, thus giving students confidence in the value of their own life experience for the purpose of metaphor interpretation. And finally, traditional poetry has been chosen over contemporary western-influenced African poetry in English, in order to help stress that figurative language, even if associated with Shakespeare, is not itself anything discouragingly alien, but an age-old part of African culture also.

However, even if the students do have the appropriate background knowledge, it still needs to be activated - and this is what these exercises attempt to do. Following the basic model used in the preceding exercises, students are first encouraged to call up associations, and then use them to make sense of the metaphor. To encourage the activating of schemata, an effort is made to go beyond the simple technique of asking students to "think about" a topic, doubts about which are expressed above (see Exercise 1); more eliciting questions are used in this respect. But crucially, at the same time as calling up associations, the questions are intended to guide those associations in directions that are more relevant to the context in which they will be applied (see Chapter III). In this way it is hoped that associations will be produced which are clearly and directly applicable in making sense of the metaphor - thus reducing the tendency noted in Exercise 3 of students calling up associations which are

subsequently under-utilised, or which are not utilisable at all (because they are not relevant to the context).

4.2. Presentation of these exercises was mainly through group work using work-sheets that required students first to discuss their responses and then write them down. However, in some lessons conducted by the researcher, the same exercises were presented orally, involving the whole class along the lines of the preceding exercises; the purpose of this was to try to ascertain the comparative efficacy of small group/written exercises as against general class/oral exercises. This was a very limited and somewhat tangential experiment from which no firm conclusion can be drawn - yet it was quite plain that students performed better in the small group/written versions of these exercises. Whereas in the oral version it was very difficult to get responses from the students, the group work produced a lively participation, apparent both from classroom observation as well as from the quite full work-sheets submitted by the groups. A teacher (at School N) reported afterwards: "one group made me aware of how small the space was [on the work-sheet] that they had to use for writing down their responses ...[so] you can see that these students want to say a lot". One reason for this contrasting response is that students felt less inhibited when working by themselves than when interacting with the white researcher; in addition, the students' obvious puzzlement in the oral exercise was possibly due to the fact that the actual metaphor being looked at was itself never written down for students to inspect. Perhaps with relatively complex literary metaphors (even when they are drawn from supposedly familiar indigenous sources) oral presentation simply will not work.

4.3. In both the schools where these work-sheets were tried out (School N and School R), most, if not all, of the responses indicate that students understood the process they were expected to go through. Although a number of groups asked for help from the teacher or researcher on certain matters (which will be discussed shortly), it was in all cases entirely their own ideas,

pooled in the first part of each exercise, that they used in the second, sense-making, part. To give a general impression of students' performance of Exercises 4 (a), (b) and (c) [p.133] a selection of work-sheets is quoted:

Exercise 4(a): "SHIELDS are used for protection. During the war or when fighting. Yes, they protect the soldiers or fighters against their enemies ...THE CHIEF is protective, strong, clever, and great. He won't allow the enemies to reach his people."

Exercise 4(b): "FOREST FIRES terrifies, shivering, burning, hurt, destroys, pollution, erosion? too fast, high speed ...THE CHIEF can destroy nature, hurt peoples, make life miserable for his enemies."

Exercise 4(c): "THE RIVER FULL OF GRINDING STONES THAT ARE SLIPPERY the slippery stones will make you to fall and water'll wash you away, stones'll hit you ...THE WARRIOR is cruel, sensitive and dangerous."

In using their ideas to come up with perfectly competent readings of the metaphors the responses from these groups are typical of most of the performances. However, there were exceptions that may be commented on. In some cases, associations gathered in the first part were simply ignored when it came to interpretation - thus for Exercise 4(b): "FOREST FIRES: it is to be next to death, danger, they fight for the land, very fast ...THE CHIEF led his army to the battlefield". In another response to this exercise, similar associations are ignored in the same way, and the metaphor is interpreted as "THE CHIEF is brave". Here a rather crude stock idea about chiefs seems to over-ride the particular features the metaphor is getting at and which these students had in fact registered in their list of associations. Such responses suggest an unwillingness to allow the metaphor's associations to communicate anything new or different about its topic, which of course defeats the whole purpose of focusing on metaphors in literary reading. (A similar tendency is seen in connection with readings of Shakespeare's metaphors: see Chapter V, 7.3.3.)

Another, slightly more common, fault in some groups was not so much the non-application of associations, as their mis-application. For example, in response to Exercise 4(b) some

groups first listed highly appropriate associations - "frightening", "kill", "damage", "destroys" - but when it came to interpreting the metaphor ("O, he was the great one, the famous one / Amongst his enemies he was a forest fire") they had this to say: "He is irresponsible leader. He don't protect his people" or "He is a harsh ruler, ... very ignorant". These interpretations are clearly influenced by the violent associations, but at the same time they have ignored the other crucial factor - the context clues ("great...famous") which should have pointed to a positive rather than derogatory view of that violence. In having their attention focused by the exercise on the metaphor, it is possible that students may be distracted from context clues. Although such responses were in a minority, they still might point to an area in which the exercises could be improved: for instance by explicitly foregrounding context clues in introductory exercises, so as to alert students to their role in metaphor interpretation in general. (In this connection, see the additional materials in Appendix A: Exercises 5 (a), (b) and (c) [p.135].)

4.4. In all the examples of students' responses cited above it might be noted that there was little shortage of actual associations gathered in the first part of each exercise, even if in some cases those associations were inadequately used afterwards. That they accumulated the right associations might have been due to the students having the appropriate schemata (fires, shields, rivers), as well as to the questions in the exercise that were designed to activate those schemata. It is clear that students did respond to these questions that were also designed to guide their associations (as noted in 4.1. above). In fact, if it does not seem churlish, it may be said that the students followed the guiding questions too diligently, supplying separate answers to each one in the manner of formal academic tests, rather than (as was envisaged) simply being prompted by them into a flow of associations. An example of this is seen in the response to Exercise 4(a), quoted above at the start of 4.3. While such responses were adequate, it is difficult not to

suspect that, without this over-conscientious response to the questions, they could have been much richer and more varied. Only in one case was the students' response close to what had been anticipated, and that is the answer to Exercise 4(b), also quoted above at the start of 4.3. Here the students seem to be producing a freer flow of associations even while working within the guidelines set by the questions. However, when the majority of the students worked on these exercises they seem to have done so (quite understandably) on the assumption, instilled in them by years of a certain kind of education, that questions are there to be answered as directly, accurately, and formally as possible. This habit should be taken into account when using questions in interactive exercises, so that the unfamiliar facilitative function of those questions is made more obvious to students. And this is most important, as well as most difficult to accomplish, where the questions are intended not only to encourage but also to guide responses. The open-endedness of the facilitative question is easily sacrificed in the interest of this guidance, thus positively encouraging the students' habit of rigid responses; this perhaps happened in these exercises. Somehow a question form should be found that guides by opening up certain areas for exploring, rather than by closing off all options except for the one that the question focuses on.

4.5. Finally, it may be asked whether anything in these performances fulfils the initial expectation that the use of indigenous metaphors might make things easier for black students in getting to grips with interactive readings of figurative language. As mentioned, the students clearly possessed the appropriate schemata, which played a large part in the success of the exercises. However, over and above the issue of schemata, use of these indigenous examples did not preclude some basic difficulties with processing the figurative language. A characteristic problem raised with the teacher or researcher by groups of students was not over instructions or what was expected of them, but resulted from reading the metaphors literally. This is illustrated by one particular student's question, reported by

the teacher at School N in connection with Exercise 4(b): "he asked, 'is this chief a living person?'. So I said, 'Yes, a living person, but he is compared to a forest fire', and he was happy: 'Oh, I see!'". Figurative meaning may be an integral part of African culture as evidenced in its oral poetry, but there is not necessarily a corresponding "formal" schema for it among African students which can be activated by use of that poetry (see Chapter III, 3.3). However, the oral poetry extracts used to do this here are probably themselves flawed as evocations of a vernacular tradition - simply because they are English translations. As such they involve the same linguistic difficulties as any imported metaphors. That it is the language, rather than the cultural content, of a metaphor that is the key factor in making students feel at home with figurative language is clearly suggested by another exchange at School N which took place directly after the oral poem exercise:

T: Do you do metaphors in vernacular [...]?  
 Ss: Yes!  
 S: In mother tongue its nicer.  
 T: What do you mean? Explain "nicer" [...].  
 S: English is a little bit difficult [...] Because some words you don't know. [...]  
 T: Ohhh? Otherwise, if you did this in mother tongue, you'd get it - [clicks her fingers].  
 Ss: Yes [laughter].

On the other hand, content does seem to help; and it is necessary to counter-balance what has been inferred so far with the more explicit evidence of the student reports on the materials, which show an especially enthusiastic response to the use of indigenous examples. Of the 22 students at School N who responded to the question "If any [exercises] were interesting, please say which ones they were", 14 chose the indigenous poems; at School Q, 13 out of 29 respondents chose these exercises, and this was a day after they had been done, suggesting that they had made a fairly strong impression. Furthermore, the manner in which the respondents referred to these exercises seems to suggest that it was specifically their culturally familiar contents that had made the impression; to the question "Which exercises did you find

interesting?", some replies were:

"Forest fires, because they were talking about chiefs";  
 "When chief is regarded as a forest fire";  
 "The one about the African poems";  
 "The one where the chief was compared to a shield".

Thus, even if the indigenous metaphors were not in every respect easier than exercises using non-indigenous examples (they do not help students to avoid certain basic problems that arise in non-indigenous metaphors), nevertheless, they were fairly popular and on the whole quite successfully managed, and possibly both these things for the same reason, which is their use of familiar cultural material.

\*

\*EXERCISE 5: Using context clues to interpret figurative language  
 [p.135]

\*EXERCISE 6: Dealing interactively with figurative language in the poetry network [p.137]

(Because there was not the opportunity to try out either of these exercise types in schools, they have not been part of the development process, and so are not dealt with here. However, the different versions of these exercises may be found in Appendix A)

\*

### Conclusion

In an attempt to introduce students to the skills involved in interactive reading of metaphor, these materials are roughly sequenced, moving from the simple to the more complex (or from everyday to literary uses) and from discrete exercises in making simple associations, to integrated exercises where associations are called up and then applied in sense-making. With regard to the introductory purpose of the materials, all of the teachers who were involved commented positively in their reports:

It is quite praiseworthy that the exercises start from what the students are used to, and develop to something new. (School R)

This was well-planned, because it created interest, easy reach for words, applicable to everyday usage of the words. Confidence in the language is created by this kind of introduction. An exposure of students' deep feelings of words is brought to the fore. (School N)

There should be a rousing introduction to enable pupils to participate freely. (School Q)

That there was in fact a reasonably good level of participation in the exercises is indicated by the lesson transcripts cited throughout this chapter; and if such participation is any guide to the success of a pupil-centred approach, then these exercises may be considered by that basic criterion generally successful. With regard to a more specific assessment, however, we should view the students' performances in terms of the two main components of the materials: activating associations and applying those in interpretation.

On the whole the exercises which seemed to work best in activating student associations were the later ones (Exercises 3 and 4, where the calling up of associations was part of a larger process of making sense of metaphors) rather than the simple association games in Exercise 1. In the latter, students (especially in the rural schools) were slow to respond. But this is not necessarily a problem with the exercises: since the very purpose of these initial exercises is to get students practising a skill they are not used to, it is to be expected that early responses will be slow and awkward. Perhaps the most telling test of these ground-laying exercises is how the students performed at later ones - and the fact that they did better there might suggest that the initial exercises did serve their purpose. At the same time, however, the fact that the later exercises elicited better responses than the simple association games may also have something to do with the fact that they have a clearer purpose: the association activity is linked to the task of making sense of a statement, whereas in the initial games the

associations are called up for no immediately clear purpose. It was noted under 3.6. that when the teacher at School Q used the simple association games, he adapted them so as to give them a purpose, by using the associations called up to interpret a metaphor. It is this impulse in teachers to put ideas to use that seems significant, and should not be ignored. While this need not imply that the simple association games have no place, it might be taken as grounds for reducing their role.

In the later exercises that involve calling up associations, the try-outs seem to highlight other issues that need to be considered. One is the nature of the directions or questions used to elicit responses. On the one hand it seems clear that students need a certain amount of careful guidance; to repeat a statement made by the teacher at School Q, "When pupils think, they should know what to think through explanations. This will help them not to be scared". Students who have been accustomed to years of transmission-style instruction are probably more than normally dependent on rigid guidelines, and conversely are left feeling more insecure ("scared") without them. At the same time, other try-outs suggested that rubrics run the risk of giving too much guidance, as well as too little: they can influence and determine student responsiveness so strongly, that the exercise becomes nothing very different from a conventional question-and-answer routine. What is needed is a balanced approach, of accepting students' limitations by giving reasonably structured directions, which at the same time encourage individual responses. It is this balance that the exercises could make more of a priority.

Furthermore, where questions are used to encourage individual response, they might more specifically address the need to develop and extend students' associations beyond their initial level. Associations that were called up in the try-outs tended to be somewhat cliched or bookish. If there is a major disappointment with the exercises, it is not that they failed to elicit student response, but that those responses do not seem to be drawing enough on the store of personal life-knowledge that

is the essence of interactive reading, particularly in literary contexts (as stressed by Rosenblatt, for instance: see Chapter III). Students may be reluctant to feed into these exercises what Vygotsky calls "everyday" as opposed to "scientific concepts", because their years of schooling in the present education system have prejudiced them against any kind of knowledge that is not acquired in the classroom. But at the same time, and using the same distinction between "everyday" and "classroom" knowledge, another explanation may be briefly suggested for students' tendency to confine themselves to "classroom" associations in these exercises. Since, for many of these L2 students, English usage is confined to the academic domain - in classrooms and textbooks and examinations - it is perhaps to be expected that the kind of associations elicited by English words would be mainly of the "classroom" variety. Conversely, the area of students' lives where "everyday" knowledge is acquired, by its very nature, is the home, neighbourhood, playground: that is, the domain of mother-tongue use. And in so far as the "everyday" knowledge of these L2 students is associated with their mother-tongue, it might be expected that little of it would be called up by English words. (It is possible, for instance, that these same association exercises performed in the mother tongue might have produced more "everyday" associations from students.) Of course, we need not accept that for these L2 students "everyday" knowledge is inextricably tied to the mother tongue, or that English is necessarily limited to the evocation of "classroom" knowledge only; with some encouragement students may be able to bridge the two domains of language use, just as they may be able to overcome their prejudices against "everyday" knowledge in favour of "classroom" knowledge. What the try-outs of the present exercises certainly show, is that more attention needs to be given to ways of foregrounding students' "everyday" experience vividly and emphatically, so that it is a more obvious source of associations than at present is the case. (For one possible line to follow in this respect, see the additional exercises in Appendix A: Exercises 5 (c) (i) and 6 (b) (i) [pp.135-6; 137].)

With regard to the second component of the process - the application of the activated associations - the try-outs again raise certain issues that were not fully considered in the early planning stage. In the first place, the try-outs showed that it is not possible in practice to keep the two parts of the process neatly separated, with students first calling up associations and then applying them. Instead the two go on concurrently: the act of applying associations so as to make sense of a particular metaphor is likely to spark off a new spate of associations. Also, in practice the way students apply their prior associations is more complex than the mechanical process of transference that was originally anticipated. In fact, it is often the case that students do not use their prior associations in any obvious way at all when it comes to the interpretation of metaphors - and this is regrettable, primarily, because a main aim of the materials is to foreground the practice of using personal resources in sense-making. While some of these insights can be utilized fairly easily (see 3.5.), other revealed complexities need more careful thought regarding alterations to the materials.

## CHAPTER V: DEVELOPING MATERIALS FOR AN INTERACTIVE APPROACH TO FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS)

In this chapter an attempt is made to apply to Shakespeare's figurative language the interactive approach which was first outlined theoretically in Chapter III, and then put into practice in a preliminary and general form in Chapter IV. The basic two-part format which is used in Chapter IV also shapes the materials developed in this chapter: that is, firstly, the activation of students' background knowledge in relation to a metaphor or simile in the form of associations, which, in the second stage, are applied in order to make sense of the metaphor. However, in the present chapter the approach is necessarily complicated by the fact that the materials are now dealing with figurative language drawn from a Shakespeare play (Julius Caesar). In the first place, the materials have to deal with cross-cultural problems likely to arise when students do not have the necessary background knowledge needed to interact with a Shakespearean metaphor. Where this is the case (as in Exercise 8), the materials attempt to put into practice the suggestions made by schema theorists referred to in Chapter III, aimed at precisely these situations in L2 reading contexts. A second complicating factor of these Shakespearean materials is that, unlike the isolated metaphors in the introductory materials of Chapter IV, the metaphors here are part of a whole play, and the materials have to pay attention to this relationship with the wider context. In some of the materials presented below (Exercises 7 and 8), individual metaphors are extracted from the play and treated in a manner similar to that used in the preliminary exercises of Chapter IV - though they are briefly contextualised in an introductory note. The later materials in this chapter (Exercise 9) deal with longer stretches of text (involving more than one metaphor), so that interactive reading of metaphors is practised in a more sustained and context-heightened way which approximates to the actual experience of reading a Shakespeare play.

