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Shakespeare is often a hurdle over which many of our students must “fall down, or else o'erleap” as his works endure as standard core texts across many grade and ability levels of high school English. Yet, despite his popularity amongst English scholars, teachers, and curriculum administrators, Shakespeare remains most unpopular with our students—especially amongst our reluctant readers. To bridge the gap, we must ask ourselves: how can we engage reluctant readers with these challenging 400-year-old plays? This thesis will delineate my experiences exploring three avenues of student engagement with the Bard’s work in my tenth grade English classroom including media and technology, writing, and physical performance.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

“Our doubts are traitors,
and make us lose the good we oft might win,
by fearing to attempt.”
— William Shakespeare, Measure for Measure

I met Will in ninth grade and immediately hated him. I argued with my teacher daily while we read Julius Caesar in class. What made Shakespeare so great? Why did we have to read such difficult texts every year? What was the point? In college everything changed. In rigorously thorough courses with Dr. Robert Hume and Dr. Laura Knoppers, I fell in love with Will. Returning to the classroom as a secondary educator, I felt prepared to teach Shakespeare. That was until I faced the reluctant readers of my 21st century classroom.

Seconds before the bell rings each morning, Rachel hustles to her seat in my first period class. While the televised morning announcements play, Rachel lays her pink iPhone across her lap and carefully spins each curled lock of her long blond hair into place with her forefinger and thumb. One morning in late fall, Rachel noticed my hefty Shakespeare anthology as I unloaded it from my briefcase. She shot an uneasy glance towards the tome and asked, “Ew... We’re not reading Shakespeare this year, are we?”

I laughed and answered, “Sure we are! But don’t worry, it’s a cool play: Macbeth.”

“Cool?” she asked, “That’s what they said about Romeo and Juliet but that play seriously sucked.”
“Well,” I answered nervously, “I’m planning our unit on Macbeth now and I’ll be sure to make it fun. What would make it better for you?”

“Honestly,” Rachel admitted, “I don’t think anything could make me understand Shakespeare. I really hate it.”

By this point, several students in Rachel’s corner were listening intently.

One, verging on anger, asked, “Why do we even have to learn Shakespeare?” while another added, “Yeah! It’s so stupid and boring.”

As quickly as the conversation had escalated I ended it citing our need to start class. In all actuality I just did not know how to respond. Shakespeare stupid, boring, and uncool? Having spent the last three years up to my neck in English literature studies, the very thought struck me as blasphemous. Tough crowd. What was I going to do?

Pedagogical Contexts for Engagement with Shakespeare

For weeks following this early morning ambush, questions were swirling and my head was spinning. I began questioning everything. Why do we teach Shakespeare? Do my students need to like Shakespeare? Does any of it matter? One thought kept resurfacing: How can I engage my reluctant readers with Shakespeare? After weeks of rumination and planning, I found myself completely absorbed with the idea of engagement. Thus, I decided to make engagement the primary endeavor of my unit and the subsequent focus of this thesis.

As a beginning teacher, I had often been offered the buzzword “engagement” as the answer to many pedagogical challenges. Throughout my undergraduate studies, I had consistently and sometimes rather blithely been encouraged to “engage students with the text” to achieve effective and meaningful instruction. When I think of engagement, I see students burying their noses in everything I hand them. I imagine enthusiastic and thoughtful class discussions and
lively student interactions. I envision students lingering in their seats after the bell, hesitant to close their copies of dog-eared, heavily annotated classics. But beyond my idealistic musings, I had to wonder: what exactly is engagement and why is it important?

To begin exploring engagement, I turned to the literature. I wondered how are other educators and scholars defining engagement? What does it mean to them? Ellen Skinner and Michael Belmont’s definition of engagement is one of the more thorough and detailed explanations in the body of literature surrounding engagement that resonated with my classroom experiences. They write:

[Students] who are engaged show sustained behavioral involvement in learning activities accompanied by a positive emotional tone. They select tasks at the border of their competencies, initiate action when given the opportunity, and exert intense effort and concentration in the implementation of learning tasks; they show generally positive emotions during ongoing action, including enthusiasm, optimism, curiosity, and interest (572).

In their article “Strengthening Student Engagement: What Do Students Want (and what really motivates them),” Richard Strong, Harvey F. Silver and Amy Robinson add to this definition:

[Students] who are engaged in their work are driven by four essential goals, each of which satisfies a particular human need:

- Success (the need for mastery)
- Curiosity (the need for understanding)
- Originality (the need for self-expression)
- Relationships (the need for involvement with others) (8-12).

Strong, Silver, and Robinson’s description of engagement resonated with both my teaching philosophy and my goals for the unit. With everything I planned, I wanted students to understand and master the content, express themselves, and collaborate with others. I also wanted students to
relate to what they read. And so, for a more comprehensive working definition of engagement, I add Claudia Geocaris’ defining characteristic of authenticity which she describes as “students’ need to see the links between the material they're studying and the real world, and to make connections with their own experiences… the tasks we ask students to carry out should, to the extent possible, be connected with the world of work, academe, the arts, and local communities” (72). Therefore, observations of engagement in this thesis will be characterized by students’ enthusiastic and sustained participation in classroom activities driven by a sense of mastery, understanding, originality, relationships, and authenticity.

Thus, the aim of this thesis is to describe how student engagement was achieved in my classroom and to explore how the demonstrated engagement characterizes some connections to thinking and learning. I designed my unit around three avenues to student engagement: media and technology, intertextuality, and physical performance. Each of these domains will be explored for its affects on student engagement. It is my sincere belief that many of these activities that attempt to engage students with Shakespeare’s work could be successfully adapted to other, more modern texts. Pseudonyms have been used however student work cited remains unaltered.

**My Self and My Students**

In partnership with the State College Area School District, Penn State operates Professional Development Schools at the local elementary, middle, and high schools. The PDS program places undergraduate and graduate interns with experienced mentors in grades nine through twelve for an entire school year. These intern-mentor pairs collaboratively teach three to four periods a day across all grade and ability levels.

As a secondary English education major, I applied and was accepted to intern at the high school PDS for the entirety of my senior year. My mentor teacher, Mrs. Motter, and I teach two
periods of Advanced English 10 and two periods of English 10. English 10 is the lowest level tenth grade English course at State High. Accordingly, our sixth period is part of State High’s Collaborative Teaching Initiative (CTI). In a CTI class, one third of students are identified as having special needs, one third are reading identified, and one third are non-identified students. At the beginning of the year, several of our students were transitioning out of their learning support program, a few students were identified as having autism, ADHD, and specific learning disorders, and several other students were wards of the state.

**Reading Survey**

But who were these students and what did they bring with them into my classroom? While I entered my classroom as a 21-year-old college student, I worried that the disconnect between my students and I might still be insurmountable. Luckily, during the first month of class, I was assigned to collect reading data from all of my students. This data was later compiled across all grade levels to detail the types of reading our students completed outside of school. For my purposes, the data collection itself was the most illuminating of my students’ reading.

Around the third week of class, I ventured out into my classroom with only a list of names on a clipboard. Over the course of a few days I casually approached students before and after class or while they worked on in-class assignments. I told them that I was collecting information on their reading habits to understand them better. Finally, I asked, “What do you read outside of school?” At first, only a few students ventured book titles, authors, genres they had been reading. 22 of my 30 English 10 students said they rarely or never read outside of school. Most of these students also expressed a strong dislike of reading. I worked with these students to expand their definition of reading beyond books. I asked them if they read newspapers, magazines or online articles. I also asked about blogs, social media, and memes.
Most of these students quickly found examples of reading they do outside of class. Still, several students remained adamant that they never read outside of school.

This survey data helped me to develop an early understanding of my students as readers. First, I came to learn that the majority of my students believed that reading was only done with a book in hand and that they very much disliked this type of reading. I also realized how much of my students’ outside activities, including reading, revolved around media and technology. When the definition of reading was expanded to include online media, many students jumped to report reading data.

**Shakespeare Survey**

I still wanted to know more. Specifically, I wondered what experience with Shakespeare my students brought with them into our classroom. First, I wanted to know what Shakespeare they had read. I also wanted to know how positive or negative those experiences were for them and why. Accordingly, I composed an online Google Docs survey with the following questions:

Which Shakespeare play(s) have you read before?

Do you like to read Shakespeare? Explain why or why not.

Do you think Shakespeare should be taught in school?

Some of the longest answers my students ventured were in response to the question: “Do you like to read Shakespeare? Explain why or why not.” The large majority of my students answered they did not. Some examples include:

“[T]o be honest I hate Shakespeare with a passion his writing is terrible”

“No, the word choice he uses drive [sic] me insane because I don't understand most of it.”

“No. I don't really see how it is relevant or how it will help me in the future which is really what school is all about.”

“No it was difficult to understand because of the old style of writing.”
The number of students who expressed difficulty with understanding Shakespeare’s language quickly and clearly emerged as a pattern. Also, several students noted how “irrelevant” they found Shakespeare to their lives. Based on the frequency of these similar responses, I focused on two primary goals for my Macbeth unit. First, I wanted to help students work both with and around Shakespeare’s difficult language. In doing so, I hoped to foster a sense of mastery and understanding that might push students to engage with the text even further.

