

YouTube Shakespeare in the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme

MA thesis

English Language and Culture: Education and Communication

Supervisor:

Dr. P.J.C.M. Franssen

Second reader:

Dr. L. Stelling

23 May 2016

Andrew Mitchell

Student number: 3094227

Minister Talmastraat 41BIS

3555 GB Utrecht

Word count: 12,888

CONTENTS

Ch. 1 – Introduction	3 – 6
Ch. 2 – Pedagogical framework	7 – 17
<i>Filmmaking</i>	7 – 10
<i>YouTube Shakespeare</i>	10 – 17
Ch. 3 – Context	18 – 25
<i>The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme</i>	18 – 19
<i>Why the IBDP?</i>	19 – 20
<i>English A: literature and English A: language and literature</i>	20 – 22
<i>Linking the IBDP and YouTube Shakespeare pedagogically</i>	22 – 25
Ch. 4 – Lesson plan	26 – 36
Ch. 5 – Conclusion	37 – 38
Works cited	39 – 42
Appendices	43 – 56
<i>Appendix I – Project outline hand-out</i>	43 – 45
<i>Appendix II – Topics hand-out</i>	46
<i>Appendix III – Sources and tools hand-out</i>	47 – 48
<i>Appendix IV – Assessment criteria</i>	49 – 52
<i>Appendix V – Group research task</i>	53
<i>Appendix VI – Individual report and assessment</i>	54
<i>Appendix VII – Group journal</i>	55
<i>Appendix VII – Project feedback</i>	56

INTRODUCTION

William Shakespeare is considered by many to be greatest author ever to have written in the English language. His creative use of complex plots, the themes he explores in his works, the manner in which he develops his characters; combined with his beautiful, poetic use of language, continues to be an enduring source of inspiration for many. One need only look at Shakespeare's contribution to the English vocabulary – of the 17,677 words in the English canon an estimated 1,700 were, according to King (n.p.), coined by Shakespeare – to see what an awe-inspiring contribution one man can make to a language and its culture alike. But, while a source of awe, admiration and enjoyment for many, the extensive body of his creative endeavours also has the capacity to daunt novices coming into contact with his works for the first time. Secondary students in particular, Dial-Driver explains, are prone to feel daunted by his material, considering this is the time many students first start working with the author.

An additional concern is the role of technology in students' lives – technology which is creating an ever-widening cultural divide between the world that Shakespeare used to inhabit, and the world of modern-day Shakespeare students. The new “digital generation” (Buckingham 5), for whom “digital media – the internet, mobile phones, computer games, and interactive television – are an indispensable aspect of [their] leisure-time experience” (Buckingham 5) is used to constant connectivity. More than a decade ago, Olsen found that the average teenager spent seventy-two hours per week using electronic media. Worldwide, children of secondary school age spend more time with media of various kinds than they do on any activity apart from sleeping (Buckingham 7). Where no more than twenty years ago students were mainly limited to in-person or telephone communication, technological advancements now present students with a whole spectrum of communication modes that they can use—quite literally at their fingertips, in the case of smartphones. Social media

applications and Web 2.0 environments, like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Tumblr, MySpace, WhatsApp and YouTube are just some of the more popular applications that form the bulk of students' media diet.

Naturally, the (social) media-saturated lives of contemporary students impact their relationship with Shakespeare. In an already technologically out-dated article on teaching Shakespeare to university students, Avery (135) describes the stereotypical twenty-first-century university student, whom he fittingly names "Jack" (the title of his work is *You Don't Know Jack*) as follows:

Jack does not read much. He has watched plenty of television. He listens persistently to his MP3 player, taking his ear buds out just at the moment I begin class and replacing them immediately when I end it. [...] He writes, but much of his writing is in the compressed lingo of the text message. [...] A word to sum up the way his history, personal habits, and economic circumstances affect his relationship to Shakespeare and my classroom is that they leave him *disengaged*. He does not know how to, or why he should, fully commit his mental and emotional resources to Shakespeare's texts.

But, while some may feel a sense of disengagement with Shakespeare as a result of his reputation and the ever-widening cultural divide between the world they inhabit and that of Shakespeare, secondary students' lives have, according to Olsen, become more theatrical compared to preceding generations of students. "Teen life," Olsen explains, "has become a self-directed media production [...]. Students are continuously engaged in the process of self-representation by sharing photos, anecdotes, *likes* and dislikes, events and opinions on social media platforms aimed at creating a preferred image of oneself towards the outside world."

Avery explains that while “many [...] seem passive in traditional classrooms, [but who] are anything but passive when it comes to media to represent themselves to each other” (139). Introducing social media in an active manner into the classroom is one way in which educators have been hoping to bridge the cultural divide between Shakespeare and modern students, making Shakespeare more approachable and more enjoyable. A collaborative YouTube Shakespeare project is one such way.

The YouTube platform requires little introduction. As what Desmet refers to as a “hybrid genre: part video, part website [which] combines the immediacy of the first with the search capacity and critical distance of the second” (66), and the number one video-sharing website of our time, YouTube’s rise to the top has been nothing short of an internet phenomenon. Founded in February 2005, YouTube belongs to the generation of what O’Reilly calls Web 2.0 environments; sites that “deliver software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an *architecture of participation* (n.p).” The site has grown exponentially in popularity and use ever since its launch (Jones & Cuthrell 76). In 2008, over 100.000 videos were uploaded and shared on YouTube every day (SIGTE n.p). In March of 2013, the platform recorded one billion unique monthly visitors for the first time since its launch (CNBC n.p.).

YouTube Shakespeare is best described as a small scene in the broader YouTube community where YouTubers’ cultural tendency towards “creative appropriation” (66) meets the works and persona of Shakespeare head on. By playing around with his works through “imitation, parody, and irony” (Desmet 66), material is created that has a high tongue-in-cheek character – in typical YouTube style. The short length of the clips (inspired by an “aesthetic of brevity” (Desmet 66)), their light-hearted nature and the fact that many play

around with context in an interesting way, makes YouTube Shakespeare an excellent source to unleash students' creativity on in the production of a short clip of their own.

This thesis looks at the value and applicability of YouTube Shakespeare as a short filmmaking project for two English literature courses of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme, with the aim of showing that engaging students in a YouTube Shakespeare project can be a valuable resource to make Shakespeare more approachable and enjoyable to secondary students of the digital generation, while also stimulating their social development. Additionally, this thesis aims to show that in terms of its approach and underlying pedagogical framework, a collaboratively-based YouTube Shakespeare project synergises well with the IBDP and its two literature courses: *English A: literature* and *English A: language and literature*. After an analysis of the pedagogical framework of both filmmaking in education and YouTube Shakespeare (chapter two) and their suitability in relation to the educational approach and vision of the IBDP (chapter three), this thesis continues with a lesson plan (chapter four), which shows one way in which a YouTube Shakespeare project can be incorporated into the aforementioned literature courses – thus balancing the theoretical and analytical with a practical, hands-on framework that can be immediately applied in an existing educational context.

In order to provide a framework for the lesson plan and developed material in chapter four, *Hamlet* has been selected as the focal point of this thesis: on the one hand, because *Hamlet* is the most featured play on YouTube; on the other hand, because in terms of its plot, character and themes, it is arguably one of Shakespeare's more complicated plays, justifying the added time investment entailed in a YouTube Shakespeare project. However, it is important to mention that a collaborative filmmaking YouTube Shakespeare project could be utilised in relation to any of Shakespeare's plays, with, in terms of the lesson plan structure and assignments created here, only minor modifications.

CHAPTER II – PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter develops the pedagogical framework of working with YouTube Shakespeare. Working with students in the development of a YouTube Shakespeare video clip has two broad pedagogical components. On the one hand, there is the process of filmmaking, and all the learning potential involved in the preparation, production and editing of material that students develop. On the other hand, there are the specific aspects involved in working with YouTube's Web 2.0 environment. As a result, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section covers the pedagogical framework of a group-based filmmaking project, while the second section deals more specifically with the pedagogical characteristics, advantages and disadvantages of working with YouTube Shakespeare in secondary education.

