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**Summary:** This essay presents a literary study for adult students of English at English A level at Komvux (municipal adult education) and Vuxenskola (a study association for adult non-formal learning). It has its basis in the question whether reading Shakespeare in the original version is suitable for language learners as form, and is beneficial as content. The classic play *Romeo and Juliet* by Shakespeare features in the course book *Read and Log on* used by the English A group at Komvux in my chosen municipality. The primary aims of the study were to explore teachers’ attitude and views on teaching literature – the classics in general, and Shakespeare in particular – to adult language learners, and students’ reactions and opinions about a lesson on Shakespeare and *Romeo and Juliet* in the original language with regards to content and usefulness.

In order to increase the number of informants, a *Romeo and Juliet* lesson was conducted amongst Vuxenskola participants in the same municipality. These participants take part in English conversation classes in “non-formal” education (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 18, my translation), in the form of study circles. Both Komvux students and Vuxenskola participants read the play of *Romeo and Juliet* in the original language, however, differences between the two groups can be
outlined based on the following factors: formal versus “non-formal” education, encountering the text as a film production versus reading the text, meeting the whole play versus reading only sections. By analysing these differences and contrasting informants’ experience of the language and the lessons’ content, conclusions can be drawn as to whether such a lesson is at all desirable or beneficial for language learners, and if so, how it should be conducted. The starting point of the present research was to establish the importance of teaching the culture\textsuperscript{1} of the target language through authentic literary works.

The survey was conducted in the form of questionnaires and interviews. Conclusions were also drawn from the lesson sequence observed at Komvux and the lesson sequence conducted by myself at Vuxenskola. As the study focuses on adult learners, it discusses the notion of life-long learning, the different venues provided for that, and the differences between students in compulsory education and adult learners who, supposedly, are in education as the result of their free choice.

\textsuperscript{1} The word \textit{culture} here is used as a collective noun to include all the different cultures as various socio-historical contexts, in which English is spoken.
Table of Contents
1. Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 5
  1.1. Background .............................................................................................................................................. 5
  1.2. Purpose ..................................................................................................................................................... 5
  1.3 Questions .................................................................................................................................................. 6
2. Theoretical background .................................................................................................................................. 7
  2.1 Importance of reading literature in the language classroom ...................................................................... 7
  2.1.1. Reading the classics – why Shakespeare? ............................................................................................ 10
  2.1.2. Reading the full work of literature versus sections ............................................................................. 12
  2.1.3. Possible problems when reading literature in a language classroom ...................................................... 13
  2.1.4. Film in the EFL classroom as an alternative or complement to reading ................................................ 15
  2.2. Shakespeare’s language ............................................................................................................................ 15
  2.2.1. Modernized version or the original language in the language classroom ............................................. 16
  2.3. Working with adult learners – life-long learning ....................................................................................... 18
  2.3.1. Describing Komvux lessons, their aims in general, and how reading takes place ................................. 19
  2.3.2. Describing Vuxenskola lessons, their aims in general, and how reading takes place ........................... 21
3. Method .......................................................................................................................................................... 23
  3.1. Procedure ................................................................................................................................................ 23
  3.1.1. Teacher interviews ............................................................................................................................... 23
  3.1.2. Lessons ................................................................................................................................................ 24
    3.1.2.1. Komvux lesson sequence on chapter 4, key elements .................................................................... 25
    3.1.2.2. Vuxenskola lesson sequence on Romeo and Juliet ....................................................................... 25
    3.1.2.3. Factors shared by both Komvux and Vuxenskola lessons ................................................................. 27
    3.1.2.4. Differences between the Komvux and Vuxenskola lesson plan and their aims ............................... 27
  3.1.3. Student questionnaires .......................................................................................................................... 28
  3.1.4. Student interviews ................................................................................................................................. 29
  3.2. Informants ............................................................................................................................................... 30
    3.2.1. Selection .......................................................................................................................................... 30
    3.2.2. Cultural background ........................................................................................................................... 31
  3.3. Reliability ............................................................................................................................................... 31
4. Discussion of results ......................................................................................................................................... 33
  4.1. Teacher perspective .................................................................................................................................. 33
    4.1.1. The importance of literature and culture in language teaching ............................................................. 33
    4.1.2. Shakespeare as a subject in the light of students’ level of proficiency ............................................... 33
    4.1.3. Original language versus a modernized version ............................................................................... 35
    4.1.4. Film adaptation in teaching literature in the language classroom ....................................................... 35
    4.1.5. Students’ expectations and motivation according to the teachers ..................................................... 36
    4.1.6. Time constraints and self-study ........................................................................................................... 37
  4.2. Student perspective .................................................................................................................................. 38
    4.2.1. Student expectations ........................................................................................................................... 38
      4.2.1.1. Students’ literary repertoire ........................................................................................................ 40
      4.2.2. Fear of not understanding the text - reading between the lines ......................................................... 40
      4.2.3. Self-study ....................................................................................................................................... 41
      4.2.4. The relevance of language historical knowledge for English A level ............................................. 43
      4.2.5. Full length work versus parts of the text ......................................................................................... 45
    4.3. Democracy in adult education ................................................................................................................ 46
    4.4. Where the teacher and student perspectives meet ................................................................................... 47
5. Conclusion ..................................................................................................................................................... 49
  5.1. Purpose of teaching Shakespeare to language learners – Teachers’ point of view .................................... 49
  5.2. Students’ point of view on learning about Shakespeare and encountering his language ............................ 49
  5.3. Future applications .................................................................................................................................. 49
6. Summary ......................................................................................................................................................... 51
Works cited list .................................................................................................................................................. 52
Appendix ............................................................................................................................................................ 55
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background
The topic of my research was inspired by the course book Read and Log on currently used in adult EFL education at Komvux in our municipality at English A level. The course plan is identical to the content of the course book. This course book was obviously designed based on the idea that English language literature, that is fiction, is an important tool in the EFL process, as each chapter of the course book is designed around a contemporary novel and its theme. Unit Four is the only chapter that constitutes an exception, which deals with Shakespeare, introducing students to Elizabethan England and Early Modern English, which in many ways differ – both in grammar and vocabulary – from the English we use and encounter in the twenty-first century. Students are to give evidence to what they have learned in this unit by writing a movie review about a Romeo and Juliet film adaptation, chosen by the teacher.

I became interested in exploring this topic even more, considering that the reading habits (of literature) of the Western world have drastically changed due to the technical innovations and globalization in general (Persson, 2007: 7). In my opinion, extensive reading is an important feature of the language learning process. Reading literature is a way of exposing language students to even more of the target language, and helping them improve their reading skills, and skills required for coping with authentic texts, while they are challenged to take an active part in their learning process (Willis, 1990: 69). On the one hand, literature is the perfect source of language models; on the other hand, it helps students see the foreign language in a cultural context. The question if this is desirable or not is much debated, the main arguments against using literature being that the language of literature is “far removed from the utterances of daily communication” and that the studying of literature is considered suitable only at advanced level (Collie and Slater, 2008: 2). Finally, reading literary works always provides a good opportunity to teach academic content (mainly literature or history) or can form the basis of a class discussion in the form of various communicative exercises, thus improving students’ verbal skills. These skills are also named as criteria for passing English 5 (English A) in the Swedish Curriculum (‘läroplan’).

1.2. Purpose
The purpose of this paper is to explore teachers’ and students’ opinion and attitude towards Shakespeare and his language as a topic in the EFL classroom in both formal and non-formal learning situations. The level of proficiency in question is English A (5) or higher. The study does not aim to give a definite answer as to whether Shakespeare and his language should be taught or
not to language learners – the writer of the study argues for the importance of teaching culture through all types of literature to language learners –, but mainly aims to look at different arguments for and against from a teacher and student perspective. I also aim to sum up the challenges and difficulties presented by Shakespeare and his language as subject within the EFL classroom, along with the didactic questions teachers should take into consideration when planning the lesson sequence.

1.3. Questions
I set out to explore the following three questions with regards to a lesson sequence about Shakespeare and one of his plays, *Romeo and Juliet* in the original language.

- What views and opinions do EFL teachers hold about teaching Shakespeare and his language to adult language learners in general, and at English A level in particular?
- How do language students evaluate the benefits, relevance and usefulness of a lesson focusing on Shakespeare and familiarizing students with Shakespeare’s language, if at all?
- If we assume that making language learners familiar with Shakespeare and his language is in any way beneficial and/or relevant for the students, what methodological questions (i.e. reading versus watching the film, original language versus simplified text, full length versus sections, etc.) should be taken into consideration when planning a lesson sequence, and what should be the central aim of such a lesson with regards to skills and knowledge?
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Importance of reading literature in the language classroom

The importance of literature

According to Frank Smith (in Lundahl, 1998: 65) we learn through reading. There are a great number of reasons why reading literature in general, and in the language classroom in particular, is an important part of education. Inger Norberg (2003: 92-93) claims that both language and literature (especially fiction literature) play an important role in our identity. By stimulating our fantasy, literature has a beneficial effect on our everyday life and problem solving skills. She also adds that literary texts stimulate discussions and contribute to the development of the thinking process – a crucial factor with children. From a broader perspective it is argued that literature speaks about the human experience:

(…) literature offers a bountiful and extremely varied body of written material which is important in the sense that it says something about fundamental human issues, and which is enduring rather than ephemeral. Its relevance moves with the passing of time, but seldom disappears completely… (Collie and Slater, 2008: 3)

The benefits of using literature in language teaching, that is reading novels, drama or poetry are important on various levels and reach beyond the language learning process. IR Cruz cited McRae of the University of Nottingham, who gave a summary of Corbett’s arguments in favor of covering literature in English language teaching. These are:

…language learning, linguistic confidence, language description and awareness, language practice, memory, active involvement, classroom interaction, post-lesson stimuli, production, enthusiasm, receptivity, related world knowledge, personal satisfaction, cultural awareness, linguistic or aesthetic curiosity, critical evaluation, grammatical, structural, or functional reinforcement, information, and constructive enjoyment. (Critic-at-Large: Literature in language teaching)

Claire J. Kramsch (2000: 131) summarizes the main argument for using literature in the language classroom over any other types of text as the following: “the piece of literary prose or poetry appeals to the students’ emotions, grabs their interest, remains in their memory and makes them partake in the memory of another speech community.” She herself, however, maintains (2000: 130-131) that the main argument is “literature’s ability to represent the particular voice of a writer among the many voices of his or her community and thus to appeal to the particular reader.”
Skill based benefits

Reading literary texts in the language classroom can be motivated by various arguments. Reading is one of the receptive skills. Based on the purpose of the reading, researchers talk about ‘extensive’ and ‘intensive’ reading (Harmer, 2004: 210). Extensive reading is reading at length, often for pleasure, at a leisurely way, therefore it happens outside the class, in the learner’s own time and on her own, i.e. without the teacher’s help. Intensive reading, on the other hand, is less relaxed and is dedicated not so much to pleasure as to achievement of a study goal, therefore it mostly happens in the classroom, under the teacher’s supervision and guidance. Intensive reading is often associated with instrumental purposes, i.e. the reader is reading to find specific information, for example reading a manual or a time table. According to Jeremy Harmer (2004: 210), in order “to get maximum benefit from their reading students need to be involved in both extensive and intensive reading”. Language learning does not and should not stop outside the classroom. However, when it comes to extensive reading, students need a great deal of encouragement from their teachers, according to Harmer (2004: 211), not to mention the students’ negative expectations about how difficult the text is (Harmer, 2004: 208). The idea of the extensive reading is to make students more positive about reading, improve their overall comprehension skills, and give them a wider passive and active vocabulary. It also develops learners’ “ability to make inferences from linguistic clues, and to deduce meaning from context …” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 5). Last but not least, literary works can always be the basis for interesting and stimulating discussion, which in turn will improve learners’ verbal and communicative skills (Carp and Olsen, 2000: 7; Collie and Slater, 2008: 7).

From a linguistic point of view, reading of literary texts is important because students should be exposed to as much L2 as possible. So it is only natural that teachers should encourage their students to engage in explicit reading, i.e. the reading of a longer piece of text, outside classroom time (Harmer, 2004: 203). Furthermore, tackling authentic texts enables the learner to acquire a vital skill, and that is the skill needed when dealing with written texts (and speech) where they might miss quite a few words but are able to get past that and still extract a general meaning (Harmer, 2004: 204). Finally, literary texts are authentic, and thus, they make the perfect language model for learners. However, critics reject this assumption by claiming that literary works do not exhibit the typical “language of daily life” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 4). Nonetheless, the same criticism does not apply to the fact that “literature provides a rich context in which individual lexical or syntactical items are made more memorable” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 5). Furthermore, reading literary works has a beneficial effect on learners’ writing skills.
Teaching culture – the debate and how literature fits in

Language is the manifestation of belonging to a particular culture, therefore equipping language learners with intercultural knowledge is one of the aims of language teaching (Tornberg, 2000: 41). Without teaching the culture that the foreign language exists in, the target language itself is reduced to a mere collection of “meaningless symbols or symbols to which the student attaches the wrong meaning; for unless he is warned, unless he receives cultural instructions, he will associate American concepts or objects with foreign symbols.” (Politzer in Tornberg, 2000: 50) Cultural knowledge gives language learners the tools to use a type of top down reading method, (i.e. using background knowledge), when decoding a text. Being familiar with the context is crucial for understanding a text, even in the first language (Tornberg, 2000: 73). Despite such obvious arguments suggesting that teaching culture is an important component of language learning, there has been much debate whether it should be taught in foreign language classrooms or not (Collie and Slater, 2008: 3). Michael Byram (in Tornberg, 2000: 51) also warns that culture is constantly changing and teachers need to take that into consideration when presenting it to language learners.

A similar thought is expressed by Anne Heith (2006: 46): “culture is no longer viewed as an object which can be examined but rather as something which is being created and changed by complex and various individuals of a dynamic collective”. However, for many, like Bo Lundahl (2009: 326), it has never been a question that teaching culture is important and that one way to do it is through authentic fiction literature, i.e. it is written for a native speaker audience, with no concessions made to speakers of a foreign language (Collie and Slater, 2008: 4; Harmer, 2004: 205). According to Collie and Slater (2008: 4) it is also the learner’s natural desire to understand the culture (or cultures) in which the foreign language is spoken. When visiting the country is not an option, learners resort to “more indirect routes”, i.e. the reading of authentic materials, and amongst these, literary works. They might be the imaginary products of the author’s mind but they still “give the foreign reader a feel for the codes and preoccupations that structure a real society.” Or as G. Ellis and J. Brewer puts it (in Lundahl, 1998: 62) “authentic storybooks (…) help to bring the real world into the classroom.”

Lundahl (2009: 326) lists various reasons, why original/authentic literature, and within that, stories are an important feature of language teaching. One of these arguments is that all cultures have stories, they talk about human experiences in different historical and cultural contexts therefore they are a source for intercultural learning. Lundahl (2009: 342) then draws the conclusion that there are no culturally neutral texts. By reading authentic texts the learner also gains insight into, and a deeper understanding of the cultural references and context of the given language.

---

2 The word culture here is used as a collective noun to include all the different cultures as various socio-historical contexts, in which English is spoken.
Finally, it is undeniable that authentic texts, which come from outside the classroom, are much more interesting and exciting to read than pre-fabricated textbook material designed to display specific language features, and thus authentic texts can even increase student motivation. In reading authentic texts learners encounter a language intended for native speakers (Collie and Slater, 2008: 4). Reading in the foreign language can also help individuals discover the delight of learning a language in general, and become more personally involved in their language learning process as the person becomes immersed in the world of a book. An analytical approach of the text is replaced by an urgency to discover how the story unfolds (Collie and Slater, 2008: 5-6). Setting reading tasks to language students undoubtedly contain the hidden agenda of “stimulating reading habits” by encouraging students to do even more private reading (Collie and Slater, 2008: 13).

