

5-2003

# The Effectiveness of Teaching Romeo and Juliet to Ninth Graders First from an Aesthetic Stance and Then from an Efferent Stance

Kevin P. Delehanty

*The College at Brockport*, [kdelehanty@williamsoncentral.org](mailto:kdelehanty@williamsoncentral.org)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd\\_theses](http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses)

 Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

To learn more about our programs visit: <http://www.brockport.edu/ehd/>

---

## Repository Citation

Delehanty, Kevin P., "The Effectiveness of Teaching Romeo and Juliet to Ninth Graders First from an Aesthetic Stance and Then from an Efferent Stance" (2003). *Education and Human Development Master's Theses*. 315.  
[http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd\\_theses/315](http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses/315)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Education and Human Development at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education and Human Development Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact [kmyers@brockport.edu](mailto:kmyers@brockport.edu).

The Effectiveness of Teaching *Romeo and Juliet* to Ninth Graders First from an  
Aesthetic Stance, and then from an Efferent Stance

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the  
Department of Education and Human Development

State University of New York

College at Brockport

in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Science in Education

by

Kevin P. Delehanty

State University of New York

College at Brockport

Brockport, New York

May 2003

Submitted by:

Kenneth Abbott 5-3-03  
Candidate Date

APPROVED BY:

Patricia E. Baker 5/6/03  
Thesis Advisor Date

Geneva Z. Begg 5/6/03  
Second Faculty Reader Date

Patricia E. Baker 5-7-03  
Director of Graduate Studies Date

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of teaching William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* first from a predominately aesthetic stance and then from a predominately efferent stance.

The subjects were eighteen ninth-grade students from a co-ed, heterogenous, rural high school. Two assessments for each stance were given and analyzed, as well as post-talk interviews completed by fifteen of the subjects.

The results proved to me what the research emphasized, namely, with fiction, approach the piece first from an aesthetic stance, and then go back and analyze it in an efferent manner if needed. Such a method engages the students and then asks them to think deeply in various ways about the piece. Additionally, it helps instill a love of literature and as a side bonus, prepares them for the Regents exam.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Research Question	1
Need for the Study	2
Limitations	5
II. Review of the Literature	6
Introduction	6
The Reader, the Text, or Both	8
<i>The Interpretation vs. the Experience</i>	11
III. Design of the Study	15
Purpose	15
Research Question	15
Methodology	16
Subjects	16
Materials	16
Procedures	17
Analysis	18
IV. Analysis of the Data	19
Purpose	19
Findings	19
Phase One	19
Phase Two	21
Phase Three	23
V. Conclusion and Implications	28
Conclusion	28
Implications for the Classroom	30
Implications for Further Research	32
References	34
Appendix A--Aesthetic Documents	
Appendix B--Efferent Documents	

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of teaching *Romeo and Juliet*, by William Shakespeare, first from a predominantly aesthetic stance, and then from an efferent stance.

#### Research Question

How effective is teaching *Romeo and Juliet* to ninth grade students by utilizing a predominantly aesthetic stance first, and then an efferent one?

### Need for the Study

First, it is imperative to emphasize that both efferent and aesthetic stances are needed in the English classroom, depending on purposes. Efferent reading is especially helpful with informational text and literary analysis, and both are strongly assessed on the new eleventh grade English Regents Exam. If one is not familiar with the new test, pay close attention to the titles of the four sections: Listening and Writing for Information and Understanding; Reading and Writing for Information and Understanding; Reading and Writing for Literary Response and Expression; and, Reading and Writing for Critical Analysis and Evaluation.

How should these research findings affect teachers of reading and English? With the reader's lived-through experience not being valued as evidenced in the Regents' types of questions, how can the teacher best serve the child and still foster a love for and enjoyment of reading? Some say it cannot be done and have therefore left the profession. Others teach to the test and either find security in knowing they have prepared their students for the big test, or do it reluctantly with much complaining. Another small group swings to the rebellious end of the pendulum and pursues purely aesthetic interaction between readers and

texts, while ignoring ever exposing the students to the Regents test they must pass in order to graduate. Some might even argue that through such an approach, students would be prepared to tackle and succeed on the Regents. Such a risky and zealous approach lacks evidence as to its effectiveness, especially since many of the terms and skills tested are purely efferent in nature. Lastly, still others find a balance between giving their students the needed exposure, practice, and skill development to adequately prepare them for the Regents, and yet encouraging a love for reading for its aesthetic gifts (and giving adequate time in the classroom for such interaction).

It can and must be done, or we will lose too many students to failure, dropping out, or giving up on ever reading for not only understanding, but also for the evocative experience. The temptation is to give up valuing, encouraging, and using the aesthetic stance because of the immense pressure incurred by the media, and most boards of education, superintendents, and principals, as well as many parents.

It takes courage, diligence, and ingenuity to prepare a curriculum that meets everyone's varied needs. Each teacher must first ask himself what is most important, and then how he can accomplish this short-term goal of passing the



state-mandated test, but also the long-term goal of fostering a love for reading for multiple purposes. Such a high wire act need not have any fatalities, teacher or student, with the proper attitude, training, and work ethic in place.

If both efferent and aesthetic responses are desired as instructional goals, teach the piece through first for the lived-through (aesthetic) experience and then go back and read it for information and analysis. Don't stop every time a metaphor, simile, symbol, or rhyme scheme is noticed. Read, feel, respond to, muse over—experience and savor--the piece as a whole first. Then go back and illustrate literary devices and discuss how they enrich the piece. The reading event will be more meaningful, enjoyable, and memorable as a result. We, as teachers, have both responsibilities of preparing our kids for the test, but even more importantly, instilling in them a lifelong enjoyment of reading. Let us not turn them off to reading; let's turn them on to it!

### Limitations

Trying to pick the optimal class period was a challenge. Factors such as class size, gender breakdown, reading ability, background, IQ, and time of day all played an important role in my decision to use my eighth period class. In addition to these factors, the class represented a wide range of experience and levels of maturity in relation to many of the topics in *Romeo and Juliet*, such as the following: lust, romance, marriage, violence, murder, suicide, emotions, impulsivity, reason, honesty, deceit, loyalty, and betrayal.

Lastly, comparing scores between the aesthetic and efferent approaches would pose the age old “apples to oranges” conundrum. Therefore, these scores will only be compared to previous years when I used an intermingling of approaches, rather than using any particular order, such as in this study.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of the Literature

#### Introduction

A reader's stance, or orientation, when starting a piece of writing directly affects the meaning thus constructed. Let us consider one text (a book on soccer) and two readers. One is a high school soccer coach who is reading a soccer drills book to implement in tomorrow's practice to increase his team's scoring potential. Next, consider a soccer enthusiast who is looking at a different section of the same book which contains vivid pictures of soccer stars in action, and their commentaries about their love for the game. The first is what Rosenblatt (1978, 1985, 1991) according to her transactional theory of reader response, calls efferent reading, that is, reading for information, systematic analysis, or utility. The second is aesthetic reading, or reading for engagement and enjoyment (the lived-through experience through thoughts, feelings, images, and associations evoked in the reader) (Cox & Many, 1989). Both are useful depending on the

reader's purpose, but Rosenblatt argues that reading literature (such as fiction and poetry, as opposed to a computer manual or game instructions) with an aesthetic stance is most important because without it, reading becomes a sterile, dry, boring, and disengaging experience for most.