Filmmaking

Utilising filmmaking in literature education has several pedagogical benefits. Filmmaking in education is a student-centred learning method, which provides a framework through which the three basic student needs of effective education – competency, autonomy and relationship (Deci & Ryan 238) – can be met. Student autonomy – which Ebbens and Ettehoven define as the “student need to shape their life and learning in the manner in which they would like, make their own decisions, and carry their own responsibility” (171) – follows from the creative licence that students are afforded when creating their own task. Relationship – defined by Ebbens as “the feeling of being part of things” (175) – is stimulated by the collaborative nature of the project. Filmmaking in secondary education is almost by necessity a group-based endeavour. Working together as a group towards the development of a final product – each student fulfilling a particular role within that group and culminating in an end product that none of the students could have completed alone (a key criteria for an effective collaborative project, according to Slavin (52)) – it is easy to see how filmmaking can be utilised to promote a sense of “being part of things” amongst students. Finally, competency –

described by Ebbens as “the feeling of being capable of meeting the set expectations of an educational task or education in general” (180) – is another basic educational need that filmmaking can stimulate. As pointed out by Allam, filmmaking “produces highly motivated students [...] by giving them a sense of empowerment and achievement” (281). Through filmmaking, students are stimulated to produce something tangible that is the result of their creativity and imagination, promoting their sense of competency in relationship to literature.

In addition, utilising filmmaking educationally caters to multiple intelligence types. Outlined by Gardner, there are eight core intelligence types – interpersonal, intrapersonal, physical-motoric, logical-mathematical, musical-rhythmic, nature-oriented, verbal-linguistic and visual-spatial – each possessing their own qualities, strengths and preferred methods of learning. Many of the more traditional methods and approaches utilised in literary courses in secondary education strongly favour students with strongly developed verbal-linguistic intelligence (Ebbens & Ettekoven 145) – those students “who think in words, easily formulate their ideas and, as a result, naturally tend to argue their positions well” (Ebbens & Ettekoven 146) – since many of the tasks students engage in during such courses involve reading, analysing and evaluating written literary material. The more complex task of filmmaking – with all the necessary subtasks involved in the development of a piece of film – caters to a far broader spectrum of intelligence types, thus increasing its educational potential for a broader range of students. As Allam explains, filmmaking “calls on students to use skills not typically required in academic study, and this is novel and exciting. It frees up the intellect and the imagination, offering new styles of working, and requires practical skills as well” (283). The inherent group-based nature of filmmaking, for example, favours interpersonal intelligence types – those students who “relish in social interaction, are sensitive to the feelings of others, and enjoy working together” (Ebbens & Ettekoven 146). The production side of a filmmaking project – considering which angle works best and how

the lighting should be arranged, for example – allows students with high visual-spatial intelligence (those students who “think in space and colours, have a strong sense of colour nuances” (Ebbens & Ettekoven 146)) to shine, while the musical-rhythmic intelligence types may enjoy and learn through the sound editing side of the project. In short, filmmaking caters to a broad range of intelligence types.

Finally, filmmaking is an effective way for students to rise through the levels of cognitive complexity on the cognitive process dimensions of Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al. 67 - 68), which is relatively characteristic of a large scale complex and creative task. With the filmmaking task, students end on the level of *creation*, the highest degree of cognitive complexity according to Anderson et al (67 – 68). A variety of subtasks – such as understanding the material upon which the film is based, writing storyboards, preparing text, and so on – belongs to the lower levels of the taxonomy. Thus, utilising filmmaking in education is a way for teachers to provide a task that starts at the lower levels of cognitive complexity and ends at the highest, furthering their understanding of the material that they are working with. As Allam points out, many students working with filmmaking “reported that the experience of making a film helped them to understand their subject better” (282). At the same time, through filmmaking, students’ development on the knowledge dimension of the taxonomy can be stimulated. According to Anderson et al., the knowledge dimension starts, with the lowest level, at the factual, continues with the conceptual, followed by the procedural, and finally, the metacognitive. In order to create a video clip students must first have a basic understanding of the facts and concepts relating to the topic around which their film is centred. In the process of creating their piece of film, students learn about the procedural side of filmmaking. Additionally, a variety of tools – journal writing, for example – can be utilised to stimulate students’ metacognitive reflection.

Of course, several considerations must be taken into account when working with filmmaking in the classroom. Firstly, there is the fact that utilising filmmaking in education is per definition relatively time-consuming. Student projects need to be well-structured in terms of activities and assessment to provide a framework for the relatively open-ended nature of the task students are engaging in, which requires careful consideration and planning by the educator working with filmmaking. The student projects themselves are also time-consuming. If the demand is made for students to produce something of relatively high quality, they will have to stick to a three-part filmmaking process of preparation, production and editing, which requires a significant investment in terms of time and energy. There is also the question of the availability of filmmaking material (both in terms of video and audio recording), which, if not available, can severely bottleneck student projects or even prevent their completion entirely. Although the almost omnipresence of smartphones in the lives of contemporary students can go some way towards providing the materials required for a filmmaking project, having visual and audial recording devices available within a school wishing to work with filmmaking is certainly beneficial to the quality of the material students can produce. Finally, working with filmmaking requires a level of competence on behalf of the educator in relation to the process of filmmaking itself, and the capacity to effectively supervise students in the various challenges that may arise as they work on their project in their groups.

YouTube Shakespeare

One of the core characteristics of working with YouTube in relation to filmmaking is that it provides a sense of real world relevance to the projects that students have developed that would be missing if students' projects remained contained within the classroom environment. Student groups' final products gain a life outside of the classroom, and can be viewed again long after the course for which they were developed has ended. As such, through their

YouTube Shakespeare projects, students become part of the “unfolding scene of YouTube Shakespeare” (O’Neill 28). Their projects can be viewed, liked and commented on by YouTube’s users, which can be a motivating experience for students. The fact that their projects are uploaded also adds a slight risk factor to the project, as there is no way to ensure that projects will be received well or seen at all, which in turn could stimulate students to work harder to produce something of greater quality than they would if it was not posted online.

Connecting the culture of YouTube with Shakespeare can further assist students in understanding the Shakespearean literature. There is an abundance of research to show that linking features with which we are unfamiliar with those with which we are more familiar in education can be beneficial to further motivation and understanding towards the unfamiliar. As Greene points out, the brain is wired to “recognise and organise coherent connections” (28 – 29), and introducing familiarity can be a way for the brain to increase the relevance it gives a particular topic which was previously more unfamiliar. Similarly, the language used in the YouTube Shakespeare subgenre – which characteristically mixes modern linguistic expressions with those from the time of Shakespeare – can provide a bridge for students to come to a deeper understanding of the language of Shakespeare. As Smith points out, “reimagining Shakespeare’s texts into their generation’s own language and media can help students engage with the material better and heighten their experience of authenticity” (4).

The light-hearted, humorous nature of the YouTube Shakespeare phenomenon, which is characterised by “parody, irony and imitation” (Desmet 6), can also be beneficial to learning by lowering inhibitions through laughter. Humour and laughter are well-known educational tools for diminishing resistance students may feel towards a particular topic. Stimulating laughter in education has the potential to lower barriers, and it can also be an empowering experience. As Gray explains, “laughter can deliver: laughter gives the laugher a

degree of confidence that can then be used to turn on and analyze a parodic target in more detail” (235).

Finally, much like filmmaking, working with YouTube Shakespeare gives students the opportunity to experience Shakespeare from a different perspective. Rather than solely being receivers of his materials, students take on the role of creators, and build something that mixes the old and the new. This “remixing” (Smith 4) is a typical feature of YouTube Shakespeare, and as such, students emulate the process Shakespeare himself went through, “remixing” his material with their own contemporary culture much like Shakespeare leant heavily on the works of Holinshed, Greco-Roman and other material when he wrote his plays.

