

UC Santa Cruz

UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Fostering Children's Engagement With Shakespeare

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4qn1h59w>

Author

Blake Cavanaugh, Kerri Marie

Publication Date

2016

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

FOSTERING CHILDREN'S ENGAGEMENT WITH SHAKESPEARE:

The Dramaturg as Pedagogue

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction

Of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In

THEATER ARTS

By

Kerri M. Blake Cavanaugh

June 2016

The Thesis of Kerri M. Blake Cavanaugh is
approved:

Michael M. Chemers, PhD, Chair

Patty Gallagher, PhD

Sean Keilen, PhD

Tyrus Miller

Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by
Kerri M. Blake Cavanaugh
2016

Table of Contents

1.	Abstract: Fostering Children’s Engagement With Shakespeare.....	iv
2.	Acknowledgements.....	vi
3.	Fostering Children’s Engagement With Shakespeare.....	1
	The Dramaturg is Present.....	2
	The Rehearsal Dramaturg.....	4
	Play Theory and the Education of Shakespeare.....	5
	The Classroom Dramaturg.....	9
	Dramaturg as Pedagogue- Linscott Workshops.....	11
	The Post-Show Talkback.....	24
	Measuring Dramaturgical Impact.....	27
	Conclusion- the Dramaturg as “Player”.....	28
4.	Appendix A- Lesson Plans for Linscott Charter School.....	30
5.	Bibliography.....	39

Appendix B- the Casebook for *Love’s Labour’s Lost*....submitted under separate cover

ABSTRACT:

FOSTERING CHILDREN’S ENGAGEMENT WITH SHAKESPEARE:

The Dramaturg as Pedagogue

By

Kerri M. Blake Cavanaugh

My goal as the production dramaturg for this year’s production of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* was to utilize my skills in dramaturgy to help create a piece that is both engaging (attracting someone’s interest or attention to promote participation and involvement) and thought provoking for young audiences; who may not be emotionally or intellectually mature enough to engage with or even understand his complicated plays. This assertion begs the question, “Are children capable of engaging meaningfully with the works of William Shakespeare?” It is my theory that children are capable of engagement with his work, it is merely the method by which we present Shakespeare to younger students that is prohibiting their engagement and enjoyment.

I went about testing this theory through a series of pre-show workshops to see if the hands on application of dramaturgical strategies could enhance a group of children’s experience with a performance of Shakespeare. I utilized the post show “talk backs” of the performance to quantify their engagement with the work through the questions that they ask; with questions pertaining to the play (plot, themes, and characters) signifying their engagement, whereas seemingly random questions (like, “Do you like Jelly Beans?”) would showcase a lack of engagement. I executed these workshops at one school, working with three different age groups, to see if my interactions with them

would differ in their engagement with the piece than those at other schools who did not receive my pre-show assistance.

In my thesis I explain the process and the results of this field study, drawing some interesting conclusions about the nature of the dramaturg's role in this kind of educational outreach.

Acknowledgments

My sincerest thanks go out to my wonderful and supportive family, who may not understand what it is I do or study but are proud of me and love me for doing it anyway.

I would also like to thank my cohorts and dear friends of the UCSC Masters of Theater Arts Program of 2016; without whom my thesis, and my sanity, would not be in tact.

To all of my wonderful theater teachers and Professors both past and present; the support and rigorous pushes I have received over the years attribute to the drive and academic confidence that I have today.

Finally to my collaborators and beloved friends in this year's production of "Shakes-To-Go"; without whom I would literally have nothing to write about and would have missed out on one of the most rewarding experiences of my life.

FOSTERING CHILDREN’S ENGAGEMENT WITH SHAKESPEARE:

The Dramaturg as Pedagogue

By

Kerri M. Blake Cavanaugh

“Shakes-to-Go” is a program of the University of California, Santa Cruz that takes one of the plays of William Shakespeare and condenses it to be performed for local children and communities in the Lower Bay Area of California. The purpose of this program is to introduce the work of Shakespeare to audiences who may not have access to it. It aims to inspire a new generation of artists to take an interest in theater (whether it be as theatre goers or practitioners).

My goal as the program dramaturg for this year’s production of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* was to utilize my skills in dramaturgy to help create a piece that is both engaging (attracting someone’s interest or attention to promote participation and involvement) and thought provoking for young audiences; who may not be emotionally or intellectually mature enough to engage with or even understand his complicated plays. This assertion begs the question, “Are children capable of engaging meaningfully with the works of William Shakespeare?” I believe that children are capable of engagement with his work, it is merely the method by which we present Shakespeare to younger students that is prohibiting their engagement and enjoyment.

My thoughts on how to measure, or record my observed responses of, their engagement was to try and utilize my skills as a dramaturg to work directly with the children in a set of pre-show workshops to see if my work with them would affect their recorded engagement. I decided that the platform which would be the most effective in

recording these differences in their engagement was the post-show talk backs. The post-show talk backs immediately follow the performances, and is the opportunity for the young audience members to directly ask questions about the show to the actors on the stage. I decided that questions pertaining to the play (plot, themes, and characters) signifying their engagement, as it would show that they were paying attention to and thinking critically of the show they just watched; whereas seemingly random questions (like, “Do you like Jelly Beans?”) would showcase a lack of engagement, because the random or disconnected nature of the question would suggest to me a lack of paying attention and critical thinking. I executed these workshops at one school, working with three different age groups, to see if my interactions with them would differ in their engagement with the piece than those at other schools who did not receive my pre-show assistance.

I realize that three classrooms within one school is a small sample size to work with and will not provide the definitive answer for children around the world; that study would require more time, money, and many double blind tests of children from different ages, backgrounds, and regions. The purpose of this field study is to observe the effects my dramaturgical work will or will not have on the audiences this program was created to serve.

THE DRAMATURG IS PRESENT

While there is no strict definition as to what dramaturgy is, a dramaturg, according to Dr. Michael M. Chemers, Professor of Theater Arts at the University of California, Santa Cruz, in his book Ghostlight: An Introductory Handbook for Dramaturgy,

determines what the aesthetic architecture of a piece of dramatic literature [(it's structure, themes, goals, and conventions)] actually is (analysis), discovers everything needed to transform that inert script into a living piece of theater (research), and applies that knowledge in a way that makes sense to a living audience at this time and place.¹

I utilize this definition of dramaturgy because the lack of strict definition allows for unlimited possibilities of how a dramaturg gathers this information and applies it.

Dramaturgy can take on different roles within the process of creating a theatrical work. In the case of this production of William Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*, both in the rehearsal room and beyond, I, as the dramaturg, am taking on the role of educator and utilizing my dramaturgical performance skills to help create a work that is both fun and engaging for young audiences. Doing this requires that I understand the world of the play (its language, plot, references, and inspirations), or I will not be able to educate anyone on the nature of this show; as well as knowing who our audience is that the production will be performing for.