As Cooper explains (1985) and Many states (1994), "reader response theory's emphasis on the role of the reader has resulted in valuing of individual interpretations. Literature is seen as events to be lived through, offering opportunities for self-knowledge and for understanding others" (p.653). Yes, there is value in reading with an efferent stance, but with the fiction genre especially, it is advantageous to go into it with an aesthetic stance. Even so, only one study (Cox & Many, 1989) has investigated the relationship between a reader's stance and level of understanding of literary works. In their study, Cox and Many found a significant statistical correlation existed. As Rosenblatt (1982) contested, and Many (1994) showed in her study of 51 eighth-grade students, most efferent responses are shallow, while subjects who focused on the lived-through experience of the story had a significantly higher mean level of understanding. Such strong findings have significant implications for the classroom.

### The Reader, the Text, or Both

Either focusing solely on the texts or focusing solely on the readers is inadequate in and of themselves. Kintgen (1986) urges, “The interaction between the reader and the text is precisely what we should be interested in. We have already witnessed the demise of the schools of literary criticism (such as New Criticism, where the text is something complete within itself with emphasis on the formal and technical properties of the piece) which focus exclusive attention on the text” (p.92).

How the reader and the text interact, and how a reader’s stance impacts the process is critical. As Many (1994) and Rosenblatt (1978) concluded, readers often fluctuate in their reading between an efferent and an aesthetic stance. Additionally, Stahl and Hayes (1997) explain, “in his own research involving graduate students, Kintgen (1983) focused on how an individual reader’s ‘horizon of expectations’ (or stance) imposes a narrative structure on the way he or she selects from a range of mental operations, of which 24 are identified” (p.335). Kintgen’s research underscored his point that a reader’s expectations necessarily will interact with each another and evolve during the course of a reading event, which makes it nearly impossible to foresee in detail how a particular reader will

engage with a particular text. Such is true even if one knows something about the prior knowledge and background of experience that reader will bring to his or her reading events (Blake & Lunn, 1986; Cox & Many, 1992; Langer, 1990).

Although they use different ways to say it, these researchers encourage us to look at readers as co-creators of meaning. The text is not useful in and of itself, except maybe to impress others with its age or reputation or as fuel for a fire, but rather it is the interaction of the reader with that text that brings it alive. What's more, each individual reader's experience with that same text is unique. And the result, according to Rosenblatt (1982) is that "reading, especially aesthetic reading, extends the scope of that environment and feeds the growth of the individual, who can then bring a richer self to further transactions with life and literature" (pp.273-274). Because the text has become a part of the reader through the dynamic, interactive process of aesthetic reading, instead of an arid dissection of the parts, the reader is changed for the better. The text doesn't change—it is still the same words on the same pages—but the reader is not the same because of the social-cognitive processes at work. An example is a reading one may have of a particular love poem before they have experienced romantic love and then that same person reading the same poem after they have just fallen

in love. Their reaction and what they take from the poem will invariably be altered, yet the poem is the same. Even so, it is important to remember that in order for a meaningful transaction to occur, both the text and the individual reader are crucial, for neither is independent in the reading event.

Important implications, according to Cullinan, Harwood, and Galda (1983) are:

...comprehension tests that assume one right answer give an inadequate picture of a reader's comprehension. Furthermore, comprehension needs to be looked at as a process rather than a product. Since comprehension is a complex phenomenon, it must be studied in a way appropriate to the phenomenon. We can no longer study just the reader or just the text. We must examine the interaction between the two. (p.37)

The aesthetic stance takes all of these points into account.

### *The Interpretation vs. the Experience*

A sad reality is the overwhelming attitude of teachers, school boards, and administrators, especially in the upper grades, to look at all literature, even stories, in an efferent manner. It is the old philosophy of the teacher having all the answers and the students simply being dry sponges ready to soak up droplets of wisdom from the teacher's mouth. Rosenblatt (1982) goes so far as to say the root of the problem in teaching literature is the adoption of teachers, and therefore, of students, of the efferent stance as the definitive one in reading. Studies (Purves, 1973) established that such a one-sided approach is responsible for students in an open situation to respond in ways already learned in the school environment. People in authority want quantifiable results, and those most readily quantified are efferent responses, such as direct multiple choice questions and easily text-defended, superficial essays. In contrast, Bleich (1975), regarding reading literature, says there is no such thing as a single, objective, unchanging meaning for a piece, and therefore an individual reads literature not to arrive at an objective meaning--or at the intended meaning of the author--but to create a personal interpretation for a novel, short story, or poem. Neglect of the aesthetic



stance by teachers may rob students of rich possibilities for growth and the joy of reading. The damage may be irreparable.

Two studies, both from upstate New York, propose a more aesthetic stance and therefore corroborate suggestions made earlier by such experts as Rosenblatt and Bleich. One was performed by Blake and Lunn (1986), from The State University of New York College at Brockport, and the other was by Hynds (1989) from Syracuse University.

Blake and Lunn--unlike Kintgen's study (mentioned earlier) that used experienced readers--looked at what relatively untrained readers did as they followed the process of reading a new poem. In this case, it was two boys and three girls, fifteen and sixteen years old, from the same suburban high school but with different English teachers. More specifically, they focused on one girl, there named Emily, who worked through the poem "Every Good Boy Does Fine." One exciting discovery was that Emily (with no prior instruction in literary criticism, with no special knowledge of figurative language terms or technical aspects of poetry) was able to perceive, interpret, and enjoy a poem in a thoroughly satisfying way. Often students complain, "I don't like it," but they actually mean, "I'm having difficulty constructing meaning." Because they have been taught

that the teacher always has the one correct interpretation, which is hardly, if ever, the same as theirs, they get afraid and turned off. Conversely, as Blake and Lunn's report illustrates, although none of the adolescents in this study initially reported liking poetry, after they had worked through an interpretation of the poem, four expressed a liking for it. Other revelations are that students respond differently to the same poem, and they respond differently than teachers do, and there is nothing wrong with either fact. Insightfully, they conclude, "... young people have different cultural backgrounds from ours. They bring to reading and responding varied educational experiences. Few of them have acquired the critical apparatus for reading poems it took us years to assimilate ... therefore, we must anticipate difficulties they face and adjust our teaching accordingly" (p.72). Teachers who always tell students "this is what this piece means" will create dependent readers who are never encouraged to create personal, meaningful interpretations.

Similar in her findings, Hynds (1989) studied four high school students from a suburban school. Each student in her study revealed remarkable qualities and potential, yet each seemed to have slipped through the cracks of the educational system in some way. Thus, teaching students to be competent readers

is no guarantee that they will bring these competencies to bear on what they read.