Of course there are also more critical voices when it comes to the educational potential of working with YouTube and YouTube Shakespeare. According to some, YouTube is merely an entertainment site – a “postmodern TV of distraction” (O’Neill 33) – which does not combine well with education. Although it is certainly true that large parts of YouTube are primarily entertainment-centred, O’Neill reminds us that a significant part of the site’s value lies in its dynamism. As an interactive online environment and material archive of mind-boggling proportions, O’Neill explains that there are “many different types of video, audiences and patterns of attention” (33), and thus that the manner in which YouTube is used lies primarily with the user making use of it and less with the platform itself. In fact, there are many serious content creators on YouTube. The Folger Shakespeare Library and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust are just two examples of more serious parties active on YouTube in relation to the field of Shakespeare studies, leading O’Neill to conclude that “YouTube and Shakespeare looks a less quirky combination than we may first think” (33).

A second argument against the use of YouTube in education is that the platform inspires a particular type of behaviour characteristic of internet usage which is not conducive

to critical thinking, but rather stimulates a type of “surface learning” (O’Neill 34). As Williams and Rowlands point out, “there is considerable evidence to support the view that many students do not explore information in any deep or reflective manner [on the internet]” (19), and that therefore incorporating internet-based resources into an educational context may prove less fruitful than intended. Although it may be true that the internet affects students in a way that is not conducive to the type of deep, critical thinking many educators would like their students to engage in, the previous statement regarding the dynamism of YouTube also applies more broadly to the internet. There are many different types of internet sources of which some may be more beneficial to learning than others. As there are many different audiences and patterns of attention on YouTube, there are also many different ways in which the internet can be utilised. The idea that its incorporation into an educational context should per definition result in surface learning is simply not valid. Furthermore, this particular line of argumentation primarily relates to a receptive use of internet sources, which creating something *for* the internet is not. The most significant learning aspect of creating a YouTube Shakespeare product lies in the development of that product, and far less in the critical analysis and evaluation of already existing sources.

Some critics of YouTube in education point out that the platform exposes students to advertising, which, they argue, should be avoided in an educational context. It is true that using YouTube in education exposes students to the platform’s commercial side – advertisement is its primary source of income –, but, as Olsen points out, students already spend numerous hours per day on social media and video-sharing websites (n.p.). Students are, thus, already exposed to a large extent to the platform’s advertising activities, regardless of whether it is used educationally. As a result of the omnipresence of such media sources in the lives of students today, many call for the importance of “media literacy” (1) development, which Hoechsmann and Poyntz define as “a set of competencies that enable us to interpret

media texts and institutions, to make media of our own, and to recognize and engage with the social and political influence of media in everyday life” (1). Rather than taking a firm line against such sources, Hoechsmann and Poyntz, amongst others, argue that the role of education should be to prepare students for their existence in the highly digitalized, media-saturated world in which they are growing up, teaching critical analysis and evaluation skills in order to “make sense of it [and] to understand its role in our societies” (1). Advertisement, seen from this perspective, can be a source through which critical understanding is promoted, rather than an obstacle or nuisance to learning. Should developing media literacy not be of the highest priority to the educator working with YouTube, there are also ways to avoid advertisement exposure. Various web browsers have add-ons (such as Adblock or uBlock) that can be downloaded to prevent advertisements from appearing, making it possible to make use of YouTube in the classroom without exposing students to advertising in the process. In fact, making students aware of these add-ons – if they are not already aware of them, being, in many cases, more media savvy than their teachers – could, considering the amount of time that they already spend on the platform in their own time, actually significantly decrease their exposure to advertising, rather than increase it.

A further criticism that is sometimes uttered in relation to YouTube’s applicability in education is that the YouTube community can often be incredibly harsh, and that working with YouTube exposes students to this harshness. As Wesch is quoted in O’Neill, “anonymity + physical distance + rare & ephemeral dialogue = hatred as public performance” (124). Students – when set the task of uploading a creative project onto the platform – could easily find themselves on the receiving end of what Wesch calls “hatred as public performance,” and is sometimes more colloquially known as “trolling.” While it is undoubtedly the case that YouTube’s users can be incredibly outspoken, condemning and destructive in their feedback of videos and other users – in large part caused by the lowered

inhibitions inherent to the platform's relative anonymity – a brief look at several existing student-based YouTube Shakespeare projects reveals two things: firstly, that very few clips are viewed more than a few hundred times and secondly, that the number of destructively critical comments is extremely low, if present at all. This is not surprising. The collection of student-based YouTube Shakespeare projects is only a small niche on YouTube, which it seems – judging by the comments on many of its videos –, is primarily visited by other students working with YouTube Shakespeare. As such, it seems to fly under the radar of most of YouTube's "trolls" and, the combination of the fact that the clips are blatantly educational in purpose and rarely viewed by more than a few hundred users make them an unattractive "hatred as public performance" target should said trolls stumble across them. Overall, there does not seem to be a huge risk that students who have posted a YouTube Shakespeare project will be on the receiving end of extremely damaging criticism. Additionally, one might raise the question what the role of education is. Should education be isolationist, or prepare students for their future lives in the society in which they live? If the latter, exposing students to the type of criticism that is regularly uttered on YouTube within the relative safety of the classroom environment could be seen as a tool to deepen their understanding of and capacity to act in the world as it exists, rather than the world as it should be.

While the above positions apply broadly to the applicability of YouTube in education, there are also several points of criticism that relate more directly to the educational potential of YouTube Shakespeare. The first is that the framework imposed by the humorous, light-hearted nature of YouTube Shakespeare – though beneficial in terms of lowering barriers between Shakespeare and students, and heightening enjoyment and motivation for students who feel daunted by Shakespeare's material – may prevent stronger students from reaching their creative potential. Thus, YouTube Shakespeare could become more a straightjacket than a means through which student creativity is unshackled. While it is certainly true that

embarking on a YouTube Shakespeare project means students have to adhere to the dominant *modus operandi* of the scene, which is characterised by parody and imitation, this does not mean that the more competent students cannot excel through it. A look at some of the student projects uploaded onto the site (*Hamlet: A Silent Film*, for example) shows some remarkably creative projects that could only have been developed by students with a strong grasp of Shakespeare and the nature of parody. The YouTube Shakespeare format is not so tight that it inhibits students from expressing themselves to their full creative potential. In fact, to create a strong parody can be quite challenging, requiring even competent students to go the extra mile to develop something worthwhile.

Another possible point of criticism is that the parodic nature of YouTube Shakespeare could cause students to take Shakespeare less seriously. The underlying fear of this line of argumentation is that as a result of YouTube Shakespeare students will no longer value Shakespeare's material, because they have learnt to associate his works with the tongue-in-cheek nature of the scene. It is true that YouTube Shakespeare can make Shakespeare's works more approachable, but the fear that, as a result of YouTube Shakespeare, students will no longer take him seriously at all is shortsighted. In fact, a lot of educators – like Dial-Driver, who explains that for many of her students, Shakespeare is an author whom they have “learned to dread” (59) – find that their students take Shakespeare *too* seriously, which can have a paralyzing effect on their capacity to engage with his material effectively. Utilising YouTube Shakespeare as a tool to decrease the distance between students and Shakespeare is precisely where its core strength as an educational tool lies. Furthermore, as previously explained, parody does not need to exclude a more critical covering of the material. “Laughter,” as Gray was quoted earlier in this chapter, “can give the laughter a degree of confidence that can then be used to turn on and analyze a parodic target in more detail” (235).

Two further points of criticism are that YouTube Shakespeare has the tendency to devalue the context within which the works were written, and may “return old blind spots and stereotypes about Shakespeare texts” (O’Neill 190 – 191). New and old material is amalgamated with little regard for the specificities of the cultural context within which it arose, and somewhat inherent to the act of parody, stereotypes are strengthened. While it is true that the “remixing” process of YouTube Shakespeare diminishes the importance of context, and that parody and imitation can return “old blind spots,” the solution to both these problems is rather simple. Both these points of criticism and the line of argumentation of the previous paragraph – concerning the fact that YouTube Shakespeare may cause students to take Shakespeare less seriously – can be solved by considering the place of YouTube Shakespeare in the broader Shakespeare curriculum, and concluding that, a YouTube Shakespeare project functions best as an add-on to more traditional modes of Shakespeare education, which deal with Shakespeare in a more serious and analytical manner.

CHAPTER III – CONTEXT

This chapter looks more closely at the educational context within which the YouTube Shakespeare project outlined in chapter IV has been developed.

