

教育部顧問室人文教育革新中綱計畫——
人文社會學科學術強化創新計畫——
人文經典研讀計畫

Report Me and My Cause Aright: Teaching *Hamlet* in Taiwan

期中報告

年度成果總報告

補助單位：教育部

計畫類別： 經典研讀課程

經典研讀活動

執行單位：中國文化大學英國語文學系

計畫主持人：胡迪 (Timothy R. Fox)

姚崇昆

執行期程：九十七年八月一日至

九十八年一月卅一日

日期：中華民國九十八年二月廿七日

教育部人文教育革新中綱計畫——人文社會學科學術強化創新計畫
人文經典研讀計畫年度成果總報告

第一部份：計畫名稱 (Project Title)

1.1 Project Title.

Report Me and My Cause Aright: Teaching *Hamlet* in Taiwan

1.2 Course Title.

《哈姆雷特》精讀(Intensive Reading on *Hamlet*)

第二部份：計畫目標 (Project Goals)

2. Project Goals.

As originally stated in the project proposal, this classroom study was designed to achieve positive results in two categories: student achievement and pedagogy. Regarding the former target goal, the project director envisioned the intensive study of *Hamlet* built upon innovative teaching approaches as resulting in: 1.) a better knowledge and appreciation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*; 2.) an enhancement of creative and critical thinking skills; 3.) an improvement of specific aspects of students' English language skills; and 4.) a growth in social and multicultural awareness.

2.1 Knowledge and Appreciation.

It was the project director's expressed hope that participating undergraduate students would achieve, simply through the sheer intensity of their exposure to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in a variety of forms, a more intimate understanding of and appreciation of this richly complex and compelling theater piece. It was expected that the serious study and performance of the text and the casual pleasure of viewing a variety of cinematic interpretations of the play would have the effect of leading students toward an awe-struck admiration for the work that many consider to be the Elizabethan bard's masterpiece. Students were also expected to increase their awareness of the considerable academic discourse regarding the play, knowledge of which would serve those individuals considering future advanced studies in English literature.

2.2 Critical and Creative Thinking.

In the original planning of the project, the director envisioned student participation in comparison, discussion, reflective writing, extra-literary art projects, and dramatic enactment would enhance students' critical thinking skills. This very important talent was also expected to undergo training and practice through the intellectual comparison of various academic or theoretical approaches to the play, as well as discussion of various theatrical interpretations of the drama. It was also hoped that the project website would be an invaluable source of information on *Hamlet*,

William Shakespeare, and the professional theater, with students involved as the primary agents of data collection and categorization for the website.

Through in-class dramatizations and the making of artistic productions using a variety of formats or modes of playback for distribution via the project website, participating students would experience insights into their own latent creative talents.

2.3 Linguistic Improvement.

Another student-focused goal advocated by the project director was the improvement of overall English language skills. Vocabulary acquisition would be increased as students engaged in the effort of rendering Elizabethan English into modern English, while the performance-based element of the project would encourage — through the heightened influence of emotion so necessary to any public performance — the remembering of a larger number of vocabulary items. Indeed, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is an ideal vehicle for this, as the play boasts the dubious distinction of having the largest number of characters who speak more lines than on-stage figures in any other Shakespearean drama.

As regards the phenomenon of language acquisition, the project's demand for peer-to-peer and student-to-teacher discussion in emotionally charged and yet relatively anxiety reduced classroom environment almost ideally meets the criteria established by linguist Stephen Krashen as key to the natural acquisition of a foreign language. The twin processes of negotiation prior to performance and the public defense of their just-performed interpretations would benefit students' communication skills. This abundance of opportunity for linguistic production and the emphasis upon public speaking *and* intra-group interaction was seen as especially beneficial to graduating learners planning to pursue careers in business where negotiaton and argumentation are crucial.

2.4 Social and Multicultural Awarness.

A final benefit expected for students involved in this project was the rise of "multicultural" understanding as participants would engage in comparisons between the older values of a past culture with the traditional values underpinning the learner's own cultural assumptions, with these then being brought into comparison with modern global and urban values that have such a strong sway over younger generations in Taiwan. It is no exaggeration to say that the study of Shakespeare is an act of cultural translation and sharing that leads to an inward focus and a closer understanding of self and society.