2.1.1. Reading the classics – why Shakespeare?
Kramsch (2000: 131) argues that “language learners have to be exposed to different types of texts, from the most conventional to the most particular (...)” One particular reason for working with classic, i.e. not modern, works of literature is that they “can transcend both time and culture to speak directly to a reader in another country” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 3), “modern works (...) rest upon and interact with a whole line of predecessors” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 163). Anne Heith (2006: 107) quotes Alvin Kernan and Terry Eagleton when stating the definition of classic as “highly valued texts”. She, furthermore, points out that what constitutes a classic is relative – the notion of a classic is never static. On the one hand, it is the age and the ideals of a period, which decide which works of art are considered as classics. Heith (2006: 107-108) demonstrates the idea by choosing Shakespeare as such an example. Forgotten or heavily edited and rewritten in order to suit the ideals of the seventeenth century, Shakespeare was then rediscovered by Romanticism, which responded positively to the structure and themes of Shakespearean texts. On the other hand, the concept of what constitutes a classic depends on the perspective of a literary theory cultivates (Heith, 2006: 112). Shakespeare is celebrated for taking up universal human experiences in his texts (Wells, 2005: xvi) and for contributing a great deal to the English language as we know it today. The combination of the two can explain why Shakespeare is considered a classic today.

In my view, reading any literature in general and the classics in particular is not only important for improving language learners’ vocabulary and reading skills, but can also serves as the topic of language learners’ studies, i.e. teachers can teach academic content in the form of literary analysis, history and culture. However, the most obvious problem with classic texts (in this sense, older texts), or in our case with Romeo and Juliet is that it cannot, strictly speaking, be used as a
language model for language learners. Therefore, the question arises whether classic works, which are inadequate for the most obvious criteria, i.e. they do not provide language learners with present-day language models, should be used at all included in language teaching. Are there any persuasive reasons for using the classics for intensive or for extensive reading purposes? The main argument against using Shakespearean language in EFL is that some of its linguistic features are outdated. The relevance of this problem is put into a different light by the fact that “speech never stands still – not even between two generations” (Crystal, 2008: 1). Linguistic features – such as meaning of words, spelling, etc. – can change even from one generation to the next. What is modern sounding today can be soon out-dated. Because of this rapid change, it is, in my opinion, an unrealistic idea to only focus on language produced in the moment as the only valid language model, and rule out any other texts, which are outside this tight and hard to define time frame.

A more common concern – not only restricted to learners of English as a foreign language – is that people of the twenty-first century doubt if a play written four hundred years ago can have any relevance, can carry any message for them. I share Frank Kermode’s view (2000: 13), who quotes Ben Johnson that Shakespeare is “not for an age, but for all time” – an argument which I will more comprehensively return to in the discussion below. Kermode further advocates his case by claiming that being familiar with Shakespeare’s work and admit to his greatness is “as necessary to our culture as an understanding, however partial, of the greatness of Mozart or of Cezanne” (p. 13). Furthermore, Kermode claims “… I believe in the value of Shakespeare…” (p. 13) and because so do I, I believe it is enough of a reason to send off any teacher on a mission to try and make her students see this same value. Not to mention all the various film adaptations based on Shakespearean plays or even of Shakespeare’s life as it might have been (Shakespeare in love).

Although the criteria for English 5 (A) students in the National Curriculum does not state that students should read literary works or classic, i.e. not modern literature, it does emphasize that students should be given the chance “to develop their knowledge on social issues and cultural understanding in different contexts and in different parts of the world where English is used” (Skolverket, ämnet engelska, p. 1, my translation). Due to the fact that classic works are of authentic nature they serve the purpose of teaching language learners the cultural, historical setting of the foreign language they are learning. Reading a classic piece of work often occurs within the frame work of discussing the age it was written in, the author whom it was written by. The authors of Read and Log on were obviously driven by the idea that by reading the classics teachers can teach academic content in the form of history and cultural history.
Shakespeare is without doubt one of the greatest poets and playwrights of English literature. His enormous influence is present both in the language and in a vast number of works of art and literature, which were directly or indirectly inspired by Shakespearean plays, or characters created by Shakespeare. The film industry constantly pays homage to the greatness of Shakespeare’s genius from free interpretations such as the Broadway musical *West Side Story*, a “Romeo and Juliet story”, or the teenage movie *10 things I hate about you* (inspired by the *Taming of the Shrew*) to reinterpretations applying the language and original setting such as Zeffirelli’s *Romeo and Juliet*, or Baz Luhrman’s *Romeo+Juliet*, which keeps the original language but changes the setting to LA at the end of the 1990s - just to name a few. Allusions to Shakespeare or his characters appear everywhere, and are thus part of the contemporary culture (and not only of the English speaking ones). One cannot understand these allusions and references without having read the original, while it is true that “phrases from his plays and poems (…) are on the lips of people who may never have read him.” (Wells, 2005: xv) The Shakespearean plays exhibit the human experience mentioned earlier, which we all seek and find in literary works.

He [Shakespeare] is valued for his humanity, his psychological insight, his wit and humour, his lyricism, his mastery of language, his ability to excite, surprise, move and, in the widest sense of the word, entertain audiences. (Wells, 2005: xvi)

### 2.1.2. Reading the full work of literature versus sections

Classroom reality is that teachers often decide against assigning the whole text to language learners to read. On the one hand, students think that reading a longer piece of text outside class is difficult and takes too much time; on the other hand, working with a longer text in class also takes up too much time and can become boring for students after a while. The obvious benefit of giving well-chosen sections of a text to students is that it allows more time to work with other novels, plays or poems, thus avoiding monotony. Course books such as *Read and Log on*, where each chapter presents only one section (or maximum two) of a literary work obviously use this approach, employing a ‘less is more’ approach. However, in case of the Shakespeare chapter, students are provided with the additional aid of the film adaptation, which helps them further to form their ideas about the play as a whole. The disadvantages of reading only sections is, however, that students will only get “bite size chunks”, “moreover there are some literary features that cannot be adequately illustrated by a short excerpt” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 11). Many points of discussion cannot be used if students read only sections. They cannot summarize the story, discuss the high-lights of the plot, contemplate the message or moral of the story, discuss character developments or “what if scenarios” because they do not know how the actual plot unfolded. On
the whole, they will have a very much limited experience of the text if not read in its entirety. Lundahl (2009: 330) has a similar view; he claims that reading just a section of the book leads to students missing out on a range of other aspects or topics raised in the book. However, despite all these disadvantages reading only sections can be an option if these sections are chosen carefully, i.e. the following factors are taken into consideration: students’ interests, needs and linguistic proficiency; and the unfolding of the book’s plot, while keeping in mind the length and nature of the course (Collie and Slater, 2008: 12)

2.1.3. Possible problems when reading literature in a language classroom
Using literature in language teaching suggests that the teacher is engaging the students in content-based learning. Critics claim that in order to engage student in meaningful content based teaching, the students’ level of proficiency must be rather advanced. A study quoted by Annamaria Pinter (2006: 41) shows, that even in the case of children, a “content driven programme” can be successfully implemented if teachers use the right tools. The programme’s success lies mainly in the fact that students are motivated and find the topic and activities satisfying. In this particular case, focus was on culture, in terms of comparing daily routines, but a similarly culture related content can be found in the teaching of literature. Despite what Collie and Slater (2008: 163) so optimistically claim that “many students, especially if they are intending to go on to literary studies, are keen to master some of the classics they have heard about”, in my experience most second language learners tend to be afraid of or dislike classical texts, or they simply feel that it is plain pointless. (Although, this might have something to do with the fact that not all the students and participants involved in this research were interested in pursuing further literary studies.) The reason for a possible dislike of the classics amongst foreign language students is a combination of several factors. The obvious main concern is that the language will be difficult to understand due to a possibly outdated grammar system and vocabulary and cannot be used as language models.

Reading a piece of literary work, written centuries ago, can pose a number of problems for both teacher and student. The most obvious problem arises from students’ negative expectation. One such negative expectation is that the text is too difficult. In contrast to Harmer’s (2004: 203) list about what makes any one text difficult, – i.e. too long words or lengthy sentences, or a combination of the two –, in the case of classics it is the difference between the linguistic features presented in the text and those found in modern English, which causes difficulty. Harmer (2004: 203) also cites Claire J. Krashen on how comprehensible input aids the language acquisition, and the more the better. However, Harmer also adds that - if comprehensible input will aid the process, it also means that incomprehensive input will not. That is a warning for the teacher to plan
carefully before exposing students to authentic texts, which they might experience as incomprehensible, confusing and eventually pointless. As Harmer points it out (2004: 207) there is a challenge when setting any kind of language task for the learner: it should be “difficult but achievable”. He also argues that the right match between the text and the task suggests that it is more important to get the task right, rather than worrying about choosing a text, which is appropriate for the learner’s level of proficiency.

Furthermore, it can be helpful for students to engage in a conscious reflection on how they read. Teachers can urge students to apply a top down reading process, i.e. not be stopped by unknown words, but try to aim for a general understanding of the text (Harmer, 2004: 337; Tornberg, 2000: 79-80, 94).

In order to tackle students’ negative expectations, teachers have to choose the literature carefully for their students, based on the students’ language level, needs, interests, cultural background (Collie and Slater, 2008: 6), and their reading habits (Brodow and Rininsland, 2005: 57). In other words, teachers have to consider the didactic question of who will read the text (Jank and Meyer in Molloy, 2003: 32). Students should feel interested and motivated to read the text in question, knowing that it has some relevance to their learning process or to themselves on some other personal level. However, a work by Shakespeare is a part of the syllabus in the course book approved for English A; it has been judged to suit learners’ language level, at least, so in this case Shakespeare is “the dirty job”, which somebody has to do (Pechter in Showalter, 2006: 79). However, many teachers might not find Shakespeare such a “dirty job”. Bengt Brodow and Kristina Rininsland (2005: 56-57) argue that the teacher’s enthusiasm for the book in question might be crucial for the students themselves. The text might be difficult but its use in the classroom can be justified if in the teacher’s opinion the text may convey an important message to the students. Kramsch (2000: 138) argues that “the teacher’s initial reaction to the text will be his most valuable asset in teaching it”. Nevertheless, that does not necessary exclude negative feelings – it is better to harbor strong negative feelings about the text than being completely indifferent to it. Then it is only a question of creating interest in the reading topic and activating the students’ previous knowledge of the subject, in order to help them apply a top down reading method when approaching the text, which in turn will lead to a more successful reading process. Otherwise – as A. Thyberg (2009: 103) points it out – students can run into problems because of cultural differences and the lack of a common frame of reference.

Since the text in question is a play, teachers must consider which teaching methods are the most suitable in order to provide students with the best result. Elaine Showalter (2006: 80) suggests that
working with a play gives the perfect opportunity for a “performance workshop”. This idea is even more obvious when considering the whole school-classroom situation can be translated into a theatre-performance situation, also pointed out by Showalter (2006: 79). However, when teaching literature, teachers tend to fall back on more traditional teaching techniques, where they feel they have to give a lecture on the subject, author, age, thus unconsciously forcing students to become passive listeners, recipients of information, provided by the all-knowing teacher-lecturer (Collie and Slater, 2008: 7; Ho, 2007: 24)

2.1.4. Film in the EFL classroom as an alternative or complement to reading
Whereas Vuxenskola students only read selected sections of the original play, Komvux students watch the film adaptation of Zeffirelli’s *Romeo and Juliet*. Brigitta Carp and Ann-Cristine Janhagen Olsen (2000: 44) point out that students, on the whole, have a positive attitude towards watching films, which in its turn creates a positive learning atmosphere. Carp and Olsen further discuss the relevance of passive vocabulary when watching films and how even a complicated language becomes accessible due to the fact that it is accompanied by pictures. Apart from regular feature films, using screen versions of famous literary works is a popular option for a film watching lesson (Carp and Olsen, 2000: 44-45). With the right exercises and questions for discussion, watching a film – just like reading a text – serves not only the purpose of training listening or reading comprehension, but also the training of verbal and writing skills (Carp and Olsen, 2000: 45). When planning a film lesson, the same question arises, as when planning a lesson around a longer piece of literary work: Should the students watch the whole film or only a section? Carp and Olsen (2000: 57) argue that if the film is too long showing certain section should be sufficient. The main point of showing the film is to give students insight into the age and the plot of the story, according to the authors. As seen above, language complexity is less of an issue in case of films than written texts because pictures accompanying the language are of a great help for students’ comprehension. There is a further debate on whether the film should be shown with or without subtitles – in the target language or in the first language shared by the students in the language group. Carp and Olsen (2000: 44) argues that a carefully chosen film can be watched without subtitles.

2.2. Shakespeare’s language
Crystal (2008: 41) argues that “the language used in Shakespearean texts” is in fact a more fortunate expression when referring to the language of Shakespearean plays, considering that linguistic features exhibited in the texts are “properties of Early Modern English in general” – “one
of the most lexically inventive periods of the history of the language” (p.41) “… period of extraordinary dynamic change” (p 160) - and Shakespearean texts are the result of collaborations, which occurred on many different levels.

Although Crystal (2008: 8-9) warns that Shakespeare’s contribution to the English language should not be “overrated”, by for example pointing out that the first use of a word in print does not mean that the word had not existed before that, it is important to let language learners (who are about to encounter the Shakespearean language) know how much Shakespeare contributed to the English language as we know it today – as one way of justifying the relevance of the topic in the language classroom. Shakespeare was an innovator, a poet who loved coining new words – words which no one had used before and which, therefore, were completely new for the audience who sat through the performance of a new Shakespearean play (Bryson, 2007: 112-113). Words, which we now take for granted (excellent, lonely, unmask, unlock, untie; Bryson, 2007: 113) and which we (and even the language learners) are familiar with were new for the contemporary audience of Shakespeare. Thus, students can be made aware that in this sense they resemble Shakespeare’s audience more than they think. With each new play, Shakespeare’s contemporary audience – similar to twenty-first century readers – could expect quite a number of brand new, freshly made words, the meaning of which they had to work out for themselves based on the context (or let go off completely, for the sake of being able to keep up with the plot, which is always more important than a few words; Kermode, 2000: 4-5). This situation resembles the one L2 learners normally find themselves in when dealing with extensive reading or listening tasks – they are acquiring the skills necessary for dealing with the L2 in a real life situation, where they might miss a few words but still should be able to get the general meaning (Harmer, 2004: 204). Students should also be aware of the fact that in Shakespeare’s time, playwrights were expected to write in verse (Kermode, 2000: 3), thus preparing them for the particular language rhythms in Elizabethan plays.

As Harmer points it out (2004: 207) there is a challenge when setting any kind of language task for the learner: it should be “difficult but achievable”. By providing participants with knowledge of Shakespeare’s language and what English was like four hundred years ago, teacher should move ‘difficult’ within the borders of ‘achievable’.

2.2.1. Modernized version or the original language in the language classroom
Crystal (2008: 146) makes a strong case against the need for modernized translations by arguing that the reason why many call for a modernized translation of Shakespearean texts is a result of the misconception between what is “difficult” and what is merely “different”. Crystal (2008: 146)
points out that it is not from a linguistic point of view that ‘difficult words’ pose a problem to modern day readers. “Difficult” words pose a problem for the reader because the comprehension requires additional knowledge, one outside the reader’s linguistic competence. This is best illustrated – in case of Renaissance arts – by the references made to Greek and Roman mythological characters, which Shakespeare’s contemporary was familiar with but twenty-first century readers might not be (p. 146). (Romeo and Juliet is relatively low on mythological references compared to other plays, but instead contains a fair amount of speeches about stars and dreams, which then require a certain familiarity with astrology and dream interpretation from the reader, instead of mythology.) Furthermore, Crystal (2008: 11) also points out that “a distinction has to be drawn (…) between the difficulty of the language and the difficulty of thought”. It means that the focus shifts from language competence, that is, the level of proficiency, to the reader’s general and literary repertoire discussed by Molloy (2003: 56) as key factors for a “match”, i.e. that the reader can make sense of the text and its message. Theoretically speaking, and considering the assumption that adult learners have much more life experience on the whole as younger learners, this concept of difficulty of language as opposed to difficulty of thought can become a main argument against modernizing Shakespearean texts.