With the language hurdle cleared, I also wanted students to analyze Shakespeare’s mastery of plot, themes and his portrayal of the human condition. I aimed to encourage students to make authentic connections to their own lives using both the text and their experiences with media paired with their own mastery of technology. As a whole, I needed to encourage students to actively and enthusiastically engage with the text despite their anxieties, incompetence, and reluctance. But how? I decided to explore three unique, yet convergent, avenues of classroom activities—media and technology, writing, and physical performance—for their effects on student engagement.
Chapter 2

“Plugging-in” to the Text: Media and Technology

From my early interaction with Rachel and the survey data, I expected a primary reaction from my students on the first day of my unit: reluctance. I knew that my students had not read Shakespeare for over a year, so I struggled with how I might reintroduce the Bard in an engaging, non-intimidating way. Yet, also from the reading data and my interactions with students, I knew one domain in which my students experienced little to no apprehension: media and technology. Stephanie Olsen reports that the average American teenager makes a “full-time job” of media consumption by spending roughly seventy-two hours per week plugged into “electronic media—defined as the Internet, cell phones, television, music and video games. Because teens are known for multitasking, their usage of devices can overlap” (Olsen, "Teens and Media: A Full-time Job"). Accordingly, I planned my entire first day (and most of my unit) around media and technology. These activities will be described and analyzed for their characteristics of student engagement.

All the World’s Our Stage

On a Monday, I introduced my plans for the first week as “Re-connecting with Will.” I began with the survey detailed in the previous chapter. While students set up their unit Google Docs (which will be analyzed under the lens of engagement with writing later), I quickly scanned the survey data and noticed the aforementioned patterns. Specifically, many students expressed apprehension about tackling Shakespeare’s difficult language. According to these responses, students were, in fact, reluctant to start reading Shakespeare. Thus, I aimed to show students that
they could understand Shakespeare without tedious line-by-line analysis. I hoped that by doing so students would begin to acquire a sense of mastery and understanding, leading them to be less reluctant to read. Michael LoMonico suggests, “It is more important to get students to like Shakespeare that it is to get them to understand every word.” (Shakespearean Ruminations and Innovations). I wanted my students to learn from reading Shakespeare not just to like Shakespeare. But, in terms of engagement, getting them to like Shakespeare seemed like a step in the right direction.

On the overhead screen, I projected Jacques’ “All the World’s a Stage” monologue from Shakespeare’s As You Like It. I explained to my students that this rather long chunk of text was from a “melancholy party-pooper in one of Shakespeare’s ‘sillier’ plays.” I further explained that in this monologue Jacques is lamenting life and comparing it to a stage production. With only this basic context established, I started reading aloud. As I read, I acted out several of the “ages of man,” cradling an invisible baby in my arms, dragging my feet to school, hunching my back, and pulling at my tights. Then, I held up seven fingers. I asked students to list each age in chronological order. Students readily shouted out answers and quickly covered each age.

I wrote numbers one through seven on the board and let students come up to sign up in pairs to each age. I instructed students to open the Google Doc I had shared with them and insert up to three images that matched their numbered lines and corresponding age. Without any further instruction, I stepped aside and students began to work.

During first period, students did not ask a single question about the text. Students spent over 25 minutes clicking around Google Images to find images to match their stages. Several students had their cell phones out. I did not know whether or not they were using them for the assignment but I abstained from interfering with their work. Instead, I walked around quietly, peaking at the Google Doc and their computer screens. Several times students asked me about some unconventional visual representations. For example, two male students wanted to include a
picture of Justin Bieber for the “mewling infant.” They explained that Bieber “has a baby face and his songs sound like a baby crying.” We laughed and I told them they could include the image as long as they explained their choice to the class. I hypothesized that this opportunity for self-expression and authentic connection might drive student engagement with the text.

At the end of the period, I had students read their chosen lines and provide a rationale for each of the images. One memorable image representation came from the fourth age. Shakespeare’s lines read:

Then a soldier,
Full of strange oaths and bearded like the pard,
Jealous in honor, sudden and quick in quarrel,
Seeking the bubble reputation
Even in the cannon's mouth.

First period students included two images. The first was of a bearded soldier. The two male students who illustrated these lines explained they chose the image “for obvious reasons” because the lines mentioned a bearded soldier. The second image showed Superman flying through the clouds with his clenched fist thrust forward. The duo explained they chose Superman because, “battles don’t just mean fighting in wars. You can have personal battles too, like problems in your life you need to fight through.” Without being dragged through grueling line-by-line analysis, defining phrases like “bearded like the pard,” students were able to identify keywords and connect them to prior knowledge and experiences. I was most excited about the eagerness students demonstrated to make connections to contemporary images that otherwise had no ties to Shakespeare (i.e. Justin Bieber).

As class ended, I showed my students the original monologue in full without the images and said, “Look how much text you guys got through without any help from me.”
One outspoken male student in particular retorted, “Well it’s easy when you don’t make us go through and define everything. We’re not stupid, we can read.” He had a point. My students could read, a fact corroborated by the reading data. It was whether or not they wanted to read Shakespeare, after all, which made them reluctant. But, by giving them control over just a small portion of text and giving them agency to illustrate the lines to their justification and originality, my students were eager to work with the text, find images, and share their rationale. For now, I was pleased to see my students confident about reading Shakespeare. But were they engaged? I was not sure until I contrasted first period’s behavior with that of sixth period’s.

That’s because in sixth period, nothing went as planned. Having scripted my lesson plan, I introduced the activity exactly as I had during first period. Sixth period students grabbed their laptops and started working. For five minutes, these students were engaged in the same ways first period was. Sixth period students moved close to their partners, clicked through Google Images, glanced at each other’s screens, and laughed often. Again, no students asked questions about the text itself.

With a rather large chunk of the period remaining, my mentor teacher encouraged me to define “unfamiliar phrases and words” as students explained their chosen images to take up the remaining time. At first I was reluctant. The objective of the activity was to show students they did not have to do just that. While Shakespeare can be difficult and defining words and reading footnotes is often imperative to academic scholarship of Shakespeare, I did not want to push my students farther away from the Bard by pointing out all of the things they did not know. I was also nervous about not knowing everything in the text myself. The last thing I wanted on the first day of my unit was a tarnished ethos.

But with ten minutes left, I decided to give it a try. As with first period, I told students to read their lines and explain their choice of images. After they explained, my mentor teacher interjected with questions about the meanings of certain words and phrases. For example, she
asked students to explain what “bearded like the pard” meant. Students returned blank stares. My mentor teacher looked to me to explain and I had to turn to my desktop dictionary to be able to say that pard referred to the leopard. And so we muddled through the rest of the lines together defining “capon,” “bubble reputation,” and “wise saws.”

Sixth period groups groaned when it was their turn to explain their images. They offered short, self-deprecating explanations defending themselves against the text analysis questions they knew were coming. For example, one reluctant group member said, “Well, we chose this image because it shows a soldier but I guess it doesn’t have anything to do with a leopard so I don’t know.” As students left the classroom, I again brought up the original monologue only this time I could not boast of how much text they worked through on their own. I felt utterly dejected. My apprehension to closely examine the text was crippling for fear of disengaging my students and for appearing underprepared, or worse, unqualified to teach Shakespeare.

I had to wonder: maybe this is how my students were feeling. In his essay “You Don’t Know Jack,” professor Bruce Avery profiles one of his most puzzling students, Jack. Jack is a non-English major college student in Avery’s freshmen Shakespeare course. Jack is a disengaged, non-reader who spends most of his time with media and technology. While Jack does not actually exist, Avery uses Jack’s characteristics to frame a problem many teachers face: disconnected, disengaged students. Avery cites Marshall Gregory’s “From Shakespeare on the Page to Shakespeare on the Stage: What I Learned about Teaching in Acting Class” to conclude:

Most of us have... an abysmally shallow understanding of what it really feels like for a student to walk into any of our classrooms knowing practically nothing about the content we are so eager to teach them. Many teachers don’t succeed in seeing things from their student’s point of view nearly as clearly as they think they do... This means that what teachers need is a deeper empathy for the rich swirls of our students’ anxieties and initial incompetence, not so we can let them off the hook for learning or hard work, but so we
can understand why they resist so powerfully being put on the learning hook in the first place (310-311).

I took a step back and tried to see things from my students’ point of view. What was to blame for the huge disparity between first and sixth periods? In terms of Silver, Strong, and Robinson’s dimensions of engagement, I had designed the activity to fulfill students’ need for understanding, mastery, self-expression, and interactions with others. Students in both periods initially engaged in interactions with others and self-expression via the Google Doc.

The main divergence, then, occurred in sixth period when I stripped students of their sense of mastery and understanding. When these students were forced to acknowledge everything they did not know, their enthusiasm, confidence, and overall participation drained quickly. Susan Spangler writes in her article “Speaking My Mind: Stop Teaching Shakespeare!” that as teachers:

> Often our practices are more about our need to feel knowledgeable about classics than about our helping students understand and appreciate them... Students learn that only the teacher is smart enough to understand Shakespeare and that if they wait long enough, the teacher will tell them what the words mean... The teaching of Shakespeare too often comes down to edifying what students cannot do or do poorly, one more kind of ‘gotcha’ education (130-131).

Our line-by-line analysis served as a kind of “gotcha education” in which I publically displayed everything the students did not know. Thus, while first period was engaged with a sense of mastery and confidence, I completely disengaged sixth period students by making them feel incompetent and helplessly reliant on the teacher. While this experience was painful for both my students and me, it served to warrant my claim that students do not engage with phrase-by-phrase analysis.
Also, I began to realize I had a layered role in the classroom. The aim of the PDS program was to position me as a full-time co-teacher in my classroom. However, I was also an intern, which meant that I was still very much a student. As such, I could not help but feel the pressure to establish my ethos in the classroom to combat the student-teacher stigma. At the same time, my stint at playing the all-knowing teacher showed me how miserable “gotcha education” can be for both the students and the teacher. I then realized that media and technology alone were not enough to engage students. Rather, media and technology emerged as a vehicle through which students could engage with the text by capitalizing on their mastery, self-expression, authenticity, and involvement with others only through careful planning for and consideration of diverse student experiences and needs on my end.