第三部份：導讀 (Review of Literature)

3.1 Review of Literature.

This project was designed according to the belief that because drama is a holistic

art form, it is therefore uniquely suited to pedagogies supportive of holistic and student-centered principles. In the history of educational philosophy these principles, while not “new” by any means, are inarguably outside of the repertoire of most subject course instructors, especially those in elementary and secondary levels of education. In fact, the prevalence of teacher-centered instruction throughout American high schools — where “the general method” for teaching Shakespeare means “lecturing ... close reading ... playing an audio script ... and then stopping it after every few lines to ask students what it meant” — has been attacked by critics for possibly encouraging a decline in the number of courses devoted to Shakespeare being offered at American colleges and universities (Manzo). “The result ... could be a new generation of English teachers who ... may not have ever read the most important author in the language” (Manzo). This current project, therefore, was designed to counter both the experience and the perception of the Shakespeare classroom as a site of boredom, confusion, and poorly cloaked hostility. It was the project director’s desire to see a de-centering of the traditional emphasis upon the teacher through a reliance upon teaching methods that respect student feedback, innovation and variety. It was further expected that the use of various learning resources, especially modern communicative technologies, would encourage student interest and engagement with the primary text. It was noted, however, that the project would still leave room for the teacher to act as a disseminator of knowledge; indeed the original syllabus set aside much of the first half of the semester for the host and guest speakers to establish a basic knowledge base of the play and the centuries of critical approaches to the drama. It is the project director’s concession that only after they are firmly grounded in an awareness of the long-established critical approaches to the text can students move forward with confidence toward greater degrees of control over their own learning.

It was therefore the project director’s expressed desire that participating project speakers would provide the foundational knowledge that educators Thomas McCann and Joseph Flanagan argue is necessary before students can engage in the processing and interpreting of a text. “Students,” they say, “should be influenced to read a text from distinct perspectives” and the consideration of “essential critical questions” before being set free to engage in individual interpretations (29).

Also important is student involvement in research, be it online or through the library. The experience of discovering active websites or unearthing scholarly articles, and the realization of the massive body of available published scholarship, is thought to aid the cause of student-centered learning by helping students realize that “argument is valuable, and that a valid reading of a text is constructed through the interactions of a community of readers and not simply the one sponsored by the

instructor” (McCann and Flanagan 35).

Similarly, it was hoped that requiring students to “discover” and then globally redistribute, via the website, a variety of academic lectures and reading materials would emotionally free project participants from the confinement of the classroom. Students would also be asked to interview and digitally record professors, theater experts and literary critics, with these digital products also being uploaded to the project website for wider dissemination, thereby giving students a sense of control over their own extra learning.

Student-centered learning would also be enhanced through the online freedom of access to the recorded class session lectures of the host and guest speakers. By making use of pre-recorded lectures prior to the arrival of a guest speaker, students would experience reduced anxiety when finally engaged in face-to-face interactions with special guest speakers. As a result, the guest speakers would, upon their arrival, need only recall the highlights of their already recorded informative lectures. In the classroom the lecturer, rather than engaging in “the mere transference of ideology,” would have the freedom to engage highly prepared and enthusiastic learners through a strategy of questioning, what some label the Socratic Method. Such an approach, “based in critical inquiry, problem posing, and problem solving,” was expected to enable the professor to more comfortably explore themes and issues related to the text that are also of relevance to student participants (Weltsek 76). The classroom therefore transforms from a site of passive one-way data transfer to a place of discovery through interaction.

The project director endorsed a heavy reliance upon video as a vehicle through which the primary text would be made more accessible. This is in accordance with the arguments of Professor Colin McGinn who suggests that the very nature of the cinematic encourages instant creativity in the mind of the viewer. Upon first sight of the video image jumpstarts a process of what McGinn calls “imaginative seeing” through which “we actively construct an interpretation of what we are seeing” (53-54). Video not only motivates students, but also may encourage creative capabilities.

Ironically, the use of video in the teaching of Shakespeare is arguably equal to reading the printed word, says American high school teacher Brenda Walton, especially when the on-screen viewing is accompanied by English-language scripted support. “The whole experience is really a multiple-intelligence dream come true,” Walton says. Such a viewing of the English-subtitled film “is not cheating,” she says, for “we are indeed reading the book,” albeit onscreen (557).

As noted earlier, the original project proposal and syllabus called for a heavy emphasis upon student performance. Experienced educators at various levels likewise endorse the use of dramatic re-enactments, including recitations, as beneficial in

providing positive opportunities for linguistic production practice. Furthermore, the reliance upon performance encourages a closer consideration of the word meanings (Sklar 39). Performances of excerpted scenes—even excerpted lines—demand a close linguistic study; once “understanding” is achieved, the excerpted items can be re-inserted into the drama for a more informative discussion of the larger drama.