As seen above, Crystal (2008: 41) argues that many of the linguistic features in Shakespearean texts (such as vocabulary, grammar, phonology, graphology) simply are different from modern use but that not makes them difficult, and on closer inspection it becomes obvious that Shakespeare’s language is not as drastically different from modern English as that would be first perceived by modern day readers. Often readers should be able to work out what the modern version of a word is (2008: 14), and often the effect of the word is in fact more important than the literal meaning (2008: 15). All in all, Crystal estimates these differences in grammar and vocabulary at the rate of 10% (2008: 12-13) - not forgetting the words, which are not different but plainly require familiarity with mythology (2008: 13). However, when Crystal by this means that approximately 90% of Shakespeare’s language is unchanged, he means that 90% of his text will not pose problems to fluent, i.e. native or native like speakers of English (2008: 15), therefore the same argument against simplified or modernized version is not that obvious in case of language learners at English A, or even at higher levels.

Apart from linguistics features, such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and spelling, which have changed, many Shakespearean jokes or references are lost on the reader of today. That constitutes another argument for a modernized version. The language of Shakespearean texts has been edited, abbreviated over the times in order to suit the needs of the audience (Wells, 2005 xv). This can justify the decision of language teachers who work with younger learners and take it for
granted that students should encounter Shakespearean texts in a simplified version and preferably in a film or cartoon adaptation (Carp and Olsen, 2000: 54). The question is if teachers of English A adult learners simply underestimate their students’ abilities when presenting them with a modernized version, or that students indeed need the help of the modern text, or at least a glossary. This takes us back to Crystal’s argument (2008: 10) that the difficulty of Shakespeare’s language for modern readers is overestimated.

Crystal (2008: 10) points out that modernization would in fact result in simplification and the loss of style (2008: 207). My reservations, furthermore, about using a simplified or modernized text are that readers have to accept the interpretation of a twenty-first century author-translator. As many of the words and references in Shakespeare do not make sense for educated modern readers (Bryson, 2007: 111), we can only guess their meaning. Whereas with an annotated text, there is always room for expressing doubt about the meaning or for listing various interpretations or possible meanings. When students are presented with a modernized or simplified version, they are presented with one translation chosen for them and they do not have the option of deciding, working it out for themselves which of the alternatives is the most likely in the context. Crystal (2008: 15) urges readers to become “more fluent in Shakespearean” rather to resort to modern translations. An understanding of how language is used in poetry is required along with “taking out the linguistic fear” (2008: 15).

2.3. Working with adult learners – life-long learning

Learning has become a life-long process in the past forty years in most of the Western European countries, and with that Sweden has become a “society of knowledge” where an advanced level of education is associated with better financial circumstances, and is also seen as a chance for personal development (Gustavsson in Ahl, 2005: 14, Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 7, 17). In Sweden, adult education is strongly supported by the government as a way of helping the unemployed and people with low education to financial prosperity (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 7). Adult education is currently considered to serve the following purposes: contributing to development in society, giving a second chance for those with incomplete education, leveling out gaps in society regarding the levels of education, and finally, contributing to an individual’s personal development (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 8). On the whole, a continuous renewing and deepening of knowledge is required due to the rapid changes in all branches and professions (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 50).

The students in this study all fall into the category of adult learners. Adult learners, in many ways differ from other age groups, i.e. adolescents or children. Adults, normally, attend school as a
result of their own decision. In comparison with adolescent learners, adults – amongst other things - are often very much motivated, more disciplined, more able to engage in abstract thought and have a vast life experience they can draw on which, in many ways, can prove very useful in their learning process (Harmer, 2004: 40, Hårdf af Segerstad, 2007: 7). Furthermore, “they [adults] often have a clear understanding of why they are learning and what they want to get out of it.” (Harmer, 2004: 40). Probably the most obvious difference between adult learners and children or young people is that – in contrast with children and adolescents – adults are not in education because it is compulsory. However, “not compulsory” cannot be automatically translated as “of one’s free will”. In Hårdf af Segerstad’s interpretation (2007: 7) it is highly questionable that all adult learners choose education of their own free will – in many cases it is a “have to” (p. 26). On the one hand, many adult learners feel that they have to choose education as the only alternative to unemployment. On the other hand, the current societal process, described above, towards an ideal of increasing knowledge can make adults feel forced to respond by reentering the educational system. This partly explains why motivations, even within the same group of adult learners, can be so diverse or even unclear for the learner herself (Hårdf af Segerstad, 2007: 7).

The issue of self-study is considered an inevitable part of adult learning – yet another issue, which can cause problems for students both in formal and non-formal learning settings (Hårdf af Segerstad, 2007: 138). As the ability to reflect over one’s learning process is a crucial component of adult education, according to Hårdf af Segerstad (2007: 28), the teachers’ main objective is to become supervisors, mentors of adult learners. The primary focus is on creating a stimulating environment where learners are given the opportunity for reflection and as a result of that, to increase their awareness of their own learning process. However, as it will be discussed below, teachers who do not see their role in the traditional way, that is, as being the one person in the classroom who knows best and therefore conveys his knowledge to the passive recipients, tend to be met by resistance from students, regardless of the age groups, and can even be discredited (McCurt, 2006: 38, 200-201).

2.3.1. Describing Komvux lessons, their aims in general, and how reading takes place

Komvux is a venue for adult education offered by each municipality in Sweden. It is part of the formal educational system, i.e. it has established goals, which apply to all students, it gives formal competences in the form of grades or similar, which enable students to enter the labour market or further education (Hårdf af Segerstad, 2007: 18). As Komvux fits into the traditional educational system, this also means that its teaching format is familiar to students from their secondary education. At Komvux, students themselves can choose if they want to study full-time, part time,
etc. and if they want to study individual courses or a whole program (AllaStudier.se). There are various reasons for why an adult wants to continue his or her education at Komvux. Many are unhappy with the grade they received at secondary school and now they re-read the same subject, others choose to study because they plan to apply for university studies. The make-up of student groups also changes over times. As (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 78) observes, in the 90s half of the students of Komvux were there because they were unemployed. Lisełot Assarson and Katarina Sipos-Zackrisson (in Larsson and Olsson, 2009: 143-144) point out – as mentioned above –, that adults have different reasons for continuing their education, therefore it cannot be claimed that adult learners at Komvux are equally motivated to study, or that they are equally motivated to do so for the sake of improving previously received grades. Even for those adult learners who plan to study further at university level education for the sake of education is in the most cases not enough to motivate (Ahl, 2005: 75).

In order to allow new students to join the course every month in the municipality where the study was conducted, teachers at English A level are required to follow a tight course plan, thus the content of the course became identical with that of the course book (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 90, 97). That also means that students have virtually no influence over the content of the course or of its framework. The course book is planned in a way, which is suitable for home studies. Furthermore, the course plan is created with considerations to the Swedish National Curriculum. Students, in order to pass the course, have to meet the criteria set by Skolverket for English 5 (A). Teaching is subject-focused. However, teachers try to apply a student-centred approach by setting mainly pair and group exercises in class when working with the text or tasks related to it. This approach of “we learn from the company we keep” (Smith in Lundahl, 1998: 65) is not only beneficial for a practical reason, such as students helping each other with unknown words, etc., but also because in pair and group work students have the chance to establish a more personal relationship with the foreign language they are learning (Collie and Slater, 1987: 9). The fact that the course is suitable for distance learning, self-study and a ‘partial’ learning autonomy, i.e. students should take responsibility for their learning process but not for the content of the study (Tornberg, 2000: 165), is strongly emphasized and encouraged. As in all formal, subject-focused education, where a target should be achieved, time is an issue in Komvux too. Teachers often feel rushed, and the unfortunate result is that students’ needs are not necessarily catered for and that student influence over the content and framework of the course is minimal (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 98-99).

When working on assigned reading tasks (each new chapter of Reading and Log on contains a 3-4 page long extract from a novel or play), students should read them at home (it gives a chance for
the experience of extensive reading), but will be engaged in the intensive reading of the text in class. Questions about the text are a mixture of factual and interpretational questions, with much more focus on the first, in order to check comprehension. The course book contains various tasks which do not necessarily build on asking questions about the text (Lundahl, 1998: 152-153). The idea of the class is similar to that of described by Thyberg (2009: 100), i.e. participants’ own experiences as readers is mainly the focus, but the focus on language improvement does not disappear entirely – error corrections still take place during the discussion. Considering the level of studies, i.e. English A and the fact that many of the written tasks are linked to film or book reviews, there is a bias towards efferent reading during the course as opposed to aesthetic reading, that is, the teaching of literature focuses on noting the literary work’s form, atmosphere or the period it was written in (Rosenblatt in Molloy, 2003: 51).

2.3.2. Describing Vuxenskola lessons, their aims in general, and how reading takes place

Vuxenskola is a venue for adult education financed by one of the political parties of Sweden. The courses are referred to as study circles; the name suggests that students (in Swedish, ‘deltagare’) have a significant influence over the content and framework of the lessons. Study circles constitute an example of “non-formal education”, that is to say, the course does not follow an established curricular plan, nor are participants required to show that they achieved a certain level of competence as a result of the study circle (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 18). “Study circles are optional and free for everybody, it builds on people’s own initiative and motivation to gain knowledge and be part of a group” (I cirkeln mitt, 2009: 6, my translation). That is to say, participants join study circles because they have a personal interest in a subject, they want to improve the related skills, and they want to do that in a group. Study circles (or workshops) “have a unique pedagogical form, the whole group, the leader, the participants contribute with their previous knowledge, their curiosity, their experiences and questions in order to take an active part in the direction of the circle and its results” (I cirkeln mitt, 2009: 6, my translation). This study form creates an ideal setting for informal learning, i.e. a more or less unplanned and spontaneous learning (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 19). However, despite the main principle of Vuxenskola that participants should take an active role in forming the content and the frame work of their circle, the fact that they gather at a venue called ‘school’, and for the sake of gaining knowledge, they tend to fall back to old school patterns and routines. Adult learners seemed to be in fact more used to having, and more in need of a traditional, knowledge giving teacher (O’Neill in Harmer, 2004: 57; Harmer, 2004: 93). Hård af Segerstad (2007: 106, 138) argues that the reason behind participants wanting the leader to take full responsibility for the educational process is that they are scared of taking responsibility for their own learning. Thus, the leader becomes the teacher and the participants the
students. Participants look to the leader as the organizer or controller (Harmer, 2004: 58), meaning that it is she who should provide the topic of discussion, which the participants in turn readily accept. Or in any case they allow themselves to be convinced if the leader points out why a given topic is beneficial for them. It is then the leader’s responsibility to initiate a truly learner-centred teaching, to encourage participants to bring their own ideas and take an active part. As the course in question is a discussion lesson, the leader’s main role is to do the questioning, make sure that the questions are truly open ended so that participants do not feel that they have to guess the answer the teacher/leader had in mind but rather help them “acquire the confidence to develop, express and value their own response” (Collie and Slater, 2008: 8, 9). Therefore, although she has to have control over the discussion by making sure that every participant has a chance to express their views and that discussion does not die down, the leader is often required – in a contradictory way –, to act as a participant herself (Harmer, 2004: 60). In instances of communication breakdowns, she should act as a prompter in order to correct errors, offer clarifications or supply the needed language model.

The reading of texts, which then form the basis of discussion in class, always takes place outside classroom time. The idea is to engage participants in extensive reading and give them time for reflection on how they want to respond to the content. Question sheets are provided for support depending on the length of the text. In case of shorter pieces, such as articles, due to their length, participants do not receive a work sheet but are asked about the text in class for the first time. The idea behind forming the questions is that participant’s answers should stimulate the others to join in the discussion (Lundahl, 1998: 152). Questions to check comprehension can emerge if the leader spots misunderstandings suggested by the participant’s views or ideas on the text. As the leader always ask what in the text inspired a certain thought in the participant they have to be able to go back to the text in order to motivate their answers and thus, show that they understood the text. As the class is about conversation, verbal interaction the questions are open ended and the focus is on interpretation and “reader response” rather than on facts (Lundahl, 1998: 153; 2009: 333).
3. METHOD

As the following case study has its focus on a situated pedagogical question, i.e. why teachers and students agree or disagree about the relevance of teaching Shakespeare in adult education English classes, I opted for a qualitative approach in the form of teacher interviews, and later for student interviews as a follow up of the results gained with the help of a quantitative method, i.e. a questionnaire. Furthermore, although students received a questionnaire – due to the small number of informants, a qualitative approach was more appropriate. However, I did not wish to discard data collected via questionnaires but decided to include them in the research analysis. The questionnaire contained options for students to express their own views or motivate their answers. Many seemed to express their interest in the topic by wanting to express opinions about other issues not covered on the questionnaire. These responses gave me the idea to conduct an in-depth interview with a number of students. The focus of this study lies on reflecting and analyzing the data gathered from informants.

3.1. Procedure

Gathering information took place in several stages. The method included observing an English A lesson, conducting teacher interviews, preparing and conducting a conversational class, followed up by student questionnaires and half-structured student interviews in groups. All interviews, with the exception of one of the teacher interviews, took place at school (Komvux classroom, teachers’ room, Vuxenskola classroom), which must have influenced the answers informants gave (Trots, 2005: 45).

Student interviews and questionnaires were conducted in English, due to the fact that most of the Komvux students (4 out of 5) had Swedish as a second language; in some cases they felt more confident about communicating in English than in Swedish. When consulting with their teacher about the language, she suggested simplified English. The language level of Vuxenskola participants is English A and above, therefore English was used. Teacher interviews were conducted in English in the case of Teacher B and C. The interview with Teacher A ended up being a mixture of Swedish and English.

3.1.1. Teacher interviews

Firstly, teacher interviews gave the background to teachers’ attitude towards teaching classics in general and Shakespeare in particular to English A students in adult education. The interview contained predesigned questions, but focus lay on exploring the question areas, therefore the
The interview was qualitative, rather than quantitative (Ejlertsson, 2005: 7). As the interview is a method for qualitative research, I was more interested in contrasting the results rather than producing a quantitative evaluation. The three teachers will be referred to as Teacher A, B and C. Teacher B and C received the same questions, while Teacher A, who conducted the lesson, received questions more specific to teaching Shakespeare in the adult language classroom. Teacher interviews were conducted at Komvux, in the teachers’ room, with the exception of Teacher C. Interviews were not tape recorded, mainly due to the fact that transcripts themselves can be interpreted in several ways (Kvale, 1997: 150, 152), but instead I chose to take notes of teachers’ answers.

### 3.1.2. Lessons
Secondly, I observed a Komvux lesson, i.e. a lesson in a traditional school environment, and conducted a lesson of my own at Vuxenskolan, a venue offering evening course where participants gather to practice their verbal skills. The reason for conducting a lesson at a class of my own was on the one hand, to increase the number of informants for the questionnaires, on the other hand, to create a contrast group, with which I could try out a different approach to working with the text, and further explore how language learners experience the task of reading a longer piece in the original language used in Shakespearean texts.

#### 3.1.2.1. Komvux lesson sequence on chapter 4, key elements
At Komvux a total of two lessons, i.e. a ninety minute lesson and a lesson for watching the film adaptation (approximately two hours and fifteen minutes) are dedicated to cover chapter 4. This involves discussing Shakespeare’s time, language, the Globe, becoming familiar with a section of *Romeo and Juliet* (the balcony scene) in the original and in a modernized version, along with a selection of film adaptations, which were directly or indirectly influenced by Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. The second lesson is dedicated to watching the full length Zeffirelli film adaptation with the relevant English subtitles, followed by the film review assignment, for which students are given approximately one week to work on outside classroom time.

Komvux students are presented with some historical facts about the age, lifestyle and what it was like to go to the Globe in Elizabethan London, before they move on to reading the balcony scene in class, and then at the end of the language sequence, they watch the Zeffirelli adaptation. Students are only presented with a section of the famous balcony scene, as an intensive reading task, and even that with the aid of a modernized translation. However, the lesson sequence ends with the full
length viewing of Zeffirelli’s film from 1968 (the teacher’s choice of adaptation), which also serves as the basis for the final written assignment, the film review. In the form of listing all the various film adaptations *Romeo and Juliet* has inspired over the years, the course book takes on the task of making students see that the works of Shakespeare are relevant even today.