Note. All exercises discussed in this chapter are to be found in Appendix B: page references are given in square brackets.

EXERCISE 7: Dealing with culturally familiar metaphors in Shakespeare [p.139]

7.1. These exercises focus on metaphors that are thought not to be culture- or period-specific, since they involve background knowledge which is likely to be possessed by African students. Exercise 7 (a) centres on Antony's metaphor of a "sudden flood of mutiny" (III,ii,206) and Exercise 7 (b), on his "dogs of war" metaphor (III,i,276). On the assumption that both floods and dogs are familiar to students, the exercise makes no effort to create or extend the relevant schemata in students, but simply tries to activate their existing knowledge as richly and as variously as possible. This is done by means of questions intended to elicit a range of associations, following the observation cited in Chapter III, that immature readers tend instinctively to privilege limited kinds of association and ignore others. Thus, the questions draw attention to the physical spectacle of flooding rivers and the effects of floods, but also emotions stirred up by floods. In the latter case, the technique used is that suggested in Chapter III of going beyond abstract word associations (which are possibly limited for L2 students) by encouraging identification with whole scenarios so as to stir personal associations and recollections. It is this personal responsiveness that is highlighted in these exercises - partly as a consequence of the observation made in Chapter IV, that students tend to resist using their personal resources and local knowledge, instead calling up only the knowledge which seems "appropriately" academic and abstract.

7.2.1. At School Q, Exercise 7 (a) [p.139] was presented by the teacher to the class as a whole, and it followed on directly from one of the introductory exercises dealt with in the last chapter. The following is an excerpt from the lesson transcript:

T: Right, lets take an example from Julius Caesar now. Here is Antony. [...] there will be a "flood of mutiny". A flood: this is a metaphor. "Flood of mutiny" - mutiny meaning what? Rebellion. So there will be a flood of rebellion. Right, lets look at the word flood, and try to

make these associations. Right, if we look at the word flood what sort of things come into your mind?

S: Death.

T: Yes, death! In flood there is death. What else?

S: More rain.

T: Yes, there's rain. Right. The circumstances you are: you are just standing, and there's a flood coming towards you. What impressions will you have? You see the flood coming towards you [tone of urgency].

Ss: You'll get wet. Fear. Crying.

T: Yes! What about small children who may be found playing inside the river, when the flood's coming? [...] So, how is the flood? It is ...?

Ss: Dangerous. Merciless.

T: Right, so, which means to say, by looking at these associations of the word flood we can understand this metaphor. When he says "a flood of mutiny", what kind of rebellion does Antony mean?

Ss: He wants it to be dangerous. Fearful war.

Two features that are largely the teacher's own contribution seem especially noteworthy here. The first is the way in which, before the interpretation starts, the teacher gives some basic decoding assistance ("Mutiny meaning what? Rebellion. So there will be a flood of rebellion. Right, lets ... try to make these associations"). That decoding problems might hinder L2 readers' efforts to interact with Shakespeare's figurative language has been noted; but it was also suggested in Chapter III that these can be dealt with, and along the lines that the teacher intuitively follows here: clearing the way for students to interact with the text at the higher level, by taking care of the lower-order functions himself. The same method was required in the try-out of Exercise 7 (c) and (d) [p.141] on two separate occasions at School R, where students had vocabulary difficulties with key elements in the metaphors, "wasp" and "dew". The researcher was reluctant to simply explain the words, which would have involved supplying their attributes and associations - and this would have been to do the students' work for them. Instead, the Zulu equivalents for each were used (isibawu and amazolo respectively); and the fact that the students then came up with appropriate associations for each suggested that they did indeed possess the schemata, but that these had not been activated by the English words. In so far as such lexical problems can be

anticipated, perhaps it would be an improvement of the materials to provide synonyms or translations (but not definitions) as a regular feature. To do so would not detract from the interactive purpose of the exercise, but simply reconcile that purpose with the need to address the "bottom-up" reading problems of L2 students.

The second notable feature of the try-out of Exercise 7 (a) at School Q is the teacher's method of stirring up associations. After beginning with simple word-associations ("If we look at the word ... what comes into your mind?"), he attempts to project the students into contrived scenarios (or "circumstances") which he depicts with some dramatic force ("you see the flood coming towards you", "what about small children who may be found playing inside the river ...?"). As suggested above (7.1.), this is a key strategy of this exercise and it is inscribed in the questions posed on the work-sheets. But in this oral lesson the teacher is able to lend it special, almost theatrical, intensity through tone and gesture; and in doing so he indicates (very fleetingly here, but more powerfully in a later presentation, noted below) a potential in the exercises for sheer enactment of figurative language that might have various benefits. These benefits will be touched on later (8.3.1.); but one of them is hinted at in the transcript of this particular try-out, by the slightly better student responsiveness that follows the teacher's scenarios.

7.2.2. Exercise 7 (a) was also tried out at School W, as a small-group exercise using work-sheets that required written answers. A factor that should be noted in connection with the Shakespeare exercises done in this school is that they were not preceded by any of the introductory materials used in the other schools to familiarise students with the format and skills involved. Thus the students here came to this exercise "cold", and this might explain certain aspects of their response. On the other hand, the teacher in this particular try-out made an effort to facilitate students' responsiveness beforehand, as this extract from the lesson transcript shows:

T: Now! "The flood of mutiny". First of all, let me ask you, when we talk of flood ... flood ... a river ... flood ... a river: what picture comes into your mind?

S: Desperation.

T: Okay. What else do you think of flood? [Silence] Literally speaking, when you talk of flood?

S: Loss.

T: Loss? Okay. What else? [Silence] Now [...] we're going to spend 10 minutes answering those two questions. I want them to be your ideas. Alright. [...]

[Murmuring, queries: signs of confusion]

T: Generally, how do you understand it? Concentrate on the questions - it will channel you, it will tell you what exactly is wanted. Right?

Whereas for the researcher the exercises were, from the start, seen as either oral work for the whole class or written work for small groups, this teacher's combination of the two modes seems a useful alternative approach. Although the results of the ensuing group discussions are mixed, they are better than the responses elicited in the oral interaction just quoted, possibly because the latter required the preliminary oral work to warm the students to the task, or start the activating process. Here are the responses of all three groups in this class:

(a) RIVERS IN FLOOD: Obviously I would be frightened, as I know a flood is uncontrollable. I will try by all means to avoid it.

THE REBELLION WILL BE: He didn't want the rebellion to be immediate, because he knew that it would bring chaos but at the same time he didn't want to expose his part in it. He disguise the motive.

(b) RIVERS IN FLOOD: This would cause to do things without good and bad. Life of people are destroyed unexpectactly. This could be associated with corruption and violence.

THE REBELLION WILL BE: Antony seeks revenge. He wanted to start war. He sort of creates a mob spirit among the Roman citizens.

(c) RIVERS IN FLOOD: It destroys; it takes away precious things e.g. homes. It creates a sense of loss to its victims. Its consequences victimize; terrifies because they are unbearable. We would feel trapped and angry.

THE REBELLION WILL BE: He would want the people to avenge for Caesar and seek for answers through violence, murder and destructions.

As advised by the teacher, the groups allowed their ideas to be "channelled" by the questions, although not all the questions were responded to. For instance, the question "What do [floods] look like?" drew no direct response, although it was thought the act of physically visualising flooding rivers might open up a range of associations. (Possibly this could be better facilitated by reformulating the directions: asking how a flood might be drawn, or what aspects would be chosen for photographing.) On the other hand, in connection with the actions and emotions associated with floods, the students' responses are good, and (c) in particular is quite exemplary here. However, this does not prevent one from noting an oddly abstract quality about these associations: "good and bad, corruption, violence, loss, victimize". This emphasis on the emotional and abstract, even positively moral, side suggests that the students are being strongly influenced in their associations by the human context of the "flood" metaphor. Of course this is only reasonable and even desirable: as noted in Chapter III, associations of the vehicle in a metaphor are properly controlled by its context. At the same time, if there is too narrow a constraint, there is little chance of the vehicle leading us to unexpectedly apt associations. Whereas it was originally feared that students' associations would tend to ignore context and therefore needed "channelling", it may be that some breadth has to be encouraged. By drawing students' attention, in this case, more explicitly to the non-human aspects of the vehicle (the physical, for instance, as noted above) as well as to the other aspects, it may be possible to enrich a view otherwise overly constrained by the context.

When it comes to the students' application of these ideas in the second part of the exercise, there seem to be difficulties, and perhaps for a reason connected to the point just made: the students' thinking about any detail of the play is too tightly controlled by their general understanding of the play. Instead of putting their ideas to some use in answering the second question, they seem inclined to ignore them or allow them to be

over-ridden by their prior knowledge of what is going on in the play. Group A above is the clearest example of this. Obviously these students have quite a shrewd grasp of this part of the play; the problem is that they are not letting it be enhanced or coloured by the useful ideas generated by the metaphor. The same is true of Group B, which seems to be repeating vague and possibly memorised notions of the play ("revenge", "mob spirit"), while neglecting the new ideas gathered in the first part which would have filled out the otherwise bland generalisations. Clearly, the students fall back on learnt facts, in which they seem to have more faith than their self-generated material. But perhaps this should be seen as inevitable as a first response to these exercises, given the habits instilled in these students by years of transmission-style education. If that is true, then what is particularly heartening is the response of Group C, whose account of the mutiny Antony wants seems to integrate what they have already learnt about the play ("avenge for Caesar") with their own ideas newly generated by the "flood" image: "through violence, murder and destructions". Admittedly their account does not use the details gleaned in their associating on "flood" (loss of homes, terror, entrapment). But even in its generality, it is quite the equal of the explanation of the "flood" metaphor given in the ISEA edition of the play (the best available): a "wave of violence" (Burse 1992:108, l.206). And here at least it is of the students' own making, and at some level, perhaps, informed by those particularities which generated it.

7.3.1. Exercise 7 (b) [p.140] was tried out first at School Y and then, in a slightly modified version, at School Q. At both schools the exercise was done in small groups using work-sheets, following the preparatory exercises discussed in the last chapter. The response from a School Y group given below suggests how the exercise is performed by above-average students (for the details of School Y students, see Chapter II):

POLICE OR GUARD DOGS LET LOOSE WOULD: devour, attack everybody they came across, can't be stopped, destroy, be harmful to close relatives and the motive is just killing!

ANTONY'S WAR WILL BE: a cruel war. There would be no mercy. He recognises no friend once in war. He would destroy everything alive that he comes across. No one should try to stop him.

The interpretation of this metaphor in the second part seems excellent, and may once again be compared with the gloss given in the ISEA edition (Burse 1992:94, ll.275-6): "the evils of war". The ideas on which the reading rests, gathered in the first part of the exercise, show that the students have allowed themselves to be guided by the questions on the work-sheet, though in a loose and flexible way, producing responses that are, quite properly, fragmentary and in note-form, rather than the formal, full-sentence style used by most students in these answer sheets. (Better students have the confidence to be informal.) In following the questions, the students have narrowed their associating appropriately, to what may be called the sub-category of a "dog" schema: vicious dogs (and here the work-sheet's use of a distinctly modern version in the "police dog" might have had a part in the activation). Furthermore, students have taken the cue in considering particularly apt aspects of that viciousness: its senselessness and indiscriminateness. Of course, these cues on the work-sheet may themselves be over-constraining, so that certain other useful aspects (the physical appearance of dogs) remain unexplored. But even if the students' associations do not include much concrete sense of the "dogness" of these vicious dogs (jaws, teeth, eyes, barks), what is produced without them in terms of behavioural associations is more than adequate for the interpretation of the metaphor, as the second part of the answer shows.

However, this record of the group's final interpretation does conceal the confusion students had in the course of the exercise, particularly over the second, application, stage. The researcher had to answer repeated queries about the connection between the vicious dogs and "Antony's war", since the work-sheet obviously did not make this clear. The researcher's verbal clarifications seemed to have helped; nevertheless it was subsequently decided

to modify the work-sheet so that the directions for the second part would be more self-explanatory - and this version was used at School Q, discussed next.

7.3.2. At School Q the large class was divided into eight groups to work on Exercise 7 (b). Against expectations, the performance here did not differ markedly from that at School Y, despite the schools' widely discrepant natures (School Q is a deeply disadvantaged rural school with a below-average record). All the groups appeared to undertake the task with energy, and though the completed work-sheets vary in quality from group to group, the overall impression is of a rich responsiveness. If the "savage dog" associations gathered in the different groups were to be pooled - as they might be in a lesson which involved a round-up session at the end - they would look like this (a sample of the total response is given here):

violent - very bad - haven't got mercy - attack - biting - killing - run away and screaming - strong - misbehaviour - dangerous - fear - brave - cruel - bitten - frightened - terrible manner - uncontrolled - death - techniques of attack - clever - powerful - fast - fearful.

Some groups tended to specialise in rather generalised, abstract associations ("dangerous, fear, death"), while others were more graphic ("uncontrolled, bitten, violent, they will bite anyone in a terrible manner"). In stressing indiscriminateness this latter group was clearly following the cue given by the questions - something that most of the other groups did not do. On the other hand, some came up with useful aspects that the questions ignore, such as the point of view of the victims ("fall down", "run away and screaming"). Across the groups, however, there is a tendency to think of the dogs in a somewhat anthropomorphical way, as suggested by "mercy", "misbehaviour", "clever", "techniques". This is quite similar to the responses to the "flood" metaphor discussed above (7.2.2.), and like them it possibly shows that even while focusing on the non-human image, the students are conscious of its human context, or are

anticipating the human application of the ideas generated by that image. As a result, very few - if any - of the "dog" associations would need to be discarded as irrelevant when it comes to their application to the soldiers. This high degree of contextual selectivity is doubtless good, economical and quite sophisticated; perhaps it is churlish, then, to be disappointed that the exercise does not activate in the students a more thorough (even gratuitous) "canine" schema.

Despite this effective accumulation of associations across the groups, however, a significant number of them failed to put them to good use in making sense of the actual metaphor. It is true that, in contrast to the students at School Y, they did not show any signs of confusion while doing the exercise: no questions were asked about the connection between the dogs and the soldiers, which might suggest that the revised directions on the work-sheet were an improvement. And certain groups did carry their ideas over into the interpretation quite as effectively as the School Y students quoted above, yet without the assistance they had needed. The following example indicates this:

POLICE OR GUARD DOGS LET LOOSE WOULD: angry and attack and even bark and bite. Surely enemy will fall down and cry; dog will still bite and violent to the enemies.  
 HOW ANTONY WANTS THE SOLDIERS TO FIGHT: they will attack without asking any reason, they will violent to the enemies, killing, destroying, damage and causes fears to the enemies.

On the other hand, many of the groups produced answers that made little use of their previously gathered ideas, even giving the impression of actively disregarding those ideas. In one case, a group listed as associations of rampaging dogs: "behave very bad, will attack everyone in the street"; but in describing the soldiers this was produced: "Mark Antony wants brave soldiers that they never run away instead of run away they will going forward until they conquare". The two parts of the exercise seem to be regarded as separate and self-contained exercises, with the second part simply calling forth stereotyped notions of soldiers and martial behaviour (bravery, conquest) unaffected by the slant

given to the subject by the dog associations in the first part. This is seen in other groups, where regardless of the negative associations in the first part ("haven't got mercy, misbehaviour"), the description of the soldiers is positive: "Antony wanted a brilliant soldiers, strong and dangerous, the soldiers who are valiant ... defeating the cold blooded murderers". Again this answer may be seen as the product of stock ideas of soldiers, which over-ride the ideas just generated in connection with dogs; or it might stem from a broader view of the play and an ingrained bias in Antony's favour (hinted by the "cold blooded" reference) which will thus see everything linked with him in a positive light.

7.3.3. It is clear that many students (though by no means all) have a problem with using the ideas generated by the metaphor's vehicle when the ideas point in different directions from those in which they are led by their intuitions or prior training. Although they start the process quite well, they seem unable to follow the implications of their own ideas through to a unexpected conclusion. Conversely, however, where metaphors do not lead students to such conclusions, there can be a very much better success rate: student performance is influenced by the nature of the particular metaphor. For instance, a further exercise (7 (e) [p.142]), tried at School R, focused on a relatively simple metaphor, used by Brutus of himself (IV,ii,164): "O, Cassius, you are yoked with a lamb". In response to this students came up with associations on lamb ("tame, innocent, weak, peaceful, passive") that they then applied to Brutus without difficulty: "he is an innocent, not aggressive, peaceful, sympathetic" etc. In this case students' associations clearly would not have involved any conflict with their preconceptions about Brutus, would in fact largely have confirmed them, and so those associations were applied quite effortlessly. If this rough distinction is accepted - between the more complex metaphors that convey "new" information and those that largely reiterate "given" information - then perhaps the materials themselves should approach the two kinds differently. This would

mean, in the case of the more ground-breaking metaphors (which are doubtless the ones most worth drawing students' attention to), that the exercises should encourage students to see the gap between their expectations and any new insights suggested by their associations; and weight should be given to those associations so that they won't be so easily over-ridden by preconceptions. It is this power of preconceptions that seems the chief (and unanticipated) problem: even in the generally very well-performed Exercise 1 (e), briefly reported above, one group decided that the "lamb" metaphor tells us that Brutus is an "honourable" man. The problem, as has already been established, is not so much in activating students' background knowledge, but in getting them to use it communicatively, as a source of discovery; some students across a fairly wide range of social and educational settings show they can do this, but perhaps not enough to instil confidence in the present materials.