Dramatic scripts are written for enactment before an audience by actors capable of drawing from an expansive repertoire of expressive, creative and physical articulations. “The dramatic context” of Shakespeare’s plays, argues Professor Rex Gibson, “demands classroom practices that are the antithesis of methods in which students sit passively, without intellectual or emotional engagement” (xii). Calling the Shakespearean text “a living force inviting active, imaginative creation,” Gibson endorses “active” classroom approaches that “release students’ imagination and involve them in speaking and acting” (xii).

In his advocacy of “active” classroom approaches, Gibson is endorsing a variety of in-class activities and techniques that can be conveniently brought together beneath the umbrella of The Performance Approach, or what former Royal Shakespeare Company director Patrick Tucker labels The Original Approach. Engagement of this classroom method demands that the professor be careful not to impose any single reading or interpretation upon the students, and show a critical respect for student dramatic enactments that can be afterwards defended logically in argument. Careful class management should ensure a classroom “social context” in which participating learners are comfortable engaging in active participation and dialogic exchanges (Townsend and Pace 594).

By their very nature performance-based approaches are built upon sound pedagogical principles that strive toward the holistic activation not only of the learner’s intellect, but of her emotions, spirit, and body. Performance-based approaches make the study of Shakespeare anything but “the paltry experience” that too many young American learners think it is (Graham 81). Classroom performance opens doors to opportunities for “dynamic expression” and satisfies the intellectual needs of learners (Graham 82).

While dramatic performance in the classroom often leads to “much laughter,” confesses high school teacher Mary Metzger, it is also for students a highly serious undertaking for students who know they are going to be called to account by their classmates (23). With performance-based teaching, agrees high school teacher Russ McDonald, “language is less of an obstacle ... because there is such a powerful incentive to produce clarity for an audience” (151). This seriousness encourages a closer degree of engagement with the text, which Metzger says leads her students toward “the easy discovery of the richness and force of Shakespeare’s language and

characterization” (23). The project director, while acknowledging Metzger’s experience, also raises a warning to her enthusiasm with a reminder that linguistic comprehension achieved through a variety of approaches is a necessary first step for students to whom English is a foreign language, for without a basic understanding of the text it is impossible to deliver an intelligent dramatic enactment.

Also noted above is the suggestion that dramatic performance of the target text aids students toward overcoming culturally based misunderstandings. It is argued here that this is much easier for students in Taiwan who have a closer sense of traditional Chinese values. Indeed, while instructors at all educational levels in the West are upset at the perception that a sense of “the otherness” of Shakespeare has “become more than ever an obstacle to our students” (Rozett 221), this is less of a problem for Taiwanese learners who have a closer awareness of traditional cultural values. Taiwanese students, for example, would — because of their understanding of filial duties — have no problem accepting Ophelia’s acquiescence to her father’s admonitions to stay away from Prince Hamlet.

The closer study of a text by students focused on enactment is intellectually arousing as learners must defend their character interpretations with both textual evidence and an awareness of the human condition. It is this second element, called into play when the text is apparently ambiguous, that makes The Performance Approach so valuable in the study of drama. From these intra-group interactions, student performers invent new knowledge bases that they then reapply not only to the performance of the selected text, but to an analysis of their world and themselves as well (Rocklin 135). “Through collaboration with peers,” says Professors Linda Tabers-Kwak and Timothy Kaufman, “students respond and transact with the text in lasting, more meaningful ways,” with characters coming alive “when students realize that themes and conflicts in today’s world share common characteristics with lives of long ago” (70). By “allowing students to connect with these themes,” agrees teacher Jennifer Morrison, “we allow them to discover the threads that unite us as human beings” (51).

In this way, reasons Professor David Sauer, the enactment of a scene is akin to a chemistry laboratory class where elements are combined and discoveries are made (173). “Much that is educational about classroom drama is focused on discoveries — both the characters’ discoveries and the students’ discoveries about what’s going on and what it means” (Robbins 65). Performance “lays the foundations for exploration of issues much larger than the scene alone might warrant,” with answers to these questions being “discoverable only through performance” (Sauer 174, 178). This process of discovery and decision — a progression in which students realize alternatives, continue toward more complex choices, and collaboratively continue to

create and explore increasing numbers of possible interpretations — is a constructive element for intellectual growth and higher order thinking. This process, in combination with classroom management skills that respect student autonomy and envision the instructor as a facilitator, also results in what Sauer sees as the “larger” aim of higher education: “the empowering of the student to make choices alone, fully conscious that any choice involves losses as well as gains, and to recognize the consequences of those choices” (182).