**Forums**

As I continued to find ways to engage my students using media and technology, I encountered two phenomena. First, after several painfully reluctant performances (as detailed in my chapter on physical engagement), I began to wonder: Why were my students so eager to use technology but so reluctant to perform in front of their peers? Bruce Avery hypothesizes on the disconnect:

The explosion of personal media among college students tells us that, while many of them seem passive in traditional classrooms, they are anything but passive when it comes to using media to represent themselves to each other. It is my view that tapping into this creativity can help to engage them with Shakespeare’s texts. For this purpose, then, the impact of these media is that they free people to represent themselves in ways they never otherwise would. This is because the mediation of the screen (and screen names) provides them with a distance from their expressions and utterances that is not possible in live space... everybody’s doing it so no one is spotlighted (139).
To ease the spotlight and pressure from my students, I scheduled breaks from performances throughout the unit to show students a film version of the play. After each act, I played the adapted act of the film and each time I encountered students on cell phones. The clash my technology initiative and our classroom’s no cell phone policy was a recurring dilemma that will be explored further later in this thesis. But even when students put away their phones, I often observed them drifting off, zoning out, and falling asleep. Students also struggled to keep to themselves during the film and we frequently had to separate a few chattier students.

And yet, contrary to their overall disengaged dispositions during the film, my students insisted they enjoyed watching it and, more importantly, they found meaning from viewing the film. In their final unit reflections, students reiterated:

I loved watching the movie after we were done reading the play. Watching the movie helped me to learn and put a picture in my mind of what was really going on. Also the actors in the movie were great and the movie is what made me really like Macbeth a little bit more.

The movie that we watched helped show a different view or a clearer image of what happened in the play.

I think it was good he [sic] would watch parts of the movie as we went along in the book so that we could really see visually what we were reading to give us a better understanding.

So my reluctant actors and actresses identified some inherent value in watching the film but it could not hold their attention. Something had to give. Then one night, I found myself scouring the Internet for engagement ideas while I watched a movie with my roommate. This was not unusual for us. In fact, I could not recall the last time I watched a movie outside of the theater
without being plugged into my laptop and cell phone. And then I thought back to the first time I brought home the *Macbeth* DVD. I surfed the web the entire time looking up pictures and activities to use in my unit. Even when we watched the video in class, I was often on my laptop quickly checking emails or catching up with other day-to-day necessities.

As a 21st century learner myself, I wondered how different my students were. Did my students multi-task as often as I did? Did they find having to sit and just watch a movie painfully boring? I wanted to find something my students could engage with during the movie that would be supplemental and not detrimental to their engagement with *Macbeth*.

Maybe the film alone was not enough media to sustain my students’ attention and subsequent engagement with the play. In terms of engagement, the viewing of the film was lacking self-expression and involvement with others. Olsen notes that 21st century teens are well known for multitasking, often using more than one device or outlet at once (Olsen, "Teens and Media: A Full-time Job"). Thus, I decided to explore the use of our district course management system’s forum application specifically as a means for allowing students to multi-task with technology while watching the film.

The first step in using forums during the movie was constructing initial threads. Unfortunately, I did not think to use a forum until the night before our last viewing of the movie so time was short. Students had just finished reading the play and were about to watch the last forty minutes of the film. So I decided to develop my threads around culminating ideas about the entire play. I hoped that this would engage students by giving them a sense of mastery and understanding during the activity. I also decided to make my posts intentionally casual yet outlandish to instigate students to respond. My posts were as follows:

1. We should feel sorry for Lady Macbeth: At the end of the play, Lady Macbeth is tortured with guilt. She goes mad and eventually has to kill herself. She didn't know how far
Macbeth would take everything. It wasn't her fault. And, I mean, she feels bad about it isn't that enough? We should feel really sorry for her.

2. It's OK that Macbeth killed Duncan because Macbeth was supposed to be king eventually. Duncan would have died eventually, right? Macbeth was just helping him along.

3. Macbeth isn’t a real man: Macbeth is weak and he is too emotional. He doesn't ever act like a real man. Lady Macbeth is more of a man than he is.

4. Macbeth is innocent: Macbeth had nothing to do with Duncan's murder. Lady Macbeth made him do it. She's the one who should be blamed for the whole thing.

5. It's all the witches’ fault. The witches started all of this. They made Macbeth do it.

I had also found several *Macbeth* memes online. Memes, cartoon-like captioned images of media tropes, are used for comedic (typically satiric) effect. My students readily referred to memes in class and I hoped they might add to the students’ sense of authentic connections to and mastery of the play to further engage them with the activity. I added six threads to the forum to include these memes (see Appendix C).

Before class, I positioned the desks in three concentric horseshoe shapes around the projector screen. I also set a student laptop on each desk. As students came in, they sat down and instinctively opened their laptops. I directed students to the online forum and explained they were to respond to my initial posts or the responses of other students at least five times. I also explained my posts were intentionally antagonistic and I encouraged students to “fight back” and “playfully and respectfully argue” with other students and me.

I played the movie and monitored students as I walked behind them. I also signed onto the forum and responded to students. My supervisor was also observing that day. In her field notes she wrote:
This feels very natural for them—they all seem engaged—sometimes they look up at the movie, sometimes they go back to writing… Students post throughout the film.

After class I read over these posts. Surprisingly, students responded less often to the memes. While I saw several students laugh and point the memes out to surrounding students, few students commented on those threads. My initial written posts had significantly more responses.

The responses to these threads varied. Most often, students responded with short “I agree because…” responses. However, several times students responded to each other and I observed these interactions to be the most interactive. In this thread, one student responded to my initial post and two others responded to her. Their interaction follows:

**Me:** It’s all the witches’ fault. The witches started all of this. They made Macbeth do it.

**Student 1:** Macbeth made a choice to do it. They in no way forced Macbeth to do anything. He wanted to be King therefore he made the decision to Duncan then continued to do more. He could have stopped anytime.

**Student 2:** I agree the witches never forced Macbeth to do anything. He made the decision to kill Duncan on his own.

**Student 3:** Ya but I think they did because they are the ones that showed him that he could kill and told him he "had to " because it was his fate.

**Student 2:** They never said he had to kill, that was Lady Macbeths [sic] decision.

**Student 1:** Exactly the witches did not force Macbeth to do anything he did it with his own free will however the witches did influence him by telling him it was his fate to be king.

**Student 3:** See that’s what I’m saying. They didn’t make him but they tricked him into it by telling him those untrue truths at the end.

**Student 1:** Yeah I see what you mean man.
Student engagement here was characterized by students’ mastery of the text, by their interactions with others, and by their self-expressions. Students engaged each other by arguing their positions on various topics in the forum. Students used their mastery of plot points and character details to either corroborate what other students were writing or to introduce different positions on the subject. Students worked on posts in the forum until the end of the movie. With only a few minutes left, I polled students about their engagement with the forum. I asked, “What do you guys think about this forum discussion?” Students responded:

I thought it was better than just sitting there watching the movie.

It was good i liked the questions. it got you really thinking.

It was nice to see what everybody else thought about the book and movie.

The final student comment was repeated several times in each period’s response thread. Students were engaging with the texts by using media and technology but also by using each other. The response aspect of the forum allowed students to engage with each other while “thinking about” and analyzing the text. Thus, the engagement was not limited to the kind of “gotcha education” of call and response, teacher-centered lessons. Instead, students were able to engage multi-modally as they dictated the direction of each discussion.

By putting the technology in their hands, that is, the students engaged with both the film and the text as individuals but also as a collective class. We know via social-cognitive theory (Vygotsky, 1986; Bandura, 1986) that students learn best by interacting collaboratively with other students. But what if students are reluctant to enter a social space in which they might work together to challenge and understand the text? As Avery suggests, technology can serve to mediate face-to-face interactions and to buffer student anxiety and reluctance. In this forum activity specifically, technology created a space in which students could engage multi-dimensionally.
Almost all of my students wrote they liked the forum and they would prefer to do it again. In the future, I wonder how I might put the forum entirely in their hands. Could they post the initial threads themselves? What if I did not put a limit on student responses? What effect on engagement would an entirely student-run forum have?

Music in the Classroom

In the midst of all of this planning and adaptation, my students still could not get enough media and technology. Almost all of my students consistently observe the State High fashion trend our classroom has playfully dubbed “the ear bud necktie.” With their cell phones in their pockets, students carefully thread their ear buds through the front of their shirts. The two wires dangle from their collar where they can be accessed as soon as the bell rings. Unfortunately, a rogue ear bud often finds its way into a student’s ear and on a regular basis we have to remind students not to listen to music during class time.

I decided if my students really wanted to listen to music that badly maybe I should be playing music in the classroom. Again, I incorporated media and technology into my lesson plan. I devised a way to engage students with the reading by indulging their desire to listen to music by way of a classroom playlist (see Appendix A). I chose songs based on their lyrical content for connections to the play. I also narrowed my search to songs students might recognize.

One of the first songs I played in my classroom was The Fray’s rendition of Kanye West’s “Heartless.” The original rap song laments a relationship broken by a cold and “heartless” lover. The Fray’s rendition slows the rhythm and lyrics of the song into a softer performance. I played this song on the day we read Lady Macbeth persuading Macbeth to murder the king. I played the song as students entered the room before we started class. One student asked, “Why is this song playing?” I announced to the class we would talk about it after our reading. We read the scene and students began free writing about persuasion and influence. I played the song again
and immediately received a few “Oh, I get it,” comments from students. I opened the floor to the entire class asking, “So why this song?” One student ventured, “Lady Macbeth is a heartless... lady.” Another student asked, “I thought this was about Kanye’s baby momma.” “Kanye doesn’t have any kids,” another student corrected. “Did Macbeth have kids?” another student asked.