### 3.1.2.2. Vuxenskola lesson sequence on *Romeo and Juliet*

Students’ expectations of a reading task play a crucial role in the learning process (Harmer, 2004: 203). I suspected that the participants needed a bit of convincing and that they presumably are full of negative expectations, such as fear of a language – that might be too difficult to understand (Harmer, 2004: 208). As an introduction of the project, the participants received a short introduction to Shakespeare’s language. I also referred to Kermode (2000: 6-7) and Bryson (2007: 103-104, when letting students know that there are sections in some of the Shakespearean texts when “… it is not quite possible to know quite what he [Shakespeare] meant.” (Bryson, 2007: 103). This influenced me when I decided to instruct the participants that, although they received an annotated copy, I would like them to give the original text a go first without looking at the explanations (some of the notes are often nothing more than pure guess work, Walter, 1972: 56, line 15). The introduction was kept as short as possible because participants do not gather for the sake of a lecture.

*Pre-reading instructions*

Reading poetry always presumes that the reader allow the language to work on her mind and emotions in a different way from the one which we normally associate with when reading a contemporary novel, or even a play (Showalter, 2006: 63). Therefore, I urged students to allow the language to work on their emotions, rather than that they should merely focus on form. Lastly, in order to make the reading task easier, I pointed out a few general differences between Shakespeare’s language and English language use today. These clarifications explained the meaning of *thou* (you), *thy* (your), -(e)st suffix in 2nd person singular, absence of the *do not/don’t* construction and occasional differences regarding word order. I told participants that the text should not necessarily constitute a language model for them.

As to students’ negative expectations concerning the content of the play and its relevance to themselves as readers (Showalter, 2006: 64), firstly I created interest by expressing my own enthusiasm about the play. Secondly, I selected parts of the play, which I consider to be of interest to the group as an audience (Showalter, 2006: 64; Jank and Meyer in Molloy, 2003: 32). In order to aid students’ comprehension and provide a starting point for discussion (not to mention, to
ensure that students become more engaged in the interpretation of the text, and thus memorizing what they read more efficiently), I put together questions, which aim to highlight the relevance of the issues—explicit and implicit—raised in the text. However, true to the spirit of any conversational lesson, participants are encouraged to prepare their own questions and express their own ideas in order to connect the play to their lives (Scholes in Showalter, 2006: 64).

When selecting the sections for reading, I was motivated by two aims. On the one hand, I tried to select not only the so-called ‘highlights’ of the text (Collie & Slater, 2008: 85-86), i.e. crucial scenes in terms of the plot, but also scenes which deal with matters which might be of interest to the participants. On the other hand, I tried to minimize the loss created by the fact that the participants were presented with only a selection of certain scenes instead of the whole play, and therefore I tried to maintain coherence, so readers still had an understanding of the plot as a whole. To this end the Prologue and the Friar’s speech at the end proved to be enormously useful, as the first hints at what is to come, while the latter summarizes all that has happened in the play in great detail, thus also allowing the reader to fill in the gaps, which might have occurred while reading the text.

**Pre-reading activity**

Participants are given sections of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. The play is in the original language, with glossary to aid comprehension of certain words or the context. The study circle leader does not activate participants’ previous knowledge by discussing the plot of the story in class, but instead focuses on providing the necessary tools so that students can cope with the language itself. The leader gives a short introduction on Shakespeare’s language, describing Shakespeare as a poet who enriched the English language with many new words (see above).

Furthermore, each participant receives a two-page-long study sheet, partly to aid comprehension, partly to help participants discover the message of the text, interpreting it by reading between the lines. The study sheet itself has three parts: pre-reading, while reading and after reading questions. The “pre-reading” section is to activate participants’ previous knowledge on the topic, whether they have read or seen the play. If not, they should take some time contemplating what the story will be about, what genre it is, who the characters in the title may be, what their relationship to one another is. The “while reading section” contains a number of discussion questions. As participants are reading a selection of sections of the play, it is clearly shown which set of questions belongs to which sections. Although there are a number of topics raised on the sheet participants are strongly encouraged to add their own ideas, raise their own questions. Finally, the “after reading” section is dedicated to an overall evaluation of the whole reading experience. Questions which participants
will later on meet in the questionnaire are raised here as well, as the answers are not only of importance for the project itself but for the participants who thus are able to assess their own learning process. Participants had three weeks to read the text. As the group meets once a week, i.e. two times between before the scheduled discussion, the leader had the opportunity to check up on the participants’ progress and eventual difficulties with the text. It showed early on that participants took the initiative to aid their reading, largely by filling in the gaps in the story, thus allowing themselves a top-down approach when reading the actual sections of the play. That is, the reader gets a general understanding of the text helped by the reader’s expectations on what they are going to read about (Harmer, 2004: 2001).

After reading
The actual lesson (two hours and fifteen minutes) was dedicated to the discussion of the text. The structure of the conversation more or less followed the questions on the study sheets. The leader makes sure that everyone has the chance to express their views and the conversation does not get stuck. After having filled out the questionnaires participants initiated a spontaneous reflection over the project, comparing notes with the others on what they thought about the language, how they aided their comprehension, etc.

3.1.2.3. Factors shared by both Komvux and Vuxenskola lessons
The Komvux and Vuxenskola lessons had the following main factors in common: the subject of Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet in the original language, students and participants are in some form of adult education; the level of proficiency corresponds to English A, or in the case of some students, slightly higher.

3.1.2.4. Differences between the Komvux and Vuxenskola lesson plan and their aims
The observed Komvux lessons and the Vuxenskola lessons differ on the following accounts: Vuxenskola has a prior focus on verbal skills with a great special attention to the learners’ own involvement in the lesson plan. Time constraint is never an issue. Komvux students, however, follow a course book, with a tight lesson plan, where students had virtually no influence over the structure of the lesson. Furthermore, Komvux students are required to engage in listening and reading exercises during the lesson, and are tested on their writing skills in the form of a film review. An additional difference is that Vuxenskola students are required to read selected parts of the original play, while Komvux watch a full length film adaptation. As it shows from questionnaire results gathered from the two groups, the fact that Komvux students encountered the
Shakespearean text the first time in class, while Vuxenskola participants had three weeks to read the selected parts of the text, had an impact on how they experience their initial encounter with the language, i.e. if they felt worried about not understanding it or not. Finally, the tasks at hand are different for the two groups. Vuxenskola students had to reflect verbally on the selected passages of the written texts, while Komvux students’ main task was to reflect on the film adaptation (and thus an overall understanding of the whole plot) in writing. Despite the points listed above, in which the two lessons differ, they retained the same elements, therefore students and participants receive questionnaire containing fairly similar questions. Questions for the two groups were designed so that it makes sense to the informant, based on which lesson he or she took part in.

3.1.3. Student questionnaires

In order to learn about students’ expectations regarding a lesson on Shakespeare, and how they evaluate the content and form of the lesson with regards to their needs as language learners, they were asked to fill out a questionnaire. The main focus was placed on relevance of content and language, i.e. Early Modern English compared to the English used today. Furthermore, the questionnaire was designed to explore the following areas: students’ overall expectations of such a lesson, if these were confirmed or not; in what ways students themselves consider the lesson beneficial for them; what degree of importance they attach to learning about the cultural and historical aspects of a foreign language and the reading of literature as part of the language learning process. The use of a group questionnaire (Ejlertsson, 2005: 8) was my attempt at gathering quantitative data about language students’ reaction to a lesson on Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet.

Due to the differences between the two lessons conducted at Komvux and Vuxenskola described above, students and participants received slightly different questionnaires. The two groups, i.e. English A at Komvux and an English conversational group at the same level of proficiency, took part in lessons on the same subject but with a different approach, therefore the questionnaires were slightly different. Questions for Komvux students did not explore the problem of reading the whole text versus only sections of it considering that Komvux students had a scheduled showing of the film adaptation, which means that students have an overall understanding of the plot. Vuxenskola students however, did not receive questions on how they wish to be graded on the chapter, as grading is not a part of the course. In case of both groups the question of self-study and experience of encountering Early Modern English were central parts of the investigation.
In order to improve further classroom practices, students were asked to consider the following points. On the one hand, Vuxenskola participants who were only assigned to read certain sections of the play (chosen by the leader/teacher) were asked to reflect on the advantages and disadvantages of not having read the whole play. On the other hand, both groups’ views were explored in the question regarding the original language versus a modernized version. Finally, I wanted to explore students’ attitude to self-study, in order to aid their own comprehension of an archaic language.

3.1.4. Student interviews
As the number of students and participants taking part in the questionnaire would not likely be statistically representative, I decided to complete questionnaires with interviews (Trost, 2005: 117). The interview questions were based on the answers students or participants gave. However, as mentioned above, student interviews became a natural extension of the questionnaires in case of the Vuxenskola participants. The Vuxenskola group, who received the questionnaire before the Komvux students, showed interest in discussing the answers they gave or any other ideas that occurred to them (and were too bored to register on the questionnaire in writing, as they do not appear there), a group interview took place. That, of course, meant that certain participants did not take part in the conversation at all (Trost, 2005: 46). The same method, i.e. group interview, was used with Komvux students, giving them the same opportunity to verbally express their thoughts rather than writing them on the questionnaire under the heading “my thoughts”. Group interview at Komvux was chosen despite the obvious disadvantages, i.e. the one mentioned above, and the fact the answers will be less varied, instead the opinion of the majority is what interviewers get (Trots, 2005: 47). I noted in my analysis when I observed a tendency for such occurrences. The choice of group interview at Komvux was motivated by a practical reason, i.e. that due to their schedules, arranging interview times or tracking down students outside classroom time was nearly impossible. Although for Komvux students I prepared questions for the interview, I allowed them to lead the conversation – similar to Vuxenskola participants (Trots, 2005:50).

Interviews – similar to teacher interviews – were not recorded. I took notes while interviewees answered. This allowed me to add my own reflections and comments on the spot, along with the answers (Trots, 2005: 55). Students were interviewed in the classroom, which could have influenced their answers (Molloy, 2003: 24), which will be taken into consideration during the analysis of the data.
3.2. Informants

Informants can be divided into two groups, i.e. teachers and students. Teachers were selected for interview based on their experience in working with adult students. Because part of my case study required observing English A lesson at Komvux, it only seemed natural to interview the teacher conducting the observed lesson. This female teacher is referred to as teacher A in the following. She has been working in adult education for a number of years, and has been teaching English A for the past 4 years. Teacher B also works at Komvux, teaching classes on English B and C level, and has been working at Komvux since 1999. Teacher C has been working as a freelance teacher both at secondary and primary schools since moving to Sweden in 2009. Before that she worked as a language teacher in her home country for seven years. During these years she worked mainly in primary education but gained experience with various age groups – including adult learners – as a freelance teacher.

The student informants are made up of two groups. One group is made up of students who took part in the Komvux English A lesson sequence, while the other group is made up of the participants of an English conversation class at Vuxenskola. The lesson on Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet as the topic of the conversation was conducted by me. All members of the two student groups are adults, i.e. over 20, both male and female. Students both at Komvux and Vuxenskola have various reasons for taking part in the course, however, both groups proved to be mixed in this respect, with a general tendency for ‘university’ and ‘better grades’ as motivation at Komvux, and while most participants attended the language circle at Vuxenskolan as a hobby and without any other external motivation factors.

3.2.1. Selection

The selection of interview persons was not a relevant question in this study, as there was only a small amount of students both at English A at Komvux and in the Vuxenskola conversational group who could be interviewed, that is, five plus six people. Finding informants at Komvux proved to be more difficult than I had anticipated first. There are approximately 25 students enrolled for English A, but only an average of seven students turn up for lessons, and even these tend to skip classes occasionally. As a result, I only found five potential informants, i.e. students who had taken part in both parts of the lesson sequence: the introduction about Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet; and watching the film during the second lesson.
Teachers were selected based on their experience with adult learners and teaching literature, preferably the English classics. English teachers at Komvux became an obvious choice. I focused on the municipality where I could use my personal contacts in finding informants.

3.2.2. Cultural background
Hård af Segerstad (2007: 127-128) discusses the relevance of students’ cultural backgrounds in how teachers should plan their syllabus, as students’ cultural and social background affect their attitude towards education. However, the current study does not discuss the ethnic background of students; informants were not asked about their cultural or ethnic background. On the one hand, this was motivated by the fact that the subject is a foreign language, i.e. does not – should not – represent the value system and culture of Sweden. Ideally, foreign language teaching-learning should take place in isolation from the cultural context, within which it is studied – even though it is hardly ever the case in reality (Kramsch, 2000: 12). Learning a foreign language always assumes a wide range of cultural and ethnic background, and not an exclusively homogenous group. On the other hand, it was motivated by the fact that the number of students taking place in the interview was small, and the only common trait amongst non-Swedish students (4 out of 5 at Komvux, 2 out of 6 at Vuxenskola) was that they all came from non-European backgrounds. Therefore, an additional division is possible between students who are native speakers of Swedish and between those for whom Swedish itself is a foreign language. The Vuxenskola group is more homogenous, with 4 participants with Swedish origins, and 2 with non-Swedish (and non-European) background but who have lived in Sweden for over 15 years, while the Komvux group consists mainly of non-Swedish students, also with non-European backgrounds, who recently, i.e. less than 5 years ago, moved to Sweden. This cultural information was available to me due to the fact that I had known both groups before the project. The same applies to teachers interviewed in the project. They did not receive questions regarding their ethnic or cultural background, however, they represent three different groups based on my knowledge of them: Swedish origin, non-Swedish origin with more than 10 years of work experience in the Swedish school system, and non-Swedish origin with less than 5 years of work experience in the Swedish school system (an additional number of years of work experience in the home country.)

3.3 Reliability
Reliability is an issue raised in case of quantitative studies (Trots, 2005: 113). However, despite using questionnaires, i.e. a quantitative method in my research, it constitutes only one part of the research methodology, with a tendency towards open questions, and followed up by further
interviews. The components of reliability, such as congruence, precision, objectivity and constancy (Trots, 2005: 111), therefore, cannot be applied to my research. The number of students involved in the questionnaire and interview phase of the project is smaller than expected but is considered to be representative in the municipality in question.
4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The current project set out to examine a particular pedagogical situation and to explore the opinions and reactions of both practicing language teachers and adult students who took part in a lesson with the same theme, i.e. Shakespeare and *Romeo and Juliet* in its original version, i.e. in Early Modern English. The discussion section therefore is divided into two parts: teacher perspective and student perspective, followed up by a section on exploring how these two perspectives meet. As shown below, methods and students’ language proficiency were key factors when discussing the topic.

4.1. Teacher perspective

Teacher interviews were conducted with the help of three teachers. Two of them are currently in adult education (Komvux); the third is an independent teacher. The results of the interviews were compared and contrasted to each other. The following main areas appeared during each conversation.

4.1.1. The importance of literature and culture in language teaching

All three teachers asked agree that literature and culture are important components of language teaching. Teacher C emphasizes the importance of literary works as language models for students, through which they can learn new vocabulary, grammar patterns, and how phrases are used. Literary works can also be a source for cultural information of the English speaking world. Furthermore, she points out the importance of being familiar with the classics in order to understand references in contemporary literary works and films. Teacher B points out that according to the curriculum for English B and C, students should read literature, and have an overview of the history of the English speaking literature. Teacher B, who has beginner students in French, also mentions that students in fact often want the cultural information more than the actual language. We concluded that it must have something to do with the fact that learners of English are surrounded by the English – especially that of the American – culture, while the French culture is not so accessible, therefore students rely heavily on the teacher for information.