As regards this project’s focus on *Hamlet*, relatively recent research into the attitudes of students enrolled in the study of Shakespeare at the college level found a large number of survey respondents expressing a belief that “reading Shakespeare had little practical purpose” other than providing them something to talk about that could make them seem “well-cultured” (Metzger 25). It is the suspicion of the project director that a similar misconception exists among Taiwan’s university students regarding the study of the Shakespearean text, and perhaps of all canonical pre-Twentieth Century works. This assumption goes unproven, however. What remains to be seen, when the results of this project are finally gathered and analyzed, is whether or not project participants will have discovered a fair amount about themselves and the society in which they live, knowledge that will benefit them for the rest of their lives.

第四部份：研讀成果 (Project Achievements)

4.1 Micro-Reading.

Students engaged in close readings of the text — a skill so old and rarely used that its practically new. Students entered the course completely unfamiliar with the art of close reading, so they are learning a new and necessary skill. After observing the student participants, the host speaker has decided that a close reading, taken slowly, is of great importance and necessary before learners can move on toward more challenging dramatic enactments. It was host speaker Professor Skupin’s defense that only through micro-reading will students achieve “the big picture.”

Open-ended post-course opinion surveys revealed student appreciation for this experience. Offering up their opinion of how they benefited from the class, some of the eight student respondents noted: “I think I understand how to read Shakespeare better, because I realize that the reason I couldn’t understand is because the words have different meaning from nowadays English;” “Study line by line and know more detailed;” “This course helps me to understand what Hamlet is talking about. And Shakespeare’s plays provide us a large space to think and imagine; there are many different ways to percept. It’s really interesting to understand that. I think that’s the one of reasons why Shakespeare successes;” “I understand more about Hamlet’s

situation.” Another student offered very positive feedback of the close-reading method: “Details. He’s (Professor Skupin) the only teacher who teaches literature word by word. It helps me a lot.”

4.2 Meaning.

As suggested by these above-offered student comments, the experience of close reading encourages a focus on language and the implications behind each utterance, exposing students to the multitude of meanings and the play of language that Shakespeare is a master of. One student response to support this argument is the acknowledgement that “I not only understand words better but also be able to grasp the wisdom or experience from the play.” Another student notes: “Now I know what ‘To be, or not to be?’ really means.” The same student adds, however: “About *Hamlet* . . . I think a semester is too short to understand *Hamlet* because it’s a long drama.”

At least one student, however, in her survey response offered a complaint that the heavy reliance upon close reading over many weeks is perhaps too one-sided and in some ways unsatisfying: “Sometimes I was worried about the details. I know there are more things which are more difficult than understanding the meanings of words. Even though I am thrilled about learning that, I know it’s not enough. How about the isms of *Hamlet*?”

4.3/4.4 Pronunciation/Emotional Delivery.

It was predicted that by semester’s end students will demonstrate a very important improvement in oral production, especially pronunciation. It was argued that students would experience increased confidence in speaking English before others, and while this is not a typical “oral presentation,” it is a necessary element for the success of any public speech endeavor. Further, Dr. Skupin steadily corrected student pronunciation throughout each class session. This faith in ongoing correction is a result of Dr. Skupin’s argument that students in Taiwan study literature for the goal of improving their English language skills.

It was also assumed in the project proposal that because students are doing line readings, enhancing their oral production skills as they approach the text through a variety of alternative vocal renderings, they would naturally inculcate an understanding of the appropriate emotional readings accompanying the wide array of word meanings. One student, at least, said in his survey response that the class “is a chance for me to show my idea with my voice . . . All my voice based on my thinking about *Hamlet*.”

Were these assumptions proven correct by semester’s end? To demonstrate this improvement, students at the semester’s conclusion produced digital audio recordings of themselves reading a section of the text aloud. These were given to Dr. Skupin for

evaluation, for he has a greater awareness of the students' abilities as they were prior to the start of the course. For evaluation in this report, however, Professor Skupin has not yet provided his feedback. This will be included in a future appended report, hopefully in the form of a published book.

4.5 Staging.

The discussion and study of the text engaged a constant emphasis upon the visual. Students were required to keep in the forefront of their minds the visual possibilities in which the text would be spoken by an actor. They practiced the art of stage direction. Unfortunately, in contrast to the proposed use of the constructs of performance theory, Professor Skupin led students in no actual dramatic enactments of the play. Some students were disappointed by this, such as the young lady who commended one of the guest speakers for being "more theater oriented," and another who suggested: "Maybe we can do some activities like drama . . . it is a little pity that we do not perform a short play in the class." Another expressed a regret at the scarcity of access to professional performances in video format: ". . . as teaching a 'play,' it would be easier to understand by 'watching' the play." Another offered: "Perhaps we can watch the play to really see the actors perform the characters."