This is particularly true, she maintains, in the reading of literature, which is always a subtle blend of analytic and aesthetic. Toward the end of her report,

Hynds cites the ever-poignant Rosenblatt:

The teacher of literature will be the first to admit that he inevitably deals with the experiences of human beings in their diverse personal and social relations... The joys of adventure, the delight in the beauty of the world, the intensities of triumph and defeat, the self-questionings and self-realizations, the pangs of love and hate. Indeed, as Henry James has said, "all life, all feeling, all observation, all Vision"—these are the province of literature. (p.58)

Hynds contends that it is preeminent for the teacher to first expand his or her horizons and accept multiple, personal understandings and value individual, aesthetic responses. By doing so, the teacher will encourage reading as a meaningful, dynamic, and lifelong pursuit.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Design of the Study

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of teaching *Romeo and Juliet*, by William Shakespeare, first from a predominantly aesthetic stance, and then from an efferent stance.

#### Research Question

How effective is teaching *Romeo and Juliet* to ninth grade students by utilizing a predominantly aesthetic stance first, and then an efferent one?

## Methodology

### Subjects

Eighteen ninth-graders from a rural upstate New York high school participated in the research. Because all ninth-graders must take and pass the Regents Exam in their junior year, my selection of subjects was a heterogenous class in order to get a fair cross-section of the student body.

### Materials

The materials included:

- The full Shakespearean play *Romeo and Juliet*, as found in the ninth-grade textbook, *Prentice Hall Literature Gold*, 1999.
- A journal of aesthetic responses, aesthetic task (comprehensive response) and question options, scoring rubric, and student samples (Appendix A)
- Efferent notes, efferent task (comprehensive response), scoring rubric, and student samples (Appendix B)

## Procedures

This study took place over a period of approximately ten weeks.

### Phase One:

The students kept a journal of aesthetic stance responses by responding periodically to teacher-generated questions or statements regarding *Romeo and Juliet* as we read through the play (See Appendix A). Upon completion of the play, they made one final aesthetic response in an extended form. To do this, they chose any three response options from the list in Appendix A..

### Phase Two:

After completing phase one, the students made efferent notes regarding Shakespeare's use of literary devices (after direct instruction on literary devices to be found in *Romeo and Juliet*). Upon completion of direct instruction and note making, the students wrote a comprehensive essay in which they, "Explained how Shakespeare's use of literary devices enhanced his play, *Romeo and Juliet*." (See Appendix B for details.)

### Phase Three:

A post-talk analysis was performed based on ten students' written interviews. Their opinions of the aesthetic and efferent approaches were documented and shared.

### Analysis

At the end of the first reading of the play, the subjects were assessed on their aesthetic journal responses and comprehensive aesthetic response through the use of a rubric. Zero was no response; 4 was an exemplary response; 1-3 were gradations between (see Appendix A). Next, the subjects were assessed on their efferent notes and comprehensive efferent essay through the use of a rubric. Zero was no response; 6 was an exemplary response; 2-5 were gradations between (see Appendix B). Data were collected based on scores using the aforementioned rubrics. Quantitative analysis (percentages and means) and qualitative analysis (judgments and conclusions, as well as anecdotal notes and observations) was then made. Lastly, the post-talk analysis of ten students' written interviews was shared.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of teaching *Romeo and Juliet*, by William Shakespeare, first from a predominantly aesthetic stance, and then from an efferent stance.

### Findings

#### Phase One

##### Aesthetic Journal

Of the eighteen subjects, only one received a zero for not handing it in, while the other seventeen students received grades between 68 and 100. One grade was in the 60s, four in the 70s, three in the 80s, six in the 90s, and three 100s.

Without the zero averaged in, the mean was 87.



Grades in order were as follows:

0, 68, 76, 76, 76, 76, 84, 84, 84, 92, 92, 92, 92, 92, 92, 100, 100, 100

### Aesthetic Composition

Only two students received zeroes for not handing it in, while the other sixteen students received grades between 70 and 98. Two grades were in the 70s, ten in the 80s, and four in the 90s.

Without the zeroes averaged in, the mean was 87.

Grades in order were as follows:

0, 0, 70, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 87, 87, 87, 87, 87, 89, 90, 93, 97, 98

### Unanticipated Results

In one student's aesthetic composition, she reveals, "During *Romeo and Juliet*, I was reminded that decisions made by teenagers aren't always logical. The characters that age, and teenagers now, sometimes make rash, emotional decisions." Such an honest and insightful statement might be expected from an adult, but I did not anticipate such poignancy from a fourteen-year-old. Especially encouraging was how she was able to connect something written

more than four hundred years ago to today's youth and therefore, find relevance in it.

### Phase Two

#### Efferent Notes

Only two students received zeroes for not handing it in, while the other sixteen students received grades between 70 and 100. One grade was in the 70s, three in the 80s, two in the 90s, and ten received 100.

Without the zeroes averaged in, the mean was 94. One important distinction is that at this phase, the grade was based on completion on the task rather than accuracy.

Grades in order were as follows:

0, 0, 70, 85, 85, 85, 93, 93, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100

### Efferent Essay

Only two students received zeroes for not handing it in, while the other sixteen students received grades between 63 and 98. Three grades were in the 60s, six in the 70s, four in the 80s, and three in the 90s.

Without the zeroes averaged in, the mean was 79.

Grades in order were as follows:

0, 0, 63, 68, 68, 73, 75, 75, 75, 75, 77, 80, 82, 83, 87, 94, 97, 98

During this second phase, students were able to clear up ambiguities and inaccuracies regarding characters and the plot they had formed previously (during Phase One, the aesthetic phase).

### Unanticipated Results

In one student's efferent essay, she shares in her conclusion, "When one sits down to write a piece of literature, one has to consider literary devices and how one wants to use them to enhance his or her piece. William Shakespeare must have pondered for a long time because his use of them is immaculate." In the body of her essay as well as the conclusion, this student illustrated her grasp of three of the literary devices Shakespeare used—dramatic irony,

characterization, and conflict. Such evidence verified my ambitious goal of getting them into the play through phase one, the aesthetic approach, and then understanding and appreciating Shakespeare's masterful use of literary devices.

### Phase Three

#### Post-talk Written Interviews

Fifteen of the eighteen subjects completed the interview questions. The following are the questions and the overall results:

1. What was your overall impression of our *Romeo and Juliet* unit?

Five responded positively, two negatively, and eight in between.

One student said, "I thought it was awesome. I've always wanted to read the book, but I never had time with sports, clubs, and other activities. I liked how we went in depth on the story and certain phrases."

Another says, "It was too long. It made me not like it. The beginning of the unit was very interesting." (That would be the aesthetic approach.)

2. What did you think about the aesthetic journal questions? Did that assignment help you understand and appreciate the play more? Explain.

Thirteen responded positively, two negatively, and none in between.

One student shared, “Yes, this assignment was a good idea that helped me out a ton. I would have failed everything if we didn’t have this assignment.”

Another said, “It helped me interact with the story more and relate to my own life.”

3. What did you think about the aesthetic composition? What about the response options? Did that assignment help you understand and appreciate the play more? Explain.

Thirteen responded positively, two negatively, and five in between.

An example comes from this student, who said, “Being able to express myself about the play and adding endings to it got me into the play more.”

And yet another shared, “I didn’t really enjoy this one. I was happy I could choose what ones I could do though. Yes, it helped me understand and appreciate because it made me relate to the play better.”

Conversely, a different student stated, “No, not really. It just made me mad because I had to write another essay.”

4. What did you think about the efferent notes on literary devices? Did that assignment help you understand and appreciate the play more? Explain.