The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme

Established in 1968, the IBDP is the first of four educational programmes created by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) (*Programmes*). Aimed at students between the ages of 16 and 19 (*Programmes*), the IBDP – sometimes also referred to as the Diploma Programme – is the most prestigious academic programme offered by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO). It is a programme that “aims to develop students who have excellent breadth and depth of knowledge – students who flourish physically, intellectually, emotionally and ethically” (*Programmes*).

The IBDP’s worldwide popularity and success as an educational programme is clearly shown by its large scale global presence: in May 2015 the programme was being offered at 2,795 schools across 143 countries worldwide, making it the world’s foremost provider of international secondary education (*Key Facts*). As an educational programme, the IBDP functions like a franchise, enabling schools to join the ranks of IB World Schools through an extensive application process (*How to become an IB World School*).

The programme has a set structure in terms of its curriculum, course content and assessment methods to which IB World Schools must adhere (*Diploma Programme*). Elective subjects are selected from six subject groups (*Curriculum*), and can be studied at two levels – standard and higher level (*Curriculum*). A fixed number of classroom hours are set per level – respectively 150 and 240 hours. On top of six elective subjects, IBDP students are expected to participate in an epistemological course that goes deeper into the manner in which we arrive at the things we (think) we know (*Theory of Knowledge*) while also doing research for

and writing an extended essay of 3,000 words. During the programme's two years, students are also expected to spend 150 hours on CAS ("creativity, action, service") –an obligatory project aimed at stimulating students' artistic, physical and social development.

In terms of its educational vision, the IBDP aims to develop students academically while also stimulating the development of their moral character. In a document outlining the main tenets of its programme, the IBDP expresses its aim "to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world" (*What is an IB education?* v), and expands on the ten core character attributes¹ it hopes to develop through its programme. In its pedagogical approach to learning, the IBDP utilises a three-step model of "inquiry, action, and reflection" (*What is an IB education?* 4).

Why the IBDP?

There are several reasons why the lesson plan featured in this thesis has been developed for the Diploma Programme. The primary reason is one of personal relevance. As an ex-IBDP student myself, I have first-hand experience of the programme and its potential for stimulating academic and personal development in students. I also agree on a personal level with the IBDP's pedagogical philosophy. Should I become an *English A: literature* or *English A: language and literature* teacher in the future, this lesson plan will be applicable in my own professional practice. However, personal relevance is not the only reason to focus on the IBDP. The Diploma Programme being offered at over 2,700 schools means that the contents of this thesis are relevant and applicable to a large number of schools across the globe.

¹ "As IB learners we strive to be: inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced and reflective" (*What is an IB education?* v).

Additionally, students in either of the two courses for which this lesson plan has been developed will generally have a relatively high English language competency. Manoeuvring through an international English-speaking environment, Diploma Programme students experience a tremendous amount of meaningful English language exposure – both in social and academic context – which, according to Krashen, is the key factor in second language acquisition (10). Being able to rely on a relatively high level of spoken and written English competency amongst students allows for a more streamlined movement towards this thesis’ more central learning objectives, which are Shakespeare-centred rather than centred on language acquisition.

English A: literature and English A: language and literature

The courses for which the lesson plans in chapter IV have been developed are *English A: literature* and *English A: language and literature*, which are both subjects in subject group one – *studies in literature and language (Curriculum)*. Each student is obliged to select a minimum of one course from this subject group. The third course in *studies in literature and language* subject group is *Literature and performance*, but it has been excluded from this thesis due to its relative marginality as an IBDP course, being offered at only a handful of IBDP schools (*Curriculum*), as opposed to the other two subjects, which are offered more broadly.

The primary difference between the two courses for which this lesson plan has been developed is that where *English A: literature* is singularly focused on literary learning objectives, *English A: language and literature* splits its focus – as the name suggests – between literary learning objectives on the one hand, and language-related learning objectives on the other. This section of the course is concerned with a deeper investigation of how language functions in the world around us. One course part – *language in cultural context* –

centres on the manner in which language features in particular contexts. The relationship between gender and language, politics and language, and race and language are few of the themes that could feature in this section of the course. Another part – *language in mass communication* – has the relationship between language and the media as its focal point, and is open to a host of areas of investigation, ranging from propaganda to the language we use when we use WhatsApp. Since the primary function of a filmmaking YouTube Shakespeare project is to make Shakespeare more approachable and enjoyable, the lesson plan in chapter IV has been developed with the literature-centred parts of this course in mind. To avoid unnecessary complication, no specific measures have been taken to incorporate the language-centred components of *English A: language and literature*. However, since none of the course parts exist on an island, the experience of working with YouTube in the context of Shakespeare will undoubtedly also expose students to particular features relevant to either of the language-centred course parts.

As part of the *studies in literature and language* subject group, the courses share seven learning objectives, while only differing on two. Since *English A: language and literature* overlap in their literary learning objectives, a lot of the material for *English A: literature* is immediately also applicable to *English A: language and literature*. Both courses express literary learning objectives – to “introduce students to a range of texts from different periods;” “recognise the importance of the contexts in which texts are written and received;” “appreciate the formal, stylistic and aesthetic qualities of texts;” and to “promote in students and enjoyment of, and lifelong interest in, language and literature” (*Language A: literature and language* 22) – that stretch across all of the four categories that Kwakernaak describes in his approaches to literature in secondary education overview (Ebbens 396). Kwakernaak explains that literature can be used to learn about the history of the work and its author, text internal features – like structure, rhythm, and rhyme, societal issues and themes, and to

develop aesthetic appreciation in students. The difference between the two courses – in terms of their literary goals – exists more in degree than in character or subject matter. As explained in chapter I, working on a YouTube Shakespeare project together can help students gain a deeper understanding of Shakespeare’s plots, themes, characters and uses of language. Furthermore, placing students in the position of creators, as opposed to the more customary role of recipients, can increase students’ appreciation of the aesthetics of Shakespeare, as they experience first-hand how challenging it is to recreate his type of language themselves.

The inherent autonomy and manoeuvring room given to teachers of the courses – which are “designed to encourage a variety of teaching approaches” (*Language A: literature guide* 14) and in which “teachers are given a great deal of freedom and responsibility to interpret the curriculum and to create a course of study that not only meets the aims and objectives of the course” (*Language A: literature guide* 14) – as well as the degree of overlap between the literature-centred section of *English A: language and literature* and *English A: literature*, meant that no structural adaptations needed to be made moving from one course to another.

Linking the IBDP and YouTube Shakespeare pedagogically

There are various pedagogical reasons why the IBDP and a group-based YouTube Shakespeare project are a good match. The first relates to the IBDP’s international orientation. Unsurprisingly, the globally functioning IBDP has a strong international orientation, stating that “the aim of all IB programmes is to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world” (*IB Continuum* 1). The IBDP’s international orientation matches well with YouTube Shakespeare, since by participating in a YouTube Shakespeare project students are inevitably connecting with YouTube’s global, online

community. As a Web 2.0 environment in which communication between community members is a key factor, YouTube continuously fosters international communication. While the YouTube Shakespeare projects uploaded onto YouTube are certainly somewhat *west-centric*, with primary contributions to the scene coming from countries in which English is the mother tongue, the comment section is not. Videos are viewed, liked, criticised and commented on by users from around the globe. Connecting to YouTube, thus, means connecting with its global, online community; in line with the IBDP's internationally oriented philosophy.

Another point is the capacity of a group-based YouTube Shakespeare project to stimulate student development across an array of areas. As previously mentioned, the IBDP “aims to develop students who have excellent breadth and depth of knowledge – students who flourish physically, intellectually, emotionally and ethically” (*Programmes*), and as such aims for its students' development in holistic terms. It is, in other words, “concerned with the whole person” (*IB Continuum 1*). As mentioned in chapter II, the group-based component of a YouTube Shakespeare project can create a positive, stimulating environment for students' social development. Through group work, students learn vital social skills that will prepare them for working life, in which cooperation and teamwork are commonplace. Students learn to divide roles, plan and delegate their workload, work together as a team and solve problems together, promoting their social development and confidence. Slavin explains that “the most important psychological outcome of cooperative learning methods is their effect on student self-esteem” (60). Students grow in their sense of self and personal value, which helps them in “their ability to withstand the disappointments of life, to be confident decision-makers, and ultimately to be happy and productive individuals” (Slavin 60). Furthermore, the performance aspect of the final product, as well as the fact that it is shared with YouTube's community, can force many students outside of their comfort zone, and into what White (1) refers to as

the “optimal performance zone,” the area in which a small amount of anxiety and stress enhance performance. With the appropriate supervision and guidance, this too could be beneficial to their personal development, as they experience a sense of competency, while doing something exciting.