4.1.2. Shakespeare as a subject in the light of students’ level of proficiency

The aim of this study was not to explore how popular Shakespeare is amongst contemporary readers or language teachers. The interview question whether teacher informants liked
Shakespeare was designed to establish a link with a previous statement by Kramsch (2000: 138) that the teacher’s initial reaction to the text is a vital tool in the teaching process of the literary work. Teacher A and C both expressed a love of Shakespeare, whereas Teacher B stressed that while Shakespeare is an important playwright, he is no more important than other, now classic authors, like Dickens. Teacher B seems to express the same “Shakespeare is a dirty job and somebody has to do it” idea, when he says that teachers cannot not teach Shakespeare – it is good literature. Teacher B adds, that he does not like reading Shakespeare, as “the old language feels disconnected”, but he does “like what Shakespeare has to say about human nature”. Teacher A acknowledges that Shakespeare is a big part of the English literature; she likes Shakespeare but would not describe the feeling as “passionate”. She also added that she is used to teaching Shakespeare and hopes that students see and understand that she likes the plays.

According to Teacher A, students should become familiar with Shakespeare because his plays are still topical and show that many things changed but people are the same. According to Teacher A, the message of the plays has not changed over the times. Teacher C in particular appreciated Shakespeare as a source of historical and cultural knowledge, and the part Shakespeare played in this respect in her own learning process in general, and that of the English language in particular. Teacher C also argues that students’ level of interest is a crucial factor whether they are ready to tackle a Shakespearean text, or not.

Both Teacher A and C argue that teaching Shakespeare is a good way of teaching academic content for students in the form of culture, literature and theatre history. Teaching Shakespeare means that students acquire much more than purely language skills. Teacher B also agreed that it is beneficial for students to learn literary analysis, however, he stressed that it is, – as learning about Shakespeare –, more suitable for students in English B or C courses. He argues that at English A level, reading Shakespeare in the original might be confusing. Teacher C argues that learning about Shakespeare is “interesting” – a word, which occurred amongst student responses too.

There is a clear difference in opinions whether English A students are ready for Shakespeare and his language, whether it is confusing or it is important for the sake of allowing students to practice their skills in comparing the languages and forms. However, all three teachers agree that students should see their passion for the subject they are teaching.
4.1.3. Original language versus a modernized version

Both Teacher A and C recognize the importance of allowing students to encounter Shakespeare’s original language, however, they emphasize the importance of a modernized version, as a way of clarifying meaning. According to Teacher C “Shakespeare’s language could be demanding for students at any level”, however, she finds it important to develop students’ skills at working out meaning, or allowing them to see how the language has changed over the times. Teacher C suggests that the best method is to use the original text alongside a modernized version. The course book used by Teacher A employs the same idea, i.e. students read a section of the original accompanied by a modernized version, however, the film adaptation they watch is entirely without modernization. Teacher A herself gives students guidelines on how to decode Shakespeare’s language, in the form of extra material, not found in the course book. Teacher A argues that reading Shakespeare in the original helps students gain language awareness. Teacher A reinforces this process by showing the balcony scenes in two different interpretations, hoping that students will be able to compare the language and the setting of the two. Teacher B, however, was more concerned with Shakespeare’s language being confusing for learners of English A. His main concern was that Shakespeare’s English does not provide a good language model for students. In his view, the focus in English A classes still lies on form, rather than on culture, or history. In his view, metalinguistic comments play a more important role at English B level. However, he adds that the language is the writer’s tool, therefore it is important for readers to meet the original version, but at English A level the aim is still to give students the language tools, the original language is not important. At English B, according to him, the situation is different – it is important that students meet the original language.

To the question whether students should receive any guidelines on how to tackle Shakespeare’s English and what forms to look out for, answers differed. Teacher B and C allow their students to notice the differences by themselves, while Teacher A finds it important to give clues to students, but she also believes in the importance of students making their own discoveries about the language.

4.1.4. Film adaptation in teaching literature in the language classroom

All three teachers agree that a film adaptation cannot replace the experience of reading the literary work in its original form. Teacher B adds, that teachers can always tell when a student opts for a film adaptation instead of reading the original literary work. However, watching the film adaptation is a part of the course and I asked Teacher A why she decided to show the Zeffirelli adaptation from 1968, rather than the more modern Baz Luhrman adaptation from 1996, which
moves the story from Renaissance Verona to LA at the end of the 1990s but keeps the original language. She motivated her choice by saying that she found it important that students can see the costumes and the environment of the original setting. Teacher A clearly finds it important that students receive historical-cultural knowledge, which they would have missed out on if they had watched the more recent adaptation, which changed the setting. Furthermore, Teacher A was concerned about students’ comprehension. She added that students might have had difficulty following the 1996 adaptation which is packed with action, has a much faster pace and can seem to be too “messy”. As a result, students would not be able to keep up with the story and the language. Teacher C agrees with Teacher B, that watching a film adaptation can never replace the experience of reading a literary work, however, considers films as a resourceful way of motivating students and even making “the reading experience more enjoyable” and “enrich readers’ imagination.”

4.1.5. Students’ expectations and motivation according to the teachers
All three teachers take it for granted that students are motivated enough to cope with whatever comes their way in the course books or in the content of the course. This supports the general idea (or presumption) that adult learners’ take part in education completely out of free will and that the prospect of getting a better grade or entering higher education is motivating enough for them to engage in any sort of task the teacher presents them with. It also suggests a more subject-, rather than learner-centred approach, as the subject proves to be the most important element of the learning process, which also shows how little or virtual no influence students have over the content of their studies. Teacher C says “students understand that it is a part of life and could be useful to have this knowledge”, which can be interpreted in a way that students without questions accept the decision of a “higher authority” (National Curriculum, the course book, the teacher). On the one hand, students can feel that they are released from their responsibilities to actively taking part in their learning process (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 128). From another perspective students are excluded from the process of planning course content (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 98-99). Teacher A also thinks that motivation is a given, suggesting that adult learners are more disciplined than teenagers taking part in compulsory education (Harmer, 2004: 40). To the question if she ever expects students to skip the Shakespeare lesson, she answers with a definite no, and adds that students are “polite”; meaning that they do what the teacher asks them to do. It is a fine illustration to what Breen’s claims, that:

students are well aware of their role identities in the classroom, and so ‘in order to maximize learning benefits, they are obliged to jointly conspire’ with their teachers to maintain a harmonious working relationship. (Breen in Ho, 2007: 23)
Breem’s view reinforces the idea that students accept their passive status and place in the educational hierarchy as lower than that of the teacher. Tanner (in Ho, 2007: 23), however, suggests that “students are generally comfortable with their role as passive learners”. Teacher B, however, says that students should be made to see the link between the subject of their studies and its relevance to their goals. Motivation is a key factor in the learning process – an unquestionable truth according to both Teacher A and C – but the teacher has to make students see the benefits of what they are learning. Literary analysis is a good tool because it helps students realize the universal nature of classics, or any other literary work they have to work with in the frame of the foreign language classroom, according to Teacher B. In Teacher B’s view, students have negative expectations of a Shakespeare lesson. It is mainly due to the fact that students at English A level still focus on language and new words, and as mentioned above by him, Shakespeare’s language cannot be used as a language model.

Teacher C also agrees that “students are not excited” about a Shakespeare lesson but adds that “they also understand that it is a part of life and could be useful to have this knowledge”. However, in her view, students’ primary expectation of a lesson is that “their language skills or vocabulary will also improve”. Teacher C still attaches an important role to the teacher’s ability in creating interest and thus motivation amongst the students. Clearly a sign that teachers cannot alone rely on the fact that, in theory, adults are personally motivated enough to tackle any topic, which bears some relevance to their studies. However, as seen above, teachers themselves see that students accept them as judges of what is relevant for their studies or not.

4.1.6. Time constraints and self-study

Time constraint was a topic that naturally came up in the interview but about which all three teachers expressed their concerns. Formal education is driven by achieving a set goal and within a fixed time frame. All three teachers admit the importance of using literature and the teaching of culture, for all the various reasons, in the foreign language classroom. However, they feel that the time constraint means they cannot go deep enough in the subject. Teacher C believes that it is in this aspect that self-study becomes an asset. According to Teacher C, the teacher should do her best to create interest amongst the students so that they would want to explore the subject further. However, Teacher B argues that self-study should not be interpreted as extra time for researching a given subject and gathering more facts, but rather a way of practicing skills needed for becoming an autonomous learner.
4.2. Student perspective

Students’ opinions regarding learning about Shakespeare and his time as well as reading and/or watching *Romeo and Juliet* in the original language were explored by using both a quantitative (questionnaires) and a qualitative method (interviews). Student interviews became a natural extension of the project. As the after reading questions of the study sheet for Vuxenskola participants included some of the questions of the questionnaire and with the request from the leader to express any other ideas related to the project, participants had a chance to express their views as if answering interview questions. Inspired by their readiness to discuss the issues brought up by the questionnaire, I prepared interview questions for the students at Komvux. However, due to poor attendance, only 3 students out of the 5 who filled out the questionnaire were available for interview. In what follows I summarize the various issues brought up in the questionnaire and during the interviews.

4.2.1. Student expectations

Students’ expectation regarding the lesson sequence about Shakespeare was fairly positive. The question about their expectation of the Shakespeare lesson offers a selection of negative and positive adjective to choose from with the open question “other” where students can use their own words. The most frequent adjectives chosen were the following amongst Komvux students – some of them decided to choose more than one description: “interesting” (4 out of 5), “informative” (1 out of 5), “fun” (1 out of 5). The only one negative comment appeared as “boring”, which the informant then diplomatically changed to “no expectations” by smudging out the first choice with a rubber. This small revision left me wondering how much students were influenced by the fact that the questionnaire – although in the absence of their teacher – was filled out in the TV room at school where they just finished watching the film adaptation, and if they were wondering about the possibility that their teacher would read their answers.

The overall positive expectations held true for the Vuxenskola group too, where the following adjectives were most frequent: “interesting” (4 out of 6), “fun” (2 out of 6), “something new/unusual” (4 out of 6), and “informative” (2 out of 6). On the whole it shows that Vuxenskola participants were most taken in by the idea that they were going to deal with something new, and the novelty of the task proved to be motivating enough. There was only one informant who chose the heading “other”, which space she used to express how concerned and “afraid” she felt that she would not understand the language – a strong feeling shared by others in the Vuxenskola group,
which had three weeks to become familiar with the text. This response is discussed in more detail in 4.2.2.

There seems to be a slight discrepancy between students’ expectation as to what they would learn during the lesson sequence and what they actually thought they got out of the lessons. (Multiple answers were possible.) Most students expected to become familiar with the story of *Romeo and Juliet* (6 of 11), how to consider the English language in a different way (5 of 11), to practice how to discuss their ideas about a work of literature/or topics raised by the play (4 of 11), to learn how to read Shakespearean texts (3 of 11), to learn new words (2 of 11). That is, students expected a shift in focus from studies of the language to academic content and metalinguistic studies. (The expectation of learning new words was not clarified – whether it meant archaisms or modern English words, however, my guess is that students expected to learn words, which would be useful for them in modern day communication.)

On the whole the same or similar answers came back with regards to what students actually thought they had learned. To the question why they thought they had a lesson about Shakespeare and *Romeo and Juliet*, all 5 Komvux students answered “it gives students a chance to compare modern English with what it was like 400 years ago.” One informant also chose that “it’s important to read/learn about famous works of literature.” Vuxenskola participants had similar ideas as to what they would learn during the lesson. One informant, however, expressed “no expectations”, and instead added that she just “did her homework”. In my interpretation, this was a way of conveying either resentment over the task or disinterest in the topic all together. When asked why Vuxenskola participants thought they had had a lesson on Shakespeare the answers were identical to that of Komvux students, i.e. “it gives students a chance to compare modern English with what it was like 400 years ago.” Interestingly enough, one Vuxenskola informant also remarked on the importance of reading famous literary works.

With the exception of one informant who opted for “I don’t know”, the other 4 Komvux students thought that the skills and/or content learned during the lesson will be of use to them as language learners. Further interviews, however, revealed that students were not quite sure how these skills are useful for them. Komvux student Zita kept talking about the words she learnt, which might come useful when reading “medical texts”. When asked for clarification to see if she meant scientific texts, she confirmed my interpretation.

On the whole I found that students’ expectations were clustered around the ideas of language comparison, academic content (learning about a literary work, culture and history), and that they
looked beyond language feature issues, that is, they did not expect to learn grammar. Interestingly, and somewhat unexpectedly, only half of the Vuxenskola participants guessed correctly that “practicing how to discuss topics raised in the play” (3 out of 6) would form the focus of the lesson. This happened despite the study sheets participants received prior to the lesson and the fact that – regardless of the topic – it is still a conversational class at the end of the day. Both Komvux and Vuxenskola groups had informants who expected to learn new words and stated that they did learn new words. However, the question is open as to whether they meant modern words, or obsolete words, and whether in the case of the later they understood the context of usage. The question of new words showed that some students were confused if the original Shakespearean text can be used as a language model or not, and if so, in what sense.

4.2.1.1. Students’ literary repertoire

Molloy (2003: 47, 119-120) quotes Rosenblatt in discussing that students’ reading experience is much influenced by “their experiences and personalities”. Another categorization of experiences is the reader’s general and literary repertoire. The latter refers to how familiar the reader is with the various literary genres and forms. When asked if they have read any Shakespearean plays before either in English, in their native language or in a simplified version, every student and participant answered with “no”. Later on, during the conversation it emerged that some have seen theatre adaptations. Therefore, the question how much the play actually matched the reader’s literary repertoire arose, despite the fact, that when introducing the Romeo and Juliet project to Vuxenskola participants I drew their attention to the fact that they essentially will meet poetic language and they should approach it and interpret it as such.

4.2.2. Fear of not understanding the text - reading between the lines

There was a clear difference between the student groups with respect to how they felt about encountering a text written in Early Modern English. Both groups received a question aimed at exploring students’ expectations of reading an archaic language. To the question whether students felt worried about not being able to understand the language of the text only one student out of the five replied that he/she “was afraid that he/she won’t understand it or it will be very difficult to read”. The other four Komvux students felt no worry at all and replied that they “knew that they will be able to understand it with some help.” As a contrast to this all six participants of the Vuxenskola lesson, without exception, replied to the same question that they were worried about the language of the text and were afraid that they won’t understand it. The reason behind the difference in student and participant expectation might be the following. Vuxenskola students had
three weeks to read the twenty page extract of *Romeo and Juliet*, whereas Komvux students encountered only a minor section of the text (the Balcony scene) accompanied by a modernized version, and in class. They saw the Zeffirelli film adaptation with the relevant subtitles; that is to say, they heard and read the same Early Modern English version, which Vuxenskola participants encountered during their reading task. However, due to the fact that reading of balcony scene during lesson one took approximately 10 minutes, and was immediately explained to them with the help of the modern translation, and then they watched the film, where – similar to a theatre performance – students did not have the time to pause over the meaning of certain words but were concentrating on following the plot. Furthermore, Komvux students read the summary of the play before watching the film. Vuxenskola participants, however, spent three weeks tackling the text, who, despite the glossary and the short introductory course on Shakespeare’s language, were struggling. It was a reading exercise, which meant that they tended to be caught up by unknown words. After filling out the questionnaire, Mariah, one of the Vuxenskola participants – despite her high level of language proficiency – repeatedly expressed her fear, i.e. how worried she was during the three weeks’ reading period. On the one hand, she struggled to extract the meaning of the play but on the other hand, she was also worried about coming to class and not being able to answer the questions on the study sheet. On the whole it seemed that participants had a problem with the ‘reading between the lines’ types of questions they were required to answer. Mariah guessed that the reasons for this lies in the sort of education her generation received, i.e. they were not trained in analysis and ‘reading between the lines’, but rather in how to look for answers, which are explicit, i.e. printed in the text. As a result they became “passive readers” (Reichenberg, 2008: 56-57). The study sheet questions, which Vuxenskola participants received, were designed in a way to help participants find the relevance between the different elements of *Romeo and Juliet* and their own life, thus making learning a personal involvement, thus stimulating more authentic, less literary style conversation. Plain reading comprehension check questions would not have served the purpose of creating such a conversational setting. However, it turned out that the text had to be decoded, the poetic language unlocked together in class with the help of the leader. Only after that could participants engage in discussing the study sheet questions.