\*

EXERCISE 8: Dealing with culturally unfamiliar metaphors in Shakespeare [p.143]

8.1. This exercise type addresses those Shakespeare metaphors that are culture-specific, involving background knowledge which black students will probably not possess. Exercise 8 (a) centres on Caesar's metaphor of "the Northern Star" (III,i,60), and Exercise 8 (b) on Cassius's "Colossus" simile (I,ii,136ff). The distinctive purpose of these exercises is to solve the problem of this missing schematic knowledge, so as to facilitate interactive reading along the lines displayed in the other exercises. One approach might have been to create new schemata, via explanatory notes on the Northern Star, and the Colossus at Rhodes. Instead of this, however, the exercises follow the method of "surrogate schemata", described in Chapter III (3.1.). Here, an analogous schema, already possessed by students, is introduced by the exercise to stand alongside the metaphor; this existing schema is then activated so as to supply associations which roughly correspond with those likely to be stirred by the metaphor's vehicle, and thus do their work in allowing students

to make sense of the metaphor interactively. The challenge here is to find a "surrogate schema" which is certain to be possessed by students, but is also close enough to the original; at the same time, there must be proper encouragement of students to superimpose their associations onto the unfamiliar vehicle of the metaphor and use them in making sense of the metaphor.

8.2.1. Exercise 8 (a) [p.143] on the Northern Star took two forms in the try-outs; but in both the surrogate schema was chosen to match the Northern Star image in its primary associations of prominence and fixity. Thus students were asked to focus on a familiar geographical landmark. In the first version, tried out at School W, the exercise started with Table Mountain, and then in order to foreground local and personal schemata more effectively, any landmark in the students' own neighbourhood. Finally students were asked to apply the ideas generated by these items to explain what Caesar is saying about himself.

This version was quite strikingly unsuccessful in the classroom. The students used work-sheets in small groups, with the teacher moving around the room answering questions. And in fact there were more questions asked here, and generally a greater display of confusion, than was noted during the try-outs of any other exercise in this project. Most of it revolved around the use of the surrogate schemata, as summed up by this student comment: "Table Mountain, why is it included in the question, and how is it important or trying to say to us?". To encourage students to use the Table Mountain item in a way which would relate it to the metaphor, questions are asked about it which focus attention on those aspects most relevant to the metaphor (fixity, prominence). If this did not work, it was at least partly due to a certain misdirection from the teacher: "You've got to tell us your ideas about Table Mountain, whatever you think, whatever comes to your mind when you think about Table Mountain". (Compare this with the advice given by another teacher at the same school, quoted above: "Concentrate on the questions - it will channel you".) As a

result students tended largely to ignore the questions, throwing themselves into the topic as if important in itself, and coming up with associations valid for Table Mountain, but irrelevant to its purpose here:

looks like a table - tourist attraction - in the Cape - good for observation, e.g. Robben Island - misty - cable car.

In only two of the six groups were such items mixed with ideas that showed some response to the guiding questions ("High, huge, flat surface, immovable, unchangeable"). But even these groups were clearly nonplussed when it came to the second part of the exercise which asked them to name a local landmark. Instead of providing students with a chance to highlight further the associations of fixity and prominence through local knowledge, this became simply another separate task, with its own (much debated) preoccupations all leading ever further away from the context and purpose of the exercise:

T: Which one did you choose, gentlemen?  
 S: Rand Mine Properties ... you go passed -  
 T: Rand Mine Properties?  
 S: Ja, you pass it on your right.  
 T: [Pause] Oh! The hills! The minedumps!  
 S: Ja, the minedumps.  
 T: Oh, okay, okay. Before you get to Diepkloof?  
 S: Mmm.  
 T: Okay, what landmark did you have in your group?  
 S: Orlando Power Station. Because its the only power station that we have in Soweto.  
 T: Okay, and how did you respond to Caesar ... comparing himself to the Northern Star? Why does he compare himself to the Northern Star, and what is the resemblance between the Northern Star and Caesar?

What is characteristic here of the whole performance, is the way in which, after completing the earlier stages of the exercise, attention switches back to the original image of the Northern Star as if everything in the interim - Table Mountain, minedumps and all - was a diversion from the real business, which is sorting out Shakespeare's words. This is picked up also in the

students' answers to the question asking them to explain what the idea of the landmarks tells us about Caesar, which largely ignore the ideas written down in response to the earlier questions, and give instead preconceptions about Caesar: "a man of his words; a man of integrity". This may be because the students have not seen the connection between their earlier ideas and this; or they may ignore their ideas on Table Mountain because those ideas are simply inapplicable to Caesar, as we have seen ("flat-topped"? "misty"?). It is perhaps significant that the two groups that did come up with usable ideas in connection with Table Mountain ("high, huge, immovable") also applied them to Caesar: "a great person, honoured and visible, never changes his mind".

8.2.2. It is possible that with better guidance from the teacher, more of the students might have used the Table Mountain analogy more profitably. But citing poor verbal back-up is not to overlook problems inherent in the design of the exercise itself, which doubtless does not integrate the extra-textual elements properly. This is suggested by a comment the teacher made in her report: "I felt that students lost focus and were concentrating on the questions/exercises and treating them as though they are independent on each other and could not relate the exercise to the play". One reason for this loss of focus may be that the extra-textual element was over-elaborate, dispersing attention over not one but two surrogate schemata that students had to process. Since the second one (the local landmark) clearly did not contribute anything to even the better groups' performance, an obvious way to improve the exercise might be to remove this element. And lastly, some attention might be paid to the nature of the remaining surrogate schema. For it to work most efficiently, it should not be so absorbingly dense with its own associations as to set itself up in competition with the original metaphor, which seems to have been the case with Table Mountain. In addition, some students in their questionnaire responses raised a contrary objection to the inclusion of Table Mountain: that it was not familiar enough to them ("I haven't seen Table Mountain before"). There is possibly a message in this for those

who believe in the efficacy of Afrocentric materials per se in making Shakespeare more accessible. In choosing analogous schemata that will be familiar to black Southern African students we should not assume the existence of a monolithic culture or even geographical consciousness. (This point is reinforced by student responses to another use of a "local" analogous schema, cited below.)

8.2.3. The same exercise on the Northern Star was tried out at School Q, with revisions based on the feedback gained from the first trial (see Exercise 8 (a) REVISED [p.144]). The two changes are the omission of the middle section dealing with a "landmark in your area", and the replacing of Table Mountain by the Drakensberg, in an effort to make the surrogate schema as local as possible (School Q is in the Drakensberg foothills). Students worked in small groups with work-sheets, but first the teacher introduced the exercise:

T: Right. Lets look at this simile. When Caesar is confronted by Metellus Cimba - remember?

Ss: Yes!

T: So Caesar says ...[reads work-sheet]. I hope you know the Drakensberg!

Ss: [Groans, cheers] Yeees!

T: So, we've got to think about the Drakensberg: how movable are they? Do they change a lot? So in that way you've got to explain - write down your own impressions of the Drakensberg. You can add as many things as you wish. And then, you've got to answer another question [reads work-sheet]: "What is Caesar like if he resembles such a Northern Star?" So, you've got to tell us by looking at the Northern Star, you must make associations.

Compared to the previous school, this lead-into the exercise is ideal, with stress being put on the guiding questions. At the same time, however, the teacher himself seems not to have grasped the purpose of this Drakensberg activity, and how its associations can be used, because (like the previous teacher) when it comes to making sense of Caesar's words he simply reverts to the Northern Star image. Revealingly, he even mis-reads the instructions on the work-sheet aimed at getting students to apply

their associations on the Drakensberg: read by him, the printed question "WHAT IS CAESAR LIKE IF HE RESEMBLES SUCH A THING?" comes out as "What is Caesar like if he resembles such a Northern Star?". All this seems to indicate a difficulty with superimposing the associations of the surrogate schema on the metaphor: there is a commitment to the text which will balk at its being even temporarily (and relatively transparently) overlaid by a substitute.

It is possible, however, that this rigid textual commitment may be stronger among teachers than among students: for despite the mixed messages from their teacher, the students at School Q performed the exercise reasonably well. The following are examples of the returned work-sheets:

a) THE DRAKENSBERG: it is not moves and change. he will remain as it is.

WHAT IS CAESAR LIKE: he doesn't change even a rain or storm. He is firm, bravery.

b) THE DRAKENSBERG: doesn't change a lot. It is constant. It is firm. It is unmovable. It is higher and great.

WHAT IS CAESAR LIKE: He is constant. He is unmovable. He is also high and great. He is always stand for the truth.

c) THE DRAKENSBERG: unmovable, changeless, dangerous, fearful.

WHAT IS CAESAR LIKE: like a Northern Star which was unmovable, He does not change. He was dangerous.

All the groups followed the guiding questions so that their thinking about the Drakensberg was focused - possibly too rigidly as in the case of Group A, but in others more flexibly, allowing for additional associations that could be used effectively in the interpretation (e.g. Group B). However, the additional associations of Group C illustrate a problem with surrogate schemata. No matter how closely such surrogates correspond to the original metaphor, they will invariably elicit some discrepant associations, which might throw the interpretation out: in this case, "dangerous" is a fine association of the mountains, but is not part of the meaning implicit in the metaphor (though it may

give that metaphor an extra, unintended, aptness). Yet this does not seem a major difficulty, since sifting out of what is inappropriate when it comes to applying associations is necessary in all metaphor reading, where context clues need to be used; here also, students might be encouraged to be selective in the same way. In general terms, it needs to be said, Group C seems quite exemplary in integrating with the original metaphor ("like a Northern Star") the ideas gleaned from the Drakensberg ("unmovable, does not change"). And this is perhaps the clearest evidence produced by this exercise, that students can manage the tie up of surrogate schema with actual metaphor so as to use their own local knowledge to make sense of the unfamiliar terms.

8.3.1. Exercise 8 (b) [p.145] follows the same basic method as the last, in providing a local analogy for a simile that is unfamiliar to black students. To match the primary feature of "Colossus" - giant-sized human form - students are asked to picture a man the size of a pylon, and come up with ideas and associations related to that. The exercise was tried out at School Q as an oral activity presented by the teacher, and School Y as a written exercise with students using work-sheets in small groups.

Ironically, at both schools (rural and urban) the aspect of the exercise that gave students most difficulty, at least initially, was the word "pylon", with which they were clearly unfamiliar, although as it transpired they possessed the concept - or schema. But that the word itself had to be explained to them suggests a potential weakness in this approach, which is similar to that pointed out by Lemmer in connection with modernised editions of Shakespeare: "the syntax and the vocabulary of the 'translation' are themselves so formidable that a gloss for the modern version would also be required" (1988:167). Of course in the case of surrogate schemata, it is not the words themselves that are important, but the topic, and that can be activated in ways other than by language. The way the researcher did it at School Y was

through a drawing, which the students recognised. But it was the method used by the teacher at School Q that was especially effective as well as highly suggestive in a general way.

To supplement a very sketchy definition of the word "pylon", when it became clear the students did not recognise it, the teacher spontaneously became a pylon, or rather (in keeping with the work-sheet), a man the size of a pylon. With his arms stretched out, he took large strides around the classroom giving the effect of towering over the seated students in a menacing manner that caused something of a sensation. Whereas the work-sheet asks the students to "think" and "imagine" a pylon-man, the teacher performed it and in so doing elicited a useful response from the students ("powerful - big - very high - danger - fear"), which they then used to make sense of what Cassius's simile says about Caesar. The method used here takes further the suggestion of a dramatic rendering of metaphor that was noted in connection with the "flood" exercise above (7.2.1). On reflection stirred by these incidents, it seems that in its vivid concreteness, figurative language has an obvious potential for enactment in one form or another: each metaphor and simile providing a tiny dramatic scene within the larger drama. And viewed in this way, the interactive reading of figurative language might be brought even closer into line with the general approach pioneered by the ISEA editions with their stress on the play as a "blue-print for performance". In this respect, the point made by Lemmer is especially apt: the language of Shakespeare "is often 'difficult' because of its semantic denseness, allusiveness and poetic power. It is in translation of these things into the language of production and performance that meaning and genuine response should be sought" (1988:167). Students will make sense of metaphors through their own associations stirred up by enactments of those metaphors (or their surrogates). (See Appendix B: Exercise 11 [p.156] for samples of such an approach.)

8.3.2. At School Y, Exercise 8 (b) was tried out under different conditions, in small groups using work-sheets. These made

slightly greater demands than did the oral version, attempting to direct students to the different aspects of the simile, so that as much as possible of its quite complex suggestiveness is grasped. In light of the "Table Mountain" activity in Exercise 8 (a), where students were able to avoid following the guiding questions, this exercise attempts to foreground its cues more emphatically in a short series of stages that are less easily ignored.

In working through the tasks, the groups at School Y performed reasonably well, responding to the cues about pylons and then applying those responses in making sense of the simile. Following the steps on the work-sheet the students first thought about pylons in terms of what people would look like from on top of them (i.e. Caesar's perspective on others), producing a mixture of concrete and abstract items, indicating that they were to some extent using their imaginations as the directions suggest:

crawling insects, very small, powerless, nothing worth caring for, like ants, good for nothing, weaker than himself, defeated peoples, useless, they appear as nothings to him.

In the second part they imagined themselves into the opposite perspective: of people on the ground looking up at a pylon-sized man (the main thrust of Cassius's simile). Here one group gave as the emotions of people looking upward: "feel inferior, powerless, feel useless, invisible, worthless", and then applied this by saying that ordinary Romans "feared [Caesar] as if they feared God the Almighty". Another group, however, allowed their pre-conceptions about the play to over-ride what they had come up with (a widespread tendency across the try-outs), so that their conclusion is that the Romans only "respect, love and adore" Caesar.

The problem with this last interpretation is that it does not fit in either with Cassius's general attitude to Caesar, or with the immediate context of the simile, which is (largely) pejorative.

It seems, however, at least partly the fault of the exercise, that in absorbing the students in the pylon scenario it allows them to forget this context, and especially who it is that is speaking the words, whose view of Caesar this is. These are important aspects of the simile which are overlooked because of the narrow focus of this exercise. In focusing students' attention on the basic fact that figurative language communicates meaning that needs to be pieced together interactively, this approach perhaps inadequately stresses that those messages, like everything else in the play, also need to be responded to as part of our general interaction with the play. Are we to accept Cassius' view of Caesar, as expressed through this simile, as a fair and valid one, or should we question it, knowing who it comes from? How does this simile fit in with our own view of Caesar that is developing as we read? In a small and somewhat tangential initiative aimed at taking this aspect further, Exercise 10 (a) [p.154] was developed, using Caesar's description of himself as a lion (II,ii,46). When it was tried out at School N the students showed that after gathering associations on "lion", they could use them as the basis of a personal response to the question, "Do you agree that Caesar is a 'lion'"? Though far from conclusive, such a performance shows that it is possible to integrate interactive reading of the details with a response-based reading at large. And this would be particularly important in cases such as Cassius's lines in Exercise 8 (b), where the views conveyed through the figurative language are especially contentious. (For further comments on Exercise 10, see below.)

\*

EXERCISE 9: Dealing with extended passages of figurative language in Shakespeare [p.146]

9.1. Whereas the previous exercises on Julius Caesar each focus on a single, isolated metaphor or simile, these aim at leading students through more sustained interactive readings of figurative language embedded in longer passages of the play. In

a characteristically Shakespearean way, these passages put across their argument by means of a rapid turn over of metaphors and similes, each of which, while distinct in itself, is linked to all the others by the single train of thought. By working through the metaphors, students might be able to engage in a more authentic kind of reading than grasping isolated statements: they will be able to follow a whole stretch of argument as it develops through its accumulating figurative logic.

The extended exercise comprises a sequence of interactive tasks, each focused on successive metaphors in the passage under discussion. These tasks follow the pattern used in all the exercises described above: they use surrogate schemata where it is thought that Shakespeare's language may be culture- or period-specific; and where the language does not seem to offer such problems, they are designed to activate as richly as possible the appropriate local knowledge that students bring with them. Four versions of this extended exercise type were tried out in schools, but it is considered sufficient to discuss in detail only one of them - Exercise 9 (a) [p.146] - with brief cross-references to the others where necessary. In fact the exercises produced almost identical results in their different classroom try-outs, and all suggest very similar points for further consideration.