4.6 Critical Thinking.

Students in this course had numerous opportunities to engage in critical thinking, but this most of all was characteristic of the approach taken in class by guest speaker Professor Ching-his Perng (彭鏡禧) of National Taiwan University. In his class session, Dr. Perng asked students to categorize soliloquies into four different categories, after which they would then defend their placements and speak on the importance of each soliloquy to the overall drama. Students demonstrated an ability to approach the text critically.

Guest speaker Dr. Beatrice Bi-qi Lei likewise forced students to think critically. Her approach to teaching the text was most vividly demonstrated by her having students silently mime the actions of the text as she reads the descriptive lines of dialogue. One important chosen scene was Ophelia's relating to her father of Hamlet's bizarre behavior during a previous encounter with her. "So what does that mean? You read the passage; you saw the couple. So what do you think Hamlet was doing?" Students eagerly offered their interpretations of the scene, with their responses allowing Dr. Lei to expand their suggestions with more of her own. As she told the students: "You see different angles you can look at Hamlet from." From the student responses, her approach was noted and appreciated.

In the survey answers, one student noted that the course had the power to "make us think," while another stressed that she and her class mates now "have the ability to read the play as well as give a creative idea about the play." This same student,

however, obliquely and succinctly criticized the close reading adopted by Dr. Skupin as contrary to the goal of enhancing critical thinking: “I think we need more discussions,” adding that she “felt a little boring in listening to the lecture.”

Nevertheless, students do suggest an improvement in their ability to critique the drama and the language upon which the play relies. As noted above, students were especially impressed with Dr. Beatrice Bi-qi Lei’s lecture. “I did think many when Professor Lei’s talking,” replied one young woman. “Her issue attracted me.” Another student noted of Dr. Lei that her questions were challenging, leading to new ways of thinking about the drama. This student appreciated these new “interesting idea(s)” and Dr. Lei’s “analyses and imagination of characters.” Another student agreed: “I think Professor Lei gives me a different point of view to take a look in Hamlet’s world.”

4.7 Academic History.

As specified in the project proposal, it was emphasized that students would achieve an awareness of traditional academic approaches to the text, as well as a familiarity with the historical information and sources. Students would learn the controversy of authorship, and attain a firm background in the history of Elizabethan theater. In their survey responses, students betrayed only a very limited awareness of the great diversity of traditional academic approaches to the text. One student noted in this area that his main achievement was “Realizing Hamlet and Shakespeare’s writing style as ‘foreshadowing’ and ‘euphism.’” Another student noted that although she “wished to learn how to read this play from different point of view,” most of the guest speakers “focused on the ‘to be or not to be’ speech.” (However, as a review of the video reveals, most of the guest speakers did not focus entirely on this famous line or soliloquy.) These, unfortunately, are the only two references among the student survey responses that refer to traditional academic approaches to the play, such as the analysis of *Hamlet* as an example of the Oedipal Complex or the reading of *Hamlet* through feminist theoretical approaches.

Interviews with Dr. Skupin suggest this overall avoidance of traditional academic approaches results first from the host speaker’s professional disdain for literary theory — which he sees as arising from fashion rather than the text itself. A second source of this neglect is the impression, expressed too late by the host speaker, that the goals of the course offered in the proposal were better subscribed for a graduate-level class. The undergraduate students attending this course, all of them students of Chinese Culture University, were not intellectually mature enough to deal with theoretical approaches. Proof of this intellectual immaturity is found in their lack of motivation, a situation admitted to by a number of survey respondents. Even after the first few weeks of class, Dr. Skupin noted, most of the enrolled students had not taken it upon themselves to read the play in its entirety, or see it in video form (even when

given the opportunity of a free semester-long film-viewing event co-hosted by the project director and Soochow University).

In retrospect, however, it is my opinion as project director — based on my experience of these same students — that with greater reliance upon traditional explanatory lecture enhanced through PowerPoint and video viewing, even the poorly motivated students could have been brought to enough understanding to allow them to engage in discussions of or comprehension of academic approaches to *Hamlet*.

第五部份：議題探討結論 (Main Research Findings)

5.1 Critical Thinking Skills.

One of the positive findings in the project is the suggestion that even low-skilled and poorly motivated students are demonstrating improvements in the area of critical thinking. Even without the advantage of the innovative classroom approach of full performance and a more interactive use of the project website, students participating in this research endeavor have demonstrated what the researchers assume to be an improvement in their critical thinking skills. While this assumption remains statistically untested, the host speaker verified this observation according to his previous familiarity with the individual students.