Working with YouTube further synergises with the IBDP’s vision of lifelong learning and learning environments. The IBDP explains that one of its core objectives is to “help students interact effectively with the learning environments they encounter and encourage them to value learning as an essential and integral part of their everyday lives” (*IB Continuum 2*). Web 2.0 environments like YouTube are clearly an integral part of students’ everyday lives. Students, we know, are already using YouTube for academic purposes (Desmet 65) and spend many hours a week on the platform. Klein estimates that young people born after the year 2000 watch an average of 11.3 hours of free online video content per week (n.p.). Using YouTube in a formal educational setting can help students develop the skills (the capacity to critically evaluate material and to perform deep searching of its database, as explained by O’Neill (70), for example) that will help them to utilise the platform as a learning platform more effectively in the future, thus assisting students in “enabl[ing them to] understand and manage the complexities of our world and provide them with skills and attitudes for taking responsible action for the future” (*IB Continuum 2*).

A final point relates to Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences. As the Diploma Programme explains, *studies in literature and language* teachers should “recognize that students learn in different ways,” and should therefore “experience a range of activities and assessment tasks that best advance their understanding and enjoyment of the texts they encounter” (*Language A: literature guide* 14). As outlined in chapter II, working together on a YouTube Shakespeare project caters to a wide array of intelligence types, as opposed to the more traditional modes of Shakespeare teaching, which strongly favour verbal-linguistic

intelligence types (Ebbens 114), and thus, is in adherence with the IBDP's stated recognition of different modes of learning.

Summary

The IBDP and a YouTube Shakespeare project are a good match for a variety of reasons: firstly, the international orientation of the IBDP suits the international, borderless character of YouTube; the IBDP's goal of stimulating holistic development in its students suits the characterising features of a collaborative and creative project; utilising YouTube in a formal educational context allows for a deepening of students' understanding of the platform, thus enabling them to recognise and potentially utilise it more effectively in the future as a learning environment; and finally, the character of a group-based YouTube Shakespeare project is pedagogically beneficial to a variety of intelligence types and modes of learning – which the IBDP recognises as important factors of effective education.

CHAPTER IV – LESSON PLAN

This chapter contains one *Hamlet*-centred lesson plan that can be utilised in *English A: literature* or the literature section of *English A: language and literature*. Particular choices made are explained where necessary and relevant.

Student tasks

Students are expected to undertake and complete five tasks for the duration of the project. The first task is a group-based research task (see appendix V). The second task consists of an individual report that students must complete by the end of the project (see appendix VI). Each group must also complete a group journal (see appendix VII), which constitutes task three. The project's primary task consists of the development of a short YouTube Shakespeare clip, which is uploaded onto the platform (task four), as described in the project outline hand-out (appendix I). During the last two classroom hours, student groups are expected to present their material to the rest of the group. This presentation is the project's fifth and final formal task.

The group research task (appendix V) has been developed with an eye towards Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al. 4). Students start with exercise 1 by *describing* a clip they have selected, an act associated with the second level of lower order thinking, *understanding*. Exercise 2 requires students to *apply* their understanding (level three), while the comparison task of exercise 3 constitutes an act at the level of *analysing* (level four).

Both the group log – journal and group presentations have been utilised to stimulate metacognitive thinking. As explained by Hiemstra, “journal writing is a tool to aid learners in terms of personal growth, synthesis, and reflection on new information that they require” (20). It is also a tool to ensure student accountability within the group process, as the journal entries provide insight into student activities. The group presentations further stimulate

students to look back at the process of developing their final product, and reflect critically on choices made throughout.

The Filmmaker's Toolkit

The Filmmaker's Toolkit, an online resource that provides hands-on tips and a framework for students embarking on a filmmaking project, has been utilised as the primary source to assist students in the process of making their short film and structuring their project. The website divides the filmmaking process into three phases: the preparation phase, the production phase, and the editing phase. In the preparation phase, students organise their thoughts, develop a storyboard, script their text, describe their shots and prepare to shoot. In the production phase, students perform and record their piece. The website provides valuable insights in relation to camera usage, lighting, white balance and sound recording. The editing phase is broken down into logging, editing, incorporating special effects, and sound and music.

The website also provides an array of helpful websites and an extensive bibliography of guidebooks, student filmmaking case studies and interesting film and art projects that may offer insights to the students.

Time framework

The lesson plan framework (which applies to both variants) utilises a total of seven classroom hours. Students are expected to spend an additional six to ten hours on the project's five tasks. The project has been divided into three sections, in line with the IBDP's preferred learning approach of inquiry, action, and reflection (*What is an IB education?* 4). The first classroom hour and homework assignment belong to the inquiry stage. Lessons two to five

belong to the action phase. The final two classroom hours (lessons six and seven) are utilised for student presentations and project reflection.

The filmmaking process has been divided into the three phases, following the structure outlined by *The Filmmaker's Toolkit*. Two classroom hours (lesson two and three) are spent on the preparatory phase. During this time students can organise their thoughts and work on their storyboard and script. The teacher is present to provide assistance. The production phase is a homework assignment, and is conducted between lesson four and five. Lessons four and five are dedicated to the editing phase. In this time, students log their material, develop a first cut, followed by a fine cut and the incorporation of sound and music. Final editing activities are conducted as homework.

The main function of the time framework above is to provide structure to student projects in terms of activities and deadlines, to ensure an appropriate amount of pressure and an indication of expected time investment and progress so that students do not remain stuck in any of the phases. Some flexibility regarding the preparation and editing phase can be afforded. Those students who feel the need to spend more time in the preparatory phase can do so in the fourth lesson. The fact that there are two classroom hours for project viewing and group presentations means that there is also some degree of flexibility here. Students who have not managed to upload their project on time can be scheduled to present in the second presentation hour and thus be given some additional time to complete their project.

The lesson plan framework has been constructed on the basis of 60-minute classroom hours. Naturally, teachers adopting the lesson plan should make appropriate modifications to suit their model if teaching at a school where classroom hours are different.

The table below outlines the time framework of the entire project:

<i>Lesson 1</i>	Introduction / group formation / topic and approaches brainstorm
<i>Lesson 2</i>	Group work (<i>preparation phase</i>): organising thoughts / storyboarding.
<i>Lesson 3</i>	Group work (<i>preparation phase</i>): storyboarding / scripting. Group – teacher meetings.
<i>Lesson 4</i>	Group work (<i>editing phase</i>): logging / first cut
<i>Lesson 5</i>	Group work (<i>editing phase</i>): fine cut / sound and music
<i>Lesson 6</i>	Project viewing / group presentations
<i>Lesson 7</i>	Project viewing / group presentations / project reflection

Group formation

Teacher-directed group formation is the most optimal manner to ensure that the available resources and student competencies are spread as evenly as possible amongst the groups. Additionally, teacher-directed group formation increases the potential for the development of social skills amongst students, since rather than working together with their usual circle of friends, students work together with students with whom they are less well-acquainted and may find teamwork and team-based problem solving more challenging.

Given the relatively diverse set of competencies that could be beneficial to their projects, it is difficult, if not impossible, to construct groups that are perfectly balanced in terms of all these competencies. It is also questionable whether such a perfect balance is even desirable. However, it is easy to see the problems that might arise in groups in which weaker

student are overrepresented, or how groups in which several stronger students have been grouped together could demotivate the rest of the class. As a general framework, students' current average grades provide an indication of their competency in terms of their knowledge and skills. Dividing students into four categories on the basis of their average grade for the course prior to the introductory lesson can assist the instructor in ensuring that groups are relatively balanced in terms of the knowledge and skills that have previously been assessed in the course.