9.2.1. On the whole, students seemed to have difficulty with the exercises. The clearest indicator of this was their behaviour during the lesson, observed by the researcher and confirmed by a teacher (at School W) in her report: "What I also observed is that the students found it difficult to understand the questions on their own and constantly needed the assistance of the teacher". And this is supported by some of the students' own reports; the extended exercises were picked out as especially difficult because they were "long" and "complicated": "Its long and you lose your understanding of the question". It seems that the exercises may simply have been too much to process, asking students to look at so many pieces of figurative language with

each one requiring them to stir up a new set of associations - a different world of experience - each time. It is perhaps inevitable that in the event the associations gathered for each task were poorer than those produced in the earlier, shorter exercises. A factor here, too, was the greater pressure of time: in a sense, the awareness of the amount of work to get through militates against the proper accumulation of personal associations needed for the interactive reading of metaphors.

And yet, another striking feature of these extended exercises is how slowly the students worked through them; very few of the work-sheets returned by the small groups in each class were completed, and many groups did not get beyond the very first of the three or four tasks. It is clear in retrospect that the researcher wildly over-estimated the speed at which these students are able to work particularly in interactive contexts involving group discussion (some groups reported time consuming dissension amongst their members, and the need to "negotiate": "we were having different opinions", "we were arguing among our self" - School W). This collective immersion in the tasks is of course a good thing, and may attest to the communicative success of the materials. On the other hand, slowing down the work undermines another purpose of the exercise which is to develop a sense of the continuity between the different parts, so that students follow the whole argument. To work, the exercise needs to insist on a more rapid progress through the individual tasks than was experienced in these try-outs. It seems that such requirements - the need both for leisure to interact with parts and a momentum that will draw all the parts together - may in the event be mutually defeating.

9.2.2. Exercise 9 (a) was tried out at School Y where it was presented by the researcher, and at School W, presented by the teacher. Task 1 focuses on Brutus's words "Lets be sacrificers, but not butchers" (II,i,166), attempting to activate associations by capitalising on the correspondence between the Roman practice of sacrificing and African customs. This aspect was foregrounded

well by the teacher in his class:

T: I'll start with asking you a very general question. We know that in our African culture we sometimes sacrifice: slaughter a cow or goat or sheep or whatever, maybe for our ancestors, or maybe for - to sacrifice for the sake of saying we are honouring our ancestors. [...] Now when you are in a ceremony - although we differ in religion and beliefs - but when you are in a ceremony when a cow or whatever is sacrificed, are there any reasons behind that?

The teacher's impromptu preamble went on for some time, indicating his own enthusiasm for the cross-cultural question of sacrificers; but it was observed that the students themselves did not seem to share it. And in fact when it came to their group work, there seems to have been a poor response to the questions on indigenous sacrifice rituals despite the teacher's scene-setting ("you are in a ceremony ..."). Because the work-sheet did not actually ask students to write down their ideas about sacrifices, we cannot be sure what ideas were raised in most groups, but certainly the answers which are meant to arise out of those ideas are not informed by much local knowledge, although there are exceptions. Most groups simply answered that Brutus sees himself as a sacrificer in order to save Rome from tyranny, which probably derived from their prior knowledge of the play. One group added that Brutus "wants to be honoured and to be seen as a healer of the disease called oppression", and another that he wants the murder "to be seen as an act of goodness" - and these may well have derived from ideas about sacrifice itself. The same pattern of response was found at St Alban's, where the reiterated phrase about Brutus was "honourable", suggests again a stock response rather than anything arising out of sacrifices.

That answers were based simply on general knowledge of the play is certain in the case of at least one group, at School W, because the group's discussion was recorded. It begins in the following way, and carries on in like fashion:

We must understand the motives of the other conspirators, and distinguish them from Brutus - Cassius, he wants to

rule Rome - [breaks into vernacular] - Brutus is a sacrificer because if he kills Caesar, it would mean Rome would be safe from tyranny - Brutus made three mistakes in the play [...].

While the discussion is well-informed and quite sophisticated (the group was made up of students identified by the teacher as his best), it shows not the least interest in following the questions about indigenous ceremonies. This may be because, as has been seen in other cases, the play itself over-rides everything else. (In connection with another extended passage, dealt with in Exercise 9 (b) [p.148], students similarly ignored entirely a task intended to elicit their local knowledge of suburbs and cities, simply focusing on the accompanying question on Portia.) Yet in this case of the sacrificers there is also the possibility that students were not simply being drawn back into the play, but were actively resisting being involved in issues of traditional African culture. Both School W and School Y are urban schools with students from the townships, where there is likely to be less adherence to traditional practices such as sacrificing, and even some antagonism to them. It is notable that the teacher at School W, in his remarks on "our African culture", acknowledges that "we differ in religion and beliefs" - and in fact some students' comments in their reports imply that there are some blacks whose religion does not involve sacrifices: "not all [the exercises] were difficult but those which included our tradition, because we are from different kinds of walks". This is a reminder from the best possible source that black students make up a multi-cultural population about which no simple assumptions should be made when it comes to plugging Shakespeare into the local context. Ironically, the group of students who actually did think about rituals of sacrifice did so not in terms of African traditions at all, but in Biblical terms: "people do sacrifices (eg Abraham in the bible) to ask from God".

9.2.3. Task 2 of Exercise 9 (a) takes Brutus's lines "Let's carve him as a dish ...not hew him as a carcass" and attempts to activate associations of "carving" and "hewing", partly by

getting students to act them out (a method discussed above, at 8.3.1.). At School W, the teacher did not give this latter aspect any additional emphasis, and none of the groups appeared to be engaging in it, possibly because it was quite out of their experience. In this class the responses to Task 2 were in fact generally poor, both in the gathering of associations and in their application. As with the previous task on sacrificing, students here seemed to either ignore the association aspect altogether or treat it cursorily. (Two groups simply copied answers from the annotations in their editions of the play, which is perhaps a not very surprising reaction given the habit of dependence inculcated in students over the years.) In all cases, there is the impression of haste to get to the second part of the task which deals with the play itself: "What feelings about the murder [of Caesar] does Brutus want the plotters to have?" Here again the groups tend to ignore the ideas half-heartedly gathered in the first part and respond on the basis of general or stock ideas about the play. This is a feature that comes up so frequently that it is not necessarily due to any local weakness; but it may have been encouraged by the actual wording of the work-sheet (just quoted) that does not specifically direct students to use their accumulated ideas. Since it has been established that students have problems in making the connection between the two parts of the exercise, every effort needs to be made to clarify and emphasise this.

When Task 2 was subsequently tried out at School Y, these directions were slightly modified, to link the two steps more explicitly - and indeed, the response was improved, though not necessarily for this reason. In fact the students' performance showed a general improvement, giving quite a different sense of at least the potential of the materials. The ideas about "carving" and "hacking" show some physical awareness that suggests that the instructions to enact the motions may have been taken up. This is a selection from the combined groups' response:

CARVE: slicing carefully, precise - mannerly, orderly -  
patience - gentle - using hands carefully;

HACK: abrupt - chopping - roughly - brutally - uncarefully.

When it came to the question about Brutus's intentions, these students' answers were also more focused and informed by the ideas they had just generated. The following is again a selection from the combined class:

BRUTUS WANTS: to kill him soft, gentle, carefully - kill Caesar with respect - kill with care and dignity - kill Caesar in an honourable way.

As the last item indicates, this class still shows the recurring tendency to fall back on stock ideas about character ("honourable"); but on the whole the responses show that students are indeed using their own ideas, either directly ("soft, gentle") or, more impressively, indirectly ("with dignity, respect"). With these students, therefore, the exercise may be said to have achieved its intended end - yet it is necessary to note that this was after a certain amount of extra clarification by the researcher in the course of the lesson. In particular, students' queries suggest that the first part of the task is obscure: "Think about these two actions: what would be your feelings ...?". On top of the direction to perform the actions, is the instruction to have feelings about them, and this switch caused some puzzlement. If the exercise is to be free-standing and not reliant on the verbal back-up of its designer, it will have to simplify this aspect, making clearer the use of performance as a stimulation of associations.

9.2.4. The performance of Exercise 9 (a): Task 3 at School W and School Y followed the same pattern as the previous one. In this task, instead of simply explaining to students the somewhat alien experience on which the simile is based (the master-servant relationship), an attempt is made to create an equivalent scenario with which they will be able to identify, using a surrogate schema (the dog-owner relationship). However, at School W students once again seem to have had serious difficulties with

the task; far from showing any sign of having engaged in the preliminary activity ("imagine you have secretly encouraged your dog..."), many students resorted to the notes in their editions of the play, copying out the relevant bits in response to the question about how Brutus wants the plotters to behave. There may be extraneous factors causing this reaction, but it is also likely that the way in which the task is framed has not helped - the jumps from reading about plotters to imagining dogs and back to the plotters, as they are presented in this compact set of directions might well seem bewildering to students. That it was bewildering to the School Y students was made clear by the groups' more outspoken complaints during the lesson. As with Task 2, the researcher had to move around the class explaining the substitute scenario of the dog fight; one student who insisted that he understood that scenario itself needed clarification on how it related to the next set of directions: "what does Brutus want the plotters to do with their violent tempers...". Altogether, there seems, for the students, to have been an excess of extra-textual material both to process and cross-reference to the text itself, and this resulted in a kind of short circuit (and hence, perhaps, the escape by the students of School W back to the straight-forward verities of editorial notes).

Such a response must cast some doubt on the usefulness of local surrogate material that in attempting to simplify actually complicates. On the other hand, once the directions had been verbally clarified for the students at School Y, the groups produced very good answers that reflect their engagement with the surrogate scenario in the first part of the task. The following are a selection:

BRUTUS WANTS THE PLOTTERS: not to continue being angry because they will seem to be enjoying to kill people and caesar's death wont have any meaning - wants them to pretend to be upset, so that the people must say they killed Caesar not for their own good.

While it is true that the School Y students who produced these

responses are probably above-average academically, it seems that the key factor responsible for their performance, in contrast to that at School W, is the extra assistance they got from the researcher but which the other students did not. And this once again must imply that as they exist now these particular exercises are problematic in their details, although possibly in their general conception they have a potential for eliciting from students some worthwhile responses.

9.2.5. Whereas the metaphor in the previous task was thought to require a local substitute which would be more accessible to students, Exercise 9 (a): Task 4 relies on the modern familiarity inherent in the metaphor (which is based on doctors), and simply attempts to activate students' schema - their abstract knowledge but also their personal experience ("Have you had a painful experience with a doctor ...?"). This task comes at the end of the extended exercise and a number of the groups did not have time to reach it. Those at both schools who did the task showed far less confusion over it than they did over the other tasks, possibly because it is more straight-forward in its structure, and does not involve any extra-textual material, or surrogate schemata. At both schools the groups responded very well to the first part, in gathering ideas about doctors and medical treatment. In fact, students seemed to involve themselves in this issue, and draw on personal feelings, more than they did in any of the other tasks in this extended exercise (particularly the sacrificers in Task 1):

I did not feel bad because I knew that the doctor is trying by all means to save my life - I felt that he wanted to save me - I went to him because I was in pain - yes; he caused the pain in order to give me a better treatment for my problem, but his pain ended in a good way because I was healed.

However, when it came to applying this material in the second part of the task, the students in both schools performed poorly, largely ignoring their ideas, and giving answers based on their general knowledge of the play. (This feature of becoming immersed

in extra-textual materials, and then forgetting them once the text is returned to, is also seen quite strikingly in the third task of Exercise 9 (c) [p.150] on "civil wars", where students produced a rich assortment of details drawn from contemporary events - Mocambique and Bosnia - but then utterly failed to put them to use.) Here students seem to have missed the vital connection between the two parts of the task (gathering ideas and applying them) - which in the case of the "doctors" may partly be because of the phrasing of the directions. These could be simplified and made more pointed in encouraging students to use their ideas; as they stand the directions do not obviously relate to the first part of the exercise at all. This concern over details of phrasing may seem minor, and indeed there are problems with the materials that are far more fundamental (as a teacher at School W commented, "I am not sure if the questions themselves were difficult or the phrasing of the questions is what beat [the students]"). But there are indications throughout the try-outs of the materials that phrasing matters. In those cases where changes in phrasing have been made between a try-out in one school and the next, improvements have been noted. And in some returned questionnaires students refer to problems of phrasing: "they were not difficult but the manner in which they were written was not clear enough" (School W), and, in connection with Exercise 9 (b) [p.157], "the last [question is difficult] ... about Brutus being the city and Portia the suburbs 'at this moment'. I mean, which moment?" (School W).

9.2.6. The extended exercises were on the whole revealed as problematic by the try-outs, although there was significant variation from task to task, and from school to school. In a sense, many of the problems are inherent in the conception of the exercise, which is to get students reading longer passages that use strings of metaphors. In order to get students to cover this kind of richly figurative text quickly, the questions have to be as compact as possible; but this leads to problems of clarity. Furthermore, because the exercises deal with longer passages, there seems to be a proportionately stronger tendency among

students to become immersed in the whole context of any given piece of figurative language, and a greater reluctance to work with extra-textual material - their own background knowledge - than they are in the shorter exercises dealing with isolated extracts. Finally, although the extended exercise is meant to lead students down a passage of sustained argument, articulated through figurative language, in effect little overall sense of the passage seems to be coming across from the exercises. This is because, although they deal with longer passages, the exercises are divided into individual tasks, and each of these (which as it turns out is very time-consuming for the students) serves to break up the attention to the whole. This may in fact be seen as the chief criticism of these extended exercises in performance, which goes to the heart of their purpose. It is possible that to achieve that purpose, the separate parts could be linked together more explicitly, to emphasise the accumulating sense emerging from the separate metaphors. At present the exercises have no interlinking elements. However, there are the other factors referred to above that lead one to doubt the efficacy of such revisions. What is quite strongly suggested by the try-out of the extended exercises is that an interactive approach to figurative language is best suited not to sustained readings-in-process at all (the approach is too slow, too fracturing), but to activities beyond such readings, dealing with short passages in isolation.

Certainly, the shorter exercises considered in the previous sections of the chapter had better responses than the extended exercises. And even when the extended exercises did not seem to work as wholes, there were enough good responses to some of the individual tasks within them to suggest that it is in these limited uses that the approach might be successful.

\*

EXERCISE 10: Miscellaneous activities with figurative language in Shakespeare [p.154]

10.1. The activities that make up the second parts of Exercise 10 (a) and Exercise 10 (b) are somewhat peripheral to the main

thrust of the materials, and therefore are only briefly described here. They attempt two things. First, they aim at introducing a more obviously "creative" element into the work on Shakespeare's figurative language, either by having students come up with metaphors and similes of their own, inspired by, or at any rate related to, one in the text - as in Exercise 10 (a); or they give students such a metaphor to serve as the basis for some discussion - as in Exercise 10 (b). The purpose is to reinforce the point that figurative language is something that we all (like Shakespeare) have recourse to, in order to communicate our ideas and observations, such as those about the play that students are asked to express via similes in the second task of Exercise 10 (a).

And this links to the second, and more important, aim of these tasks, which is to lead students back into a consideration of the whole play, after having focused on the isolated metaphorical passage in the first part of each exercise. Indeed, in many of the exercises discussed in the chapter, it is precisely this that is lacking: techniques to contextualise the work on isolated metaphors, to connect it up with related aspects of the play, to make it not an end in itself, but a springboard for a more wide-ranging treatment of the play. (This relates to a point made earlier about contextualised readings: at 8.3.2). It is possibly only by including this dimension that work on metaphors is ultimately worth the trouble put into it. At any rate, there are opportunities for capitalising on metaphors that it is a pity to squander. The second parts of Exercises 10 (a) and (b) give examples of these.

10.2. Of the two versions, only Exercise 10 (a) [p.154] was tried out, at School N. (The first part of this exercise was briefly discussed at 8.3.2; only the second part is dealt with here.) After working on Caesar's description of himself as a "lion", students are asked to suggest animal-similes for other characters in the play. In response, the following were given:

"BRUTUS: hyena - chamileon";

"CASSIUS: jackal - snake";  
"ANTONY: sheep - lamb".

Many of these choices are surprising and in need of some explanation - though because it is not asked for by the question, none is given. This weakness in the design was noted by the teacher at School N: "you could question this [students' choices], and they would end up quoting from the text to support their argument". In this way, the task would indeed lead back into some useful reflection on the play as a whole, with a combination of creativity and close reading. (Another way to elicit this might be to get students to show their chosen animals to partners who have to identify the characters represented by each: contentious choices would have to be justified with reference both to individual perceptions of the characters and ultimately, to the text itself.)

The teacher here made a further suggestion about the exercise which is worth quoting:

I think students wanted to put more than one animal for one character ....It could have been helpful to have at least animals in a list and say pick and match, perhaps open the choice to any number of animals. You could have had an experience of their mixed feelings about the characters who might represent different contrasting animals, e.g. lamb and lion for one of jackal and tiger et cetera.