Justification for this argument of improvement in the area of critical thinking may also be achieved through a process of reasoning that likewise builds upon an assumption. This argument builds upon the observation that students enrolled in this project have thus far displayed a lack of strong motivation toward the target text. This must not be understood as a criticism of the students' overall intellectual abilities, but is offered here in support of a further intimation that these students have in their previous academic experiences most likely not been forced to practice the intellectual accomplishment of making critical judgments. Had they been otherwise academically challenged they would most likely demonstrate a greater curiosity and a higher degree of motivation toward the study, reading and experiencing of the target text, *Hamlet*. As host speaker Dr. Michael Skupin observed, the students “just aren't hungry” for a large serving of *Hamlet*.

And so it was observed with delight by both the host speaker and the project administrative assistant that the students were capable of demonstrating critical thinking skills in their classroom interactions with Dr. Ching-hsi Perng (彭鏡禧) of National Taiwan University. In his class session, guest speaker Dr. Perng asked students to categorize a number of soliloquies from *Hamlet* into four different categories. Students then defended their placement decisions and spoke on the importance of each soliloquy to the overall drama. Through this activity, Dr. Perng provided students an opportunity to exercise critical thinking skills and defend their

judgments through discussion and argumentation. The host speaker, according to his previous awareness of the students' abilities, behaviors and motivations, was surprised and pleased to see students demonstrating abilities that they had not shown during the previous three years of their classroom encounters with him.

What is the source of this perceived growth in critical thinking skills? It is argued here that two major factors contributed to this. The first is that students had an opportunity to view and review Professor Perng's lecture, which had been pre-recorded and distributed to students a week prior to the scholar's scheduled arrival as a guest speaker. This enabled Dr. Perng to rely more upon student-centered instruction, allowing learners to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. On their part, students were somewhat intimidated by the prospect of attending class with a highly respected professor from National Taiwan University, and this anxiety perhaps served as sufficient motivation for them to engage in pre-class viewings of Dr. Perng's pre-recorded lecture.

The second contributive factor is that students had been patiently exposed, over the weeks prior to Dr. Perng's arrival, to the similar topic of analysis through the in-depth and performative oral readings with the host speaker, Dr. Michael Skupin. As Professor Skupin later observed, "We'd been dealing with the same focus on the rhythm of the play for weeks, but when Dr. Perng arrived, he got through to them. I could see their eyes lit up and they 'got it,' by God, they got it."

While having access to Dr. Perng's pre-recorded lecture was important, it was also crucial that students were confident that they could express themselves without fear of embarrassment or mockery. They respected Dr. Perng's professionalism, but perhaps more importantly they had experienced many weeks of Dr. Skupin's mature treatment of them as responsible individuals. The previous weeks of exposure to the text finally "sank in," with Dr. Skupin's teaching preparing the soil that was then rich with nutrients so that Dr. Perng's lecture (in Chinese, it should be noted) was the warmth that led to an instant sprouting of comprehension. The students were also comfortable that their interpretations were respected by the host speaker, and even in instances of disagreement they understood that if they could argue through logic their opinions would be accepted. In the host speaker's weekly sessions they were practicing making critical evaluations, and gaining personal confidence by speaking out and arguing for these opinions.

It may also be argued here that further research may be suggested to investigate the value of using Chinese in the literary studies classroom. Interviews with undergraduates at National Tsinghua University in Hsinchu, where I also teach American Literature as a part-time professor, suggest that students have a greater sense of pleasure and comprehension when they are allowed to discuss their target

texts in Chinese. Indeed, students in their survey responses demonstrated great preferences for both Dr. Perng and Dr. Lei, the former having lectured in Chinese, and the latter having provided Chinese Opera (therefore, Mandarin language) video interpretations of the play. While Dr. Skupin's argument that literary studies in Taiwan serve the purpose of language learning must be acknowledged, it is my argument also that literary studies must also serve the goal of enhancing critical thinking skills.

To evaluate students' growth in terms of critical thinking skills, this project assigned a take-home essay as part of the final exam requirements. This evaluative method falls far short of the requirements for the establishment of statistical or scientific proof, but it nevertheless offers students an opportunity to demonstrate critical thinking skills. The essay topic asked students to ponder the meaning of *Hamlet* for modern Taiwan's society. In other words, what does *Hamlet* have to say about Taiwan? Suggestion of critical thinking skills would be found in essays that use the drama to understand, or at least recognize, similar crises and situations at various levels in Taiwan, from the personal to the public. Overall, the essays offered these connections.