Why was I particularly qualified to teach this production of *LLL* to a group of school children that would be viewing the performance rather than a state certified schoolteacher? I, as the dramaturg, act as a conduit between the rehearsal room and the audience itself, whereas the teacher's involvement is solely in the classroom. *Presence* is one of the most important aspects of dramaturgy, because in order for us to effectively do our job we need to *be* there.

¹ Chemers, Michael M. *Ghost Light: An Introductory Handbook for Dramaturgy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print. Pg. 3.

The dramaturg exists in a liminal state, being on both sides of a boundary or threshold, with their involvement with both the creative process and the audience. My work in the rehearsal room, and by extension the classroom, was a direct result of working as a dramaturg with Dr. Patty Gallagher, the director of this production of *LLL*. The direction and vision of Dr. Gallagher in the rehearsal room informed my research of the language, themes and constructs that I would then be using in my workshops with the children at Linscott Charter School. Her vision, or concept, is that:

the language carries the play. The themes prevalent in the text are the themes of this production. [My concept is] what you can do with just the language, expressive capacity of an actor's body, and the audience's imagination... I'm just doing the play as written.

Keeping this concept in mind I was able to shape the content of both my research and my lesson plan to promote Dr. Gallagher's vision of the production, making sure to emphasize language (in an activity where students write "love letters") and expressive capacity (activities where students utilize their physical bodies to tell a story "Take a Walk" and "Tableaux") with my work at the Linscott Charter School.

THE REHEARSAL DRAMATURG

The plot of *Love's Labour's Lost*, or *LLL*, is less driven by action than it is by language, and thus my first step in "determining the aesthetic architecture" of the play, as Chemers said, was to dive deep into the work's language. This includes understanding the intent of every speech and how it pertains to the work as a whole, understanding the influence of the works of John Lyly and Sir Philip Sidney on the language and characters

of the play, researching the historical events and people the play satirizes, and understanding the influence *commedia dell'arte* has on the formation of the characters. With all of this research underway, my next task was to bring my findings into the rehearsal room, implementing my knowledge onto the work of the actors, directors and designers. For further information on this research see the Casebook (Appendix B).

This year's "Shakes-To-Go" production has taken on the new challenge of split casting: having twice the actors available than previous productions and having each character played by two people. We split the characters into two ten person casts called the "Apples" and the "Oranges," because while they are individual casts with their own unique qualities they are both excellent and not in comparison with the other. With the inclusion of the "Apples" and "Oranges" my presence in the rehearsal space helped to insure the clarity of the language and themes of *LLL* through the application of text coaching, where I made myself available to work with the actors to facilitate their understanding of the text. This helped to insure that our target audiences would be linguistically and thematically involved as well as entertained through the clarity of the actors.

PLAY THEORY AND THE EDUCATION OF SHAKESPEARE

Children when they enter the world of education are in a transitional state. They leave the comfort of their homes and are suddenly given responsibilities. The only 'responsibility' they have known up to this point is their need and desire to play and relish their childhood. When placed into a classroom where they are expected to sit still and focus on tasks of learning, then, a child may face a state of crisis in the sudden responsibility. But this crisis is engendered as much by our strategies for education,

which seem to treat the concept of play in a rather antiquated way, indeed as if we still followed Schiller's definition of play as "the aimless expenditure of exuberant energy."²

What if play were incorporated into the responsibility of learning?

Richard Courtney, in his book Play, Drama and Thought: the Intellectual Background to Dramatic Education, describes play as "the foundation for the arts." Imitation, experimentation, imaginative thinking, and the creation of whole worlds of the mind are all critical components of an educational experience that can be fostered by play. Following Freud, Courtney asserts that "play elaborates material already experienced; it is a form of secondary symbolism with which the child attempts to order reality in accordance with the symbolic thought of his unconscious."³ This "aimless expenditure of exuberant energy," can actually be a powerful tool with which children can make sense of the world around them as well as spark joy and passion for learning. Through play, and the enjoyment that accompanies the activity, children need not be forced to suffer through educational tasks that may otherwise come across as tedious or boring but can meet the challenge, and enjoy, the process of their education.

For many students of the Bard, the first few goes at his work are neither fun nor rewarding. Many students' first introductions to the work of Shakespeare take place in an English classroom, and they are told to approach the work as they would a novel or even a scientific text. In a conversation with Cody Lee, who plays Boyett in the Oranges cast, he reflected on how he used to hate learning the works of Shakespeare in school because of this method which was presented to him in his education: "We were just told to sit

² Courtney, Richard. *Play, Drama, and Thought: the Intellectual Background to Dramatic Education*. London: Cassell & Co. LTD, 1968. Print. Pg. 22.

³ Courtney, Richard. *Play Drama and Thought: the Intellectual Background to Dramatic education*. London: Cassell & Co. LTD. 1968. Print. Pg. 73.

there, either taking turns reading each individual lines aloud or reading silently on our own. ... I really did not like [Shakespeare's work] until I started learning about it in *theatre* classes.”⁴ This is one of the inherent problems of the early education of Shakespeare because his works are not novels but performative texts, meaning they are intended to be experienced not as texts but visually, audibly, and kinesthetically.

Edward L. Rocklin in his book, Performance Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare cites this traditional teaching method as an inherently limited way of learning Shakespeare's work:

[One of the] most obvious symptoms of how we narrow our [educational] options are in front of us in many classrooms: students sit in rows looking at the back of the head of the person in front of them, and they take notes while the teacher lectures. [This point to] what is being limited, which is student participation and, in particular, the use of the body as a source of learning.⁵

For younger audiences, the works of Shakespeare presented in this way can come off as confusing and old fashioned due to its complicated language and apparent distance from anything the audience may find relatable: the audience may not be able to see themselves in these old stories and therefore will find these narratives irrelevant to their lives.

Another major way that the works of Shakespeare comes off as 'old fashioned' or irrelevant is through seeing live performances of his works at a young age with a lack of diversity. This introduction may be disengaging for an audience member is if there is not

⁴ Interview with Cody Lee, January 18, 2016

⁵ Rocklin, Edward L. *Performance Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2005. Print. Pg. 352

a single person on stage who looks like them. Historically, much of Shakespeare's work has been performed by predominantly Caucasian actors, with performers of color rarely taking on protagonistic roles. The problem with this convention is that it alienates much of the population.