The use of a list could limit the students' own creative participation in such an exercise, though it might also be the sort of compromise that ends up facilitating a richer engagement with the play. As the reference to the students' "mixed feelings about the characters" indicates, this teacher, at least, has no doubt that there is amongst her students a personal involvement with the play as a whole, which the work with the similes can foreground and develop. And more generally, this might suggest that it is possible for a task that starts off by focusing on a piece of figurative language, to broaden into a more

comprehensive exercise in response-based reading.

\*

\*EXERCISE 11: Performance activities with figurative language in Shakespeare [p.156]

(Because there was no opportunity to try out the versions of this exercise in schools, they are not part of the development process, and so are not dealt with here. However they may be found in Appendix B.)

\*

### Conclusion

To elicit the students' opinion of the materials, they were asked to complete questionnaires. A total of 221 responses were collected from the five schools involved in the project (the details are given in Appendix F). The pattern of their responses to the general questions about the materials is for the most part resoundingly clear. 90% said that they had understood what they were expected to do; 68% said that none of the exercises was too difficult to answer; 94% said that they found the exercises interesting; 91% said the exercises helped them to understand Shakespeare's figurative language. The response from the students is quite strikingly positive and enthusiastic and encouraging. For all the standard reasons (mentioned in the research design in Chapter II), these responses are not given primary importance in the evaluation of the materials, but they are noted. What may give some credence to the generally positive feedback is, paradoxically, the relatively muted response to the second question - on the difficulty of the exercises. The fact that almost 30% of the students expressed their problems with the materials in the midst of their positive assessment seems to suggest that the assessment is not automatic and unreflecting. And of course this particular problem acknowledged by the students is what the work-sheets also indicated. Furthermore, from a school-by-school breakdown of these responses, it is clear

that the bulk of the students who expressed difficulties were at one school, School W. This was the only school where the introductory materials on association skills (dealt with in Chapter IV) were not used: students were simply launched directly into the Shakespeare materials. This might confirm the starting assumption that such materials require some basic preparation.

The generally enthusiastic response in these student questionnaires is further endorsed by the teachers' reports on the materials: both in their perception of the students' reactions, and in their own feelings. The following are taken from their reports:

I do support the use of familiar ground to anchor new ideas ... especially on something or rather a subject like Shakespearean drama. Your Exercises in this respect are very good and intriguing. (1st teacher, School W)

Imaginative approach brings about vivid and practical understanding of the play. Personally I feel the material is reasonably simplified and thought-provoking. In some instances students could not precisely apply their knowledge to the metaphoric expressions given, although this was on rare occasions. Generally the students enjoyed the whole exercise. (2nd teacher, School W)

Very good since they involve pupils to make use of their everyday life situations. It was interesting to them. (School Q)

The exercises offer children excellent training in figurative language. Children appreciate these exercises and they (exercises) have done away with fear that these children always had for Shakespearean writing. (School R)

That these are to be taken as serious assessments which are the product of some reflection (rather than of politeness) is suggested by the fact that most of these teachers, on other occasions during the try-outs, voiced certain criticisms, which have been incorporated into the discussion in this and the preceding chapter. Furthermore, with the exception of the teacher at School R, these comments stem not only from observing the materials in action, but from teaching them and dealing with

students' responses to them. And in this respect, as both observers and presenters of the exercises, their comments bear out the researcher's impressions - both as observer and presenter - that the lessons were characterised by a lively engagement with the tasks and a high degree of sheer productiveness both of conversation and written material.

However, this impression of the students' performance is inevitably complicated by the details of that written material, in the work-sheets which the teachers did not see but which have been the subject of most of the preceding chapter. Despite the students' assurances (in the questionnaires) of their control over and benefit from the exercises, their performance was disappointing in one respect. Even where they generated useful material from their own background knowledge, they did not consistently use it in their reading of the text (see the remark of the second teacher at School W, quoted above). Why is this the case? The students, quite understandably, were throughout these exercises on Julius Caesar preoccupied with the play itself, showing an over-riding compulsion to keep close to the play and return to it as quickly as possible after the distractions of the exercises - and it is as so many distractions from the play that they seem to have seen the tasks aimed at activating their own background knowledge. This is especially true of the tasks involving "surrogate schemata". That they should have taken this view of the tasks is partly the fault of the exercises themselves or the way they were presented. It is possible that they present the schema activation tasks in a way that divorces them from the play, or at least does not integrate them enough. They do not facilitate an easy linking of play and students' background knowledge. But there may be another reason why the students did not use this knowledge or saw it as a puzzling distraction. The students' own habit of thought, instilled through years of a certain kind of education, privileges knowledge got from books and teachers and under-values personal knowledge and extra-curricular experience. This latter kind of knowledge, even when summoned up through schema-activation tasks, is not trusted

sufficiently as a source of meaning, and students fall back on meanings they have "learned" about the play. Indeed, what might seem like their preoccupation with the play that is pulling them away from reflecting on and using their own life-knowledge is actually their preoccupation with this learned knowledge of the play with which they feel secure and confident.

With these transmission-style habits forming the general context in which the interactive materials were tried out, it is perhaps not surprising that problems were experienced in getting students to find answers out of their own personal knowledge. Perhaps the real surprise is that in many instances students showed that they were able to transcend those habits and actually produce interactive readings. And there are enough of those cases to suggest that students are ready to respond to a different approach, given the appropriate input. In fact a number of students showed not only that they could perform the tasks but that they actually grasped the principle of the approach itself, as these comments from the returned questionnaires indicate:

I can use my own ideas to understand the [figurative] language. (School R)

I used my own discretion. (School Y)

The exercises wanted only my point of view. (School N)

None of them was difficult because they include our real feeling about things around us. (School Y)

The next best thing to an environment already prepared for an interactive approach to literature is one which, at its best, is amenable and even impatient for it to be commenced. To the question "Did the exercises help you to understand Shakespeare's metaphors and similes?" two student responses were:

I can say yes/no because if we can do such questions maybe I could understand. (School W)

Yes. Please try to send us more about Julius Caesar.  
(School N)

## CHAPTER VI: GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In attempting to establish ways of dealing interactively with figurative language, this project has raised more questions and problems than it has found satisfactory answers for. In an important sense, though, this is precisely what it was meant to do, as an exercise in formative evaluation. The purpose of the classroom try-outs was to reveal aspects of the conception and design of the materials which need further attention. However, because the present project constitutes only a very limited R & D cycle (see Chapter II), there is not the scope for sustained treatment of these aspects. The most that such a project can do is simply to record the points that have emerged.

These points have been recorded in Chapters IV and V, in the descriptions of individual exercise trials, and summarised at various stages of those chapters, which it may be convenient to recall here. Running summaries are found in Chapter IV at 1.6, 2.5, 4.5, and finally in the general conclusions on the non-Shakespearean materials (p.73). In Chapter V, summaries are found at 7.3.3, 8.2.2, 9.2.6, and in the general conclusions on the Shakespearean materials (p.111). Rather than reiterate the specific points made there, the remainder of this chapter will make some general observations about what the try-outs revealed, leading into some recommendations regarding further work in this area.

1. On the whole, the materials were met in the classrooms with a responsiveness that exceeded the researcher's expectations. Even in those schools where the general approach was clearly unfamiliar, there was nothing of the resistance to non-transmission-style methods noted by others involved in similar situations (Walters & England 1988:213). On the contrary, these try-outs showed students as quick to participate in both group work and teacher-student interactions: offering their own ideas, listening to and using those of others, taking cues from teachers but not passively relying on them; no blank answer sheets were

returned by any group. This is not to gainsay the different observations of others, or to make any claims for the particular materials used, but simply to indicate that in this small but fairly varied selection of classes, a more optimistic impression was formed of African students' (and teachers') receptiveness to learner-centred methodology in general.

2. One aspect of this responsiveness that is linked to these particular materials was the sheer amount of language use they generated. No doubt some degree of language practice is given by all interactive approaches to teaching; but what emerged as a striking feature of these association exercises (and one that was hitherto unrecognised) is how specifically "vocabulary-intensive" they are. The making of associations is a finding of words. As students found words to express their associations, it was these words again (as much as memories or mental pictures) that suggested yet other words, so that the whole process emerged, to a greater degree than was originally realised, as word-driven. This must make obvious difficulties for students whose English vocabulary is very limited. But what is in fact remarkable is how many associations - whole constellations of words - the students were able to come up with nevertheless. From another angle, the "vocabulary-intensive" nature of the association exercises makes them excellent teaching tools for vocabulary building (as noted by one of the teachers in the try outs: see Chapter IV: 3.2). It is possible that, with some input from studies of vocabulary development, more might be made of this aspect of the exercises.

3. Regardless of how good the students' associations were, however, it is difficult not to see ways in which they might have been better or more wide-ranging. Frequently, for instance, associations were clichéd or bookish rather than first-hand; or with certain metaphors, particular facets were totally ignored. To a certain extent, this comes down to the nature of the questions that were meant to elicit the associations, so that if there were gaps and limitations in the students's responses they might be rectified by revised questions that are more suggestive,

or give better direction. As discussed, theoretically, in Chapter III, much hinges on the careful shaping and nuancing of questions so as to activate background knowledge not only richly, but pointedly ("precise elaboration"). But as the try-outs showed, this is in practice difficult to achieve. In attempting both to open up areas of experience and to channel students through them, the multiple-question format tended to become (for the students) an intimidating reading task in itself: disjointed, layered, full of twists and turns - and hence more likely to perplex than facilitate. In the interests of getting some useful responses, it is necessary to keep a strict limit on the questions; it is perhaps a limited suggestiveness that characterised the most successful exercises (and the fact that there were so many associations raised through the try-outs suggests that the questions often did strike the right balance). Less is more. Alternatively, it might be worth while to look for a different kind of triggering device altogether, as an alternative to the multiple questions that often seemed to have authoritarian resonances for students, who responded accordingly (mechanically, rote-like). The multiple questions are also clumsy; ideally a more efficient triggering device would be suggestive and compact. The vividness and emotive power of slogans, graffiti, forms of journalism and advertising might provide useful models - although here there is a danger of returning full circle, and using certain kinds of figurative language to help students explore others.

4. But by far the most striking revelation of the try-outs, and the feature that gives rise to repeated speculation throughout Chapters IV and V, concerns the students' performance in applying - or failing to apply - their associations when it came to making sense of the respective metaphors. The non-contextualised metaphors used in the early, non-Shakespearean materials revealed how complex the process of transferring associations between vehicle and topic can be. But what was highlighted by the materials based on the Shakespeare network was simply how little the prior associations were used at all. Of course, many students

did use their associations to come up with often excellent interpretations (better than the equivalents to be found in editors' notes); and there were enough of these to suggest to one teacher how empowering the approach could be: "[they have] tamed the tiger!". It is nevertheless true that when it came to interpreting metaphors in the play, students tended to ignore ideas suggested by their own accumulated associations, and instead to fall back on their general knowledge of the play acquired in their lessons. Such "classroom" knowledge seemed quite regularly to take precedence over their own life-generated ideas, even when those ideas must have been fresher in their minds, more concrete and personal. Despite all this - or because of all this - their own ideas were not regarded as anything that had a role in reading the actual lines on the page. Possibly the most striking general observation that emerged from the try-outs is that, quite simply, it is easier to activate students' background knowledge than it is to get them to use it. In the light of this, the materials should be altered to give stronger emphasis to the application of background knowledge. Or more importantly, the materials might attempt to get students integrating that knowledge with their general knowledge of the play, perhaps by foregrounding their knowledge of the play, so that it is not allowed to invisibly predominate, as it did in these try-outs.

However, it may not be wise to draw any binding conclusions from the fact that in the circumstances of these particular try-outs students disregarded their own associations in favour of their general knowledge of the play. In all the schools used for the try-outs, the students performed the exercises when they had either completed their (teacher-centred) study of the play, or were very well-advanced through it. If the exercises had been done earlier in their reading, when the students did not already feel so much in possession of the facts, with their minds already made up about the play, it is possible that their general knowledge of the play might not have exerted such an over-riding influence. If the materials had from the start been a part of the

gradual, groping process of making sense of things, the students might have been more receptive to different sources of meaning, including their own background knowledge. And this might be especially true if the materials had been part of a generally interactive approach, such as the ISEA editions of Shakespeare which foreground the students' own "life worlds" as one source of meaning, and downplay the role of the teacher as another.

5. This brings us to the issue of how such materials might be integrated into a larger teaching programme or editions of Shakespeare designed for schools (such as the ISEA series). There seem to be two main ways. The first is for the exercises to be part of the actual "reading-in-progress", dealing with figurative language as it is encountered in the text, by means of questions embedded in the parallel notes. Such questions would replace the kind of explanations that are regularly used by editors and teachers at present (see Chapter III), so that students would be involved as partners in the interpretive process, rather than remaining passive recipients of it. The obvious disadvantage in this, however, is that such interpretations as are encouraged in the present materials require fairly elaborate facilitation and are time consuming for students - as the try outs showed. And in many cases, the metaphor itself will be of too limited an importance to warrant the interruption of the students' reading process. As the editors of the ISEA Shakespeare series insist, "there is predominant need to maintain narrative drive for the learner" (personal communication). (Compare Dr Johnson's observation in the same context: "the mind is refrigerated by interruption" (in Raleigh 1908:62).)

It is accepted that it would be counter-productive to treat interactively all the figurative language that would be encountered in a reading. Nevertheless, it might be possible to do this with a selection of metaphors during the reading-in-progress. Those which have a more critical function (clarifying character or motive, opening up an important concern of the play)

might justify a pause in the narrative drive - particularly if it coincided with a hiatus in the larger dramatic structure (the end of a scene, or of a self-contained dialogue or soliloquy). One use of the metaphor in Shakespeare is in fact to succinctly summarise an idea or perception or argument or feeling that has been gradually developed through the preceding lines, and this might be precisely the type, and the moment, for which the interactive approach is suited. Alternatively, the exercises in their present, somewhat elaborate, form might be adapted or broken up, so as to be integrated in the reading-in-progress more flexibly. Parts of an exercise could be used: for instance, those which focus on enacting figurative language as a way of stirring associations (Exercise 11) might be incorporated in the "staging suggestions" of a teaching programme. Furthermore, it might be possible to include the interactive approach in the notes of an edition by synthesising it with the traditional decoding approach that is already there. Here, in order to get students to come up with their own associations, one would not use an elaborate set of triggering questions, but rather use some of the associations typically supplied by glosses, in order to start off a process of associating which the students would complete with their own ideas, as a kind of cloze exercise (as noted above, it is as much other words that trigger associations, as mental pictures). In this compromise between transmission-style and interactive approaches, the gloss (or semi-gloss) itself would serve as the triggering device: perhaps one option for the more efficient type of trigger that was referred to above.

The second and less problematic way for the interactive approach to be incorporated in a teaching programme or edition would be as part of the "post-reading" exercises, at the end of acts or the close of the play, when students are encouraged to reflect back on what they have read. In editions such as those of the ISEA, these learner-centred activities generally encourage responses to the larger aspects of the play (character, plot, situation, moral and social concerns); but there is no reason why here, without the pressure to maintain the narrative drive, some

attention to the detail of language might not be similarly encouraged - particularly when it is also treated interactively. Apart from being important for its own sake, such focus on figurative language might be used to open up the larger aspects of the play as well, in ways considered in the previous chapter. There is often an assumption that, however engagingly we can present other aspects of the plays, language work will always force us back into dullness and dryness; and for this reason generally innovative approaches might exclude language activities. But as the try-outs of the materials in this project seem to suggest (in students' and teachers' comments as much as in the feed back from performances), figurative language is as conducive to engaging, interactive treatment as any other aspect of Shakespeare.