One of the more vital competencies relating to any filmmaking project is the capacity to edit video material. Although there are a variety of free online resources with a relatively high degree of user-friendliness that can be utilised to perform this function, having at least one person per group with affinity towards using this type of application will allow student groups to work more efficiently and focus more of their energy on the other, more Shakespeare-centred areas of the project.

Group formation can also play a role in terms of physical resources. Depending on the context and the availability of recording devices and microphones, there may be a need to supplement materials available in the school. Making sure resources are most optimally spread across groups is another argument for teacher-directed group formation.

The ideal group size for most cooperative tasks is, according to Woolfolk, between two and five students (487). Given the relative size of the task and the various sub-tasks involved in developing a piece of film together, it is suggested to lean towards the higher end of this range. Having groups of four or five students should be considered ideal.

A final point of consideration is the male-female ratio in groups. Woolfolk advises that, where possible, a balance should be struck between boys and girls in any cooperative educational group setting, since groups in which either boys or girls are overrepresented increases the likelihood of in-group social problems (483).

Homework / deadlines

The following homework assignments / deadlines apply to the project:

<i>Before lesson 2</i>	Group research task (appendix V) / finalise topic and (broad) approach / communicate to teacher
<i>Before lesson 4</i>	Complete thought organisation, storyboard, and scripting Record performance
<i>Before lesson 5</i>	Complete logging / first cut
<i>Before lesson 6</i>	Fine cut / sound editing / uploading Prepare brief presentation
<i>Before lesson 7</i>	Group journal (appendix VII) / individual report and assessment form (appendix VI)

Role of the teacher

The fact that students spend the majority of their time working on their projects in groups naturally has an impact on the role of the teacher for the duration of the project. A well-established shift that teachers need to make when working with group-based projects is from that of knowledge-transferor to supervisor and coach (Woolfolk 489). For the development of social skills the teacher should stimulate listening, turn-taking and in-group conflict management, while for higher-level conceptual tasks the instructor should focus on stimulating effective questioning, explaining, elaborating, synthesising and using and connecting knowledge sources (Woolfolk 490). For obvious reasons, it is also important that

the teacher supervising the course has a relatively high degree of competency in relation to managing group dynamics.

Group – teacher meetings have been scheduled in the third lesson. Although the teacher is present and available throughout all of the classroom sessions, particular moments have been set for each group to meet with the teacher to ensure that the teacher has the opportunity to monitor groups' progress and make relevant suggestions while increasing individual accountability and ensuring that no groups fly under the radar for the duration of the project.

Assessment

Students are assessed in several ways. The largest factor determining students' final mark is the quality of the clip that is uploaded onto YouTube. The final product is weighted at 50 percent. Additionally, students are graded for their group research task (10 percent) and the quality of their group's journal (20 percent). The final presentations are not graded separately. Students' individual contribution to the project constitutes a further 20 percent of their final mark. Individual students' contribution to the project is established on the basis of their individual assessment form and their group's log.

The final YouTube product is assessed on the basis of four assessment criteria (see appendix IV), which is in line with the IBDP's stated method of assessment (*Language A: literature guide* 23). The group research task and group journal are weighted to ensure that students take them seriously, but at respectively 10 percent and 20 percent, their weighting reflects the time investment expected of student groups to complete them successfully. The choice was made not to grade group presentations, to enable the presentation sessions to be somewhat relaxed and informal, in order to counterbalance the excitement many students will be experiencing at showcasing their final products.

The individual marks students receive for their personal contribution to the project are an important factor in the grading process. As Slavin points out, “effective cooperation is best achieved when balancing individual accountability with group accountability” (66). Assessing a group project exclusively in individual terms can lead to the situation that what benefits the individual is at odds with what benefits the group, thus damaging students’ motivation to contribute to the group process; while exclusively group-centred assessment could stimulate freeloading, and demotivate students who feel they are contributing more than their fair share to the project.

Starting situation students

It is assumed that students embarking on this project have covered *Hamlet* in class. Students should have a reasonable understanding of the plot, themes, characters, use of language and stylistic devices employed in the play. Some background knowledge regarding Shakespeare’s historical context is also beneficial. Considering the time investment involved in their project, anywhere between eight and twelve classroom hours (excluding time investment as homework) should suffice. This lesson plan has been developed for adoption right after *Hamlet* has been covered in class. As such, the filmmaking project functions as an add-on to a more traditional covering of the material in question.

In terms of Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al. 4) working with existing material for the creation of something new is the highest level of cognitive complexity. Therefore, a reasonable foundation in terms of knowledge and understanding is a necessary requirement to perform the creative task implied in the filmmaking.

Standard level / higher level

As outlined in chapter III, the IBDP utilises a two-levelled system for most of its courses; *English A: literature* and *English A: language and literature* are no exceptions to this. Both courses can be taken at both levels. This lesson plan can be utilised in both level variants. However, in terms of time investment, the lesson plan was originally developed with the higher level variant of both courses in mind. Since standard level utilises fewer classroom hours (150 at standard level, as opposed to 240 at higher level), adopting this lesson plan at standard level teachers should take into account that the number of hours spent on one work is relatively high, though not problematically so.

Required materials

The list below outlines the minimum requirements for utilising this lesson plan:

- One recording device per group
- One camera microphone per group
- One laptop per group / access to the school's computer facilities
- An internet connection
- Open access to YouTube.com

Obviously, lacking resources can severely bottleneck groups' progress, making it important for any teacher utilising this lesson plan to investigate the availability of resources in advance of the project's start. However, since this section is highly context dependant, it is unnecessary to go into great detail here. However, two obvious solutions to limited availability of resources – particularly relating to the recording devices and microphones – are for students to find the required materials in their social circles, or, if the materials are available, but not in the required quantities, to create a schedule and take turns.

Introductory lesson

The first lesson is aimed at outlining the filmmaking project that students will be embarking upon. Two existing YouTube Shakespeare student projects are viewed to give students an impression of the type of YouTube Shakespeare product they can be aiming for. Groups are also formed, and students are given time to brainstorm a topic with their group.

Min.	Teacher activities:	Student activities:
2 – 12	<p>Show four minutes of <i>Hamlet – The Silent Film</i>.</p> <p>Show <i>Hamlet Rap AP English</i>.</p> <p>Ask students to focus on context / style / use of language.</p>	Take notes while watching.
12 – 18	Create mind-map / discuss student observations.	Provide insights.
18 – 34	<p>Explain project outline / learning objectives / time framework / assessment / homework / deadlines.</p> <p>Explain phases <i>Filmmaker’s Toolkit</i>.</p> <p>Provide project outline hand-out.</p>	Ask questions.
34 – 38	Direct group formation.	Form groups.
38 – 40	Ask students to rearrange seats.	Rearrange seats so that groups are seated together.
40 – 55	Assist / answer questions.	Brainstorm topics / approaches.

55 – 58	Explain individual homework assignment.	Listen.

Group presentations

The group presentations are intended to allow all groups to view each other’s products and learn from the choices made by other groups, and where possible, the lessons learnt by other groups. Each group is asked to supplement the viewing of their final product with a five-minute presentation in which the group’s topic and primary creative choices are explained.

Guiding questions are:

- Why did our group select this particular topic?
- In what manner did we approach our topic, and why?
- What did we learn about working together as a group? What would we do differently if we were asked to complete another such project?
- What did we learn about Shakespeare / *Hamlet* as a result of this project?

Project feedback

At the end of the project, students are asked to provide feedback on the overall project (see appendix VIII). Students are asked to grade the experience using a Likert scale. Feedback is documented anonymously and handed in to the course instructor. The feedback can be utilised for a more extensive, statistical analysis, or used to initiate a feedback session. At present, no model for statistical analysis has been developed.