The Royal Shakespeare Company in London has a program similar to "Shakes-To-Go", called "Stand Up for Shakespeare," where they abridge one of the works of Shakespeare and tour local schools and communities.⁶ In that company Tarell Alvin McCraney, an African American playwright and director, chose to direct *Hamlet* for the program and cast Dharmesh Patel in the titular role, the first British Asian Hamlet in the history of the company, claiming:

It was hugely important for me to cast a Hamlet of colour. We're in London, for God's sake, where around 40% of people are non-white. Something happens when your first theater experience is at a young age. But if you're a minority and, in the first show you see, everyone is white, followed by another that's the same and so on, you think; 'Oh, this is for them.' A pattern builds. And it's difficult to overcome.⁷

I saw this as a similar issue in much of the theater performed in the Lower Bay Area of California, where our target audiences reside, in which the stage is flooded with many white actors and maybe two to three actors of color sharing the stage.

⁶ Winston, Joe. *Transforming the Teaching of Shakespeare with the Royal Shakespeare Company*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015. Page 15.

⁷ Winston, Joe. *Transforming the Teaching of Shakespeare with the Royal Shakespeare Company*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015. Page 15.

Our target audiences are the children of Santa Cruz County, Monterey, and San Jose with ages ranging from nine to eighteen years old. Many of the students Shakes-To-Go performs for are students of color. When going to schools in Watsonville or Aptos the ethnic makeup of the audiences mainly consist of Hispanic and Latino students; as well as students of Asian, African, Arabic, and European descent. This year, there are seven actors of color within the two casts who play protagonistic characters. Our Kings of Navarre are Asian American and Hispanic American; one of our Berownes is Hispanic American, as well as one of each of our Armados, Katherines, and Costards. With having a wider variety of ethnic backgrounds on stage, we allow the opportunity for more audience members to see themselves onstage and see themselves portrayed in a positive way. This helps students of color to see the works of Shakespeare as a possible avenue of interest or study in their academic or extracurricular pursuits.

THE CLASSROOM DRAMATURG

In my time working with a second grade classroom at Westlake Elementary in 2014⁸, I noticed that young children, who make up the majority of our audiences, spend much of their early education focusing on introductory basics, such as addition and spelling, and the repetition of those basics. Through repetition they are able to have a grounded understanding of what is expected in their education, and after achieving the basic understanding are ready to delve deeper into a fuller understanding of each subject. They learn about focus, how to work, how to learn, and how to listen and obey authority figures.

⁸ I spent three months volunteering in a second grade classroom where I helped to facilitate activities and tutored them in various subjects such as addition, geography, spelling and reading.

The California State Department of Education's suggested lesson plan Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve, amended in 2004, encourages a "comprehensive program" of arts training:

Students in a comprehensive program are expected to master the standards of an arts discipline, which are grouped under the following strands: a. artistic perception [(processing, analyzing, and responding to sensory information through the use of the language and skills unique to each discipline)], b. creative expression [(creating a work, performing, and participating in the arts disciplines to communicate meaning and intent)], c. historical and cultural context [(concerning the work students do toward understanding the historical contributions and cultural dimensions of an arts discipline)], d. aesthetic valuing [(analyzing and critiquing works of dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts)], e. connections, relationships, and applications [(connecting and applying what is learned in one arts discipline and comparing it to learning in the other arts, other subject areas, and careers).⁹

In reality, however, it's unlikely for a school, particularly an underfunded one, to have the resources and wherewithal to produce a "comprehensive program."

Using these guidelines, and five component strands, I developed a lesson plan catering to the suggested areas of learning to help create an effective workshop to prepare the children I would be working with for the performance. It was my hope in utilizing

⁹ Education, State Board Of. "Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Grade Kindergarten Through Twelve." (n.d.): n. pag. *California Department of Education*. California Department of Education. Web. 20 May 2016. <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/vpaframewrk.pdf>>.

these resources to give my workshops an educational background that would easily be understandable for the children, as they would coincide with how they were learning about art, and putting my own dramaturgical spin on it by utilizing activities and exercises I have learned in my previous of theatrical training to familiarize them with the characters, themes, and events of the play.

The children I worked with in my research were students at the Linscott Charter School in Watsonville, California, which teaches Kindergarten through seventh grade; and worked with me two days prior to seeing the live performance. I worked with three different classrooms throughout the morning of April 6th, 2016 of different age ranges and understandings of theatre, performance, and of the work of William Shakespeare.

DRAMATURG AS PEDAGOGUE- LINSOTT WORKSHOPS

My first workshop was held in the “Rainbow Room” with a group of twenty-five students in the first through the third grade, respective ages ranging from six to nine years old. My main goal for this group of students, knowing that language was going to be their biggest obstacle in their engagement of the play, was to give them tips and tricks to understanding what was happening in the play. At the start of the workshop I made sure to establish everyone’s understanding of theatrical terms and conventions, to see how basic I needed to get in my instruction in order to help them understand the show they would be seeing. I asked questions such as, “What is a play?,” “What is an actor?,” “What is a script?,” and “What is an audience?”. I was pleasantly surprised when the students in the room raised their hands with vigor and gave definitions of each of these terms, but even more thrilled when I ask them, “Who here has heard of William

Shakespeare?,” and “Who here has seen a performance of Shakespeare?” and every single child raised their hand.

Next was establishing the story, I read a condensed summary of the play out loud to them to get them familiarized with the events and characters of the show. I then began to talk with them about the language, talking about the rhythm of the speech, the “big, fancy words”, and asking them if they found the language difficult. Again, every child raised their¹⁰ hand and I took that moment to segue into our first activity.

Appealing to the childlike craving and need for play, I had them partake in a variety of exercises adapted from actor training activities that I have learned in my years of study. One of these is an activity I like to call, “Take a Walk,” where I worked with the children to pick up on different facial and body cues in order to understand what was happening in a scene or performative moment. Keeping these factors in mind, and harkening to my research of *commedia dell’arte*, I demonstrated the activity to the seemingly eager group of youngsters.

While speaking in gibberish I contorted my face and body, and asked them to identify what I was thinking or feeling and to tell me what about my face or body made them think so. After going through the easily identifiable emotions of sadness, anger, fear, and happiness I went a little further. I asked them to identify the differences between contentment happiness, excited happiness, and in-love happiness still utilizing my face and physicality. After showing them I asked for three volunteers to come up and try for themselves, letting them participate and enacting what Edward L. Rocklin calls, “learning

¹⁰ I have made a purposeful and conscious decision to use the singular “they” pronoun in this thesis, as it is a legitimate, and non-gendered, singular pronoun.

by doing”.¹¹ I gave each volunteer an emotion/action and told them to walk around the room and get their classmates to guess their intention. The children engaged enthusiastically with the interactive aspect of this activity and shouted out answers, and the reasons for their answers, as their peers walked around the room. With the excitement of participation and play being entered into the lesson, I immediately moved on to an activity where every student had the ability to participate.