4.2.3. Self-study

Hård af Segerstad (2007: 12-13, 28) considers self-study and metacognitive skills, i.e. the ability to reflect over one’s own learning and thought process as an obvious component of both adult education and life-long learning. She argues that an increased degree of consciousness regarding the learner’s own learning process is a requirement of autonomous learning (p. 28).
To the question whether they did any extra studying at home in order to understand better what the play was about, all Vuxenskola participants answered “yes”. The most popular way of aiding comprehension was reading the summary of the play (4 out of 6), one participant combined this method with looking up words or reading the text in a modernized version, one informant only looked up unknown words, three people named other methods: one person searched on the internet for “resume” (which I interpreted as a review), another read about the scenes and the acts, a third person only wrote “I used the computer for more information”. Despite the different formulations these methods seem to describe the same idea/strategy, that is, participants tried to gain background knowledge about the text they were to read, thus allowing themselves a top down reading technique. After filling out the questionnaire, participants spontaneously started swapping tips amongst themselves on how they aided their reading comprehension, thus a genuine situation of informal learning took place (Härd af Segerstad, 2007: 18-19).

Komvux students, however, did not seem to put the same amount of effort into preparing themselves for understanding the text, presented to them in the form of the film adaptation. 2 out of 5 looked up the summary of the plot (which in fact was part of their homework: as preparation for watching the film they had to read those pages in their course book Read and Log on, which amongst other things, contain the summary of the plot). One person answered that he/she looked up words; the remaining two however, did not do any extra work outside classroom time. Answers for this question in the Komvux student group should be treated with caution. On the one hand, students were clearly instructed by their teacher to read the summary of the play, and any other information about Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet from the course book before they come to watch the film. On the other hand, students (who filled out the questionnaire directly after having seen the film) might have left the extra work for after they have watched the film – in case they found that comprehension was difficult, and in order to be able to complete their written assignment (film review) they would need to rely on internet sources.

Because they had not been tested on their knowledge about Romeo and Juliet as the Vuxenskola participants had been at the time of answering this particular question of the questionnaire, Komvux students might not yet have felt the pressure to put any extra work into their comprehension. Komvux students did not feel motivated to come prepared to a film viewing. Those who came prepared, i.e. did extra work at home, probably merely followed the teacher’s instructions and did their homework. Therefore, the one person who replied that he/she “looked up unknown words”, could have referred to unknown words of modern English, which he/she encountered while reading the pre-fabricated text of the course book, rather than words occurring in the play – as it was clearly the case for Vuxenskola participants. A further explanation for the
differences between the answers from Vuxenskola participants and Komvux students can be explained by Härd af Segerstad’s (2007: 24) view that wanting to belong to a social group can be a major motivation for learning. Härd af Segerstad illustrates this with the example of a student who became more engaged in self-study as a result of taking part in a study group. Coming to group meetings unprepared was neither fun nor rewarding. This, however, changed when the student in question decided to come prepared and thus, could contribute to the group’s work (p. 25). The same thinking process must have motivated the Vuxenskola participants, who, at the end of the lesson, repeatedly mentioned how worried they had been about coming to class and then not being able to “open their mouth”. The Komvux students did not experience this sense of belonging to the group. Their knowledge of the text and the subject matter would be judged individually and in isolation from the others, in the form of written assignments.

On occasions when the leader checked on how participants progressed with the reading task, it became apparent early on that nearly all the participants (all of those who took the task seriously) aided their comprehension by looking up the summary of the play on the internet. One web page was especially popular amongst the participants – although they seemed to have found it independently of each other –, which gave a scene-to-scene break down of the play. Although a web site which displayed a complete modernized version of the play was also used as aid by some, participants on the whole seemed to find it more important to have a general understanding of the play and its plot, rather than a plain word for word comprehension of it.

4.2.4. The relevance of language historical knowledge for English A level

At the heart of my study lies the question whether learning about and trying to tackle Early Modern English at English A level is a relevant part of English as a foreign language learning. This question was raised both in the questionnaire and during the interviews and discussions. Komvux students had a divided opinion in the questionnaire whether it would have been better to read the text or watch the film in a modernized version (3 for the modernized version, 2 for the original version) but when interviewed they showed a much more positive attitude to having heard Early Modern English. Both Vuxenskola participants and Komvux students agreed that reading Shakespeare’s language in the original was “interesting” and “something new”. Both groups agreed that the novelty of the experience was a good enough reason in itself for being part of the course plan. To the interview question for Komvux students whether – if they could choose which chapters of the course book to cover, meaning they could skip certain chapters – they would have skipped this unit about Shakespeare, the answer was a unanimous “no”. The word “interesting” occurred once more as an explanation for why they themselves would have wanted to work with
this chapter, two of the students added that “it is important to know what the ‘old’ language looked like”. When asked what they mean exactly by this statement, students became uncertain. One of them said that it is important to know this language because it is the language of scientific texts; she also described it as “cleaner”. When asked what she meant, she explained that Shakespeare’s language has “more structure” and is “not full of slang”. This and the earlier mention of the “old language” left me wondering if, on the one hand, every student realized how Shakespeare’s language differs from modern English, and on the other hand, how Shakespeare’s register was perceived by his contemporary audience. As a conclusion, we can say that Komvux students did not necessarily have a clear understanding of why being familiar with Early Modern English is relevant for them as language learners, nor how this knowledge is relevant for users of modern English. As a final remark, the interview was conducted in the classroom, although without the presence of the teacher. In any case, the location left me wondering if students felt that they should justify why reading a Shakespearean text is beneficial for them, to give me the “right answer” rather than expressing any other negative attitudes or even admitting that they are unsure as to what use the lesson will be to them (Molloy, 2003: 24).

At Vuxenskolan one participant took up a completely different approach to why becoming familiar with Shakespeare’s language is relevant for her. She in particular was very much taken in by the original language of the play, and its melody. She expressed the idea that in order to understand what the author wanted to convey we need to read what he has written in the original version. Any attempts at rephrasing in order to modernize the language results in losing out on the original style, and thus the atmosphere of the text. She in particular stressed the importance of the rhymes and rhythm of the text, others in general agreed with her on one account, that in order to feel the atmosphere of the age, one has to read or hear the text in the original language. A question regarding the debate on modernized version versus the original language was raised in the questionnaire for both groups and many an answer indicate that language students do look beyond the need for language models and have a need for cultural and historical experience and knowledge of the foreign language. Nevertheless, effortless comprehension does take priority. To the question if they would have rather read Romeo and Juliet in modern English 3 out of 6 answered “yes, it would have been easier to understand it” and only 1 answered “no, you need to read the original in order to feel the atmosphere”. There was a third alternative under the heading “other” where informants can write their own views, but instead the remaining two informants marked both “yes” and “no” as their answers and rank ordered them as “yes” for a modernized version as being more important than students experiencing the atmosphere of the text by reading it in the original version. Vuxenskola participants’ aversion to the original language was expressed in a further question on whether they consider reading the whole of the play or any other Shakespearean texts
two informants answered “yes”, but added their own comments: “but not in the original text!”, “not the old one”, thus making it very clear that comprehension was prioritized over feeling the atmosphere, or that they found Early Modern English very difficult to decode.

4.2.5. Full length work versus parts of the text
The following question was only relevant for participants at Vuxenskola. Their task was to read only certain sections of the text, which was selected by the course leader, whereas Komvux students saw a film adaptation, and the course book itself gave a summary of the plot. When asked if watching the film adaptation was as good as reading the original Komvux students answered “yes”, meaning that the film adaptation fulfilled the task of giving a global understanding of the plot. On further questions, Zita said that reading the text is better from a language learning perspective as it gives her the chance to go back to the text and look up words she does not understand.

As shown above, Vuxenskola participants recognized their need for understanding the whole plot of the play quite early on and they aided their reading comprehension by looking up the summary of the play. That showed that my attempt at maintaining coherence by choosing sections of the play, which would allow readers a general understanding of the plot and how the scenes are linked, obviously failed. 2 out of 6 informants answered that it was a bad idea to only read parts of the original play, 1 of them claiming that she can only understand the text if she reads the whole work, but added that a short summary would have helped. The remaining 4 informants answered “yes” to the question if it was good to read only parts of the play. 3 of them motivated their answer by claiming that “it is enough to focus on the important parts of the text” but agreed that it was important to have a general understanding of the plot. 1 out of these 3 meant that the sections should be chosen by the teacher, while the 2 marked “it does not matter”, indicating in both cases that participant are less aware of their own part in the learning process. Only 1 of the 4, who claimed that reading parts of the text was a good solution, said that the reason for this is that “students don’t have to read that much, the whole play would have been too long to read” but also added that “you can read parts of the it only if you the story before reading”, which I interpret as another verification of the fact that participants on the whole needed to have a general understanding of the plot. I also felt that participants felt less motivated after the reading task and in the light of that they would not have considered reading the whole text. Komvux students read the summary of the play before watching the film adaptation, which must have made the comprehension task easier for them.
4.3 Democracy in adult education

The most important aspect noted during the lesson observation and from participants’ reaction during the lesson conducted by myself had less to do with the topic of the lesson and more to do with the teacher-student relationships from a power perspective. As discussed above in 2.3., adult learners, especially at Vuxenskola, are strongly encouraged to take an active part in the planning and execution of the lesson. On the one hand, students and participants tend to feel relief at being able to pass responsibilities back to the teacher. Indeed, in order to be able to rule a tight ship, it is always best if the teacher makes the decisions and lays them out for the students. As seen from the structure of Komvux, which is open to take new students every month, a tight course plan is needed. However, the course plan is completely replaced by the course book, which now rules the lesson plan. As it became clear from teacher interviews, time is a crucial factor from the teacher’s point of view when considering how much students are allowed to influence the teaching. Students at Komvux do not have an influence over which film adaptation they watch (or which Shakespearean play they study) – it is decided by the teacher. On the one hand, the teacher chose Zeffirelli because it is part of a “cultural heritage” (Molloy, 2003: 41) – her choice is governed by what she thinks her students should get out of the experience (becoming familiar with costumes, the age). On the other hand, the teacher motivates her choice by considering the limitations of her students with regards to their proficiency in English (the Baz Luhrman adaptation might be too “messy” for them).

Vuxenskola participants were up against the same teacher/leader dominance – the play was chosen by me and participants accepted that. It was apparent for me that participants did this as a way of helping me with my project. There was only one participant who “rebelled”, that is, made it clear for me that she cannot promise to put in extra work just because I chose this topic and assigned this reading task. I accepted it as such and told her to only do as much as she felt comfortable doing. She was under no obligation to me – it is, after all, a non-formal educational setting. The question of “who reads” (Jank and Meyer in Molloy, 2003: 32) governed my decision as to which parts within the play participants should read. I wanted to select parts which I thought might be of interest to them, which can grant the closest match between the text and their general repertoire (Molloy, 2003: 52, 56). Of course students can hardly select the sections without having a general understanding of the plot, however, when participants were asked who should decide which parts to read they answered “it doesn’t matter who chooses the sections” (2 informants) or that it should be the ”teacher” (1 informant). No one opted for student influence in the decision making. (3 participants did not answer the question as they found reading only sections of the text confusing and would have opted for reading the whole text.) This supports the argument made by Hård af
Segerstad discussed in 3.2 that adult learners tend to renounce their responsibilities in the learning process quite easily.

The unsure or vague answers given to questions exploring student and participant expectations or if they consider the lesson to be of any use to them as language learners suggest that students are not quite clear as to why they read or watch a classic piece of literature (Molloy, 2003: 41). On the one hand, from the answers given to questionnaires language learners seem to accept and not question the validity of the lesson, during interviews they hoped to guess “the right answer” when describing what they learnt and why it is important for them. On the other hand, the teacher herself admits that students perform in their roles, i.e. they accept the teacher’s proposal without any further questions. Only one participant out of the 11 informants expressed her resentment over her inactive position in the selection of the text, topic, task itself or more generally, the way of pursuing knowledge (Hård af Segerstad, 2007: 37-38), by answering the questions on expectations with “I just did the homework”, meaning she read what she was given because she had no choice. This probably was the same person who came up to me directly after I handed out the text telling me she might not read it.

4.4. Where the teacher and student perspectives meet

After having described what teachers and what students and participants had to say about learning about Shakespeare and engaging in his language in the EFL language classroom in general, and on English A level in particular, we have seen that there are various aspects, in which students and teachers agree. The fact that students find Shakespeare new and interesting was confirmed by all the students. Even Vuxenskola participants, who struggled with selected parts of the text for three weeks, expressed their judgment with a smile: “it was something new, something different”.

I also found that students and teachers unconsciously cooperate with each other. Despite the awareness that students should be allowed to take an active part in the planning of the content of the course, students and participants give up on their responsibilities easily and expect the teacher, that is, the person in charge, to decide about the content and framework. Neither do students seem to question why a certain topic is beneficial for them or relevant for their studies. To the contrary, they even show a tendency to justify why it is important for them. Words such as “interesting” and “important” are used as argument for why learning about Shakespeare and his language is supposed to be relevant for them, however, on closer inspection, I found that students are not exactly sure why it is “important” for them. From their responses I gathered, they tried to guess what the teacher had in mind when he or she decided that Shakespeare is a subject that they can
benefit from. As to clarifying why they found the topic interesting, they seemed to share the teachers’ view and what teachers have in mind when presenting their students with the topic: language awareness, gaining skills in forming metalinguistic comments in the form of comparing Shakespeare’s language with modern English, and finally, learning about the history and culture of an English speaking nation. Teacher B had the same arguments but not for English A level. Most of the students interviewed have an understanding that a Shakespeare lesson is not primarily about learning new words or grammar patterns, however, there seems to be confusion amongst students as to using Shakespearean language as language model. This confirms the worries expressed by Teacher B, who stated that, language models are the main priority of language students at English A level and that literature is an important part of language teaching as a vehicle to convey cultural knowledge, but he would not use classics at this level – because they are not reliable language models at this stage.
5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Purpose of teaching Shakespeare to language learners in general and at English A in particular – Teachers’ point of view

There is no general consensus as to the relevance of introducing language learners to Shakespeare and his language, and for what purpose. Some teachers emphasize Shakespeare’s place in the English speaking literature, his influence on the English language and view a lesson sequence designed around his figure as a way of conveying cultural and historical knowledge of the target language to language learners. Furthermore, teachers do not underestimate the relevance of language historical knowledge. On the opposing side I found that there is a worry that introducing Shakespearean language at an early stage can confuse students in their language learning as the language model provided is not reliable. Interviews with students showed that these concerns are not without ground. Students do need clear instructions as to make them realize what parts of the language is obsolete and in what context other features can be used. The time constraint, which was often alluded to by teachers, however, is often the explanation for why students are left alone without clear instruction, or that they are encouraged to fill in the gaps in the form of self-study.

5.2. Students’ point of view on learning about Shakespeare and encountering his language at English A level

Students’ reaction as to the relevance of lessons about Shakespeare and reading/hearing his original language, on the one hand, proves that students have a positive attitude towards new challenges and that they are interested in the culture, literature and history of the language they are learning. On the other hand, they are not always clear about how useful what they learned will be for them as language learners, or why. Their complete acceptance of the teacher’s directions on what they should study and why, show that despite the efforts – expressed on a theoretical level in various documents from the National Curriculum to non-formal learning venue’s own documents – of shared responsibilities and making learners active in their learning process, students are more comfortable with the traditional routines of passivity. Moreover, having the full control is a convenient solution for teachers as well because of the time constraint they are constantly under.