6. Finally, of course, the scope of such treatment is not limited to figurative language as a variety of general language use. It is not only in metaphor and simile that words' associations are used to convey meanings of all kinds beyond the simple denotations of those words. Figurative language makes unique use of such associations, but all words used everywhere carry connotations that have their source in what Rosenblatt calls readers' "life material" and Leech their "real world" knowledge. For good readers who are sensitive to the rich life-associations triggered by them, such words have resonances which deepen and extend the reading experience, and this is regardless of how literally those words are used. (Leech: "it is necessary to remind ourselves once more that literal and figurative usage ... are two ends of a scale, rather than clear-cut categories", 1969:147). There seems no reason, then, why the practice of encouraging in students a sensitivity to, and use of, their real world knowledge in reading figurative language, should not be broadened to cover the non-figurative as well - thus deepening and extending their interactive reading of Shakespeare's language in general.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, R. (Ed.). 1985. Teaching Shakespeare: Essays on approaches to Shakespeare in schools and colleges. London: Robert Royce.
- Aers, L. & Wheale, N. (Eds). 1991. Shakespeare in the changing Curriculum. London: Routledge.
- Alderson, J.C. & Urquhart, A.H. (Eds). 1984. Reading in a foreign language. London: Longman.
- Andrews, J.F. 1984. Editorial. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35 (5).
- Au, K. 1979. Using the experience-text-relationship method with minority children. The Reading Teacher, 32 (6).
- Berry, R. 1977. The Shakespearean metaphor: Studies in language and form. London: Macmillan.
- Black, M. 1962. Models and metaphors: Studies in language and philosophy. Ithaca & London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Bleich, D. 1975. Readings and feelings: An introduction to subjective criticism. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. 1983. Educational research: An introduction. Fourth Edition. New York: Longman.
- Brooke-Rose, C. 1958. A grammar of metaphor. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Burse, J. (Ed.). 1992. Julius Caesar. By William Shakespeare. Pilot Edition. Macmillan Communicative Shakespeare Series. Johannesburg: Macmillan Boleswa.
- Cameron, J. 1991. Off the beaten track: A consideration of the implications for teachers of recent developments in the study of metaphor. English in Education, 25 (2).
- Carrell, P.L. 1983. Three components of background knowledge in reading comprehension. Language Learning, 33 (2).
- Carrell, P.L. 1984a. Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. The Modern Language Journal, 68 (4).
- Carrell, P.L. 1984b. Evidence of a formal schemata in second language comprehension. Language Learning, 34 (2).
- Carrell, P.L. 1987. Content and formal schemata in ESL reading.

- TESOL Quarterly, 21 (3).
- Carrell, P.L. 1988a. Some causes of text-boundedness and schema-interference in ESL reading. In Carrell et al. 1988.
- Carrell, P.L. 1988b. Interactive text processing: implications for ESL/second language reading classrooms. In Carrell et al. 1988.
- Carrell, P.L. & Eisterhold, J.C. 1988. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In Carrell et al. 1988.
- Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. & Eskey, D.E. (Eds). 1988. Interactive approaches to second language reading. Cambridge: CUP.
- Clarke, M.A. & Silberstein, S. 1977. Toward a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class. Language Learning, 27 (1).
- Clemen, W. 1977. The development of Shakespeare's imagery. Second Edition. London: Methuen.
- Cohen L. & Manion, L. 1989. Research methods in education. Third Edition. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, R.A. 1990. Editorial. Shakespeare Quarterly, 41 (2).
- Cope, T. (Ed.). 1968. Izibongo: Zulu praise-poems. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Corcoran, B. & Evans, E. (Eds). 1987. Readers, texts, teachers. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.
- Eagleton, T. 1983. Literary theory: An introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Eliot, R. 1990. Encouraging reader-response to literature in ESL situations. ELT Journal, 44 (3).
- ELTIC. 1990a. Teaching Shakespeare in ESL: An ELTIC manual for teachers.
- ELTIC. 1990b. Romeo and Juliet: A first reading.
- Eskey, D.E. 1988. Holding in the bottom: An interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In Carrell et al. 1988.
- Eskey, D.E. & Grabe, W. 1988. Interactive models for second language reading: perspectives on instruction. In Carrell et al 1988.
- Finnegan, R. 1970. Oral literature in Africa. Nairobi: OUP.

- Floyd, P. & Carrell, P.L. Effects on ESL reading of teaching cultural content schemata. Language Learning, 37 (1).
- Frey, C. 1984. Teaching Shakespeare in America. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35 (5).
- Gajdusek, L. 1988. Toward wider use of literature in ESL: Why and how. TESOL Quarterly, 22 (2).
- Gay, L.R. 1987. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. London: Merrill.
- Geertz, C. 1983. Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York: Basic Books.
- Gibson, R. (Ed.). 1989. Shakespeare and schools, 10 (Autumn).
- Hartshorne, K. 1992. Crisis and challenge: Black education 1910-1990. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkes, T. 1989. Metaphor. Critical Idiom. London: Routledge.
- Hawkins, S. 1984. Teaching the theatre of the imagination. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35 (5).
- Hayhoe, M. & Parker, S. (Eds). 1990. Reading and response. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Holmes, J.O. 1990. 'O, what learning is!': Some pedagogical practices for Romeo and Juliet. Shakespeare Quarterly, 41 (2).
- Hudson, T. 1988. The effects of induced schemata on the "short circuit" in L2 reading: Non-decoding factors in L2 reading performance. In Carrell et al. 1988.
- Husen, T. 1988. Educational research and policy making. In Keeves 1988, 173-178.
- Hussey, S.S. 1992. The literary language of Shakespeare. Second Edition. London: Longman.
- Iser, W. 1978. The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kantz, M. 1987. Toward a pedagogically useful theory of literary reading. Poetics, 16.
- Keeves, J.P. (Ed.). 1988. Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kunene, D.P. 1971. Heroic poetry of the Basotho. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Kunene, D.P. 1972. Metaphor and symbolism in the heroic poetry of Southern Africa. In Dorson, R.M. (Ed.), African Folklore. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1972.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. Metaphors we live by. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Langer, J.A. 1981. From theory to practice: a prereading plan. Journal of Reading, 25 (2).
- Leech, G.N. 1969. A linguistic guide to English poetry. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. 1974. Semantics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lemmer, A. 1986. A response-based model for literature teaching. Crux, (May).
- Lemmer, A. 1988. Upgrading the study of Shakespeare in Southern African high schools: An interim report. Grahamstown: ISEA.
- Lemmer, A. 1993. Bums off seats. In the Proceedings of the 12th Annual SAALA Conference, UPE. Volume 2.
- Lewy, A. (Ed.). 1977. Handbook for curriculum evaluation. Paris: UNESCO / New York: Longman.
- Low, G.D. 1988. On teaching metaphor. Applied Linguistics, 9 (2)
- MacLennan, R. (Ed.). 1983. Romeo and Juliet. By William Shakespeare. Stratford Series. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Moll, L.C. 1990. Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of socio-historical psychology. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Nowotny, W. 1962. The language poets use. London: The Athlone Press.
- Opland, J. 1983. Xhosa oral poetry: Aspects of a black South African tradition. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Ortony, A. 1975. Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice. Educational Theory, 25 (1).
- Ortony, A. (Ed.). 1979. Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: CUP.
- Protherough, R. 1983. Developing response to fiction. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Raleigh, W. (Ed.). 1908. Johnson on Shakespeare. London: OUP.
- Romaine, S. 1989. Bilingualism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. 1938/1968. Literature as exploration. Second

- Edition. London: Heinemann.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. 1978. The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work. Carbondale, Ill.: S. Illinois Univ. Press.
- Rumelhart, D.E. 1980. Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In Spiro et al. 1980.
- Scriven, M. 1966. The methodology of evaluation. Lafayette, Indiana: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Seward, T. (Ed.). 1992. Romeo and Juliet. By William Shakespeare. Cambridge Schools Shakespeare Series. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Schofer, P. 1990. Literature and communicative competence. Foreign Language Annals, 23 (4).
- Spack, R. 1985. Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: bridging the gaps. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (4).
- Spiro, R.J., Bruce, B.C. & Brewer, W.F. (Eds). 1980. Theoretical issues in reading comprehension: Perspectives from cognitive psychology, linguistics, artificial intelligence and education. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Spurgeon, C. 1935. Shakespeare's imagery and what it tells us. Cambridge: CUP.
- Steffensen, M.S., Joag-Dev, C. & Anderson, R.C. 1979. A cross-cultural perspective on reading comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 15 (1).
- Walters, P.S. & England, V. 1988. The teaching of English literature in black high schools. Grahamstown: ISEA.
- Winer, E. 1988. The point of words: Children's understanding of metaphor and irony. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Wright, L. 1987. Shakespeare for students in Southern Africa - a report. Shakespeare in Southern Africa, Vol 1.
- Wright, L. & Bursey, J. 1991. The L2 learner versus Shakespeare's editors. Crux, 25 (2).
- Wright, L. & Bursey, J. 1994. Page to stage: the teaching of Julius Caesar. Crux, 28 (1).

## APPENDIX A: THE MATERIALS ON NON-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS

Note: Collected here are the exercises discussed in Chapter IV. (The exercises which were not tried out in schools are marked thus: #.)

EXERCISE 1: Practising basic associative thinkingExercise 1 (a)

Work as a class, orally.

As quickly as possible, say what each of these words makes you think of:

WATER	BED
SUN	CHURCH

Exercise 1 (b)

Work as a class, orally.

As quickly as possible, say what each of these COLOURS makes you think of:

GREEN	BLUE
BROWN	RED

Exercise 1 (c)

Work as a class, orally.

Quickly read through the following, and say what EMOTIONS or FEELINGS these words make you think of:

WEDDING	FUNERAL
SPORT MEETING	EXAMINATION

Exercise 1 (d)

Work as a class, orally.

Quickly read through the following, and say what ACTIVITIES these words make you think of, or remember, or imagine:

DOCTORS	PUPILS
SHOPKEEPERS	POLITICIANS

Exercise 1 (e)

Work as a class, orally.

Imagine that you have gone blind, and are trying to remind yourself what certain things LOOKED like: what words would you use?

MOUNTAIN	MOON
TREES	PYLONS

#Exercise 1 (f)

Work as a class, orally. Complete these comparisons, using your own experiences.

AS COLD AS ...
AS HIGH AS ...
AS SOFT AS ...
AS NOISY AS ...
AS PAINFUL AS ...
AS BORING AS ...

#Exercise 1 (g)

Work in groups, orally.

You are trying to decide where to go on holiday. To help you decide which of the following places you should choose, say what each one makes you think of:

NEW YORK :
WESTERN CAPE:
NAMIBIA:
SUN CITY :

#Exercise 1 (h)

Work in pairs, orally.

You are asked to draw some posters on the topics listed below. Think about each topic, and decide what you will put into your poster.

"SUMMER" :
"HEALTH" :
"FREEDOM" :
"EMPLOYMENT" :
"POWER" :

EXERCISE 2: Using associations to interpret non-figurative language

Exercise 2 (a)

Work as a class, orally.

You want a dog that will guard your property and chase away intruders. Two dogs are advertised: think about their NAMES. Say which dog would be best for you, and why.

ROSE PETAL

WARRIOR

Exercise 2 (b)

Work as a class, orally.

You want to bet on a horse race, but all you know about the horses is their NAMES. Think about the names, and say which horse you would bet on, and why.

ROCKET

OLD GRANNY

Exercise 2 (c)

Work as a class, orally.

(i) You are on the committee of a new soccer club, and have to find a NAME for the team. Two have been suggested: think about them, and say which you would choose and why.

HAPPY DREAMERS F.C.

CHEETAHS

(ii) Your committee decides that neither of these names is exactly right, so you have to think of one yourselves. But it must have the associations suitable for your first-class soccer team which is going to be fit, fast, cunning, fearless and (of course) victorious.

#Exercise 2 (d)

Work as a class, orally.

Three brothers have NICKNAMES. Think about these names, and say what you would expect each brother to be like.

GIRAFFE

PROFESSOR

ELVIS

EXERCISE 3: Using associations to interpret everyday figurative language

Exercise 3 (a)

Work as a class, orally.

(i) Say what the following words make you think of:

CHURCH

BATTLEFIELD

(ii) Now use your ideas to work out what is being said about two homes in the following simile and metaphor:

HIS HOME IS LIKE A CHURCH.  
HER HOME IS A BATTLEFIELD.

Exercise 3 (b)

Work as a class, orally.

(i) Say what the following words make you think of:

KNIFE

MEDICINE

(ii) Now use your ideas to work out what is being said in the following simile and metaphor:

HER WORDS WERE LIKE KNIVES THROWN AT ME.  
HIS WORDS WERE LIKE MEDICINE TO ME.

Exercise 3 (c)

Work as a class, orally.

We are going to work out what the following metaphor and simile tell us about these people's lives:

SUSIE'S LIFE IS ONE LONG PARTY.  
SAM'S LIFE IS LIKE ONE LONG NIGHTMARE.

(i) First, think about **PARTY** and **NIGHTMARE**. What ideas come into your mind in connection with these words?

(ii) Now, use your ideas to explain what the metaphor and simile are telling us.

## #Exercise 3 (d)

Work in groups.

(i) First, each of you should read the following words, and write down as quickly as you can what they make you think of: things, feelings, activities, looks or anything at all.

JAIL BATTLEFIELD LIBRARY
--------------------------------

(ii) Next, compare your answers with the rest of your group: have you all put down the same things, or have you thought of different things? Combine all the different associations of each word into a "dictionary", that you can use next.

(iii) Now use your "dictionary" to help you discover what is different about the "homes" described below:

- |  |
|--|
| (a) My friend's home is like a JAIL.                             |
| (b) With all my family studying, our home is becoming a LIBRARY! |
| (c) Sadly, many homes today seem like BATTLEFIELDS.              |

## #Exercise 3 (e)

Work in groups.

(i) Sometimes there is a lot you could put down for each word, but your mind seems dead. To spark off your thinking about the word below, ask yourself these questions:

- \* what looks, sounds, sensations do you think of?
- \* what functions, actions, behaviour?
- \* what people, places, events?
- \* what feelings does it cause in you?

BOMBS	PALACE
ATHLETE	GOLDMINE
HIPPOPOTAMUS	WINTER

(ii) When you have finished, make another "dictionary" of your group's associations, to use next.

(iv) What associations do you have in your "dictionary" for:

BOMB? ATHLETE? HIPPOPOTAMUS?
------------------------------------

Use them to help you to decide from following sentences whether you would buy car (a), (b) or (c):

- (a) This model is cheap, but may be a ticking BOMB.
- (b) This car is an ATHLETE, ready for the Comrades Marathon.
- (c) You will love this superb HIPPOPOTAMUS of a machine.

### #Exercise 3 (f)

Work individually.

Imagine that your boyfriend or girlfriend has gone to live somewhere else, and sent you a telegram telling you how he or she feels. To save money, all that the telegram says is:

SINCE I LEFT, MY LIFE HAS TURNED INTO WINTER.

(i) In order to work out what she means (and what she would have said in full if she had more money!), look at WINTER. What does it make you think of, imagine or remember? (Look back at WINTER in your "dictionary" of associations in Exercise 3(e).) Can you add anything more about winter: What sights and feelings? What is the world like in this season? How do people view it?

(ii) Write down in full what you think she is feeling.

(iii) You must send a telegram in reply, to describe your emotions. How would you feel if your closest friend went to live somewhere else? You also have to keep it short, so use a metaphor as she or he did:

WHEN YOU WENT AWAY MY LIFE .....

EXERCISE 4: Interacting with figurative language in traditional African poetry

Exercise 4 (a)

Work in groups, with written answers.

Use your own ideas to understand metaphors and similes.

Here is a description of a chief, found in a traditional African praise poem that uses metaphors:

Thou mighty one, son of the valleys,  
Thou strong SHIELD of thy people!

(i) Think about SHIELDS: what are they used for? When are they used? Do we consider them valuable? Choose one of your group to write down your ideas here:

SHIELDS:.....  
.....

(ii) Now use your ideas to explain what is being said about this chief. Write your answer here:

THE CHIEF IS CALLED "A SHIELD" BECAUSE HE.....  
.....

Exercise 4 (b)

Work in groups, with written answers.

Use your own ideas to understand metaphors and similes.

Here is a description of a chief, found in a traditional African praise poem that uses metaphors:

O, he was the great one, the famous one:  
Amongst his enemies he was a FOREST FIRE!

(i) Think about FOREST FIRES: what is it like to be near one? What do they do to the land? How fast do they move? Write down your answers here:

FOREST FIRES:.....  
.....

(ii) Now use your ideas about FOREST FIRES to explain what is being said about this chief. Write your answer here:

THE CHIEF IS CALLED "A FOREST FIRE" BECAUSE HE.....

Exercise 4 (c)

Work in groups, with written answers.

Use your own ideas to understand metaphors and similes.

Here is a description of a warrior, found in a traditional African praise poem that uses metaphors:

Mahogwe is bitter like the shongwe plant,  
 He, THE RIVER FULL OF GRINDING STONES THAT ARE SLIPPERY,  
 The young reebuck of Mashiyi!

(i) The warrior is described as a certain kind of RIVER. Think of a mountain river, with GRINDING STONES that are SLIPPERY: what is it like to get across such a river, especially in flood? What would it be like to fall between the rocks? Write your ideas here  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

(ii) Use your ideas about such rivers to explain what is being said about this warrior: would he be gentle, quiet and harmless in war?  
 THE WARRIOR IS DESCRIBED AS SUCH A RIVER BECAUSE.....  
 .....

#Exercise 4 (d)

Work in groups, with written answers.

The following metaphor comes from a traditional African poem. It describes a young girl who has been married off to an old man:

Such was the marriage of Thuthula sweet.  
 She thus became the wife of Ndlambe bold.  
 With life around she seemed to be in death;  
 To her life seemed AN EMPTY HONEYCOMB.

(i) The girl's life is described as an EMPTY HONEYCOMB. Think about what we find in HONEYCOMBS: what taste does it have? Is it healthy or not, pleasant or not? Write down your ideas here:  
 HONEYCOMBS:.....