Three responded positively, six negatively, and six in between.

One said, “I hated doing these. They were hard.”

Another stated, “I thought it was too long. This one I didn’t really feel that it helped. Maybe some literary terms more than others.”

5. What did you think about the efferent essay on literary devices and how they enhance the play? Did that assignment help you understand and appreciate the play more? Explain.

Two responded positively, ten negatively, and three in between.

To quote one student, “I don’t think the essay helped at all. I didn’t really like it because I just repeated what I had written for the notes.”

Another echoed similar distaste, “By the time I wrote this essay I didn’t like *Romeo and Juliet* anymore. The essay reflected the notes and those helped me.”

In contrast, one student said, “Yup, it did help me appreciate the play more, but it was a lot of work.”

7. If you could change anything we did to better understand and appreciate the play more, what would it be? Explain.

Four responded that nothing should change, while eleven shared ideas on how it should have been done differently.

One exclaimed, “I really wouldn’t change anything. It was an awesome unit.”

And another said, “I don’t think I would do anything different. I just might make it a shorter unit.”

A different response came from this student, “Keep the aesthetic journal questions and write only one essay. It seemed like a lot of work for one story.”

And still another shared, “Get rid of the efferent essay because the notes were enough to understand the play.”

Also, one admitted, “Less thinking and hard work.”

Lastly, one shared, “Go and watch it, see in real life the tragedy.”

### Unanticipated Results

Initially, I had expected more students than actually did to enjoy phase two, the efferent phase. Overwhelmingly, students expressed preference for phase one, the aesthetic phase. Many said the efferent phase, especially the efferent essay, was too hard, too much work, or redundant.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### Conclusion and Implications

#### Conclusion

Overall, the unit was successful, albeit four weeks or so too long. By the end of the ten weeks, they were over saturated with *Romeo and Juliet*, and they were more than ready for new material.

And yet, as a whole, they knew the play well, much better than in previous years when a combination of both approaches (aesthetic and efferent), neither in such depth, was used. The discussion, sharing, writing, and repetition of elements, all contributed to their enjoyment and understanding of the play.

Concerning the aesthetic approach, most students on the aesthetic composition gravitated toward the alternate ending, the extension, and expressing what they would have done if in the character's place. One might

presume these are the easiest of the choices. Overall, they performed these tasks well. Even more impressive were their aesthetic journal responses, which exhibited quick and in-depth engagement.

Concerning the efferent approach, I wondered why--for some--abstract thinking, regarding figurative language especially, as well as application of knowledge, was limited. Could it be that some may not be able to perform these thinking tasks because of developmental issues or lower I.Q., or a lack of motivation? Such determination is impossible regarding the scope of this study, even though it is intriguing. On a more positive note, by explaining and working with the literary devices in the context of the play, it was a wonderful review and self-check for their comprehension and attention to plot, characters, and detail. By doing so, it also remedied inaccurate conceptions and lapses in comprehension.

Importantly, the overall order worked well, considering the post-talk interviews as evidence. Since so many preferred the aesthetic approach, it was essential to use that approach first to get them engaged, which it obviously did. Because the Regents exam will ask them to show their knowledge of literary

devices, I was glad to see many of them exhibit an understanding of these, even though they may not appreciate explaining them.

As further evidence of the effectiveness of this approach, when I did *Romeo and Juliet* review for the January Midterm Exam, students performed exceptionally well as compared to other years with different approaches. Considering the accuracy, enthusiasm, and confidence with which they responded to questions on plot, characters, and literary terms, it was obvious that the overwhelming majority of students knew the play handily.

#### Implications for the Classroom

From now on, I will make a point of approaching a piece of literature first aesthetically, and then efferently. This study has proven to me its effectiveness, as so many experts in the field have already stressed. People like Cox and Many(1989, 1992), Kintgen (1983, 1986), and Rosenblatt (1978, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1991) know that engagement first through interaction between the reader and the text is essential. The experience first, and then the interpretation or analysis, both of which vary from reader to reader, is crucial. In reality, both

approaches naturally occur simultaneously, or in conjunction with one another, especially in experienced readers. However, when in the classroom, students may need guidance through the piece, and when this is true, the order of aesthetic and then efferent is preferable.

An important side note is that said approach is for academic reading, which is never purely aesthetic since an assessment is almost always attached. From my experiences with reading for pleasure only, engagement in the piece is most often purely aesthetic in nature. In order to interest the students and prepare them for the types of tasks the Regents has deemed necessary, however, the approach used in this study is advised.

Changes I plan on making in the future include cutting down on the number of literary devices covered. Instead of twenty-five devices, five to ten would be sufficient. Then, they probably would not be so overwhelmed with the amount of data and time needed to complete the tasks of defining terms, finding examples in the play, and explaining how they enhanced the play. Here, less may mean more, specifically in the areas of comprehension, application, and appreciation. The five devices, because of their frequency and importance to the story, I see as paramount are the following: characterization,

conflict, dramatic irony, foreshadowing, and theme. Maybe at the college level one could cover a number of devices like twenty-five, but for freshmen in high school, this was overly ambitious, much like a character flaw in one of Shakespeare's main characters in one of his other famous tragedies.

### Implications for Further Research

When looking at the lackluster performance during the efferent approach, one must consider possible causes. Further study might prove fruitful in the area of this type of thinking. Analytical and often abstract in nature, research into age related development of mental processes might reveal telling results. Or, could it be a lower overall intelligence level, regardless of age, that limits success in this approach? What about cultural apathy and indolence? Possibly, lack of prior knowledge of many of the devices made it overwhelming to learn and apply the new knowledge over a short period of time. Lastly, what about issues around sustained concentration and motivation over a ten-week period? Might any or all of these also contribute to lower interest in the play? All of these imply a need for further study.

A different technique that might also be successful is to use this approach with several pieces over the course of the year, starting with five devices, and then for the next text, adding five. Then, for the next text, adding five that apply so ten are used, but only five are new to the students, and so on. Such a scaffolding approach is also worthy of further study.

Another related area of interest would be a study into why certain students chose certain aesthetic response options over others, as well as why some chose certain literary devices over others. Issues around experience, prior knowledge, likes, dislikes, and learning styles may all be factors and areas of further research.

Lastly, the importance of finding a balance between enjoyment and analysis, engagement and assessment, is essential if we as educators are to both instruct and inspire. Our ultimate goals include preparing them for the academic tasks that loom ahead, but at the same time instilling a lifelong pursuit and enjoyment of reading. Are we up to the challenge?

### References

Blake, R., & Lunn, A. (1986). Responding to poetry: High school students read poetry. *English Journal*, 75(2), 68-73.

Bleich, D. (1975). *Readings and Feelings*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Cox, C., & Many, J.E. (1989, March). *Reader stance towards a literary work: Applying the transactional theory to children's responses*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Cox, C., & Many, J. E. (1992). Toward an understanding of the aesthetic response to literature. *Language Arts*, 69, 28-33.

Cooper, C.R. (Ed.). (1985). *Researching response to literature and the teaching and the teaching of literature*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cullinan, B.E., Harwood, K.T., & Galda, L. (1983). The reader and the story: Comprehension and response. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 16(3), 29-38.