Again, I opened the question to the entire class and we discussed clues from the text about the Macbeth family. One student conjectured, “I think if Lady Macbeth had a baby she wouldn’t be so terrible. Moms don’t do that sort of stuff.” I asked the class, “Does it change things if they had kids? What does being a mother have to do with how we view someone?” The lively conversation continued until the bell cut us off.

When I played music, students were apt to discuss the songs and their relation to the text. The students’ interest in music facilitated connections between media, their experiences, and the literature. This intertext between popular songs and the play created a space in which student interaction was not limited to the text itself. Instead, students were able to reference their own prior knowledge and expertise of music to engage with the text. Thus, playing music in the classroom capitalized on the self-expressive characteristic of engagement as well as students’ need for mastery and involvement with others to get students actively and enthusiastically involved in the reading of Shakespeare.

In the future, I am interested in exploring ways for students to bring in and share their own favorite music. I understand some teachers offer activities in which students construct a soundtrack to a scene, play, or novel as a final assessment. In these instances, as it did in my classroom, music serves as a supplementary text. Based on my students’ enthusiasm and willingness to analyze lyrics, themes, and moods, I am curious about the uses of music as a primary text in a lesson or even in a unit.
Chapter 3

Writing to Engage Intertextually

Both with and without media and technology, I also engaged my students in writing about the text by encouraging intertextuality. In my initial Shakespeare survey, most students expressed how “irrelevant” they found Shakespeare to their lives. In her piece “An Intertextual Approach to Teaching Shakespeare,” Hanna Scolnicov insists reading Shakespeare place the text “in a new web of relationships with other texts… Instead of seeking within the work itself for structure and meaning, this methodology goes outside the individual work to create a context for it. The play is no longer a self-contained unit… Rather, it is enmeshed in an ever-growing web of intertextual relations” (210). That is, students construct meaning of the text by placing it in a context amongst other texts they have previously experienced. In this context, meaning is a construction of the text’s relationships to other texts. Thus, authenticity will be analyzed most often in this chapter as it relates to student engagement in these intertextual activities.

Storyboarding

My first endeavor in intertextuality with my students was entirely unintentional. As I planned my unit, I realized that during a five week unit, students would likely benefit from some sort of summary of events in chronological order that they could look back on. During both our poetry and Monster units, I had explored the use of storyboards as a means of having students delineate actions and events by writing and illustrating.

For Macbeth, I created a storyboard with three spaces for writing (see Appendix B). The first two were “When?” and “What happens?” for students to identify the act(s) and scene(s) and
the chronological events therein. The third section of the storyboard was for “Connections.” Here, students were encouraged to note any connections the act(s) or scene(s) had to anything they had previously seen, read, watched, or experienced.

After I re-introduced the concept of storyboarding for this unit, I split the first act into two frames to lessen the summary load. After this first act, we then completed one frame per act. Each time students storyboarded, I projected an electronic copy of the storyboard onto the white dry erase board. I wrote the act number at the top of the frame and we summarized as a class. I asked guiding questions when students became stuck or were confused as to the order of events but overall students who verbally dictated events did the majority of the summarizing. I wrote what students said on the board as they wrote in their individual packets.

After we summarized, I asked students to take a moment to brainstorm any connections to the act they identified. I typically waited two to three minutes for students to consider and write down a variety of connections. Then, as a whole class, we came back together to share connections as I wrote them on the board. Over the course of the unit, we completed six frames of the storyboard. Students identified the following connections to *Macbeth*:


**Other:** March Madness, *CSI, Hillary Clinton, Marie Antoinette, Michelle Obama, Criminal Minds, Law & Order.*
As each of these intertextual connections was suggested, the volunteering student provided a rationale for his or her connection. As students shared out, we discussed the connection as a class. Other students in the class often spoke up to acknowledge the connection or to ask questions about its relevance. For example, *The Lord of the Rings* was identified as a connection during almost every storyboarding session. Different students referenced the books and movies for their thematic connections to *Macbeth* including fate, influence, persuasion, kings, battles, friendships, magic, murder, and death. The comparison, contrast, or otherwise juxtaposition of the texts gave students a framework of prior knowledge and experience to analyze and interact with *Macbeth* both individually and as a collective class. Thus, while actively making connections between *Macbeth* and other texts, students were engaged. Here, student engagement was characterized by sustained and enthusiastic self-expression and interactions with others driven by the authenticity students achieved via their construction of intertextual connections to outside texts.

**Visual Representations**

While the storyboard was used primarily for writing both the summary and the aforementioned connections, I also included a space for illustrations in the form of a blank rectangle framed by stage curtains. After summarizing events and noting any connections, students were asked to draw an image of what they believed to be important, funny, or otherwise significant to help them remember the act(s) or scene(s).

As I analyzed the storyboards post unit, I noticed that the summaries and list of connections were virtually verbatim from board to board. The illustrations, however, were incredibly variant. As a class, we constructed the following summary for Act II:

Lady Macbeth drugs the guards. Macbeth kills Duncan as the king sleeps. Macbeth immediately feels awful and Lady Macbeth is left to ‘clean up.’ In the morning, Macduff
discovers Duncan’s body. Lady Macbeth and Macbeth pretend to be distraught.

Malcolm and Donalbain flee which makes them look guilty. The brothers are accused of hiring a hit on Duncan. Macbeth is set to be king.

Again, this summary was virtually unchanged between student boards. However, no two student drawings were alike. For this same scene, different students drew Lady Macbeth drugging the guards, Macbeth killing Duncan, Malcolm and Donalbain appearing suspicious, Malcolm and Donalbain fleeing, etc.

What did this show about my students’ reading and overall engagement with the text? In their article “Shakespeare in 3D: Bringing the Bard to Life through New (Old) Media,” Nick Kremer and Harlow Sanders write:

The process of creating graphic images from a verbal text organizes students’ thinking. It taps into their working memory and refines it as it incorporates the new information. In short, students’ comprehension of the verbal text is significantly improved. Additionally, storyboarding flexes the imagination of the artist and the viewer, both of whom must supply closure to ‘fill in the gaps’ between frames of the narrative (60).

If the creation of graphic images in the storyboard organizes students’ thinking, what effect does it have on engagement? Perhaps students used these drawings to flex their imaginative capacities after our reading. Here, student engagement with the storyboard might be characterized by students’ original artistic self-expressions. What is important or interesting to one reader might seem tangential to another. Thus, the variance in drawing indicates unique, personal expressions of textual engagement.
Journaling: Intertextual Connections

Separate from the storyboards, students also made intertextual connections in their free writing. Over the course of the unit, students completed three freewrites about the play in Google Doc journals. While the freewrites were open to anything the students cared to write about, I posted guiding questions students might consider on the board. Typically, students free wrote for about five to ten minutes at a time.

In their first assigned freewrite, I asked students to think about the supernatural after we read the first few scenes of the play. I posted the following guiding questions on the board:

Do you believe in the supernatural? What do you make of witches or ghosts? Do you think anyone can predict the future? What if someone gave you a few predictions and they started to come true? What would you think? Where have you seen witches or ghosts before? (Movies, TV shows, music...)

Students in both periods spent about ten minutes responding to this prompt. While I read the responses after class, I noticed several students engaging intertextually by positioning the text in a network of more familiar texts. One student wrote:

I do not believe in the supernatural. To me ghosts are just make believe and do not actually exist. There are many explanations to the scary things that happen when people say that it is a ghost. I read a paper written by people with my same belief on the subject this year in science. When you hear a door just randomly open it may have been because in the winter there is barely any humidity so the wooden door will shrink causing the door not to close properly then open at a later time by itself. Also, when you close a door it can act like a vacuum and pull all the open doors in the house closed with it. Another thing that could explain ghosts is just the wind howling or a branch hitting on the window.
Another student wrote:

I don’t believe that there are ghosts in the world that we live in. I can’t prove this because I have never experienced any ghosts in my life and the only way I will believe in them is if I see one or confront one in anyway. I’ve heard people say that they have seen ghosts before and and that they have heard them but I just think they are exaggerating. We were reading this story about ghosts in biology, and it said that people can hallucinate if they are really tired because their mind isn’t focused, and they see or hear things that aren’t really happening.

These students used prior knowledge of outside texts to inform their responses to the witches. The intertextuality between *Macbeth* and the articles these students read in science class helped them to make sense of what was happening in the play. The freewriting created a space in which students could interact with the text by drawing on ideas and information from other texts. In this space, students were not limited to the core text. Instead, students were free to explore their unique ideas and opinions related to the reading by referencing other texts making for a more authentic and therefore engaging interaction with the text.

For this purpose, Scolnicov argues “we should not allow [academic Shakespeare scholarship] to stifle the personality and originality of the students, especially those trying to make their first steps in Shakespeare criticism” (219). By using the intertextual approach, I was able to engage students in writing about the text by encouraging originality and self-expression and connections to their mastery of prior knowledge. Student engagement, then, came from giving students the agency to identify and incorporate past experiences with diverse texts and the freedom to express themselves in a written space.
Journaling: Related Student Experiences

As I analyzed the freewrites further, I noticed students also placed the text in the context of their past experiences outside of academia. While the intertextual approach to free writing and storyboarding helped students to engage with the text, many of my students were not avid readers. And while most of them were avid media consumers, surprisingly, some of the most enthusiastic and sustained written responses my students offered originated from their own lives and experiences, often unrelated to other texts or to media and technology.