(ii) Use your ideas to explain what kind of life this girl has. Remember! Her life is described not as a honeycomb, but as an EMPTY honeycomb. What is missing from her life?  
 .....

#EXERCISE 5: Using context clues to interpret figurative language

## #Exercise 5 (a)

Work in groups.

(i) Discuss what you have experienced yourselves or heard about to do with the following:

CITIES

Think about good and bad things; perhaps one of you can make two lists: one for positive associations, and one for negative.

(ii) Now read these sentences:

- A. The poor boy is in deep trouble: he has got a real CITY girl for a wife!
- B. The lucky girl has hit the jackpot: she's found a real CITY man for a husband!

(iii) Is it your positive or negative associations of CITY that help you to understand A? What is the girl like? Is it your positive or negative associations of CITY that help you to understand B? What is the man like?

## #Exercise 5(b)

Work in groups.

Think about the following:

NIGHT

(i) Can you think of unpleasant things associated with the night? Can you think of pleasant things? List as many of both kinds as you can: think of experiences you have had, stories you have heard, things you may have learnt about night life in other places.

(ii) Now, read this line from a poem in The Wind at Dawn (p.47), where the poet is speaking to a woman called Naett:

Naett, coin of gold, shining coal, you my NIGHT, my sun!

In this poem are we meant to think of positive or negative associations of NIGHT? Which of the other words tell us this? What is the speaker saying about Naett when he calls her his "night"?

## #Exercise 5 (c)

Work in groups.

Think about the following:

SPIDERS

- (i) Picture a spider: do you know different kinds? What do they look like? Can you imagine touching one? How do they make you feel? Are they dangerous? How do they live? What do they eat?
- (ii) Read these lines from a poem in The Wind at Dawn (p.55):

OLD GRANNY  
 A little freezing Spider  
 Legs and arms gathered in her chest  
 Rocking with flu  
 I saw old Granny  
 At Harare Market.

Now think about spiders again: are the things you thought about before useful to you here, do they fit in with the poem? Is the poem saying that Granny is dangerous like a spider? What other features of spiders should we be thinking of to understand the poem?

#Exercise 5 (d)

Work in groups.

Read the following lines from a traditional African poem in praise of a chief:

Amongst the trees which one does he resemble?  
 He is like the hardy essenwood tree.

Do you know what an ESSENWOOD TREE is? Your dictionary may not tell you about the tree; but try looking up the meaning of HARDY. From it can you work out something about the tree: Is the tree probably valuable or worthless, impressive or unimpressive? Can you guess in what way? Is the poet saying something negative or positive about the chief?

#EXERCISE 6: Interacting with figurative language from the poetry setwork

#Exercise 6 (a)

Work as a class, orally.

Read these lines from a poem in The Wind at Dawn (p.6) about a black man on a crowded train in the early morning:

the coach  
squeezes me like a lemon  
of all the juice of my life.

LEMON

- (i) Think about lemons. What is the first thing you remember? (What if the poet had said "orange" or "grape" instead of "lemon": they are also fruit - but what different associations do they have?)
- (ii) What does this "lemon" tell us about his life and feelings?

#Exercise 6 (b)

Work as a class, orally.

(i) Have you ever spent a night in the countryside, far from towns and street-lights, perhaps without electricity? Imagine what it would be like to be lost, walking down a country road in the darkness. How would you feel if you were to catch sight of a light? How would the light help you?

(ii) Now, read this poem about Shaka in The Wind at Dawn (p.31):

His eyes were LANTERNS  
that shone from the dark valleys of Zululand.

(iii) Using the thoughts you had about lights in dark places, try to explain what the poet is saying about Shaka.

## #Exercise 6 (c)

Work in groups.

Here are 3 descriptions of daybreak, from The Wind at Dawn:

(a) Day flips a golden coin. (p.7)	GOLDEN COIN
(b) The sword of daybreak snips the shroud of the night. (p.6)	SWORD
(c) Dawn, treading soft as tip-toe child. (p.103)	CHILD

Work in three groups, each group looking at a different poem. All the poems are all about daybreak, but each sees it in a different way. Each group should try to discover how their poem sees the dawn by thinking about the key word (in the box): what associations does it have? In what way can they also be linked to the dawn. Finally, the different ways should be compared by everyone. Can you suggest other ways of seeing the dawn?

APPENDIX B: THE MATERIALS ON SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS

Note. Collected here are the exercises discussed in Chapter V. (Those exercises which were not tried out in schools are marked thus: #.)

EXERCISE 7: Dealing with culturally familiar metaphors in Shakespeare

Exercise 7 (a)

When Mark Antony speaks to the Romans after the murder of Caesar, he tries to make them angry. What he wants to create is described in this way:

"A FLOOD of mutiny"

He wants the rebellion to be like a FLOOD. Think about rivers in FLOOD:

- what do they do to everything in their way?
- how would you feel if you were threatened by such a river?

Choose one of your group to write your ideas here:

RIVERS IN FLOOD.....

.....

.....

.....

\* Use these ideas about FLOODS to explain what kind of rebellion Antony wants, if he calls it a FLOOD OF MUTINY:

THE REBELLION WILL BE.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Exercise 7 (b)

After the murder of Caesar, Mark Antony wants to take revenge by going to war against the murderers:

"A curse shall light upon the limbs of men;  
Domestic fury and fierce civil strife  
Shall cumber all the parts of Italy;  
Cry "havoc!" and let slip THE DOGS OF WAR."

(a) To see what kind of war Antony wants, think about DOGS:

- can you describe what HUNTING DOGS or POLICE DOGS are like in action?
- think about GUARD DOGS behind fences or on chains: have you imagined what would happen if they got free? Picture how they would behave: would they attack only the guilty or everyone (women? children?). Would they listen to anyone?

Let one of your group briefly write down your ideas here:

POLICE OR GUARD DOGS LET LOOSE WOULD .....

.....

.....

.....

\* Now, use these ideas about how DOGS behave to explain how Antony wants the soldiers to fight. Write down your answer here:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Exercise 7 (c)

When Brutus and Cassius have an argument, Brutus criticises Cassius for the way he has been speaking. He uses the following metaphor to describe Cassius' words:

"WASPISH"

What does it mean to say that Cassius' words are WASPISH? What do you know about WASPS? To come up with some ideas, contrast WASPS with another insect: BUTTERFLIES. In what way are they different?

WASPS.....

\* Use your ideas to explain what is being said about Cassius' words, when they are called WASPISH:

CASSIUS' WORDS ARE.....  
.....

Exercise 7 (d)

Before the murder of Caesar, Brutus is worried and unable to sleep. While he is walking around, he sees his young servant sleeping, and he describes him in this way:

"Boy, Lucius! - Fast asleep? It is no matter.  
Enjoy the HONEY-HEAVY DEW of slumber"

(1) Lucius's sleep is described as HONEY and DEW. Think about these things: are they unpleasant or pleasant? Write down your ideas here:

HONEY.....

DEW.....

\* Use your ideas about HONEY and DEW to explain what kind of SLEEP Lucius is having, if it is described as HONEY and DEW:

LUCIUS' SLEEP IS .....  
.....  
.....

Exercise 7 (e)

1. Brutus describes himself to his partner, Cassius, in the following words. Can you explain what he means?

"O, Cassius, you are yoked [joined] with a LAMB"

Brutus sees himself as a LAMB. What do you know about lambs? To come up with some ideas, contrast LAMBS with TIGERS: how are they different?

TIGERS.....

LAMBS.....

\* What sort of person would Brutus be if he called himself a TIGER?

.....

\* What sort of person is he, if he calls himself a LAMB?

.....

Exercise 7 (f)

Brutus is a man admired by everyone, but he is not perfect. Can you give one reason why, by looking at these lines where Cassius thinks about persuading Brutus to kill Caesar?

"Well, Brutus, thou art noble; yet I see  
Thy honourable mettle may be wrought  
From that it is disposed"

Cassius thinks of Brutus as a piece of metal that he (Cassius) is working on, as if he were a craftsman. Give some examples of what metal workers do with pieces of metal.

.....

\* If Brutus is like a piece of metal, what is Cassius trying to "do" with him?

.....

\* A piece of metal has no say in what is done to it. Is a person (like Brutus) the same? What could Brutus do?

.....

EXERCISE 8: Dealing with culturally unfamiliar metaphors in Shakespeare

Exercise 8 (a)

Caesar is in the Senate, just before he is murdered. He is asked to change his mind on a policy, but he totally refuses.

"I am as constant AS THE NORTHERN STAR  
Of whose true fixed and resting quality  
There is no fellow in the firmament"

To explain why he is unable to change his mind, Caesar compares his personality to the NORTHERN STAR. If Caesar had been a South African, he might have compared himself to TABLE MOUNTAIN. Think about this landmark: how movable is it? Can we always depend on it to be the same? (Think of a similar landmark in your own area that is always there and which you use to direct people.)

IDEAS ABOUT TABLE MOUNTAIN.....  
.....  
.....

A LANDMARK IN OUR AREA.....

\* What is Caesar like if he resembles such a thing?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Exercise 8 (a) REVISED

Caesar is in the Senate, just before he is murdered. He is asked to change his mind on a policy, but he totally refuses.

"I am as constant AS THE NORTHERN STAR  
Of whose true fixed and resting quality  
There is no fellow in the firmament"

To explain why he is unable to change his mind, Caesar compares his personality to the NORTHERN STAR. If Caesar had been a South African, he might have compared himself to the DRAKENSBERG, to say the same thing about his personality. Think about the DRAKENSBERG: how movable are they? Do they change a lot like leaves on trees, or clouds in the sky?

.....  
.....

\* What is Caesar like if he resembles such a thing?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Exercise 8 (b)

Read the following description of Caesar, spoken by Cassius at the beginning of the play.

"Why, man, he doth bestride [stand over] the narrow world  
LIKE A COLOSSUS, and we petty men  
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about  
To find ourselves dishonourable graves"

Caesar is compared to the Colossus, a famous statue that was the height of an ELECTRICITY PYLON. To find out what Cassius is saying about Caesar, think of a man the size of a PYLON.

(a) What would ordinary people look like to someone that size? (Try to imagine yourself on top of a pylon, looking down.)

.....  
.....

\* Use your ideas to say how ordinary Romans appear to Caesar:

.....

(b) How would ordinary people feel if faced by a man as big as a pylon? (Imagine yourself on the ground, looking up.)

.....  
.....

\* Use your ideas to say how ordinary Romans feel about Caesar.

.....  
.....

EXERCISE 9: Dealing with extended passages of figurative language

Exercise 9 (a)

Those involved in the plot to kill Caesar are meeting secretly at Brutus' house to discuss how they will go about it. Read the following speech by Brutus:

BRUTUS	
	Let's be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius.
	We all stand up against the spirit of Caesar, And in the spirit of men there is no blood. O, that we then could come by Caesar's spirit, 170 And not dismember Caesar! But, alas, Caesar must bleed for it. And, gentle friends, Let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully.
175	Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods, Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds. And let our hearts, as subtle masters do, Stir up their servants to an act of rage, And after seem to chide 'em. This shall make Our purpose necessary, and not envious; Which so appearing to the common eyes, 180 We shall be called purgers, not murderers.

- 167. stand up...Caesar: oppose what Caesar represents (i.e. dictatorship and tyranny).
- 168. spirit: soul and beliefs, ideas, principles.
- 169-170. that we...Caesar: if only we could gain hold of Caesar's spirit without having to hack him into pieces!
- 171. Caesar must bleed: Caesar's body must die.  
gentle: noble, kind, unselfish. (Do you think this is a strange word to use here? Why?)
- 172. boldly: confidently, openly, bravely.  
wrathfully: viciously, angrily.
  
- 173-177. And let...chide 'em: And, in the same way that crafty masters provoke their servants to do something in anger and then appear to scold them, let our hearts stir us up (to carry out our plan).
- 176. their servants: (i.e. the feelings of the conspirators so that they are prepared to commit murder; or perhaps their hands, which must actually kill Caesar.)
- 177-178. This shall...envious: If we behave as I've suggested, what we intend to do will seem necessary and not just something that we did out of hatred.
- 179. Which...eyes: And if the common people think this (i.e. that our action was necessary).

1. Line 166 "Let's be sacrificers, but not butchers":

Have you been to, or heard about, a ceremony where an animal is SACRIFICED? Describe the event for others: what happened, what was the atmosphere like? Are these sacrifices simply to get meat to eat, or is there usually some more serious reason? (Give an example.) Contrast this with BUTCHERS: why do they kill animals?

\* Why does Brutus see himself as a SACRIFICER and not a BUTCHER? What does he want to get from killing Caesar?

.....  
.....

2. Lines 172-3 "Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods, / Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds":

Compare how you might CARVE meat at a solemn ceremony (imagine, if you can, it happening in a church), and how you would CHOP or HACK ("hew") it for dogs. Would one take more time than the other, or different use of hands and arms? (Imitate CARVING and HACKING, and let your partner guess which is which.)

Think about these two actions: what would be your feelings about the task in each case? Write your answers on the next page:  
CARVING:.....

HACKING:.....

\* What feelings about the murder does Brutus want the plotters to have?

.....  
.....

3. Lines 175-177 "And let our hearts, as subtle masters do, / Stir up their servants to an act of rage, / And after seem to chide 'em":

Brutus tells the plotters to stir up their tempers to kill Caesar - but what should they do afterwards? Imagine that you have secretly encouraged your dog to viciously attack another animal in public (like a sly "master" stirring up his "servants"). Afterwards would you praise it loudly or pretend to be upset and scold it ("chide 'em")? Why might you do the second thing?

\* What does Brutus want the plotters to do with their violent tempers after the crime?

.....  
.....  
.....

4. Lines 177-180 "This shall make / Our purpose necessary, and not envious [so that] We shall be called purgers, not murderers":

Both DOCTORS and MURDERERS cause pain and sometimes death (a doctor's patient can die on the operating table): but do we see them in the same way? Do doctors want to cause pain, or benefit from causing pain? Why do they do it? (Have you had a painful experience with a doctor? What did you feel towards him or her?)

.....  
.....  
.....

\* In what way do the plotters resemble DOCTORS, according to Brutus? How does he think the Romans should feel towards them?

.....

Exercise 9 (b)

Brutus is so often lost in thought (at the start of the play) that Portia is growing unhappy about the cold and distant way she is being treated by him. Read the following conversation they have with one another:

- 278. I should not need: I wouldn't have to kneel.  
gentle: kind.
- 280. Is it excepted...you?: Is it specified that you don't have to tell me your secrets?
- 281. Am I your self: Am I your other half, do you trust me, do you tell me your secrets.
- 282. as it were...limitation?: only in some ways and for certain times?
- 283. keep with you: keep you company, stay with you.
  
- 285. If it be no more: If this is all I am to you.
- 286. harlot: whore, mistress, prostitute.
- 288. ruddy drops: the drops of red blood.

BRUTUS                      Kneel not, gentle Portia.

PORTIA (*rising*)  
I should not need if you were gentle Brutus.  
Within the bond of marriage, tell me, Brutus,

280 Is it excepted I should know no secrets  
That appertain to you? Am I your self  
But as it were in sort or limitation?  
To keep with you at meals, comfort your bed,  
And talk to you sometimes?                      Dwell I but in the suburbs

285 Of your good pleasure? If it be no more,  
Portia is Brutus' harlot, not his wife.

BRUTUS  
You are my true and honourable wife,  
As dear to me as are the ruddy drops  
That visit my sad heart.

1. Lines 284-5 "Dwell I but in the suburbs / Of your good pleasure?":

If Brutus is seen as a city, Portia thinks she lives in the SUBURBS of that city. Name the most important places and activities in a city (e.g. banks, municipal offices):

.....  
To be a part of these, where do you have to live: in the suburbs, or the city-centre? .....

\* If Portia lives in the "suburbs" of Brutus' life, does she have a part in his important business?

.....

(Turn over the page for more questions.)

2. Lines 285-6 "If it be no more, / Portia is Brutus' harlot, not his wife":

Portia says she feels more like Brutus' PROSTITUTE ("harlot") than his WIFE. Prostitutes are physically close to their customers, but how much can they know about their customers? What parts of the customer's life would a prostitute know anything about? In what way is it different with a man's wife?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

\* How much of Brutus' life does Portia think she knows, if she calls herself his "harlot"?

.....  
 .....

3. Lines 287-9 "You are ... as dear to me as are the ruddy drops / That visit my sad heart":

Portia is as precious to Brutus as his own blood. What part does blood play in our bodies: more or less important than our hair, for example, or fingernails? What happens to us if we lose too much blood?

.....  
 .....

\* What does this tell you about how Brutus feels about Portia?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

(Imagine he had said: "You are as dear to me as my FINGERNAILS!" What would this tell you about his feelings for Portia?)

.....  
 .....

