

comparison of novella *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and film *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Directions:

How do Stevenson's novella published in 1886 and Fleming's film released in 1941 use different devices to explore and develop an assertion about duality, identity, monstrosity, or inhumanity? Compose a clearly articulated theme that reveals your understanding of the complex texts, and develop your central idea with evidence. You must discuss elements of structure in your analysis but should also consider devices such as internal conflict, external conflict, motif, juxtaposition, foil, setting, imagery as well as 19<sup>th</sup> century ideologies.

**Standards**

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.R.1:** Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.R.2:** Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.R.3:** Analyze how and why individuals, events, or ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.R.9:** Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.L.6:** Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.W.2:** Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.W.4:** Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.CCRA.W.9:** Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

**Rubric**

**9-8 (95/90)**

Superior responses are convincing in their analysis of text(s), precise in their carefully-chosen **textual evidence**, coherent in their definitions and use of **literary and rhetorical concepts**, and free of plot summary. These responses need not be without surface flaws, but they demonstrate the adept writer's ability to discuss **complex ideas** with insight and control of a wide range of the **elements of writing and language** (including organization, syntax, conventions, and integration of quotations). At all times, they make a compelling case for their ideas and stay focused on the question and the **precisely-stated thesis**. These essays reflect **stylistic flair**, utilize **advanced vocabulary**, and provide in-depth and original analysis.

**7-6 (85/80)**

These effective responses offer a reasonable analysis of text(s) as well as directly and accurately refer to the text(s) and literary and rhetorical concepts for support with minimal plot summary. They demonstrate the writer's ability to proficiently express complex ideas clearly, and they provide a sustained position and focus; however, they reveal a more limited understanding of complexity and concepts than do the papers in the 9-8 range. Generally, 6 essays present a less sophisticated analysis and less consistent command of the elements of effective writing than essays scored 7.

**5 (70)**

Offering a safe and plausible analysis of text(s), these competent responses make some reference to text(s) and literary and rhetorical concepts but include some plot summary and may not examine complexity effectively. Explanations may be mechanical or inadequately relate evidence to meaning, and the analysis may be minimally supported and developed. They may be formulaic and are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as the upper papers. On the other hand, the writing is adequate to convey the writer's ideas and stays focused on the topic.

**4-3 (60/50)**

These responses offer an inadequate analysis of text(s) as discussion is likely to be unpersuasive, unfocused, underdeveloped, or misguided. The meaning they deduce may be inaccurate or insubstantial and not clearly related to the topic or evidence. The presentation of ideas may be repetitive. The writing may convey the writer's ideas, but it reveals weaker control over such elements as diction, organization, syntax, or conventions. The 3 essays may contain **misinterpretations** of the topic or the work(s) they discuss; they may also contain little, if any, supporting evidence, and practice **paraphrase** and **plot summary** at the expense of analysis.

**2-1 (40/30)**

These responses compound the weakness of essays in the 4-3 range and are frequently unacceptably brief in their attempt to analyze text(s). They may persistently **misread**, and usually offer **little clarity, organization, or support**. They may be poorly written on several counts, including many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Although the writer may have made some effort to answer the question, the views presented have **little coherence**.

**Theme Statement**

The 1886 novella *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and the 1941 film *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* both reflect upon \_\_\_\_\_ and reveal \_\_\_\_\_.

(topic/abstract concept) (assertion about human condition)

**Topic Sentence**

evidence (and literary devices) from the 1886 novella <i>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	evidence (and literary devices) from the 1941 film <i>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>

**Topic Sentence**

evidence (and literary devices) from the 1886 novella <i>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	evidence (and literary devices) from the 1941 film <i>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>