CHAPTER V – CONCLUSION

This thesis has looked at the potential of a YouTube Shakespeare project to make Shakespeare more, approachable and enjoyable for secondary students in the *English A: literature* and *English A: language and literature* courses of the International Baccalaureate Programme, and found that, as a project it does have this potential. Working with YouTube Shakespeare can be a positive learning experience for students, both academically and socially, through its adherence to the three basic requirements for effective education, the manner in which it caters to multiple intelligences, and the fact that the development of a YouTube Shakespeare project requires students to collaborate creatively together. The YouTube platform can provide students with a sense of real world relevance, and, given students familiarity with the platform, make Shakespeare more approachable. The light-hearted nature of the YouTube Shakespeare scene – which functions through imitation and parody – can further increase the approachability of Shakespeare and promote student enjoyment.

Furthermore, working with YouTube Shakespeare can be used to reach the literary learning objectives of both *English A: literature* and *English A: language and literature* and matches well with the IBDP's pedagogical vision, which values and appreciates the importance of social development, differing styles of learning, and alternative learning environments.

A consideration when working with YouTube Shakespeare as a filmmaking project in secondary education should be that it is by definition relatively time-consuming, both in the time required on behalf of the teacher working with the project in terms of preparation and supervision, as well as the time students spend on their projects. For IBDP teachers of the aforementioned courses, a big part of the required preparation time can be avoided by utilising the lesson plan created in chapter IV. Additionally, any teacher wishing to work with

a YouTube Shakespeare project should make sure that the necessary materials are available, since lacking either visual or auidial recording devices will bottleneck a group's progress.

Finally, the parodic, light-hearted nature of YouTube Shakespeare and the fact that it has the tendency to return old blind spots and devalue context, means that, in order to do justice to the genius that is Shakespeare, a YouTube Shakespeare project functions best as a complementary add-on to more traditional modes of Shakespeare education, in which his works, context and reception are dealt with in a more serious fashion.

Although it is possible to imagine using filmmaking and YouTube as a tool to make dealing with any literary work more approachable and enjoyable, this type of project functions well in relation to Shakespeare due to the relatively wide cultural distance between students and Shakespeare and the large-scale presence of YouTube Shakespeare material on YouTube, which is a direct result of his established reputation as one of the foremost cultural figures of Western civilisation.

WORKS CITED

- A Guide to Curriculum Development*. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014. Web. 19 May 2015.
- Anderson L.W., D.R. Krahwohl, and R.E. Mayer. *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing, A: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Complete Edition*. Columbus: Allyn & Bacon, 2001.
- Allam, C. "Creative activity and its impact on student learning – issues of implementation." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 45.3 (2014): 281 – 288. Print.
- Avery, B. "You Don't Know Jack: Engaging the Twenty-First-Century Student with Shakespeare's Plays." *Pedagogy* 11.1 (2011): 135 – 152. Print.
- Brown, J.S. "Growing up Digital: How the Web Changes Work, Education, and the Way People Learn." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 32.2 (2000): 11 – 20. Print.
- Buckingham, D. "Schooling the Digital Generation: Popular Culture, New Media and the Future of Education." *Medien Impulse* 59 (2007): 5 – 20. Web. 19 Nov. 2014.
- CAS Projects*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016.
<<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/curriculum/creativity-action-and-service/cas-projects/>>
- "YouTube Reaches 1 Billion Users Milestone." *CNBC*, 2013. Web. 18 March 2015.
<<http://www.cnn.com/id/100575883>>
- Conway, C. "YouTube and the Cultural Studies Classroom." *Inside Higher Ed*, 2006. Web. 13 March 2016. <<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2006/11/13/youtube-and-cultural-studies-classroom>>
- Curriculum*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016.
<<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/curriculum/>>

- Deci, E.L. & R.M. Ryan. "A Motivational Approach to Self: Integration in Personality." *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* 38 (1990): 237 – 288. Print.
- Desmet, C. "Teaching Shakespeare with YouTube." *English Journal* 99.1 (2009): 65 – 70. Web. 18 June 2014.
- Dial-Driver, E. "Fusion Curriculum." *Fantasy Media in the Classroom: Essays on Teaching with Film, Television, Literature, Graphic Novels and Video Games*. Ed. S. Emmons, E. Dial-Driver & J.M. Ford. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers (2012): 58 – 73. Web. 29 June 2014.
- DiNucci, D. "Fragmented Future." *Design & New Media*. 1999. Web. 21 Apr. 2015.
- Diploma Programme*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016. <<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/>>
- Duffy, P. "Engaging the YouTube Google-Eyed Generation: Strategies for Using Web 2.0 in Teaching and Learning." *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning* 6.2 (2008): 119 – 130. Web. 13 March 2016.
- Ebbens, S. & S. Ettekoven. *Effectief Leren*, 2012. Groningen: Noordhoff Uitgevers.
- Gardner, H. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, 1983. New York: Basic Books.
- Gray, J. "Television Teaching: Parody, *The Simpsons*, and Media Literacy Education." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 22.3 (2005): 223 – 238. Print.
- Greene, A.J. "Making Connections." *Scientific American Mind* 21 (2010): 22 – 29. Web. 4 Dec. 2015.
- Hiemstra, R. "Uses and Benefits of Journal Writing." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 90.3 (2001): 19 – 26. Print.
- How to become an IB World School*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016. <<http://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/how-to-become-an-ib-school/>>

- Jones, T. and K. Cuthrell. "YouTube: Educational Potentials and Pitfalls." *Computers in the Schools: Interdisciplinary Journal of Practice, Theory, and Applied Research* 28.1 (2011): 75 – 85. Web. 6 July 2014.
- Key Facts about the DP*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016. <<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/what-is-the-dp/key-facts-about-the-dp/>>
- King, W. "Words Shakespeare Invented." *No Sweat Shakespeare*. No Sweat Shakespeare, 2011. Web. 13 Nov. 2015.
- Krashen, S.D. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*, 2009. First internet edition. Web. 25 April 2016.
- Language A: language and literature guide*. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2013. Web. 13 July 2015.
- Language A: literature guide*. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2013. Web. 13 July 2015.
- Language A: literature (SL/HL)*. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016. <<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/curriculum/language-and-literature/language-a-literature-slhl/>>
- Literature and performance guide*. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2013. Web. 18 July 2015.
- Olsen, S. "Teens and Media: A Full-Time Job." *CNET*. S Interactive Inc., 2006. Web. 1 Aug. 2015.
- O'Neill, S. *Shakespeare and YouTube: New Media Forms of the Bard*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. Web. 1 July 2014.
- O'Reilly, T. "What is Web 2.0? Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software." *O'Reilly*, 2005. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.

Programmes. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6 March 2016.

<<http://www.ibo.org/en/programmes/>>

SIGTE Leadership and NTLIS Program Committee. "Realizing technology potential through TPACK." *Learning and Leading with Technology* 36.2 (2008): 23 – 26.

Smith, R.S. "Teachers Shake Up Shakespeare with Digital Media." *Edutopia*, 2012.

<<http://www.edutopia.org/teaching-shakespeare-digital-media>>

Slavin, R.E. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*, 1995. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Studies in Language and Literature. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web.

6 March 2016. <<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/curriculum/language-and-literature/>>

The Filmmaker's Toolkit, 2016. <<http://filmmakers-toolkit.group.shef.ac.uk/index.html>>

The IB Learner Profile. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2010. Web. 13 July 2015.

What is an IB education? International Baccalaureate Organization, August 2013. Web. 29 July 2014.

Understanding DP assessment. The International Baccalaureate Organization, n.d. Web. 6

March 2016. <<http://www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/assessment-and-exams/understanding-ib-assessment/>>

Williams, P. and I. Rowlands. *Information Behaviour of the Researcher of the Future; Work Package II: The Literature on Young People and Their Information Behaviour*, 2007.

Web.

<<http://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140614113317/http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/reppres/ggworkpackageii.pdf>>

Woolfolk, A., *Psychology in Education*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2013.

Appendix I – Project outline hand-out

Project outline

For the next seven classroom hours, you will be developing your own YouTube Shakespeare project, which you will upload onto YouTube upon completion. You will be working together in groups of four or five students. Your group can select a topic from the topics list, or invent your own (but make sure to discuss with your teacher first).

There are three stages to your project: preparation, production, and editing (see the *Filmmaker's Toolkit*²). Once all the projects are uploaded, we will view them in class, accompanied by a short presentation.