One particularly memorable connection came from a student’s reflection on guilt. After reading Lady Macbeth’s sleepwalking scene, students free wrote considering the following:

Think of a time when you felt guilty... what happened? Do you experience guilt often or are you more resistant to guilt? Has guilt ever prevented you from doing something? Has guilt ever made you do something?

After about ten minutes of free writing, students paired with someone close to them to share their stories or reflections. Then, we came together as a whole class to share. One student insisted on going first. He read his reflection as follows:

One time in 4th grade, it was the last day of school and me and my friend were playing on the swings. There was a nest in a little tree and there were two eggs. I was dumb enough to pick them up and I was running to show them to my friend and I slipped and the eggs flew out of my hands and they broke right under the swing I was swinging on. My friend was the only one who saw. He asked me what I did and I said I tripped. While he was swinging on the swings i went around telling everyone to follow me and see what my one friend did. About 8 people followed me and I showed them the eggs and blamed my friend for doing it. He tried to come back saying I did it but it was too late. Everyone already believed me. Later that day i felt so awful. I felt sick to my stomach thinking
about how he probably hated me now. The next day I told everyone I did it and I apologized to my friend and he is still my best friend and we hang out all the time.

After he finished reading, another student remarked, “That reminds me of those two sons [Malcolm and Donalbain] who get blamed for murdering the king [Duncan]. Like, I wonder if that’s part of the reason why Lady Macbeth feels so guilty.” The author of the story responded, “Well, it’s not like I blamed my friend for murder...” “Murder of baby birds! Murder is murder,” joked another student. “It’s different,” defended the author. I interjected, opening the discussion to the entire class asking, “How is it different? Are some offenses worse than others? Is it a different level of guilt?”

In these freewrites and ensuing discussions, students used their past experiences to frame their engagement with the text. When students freewrote, connections from their past contextualized what they had read. Furthermore, students collaboratively engaged in these activities. When students shared their written connections, other students validated and expanded the connections by sharing similar experiences or by offering analyses on the relationship between the personal experience and the text. This space allowed self-expression and interactions with others to drive engagement. Thus, while the freewriting was an individual activity, the sharing of the freewrites allowed students to participate in a collaborative engagement with the text in which they were able to freely and creatively express themselves.

Playing music in the classroom (as detailed in a previous section) paired with the Google Docs journaling pushed students to engage collaboratively and self-expressively with the text even further. One morning I played Muse’s “Madness” to go along with our reading of Lady Macbeth’s suicide. Jake, a quiet student who rarely spoke, let alone participated, grabbed my attention. “You listen to Muse?” he asked jokingly, “I didn’t know you liked good music.” “Good music?” I asked, “This is gold! I feel like this was written for Lady Macbeth.” “I wouldn’t be surprised,” Jake answered, “she’s, like, the crazy lady archetype.” We chatted for a
while and Jake started to share about his band. The bell cut us off and students got to work on a freewrite asking, “Is it ever OK to use people to get what you want? What might the consequences be of using people? Would you feel guilty?” After class, Jake approached me and said, “Miss Dodd, check out my Google Doc. I wrote more about my band and stuff.” He shared:

I am in a band and one day the singer was sick and I am the second best singer. The drummer told me that I had to sing and I had to agree or else the song would be worthless. During the gig that we had that week the singer did not know the lyrics because she had been sick so I had to sing. Luckily for me it was a pretty famous song so my botched singing did not ruin it because some of the crowd sang too. Depending on what you want it is okay to get people to do it, if it is something like sing then it is ok but if it is murder than if you don’t have enough common sense to stay away from that then you deserve the consequences.

I read Jake’s response and commented via the Google Doc with more questions about his band and how ambition can ruin relationships. The next day we chatted about music and Macbeth for several minutes before class. This interaction encouraged the student to use his past experiences to frame his engagement with the literature. Jake engaged by expressing himself authentically and originally in writing and by interacting with me as we discussed music and the text.

Thus, by encouraging personal connections with freewriting and music in the classroom, I not only helped my students to interact with the text but I also opened lines of communication between students who typically did not otherwise participate. Music and personal stories created a shared space in my classroom in which students could use the expression of their personal experiences and musical expertise to frame their engagement with the text. Students collaboratively engaged in the construction of intertextual connections. While I sometimes shared my personal experiences and conversed with individual students and with the class as a
whole about their own connections, the collaborative engagement was almost entirely student-driven.
Chapter 4

Physical Engagement With the Text

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges I faced as I encouraged my students to engage with the text was getting them up and moving. Having taught Shakespeare courses and facilitated workshops for teachers on teaching Shakespeare for over 30 years, Michael LoMonico asserts in his piece “Shakespearean Ruminations and Innovations” that “It is more important to get students to like Shakespeare than it is to get them to understand every word... The best way to get students to like Shakespeare is by getting them to perform Shakespeare” (23-24). Beyond just convincing our students to like Shakespeare, Avery notes, “physical activity actually facilitates attentiveness and helps students to process language” (143).

The importance of physical activity while teaching Shakespeare is widely accepted in the field. After all, as most scholars note, Shakespeare wrote plays. As such, it is imperative we encourage our students to get up and moving to the direction and rhythm of Shakespeare’s words. Thankfully, I had the chance to scaffold student performances five weeks earlier in the year when we completed a unit on Walter Dean Myers’ Monster, a contemporary screenplay written about a fictional African-American teenager who faces serious jail time for his alleged involvement in a botched drug store robbery. Over the course of that unit, students freely and enthusiastically volunteered for roles as attorneys, jail cellmates, neighborhood friends, parents, thugs, and criminals. Exactly why my students engaged with this text so freely and enthusiastically is a question I will explore later in this chapter as I contrast their Monster performances against those for Macbeth.
Reluctant Readers Turned Apprehensive Actors

After our *Monster* unit and before we began reading *Macbeth*, I wanted to obtain a sense of the background experience in Shakespeare performance my students brought with them into the classroom. So, I visited a ninth grade classroom as they began reading *Romeo and Juliet*. I learned via the Shakespeare survey that all but two of my students read this play in a State High classroom the previous year. My field observations follow:

- Mrs. Smith’s transition: “Okay, now for the fun part. Take out these two sheets from yesterday that look like this...” She holds up the sheets and slowly pans them across the classroom horseshoe. On the sheet is a line that reads, “Question for today: How does Shakespeare set the stage for tragedy?”

- “You’re going to choose a line and bring it alive for the class. We’re going to put you in groups and give you a group of lines to look at. I want you to choose ONE line that you think has particular significance or meaning and act it out for the class using the original text. So pick ONE line that you think would be most helpful for the class to see acted out.”

- When the time comes to share, laughter and smiles can be observed in each group. One student asks, “Can I wear a crown?” When told he can, he responds with, “Yes!”

- The first group goes to the front of the class. They explain which part of the play their line comes from. One male student reads the line with a sword in his hands. As he reads, he shakes the foam sword violently. He performs his line and strikes out at his group members with the sword. The audience of students laughs and claps.

- Mrs. Smith guides the performances by debriefing the event and transitioning into the next group: “Okay next group, what are we going to see, what point of the play? What’s
the emotion of this scene? So this is when Capulet wants to join in the brawl... Notice how he gives so much expression to just one word. What does that word, ‘ho,’ mean again?” … “So tell us where we are and watch we’re watching for, group.” Each group performs and finishes this way.

• “Great job, I really appreciate you all getting up here and performing for us. It’s always tough getting started. But we’re going to keep reading and learning to the point where we’re comfortable acting entire scenes out.” As each group ends their performance, they laugh back to their seats and comment to each other. I can’t hear what they say.

This observation gave me some insight into the thorough and scaffolded experiences with Shakespeare my students brought into my classroom. As tenth graders, their previous year’s study of *Romeo and Juliet* was typically the first time they encountered Shakespeare in depth. As such, I observed the ninth grade teacher carefully scaffolding for the performance driven analysis that would comprise the larger part of her Shakespeare unit. The teacher scaffolded the students off to a slow but steady start, managing their anxieties and helping them to become comfortable on stage. She also helped students reference the text as they grappled with Shakespeare’s archaic or otherwise puzzling language.

Realizing that not all of my students had this particular teacher, I summarized my observation to each class and asked if their experiences were similar. All of the students who had previously encountered Shakespeare reported that their experiences were congruent. This observation and subsequent inquiry reassured me somewhat as I began my unit. I could see where my students were coming from and their background experience appeared thoroughly scaffolded and grounded in the text. Not to mention, the students I observed in ninth grade appeared to be having a fun time, laughing and joking as they performed their lines in front of the class.
For reasons unknown, however, as I started my Macbeth unit the performance aspect of our study was met with the most reluctance. I wondered: if self-expression encouraged engagement, and I was offering chances for self-expression, why weren’t students biting? Were the generally self-conscious dispositions of my teenaged students to blame? I would have to wait to find out. The first two days of our unit started with extensive character introductions and “Re-connecting with Will” activities detailed in the previous chapters. On the third day, we began reading. Naturally, we started with Act I Scene i where the three witches plan to meet with Macbeth.

In first period, I began by asking for three witches and after only a few seconds of wait time three young ladies raised their hands. (These three ladies were almost always enthusiastic about taking reading parts, especially as we read Monster.) I asked our three witches to come up and gather around the black cauldron at the front of the room. “Wait, we have to get up?” one student asked. I met her reluctance with an enthusiastic “Of course!” and motioned for our actresses to take the stage. All three grudgingly obliged, literally dragging their feet and groaning as they sulked to the front of the room.