5.3. Future applications

As this study shows there is no clear answer to whether Shakespeare and the original language used in Shakespearean texts should form parts of English as a foreign language in adult education, be it formal or non-formal. Teacher opinions vary depending on which aspect of language teaching
they are most concerned with at English A level (form or content, i.e. literature and culture). Students, on the whole, have a positive attitude towards the subject but need more guidance as to the relevance of the aims of the lesson and the applicability of what they have learnt. As to methodology, based on the results of lesson observations and student responses it is important to note that a lesson sequence including Shakespeare’s language require careful planning. The relevance of top down reading technique is without doubt plays a key factor in the success of the lesson sequence. That is, the focus while reading is placed on not the word for word comprehension but on extracting a general meaning facilitated by the reader’s previous knowledge, so called “schemata” (Harmer, 2004: 201; Willis in Lundahl, 2009: 176). As a result, students should be familiar with the plot if they are to tackle the text in the original version, or should have the help of a modernized version. In any case, careful planning is necessary in order to aid students’ extensive reading exercise so that the feelings of fear of the language described by Vuxenskola participants can be avoided. No clear answer was found to the question whether Romeo and Juliet should be assigned as a reading task and if it is the full length text or only sections students should read. The same applies to the question of opting for watching a film adaptation instead of setting an extensive reading task. However, in both cases the time constraint is likely to become the decisive factor.
6. SUMMARY

The focus of this study was to explore Shakespeare and his language as a topic for language learners at English A level. The focus group of this study was made up of adult learners, who, in many respects, differ from younger learners in compulsory education.

This research paper was based on a case study, observing and conducting a lesson sequence on Shakespeare and his language in the form of familiarizing students with the play of *Romeo and Juliet* as a reading and film watching exercise. Further data were collected from students and teachers in the form of interviews and questionnaires. The project started as a quantitative study with questionnaires aimed at students, measuring the proportions in students’ opinions on what they hope to gain from a Shakespeare lesson, what they think of reading Shakespeare’s language and how they aid their own learning process. However, I soon found that the project needed a more qualitative approach, thus interviews were conducted not only amongst three teachers, but amongst the students and participants themselves.

As the results of questionnaires, interviews and lesson observations show, there is no clear answer to the question whether Shakespeare as academic content and his language are beneficial and useful to adult language learners at English A level. Literature as a source for cultural and even historical knowledge is viewed as an important component of language learning both by teachers and students. However, the relevance of language proficiency when teaching literature or exposing language learners to obsolete linguistic features is debatable. With regards to students’ response, their motivation for finding the subject relevant is influenced by several factors – not least by their “old habit” of accepting teacher dominance, that is, students trust the teacher’s judgment on what is important for them as language learners – while these reasons might remain unclear for learner themselves. Teachers, therefore, if they choose to teach Shakespeare and his language to language learners, should clearly outline why they are using a Shakespearean text and equip students with the tools for tackling the language. This should mean not only the teaching of linguistic features so that language learners can extract the modern meaning of formally different words (Crystal, 2008: 147), but also giving them the tools for unlocking poetic language and the words, which are difficult from a non-linguistic perspective (Crystal, 2008: 146). Such work might require much more time than what teachers currently have at their disposal.
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Appendix A – class observation at Komvux
This section contains the report from the observation without commentary.

Lesson 1 of 2
Date: November 1st, 2011
Time: 9.30am – 11am
Number of students: 6
Class: English A
Place: regular classroom

The teacher starts the lesson by putting up a big “Shakespeare map” on the white board. This map is in English and contains information about the following areas: Shakespeare’s life and everyday life in his time, structure of the Globe and its audience in the sixteenth century, Shakespeare’s works, Shakespeare’s language. The map is illustrated and colourful. After a few general introductory words about Shakespeare (mainly about what sort of things he wrote) the teacher places the map on a table, around which all the students can gather. Students are required to look at the map individually and find out the rest of the information by themselves. They are allowed to discuss things in pairs if they want to.

The teacher shows students a section of As you like it. It is a clip of a theatre production of the monologue starting with the famous line “All the world’s a stage”, and is taken from Youtube. Students are given the information that it is about the seven ages of the man. After the clip the teacher tells students again that this clip was about the seven ages of a man’s life.

Students read pages 76 and 77 in their course book in pairs. These pages contain further information about William Shakespeare’s life and works, the English language and London in his time, the Plague, the Globe (its structure, audience, performances). Students read the texts out loud to each other, the teacher walks around. The teacher then asks factual questions in order to check comprehension. She then further encourages students to engage in self study by using the links on Fronter. Students in pairs look at the link chosen by the teacher about the Globe. The teacher explains that this link is not as interesting as the other one was. That linked gave an animated guided tour of the sixteenth century Globe but for some reason has disappeared from the internet. The new link shows the Globe as it is today. The teacher shows students how they can navigate on the site, then tells students that they can come to her one by one to discuss the results of a previous test.
Then students are to read the Balcony scene in the course book, both in Shakespeare’s original and the modernized version. Students can read it out loud to each other when working in pairs. Then they can log on to Fronter, where they find links to two different interpretations of the Balcony scene: scenes from Zeffirelli’s and Baz Luhrman’s film adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*. Students are required to compare the two scenes in pairs.

Before watching the film during the next lesson, students have to read pages 78 to 86 in the course book (in their own time), which contain the summary of the play, the Balcony scene in Shakespeare’s original and in a modernised version, the description of famous film adaptations of *Romeo and Juliet*, including Zeffirelli’s version, which the students will watch during the next lesson. The last page is a guide line on how to write a film review, which is how students will be graded on this chapter.

The teacher writes on the white board the important elements of a film review, based on what is written on page 86 in the course book.

10.30am: there is still time left, so students can continue to read in pairs, pages 78 and onwards. Students are very eager to use their voices, so again, they are reading the text out loud, taking turns.

**Lesson 2 of 2**

Date: November 3rd, 2011  
Time: 8am – 10.30am  
Number of students: 6 (2 leave class early)  
Class: English A  
Place: video room

Teacher A inserts the DVD into the player, explains one more time the importance of starting to work on the written assignment as soon as possible - while their memories of the film are still fresh - and suggests that students should take notes while they are watching the film. The teacher then leaves the room. One particular student takes notes throughout the entire film, the others only watch. At the end of the film, the observer takes care of switching of the equipment and distributes the questionnaires. Students do not meet their teacher again until the next lesson in four days’ time.
Appendix B – observation report of the progress of the reading task and the lesson at Vuxenskola

This section contains the report of the process of the ‘Romeo and Juliet’ reading task and the actual lesson sequence itself at Vuxenskola, without commentary

**Lesson 1 of 4**

Date: October 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2011  
Time: 6pm – 8.15pm  
Number of students: 6  
Class: English conversation, English A level or higher  
Place: Vuxenskola

6pm: Participants already agreed to take part in the project of reading certain parts of *Romeo and Juliet* in the original language. Participants receive the printed copies, altogether twenty A4 sheets, however, only half of the page is filled with the original text, the opposite page contains annotations. Participants are told that it looks more than it is and also that the leader used a pink highlighter to mark where the various sections end.

6.10pm: The leader gives a brief introduction of language used by Shakespeare, pointing out the thou/thee/thy words, the –st morpheme and the problem of the missing *do* in negation, or even in questions. Participants can test their knowledge by quickly analyzing a sentence, using the grammar rules mentioned above. Participants are also told about how much Shakespeare has contributed to the English language as we know it today, that often his own audience was used to hearing new words during the performance of new plays. That is to say, even Shakespeare’s contemporaries were often unsure about the meaning of every single word. The group leader emphasizes the fact that the language is difficult but tries to urge participants not to lose heart – mainly by pointing it out that a major part of the text is written in verse, and should be treaded as poetry. She also asks them to give the text a go first without looking at the notes.

6.30pm: The leader hands out the study sheets and explains about the three sections, i.e. pre-reading, while-reading and after reading questions. She emphasizes the fact that these questions are to aid their understanding, help them memorize what they have read but also, that they are not the only questions raised in the text and that participants themselves can come up with their own questions. The questions are not to check comprehension. The group leader then asks if there are any questions. There is none. The deadline is 25\textsuperscript{th} October, when the conversation based on the topics raised in *Romeo and Juliet* will take place. One of the participants then informs the leader
that she cannot be present that they. The leader offers to check if they can change the date with participants who are not present and get back to them about the actual date of the Romeo and Juliet lesson during the following week.

6.45pm: The regular course of the lesson resumes.

Lesson 2 of 4
Date: October 18th, 2011
Time: 6pm – 8.15pm
Number of students: 5
Class: English conversation, English A level or higher
Place: Vuxenskola

6pm: The leader informs participants that the deadline is moved one week forward, the lesson will take place on 1st November. There is a general relief at the news. The leader asks participants how they are doing with the reading. One participant doubts if she can finish reading the text as she - although she initially agreed to take part in the project - does seem to have reservations about investing so much of her own time into reading, i.e. self study. The group leader notes that it only shows the reality of requesting students, and especially participants to read in their own time. Participants do not have the obligation to do work outside class time. Other participants, however, although they express their concern that the text is too much and too complicated, they already name a few tricks they have used to aid their comprehension, i.e. looking up summaries on the internet, etc. After brief consideration, the leader decides to give out another source, the No Fear Shakespeare website, explaining that it contains a modernized version of every Shakespearean play. Participants seem keen to use it as an aid.

6.15 pm: The regular lesson starts.

Lesson 3 of 4
Date: October 25th, 2011
Time: 6pm – 8.15pm
Number of students: 2
Class: English conversation, English A level or higher
Place: Vuxenskola
6pm: General questions on how participants are doing with the reading. One of them mentions that she relied heavily on the help given by the No Fear Shakespeare website. The group leader emphasizes again that participants should not stress over not understanding every single word but allow the language to work on them.

6.15 pm: The regular lesson starts.

**Lesson 4 of 4**
Date: November 1st, 2011
Time: 6pm – 8.15pm
Number of students: 6
Class: English conversation, English A level or higher
Place: Vuxenskola

6pm: Warm up conversation while waiting for the last participant to arrive.

6.05pm: Welcoming everyone and announcing that the time has come for the *Romeo and Juliet* lesson. A short recap on what the leader told participants on the first lesson about Shakespeare, his language, his theatre. It is important that participants do not become into passive listeners, so the leader again tries to ask questions, which allow participants guess the answer.

The discussion of pre-reading questions takes up only a few minutes.

The leader takes the group to discussing *while reading* questions. The group is off to a slow start. The leader senses that participants experience this task as a real school task where they have to wait for teacher instructions. The leader tries to solve the situation by pointing this out jokingly, and reminds participants one more time that they should feel free to express their opinions. However, it is soon apparent that most of the participants could not answer the questions, therefore, the leader brings the discussion to the level of words in order to entice the answers out of the participants. One particular such discussion was about how Juliet describes Romeo when she found out that he had killed her cousin. Going down to the level of words and with the help of free associations, participants edge closer to understanding the text.

As the conversation is flowing and the questions are aimed at creating an authentic conversation, the group does not strictly follow the order of questions as it on the study sheet. However, the
leader tries to lead the conversation in a way, that participants cover all the sections and have a chance to express their ideas and opinions on each section.

Only one or two questions are aimed at checking comprehension, the vast majority of questions require participants to read between the lines. However, in the intensity of the conversation, lighter matters are raised. One participant wonders about the age of the lovers, and another one answers. Yet another participant adds that the lovers were older in the original story, which then leads to her reading out a passage from an internet source discussing the origins and inspirations for Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. The conversation turns to discussing Shakespeare’s message, i.e. that he wanted his audience to feel sympathy for the lovers and therefore made them younger. This leads to a small discussion in the group on how the story of lovers going against their parents’ will could have been received by Shakespeare’s audience, in an age where arranged marriages was the norm. One participant also wonders if the story could have been based on a true story.

7.30pm: Participants turn to discussing the help they used in understanding the text, they exchange tips. One internet page was particularly popular – it contained a scene to scene summary of the play. Participants express their relief at having been able to understand the text in more depth, now that it has been discussed from so many different points of view. A few worried that they would not be able to contribute in any way but even they have become relaxed by the end of the lesson.

7.50pm: Participants receive the questionnaire.

8.05pm: Participants express their feeling about the lesson: what they have expected and what the actual lesson turned out to be. Although nearly everyone skipped the question on “your own thoughts”, now is the time to express their own ideas and comments, which were not overtly investigated in the questionnaire. The most important aspects about the whole three week experience come to light now, in the last 15-20 minutes. The lesson goes on for an extra ten minutes. On the whole everyone seems to be pleased with the lesson, appreciating the fact that it was something new and different.
Appendix C – student questionnaire at Komvux

1. What were your expectations of a lesson on Shakespeare lesson? That it will be ..
   - Boring
   - Pointless
   - Fun
   - Interesting
   - Something new/unusual
   - Informative
   - No expectations
   - Other: ...........................................

2. What did you expect to learn during these lessons?
   - history (of England in Shakespeare's time)
   - the story of Romeo and Juliet, and maybe other plays by Shakespeare
   - how to discuss my ideas about a work of literature
   - how to discuss my ideas about topics raised in the play
   - new words
   - how to look at the English language in a different way
   - to be able to read Shakespearean texts
   - I didn't expect anything at all
   - Other: ..................................................

3. What did you learn during these lessons?
   - history (England in Shakespeare's time)
   - the story of Romeo and Juliet, and maybe other plays by Shakespeare
   - how to discuss my ideas about a work of literature
   - how to discuss my ideas about topics raised in the play
   - I learned new words
   - How to look at the English language in a different way
   - how to read Shakespearean texts
   - I didn't learn anything at all
   - Other: ..................................................

4. Are the things you learnt in this unit important for you as a language learner?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Parts of it (Which parts?............................................)
   - I don't know

5. Why do you think you had a lesson on Shakespeare and Romeo and Juliet?
   - I don't know
   - It's important to read/learn about famous works of literature
   - It gives students a chance to compare modern English with what it was like 400 years ago
   - Other ..................................................
6. Do you think it was important for you as a language learner to have a lesson about Shakespeare?
   o Yes, because ....................................................................................
   o No, because..........................................................................................
   o I don’t know

7. Do you think it was important for you as a language learner to watch Romeo and Juliet in the original?
   o Yes, because ....................................................................................
   o No, because..........................................................................................
   o I don’t know

8. After these lessons do you consider reading other Shakespeare plays?
   o Yes
   o No
   o I don’t know

9. Were you worried about the language of the text/film?
   o Yes, I was afraid that I won’t understand it or it will be very difficult to read
   o I didn’t know what the language of the text/film will be like
   o I didn’t think about it
   o No, I knew that I will be able to understand it with some help

10. Would you rather have read/watched Romeo and Juliet in modern English?
    o Yes, it would have been easier to understand
    o No, you need to read/hear the original in order to feel the atmosphere of the age
    o Other.................................................................

11. Have you read Shakespeare before?
    o Yes, in my first language
    o Yes, in another language
    o Yes, in English, but in a modernized version
    o Yes, in the English original
    o No

12. Which part was the best about working with the unit on Shakespeare?
    o Reading the original text
    o Comparing the original with the modernized version
    o Talking=finding out about the topics raised in Romeo and Juliet
    o Talking=finding out about the age of Shakespeare
    o Watching and/or discussing the film adaptations
    o Writing the film review
13. Did you do any extra studying at home in order to understand better what the play was about?
   o Yes, I read a summary so that I can have a general idea of what the story was about
   o Yes, I looked up words/read the text in a modernized version
   o Yes, I checked out the links on Fronter
   o Yes, ..............................................................
   o No, I didn’t do any extra work

14. On a 1 to 5 scale, how important is it to learn about the history of the language that you are learning?
   o 1 (not important at all)  2  3  4  5 (it is very important)

15. On a 1 to 5 scale, how important is it to learn about the culture and literature of the language that you are learning?
   o 1 (not important at all)  2  3  4  5 (it is very important)

16. What is the most important thing for you when you read in the foreign language?
   Please mark the following from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (most important).
   o I want to practice my reading skills
   o I want to learn new words
   o I want to see how words/phrases and grammar are used in a text that is written for native speakers
   o I want to find out about the culture of foreign language (ideas, values, customs, etc.)
   o I want to find out about literature, especially

17. How would you want to be graded on this chapter?
   o Writing a film review was a good way
   o A general test in writing on the facts and new words learned in the chapter
   o An oral exam on the facts and new words learned in the chapter
   o A discussion in general about Shakespeare’s time, the play and its message for readers today

18. Are there any elements in the play (characters, language, plot) which touched you in any way?
   .............................................................................................................................