Hynds, S. (1989). Bringing life to literature and literature to life: Social constructs and contexts of four adolescent readers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 23(1), 30-61.

Kintgen, E. (1983). *The perception of poetry*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kintgen, E. (1986). Expectations and processes in reading poetic narratives. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 4(1), 79-95.

Langer, J. (1990). The process of understanding: Reading for literary and informative purposes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24(3), 229-260.

Many, J.E. (1994). The effect of reader stance on students' personal understanding of literature. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. (pp. 653-667). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Purves, A. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1982). The literary transaction: Evocation and response. *Theory into Practice*, 21, 268-277.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1983). *Literature as exploration*. New York: MLA.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1985). The transactional theory of the literary work. In C.R. Cooper (Ed.), *Researching response to literature and the teaching of literature* (pp. 33-53). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1991). Literature—S.O.S.! *Language Arts*, 78(6), 444-448.

Stahl, S.A., & Hayes, D.A. (Eds.). (1997). *Instructional models in reading*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.



**APPENDIX A**  
**AESTHETIC DOCUMENTS**

## Romeo and Juliet

**Task:** Respond thoughtfully and thoroughly to all of the following:

10/28—Have you ever held a grudge? If so, explain. Why? Who was involved? How long? Was it ever resolved? How?

10/29—What's your opinion/experience of teenage love? Are teenagers capable of true love for one another? Explain.

10/30—Is love at first sight truly possible? Explain.

10/31—Suppose you were \_\_\_\_\_. Knowing what you know about the situations in the play, how would you feel/act now? (In the blank, put a character from Romeo and Juliet you would like to imagine taking the place of—put yourself in his or her situation.)

11/1—Visualize the Capulet masquerade party. What is it like? Describe it.

11/6—Pretend you are a friend of either Romeo or Juliet's. Give them advice regarding their relationship. Dear Romeo, ... or, Dear Juliet, ...

11/14—Do you think the Friar should have married Romeo and Juliet? Explain.

Imagine the Friar does not agree to marry Romeo and Juliet. How would they react? What would they do?

11/18—Remember a time when someone impugned your honor (words, gestures, or actions). What did you do? If you could do it over again, how would you react?

11/21/25—What is your take on what has happened so far (your opinion of the characters and their situation)?

12/2—Think of as many things as you can that could/might go wrong with Friar's plan.

12/4—At this point in the play, if you were Romeo or Juliet, what would you do?

October 28: I don't hold a grudge against many people. I am not that kind of person. If I have a problem with someone, I just talk to him or her about it. But if I know that that person has done something bad to me before, then I might hold it against them and not talk to them.

October 29: I think that teenagers are capable of true love. I know that I personally haven't experienced it yet but someday I think I will. I think teenage love can sometimes just be their hormones. Although, other teenagers may really be in love and it isn't their hormones.

October 30: I do not believe in love at first sight. I don't think it is possible. How can you see a person and instantly be in love with them? You don't know anything about their personality. A guy could be hot, but he could also be a complete jerk. I defiantly don't believe in love at first sight.

October 31: I am ROMEO. I would try and forget Rosaline and move onto better things. There are plenty of other girls that I could fall in love with. I am at a great party and I should spend my time finding a new lover as opposed to crying over the one I lost.

November 1: The Montague's house is full of people. There is a ton of food. The smell of the food is overwhelming. Everyone is elegantly dressed, as is the hall with its banners and flags. The dance floor is crowded with people.

November 6: Dear Romeo,

I hope that you find a new love. Rosaline isn't worth crying over and wasting your life. There are plenty of other fish in the sea, if you know what I mean!!!

Your Friend,

Benevolio

November 14: 1. Yes, I think that the Friar should have married Romeo and Juliet because it is what they wanted. They loved each other. Juliet would've ended up marrying Paris if she didn't marry Romeo. She loved Romeo and not Paris so it was better for her to be married to Romeo.

2. I think that Romeo and Juliet would have rebelled and would have run away and gotten married anyway. This would have caused even more heartbreak for the two families. If the Friar refused to marry them, I think that they both would be losing a well-trusted friend and confidant.

November 18: Megan and Stephanie made me cry. So I made them cry. We were in third grade and when I came out of the bathroom that told me we had to talk. I then started to cry. We have had our ups and downs since then. We are pretty good friends now. If I could do it over again I wouldn't have gone to the bathroom in the first place.

November 25: My take/opinions of the characters and their situation are that Romeo is in trouble with the law and can't see his love Juliet. Juliet is madly in love with Romeo. Lady Capulet and Capulet along with Lady Montague and Montague are extremely

stubborn and need to get over their life-long grudges. Friar is caught in the middle of everything along with the Nurse.

December 2: Romeo doesn't get the letter because Friar John doesn't get there to deliver it. The Nurse could find out the plan and not leave Juliet alone. The Prince could find Romeo while Romeo is trying to wake Juliet up. The potion that Juliet drinks could kill her.

December 4: If I was Romeo, I would have to go find out for myself if Juliet was dead. If I found out that she was dead, then I would grieve but I wouldn't kill myself. I only knew her for a couple days anyway. I could fall in love with someone else. If Juliet wasn't dead then I would be extremely happy and we would run away to Mantua.

## **Romeo and Juliet**

**Task:** In a total of 500 words or more, write well thought out and detailed responses to *any three* of the following. Use the accompanying rubric to guide you. Value = 15% of second marking period grade. No late papers accepted.

- What were your predominant feelings during and after the play?
- What were your predominant thoughts during and after the play?
- What were your predominant visual images during and after the play?
- What were you reminded of during and after the play?
- What have you learned about yourself as a result of reading the play?
- What have you learned about people (the human race) as a result of reading the play?
- In what ways have you been changed, or affected, by reading the play?
- In what ways have you experienced anything similar in your own life to any of the characters' experiences/feelings/thoughts?
- What is your personal interpretation/opinion of the play?
- Write an alternate ending to the play.
- Write an extension to the play. What happens next?

Required First Draft Due Date (with self-evaluation rubric score): \_\_\_\_\_

Required Final Draft Due Date (with self-evaluation rubric score): \_\_\_\_\_

## Aesthetic Composition Rubric (Romeo & Juliet)

	4	3	2	1
<b>Meaning</b>	Responses appropriately convey insightful & engaging experiences, ideas, and/or feelings.	Responses appropriately convey effective experiences, ideas, and/or feelings.	Responses convey some experiences, ideas, and/or feelings.	Responses convey very limited and/or unrelated experiences, ideas, and/or feelings.
<b>Organization</b>	Responses are clearly organized and very easy to follow.	Responses are organized and easy to follow.	Responses are somewhat organized and fairly easy to follow.	Responses are disorganized and difficult to follow.
<b>Language Use</b>	Responses are conveyed with evocative and commanding language skills (words, phrasing, sentencing, paragraphing, voice).	Responses are conveyed with accurate and interesting language skills (words, phrasing, sentencing, paragraphing, voice).	Responses are conveyed with limited language skills (words, phrasing, sentencing, paragraphing, voice).	Responses are conveyed with very limited language skills (words, phrasing, sentencing, paragraphing, voice).
<b>Development</b>	Responses are fully developed with vivid and specific description and details.	Responses are fairly developed with specific description and details.	Responses are underdeveloped; lacks specific description and details.	Responses are severely underdeveloped; lacks specific description and details.
<b>Conventions</b>	Responses accurately follow the conventions of English, which enhances the message (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, usage, grammar).	For the most part, responses follow the conventions of English; message is easily maintained (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, usage, grammar).	Responses' messages are somewhat unclear because of errors in the conventions of English (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, usage, grammar)	Responses' messages are extremely unclear because of many errors in the conventions of English (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, usage, grammar).