One student confessed: "Originally, I felt difficult to find the relevance among Hamlet and modern Taiwan society. However, after I studied Hamlet, theatre work, and think about it. I realize that some problems exist in human nature is universal." The student then went on to point out that both *Hamlet* and the locally produced satire *Shamlet* "makes me think about Taiwan's Political parties' conflict, group' conflict (Taiwanese, aborigine, etc.)." She narrowed her focus to the personal as well, arguing that the drama served as a reminder of Taiwan's increasing levels of depression and divorce.

As a senior facing a strong possibility of graduating, another student essayist wrote that Hamlet's desire to return to Wittenberg for continuance of his studies echoed the sentiments of many young adults in Taiwan who would rather continue toward graduate studies rather than sit around home in misery because of unemployment or underemployment.

This same student could not resist an opportunity to analyze the drama itself by reversing his authentic experiences as a youthful student of similar age to Hamlet in order to understand the prince's angry treatment of Ophelia. His conclusion is that Hamlet had too much time on his hands and was too involved in court politics. "If Hamlet was just a college student, he would not care so much things. Thus means he perhaps marry Ophelia."

A third student essay compares the political rivalry of the play to the economic rivalry in the Taiwan-China business world in which "the competition between different companies of the same business becomes fiercer and fiercer." The corruption

of King Claudius, who takes the throne without actually deserving it, stirs the student to observe that while businessmen in Taiwan could once expect to be rewarded for their hard work, they were overcome by “the economic situation and the changing of Taiwan society.” In other words, “the businessmen became profiteers and dishonest traders who would try to get as more profit as they can recklessly.” The student pointed to the example of the demise of the once-leading Alexander Health Club to demonstrate her argument the desire for ever-expanding profits leads to corruption, lies, and eventual downfall.

While these essays offer examples of critical thinking skills, they are only three out of nine papers that deserve note. While only 30 percent may not be a strong indicator of critical thinking skills, it nevertheless shows the potential for using a classic text such as *Hamlet* for encouraging students to think about themselves, their communities, and their world. Engagement in this contemplative act is an exercise in critical thinking.

5.2 Oral Production Practice.

It was assumed in the original project proposal that this in-classroom teaching experiment would demonstrate benefits for students in the areas of vocabulary acquisition and public speaking, especially the skills of argumentation and negotiation. Confirmation of this, unfortunately, is limited to proof of improvement in vocabulary acquisition. This will be argued below through a comparison of scores from a TOEFL-style exam administered at the start and end of the semester.

As for the suggestion that this course would enhance participating students’ skills of argumentation and negotiation, this must remain an unproven hypothesis. However, observation of how the course was conducted under Dr. Skupin’s direction reveals a steady emphasis upon question and response. Student answers to questions as simple as “What sound do the trumpets make?” (answer: they bray) lead to other questions such as “What animal brays; what does a bray sound like; is it a pleasant or unpleasant sound?” — with incorrect responses leading to challenges to defend the wrong answer. This weekly exercise in the question/answer-challenge/response pattern may be seen as a practice in argumentation.

More positively, the argument that the course will result in enhanced vocabulary acquisition has been proven accurate, with pre- and post-semester exams demonstrating improvement in vocabulary recognition. The test consisted of 40 questions built around 13 reading passages. All but one of the passages were from the drama, while the final reading was a “lecture” about the history of criticism regarding the character Hamlet. The readings excerpted from *Hamlet* ranged from one-line selections (“Frailty, thy name is woman”) to eight-line selections. The questions in the readings checked overall comprehension (“Put more concisely, this passage is

saying...”) to vocabulary identification (“What does “libertine” suggest in this passage?”). Some questions also challenged students to engage their reasoning skills (with answers available in the reading, such as: “No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm” — Question: “If witches ‘charm,’ then what do fairies do?” — Answer: a.) steal babies). Other questions demand a degree of knowledge of cultures (such as the reading: “Some say that ever ‘gainst that season comes/ Wherein our Savior’s birth is celebrated” — Question: “What is ‘that season ... wherein our Savior’s birth is celebrated’? — Answer: Winter).

Analysis of the pre-semester and post-semester exam results show an overall improvement in the number of “correct” answers. The nine students who took the exam were not allowed to keep copies of the test, and were unaware that the same set of questions administered on the first day of class would be returning unchanged as their final exam. These nine — representing the entire class — averaged eight correct answers more in the post-semester exam than in the pre-semester exam. Surprisingly, almost 25 percent of the 40 questions saw negative results. In other words, nine of the 40 test questions received fewer correct responses in the post-semester exam than in the pre-semester exam. Otherwise, the results were positive. Twenty three questions drew a greater number of correct answers for the post-semester exam than for the pre-semester exam, while eight questions saw no change in the number of correct answers.