I wanted to take these pantomime skills they learned/witnessed and apply it to the narrative of the play, so that when they would see the performance two days later they would recognize certain moments because they were able to be part of them. I split them into three groups and had them play, “Tableaux,” where they work together as a group to create a still image of a moment in the play. One group enacted the initial meeting of the lords and ladies, the moment I called, “Love at First Sight;” another the masquerade; and the final group enacted the play within the play. I also took this exercise as a reminder of the themes in the show, calling attention to how ‘love at first sight’ and deception/miscommunication were integral to what occurs in the play.

The students seemed to enjoy the activity but some groups were easier to work with than others; mainly because of the maturity of the participants. It was a struggle to get the boys and girls to interact with each other in the love at first sight scene. They expressed hesitation, on the grounds that cross gendered contact of any kind is “gross,” but once I explained that they didn’t actually have to touch one another they began to participate and appeared to be having fun. The boys started doing tough guy poses to impress the girls, one of them thought to get down on one knee and give one of the girls a

¹¹ Rocklin, Edward L. *Performance Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2005. Print. Pg. 352

gift (a crayon); and the girls had fun blowing kisses and twirling their hair. It was interesting to notice the performative gender roles that each student naturally fell into without any prompting from me.

The masquerade posed the most difficult problem, maturity-wise. As soon as I asked them to pair up, some of them with opposite genders, the girls visibly shut down and refused to participate. I was surprised to see the boys in the group had no problem with the activity, and were in fact trying to convince the girls to “play” with them. After getting some help from their teacher, we were able to convince two of the girls to pair up with a boy and then there were two same sex pairings (which worked under the guise of their comfort levels as well as prepared them for the pairing of Lorena Rubio and Emily Schneiderman as Katherine and Longaville).

The play within a play posed a different set of challenges where there were a lot of ideas floating around but not a lot of decisions being made. Getting them to rein in their ideas was a bit of a challenge as they wanted to do things bigger and grander. After helping them to focus on “cool, dramatic” poses I worked them on how to show the difference between performers and an audience. The seemingly shyer students in the group were happy to make up the audience and had their own fun interacting with each other in the tableaux; showing the bad audience members by those who looked like they were talking, and the good audience members by those who were pretending to laugh and also shushing the “bad” audience members. The actors were the more outgoing kids so we saw a lot of dramatic arm gestures and open singing mouths from the girls, whereas the boys were doing muscle arms and playing with levels.

This classroom posed the most difficult obstacles attention-wise; after getting riled up by the interactive activity there was a major focus and behaviour problem in the room. The teachers, ready for this situation, had me work with each individual group while they played “quiet ball” with the other two groups, a game where they sit in a circle silently and volleyed a soft ball around the circle.

Once I was able to work on fixed poses, the groups presented their scenes and while they stayed stationary I asked the other groups what they saw and thought was going on. Of all the scenes the overwhelming favorite was the staged play, and in order to imprint the importance of the performer/audience relationship to the rest of the class I had them identify what the interactions were between the audience and the performers as well as asking what each individual was doing.

Seeing as how I only had an hour with this group, I could not do any more activities. I spent the last few minutes doing a “post-workshop discussion” to prepare them for the “post-show discussion” they would participate in after the performance. I asked them by a raise of hands, “Who learned something new today?” Again, all of them raised their hands. I asked them to elaborate, “What did you learn today?” The answer I received the most was how to use the body and face to learn what was going on if you couldn’t understand someone, and the most fun answer I heard was that they wanted to play “Take a Walk” again. After saying my goodbyes to the group, many ran over to give me a hug and thank me for coming before running back to their teacher to prepare for the field trip they were about to go on.

The next group I worked with was a seventh grade class held in the “Lion’s Lair”, with a room of about thirty twelve to thirteen year olds. I realized in working with an

older group that I wouldn't have to be so basic in my expectation of theatrical conventions. So I asked them for more specific definitions. Rather than asking, "What is a play?," I asked, "What goes into making a play?" I received some obvious answers such as actors, a set, costumes, props, a director, an audience, and a script; but when I asked, "What about a dramaturg?," I was met with a room full of blank stares and silence.

I took that opportunity to teach them a new aspect of theatre and what a dramaturg, or specifically what I as a dramaturg, does for a production. I gave my own introductory definition pertaining to the performance they would be seeing, in order to give it relevance to their own lives by explaining my impact on what they would be experiencing a few days later, and told them how I acted as the guide to the text. I told them about understanding the vocabulary, the themes, the contexts, the inspirations, and the conventions of iambic pentameter; and how that in turn affects the performance by creating a team of actors and directors that are more informed and in on the nearly 500 year old jokes, and helps the audience to be in on those jokes as well.

After establishing the new convention, I asked them a similar question to the younger kids, "Who here has difficulty understanding the language of Shakespeare?" As expected, all of the students raised their hands. I then asked how they had learned to read/study Shakespeare, and one girl answered, "We just read it out loud, line by line." Expecting this answer, as it was the same way I was initially taught to read the works of Shakespeare and what Rocklin cites as the most common method, I then explained to them how this was a performative text and it was meant to be performed as rhythmic speech rather than line by line. I then did an exercise where I read the King of Navarre's opening speech first the way they were used to hearing it, line by line; then as rhythmic

speech. After the two I asked which one they understood more, the whole class agreed that the performative rhythmic speech was much easier to understand.

After teaching them how to expect the texts of Shakespeare in a performative setting, I then focused on how I got them to care about this nearly 500 year old text. Recalling my own experience as an apathetic seventh grader learning Shakespeare, I could only remember thinking, “Why should I care about this? What does this have to do with me?” If I wanted them to care about the works of Shakespeare, then I would need to cite examples of how Shakespeare has already entered their lives.

I then spoke with them about how the works of Shakespeare are still prevalent in popular culture today; citing films I assumed they had seen because of their cultural significance and their age group such as *The Lion King*, *10 Things I Hate About You*, and *She’s The Man*. The biggest reaction came from *The Lion King*, which most admitted to watching repeatedly as children. Using these examples I posed the question, “If these plays and stories have been around for hundreds of years, why are we still making newer versions, or adaptations, of them?” The room was, again, full of silence but this time there were no blank stares. Many of the students appeared to be seriously considering this question. After no one offered an answer I told them my opinion, “It is because even after all of these years there is still something about these works that resonate with us today, and teach us something new about ourselves as we relate to the work.”

Remembering again what it was like to be in seventh grade, I remembered that the only thing myself and my peers cared about was dating. Who was dating who, who liked who, what was reciprocated, and what was not. I then took this opportunity to go through the plot of the play, highlighting major characters and events as well as emphasising who

was trying to court who. After going through the plot I asked them what seemed to be the major themes or events that were happening in the play, and they agreed that the two that stuck out to them were the constant miscommunications and deceptions. I then asked them, by a raise of hands, if they thought that young people interested in dating in each other still behave in similar ways. Almost all of the girls raised their hands and about half of the boys raised theirs.