In the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, William Shakespeare wrote a poetic romance called The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet. Little did Shakespeare know that his play would become a world-renowned love story. After analyzing The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, one could find many various ways to react to it. I will be discussing what I was reminded of during the play, my views on the human race as a whole, and how the tragedy could have ended differently.

While reading Romeo and Juliet, I am reminded of many things. For me, the most <sup>awk</sup> forward thought in the reading is how teenagers have to make major decisions. Take Juliet, for example. She had just reached the age of thirteen and already had a suitor, Paris. Romeo, not much older, had already had his heart broken by Rosaline. But then one night, at the Capulet's masquerade party, Romeo and Juliet meet and fall in love. How is it possible that kids that young know that they've found "the one"? Another decision that Romeo made was to fight Tybalt. He knew that the fight would only end in someone's death. Fortunately, Romeo was not killed as his punishment for killing Tybalt. Instead, he was banished to Mantua, away from his lady Juliet. Juliet's decision to fake her death, without forwarning Romeo, led to the fatal conclusion of the play. During Romeo and Juliet, I am reminded that decisions made by teenagers aren't always logical. The characters that age, and teenagers now, sometimes make rash, emotional decisions.

True



Not only is a reader ~~be~~ reminded of the consequences of major decisions, they can also draw conclusions about the human race as a whole. My interpretation of the human race in this play is that they are unyielding and extremely stubborn. The ongoing grudge that the Montague's and the Capulet's held against each other was ridiculous. Because of the grudge, that neither family could remember the basis of, they lost their only children, Romeo and Juliet. I mean, if the Montague's and the Capulet's had tried to get along during their own lifetime as opposed to just hating each other, they might have actually liked each other. The only characters in the play that didn't hold the grudge against each other were Romeo Montague, Juliet Capulet, and Friar Lawrence. Romeo and Juliet loved each other and the Friar acknowledged their love and so he married them. He accepted their love even though he knew they had been taught to hate each other. The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet would have ended differently if the Montague's and the Capulet's hadn't held their grudges.

There are many ways that the tragedy could have ended. William Shakespeare chose for the play to end with the unresolved conflicts between the two families causing death of the two main characters, Romeo and Juliet. If I were Shakespeare, I would have ended the play differently, on a happier note.

In my ending of Romeo and Juliet, I would have had Friar John successfully deliver the letter to Romeo in Mantua. Romeo would have raced back to his loves tomb as if she were really <sup>confess</sup> dead. When he arrived in Verona, he would have helped Juliet wake up from her deep slumber. Unfortunately, when Romeo and Juliet were making their getaway back to Mantua, the County Paris shows up. Paris is extremely angry because his love was supposed to be dead and is now alive and running off with the enemy! Romeo and Juliet jump on the back of Romeo's horse and gallop away. Paris climbs onto his carriage and follows them. In Paris' attempt to reclaim Juliet,

he grabs her from the back of the horse. Romeo holds onto Juliet and she is dangling between the horse and the carriage. Romeo throws a solid punch at Paris. Paris loses his balance and releases his grip on Juliet. Romeo and Juliet ride away into the sunset and live happily ever after in Mantua!

While looking at The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, a reader is reminded of many things including how ~~the~~ rash teenage decisions can affect your life, and how “bull-headed” the human race can be. During the play when Mercutio and Tybalt are fighting, and right before Mercutio dies, he shouts, “...a plague on both your houses!” Because of the grudge and the fighting between the Capulet’s and the Montague’s, Mercutio dies. The play taught me that you should “love thine neighbor as <sup>thy</sup> yourself.” If everyone <sup>try</sup> tries this, then the world would be a better place.

**APPENDIX B**  
**EFFERENT DOCUMENTS**

## **Romeo and Juliet Essay Notes**

**Task:** On loose-leaf paper, (a.) define the following literary terms and devices. Use your textbook glossary for help (p. 946). After each definition, (b.) write at least one example from Shakespeare's play, *Romeo and Juliet*. After each example, (c.) explain how it enhances, or helps the play. For the underlined ones, (d.) find at least three examples (with explanation for each how it enhances the play). Value = 10% of second marking period grade. No late papers accepted.

1. alliteration
2. allusion
3. blank verse
4. characterization
5. conflict
6. connotation
7. dramatic irony
8. extended metaphor
9. figurative language
10. foreshadowing
11. imagery
12. metaphor
13. meter (especially iambic pentameter)
14. monologue
15. mood
16. motivation
17. personification
18. rhyme
19. rhyme scheme

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

English 9

Mr. Delehanty

PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

20. setting

21. simile

22. soliloquy

23. symbol

24. theme

25. tragedy

Due Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. **Alliteration:** repetition of the beginning sounds of a word more than 3 times.
  - Pg. 705 184: Juliet. "Good night, good night! Parting is such sweet sorrow!"
  - The alliteration enhances the story by adding a musical effect and heightens the mood of the play.
  
2. **Allusion:** a well-known person, place or event that the readers can relate to.
  - Pg. 709 40: Mercutio. "Dido a dowdy, Cleopatra a gypsy, Helen and Hero hildings and harlots."
  - Pg. 707 65: Friar. "Holy Saint Francis!"
  - Pg. 702 93: Juliet. "They say Jove laughs."
  - The allusion enhances the story by helping the reader to better understand what the author is trying to say.
  
3. **Blank Verse:** poetry that doesn't rhyme.
  - Pg. 725 152: Benvolio. "With gentle breath, calm look, knees humbly bowed..."
  - The blank verse enhances the story by making the story more musical to the reader's ear.
  
4. **Characterization:** act of creating and developing a character.
  - Pg. 725 131: Citizen. "Tybalt, that murder, which way ran he?"
  - Pg. 699 33: Mercutio. "If love be blind, love cannot hit the mark."
  - Pg. 706 47: Friar. "That's my good son! But where hast thou been then?"
  - Blank verse increases the level of interest.
  
5. **Conflict:** a struggle between opposing forces: internal or external.
  - Pg. 680 195: Romeo. "In sadness, cousin, I do love a woman."
  - Pg: 675 54: Sampson. "Draw, if you be men, Gregory, remember thy swashing plow!"
  - Pg. 674 29: Gregory. "Draw thy too!"
  - Conflict adds suspense and allows the reader to know that the characters went through the same things they do.
  
6. **Connotation:** the different aspects of a word; the feelings and thoughts that the reader has towards that word.
  - Pg. 739 100: Juliet. "Abhors"
  - Abhors reminds me of how much hate there is in the world and how much hate there is in love.
  - Words the readers can relate and feel to.

7. Dramatic Irony: a contradiction between what a character knows or what the reader knows to be true.

- Pg. 761 18: Balthasar. "Her body sleeps in Capet's monument and her immortal part with angels live."
- Dramatic irony adds tension and excitement.