Exercise 9 (c)

Brutus is troubled and restless, since he cannot decide whether his decision to kill Caesar is the right or wrong one. Read the following speech by Brutus:

64-69. The genius...insurrection: he is torn between his conscience and what he knows s going to do, like a country suffering a civil war.

*Enter Lucius*

LUCIUS  
Sir, March is wasted fifteen days.  
*Knock within*

BRUTUS  
60 'Tis good. Go to the gate; somebody knocks. *Exit Lucius*

*Enter Lucius*

65 Since Cassius first did whet me against Caesar  
I have not slept.  
Between the acting of a dreadful thing  
And the first motion, all the interim is  
Like a phantasma or a hideous dream.  
The genius and the mortal instruments  
Are theryn counsel; and the state of man,  
Like to a little kingdom, suffers then  
The nature of an insurrection.

*Enter Lucius*

LUCIUS  
70 Sir, 'tis your brother Cassius at the door,  
Who doth desire to see you.

BRUTUS Is he alone?

LUCIUS  
No, sir, there are more with him.

1. Line 61 "Since Cassius first did whet me against Caesar":

Brutus sees himself as a knife being sharpened (or "whet") by Cassius. Think about KNIVES and what they are used for. Are they any danger on their own, or only when used in a certain way, or by certain people?

.....  
.....

\* If Brutus is a knife: could he be dangerous? In what way? In whose hands?

.....  
.....

(See next page for more questions.)

2. Lines 64-65 "all the interim is / Like a phantasma or a hideous dream":

For Brutus, waiting for the plot to be put into action is like a bad dream. Think about NIGHTMARES: what is it like waking up from them? What different kinds are there: try to describe them.

\* Which kind of nightmare do you think Brutus's life has become? How would a person look, behave and feel, living such a life?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

3. Lines 67-69 "the state of man, / Like to a little kingdom, suffers then / the nature of an insurrection":

Brutus thinks of himself as a country (or "kingdom") in the middle of a revolution or civil war ("insurrection"). Think about CIVIL WARS: what happens, how does life change during them? Name an actual country that is having a civil war at the moment: what are the different sides?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

\* What are the different sides in Brutus? How are they like sides in a civil war? How do you think his "war" has changed his life?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Exercise 9 (d)

Cassius, Casca and Cinna have agreed to organise a plot to kill Caesar, but they want to persuade Brutus to join with them. Read the following conversation they have with each other about Brutus:

- 142. *Be you content:* Don't worry about that, set your mind at rest as far as that's concerned.
- 143. *Look you...Chair:* Make sure you leave it on the magistrate's chair. (Brutus is a Praetor or magistrate.)
- 144. *Where Brutus...find it:* Where no one except Brutus will find it.
- 146. *Set this up...statue:* Use wax to stick this (piece of paper) to the statue of old Brutus.
  
- 147. *Repair:* Make your way, go, return.
- 149. *All but...Cimber:* Everyone except Metellus Cimber.
- 151. *I will hie...bade me:* I'll hurry and put these papers where you told me to.
- 153. *ere day:* before daybreak, before it's morning.
- 156. *the man...ours:* he'll be completely on our side at the next meeting.
- 160. *that which would appear...worthiness:* something that would seem wrong if we did it would become good and honourable if people saw that he (i.e. Brutus) gave it his support and approval.
  
- 162. *concoited:* described, expressed, understood, judged.
- 164. *be sure of him:* make sure of his support, be certain that he's on our side.

CASSIUS  
 Be you content. Good Cinna, take this paper,  
*He gives Cinna letters*  
 And look you lay it in the Praetor's Chair,  
 Where Brutus may but find it, and throw this  
 145 In at his window. Set this up with wax  
 Upon old Brutus' statue. All this done,  
 Repair to Pompey's Porch where you shall find us.  
 Is Decius Brutus and Trebonius there?

CINNA  
 All but Metellus Cimber, and he's gone  
 150 To seek you at your house. Well, I will hie,  
 And so bestow these papers as you bade me.

CASSIUS.  
 That done, repair to Pompey's Theatre. *Exit Cinna*  
 Come, Casca, you and I will yet ere day  
 See Brutus at his house. Three parts of him  
 155 Is ours already, and the man entire  
 Upon the next encounter yields him ours.

CASCA  
 O, he sits high in all the people's hearts;  
 And that which would appear offence in us  
 His countenance, like richest alchemy,  
 160 Will change to virtue and to worthiness.

CASSIUS  
 Him and his worth, and our great need of him,  
 You have right well concoited. Let us go,  
 For it is after midnight, and ere day  
 We will awake him and be sure of him. *Exeunt*

1. Lines 154-5 "Three parts of him / Is ours already":

Cassius is trying to get Brutus on his side, and he describes this as if Brutus is a country that is gradually being taken over by Cassius, in "parts". Imagine a country in this situation: for example, if Angola were to be slowly invaded by Zimbabwe, what would happen when it was finally taken over "entirely", how would it be treated?

.....

\* How do you think Cassius will treat Brutus when he has totally "taken over" Brutus?

.....

2. Line 157 "O, he sits high in all the people's hearts":

After a sports victory, who gets carried off the field sitting

high on the shoulders of others? In a courtroom or at a political rally, who has the highest seat?

How do we feel and think about these people that "sit high"?

.....  
.....

\* How do the Romans think and feel about Brutus who also "sits high"?

.....  
.....

3. Lines 158-160 "That which would appear offence in us / His countenance, like richest alchemy, / Will change to virtue and to worthiness":

In Shakespeare's day, it was thought that the science of "alchemy" could turn worthless metal into gold. In our world, adverts do the same. Can you think of any unpleasant things that are made to look good in adverts? Some adverts use certain people standing next to things, to make the things look good.

\* In what ways would such people have to be like Brutus?

.....  
.....  
.....

\* What unpleasant thing does Cassius want Brutus to make look good?

.....  
.....

EXERCISE 10: Miscellaneous activities with figurative language in Shakespeare

Exercise 10 (a)

(1) When Calpurnia tries to stop Caesar from going to the Capitol, Caesar says that he is not afraid to go. This is how he describes himself:

"Danger knows full well  
That Caesar is more dangerous than he.  
We are two lions littered [born] in one day"

Caesar sees himself as a LION. Think about LIONS and their behaviour. What would you expect a person who was "a lion" to be like:

.....

\* Do you agree that Caesar is "a lion"? Give reasons for your answer.

.....

.....

.....

(2) What ANIMALS would you use to describe other characters in the play? Complete the following sentences.

(Example: Caesar is a ... LION)

BRUTUS IS A .....

CASSIUS IS A .....

ANTONY IS A .....

#Exercise 10 (b)

At the end of the play, after Cassius dies in the battle at Philippi, Cassius is described in this way:

"But Cassius is no more ... The SUN of Rome is set"

(1) Cassius is described as a SUN, and his death is seen as the SUNSET. Think about the SUN: what place does it have in our solar system? How important is it in our lives? What does it do for us? Could we live without it?

.....

.....

.....

.....

\* Use your ideas about the SUN to explain what is being said about Cassius, when he is likened to the SUN:

.....

.....

.....

(2) If Cassius is like the SETTING SUN, can you think of a character in the play who is like the RISING SUN at the end of the play? Give reasons for your answer.

.....

.....

.....

.....

#EXERCISE 11: Performance activities with figurative language in Shakespeare

These exercises attempt to show how interactive work with figurative language might be linked to a more general aim of presenting the play as a "blue-print for performance".

#Exercise 11 (a)

[Adapted version of Exercise 9 (a): Task 4 (II,i,180)]

"We shall be called purgers, not murderers": Brutus sees the killers as acting like doctors ("purgers"). Think about DOCTORS: what do they do? Do they cause pain? Why? Can you describe any treatment you have had from doctors: what they did, how you felt about them?

\*HOW MIGHT BRUTUS BEHAVE TO SUGGEST THE ACTIONS OF A DOCTOR? THINK OF ANY DOCTOR YOU HAVE SEEN "IN ACTION" AND TRY TO IMITATE THEM.

Use your ideas to explain how Brutus wants the killers to appear to the people of Rome.

#Exercise 11 (b)

[Adapted from Exercise 9 (b): Task 1 (II,i,284-5)]

"Dwell I but in the suburbs / Of your good pleasure?" : If Brutus is seen as a city, Portia thinks she lives in the SUBURBS of that city. Describe or draw a map of the most important places in a city you know (e.g. banks, municipal offices). Are these things in the suburbs, or the city-centre? If Portia lives in the "suburbs" of Brutus' life, what does this tell us about her part in his life?

\*WHERE ON STAGE SHOULD PORTIA STAND TO SUGGEST THAT SHE IS "IN THE SUBURBS" OF BRUTUS' LIFE? HOW FAR IS SHE FROM BRUTUS?

#Exercise 11 (c)

[Adapted from Exercise 9 (c): Task 1 (II,i,61-2)]

"Since Cassius first did whet me against Caesar" : What kind of metal objects do we sharpen (or "whet") so that they will work better? What kind of work are they used for? Can you think of a later scene in the play where such objects are actually used?

\*SHOULD BRUTUS ACTUALLY BE HOLDING SUCH AN OBJECT NOW? WHAT COULD HE BE DOING WITH IT?

Why does Brutus see himself as one of these objects? In what way might Cassius "use" him as such an object?

## #Exercise 11 (d)

[Adapted from Exercise 9 (c): Task 3 (II,i,67-9)]

"the state of man, / Like to a little kingdom, suffers then / the nature of an insurrection" : Brutus thinks of himself as a country (or "kingdom") in the middle of a revolution or civil war ("insurrection"). Think about CIVIL WARS: what happens, how does life change during them? What are the different sides in Brutus' "civil war"? How do you think his "war" has changed his life? \*HOW COULD BRUTUS BEHAVE TO SHOW THIS "WAR" GOING ON BETWEEN TWO SIDES OF HIS MIND? SUGGEST HOW HIS APPEARANCE COULD RESEMBLE THAT OF PEOPLE LIVING IN A REAL CIVIL WAR.

## #Exercise 11 (e)

[Adapted from Exercise 9 (d): Task 2 (I,iii,157)]

"O, he sits high in all the people's hearts" : After a sports victory, who gets carried off the field sitting high on the shoulders of others? In a courtroom or at a political rally, who has the highest seat? How do we feel and think about these people that "sit high"?

\*HOW COULD CASCA AND CASSIUS ACT TO SUGGEST SOMEONE ACTUALLY SITTING IN SUCH A POSITION?

Use your ideas to explain how the Romans think and feel about Brutus who also "sits high"?

\*

## APPENDIX C: CLASSROOM TRY-OUTS: LESSON PLANS

## (1) School N

Lesson plan:

DAY 1

Exercise 3 (a), (b) - oral (with teacher)  
Exercise 4 (a) / Exercise 4 (b) - written  
Exercise 7 (f) / Exercise 10 (a) - written

## (2) School Q

Lesson plan:

DAY 1

Exercise 3 (c) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 1 (a) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 2 (a), (c), (d) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 4 (b) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 7 (b) - written

DAY 2

Exercise 1 (a), (b) - oral (with teacher)  
Exercise 7 (a) - oral (with teacher)  
Exercise 8 (b) - oral (with teacher)  
Exercise 8 (a) REVISED - written

## (3) School R

Lesson plan:

DAY 1

Exercise 2 (a), (b) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 4 (a), (b) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 4 (c) - written  
Exercise 7 (c), (d) - written

DAY 2

Exercise 3 (a), (b) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 7 (d) - oral (with researcher)  
Exercise 9 (c) - written

## (4) School W

Lesson plan:

DAY 1

CLASS 1:

Exercise 8 (a) - written  
Exercise 9 (b) - written

CLASS 2:

Exercise 7 (a) - written  
Exercise 9 (a) - written

## (5) School Y

Lesson plan:

DAY 1

Exercise 3 (c) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 4 (a) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 7 (b) / Exercise 8 (b) - written

Exercise 9 (d) - written

DAY 2

Exercise 1 (b), (e) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 2 (a), (b), (c) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 9 (a) - written

## (6) School Z

Materials tried out in the absence of the researcher:

Exercise 7 (b) - written

Exercise 8 (b) - written

Exercise 9 (b), (c), (d) - written

## (7) Teachers' Workshop

Materials tried out:

Exercise 1 (b), (d), (f) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 3 (d) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 4 (a), (b), (d) - oral (with researcher)

Exercise 6 (a), (b) - oral (with researcher)

## APPENDIX D: EXERCISES ON FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE : NOTE FOR TEACHERS

1. These exercises are intended to help students understand figurative language for themselves and with reference to their own experiences. The emphasis is on Julius Caesar, but other kinds of figurative language are used as well.

2. The basic approach to metaphors and similes in these exercises is one which stresses the importance of readers using their own everyday "life" knowledge to work out what is being said.

Here is an example of a metaphor:

HIS DAUGHTER IS A FLOWER IN HIS LIFE

To understand what is being said about "his daughter", the reader must go through 2 steps.

\* Firstly, think about FLOWERS: what associations from the reader's everyday knowledge are stirred up by the word? Here are some:

BRIGHT - FRAGRANT - COLOURFUL - PRETTY - ROSES -  
DAISIES - THORNS - SOIL - DELICATE.

\* Secondly, apply these ideas to "his daughter", to work out what is being said about her. (Not all of them will be relevant, eg SOIL.) Thus the reader understands:

HIS DAUGHTER IS A COLOURFUL AND PRETTY PART OF HIS LIFE

3. To understand metaphors, students are encouraged to go through these simple steps, stirring up and applying their own everyday knowledge in this way. They have all the everyday knowledge they need to work out most of Shakespeare's metaphors - even if they don't realise it. After these exercises they might!

4. To get the students' own everyday knowledge working so that they can come up with answers for themselves, the exercises ask questions. They do not give facts and explanations. In a lesson, the teacher should back this up, helping students to find their own meanings rather than simply supplying students with answers.

5. The students are not given lengthy technical explanations of metaphor and simile. What is more important is that they can read actual metaphors and similes for meaning when they find them.

6. The exercises call for group work (approximately 5 per group). In a big class, students can easily avoid giving their own ideas, but in small groups, each student is forced to contribute.

7. The exercises involve reading activities, but also oral and written work through discussion and note taking. In this way the exercises combine literature and language teaching.

APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRES

(a) For teachers

When following your own line of thinking about my materials on Shakespeare's figurative language, please also give some thought to these things:

\* my general approach to teaching figurative language (as outlined in the "Note to Teachers"): any aspects, potential problems I've ignored?

\* the kinds of questions I've asked to get pupils using their own everyday knowledge in connection with metaphors: too many? not enough? not the right sort? any of your own suggestions?

\* are the instructions clear enough: is there a problem knowing what is wanted?

\* if the pupils' everyday knowledge is stirred up by the questions, is there a potential problem applying that knowledge to the metaphor, so as to work out its meaning? Any suggestions for how this could be improved?

(b) For students

WHAT DO STUDENTS THINK ABOUT THESE EXERCISES?

1. Did you understand what you were expected to do in them?

.....

2. Were any of the exercise too difficult to answer? .....

If any were too difficult, please say which ones they were, and try to say why they were difficult:

.....

.....

3. Did you find any of the exercises interesting? .....

If any were interesting, please say which ones they were:

.....

4. Did the exercises help you to understand Shakespeare's metaphors and similes?

.....

## APPENDIX F: RESPONSES TO STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTION 1 Did you understand what you were expected to do?

<u>School:</u>	<u>Yes:</u>	<u>Some:</u>	<u>No:</u>
School W	49 (86%)	6	1
School Y	18 (78%)	3	1
School Q	59 (86%)	0	7
School R	41 (98%)	0	1
School N	32 (97%)	0	0
TOTAL	199 (90%)	9	10

QUESTION 2 Were any of the exercises too difficult to answer?

<u>School:</u>	<u>No:</u>	<u>Yes:</u>
School W	30 (54%)	25 (45%)
School Y	15 (65%)	5 (22%)
School Q	47 (68%)	17 (25%)
School R	31 (74%)	10 (24%)
School N	28 (85%)	5 (15%)
TOTAL	151 (68%)	62 (28%)

QUESTION 3 Did you find any of the exercises interesting?

<u>School:</u>	<u>Yes:</u>	<u>Very much:</u>	<u>No:</u>
School W	48 +	5 (95%)	0
School Y	19 +	4 (100%)	0
School Q	57 +	0 (83%)	2
School R	41 +	0 (98%)	0
School N	29 +	4 (100%)	0
TOTAL	194 +	13 (94%)	2

QUESTION 4 Did the exercises help you to understand Shakespeare's metaphors and similes?

<u>School:</u>	<u>Yes:</u>	<u>Very Much:</u>	<u>Some:</u>	<u>No:</u>
School W	46 +	2 (86%)	4	3
School Y	18 +	5 (100%)	0	0
School Q	48 +	9 (83%)	0	2
School R	39 +	2 (98%)	0	0
School N	26 +	6 (97%)	0	0
TOTAL	177 +	24 (91%)	4	5