I then explained that my understanding of this play, inspired and influenced by a discussion of the play with my former mentor Dr. Michael Warren from my internship at Santa Cruz Shakespeare¹², is about wooing games and how language can help you to express those feelings or hide from them. I then reminded them of the scene in the play where the King of Navarre and his Lords catch each other writing cheesy love letters. I then asked the class, “Do people your age still write poems for each other?” which met a room a shaking heads; “How about songs?” one or two of the boys nodded their heads in agreement; and “Mix tapes?” which was met with mixed reactions. In response, one of the girls asked, “Like, playlists?” which everyone in the class agreed was happening amongst their generation. I then opened up the discussion and asked them how they saw dating and courtship happening today. The general consensus was that people don’t actually talk to one another about how they really feel, but try to break the ice and ease the tension with jokes and pick up lines rather than letting on their true intentions.

I used this discussion to segue into an activity where I had each of them take out a piece of paper and write a love letter/song lyric/pick up line that fits in the petrarchan

¹² My professional internship with Santa Cruz Shakespeare was as a dramaturgical assistant to Dr. Warren for their production of *Much Ado About Nothing* directed by Laura Gordon in the summer of 2015. Apart from honing my skills as a dramaturg, this internship was a great opportunity to connect with professional scholars and theatre artists.

style of excess, the style the the King and his Lords were taught to appreciate and express notions of “love”. This style, while once considered to display wit and charisma is considered in modern times to be overtop and ridiculous. I encouraged them to go big, stating, “I want you to get as cheesy and ridiculous as you can, it would be great if you could go so far that you make yourself laugh with what you write.” I also offered, keeping the letters anonymous, if they wanted I would read their ‘letters’ aloud to the class and we could do a vote to see if we would say yes to going out with someone who said that to them. I thought that this activity would be an effective way of getting the students to empathize with both the Lords and the Ladies, by being the ones writing the letters and then the ones who have to hear the letters and decide whether to take it seriously or as a joke.

After 10 minutes of free writing those who wanted their letters read lifted their arms up with their papers. I went around the room collecting them and then shuffled them up to keep the anonymity of the room. Most of the letters I received were pick up lines, and all but one submission got instant rejection. The biggest reactions came from, “Are you from Little Caesars, because you’re hot and ready,” and “You’re 70% water and I’m thirsty,” which garnered both laughter and immediate rejection.¹³ The only submission worthy enough to be given an outstanding yes was, “Your eyes are a pure as heaven itself... You visit my dreams every night. You’re the reason I wake up smiling,” because while cheesy it was agreed to be incredibly sweet and a really nice thing to say to someone. After the giggles subsided and the letters were all read I asked the class, “Why do you think people use lines like this?” and, “Do they ever work?” The girls

¹³ All turned in submissions can be found in the Appendix B casebook.

immediately responded with many nos, with one girl saying, “Only if it’s really funny;” but no one could say why people use lines like this.

I admitted that while I was not an expert on the subject, my theory was that it is easier for some people to hide behind humor or a confident persona than it is to be honest and vulnerable with another person. I then likened this idea to how a lot of dating in the modern day takes place online through apps and social media sites, and how when someone is behind a computer screen they have the opportunity to be bolder and put forth a version of themselves that they would want others to see. On the other hand it also puts one at risk of being deceived by said personas and realize that a person in real life could be nothing like what they portray themselves as online.

I connected this idea to the themes of deception and miscommunication in order to bring it back to the text. I explained to the group about the ladies’ frustration in the play with the lords who have been playing games in their courtship, and how they don’t actually believe them when they say they are in love. I then quoted the Princess of France:

We have received your letters full of love;
Your favours, the ambassadors of love;
And, in our maiden council, rated them
At courtship, pleasant jest and courtesy,
As bombast and as lining to the time:
But more devout than this in our respects
Have we not been; and therefore met your loves

In their own fashion, like a merriment. (V. ii) ¹⁴

I allowed some time for this speech to sink in as I observed the room. Many of the students sat there wide eyed, a few of the girls began whispering to one another, a few of the boys appeared to be taking calculated breaths, and there was one girl sitting in the back of the class staring at me with her hand covering her mouth as if I had just told her her life story.

After a long moment I asked the group by raise of hands, “Is this hitting close to home for anyone here?”, and about 80% of the students raised their hands. Knowing that my time with them was almost over I asked them two more questions, “Who here is surprised that they relate to the works of Shakespeare more than they thought they could?”, about 90% of students raised their hands in agreement; and “Who here is really excited to see the show on Friday?” to which everyone in the room raised their hands and one student lamented the fact that they would be out of town. I thanked them for having me, told them I would see them on Friday, and as they gathered for their lunch period I asked if I could possibly keep some of their letters, to which I received resoundingly enthusiastic yesses.

My next group was a classroom of second and third graders in the “Phoenix Hall”. I was less nervous for this group, as it was a similar age group to my first workshop and I had an idea of what to expect attention and maturity wise. I had a lesson plan identical to the first group, so that I could observe key differences when presenting two different groups of the same age with the same material.

¹⁴ Shakespeare, William. *Love's Labour's Lost*. Ed. H.R. Woudhuysen. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. Print. 5.2.771-778.

While this class was very similar to the first workshop there were some key differences that I had noticed: the first major difference was how eager they were to talk, whether it was about the play or not. While the third graders seemed actively involved in the discussion of the play and of theatre, the second graders seemed more interested in hearing their own voices. Many would start to talk about the plays or questions I would pose them, then go off on tangents because it was “their turn” to talk. Visual and Performing Arts Framework gives a possible explanation of this behavior, “Second Grade students have learned a lot. They become excited when they can connect their previous learning with something new or when they can demonstrate their expanding skills.”¹⁵ While I do admit to a bit of impatience with the constant interruptions and non sequiturs, I recognize now that this interaction of having their voices heard by their peers and instructors is their way of showing how much they are learning and that they are engaged with the material.

The next major difference I noticed was their willingness to ask questions. Whether it was about me, about theatrical conventions, or about the play they were outwardly curious and wanted access to as much information as possible. This enthusiastic response was explained in Visual and Performing Arts Framework through the assertion that, “As they begin to learn more about community, [(their peers, instructors, and those around them)] they become more curious about themselves and about others.”¹⁶ Hence the compulsion to ask more questions.

¹⁵ Education, State Board Of. "Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Grade Kindergarten Through Twelve." (n.d.): n. pag. *California Department of Education*. California Department of Education. Web. 20 May 2016. <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/vpaframewrk.pdf>>.

¹⁶ Education, State Board Of. "Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Grade Kindergarten Through Twelve." (n.d.): n. pag. *California Department of Education*. California Department of Education. Web. 20 May 2016. <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/vpaframewrk.pdf>>.