8. Extended metaphor: a figure of speech is compared to something else.

- Pg. 686 81-88: Lady Capulet. "Read o'er the volume of young Paris' face... to beautify him only lacks a cover."
- Pg. 731 17-18: Romeo. "There is no world without Verona walls, but purgatory, torture, hell itself."
- Pg. 703 133: Juliet. "My bounty is as boundless as the sea."
- Adds a clear picture and sounds more poetic.

9. Figurative language: writing or speech not meant to be interpreted literally.

- Pg. 752 15-16: Juliet. "I have a faint cold fear thrills through my veins that almost freezes up the heat of life."
- Adds more depth and is poetic... not meant to be taken literally.

10. Foreshadowing: clues or hints that forecast future events.

- Pg. 724 138: Romeo. "I am fortune's fool!"
- Pg. 761 6: Romeo. "I dreamt my lady came and found me dead."
- Pg. 762 34: Romeo. "Well, Juliet, I will lie with thee tonight."
- Foreshadowing lets the reader know that bad things lie ahead.

11. Imagery: the descriptive or figurative language used in literature to create word pictures for the reader.

- Pg. 767 94-96: Romeo. "Thou art not conquered. Beauty's ensign yet is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks, and death's pale flag is not advanced there."
- Creates a picture in the readers head and helps them better understand what is happening.

12. Metaphor: comparison, directly comparing two things, not using like or as.

- Pg. 680 76: Nurse. "As all the world-why, he's a man of wax."
- Pg. 686 78: Nurse. "Nay, he's a flower, in faith- a very flower."
- Pg. 683 87: Benvolio. "And I will make thee thing thy swan a crow."
- Gives depth and feeling of the speaker and to the reader.

13. Meter: musical pattern, beat of 10.

- Pg. 723 88: Mercutio. "A plague a both houses! I am sped!"
- Pg. 737 42: Romeo. "Farewell, farewell! One kiss, and I'll descend."
- Pg. 739 112: Juliet. "Madam, in happy time! What day is that?"
- Adds musical sound and beat to the words.

14. Monologue: a speech given by a character in a play, story, or poem.
- Pg. 742 178-197: Capulet. "God's bread! It makes me mad... Trust to't. Bethink you. I'll not be forsworn."
  - Pg. 766 74-120: Romeo. "In faith, I will. Let me peruse this face... Thy drugs are quick. Thus with a kiss I die."
  - Pg. 771 229-268: Friar. "I will be brief, for my short date of breath... unto the rigor of severest law."
  - Add summary and emotion to the play.
15. Mood: feeling created by a passage to the reader.
- Pg. 769 148-150: Juliet. "O comfortable friar! Where is my lord? I do remember well where I should be, and there I am. Where is my Romeo?"
  - The writer makes us feel in a certain way, emotionally.
16. Motivation: reason that explains or partially explains why a character thinks, feels, acts, or behaves in a certain way.
- Pg. 691 15-32: Capulet. "Welcome gentlemen! Ladies that have their toes... were in a mask?"
  - Helps you understand the characters.
17. Personification: type of figurative language in which a non-human subject is given human characteristics.
- Pg. 680 199-297: Romeo. "Well, in that hit you miss. She'll not be hit with Cupid's arrow... that, when she dies, with beauty dies her store."
  - Pg. 681 14-28: Capulet. "Earth hath swallowed all my hopes but she... Of limping Winter treads, even such delight."
  - Pg. 689 53-69: Mercutio. "O, Then I see Queen Mab hath been with you... Time out o' mind the fairies coachmakers."
  - Lets us have a deeper understanding.
18. Rhyme: repetition of sounds at the end of words.
- Pg. 681 24-25: Capulet. "At my poor house look to behold this night, Earth treading starts that make dark heaven light."
  - Pg. 686 89-90: Lady Capulet. "The fish lives in the sea, and 'tis much pride, for fair without the fair within to hide."
  - Pg. 705 9-10: Friar. "The earth that's nature's mother is her tomb. What is her burying grave, that is her womb."
  - Adds poetic ness and it is interesting to hear.
19. Rhyme Scene: a regular pattern of rhyming words in a poem. (aabb stanza)
- Pg. 680 199-203: Romeo. "Well, in that hit you miss. She'll not be hit with Cupid's arrow... From Love's weak childish bow she lives uncharmed."
  - Adds a musical quality.



20. **Setting:** time and place of the action, past, present, future, specific dates.
- Pg. 673 2: Chorus. "In fair Verona, where we lay our scene."
  - Lets you visualize the place and the characters.
21. **Simile:** figure of speech in which like or as are used to compare two basically unlike ideas.
- Pg. 723 92-93: Mercutio. "No, 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door; but 'tis enough."
  - Pg. 687 6: Benvolio. "Scaring the ladies like a crowkeeper."
  - Pg. 692 44-45: Romeo. "It seems she hangs upon the cheek of night as a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear."
  - Adds more details, more visuals, and depth.
22. **Soliloquy:** a long speech expressing the characters thoughts and feelings while they are alone onstage.
- Pg. 705 1-22: Friar. "The gray-eyed morn smiles on the frowning night... And vice sometime by action dignified."
  - Pg. 727 1-31: Juliet. "Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds... and may not wear them. O, here comes my nurse."
  - Pg. 766 74-120: Romeo. "In faith, I will. Let me peruse this face... Thy drugs are quick. Thus with a kiss I die!"
  - Helps us to know the inner thought and feelings of the characters.
23. **Symbol:** anything that stands for something else.
- Pg. 678 163: Romeo. "Alas that love, whose view is muffled still."
  - Helps the reader understand and related to what the author is talking about.
24. **Theme:** a message or moral woven throughout and revealed throughout the story.
- Pg. 774 290-292: Prince. "Where be these enemies? Capulet, Montague... That heaven finds means to kill your joys with love."
  - Pg. 734 108-158: Friar. "Hold thy desperate hand... Romeo is coming."
  - Pg. 707 65-80: Friar. "Holy Saint Francis! What a change is here... Women may fall when there's no strength in men."
  - Tells you the purpose of the story.
25. **Tragedy:** literature that results in a catastrophe for the main characters.
- Pg. 768 120: Romeo. "Thy drugs are quick. Thus with a kiss I die!"
  - Makes the story more suspenseful while you are waiting for something to happen.

## Romeo and Juliet Essay

**Task:** In a total of 500 words or more, write a well thought out and detailed essay in which you “Explain how Shakespeare’s use of literary devices enhances his play, *Romeo and Juliet*.” Use the accompanying rubric to guide you. Value = 15% of second marking period grade. No late papers accepted.