Sixth period introductory performances elicited similar responses. This time, upon my asking for three volunteer witches, two females and one male raised their hands. I invited them up and again I faced impenetrable reluctance. The male student, who insisted on always performing Monster’s lead prosecutor, retracted his participation. I encouraged him to get up and join his witch sisters but he said, “No, never mind. I thought we could sit. Why do we have to stand? I’ll only do it if I can sit.” For the sake of precious class time, I quickly thanked and dismissed this reluctant actor from the stage and implored the class for a new, more active witch. After a minute or so one finally volunteered. But as she walked up to the front of the classroom, I turned to find that all three had taken seats around the cauldron. Again, when I encouraged the
witches to stand, they groaned and sighed heavily as they slowly peeled themselves off of their chairs.

Both sets of witches read in quiet monotone. The witches did not turn toward each other and they absolutely refused to dance or even skip around the cauldron. When we stopped as a class to look closely at lines or stage directions, my witches sighed loudly and begged to be allowed to return to their seats.

I reflected on Avery’s suggestion that students are drawn to social media over face-to-face communication because the computer or cell phone screens mediate these interactions and provide a sense of removal and security. What did their reluctance to perform in front of each other indicate? Were issues of body image or other adolescent insecurities to blame? Was I throwing my students into uncomfortable territory? When I asked my students, they insisted they were just tired or lazy. Whatever the case, something was seriously inhibiting my students’ performance of the script and their subsequent engagement with the text.

**Beating “The Ferris Bueller Effect” and the Post Lunch Slump**

After several days of painfully reluctant scene performances each period, I was left wondering: What happened to my eager actors and actresses? A week into our Macbeth readings, reluctant performances had become the norm. In first period, I battled what graduated PDS intern Laura Cunningham once referred to as “The Ferris Bueller Effect.” Not unlike the students in the satirical classroom in the film, my first period actors and actresses responded to my pleas for actors and actresses with blank stares. In sixth period, my students returned from lunch tired and unresponsive. I found myself droning, “Volunteers? …Volunteers? …Volunteers?”

Reflecting on the juxtaposed receptions of our classroom performances, several key differences between Monster and Macbeth emerged. During Monster performances, students sat for the majority of the reading. As a courtroom drama, most of the screenplay was performed
with students sitting behind desks imagined as attorneys’ benches or witness stands. Only a few times throughout the unit were students required to stand to perform quick flashback scenes of the drugstore or neighborhood. From their seats, student actors read their contemporary lines with ease and enthusiasm. We rarely stopped to analyze the text. When we did, it was typically to cover major plot points at the end of a scene. Only a few times did we need to stop to decipher flashbacks or particularly difficult dialect. Perhaps during Monster students had a stronger sense of mastery and understanding that encouraged them to engage and take risks.

Whatever the case, I had a few options. The first was to let my students sit in their seats. Maybe I could configure the desks in the front of the room such that the witches could sit around the cauldron. But then what happens when Macduff and Macbeth fight? Would students swinging swords from their seats give the same effect? I just was not convinced. But while I could not reasonably let students sit during every scene, I knew I needed to make changes to make my students comfortable with and excited about performing in front of the class. The first change was addressing the clash of performance and technology happening in my classroom, culminating in the use of cell phones. I later learned I would also need to learn to laugh, even during murder scenes.

The Cell Phone Problem: The Contradiction of a No Cell Phone Policy in a Media-Rich Classroom

Well into the unit, to help my students better understand each act, I incorporated PBS’s contemporary Macbeth adaptation starring Patrick Stewart. On the morning of our first viewing, I drew the blinds and on the blackboard in big block letters I wrote: “English 10 Cinemas Inc.” As students entered the classroom, I played the usher, instructing them to quietly find their preferred seats. As the bell rang I cordially implored, “Please silence your cell phones. The show
will begin shortly.” Several students gave an exaggerated, “Ooh” or “Ah.” Others could not help but blurt, “Are we watching a movie?”

Shortly after I pressed play I noticed students on cell phones. After a few quiet reminders went unheeded, my anger built until I finally burst, “We have a no cell phone policy in this room. We’re watching a movie. Don’t be rude. Put your phones away now.” Immediately after I snapped I felt something was seriously amiss. I let the cell phone use slide during our monologue illustration activity. After all, my unit goal was to engage my students with technology. And yet I found myself scolding them for using the technology with which they are arguably most adept. I was sending my students mixed messages and they weren’t the only ones confused.

This was not a new contradiction. From the first day of the school year, I often found myself sneaking up to students to reprimand their distractions while my mentor teacher led the day’s instruction. I often felt I was fighting a losing battle and I sometimes looked the other way. But when I finally took the role as lead teacher for this unit, my contradictory philosophy on cell phone use in the classroom came back to bite me.

I now had two dilemmas on my hands. I could not get my students to engage physically and I could not keep them off of their cell phones. Perhaps there was a way I could use one to counteract the other. After consulting with a fellow English 10 teacher, I found an activity that met students at the intersection of performance and technology called “Can You Hear Macbeth Now?” This activity was adapted from the Folger Shakespeare Library’s online collection of educational resources. The activity requires students to perform the scene of Banquo’s murder relying entirely on sound. To begin, I had my students listen to the first scene of the play on tape and make notes on a printed copy of the scene of the sounds they heard including music, different voices, noise levels etc. As a class, we talked about the sounds and what they contributed to the events and their meaning.
Then, students formed groups and received a copy of Act III Scene iii. In their groups, students read the scene several times to understand what happens. For my students, this proved to be the most difficult step. After the first read-through, several groups did not understand Banquo was slain by the three crouching murderers and Fleance had escaped. I had to call their attention to the stage directions [Exit FLEANCE] as well as the line “There’s but one down; the son is fled.” After a bit of direction from me and a few more read-throughs, students came to understand the entirety of the short scene.

Students then went through the scene to make note of sounds that might help the audience “hear” and understand the events of the scene without seeing them. Students were encouraged to use cell phones and laptops to find sound effects or to make sounds using their bodies or items from around the room. At this point, students needed little to no direction. In fact, when one group that had experienced difficulty deciphering the events of the scene began to script their sound effects, one group member had to shoo me away joking, “Miss Dodd, you’re being that nosy waitress. The food’s good, all right? You don’t need to come back every five seconds. We got this.”

Students spent twenty minutes huddled over their laptops and cell phones finding sounds to add to their performances. I observed them asking questions of each other about the plot, meanings of certain lines, and which sounds to use and when. After thoroughly scripting and practicing, students gathered behind a curtain to perform the scene using their voices and sounds. What followed was surprising.

First, in each period, while I typically had to beg students to take parts, I had to pull names from the cauldron to determine which group would go first. Then, as each group prepared to perform, I observed smiles and laughter throughout the entire classroom. At first, I was a little unsettled because this was a murder scene and I was concerned students might drift off task.
However, despite a few giggle fits, each group composed themselves and delivered animated performances filled with various sounds.

After each performance, audience members were eager to compare and contrast scenes, playfully criticizing sound choices as “not as cool” as their own. Lively arguments followed with students justifying their sounds to each other by citing the text. For example, one student audience member remarked after a group performance, “I didn’t like the sound of the rain—it was distracting.” One of the group members retorted, “[The play] says, ‘Let the rain come down’ and it makes the scene creepy. How else do you think nobody would hear or see the murders? They murdered him in the rain to hide their tracks, duh.”

During this activity, students actively engaged with the text in two convergent contexts. First, students engaged in close reading as they scripted and defended their choice of sounds. Students also were physically engaged as they read lines and made or played sound effects. So, I had to wonder: What was so different about this activity that made students want to perform?

Looking for answers, I went straight to the source: my students. At the end of the activity, I praised each period for their engagement and asked, “What was the difference between this and what we do every other time?” While I thought students would say that the anonymity and the use of technology was the difference, the overwhelming answer was, “It was fun!”

Students explained they were comfortable because they had an opportunity to “really understand” the words they were about to perform. In fact, several students admitted to using the modern English translation from the book to help them better understand the scene. Thus, students’ sense of mastery of the text fueled their written and physical engagement.

Students added that “not having to be serious” in their interactions with others made them want to perform. The scene adaptations gave students a space in which they might engage with the text by freely expressing themselves. I asked if being silly distracted from their understanding of the play and students vehemently denied the mere suggestion. Instead, they explained that
being silly gave them “more freedom” to express themselves and explore the scene which made them want to read and act.

From this experience, I realized I needed to make some major changes to my unit if I wanted my students to continue to meaningfully engage with the text during our class performances. The first required a major tonal transformation.

**Learning to Laugh**

The first major change I made was learning to laugh. While I like to see students laughing and having fun in my classroom, from the very beginning of the unit I resolved to create a classroom tone and mood congruent with that of the play. I initially assumed the only way students could engage with *Macbeth* with its witches, prophecies, and murders, was by putting themselves in an eerie and solemn state of mind. But after seeing my students have so much fun with the scenes, laughing and joking with each other while still engaging with the text, I completely surrendered my control of the classroom tone and let the students take the lead. If they wanted to be silly with props and giggle through a scene, I not only let it slide, I followed suit.

Over the next few weeks, I observed a marked change in my students’ willingness to perform and subsequently their engagement with the text. The most distinct and memorable example of this engagement happened during sixth period’s last performance. In the final act of the play, Macbeth comes to the fatal realization that he has been duped by the witches’ statements. He mourns his wife’s death and decides to meet fate on the battlefield. Macbeth is slain and beheaded by Macduff. Macbeth’s severed head is then carried into the final scene in which Malcolm is crowned the new king of Scotland.