Time framework

<i>Lesson 1</i>	Introduction
<i>Lessons 2 – 3</i>	Preparation phase
<i>Lesson 3</i>	Preparation phase / group meetings
<i>Lesson 4 – 5</i>	Editing phase
<i>Lessons 6 – 7</i>	Project viewing / presentations

² <http://filmmakers-toolkit.group.shef.ac.uk/toolkit.html>

Deadlines

<i>Before lesson 2</i>	Group research task (appendix V) / finalise topic and (broad) approach / communicate to teacher
<i>Before lesson 4</i>	Complete thought organisation, storyboard, and scripting Record performance
<i>Before lesson 5</i>	Complete logging / first cut
<i>Before lesson 6</i>	Fine cut / sound editing / uploading Prepare brief presentation
<i>Before lesson 7</i>	Group journal (appendix VII) / individual report and assessment form (appendix VI)

Assessment

<i>Final group product</i>	50%
<i>Group journal</i>	20%
<i>Group research task</i>	10%
<i>Individual contribution</i>	20%

Assessment criteria final product

Creativity	5 marks
Organisation	5 marks
Knowledge and understanding	5 marks
Language	5 marks
Total	20 marks

Appendix II – *Topics hand-out*

Topics

Choose a topic from one of the categories below (or invent your own).

1. Create a *Hamlet* movie trailer.
2. Perform a scene / short act from *Hamlet*, with a modern-day twist of your choosing.
3. Mash up aspects of the plot, characters, and / or themes of *Hamlet* or Shakespeare's life with a modern day pop song.
4. Create a YouTube review of *Hamlet*.
5. Present Hamlet or another character from the play in an interview situation.
6. A women's rights activist's response to the treatment of women in *Hamlet*.
7. A WhatsApp group conversation between three or more characters from *Hamlet*.
8. Perform a scene / short act from *Hamlet*, or create a story synopsis using "Dutchified English."
9. A topic of your own choosing (discuss with instructor for approval).

Appendix III – Sources and tools hand-out

Sources and tools

Examples of Shakespeare on YouTube:

- *Shakespeare “Thrift Shop” parody.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rrvV160GJZA>
- *Hamlet (Shakespeare) – Thug Notes Summary and Analysis.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A98tf9krihg>
- *Hamlet Summary – High School Summary.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7a-AgomL1MU>
- *Shakespeare sketch – A Small Rewrite.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IwbB6B0cQs4>

Prior student projects:

- Sam Burgess’ *English Hamlet Project.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SnhHR5IWVWI>
- Nacho Libre’s *Hamlet Rap AP English FINAL CUT.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3PezHcyFamQ>
- Katelynn Barlowe’s *Hamlet – The Silent Film.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y2LWlrG1VWY>
- Terry He’s *Macbeth Rap (HQ) – Take the Crown.*
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ufRtoS6usw>

Useful tools

- The Filmmaker's Toolkit (useful website that provides insight into making a film)
 - <http://www.filmmakers-toolkit.group.shef.ac.uk/organising.html>
- Audacity (free online sound editing software)
 - <http://audacity.sourceforge.net/?lang=de>
- Animoto (free online video editing software)
 - <http://animoto.com/>
- Movie Maker (free online video editing software)
 - <http://windows-movie-maker.softonic.de/>
- Camtasia (free online video editing software and screen recorder)
 - <http://www.techsmith.com>
- Go Animate (Create an animated video)
 - <http://goanimate.com/>

Appendix IV – Assessment criteria

Criterion A: Creativity

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The final product does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The final product displays a very low level of creativity in terms of topic choice, and the angle taken in relation to that topic, use of language and the overall performance.
2	The final product displays a below average level of creativity in terms of topic choice, and the angle taken in relation to that topic, use of language and the overall performance.
3	The final product displays an average level of creativity in terms of topic choice, and the angle taken in relation to that topic, use of language and the overall performance.
4	The final product displays a high level of creativity in terms of topic choice, and the angle taken in relation to that topic, use of language and the overall performance.
5	An exceptionally high level of creativity is on display in the final product. The angle taken in relation to the topic is highly original, language is used creatively and the overall performance is exceptionally well done.

Criterion B: Organisation

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The final product does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	Little organisation and structure are apparent.
2	Some organisation is apparent. The task has some structure, and is somewhat coherent.
3	The task is organised. The task is relatively well structured, and coherent.
4	The task is organised. The structure is generally coherent.
5	The task is well organised, and structurally coherent.

Criterion C: Knowledge and understanding

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The final product does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There is little knowledge and no understanding of Shakespeare / <i>Hamlet</i> and / or the themes of 'language in cultural context,' 'language in mass communication' or the techniques of literary criticism on display in the final product.
2	There is some knowledge and understanding of Shakespeare / <i>Hamlet</i> and / or the themes of 'language in cultural context,' 'language in mass communication' or the techniques of literary criticism on display in the final product.
3	There is adequate knowledge and understanding of Shakespeare / <i>Hamlet</i> and / or the themes of 'language in cultural context,' 'language in mass communication' or the techniques of literary criticism on display in the final product.
4	There is good knowledge and understanding of Shakespeare / <i>Hamlet</i> and / or the themes of 'language in cultural context,' 'language in mass communication' or the techniques of literary criticism on display in the final product.
5	There is exceptional knowledge and understanding of Shakespeare / <i>Hamlet</i> and / or the themes of 'language in cultural context,' 'language in mass communication' or the techniques of literary criticism on display in the final product.

Criterion D: Language

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The final product does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction, and little sense of register and style.
2	Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
3	Language is clear and carefully chosen, with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
4	Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.
5	Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.

Appendix V – Group research task

Read through the “toolkit” section of the filmmaker’s toolkit website.

Find an existing *Hamlet*-based student project on YouTube.

Exercise 1 [1 point]

Describe the clip you have selected. Consider use of language, context, relevant plots / themes from *Hamlet*.

Exercise 2 [2 points]

Select one fragment from the clip that stands in either a positive or negative way in terms of its production. Explain why it stands out, and if negatively, what you would have done differently.

Exercise 3 [4 points]

Find another *Hamlet*-based student project on YouTube. Compare this clip to the clip you analysed in exercises 1 and 2. In what areas are the clips similar and where do they differ? Explain which clip is better in your opinion. Support your case with arguments.

Exercise 4 [3 points]

Outline two learning lessons that you have learnt from the clips.

Appendix VI – *Individual report and assessment*

Exercise 1

Describe your contribution to the project. Consider such things as creative writing, performing, recording, video editing, and planning. Supplement with other activities you feel made a valuable contribution to your final product.

You may use bullet-points.

Exercise 2

Give yourself a mark for your contribution to the project, whereby a one is the lowest and a ten is the highest. Provide arguments explaining why you feel this mark is justified.

Use between 250 and 500 words.

Appendix VII – *Group journal*

Exercise 1 [3 points] (max. 500 words)

Create a bullet-point logbook of who did what for the duration of the project. You don't have to go into specifics. Be brief and be broad.

Exercise 2 [7 points] (900 – 1,200 words)

Keep a journal of your project in which you describe problems / challenges you faced and how you overcame them. Also consider what new insights you gained through the project.

Write informally.

Categories of interest are:

- a) Knowledge of Shakespeare or *Hamlet*
- b) Working together as a group
- c) Filming your project
- d) Your performance

Appendix 8 – Project feedback

Tick the box that best represents your view.

SA = strongly agree

A = agree

N = neutral

D = disagree

SD = strongly disagree

	SA	A	N	D	SD
<i>1) I have a more positive view of Shakespeare thanks to this project.</i>					
<i>2) I learnt a lot about Hamlet through this project.</i>					
<i>3) My knowledge of working together as a group has improved through this project.</i>					
<i>4) I learnt a lot about filmmaking through this project.</i>					
<i>5) I enjoyed this project.</i>					
<i>6) It was clear what was expected of me for the duration of this project.</i>					
<i>7) The demands in terms of time investment were reasonable.</i>					
<i>8) The grading system employed for the project was reasonable.</i>					
<i>9) The teacher's role in the project was clear.</i>					
<i>10) The teacher provided valuable guidance and assistance for the duration of the project.</i>					

I give this project the following grade out of ten: ...