The third major difference that I noticed was in the maturity levels between the second graders and the third graders. When I had them play, “Tableaux,” the only group that seemed to be having focus and maturity issues was the group of second graders who were asked to portray the “Love at First Sight” scene. They seemed distracted and expressed not wanting to participate in the activity, sighting similar hesitations with the cross gendered interaction as the first workshop. This group, however, did not become more willing after I explained that they didn’t have to actually be in contact and that it was just pretend.

After the students’ stern coercion from their teachers, they finally participated, kind of. Rather than come up with ideas on their own they insisted I just tell them what to do. Seeing as how I couldn’t spend the entire time with just that group, I acquiesced and put them in similar poses as the group in the first workshop, playing on recognizable tropes of gender and what each gender looks like when they are in love in order to get the class to identify what was going on in the scene. When it came time to show the scene to the rest of the class, the boys in the group seemed to forget the poses and just stood there staring at the “audience” while the girls struck their poses. In order to keep up the appearance of participation I took whatever awkwardness or uncomfortabilty felt by the boys in the scene and applied it to courtship, and how sometimes people can be shy and not know how to express their feelings.

The third graders, on the other hand, were visibly enthusiastic about the activity and brought a lot of ideas to their scenes. The “masquerade” scene had no problems in pairing up and when two of the girls asked if they could be paired together I encouraged the idea, wanting to also prepare them for the onstage same sex pairing of Lorena and

Emily. The “play within a play” appeared to be having the most fun with their scene. The ‘audience’ members of the group did very big and exaggerated poses of laughing, crying, and shushing; myself again asking them to show what a good/bad audience member is. While the ‘actors’ went big with their poses. The girls were playing with dance poses on the ground while the boys wanted to do some acrobatic lifts to portray their play. This scene, again, was the favorite of the room.

I ended with this group in the same fashion as the first, where I asked them questions about what they learned, what they liked, and if they were excited to see the show. They answered very enthusiastically to each question, many hugging me goodbye like the first class. One student even came up to me and asking if I would be coming back too, to which I explained that I would and that I’d be asking them questions after the show just like I did in the workshop.

THE POST-SHOW TALKBACK

I left the school feeling both nervous and excited. I hoped that my workshops, and me playing with the children, would enhance their enjoyment of the show and translate in an active discussion in the post-show talk back. I returned to the school two days later with the cast, which was incidentally the first performance of the “Apples” cast, and awaited the reactions of my ‘students.’ The seating arrangements and lay out of the theater allowed me to closely observe audience engagement with the performance by placing me in a hallway on audience right with wide window holes facing the audience. I noticed as the classes were filing in that the students I had worked with made up the front portion of the audience with the students of Watsonville High, who were also attending the performance and with whom I had not worked with, filled in the back of the audience.

The middle and elementary school students appeared actively engaged in the show, laughing and listening intently, whereas the high school students didn't seem to care about the performance. Some students were whispering to each other throughout the show, many were playing on their phones, and some were using the opportunity of being out of class to take a nap.

Keeping these observations in mind I had a feeling going into the discussion that the questions would be mainly, if not entirely, coming from the younger portion of the audience. This feeling ended up being very correct. After the performance ended and the applause subsided, I walked onto the stage to facilitate the post-show discussion. This was done for two reasons: the first was to give the kids I worked with a familiar face to encourage and direct their questions to, and second was to give examples to the actors of how a post-show discussion could be ran for the performances in which I would not be attending.

After the discussion began with me and the cast introducing themselves and explaining how they worked on the show (they as their characters, and I as the dramaturg), the students almost immediately began asking questions. I was thrilled with the enthusiasm of their participation but a bit shocked and disappointed that the vast majority of their questions had nothing to do with the play. Almost all of the questions were geared toward the actors and their likes and dislikes. Rather than telling us their favorite moments, characters, and costumes they wanted to know what our favorites were. The questions that elicited the biggest reactions from both actors and crew were: "Who is your guys' [sic] favorite character?" with everyone including the audience agreeing on Gianna DiGregorio's portrayal of Don Armado; and "Do you like

marshmallows?” This last question caused the audience and the actors to laugh, and Jose Balistrieri who portrayed Berowne vehemently responded with, “I LOVE marshmallows.”

I asked the students a rather leading question: “Who here thought the language was hard to understand, but they still had a really fun time watching the show?” To my pleasant surprise 70% of the room raised their hands, much more than I was expecting, and I ended the discussion shortly after that. We said our goodbyes before adjourning backstage as the audience cleared out of the auditorium.

While I was reflecting on the questions that were asked, disappointed in the lack of questions pertaining to the play, one of the actors made a point to approach me to tell me what he noticed about the discussion. UCSC Undergraduate Senior Quest Zeidler, who portrayed Boyett, told me that his favorite part of the discussion was “seeing how excited the kids got as soon as you walked on the stage for the talk back.” It was this comment that sparked an idea that shaped my evaluation of the discussion: just because they don’t ask questions about the play doesn’t mean that they weren’t engaged.

Recalling their enthusiasm in speaking to both myself and the actors, I realized that their excitement in speaking to the people who helped to create the art they saw onstage was their way of showing their engagement. The only interaction these children have had with the actors is witnessing them as their characters and while they can differentiate the character from the actor their questions and comments expressed a desire to interact directly with the actors, who as far as the children are concerned are the embodiment of those characters. I observe that my work with these “children” helped to transgress the barriers that embarrassment or self-consciousness might impose between

them in the actors. By being accessible to them and by being a representative of the creative team I act as a conduit so that the children may see the actors as students like themselves, more grown up if not fully “adult” like their parents and teachers.

When I discussed this idea with Kendra Dority, a PhD. candidate in Literature at UCSC, who was in charge of Education Outreach for Shakes-To-Go and attended the performance, she brought up an interesting point. She asked me, “Can you even quantitatively measure engagement with art? I don’t think you can. It’s about the long term impact and how the art affects you down the road.” While this may not be a tangible answer, I agree with her quandary. Art and culture work their way into a person’s memory and have the opportunity to spark passions and desires that they may not have realized otherwise. Based on the enthusiasm of these students I would not be surprised to learn if later in life some of these children become Shakespeare practitioners, or at least patrons of his shows.

MEASURING DRAMATURGICAL IMPACT

I noticed similarities in the questions asked by students with whom I did not work prior to performances. Most of the questions I collected from other post-show discussions were also directed to the actors, with a surprising amount of questions about certain conventions of the play and about the works of Shakespeare. The data gathered from these “control groups” raised an important question: if both groups asked similar questions *did* my work have a measurable impact on the engagement of the children that I worked with? Could this kind of impact actually be “measured” at all? Did it need to be?