Several students volunteered at the beginning of the period to perform the few roles we had listed. I cast roles and students came to the front, grabbing swords, crowns and nametags.
We started with the rather morbid scene in which Macbeth learns his wife has committed suicide. One student asked, “How did she kill herself?” I opened the floor to the class. One student joked, “Maybe she nagged herself to death.” We all laughed and recounted how persuasive Lady Macbeth was at the beginning of the play. Seizing the moment, I asked “So do we feel bad for her now?” The class erupted as students cited the text to playfully argue their points for or against Lady Macbeth’s redemption.

After much discussion and laughter, we continued reading. In Macbeth’s final scene, two male students had fun with the lines, “Turn, hell hound, turn,” and “Lay on, Macduff,” laughing as they thrust their swords at each other and dodged each other’s. When the script directed [MACBETH is slain], the student playing Macbeth squeezed Macduff’s sword between his arm and side and fell to the floor with a giggling groan. Macduff dragged Macbeth off stage by his feet as the audience laughed and cheered.

When the two actors reentered for the final scene, the stage directions called for Macbeth’s severed head. One female student, in shock, exclaimed, “Wait, he cut off Macbeth’s head?” Another student pointed to the stage direction in response and the class erupted with an equal mix of “Awesome”s and “Ew”s.

Accordingly, I found this “sillier” physical engagement with the text, while not always true to the tone of the script, invaluable to my students’ understanding of actions and events in the text. Kremer and Sanders maintain “the information contained in visual texts—sets, costumes, props, character expressions/posturing—provide readers with a ‘silent’ language by which to make meaning” (58). While my students were not exactly silent, there was certainly a language being imparted. This language of gestures, props, and even laughter corroborated and supplemented what students gleaned from the text alone, with several students catching events and character details only after seeing them acted (rather playfully) on “stage.”
However, not all educators agree with this pedagogical philosophy of uninhibited fun. In his book *Reshaping High School English*, Bruce Pirie devotes an entire chapter to drama in the classroom. Pirie reflects on his own successes with classroom drama to argue for a central rather than peripheral role for dramatic performances in the classroom. However, Pirie does not believe fun is always appropriate. After describing an activity in which students construct a dreamscape for fictional characters, Pirie reiterates his directions to students “I hope you have fun making Macbeth’s nightmare come alive” he announces, “but let’s not confuse ‘having fun’ with ‘being funny.’ There’s nothing funny about what’s going on inside *Macbeth*, and if you make us laugh, you’ve done something wrong” (62). Pirie goes on to say that, if left to their own devices, students will resort to silly, superficial interactions with the text and that teachers are severely remiss if we do not “constantly challenge shallowness” (62). He writes, “Drama, like anything else in the English program, doesn’t have to be shallow, but it will be if the instructor is satisfied with mere fun” (62). After reading Pirie’s thoughts on the matter, I had to wonder: Was fun coming in between my students and their learning? Were my students engaging only shallowly? Conversely, did restricting laughter in the classroom impede students’ self-expressions, interactions with others, sense of mastery, and subsequent engagement? To explore these and other questions, I decided to analyze the final performance assessments that I designed prior to the start of the unit.

**Final Performances**

Having observed my students engage with the text so willingly and enthusiastically during our sillier in class performances, I was excited to see what they would do with their final performance assessment. When it comes to this kind of summative assessment, Kremer and Sanders write, “Assessing students through performance—as opposed to their recall of obscure
plot details—provides a more authentic indication of textual mastery and requires an enhanced level of engagement” (58). Further, Michael LoMonico asserts:

Acting out a scene is a form of close reading: it’s close reading on your feet. Students learn Shakespeare best when given the opportunity to get the play up on its feet. The amount of analysis that goes into presenting a scene cannot be duplicated with lectures or study questions. Simply reading the play does not produce the same results. While some of your colleagues and some administrators might think that the noise coming from your room and the delighted faces leaving your class mean that there’s not much learning going on in your classroom, nothing can be further from the truth (24).

Thus, the aim of this performance assessment was to allow students to achieve this “enhanced level of engagement” by getting the play “up on its feet.” We had performed nearly every scene in class but only by reading from the play text itself. Kremer and Sanders claim, “Performing Shakespeare does not mean having students sit at their desks reading aloud, or having students stand in front of the room reading aloud” (24). I realized that early in the unit our performances were limited to students standing and reading. In this setting, there was little to no room for self-expression (especially laughter) and interaction with others. Perhaps our reading from the text this way contributed to my students’ early reluctance. Further, perhaps the lack of interaction and self-expression resulted in restricted engagement. Kremer and Sanders write that engaging performance means:

Engaging students with the words in such a way that requires them to make informed decisions about the text and then speaking those lines and interacting with their classmates. It might also mean working with a group of their classmates to edit a scene, create a director’s prompt book for it, figure out what sort of minimal costumes and props they need, and perform it in a classroom (24).
Thus, to promote further engagement, I wanted my students to modernize a scene of their choosing for our final assessments, flexing their social skills and self-expression. To do so, students would also have to employ their refined intertextual skills. I had hoped that the scaffolding work we had done with making connections, writing, and performing would allow students to capitalize on their mastery of the play to engage on an entirely new level. Additionally, I wanted to see if my students could have fun at the same time. Thus, all of my attempts at student engagement culminated in these final group performances.

Two weeks before the end of our reading, I introduced the final performance worksheet and rubric to my students. Over the next two weeks I reminded students to “brainstorm” ideas for scene adaptations. On the Friday of our forum activity, I told students to pick groups (three to six students per group) and to come in on Monday with an idea of which scene they might like to modernize.

On Monday, nearly every group of students had an idea of which scene they wanted to perform. Students met in groups and brainstormed further about how they might bring the scene to life. After twenty minutes, I asked groups to submit which scenes they chose. I then shared a Google Doc of Shakespeare’s original scene with each respective group. I asked students to do the following: cast modern characters, list props and costumes, describe the “stage” setup, rewrite Shakespeare’s lines, and add stage directions (enters and exits, cues, actor expressions, and movements). Over the next four days, students worked in their groups to modernize their chosen scenes.

For the purposes of this exploration of engagement, I would like to focus on one student group’s work in depth henceforth referred to as Group 1. This first period group consisted of four male students and one female. These students were known friends and they jumped at the opportunity to work together. Group 1 chose the scene in which Macbeth and Banquo meet three witches who predict the men’s future greatness. Group 1 decided to perform the scene in
modern-day New York City. In this setting, the witches were recast as homeless people and Macbeth and Banquo as policemen. (See Appendix D for the group’s unaltered script in full).

During Group 1’s preparation, the students had to make a major decision. Their first draft of the script had some inconsistencies in the translation of the hierarchies of archaic Scottish military titles to those of a modern-day police station. Most obvious were the titles of thane and King with which Macbeth and Banquo were to be greeted. In the original script, students used the titles deputy and commissioner interchangeably. During their first read-through, students argued over which title superseded the other. The sole female member of the group (whose father happens to be a policeman) argued, “the scene won’t make sense if we make the witches say that Macbeth is commissioner then deputy because commissioner is more important like king and he gets higher and higher [in rank] as the play goes on.”

The students argued for a while over which police title would be comparable to thane and which would be like king. The students decided that Macbeth could not be “just a cop” because “he has more power at the beginning than other people but not all the power.” Therefore, they decided to translate Macbeth’s Thane of Glamis title to Deputy of Queens, NY. Then, Macbeth would be Commissioner of New York. Finally, Macbeth’s predicted kingship over Scotland would be foretold to Macbeth as his future as mayor.

When I asked the students about these changes, one male group member said, “We had to mess with [the scene] to make it make sense, you know? Like, if the homeless dudes said Macbeth would be mayor of New York and then later he would be the commissioner, like, that doesn’t even make sense because mayor is better we had to make him, like, climb the ladder.”

The students’ scene did not go beyond Macbeth’s acquisition of the title of Thane of Cawdor (or commissioner, here). However, the students worried about disrupting the logic and order of the entire play. Students achieved a sense of authenticity by adjusting the script to modern contexts. The students engaged deeply with the text, developing a clear sense of the
scene itself and of how the scene fit into the play as a whole. That is, students engaged thoughtfully and critically in scene analysis and translation while considering its contextual relevance. The resulting mastery of the text drove students to physically engage in front of the class.

Furthermore, when it came to the performance itself, despite their hard work and careful consideration, the students still had fun. Group 1 scripted their homeless witches’ lines as street talk or Ebonics. When they delivered these lines, the cast and audience laughed. But did it detract from the meaning making or understanding of both the performers and the audience members? In terms of engagement via self-expression and interaction, I would suggest that it only deepened students’ engagement with the text. In a final reflection, one student wrote: “I also liked the final project when we had to script a scene. I feel like it gave us some room to share our own opinions of [Shakespeare’s] writing even if they were pretty ridiculous.” The scene adaptations gave students a space in which they might engage with the text by expressing themselves. The playfulness written into the script allowed for self-expression. The fun also captured the audience members’ attention and after the play other students were eager to spend a considerable amount of time commenting on the groups’ adaptations, further engaging the students via their collaborative involvement. In the final performances as a whole, students capitalized on their mastery and understanding of the text, self-expression, and interactions with others to engage thoughtfully and enthusiastically with the text.
Chapter 5 Conclusions

Limitations

I would like to take part of this space to acknowledge some shortcomings in this exploration of engagement. First, I did not have any English Language Learners enrolled in any of my English sections. I imagine Philip Levien’s online collection of work with English Language Learners and Shakespeare at San Marcos High School in Santa Barbara, California would be helpful in considering this diverse and growing group of students (Levien, Phil. "Why Teach and Perform Shakespeare?").