Choose **any three literary devices** from the following list to use as evidence: (Use the glossary in your textbook—page 946—for definitions and examples, as well as your notes.)

alliteration    allusion    blank verse    characterization    conflict  
connotation    dramatic irony    extended metaphor    figurative language  
foreshadowing    imagery    metaphor    meter    monologue    mood  
motivation    personification    rhyme    rhyme scheme    setting  
simile    soliloquy    symbol    theme    tragedy

Required Rough Draft Due Date (with self-evaluation rubric score) \_\_\_\_\_

Required Final Draft Due Date (with self-evaluation rubric score) \_\_\_\_\_

## *Romeo and Juliet* Efferent Essay Scoring Rubric

<b><u>QUALITY</u></b>	<b>6 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>5 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>4 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>3 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>2 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>1 Responses at this level:</b>
<b><u>Meaning:</u> the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding -ing, interpretation, and analysis of the task and text.</b>	-provide a thesis that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis -use the criteria to make insightful analysis of the text.	-provide a thesis that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis -use the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of the text.	-provide a reasonable thesis that establishes the criteria for analysis -make implicit connections between criteria and the text.	-provide a simple thesis that suggests some criteria for analysis -make superficial connections between criteria and the text.	-provide a confused or incomplete thesis -may allude to the thesis but do not use it to analyze the text.	-do not refer to the thesis -reflect minimal or no analysis of the text.
<b><u>Development:</u> the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the text.</b>	-develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from the text.	-develop ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from the text.	-develop some ideas more fully than others, with reference to relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from the text.	-develop ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text. -may rely primarily on plot summary.	-are incomplete or largely underdeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the text are vague, irrelevant, repetitive, or unjustified.	-are minimal, with no evidence of development.
<b><u>Organization:</u> the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence.</b>	-maintain the focus established by the thesis. -exhibit a logical and coherent structure through skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions.	-maintain the focus established by the thesis. -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through use of appropriate devices and transitions.	-maintain a clear and appropriate focus. -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas, but may lack internal consistency.	-establish, but fail to maintain, an appropriate focus. -exhibit a rudimentary structure, but may include some inconsistencies or irrelevancies.	-lack an appropriate focus, but suggest some organization, or suggest a focus but lack organization.	-show no focus or organization.

**Romeo and Juliet Efferent Essay Scoring Rubric**

<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>6 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>5 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>4 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>3 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>2 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>1 Responses at this level:</b>
<b><u>Language Use:</u> the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety.</b>	-are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose. -vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning.	-use language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose. -vary structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing.	-use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose. -occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length.	-rely on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose. -exhibit some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success.	-use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose. -reveal little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect.	-are minimal. -use language that is incoherent or inappropriate
<b><u>Conventions:</u> the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage.</b>	-demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.	-demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language.	-demonstrate partial control, exhibiting errors that do not hinder comprehension.	-demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension.	-demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult.	-are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable. -may be illegible or not recognizable as English.

Adapted from pamphlet: "Session Two, FOR TEACHERS ONLY. The University of the State of New York, REGENTS HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION, ENGLISH, Thursday, August 17, 2000, SCORING KEY AND RATING GUIDE."

“A pair of star-crossed lovers take their life; whose misadventured piteous overthrows doth with their death bury their parents strife.” (Prologue, Lines 6-9) From reading this quote, a reader could assume many things or have many questions. In William Shakespeare’s 16<sup>th</sup> century play, The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, Shakespeare uses literary devices to enhance his play. By adding these literary devices, Shakespeare can help his readers, or the audience, to better understand the play.

One example of a literary device that Shakespeare used is dramatic irony. Dramatic irony is a contradiction between what the character knows and what the reader knows to be true. In ~~Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet~~, (Act V, Scene i, Lines 18-19), Balthasar goes to Mantua and tells Romeo about Juliet. “Her body sleeps in Capels’ monument, and her immortal part with angels live,” says Balthasar. He is telling Romeo that Juliet is dead, but we, as the reader, know about Friar Lawrence’s plan and that Juliet is just in a deep sleep. Another example of dramatic irony is when Lady Capulet tells Juliet that she is to marry County Paris. <sup>she is not</sup> (Act III, Scene v, Lines 113-116), “Marry, my child, early next Thursday morn, the gallant, young, and noble gentleman, The County Paris, at Saint Peter’s Church, shall happily make thee there a joyful bride.” This is dramatic irony because we know that Juliet is already married to her family’s enemy, Romeo. But Juliet’s parents do not know which is why they arranged Juliet’s marriage to County Paris. Dramatic irony helps the reader by adding tension and excitement but it also specifically makes the characters not know what is happening in their own story.

Another literary device besides dramatic irony is foreshadowing. Foreshadowing is a literary device that gives clues or hints that forecast future events. One way Shakespeare does this is when Juliet and Romeo have just had their honeymoon night in Juliet’s bedroom and it is time for Romeo to leave. (Act III, Scene v, Lines 54-57), Juliet says to Romeo, “O God, I have an ill-divining soul! Methinks I see thee, now thou art so low, as one dead in the bottom of a tomb. Either my eyesight fails, or thou lookest pale.”

/ = new part

Juliet just predicted that Romeo would be dead the next time they see each other. Then later in the play, Romeo does end up being dead by the time Juliet sees him next. Another time Shakespeare uses foreshadowing is when Romeo has just fought Tybalt because Tybalt killed his friend Mercutio. When Tybalt falls down dead, Romeo screams, "I am fortune's fool!" (Act III, Scene i, Line 131). Romeo yells this because he has just married Juliet and now because he killed Tybalt, he knows he will have to be banished away from Juliet. As Romeo predicted, he is banished to Mantua, away from Juliet. Foreshadowing lets the reader know that something will happen in the future and specifically that the character will start to have things go wrong for him or her.

In The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, Shakespeare also used the literary device of soliloquy. A soliloquy is a long speech expressing the character's thoughts and feelings while they are alone onstage. After Juliet has married Romeo, she is awaiting the night so that she and Romeo can be together, (Act III, Scene ii, Lines 1-31). Juliet says, "Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds, towards Phoebus' lodging! Such a wagoner as Phaeton would whip you to the west and bring in cloudy night immediately...so tedious is this day as is the night before some festival to an impatient child that hath new robes and may not wear them. O, here comes my nurse." She is talking about how the day can't seem to end and she can't wait to be with Romeo. Juliet is very impatient about waiting for the time when they can be together and compares it to when a child has new clothes and can't wear them yet. Another example of Shakespeare's use of soliloquy is when Romeo comes back from Mantua and finds Juliet dead, (Act V, Scene iii, Lines 74-120). "In faith, I will. Let me peruse this face...Here's to my love! O true apothecary! Thy drugs are quick. Thus with a kiss I die," says Romeo. In the beginning of this soliloquy, Romeo is talking to the dead County Paris. He doesn't lay County Paris with Juliet because that is where Romeo wanted to lie. Romeo then goes on to talk to the supposedly dead Juliet, saying how even though she is dead, she is still incredibly beautiful. Then Romeo picks up the poison and drinks it and dies, just as Juliet is stirring from her sleep. A soliloquy helps the reader understand the innermost feelings of a character and specifically helps the reader to know exactly what the character is going through.

The enhancement and understanding of a play really depends on how a writer uses the literary tools to their benefit. Shakespeare does a wonderful job of portraying his tragic love-story uses the literary devices of dramatic irony, foreshadowing, and soliloquy. Dramatic irony helps the reader by stay more into the play by adding tension and excitement. Foreshadowing helps the reader by giving them clues to what might happen next but without telling everything. By helping the reader to know and understand the characters' problems or feelings, soliloquy can help the reader relate to what is going on in the play. These three literary devices help make The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet such a well-known piece of literature.