Even with the similar state of the questions, my experience working with the students at Linscott Charter School led me to believe that I most definitely made a

difference in their understanding and engagement of the play. Although I did not achieve the results I initially hoped for, I have learned that meaningful engagement isn't something that can be measured quantitatively. Through this field study I have learned that you can, however, qualitatively measure their engagement. By utilizing fun and play, or the aimless expenditure of exuberant energy, I witnessed first hand the children's engagement with the performance. In their interactions with both myself and the cast they were able to use their questions to elaborate on and make sense of the material they were presented, and through these questions engaged meaningfully with the work.

I observed that their enthusiasm for the performance and in the opportunity to talk with the actors was heavily influenced by the work I did with them two days prior. In utilizing group activities, I was able to let the younger children experience and familiarize themselves with the world of the play. In asking the seventh graders to think about aspects of their life that are similar to those of the play, I gave them the opportunity to empathize with a nearly 500 year old play and realize that they *can* relate to this seemingly complicated playwright and that his work *does* apply to them.

CONCLUSION- THE DRAMATURG AS "PLAYER"

Earlier I touched on the dramaturg's necessity for presence. Why was I particularly qualified to teach this production of *LLL* to a group of school children that would be viewing the performance rather than a state certified school teacher? I, as the dramaturg, act as a conduit between the rehearsal room and the audience itself, whereas the teacher's involvement is solely in the classroom. The dramaturg exists in a liminal state, being on both sides of a boundary or threshold, with their involvement with both the creative process and the audience.

My work in the rehearsal room, and by extension the classroom, was a direct result of working with Dr. Patty Gallagher, whose direction and vision in the rehearsal room informed my research of the language, themes and constructs that I would then be using in my workshops at Linscott Charter School. Her vision, or concept, being:

the language carries the play. The themes prevalent in the text are the themes of this production. [My concept is] what you can do with just the language, expressive capacity of an actor's body , and the audience's imagination... I'm just doing the play as written.¹⁷

Keeping this concept in mind I was able to shape the content of both my research and my lesson plan to promote Dr. Gallagher's vision of the production, making sure to emphasize language (the Lion's Den "love letters") and expressive capacity (the Rainbow Room and Phoenix Hall "Taking a Walk" and "Tableaux").

In the process of this production I as the dramaturg acted as a "player": I was present from the auditions to the rehearsals, to some of the performances (even performing at one point)¹⁸, the talkbacks, and I literally played with the children. I am an integral part of this process; not by virtue of intelligence or knowledge but because I was there, embodied in the process of the rehearsals as well as in the room with the children. From the beginning a part of Dr. Gallagher's vision to utilize the play's language and the expressive capacity of the actors, a holder of the dramaturgical perspective and that is what qualifies my position for the dramaturg as pedagogue.

¹⁷ In an interview with Dr. Patty Gallagher on April 7, 2016

¹⁸ On April 26, 2016 I acted as the Swing Understudy for the Princess of France for the production's performance for the UCSC course "Shakespeare for Everyone" taught by Professor Danny Scheie

Appendix B- Lesson Plans for Linscott Charter School

9am Teacher Darlene (3rd Grade) 45-50 minutes

- Establish Conventions/Definitions
 - What is theatre? A play?
 - What I do
 - What is a plot? A Character? Conflict? Props? A script? An Audience
 - What does the audience do?
 - Who knows who Shakespeare is?
 - What do you know about him?
 - What Shakespeare is
 - His impact on the World- The Lion King
 - Introduce Tricks to “knowing” the language
 - Listening to intention
 - Physicality
 - Picking up on emotions and personality through the face and body
 - What happens in the play?
 - Basic summary
 - The King of Navarre and his two lords(friends), Berowne and Longaville, swear an oath to scholarship (school), which includes fasting and avoiding contact with women for three years (and declares it a law throughout the kingdom). They receive a letter from Don Armado, a Spaniard visiting the King's court, telling them that he has caught Costard, a fool, and Jaquenetta, a country girl, playing together in the park. The King announces Costard's sentence, and he and the lords go off to begin their oath.
 - Don Armado confesses to Moth, his page, that he has fallen in love with Jaquenetta. He writes her a letter that he asks Costard to deliver.
 - Meanwhile, the Princess of France has arrived to visit the King. Because of his oath, however, the King cannot receive the Princess and her party at his court; he and his

lords must visit them at their camp outside the castle. The three lords fall in love with the three ladies at first sight. Berowne gives Costard a letter to deliver to Rosaline, but Costard accidentally switches it with the letter from Don Armado to Jaquenetta. When he gives Berowne's letter to Jaquenetta, she brings it to Lady Katherine. She tells her that the letter was meant for someone else and to deliver it to the King.

- Berowne watches the King from a hiding spot as he reads about his love for the Princess. Longaville enters, and the King hides as well; he and Berowne observe Longaville reading of his love for Katherine. The King then advances and scolds Longaville for breaking the oath. Berowne advances and reveals that the King is in love as well. Jaquenetta arrives and gives Berowne the letter, which he rips up. However, Longaville picks up a piece of the letter with Berowne's name on it, and Berowne confesses that he is in love as well. The three men decide to court their women.
- The King and his lords arrive at the Princess's pavilion dressed as Muscovites. The women heed Boyet's prior warnings and decide to switch favors, so that the men will mistake them for each other. After the men leave and reappear as themselves, the women reveal their prank. They all watch a show of the Nine Worthies, performed by Don Armado, Moth, Costard, and Anthony Dull. Boyett learns about and has to tell the Princess that her father has died, and she prepares to return to France. The women tell their

suitors to seek them again in a year, and the play ends with their departure.

- Themes
 - Love at First Sight/Courtship
 - How do you tell someone you just met how you feel?
 - Miscommunication
 - All of those darn letters
 - Disguises
- Interactive Activities
 - Tableaux recreating certain moments and asking the students what they see
 - Love at first sight
 - Them all in disguise
 - Armado and Costard almost fight scene, the men making fun
 - Take a Walk (character traits)
 - Telephone (Miscommunication)
- Discussion after each activity?
 - What was fun?
 - What did you see?
 - What was your favorite?
 - What would YOU do?