Furthermore, State College High School is incredibly privileged in its access to technology. Each English classroom has a set of MacBook laptop computers. These laptops stay in our classroom where we can access them anytime we want. We also have a projector and big screen through which these laptops can project assignments, activities, and films. These laptops also have constant access to the district’s course management system, developed with online activities such as the forum. Without these classroom amenities, many of my engagement activities with media and technology would be difficult if not impossible to accomplish in full. Many of the sources I encountered in this study tout technology as an invaluable tool for teaching Shakespeare to 21st century high school students. However, I have not found literature that specifically considers teachers and students in situations without these privileges.

And finally, the question: does engagement matter? Axelson and Flick insist the connection between student engagement and learning is not empirically substantiated as of yet. They write:

It is often assumed that engagement is causally related to learning. Yet the causal ordering, if any, among engagement, learning, and student outcomes is unclear. Many educational theorists assume a causal relationship they haven’t really proved between
what John Bransford and his colleagues call “cognitive competence” (i.e., learning) and motivational factors, perhaps because it is so difficult to control for all the variables in such a way as to produce more persuasive evidence of causality. And there is the even more complex problem of what we mean by “learning.” We do know a great deal about student engagement that matters for learning and that we can build on. We know, or at least have reason to believe, that it is better for a student to be engaged … than not to be (42).

Axelson and Flick suggest that while engagement is not necessarily detrimental, it has not proven to be entirely imperative to learning. Despite these limitations and lingering unknowns, what I learned about my students and their engagement has proved invaluable to me as a new teacher.

**Themes of Self-Expression and Collaboration**

Throughout the unit, students capitalized on their self-expressions, interactions with others, sense of mastery, and authenticity to engage with the text. Of these, two avenues of engagement recurred most prominently. First, self-expression catalyzed student engagement in nearly every activity analyzed in this study. In activities employing media and technology specifically, the computer screen mediated students’ anxieties and insecurities. In this space (including the Google Docs freewriting and the forum responses), students were able to express themselves freely and openly.

Students’ interactions with others also emerged as a prominent theme in this study of engagement. Most often, these interactions began with students expressing themselves to each other. Over the course of the unit, I observed how willingly and deeply my students engaged with the text by expressing their personal connections, past experiences, musical tastes, and personal opinions to others. This intertextual engagement and expression brought students together as a classroom community in which they collaboratively engaged in textual analysis and
performance. The construction of this collaborative student-centered space was crucial to students’ engagement with *Macbeth*.

Through my close analysis of their engagement, I learned that my students, as reluctant as they first appeared, were complex, competent individuals whose experience and expertise enriched our studies far beyond my initial expectations. As a beginning teacher, I am excited to explore other variables of student engagement as I move on from my classroom. I wonder: how can I design activities that are even more student-centered? What does student engagement with Shakespeare look like at other ability and grade levels? Furthermore, when and how should we introduce Shakespeare to our students to ensure consistent engaging and enriching experiences with the Bard’s work? And finally, as the age gap between my students and me widens, will our pool of shared intertextual connections shrink? What happens when the teacher does not understand or identify with the connections students make to the text and what will it mean for student engagement?
Appendix A

*Macbeth* Classroom Playlist

AWOLNATION – “Sail”

Band of Horses – “Is There A Ghost”

Band of Horses – “The Funeral”

Bon Iver – “Woods”

Cake – “Palm Of Your Hand”

Cake – “End of the Movie”

Coldplay – “Up in Flames”

DeYarmond Edison – “Silent Signs”

Ed Sheeran – “Drunk”

The Fray – Heartless – “Swinghouse Session”

Gotye – “Somebody That I Used To Know”

Harry Potter Soundtrack – “Double Trouble”

Imagine Dragons – “Radioactive”

Kanye West – “POWER” - Album Version (Edited)

Mumford & Sons – “Roll Away Your Stone”

Muse – “Madness”

Pixies – “Where Is My Mind?”

The Shins – “Sleeping Lessons”

Weezer – “Say It Ain't So”
Appendix B
Shakespeare Storyboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Example *Macbeth* Memes

**I WAS IRONIC**

BEFORE IT WAS COOL

**I DONT ALWAYS TALK TO WITCHES...**

BUT WHEN I DO I KILL THE KING OF SCOTLAND

**SHAKESPEARE**

Y THOU NO TALK NORMALLY
Appendix D
Group 1 Script

Cast:
Homeless 1: Lilly (Sweatshirt & sweatpants)
Homeless 2: Jake (Sweatshirt & sweatpants)
Homeless 3: Tyler (Sweatshirt & sweatpants)
Banquo: Harry - Deputy Banquo (Black shirt, flashlight and badge)
Macbeth: Ron - Deputy Macbeth (Black shirt, flashlight and badge)
Ross: Jake - Guards
Angus: Lilly - Guards

Prop List
-Garbage can -2 badges -2 flashlight -2 hats

Stage Setup:
Wall facing the front. Homeless live behind it. Trash can in front in the middle of the stage. Three items in trash can Banquo and Macbeth entire stage right.

Summary:
We will be performing Act 1 Scene 3. The setting is in an alley in Queens, New York. The characters in this scene are Deputy Macbeth which is being played by Ron, Deputy Banquo played by Harry, Homeless person 1 played by Lilly, Homeless Person 2 played by Jake, and Homeless Person 3 played by Tyler. In this scene Deputy Banquo and Deputy Macbeth run into the 3 homeless siblings and are given their prophecies.

SCENE III. An alley in Queens, New York. Sirens. Enter the homeless

Lilly: Where ya been, brother? Points

Jake: Searching the streets for loose change. I found 3 dollars. I’m a high roller today In excitement

Tyler
Sister, where you at? Looks around

Lilly

'Give me,' I quote,
'Are you, homeless!' the ronyon cries.

Jake
I'll give you the help you ever so need. sarcastically
Lilly
What a kind fellow

Tyler: And I another.

Lilly
I will drain him dry:
He shall never sleep again
He will be cursed for nine times in nine weeks

Second homeless-Jake
Show me, show me. enthusiastically.

Lilly
Here I have a pilot's thumb,
Wreck'd as homeward he did come.
Drum within

Tyler
A drum, a drum!
Macbeth doth come.

ALL
The weird siblings, hand in hand,
Posters of the sea and land,
Thus do go about, about:
Thrice to thine and thrice to mine
And thrice again, to make up nine.
Peace! the charm's wound up.

Enter MACBETH and BANQUO

Ron cop: Today was the weirdest slash best day of my police career (face Harry)

Harry Deputy
how far is it to the station. look at these people.
their clothes are horrible
are we sure that they are people
Are you from here?
do you understand me?
each of you have chappy finger.
you all must surely be human
and yet your appearance doesn’t allude to that

Ron cop
Tell me who you are (Face the witches)

Lilly
All hail, Macbeth! hail to thee, Deputy!
Jake
praise, Macbeth, praise to thee, Commissioner!  

Tyler
All hail, Macbeth, thou shalt be Mayor hereafter!

Harry Deputy
(to Ron cop)
Chef why do you look afraid
when the news you hear is so great
If you can really see into the future
what is to come for me

Lilly Facing Macbeth and Banquo
Yo, Hail!

Jake
Hail!

Tyler
Hail brah!

Lilly
Lesser than Macbeth, and greater.

Jake
Not so lucky, yet much stronger. in a wise tone

Tyler
Thou shalt get Mayors, though thou be none:
So all hail, Macbeth and Banquo!

Lilly sitting
Banquo and Macbeth, all hail!

Ron cop
If you don’t tell me I’ll arrest you  
I know I am a Deputy;  
But I’m now a commissioner? the commissioner lives,  
A great man; and to be Mayor is unbelievable  
No more than to be commissioner. Where did you hear this prophecy? Tell me

Homeless vanish  
(Lilly and Jake run outside to change)

Harry Deputy
like a dirty shirt  
they're off
Ron cop
Now that they are gone. I wish they would have stayed. (Face Harry)

Harry Deputy
did we just imagine them

Ron cop
Your children shall be Mayors. (Face Harry)

Harry Deputy
You shall be Mayor.

Ron cop
And commissioner too: I am not so (Face Harry)

Harry Deputy
look here comes a car toward us.

Enter ROSS and ANGUS

ROSS- Jake
Mayor Duncan heard of your success in battle and he’s pumped.

Lilly  hand outstretched
We have been sent
to thank you
but only to announce his presence

ROSS- Jake
guess what!? For having great honor and courage, you are now commissioner.

Harry Deputy
Is what you say true chief

Ron cop
The commissioner lives: why do you call me something I am not? (face Angus and Watch)

ANGUS
The commissioner still lives but he has betrayed the Mayor
so we will kill him

Ron cop
[Aside] Deputy, and commissioner then Mayor!
[To ROSS and ANGUS]
Thanks for telling me
[To Harry Deputy]
Do you not hope your children will be Mayors?
When people gave me the position of commissioner. I think no less of them.
Harry Deputy
Okay chief these all seem great
but sometimes they’re just a play on words
and you can’t change fate

Ron cop
My two prophecies have came true.
They are good.
They have given me success.
I am a commissioner .
This title makes my hair stand on end
The thought of it makes me nervous

Harry Deputy
Look, how our partner's rapt.

Ron cop
[Aside] If chance will have me Mayor, why, chance may badge me,
Without my stir.

Harry Deputy
(to angus)
the dark side troubles him Chief.
If the glove don’t fit you must not pick

Ron cop
[Aside] Come what come may,
Time and the hour runs through the roughest day.

Harry Deputy
come on Deputy. wait until the time comes.

Ron
I forget what I was going to say.
Give me a second to remember.
Lets think about what has happened when have more time.
We will talk about once we have slept on it.

Harry Deputy
Its been stimulating

Ron cop
Till then, enough. Come, friends.

Exit
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