Mark the answers that describe YOU
  ➢ I am a woman / man
  ➢ My age is 20+, 30+, 40+, 50+, 60+
  ➢ I am studying English as a hobby / I want a better grade that I already have / I am planning to go to university / other.........................................................
  ➢ My attitude to literature/reading: I read a lot / sometimes / rarely / never
  ➢ I think reading literature in English is important / not important / might be important for becoming better at the language.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP
Appendix D – participant questionnaire at Vuxenskola

19. What did you learn during this lesson?
   - I learnt about history (England in Shakespeare's time)
   - I became familiar with the story of *Romeo and Juliet*, and maybe other plays by Shakespeare
   - I practiced discussing my ideas about a work of literature
   - I practiced discussing my ideas about topics raised in the play
   - I learnt new words
   - I learnt to look at the English language in a different way
   - I find it easier now to read Shakespearean texts
   - I didn’t learn anything new (go to Q3)
   - ..............................................................

20. Are the things you learnt today important for you as a language learner?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Parts of it
   - I don’t know

21. After this lesson do you consider reading the whole *Romeo and Juliet*?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don’t know

22. After this lesson/these lessons do you consider reading other Shakespeare plays too?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don’t know

23. Do you think it was a good idea to only read parts of the original play?
   - Yes (→go to Q6)
   - No (→go to Q9)
   - I don’t know (→go to Q7)

24. Why is it a good idea to read only parts of the play?
   - Students don’t have to read that much, the whole play would have been too long to read
   - It's enough to focus on the important parts of the text
   - Other: ..............................................
25. Was it important to know the whole story in general, i.e. the summary of the play?
   o Yes
   o No
   o I don't know

26. Who should choose which sections of the play students/participants should read?
   o Teacher/leader
   o Students/participants
   o It doesn’t matter

27. Why is it a bad idea to read only parts of the play?
   o I can’t understand the story unless I read the whole play
   o I feel I can’t influence which sections I want to read and discuss
   o Other………………………………

28. Were you worried about the language of the text?
   o Yes, I was afraid that I won’t understand it or it will be very difficult to read
   o I didn’t know what the language of the text will be like
   o I didn’t think about it
   o No, I knew that I will be able to understand it with some help

28. Would you rather have read Romeo and Juliet in modern English?
   o Yes, it would have been easier to understand it
   o No, you need to read the original in order to feel the atmosphere
   o Other………………………………………………

29. What did you expect of this lesson? That it will be ..
   o Boring
   o Pointless
   o Fun
   o Interesting
   o Something new/unusual
   o Informative
   o Exciting
   o .........................
   o No expectations (go to Q14)
30. Motivate your answer for Q10.

31. What did you expect to do/learn during this lesson? That I’ll ...
   o Learn about history (England in Shakespeare’s time)
   o become familiar with the story of Romeo and Juliet, and maybe other plays by Shakespeare
   o practice discussing my ideas about a work of literature
   o practice discussing my ideas about topics raised in the play
   o learn new words
   o learn to look at the English language in a different way
   o Learn how to read Shakespearean texts
   o Learn new grammar
   o I didn’t know what I would learn
   o .........................................................

32. Why do you think you had a lesson on Romeo and Juliet?
   o I don’t know
   o It’s important to read/learn about famous works of literature
   o It gives students a chance to compare modern English with what it was like 400 years ago
   o Other: ..............................................

33. On a 1 to 5 scale, how important is it to learn about the history of the language that you are learning?
   o 1 (not important at all) 2 3 4 5 (it is very important)

34. On a 1 to 5 scale, how important is it to learn about the culture and literature of the language that you are learning?
   1 (not important at all) 2 3 4 5 (it is very important)

35. What is the most important thing for you when you read in the foreign language? Please mark the following from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (most important).
   o I want to practice my reading skills
   o I want to learn new words
   o I want to see how words/phrases and grammar are used in a text that is written for native speakers
   o I want to find out about the culture of foreign language (ideas, values, customs, etc.)
   o I want to find out about literature, especially
36. Did you do extra studying at home in order to understand better what the play was about?
   o Yes, I read a summary so that I can have a general idea of what the story was about
   o Yes, I looked up words/read the text in a modernized version
   o Yes, .................................................................
   o No, I didn’t do any extra work, just read the pages I had been given

37. Which part was the best part of this ‘project’?
   o Reading the original text
   o Comparing the original with the modernized version
   o Talking about the topics raised in Romeo and Juliet
   o Talking/finding out about the age of Shakespeare
   o Talking about the film adaptations

38. Are there any elements in the play (characters, language, plot) which touched you in any way?
........................................................................................................................................

39. Your own thoughts ...

Circle the answers that describe YOU
   ➢ I am a woman/man
   ➢ My age is 20+, 30+, 40+, 50+, 60+
   ➢ I am studying English as a hobby / I want a better grade that I already have / I am planning to go to university / other..........................
   ➢ My attitude to literature/reading: I read a lot / sometimes / rarely / never
   ➢ I think reading literature in English is important / not important / might be important for becoming better at the language

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP
Appendix E – teacher interview questions

Teacher interview – for the teacher teaching the observed Komvux English A group

1. Why do you think it’s important that students read/become familiar with a Shakespearean play or film adaptation?

2. What should they gain from a Shakespeare lesson? (language awareness, grammar, new words, academic content as to Shakespeare’s life and theatre or analysis of a literary text)

3. All chapters are based on a novel, chapter 4 is the only one with a classic. Why Shakespeare? Would you choose some other classic to read?

4. Do you like teaching Romeo and Juliet? If so, do you think the students can see your passion for the text?

5. Romeo and Juliet in the original language does not appear on the list of books students can choose from for their book review. Why not? Do you think no one would choose it?

6. Why did you pick the Zeffirelli, instead of for example the Baz Luhrman adaptation from 1996, or a looser interpretation, such as the Broadway musical Westside story? Is it important that students see something which is closest to the original (both in language and era, history)?

7. Do think it’s important to prepare students for the language of Shakespeare? Why? Why not?

8. Do you expect students to skip Shakespeare lessons? Do you think they enjoy it or find it boring/pointless? Are you prepared for negative expectations?

9. Do you enjoy teaching chapter 4? Why? Why not?

10. Is reading important for you?

11. Do you think reading literature is an important component of language learning?

12. How do you think the teacher can convince/motivate/win the students about wanting to engage in the study of a Shakespearean play?
13. How does Shakespeare fit in to the communicative language teaching approach? Should we make Shakespeare personal for the students? Is it important to do so? Why? Why not?

Teacher interview / general

1. Do you think that **reading literature** is an important component of foreign language learning? Why and in what ways? (grammar, vocabulary, cultural/historical knowledge, academic content, provide skills required according to Skolverket Engelska A requirement as comparing and analyzing a literary piece of work?)

2. Is the original language important (students should read/hear the original), or can it be substituted with a film adaptation or a modernized text when you teach Shakespeare?

3. Do you like Shakespeare? Why? Why not?

4. Do you think that students should see your passion for the literary text you are teaching? Do you think this passion can influence students’ expectations in a positive way?

5. Can/could you teach a book you don’t like or feel that it’s not worth teaching?

6. Did you teach classics or Shakespeare?
   a. With what aim/focus?
   b. What method?
   c. Age group, motivation of group (grade, further studies)

7. Do you think that reading **the classics** is an important component of foreign language learning? Why, and in what ways? (grammar, vocabulary, cultural/historical knowledge, academic content, provide skills required according to Skolverket Engelska A requirement as comparing and analyzing a literary piece of work?)
   a. Which classic?
   b. Reading Shakespeare? Which play?

8. On what level do you think students are ready to tackle Shakespeare? (English A or more advanced?)

9. What is your experience regarding student’s expectations, attitudes when starting Shakespeare/any of the classics/any works of literature?
a. Are these negative?

b. What are students hoping to get out of such lessons? (vocabulary, grammar, cultural knowledge, etc.)

10. What are your aims when teaching Shakespeare? What should students gain from such a lesson?

11. Is it important for students in general to learn about Shakespeare’s language and his contribution to the English language? Does it depend on the level and interests of the students?

12. Is it important to familiarize students with the language of Shakespeare before letting them meet the language of Shakespearean texts?


14. Your own thoughts, comments…
Appendix F – student interview questions at Komvux

Related to Q4: Many wrote that they learned the following things:
  o How to look at English in a different way
  o How to read Shakespearean texts
  o To be familiar with the story of Romeo and Juliet (what does that give you as an language learner?)
  o Learned new words (will you be able to use these words in modern language situation?)

Why/in what ways are the things you learnt are important for you as a language learner?

Related to Q5: Why do you think you had a lesson on Shakespeare?
  Why do you think the teacher decides to teach you this chapter on Shakespeare?
  Is it really important for you at English A level to learn about early modern English?
  Do you think there are other benefits of reading Shakespeare for you as a person, and not only as a language learner?

Related to Q6
  If you could choose which chapters to cover during the lesson, would have you chosen the chapter on Shakespeare?

Related to Q7
  Is it important to know what the ‘old language’ was like? Why? Why not?

Related to Q8: some said yes, when asked if they consider reading other Shakespearean texts.
  Why would you want to read more Shakespeare?

Related to Q12
  What would have you focused on when working with this chapter? How would have you planed a lesson?
    o Teacher telling you more facts
    o Discussing things (compare ages, film adaptation, play itself)
    o Finding out more facts on your own (more home study)

Related to Q13
  Do you think that being familiar with the summary of the play (what it was about) helped you understand the film and its language? How/why?
Related to Q14

Why do you think knowing the history of a language/what it was like 400 years ago is important/unimportant at English A?

Related to Q15

Why do you think knowing the culture and literature of a language is important/unimportant at English A?

You read only one section of the play (Balcony scene) but seen the whole film.

Was it important to see the whole film? Why? Why not?

Would it have been better to read the whole play instead?

What are the advantages/disadvantages of seeing a film adaptation?

What are the advantages/disadvantages of reading the whole play?
Appendix G – study sheet for Vuxenskola

**Before reading**

- Have you read the play before, seen any film adaptations or the play itself at the theatre? Were there any memorable scenes, lines, characters, etc.? Did you like it? Why? Why not?
- How familiar are you with the plot (story), characters? Is this a love story, tragedy, etc.?

**Questions per page**

p. 39 prologue

- What do you think the origin of the enmity is between the two families? How serious is it?

pp. 49-51

- What is the matter with Romeo? What clues do you find in the text?
- What is the relationship between Romeo and his parents? (intimate, loving, etc?)
- In what ways have parent-child relationships changed over the times?
  - Is it important to have your child’s confidence in every matter, even love?
  - Is the level of intimacy influenced by the age of the “child” (teenager/young adult/adult)?

p. 57

- How would you describe Capulet’s relationship with his daughter, Juliet, and his fatherly feelings about her, based on the topic of the conversation between him and Paris?

p. 91 “Passion lends them power…” (line 13)

- Have you ever done anything dangerous or irrational under the impulse of passion? Is passion dangerous or a positive force/feeling?

pp. 97-99 the balcony scene

- How much of your identity (religion, family, friends, etc.) would you give up for the person you are in love with? (What are the components of our identity?)

p 129

- What is Juliet’s relationship like with the Nurse? Does that suggest the nature of the relationship between Juliet and her own mother?
- What is your opinion about employing au-pairs, child minders or nannies? What are the reasons for employing help in raising children at home – in the 16th century and in our time?
  - How does the presence of a nanny influence the mother-child relationship, if at all?

pp. 153-155

- When it comes to loyalty, who come first? Parents/siblings/cousins or spouses (wife/husband)? Who should Juliet show loyalty to? To her cousin, Tybalt or to her husband, who killed a blood relative of hers?
Do you always have to protect your spouse, even if he/she committed or is alleged to have committed a crime?

pp. 181-185

- What is your opinion about arranged marriages?
- Is the wrath of Capulet justified? Did you expect it or did it surprise you based on how Capulet came across as a father in an earlier scene (p. 57) when he discussed Paris’s marriage proposal?
- What do you think of Lady Capulet’s reaction? Should she take her daughter’s or her husband’s side? What would you have done? What does her reaction say about her relationship with Juliet?
- Would you want to have a say in who your child marries? Would you interfere if you thought your child makes a mistake by marrying a person of her/his own choice?

pp. 243-247

- What is the moral of the story of Romeo and Juliet? Could it be different for the audience of the 16th century from that of today?
  - arranged marriages versus following your heart and taking risks for love
  - teenagers disobeying their parents – do parents always know best?
  - Parent-child relationships
  - Anything else? ...

After reading

- Do you think that the story of Romeo and Juliet carries a message for readers/theatre-goers of the 21st century? If so, why? Why not?
- What do you think about the language, the images, e.g. “star-crossed lovers”? Should the language be modernized or should the text be read in the original? Why? Why not? If modernized, in what ways?
- Are there any elements in the play (characters, language, plot) that touched you in any way?
- Was it a good idea to only read certain parts of the play? Did you feel sometimes that you would have liked to read on? Would you rather have read the whole play? Do you think it makes sense to read only parts of the play? Why? Why not?
- How much did reading the text confirm your expectations of reading a play by Shakespeare?
- Your own thoughts …
Appendix H – information sheet

Information sheet
Studiens syfte: att undersöka engelska lärares och språkstudenternas åsikt om att undervisa/lära sig om Shakespeare och *Romeo och Julia* (i sin ursprungliga tidig nyengelska version) i vuxenutbildning på engelska A nivå, eller högre.
Informanter: Lärare i engelska vid Komvux i Sandviken (sample: 2)
   Gymnasielärare i engelska i Sandviken (sample 1)
   Elever i engelska vid Komvux i Sandviken (sample: 5)
   Deltagare i engelska konversation vid Vuxenskola i Sandviken (sample: 6).
Undersökningen är ett examensarbete vid Högskolan i Gävle.

Metod:
   halvstrukturerade intervjuer för lärare (ca 30 min)
   enkät för eleverna vid Komvux och deltagarna vid Vuxenskola (ca 15 min)
   halvstrukturerade intervju i grupp för eleverna och deltagarna (ca 15 min)
De insamlade uppgifterna kommer inte att användas för något annat syfte än för forskning.

Forskare: Lärarstudierande Judit Korcsolan
Handleare: Docent Alan Shima, Högskolan i Gävle


Forskningsetiska principer

**Informationskravet:** Forskare ska informera de av forskningen berörda om den aktuella forskningsuppgiftens syfte. Du bör ha blivit informerad om Din uppgift i projektet och vilka villkor som gäller för Ditt deltagande, samt att Ditt deltagande är frivilligt.

**Samtyckeskravet:** Deltagare i en undersökning har rätt att själva bestämma över sin medverkan. Du bör ha blivit informerad om att ditt samtycke krävs, att Du har rätt att självständigtbestämma om, hur länge och på vilka villkor Du ska delta, samt att Ditt beslut att delta/avbryta inte får åtföljas av otillbörlig påtryckning/påverkan.

**Konfidentialitetskravet:** Uppgifter om alla i en undersökning ingående personer ska ges största möjliga konfidentialitet och personuppgifterna förvaras på ett sådant sätt att obehöriga inte kan ta del av dem. Du bör ha blivit informerad om att alla uppgifter om identifierbara personer ska antecknas, lagras och avrapporteras på ett sådant sätt att enskilda människor inte kan identifieras av utomstående, att personuppgifter inte får lämnas ut till utomstående, samt att åtgärder måste vidtas för att försvåra för utomstående att identifiera enskilda individer/grupper av individer.

**Nyttjandekravet:** Uppgifter insamlade om enskilda personer får endast användas för forskningsändamål.