10am Michelle or Brett (7th Grade) 45-50 minutes

- Establish Conventions/Definitions
 - What is theatre? A play?
 - What I do
 - What is a playwright? How do you make a show? A Director? An audience member?
 - Who knows who Shakespeare is?
 - What do you know about him?
 - What Shakespeare is
 - His impact on the World- The Lion King, She's the Man
 - Introduce Tricks to "knowing" the language
 - Iambic Pentameter, looks like lined poetry but actually plays as actual speech.
 - Show difference in text readings
 - Listening to intention
 - Physicality
 - Commedia And Stock Characters
 - What happens in the play?
 - Basic summary
 - The King of Navarre and his two lords(friends), Berowne and Longaville, swear an oath to scholarship (school), which includes fasting and avoiding contact with women for three years (and declares it a law throughout the kingdom). They receive a letter from Don Armado, a Spaniard visiting the King's court, telling them that he has caught Costard, a fool, and Jaquenetta, a country girl, playing together in the park. The King announces Costard's sentence, and he and the lords go off to begin their oath.
 - Don Armado confesses to Moth, his page, that he has fallen in love with Jaquenetta. He writes her a letter that he asks Costard to deliver.
 - Meanwhile, the Princess of France has arrived to visit the King. Because of his oath, however, the King cannot receive the Princess and her party at his court; he and his

lords must visit them at their camp outside the castle. The three lords fall in love with the three ladies at first sight. Berowne gives Costard a letter to deliver to Rosaline, but Costard accidentally switches it with the letter from Don Armado to Jaquenetta. When he gives Berowne's letter to Jaquenetta, she brings it to Lady Katherine. She tells her that the letter was meant for someone else and to deliver it to the King.

- Berowne watches the King from a hiding spot as he reads about his love for the Princess. Longaville enters, and the King hides as well; he and Berowne observe Longaville reading of his love for Katherine. The King then advances and scolds Longaville for breaking the oath. Berowne advances and reveals that the King is in love as well. Jaquenetta arrives and gives Berowne the letter, which he rips up. However, Longaville picks up a piece of the letter with Berowne's name on it, and Berowne confesses that he is in love as well. The three men decide to court their women.
- The King and his lords arrive at the Princess's pavilion dressed as Muscovites. The women heed Boyet's prior warnings and decide to switch favors, so that the men will mistake them for each other. After the men leave and reappear as themselves, the women reveal their prank. They all watch a show of the Nine Worthies, performed by Don Armado, Moth, Costard, and Anthony Dull. Boyett learns about and has to tell the Princess that her father has died, and she prepares to return to France. The women tell their

suitors to seek them again in a year, and the play ends with their departure.

- Themes
 - Love at First Sight/Courtship
 - How do you tell someone you just met how you feel?
 - Mixtapes, songs, love poems, buy them things?
 - Miscommunication
 - All of those darn letters
 - Disguises
- Interactive Activities
 - Write a love letter (be as cheesy as you can possibly be), do you think they would say yes?
 - Give them the perspective of the receiver, read Princess of France Speech
 - We have received your letters full of love;

Your favours, the ambassadors of love;

And, in our maiden council, rated them

At courtship, pleasant jest and courtesy,

As bombast and as lining to the time:

But more devout than this in our respects

Have we not been; and therefore met your loves

In their own fashion, like a merriment. (V. ii) ¹⁹
- Discussion after each activity
 - What was easy to understand? What wasn't?
 - What did you find interesting?
 - What would you have done differently?

¹⁹ Shakespeare, William. *Love's Labour's Lost*. Ed. H.R. Woudhuysen. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. Print. 5.2.771-778.

11am Darlene- Phoenix Hall (3rd and 2nd Grade) 45-50 minutes

- Establish Conventions/Definitions
 - What is theatre? A play?
 - What I do
 - What is a plot? A Character? Conflict? Props? A script? An Audience
 - What does the audience do?
 - Who knows who Shakespeare is?
 - What do you know about him?
 - What Shakespeare is
 - His impact on the World- The Lion King
 - Introduce Tricks to “knowing” the language
 - Listening to intention
 - Physicality
 - Commedia And Stock Characters
 - What happens in the play?
 - Basic summary
 - The King of Navarre and his two lords(friends), Berowne and Longaville, swear an oath to scholarship (school), which includes fasting and avoiding contact with women for three years (and declares it a law throughout the kingdom). They receive a letter from Don Armado, a Spaniard visiting the King's court, telling them that he has caught Costard, a fool, and Jaquenetta, a country girl, playing together in the park. The King announces Costard's sentence, and he and the lords go off to begin their oath.
 - Don Armado confesses to Moth, his page, that he has fallen in love with Jaquenetta. He writes her a letter that he asks Costard to deliver.
 - Meanwhile, the Princess of France has arrived to visit the King. Because of his oath, however, the King cannot receive the Princess and her party at his court; he and his lords must visit them at their camp outside the castle. The three lords fall in love with the three ladies at first sight.

Berowne gives Costard a letter to deliver to Rosaline, but Costard accidentally switches it with the letter from Don Armado to Jaquenetta. When he gives Berowne's letter to Jaquenetta, she brings it to Lady Katherine. She tells her that the letter was meant for someone else and to deliver it to the King.

- Berowne watches the King from a hiding spot as he reads about his love for the Princess. Longaville enters, and the King hides as well; he and Berowne observe Longaville reading of his love for Katherine. The King then advances and scolds Longaville for breaking the oath. Berowne advances and reveals that the King is in love as well. Jaquenetta arrives and gives Berowne the letter, which he rips up. However, Longaville picks up a piece of the letter with Berowne's name on it, and Berowne confesses that he is in love as well. The three men decide to court their women.
- The King and his lords arrive at the Princess's pavilion dressed as Muscovites. The women heed Boyet's prior warnings and decide to switch favors, so that the men will mistake them for each other. After the men leave and reappear as themselves, the women reveal their prank. They all watch a show of the Nine Worthies, performed by Don Armado, Moth, Costard, and Anthony Dull. Boyett learns about and has to tell the Princess that her father has died, and she prepares to return to France. The women tell their suitors to seek them again in a year, and the play ends with their departure.

- Themes

- Love at First Sight/Courtship
 - How do you tell someone you just met how you feel?
- Miscommunication
 - All of those darn letters
 - Disguises
- Interactive Activities
 - Tableaux recreating certain moments and asking the students what they see
 - Love at first sight
 - Them all in disguise
 - Armado and Costard almost fight scene, the men making fun
 - Take a Walk (character traits)
 - Telephone (Miscommunication)
- Discussion after each activity?
 - What was fun?
 - What did you see?
 - What was your favorite?
 - What would YOU do?

Bibliography

1. Chemers, Michael M. *Ghostlight: An Introductory Handbook for Dramaturgy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print.
2. Courtney, Richard. *Play, Drama, and Thought: the Intellectual Background to Dramatic Education*. London: Cassell & Co. LTD, 1968. Print.
3. Rocklin, Edward L. *Performance Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2005. Print.
4. Shakespeare, William. *Love's Labour's Lost*. Ed. H.R. Woudhuysen. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. Print.
5. Education, State Board Of. "Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Grade Kindergarten Through Twelve." (n.d.): n. pag. *California Department of Education*. California Department of Education. Web. 20 May 2016.
<<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/cf/documents/vpaframewrk.pdf>>.
6. Winston, Joe. *Transforming the Teaching of Shakespeare with the Royal Shakespeare Company*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2010.