Curiously, the greatest change was represented by the four questions connected to the final passage, the fabricated lecture. This reading offers a modern-English lecture about the various scholarly interpretations of Hamlet’s personality. The pre-semester exam saw no correct answers to Questions 37 to 40. The post-semester exam, however, saw five correct answers for Question 37, seven for Question 38, seven for Question 39, and six for Question 40. It may be argued that these positive results reflect a beneficial intellectual outcome of the course. Exposure to the guest speakers — each of whom approached *Hamlet* with a different intellectual agenda — and Dr. Skupin’s erudite discussions of Shakespeare scholarship, endowed students with a greater degree of confidence and comfort in “academic language.”

Even after three years as undergraduates taking required courses in literary studies, students had not become familiar with the notion that Western academia had over centuries developed various “schools of thought” regarding any single text. This class opened the participants to the notion that a single text — in this case *Hamlet* — could be interpreted through different theoretical constructs. The final reading passage on the exam offered notions that were both familiar and unfamiliar, but that is not what led to such overwhelming positive results. The students’ correct answer selections suggests that the intensive study of a single canonical text, under the

guidance of an experienced and somewhat traditional (dare we say “old school”) host speaker with important contributions from guest speakers of differing intellectual and pedagogical approaches, has positive benefits in preparing students for a larger world of scholarship. Those who choose to move on toward graduate studies are now more prepared for the challenge.

The test results also suggest that most of the students have learned not to live in terror of scholarly language and the notion of theoretical conceptualization. Demonstration of this comes from the fact that the test had not changed: the reading passage and questions remained the same. What had changed were the students. The answers to the questions had always been available in the reading passage, but only at the end of the semester were students confident enough not to panic into a blindness that would prevent them from recognizing these answers within the reading.

Students also demonstrated a greater knowledge of the drama. The test included 10 questions that demanded students identify and write down the names of characters from the play. The post-semester exam saw an average of four correct answers than the pre-semester exam. Every question saw an increase in the number of correct answers, although no single question garnered correct responses from all nine student examinees. This demonstrates that participation in the course at the very least gives students a familiarity with the characters and their role in the drama.

第六部份：目標達成情況與自評 (Completion of Target Goals and Self-Evaluation)

6.1 The Performance Approach.

A primary goal of this teaching/research project was to evaluate, in an authentic classroom setting, the applicability of “the performance approach” in Taiwan. The Shakespearean masterpiece *Hamlet* was selected as the primary text for this endeavor because of the work’s fascinating complexities and numerous opportunities for dramatic enactment and varied interpretation. It was assumed that students would, in the first half of the semester, achieve a strong knowledge of the drama’s plot and characters. Through guest lectures the students were also expected to achieve at least a simple awareness of the major critical approaches that have been applied to the study of the play by scholars over the past three centuries.

Unfortunately, most of the students participating in this course showed little personal ambition, initiative or interest in learning the full plot of the drama. Only one student revealed a true fascination with the text, an interest that is indicative of her personal love for theater. This overwhelming sense of mediocre ambition influenced the host speaker’s ultimate decision to set aside the proposed goal of building a class upon the principles and techniques of performance theory in favor of a traditional method of close reading. While Dr. Skupin saw those enrolled for the course as “a

great group of students,” he also believed they lacked the proper training required for dealing correctly with *Hamlet*. More specifically, Dr. Skupin saw a need to train the students to understand and recognize the differences between iambic pentameter, blank verse, and euphuism. Without that important groundwork, he argued, the students would fail to achieve a true understanding and appreciation of the play. Once the rhythmic frame is constructed, then students would be asked to work at “filling in the big picture,” Skupin said. As regards the project proposal’s goal of using “innovative classroom approaches” (specifically, the performance approach and film viewing/comparison) to teach *Hamlet*, Dr. Skupin neatly responds that close reading and the study of rhythm are “so old they’re new.”

As argued earlier, the host speaker’s method of close reading is not altogether different from the project proposal’s originally stated goal of examining the application of the performance approach. Dr. Skupin brought a directorial mindset to the line-by-line study of the text, along with the passion of a dedicated language instructor. After analyzing the text for word and phrasal meaning, students then tackle the pronunciation of the words. Modern “American” English was compared with the language that Shakespeare most likely brought to the stage and with modern “Queen’s English.” After understanding that a different accentuation can make all the difference in how the word is “heard,” students then took on the words for themselves.

Students also focused on the rhythm of the poetry, practicing reading with an eye on the specific poetic approach. Through practice students embedded in their memories the knowledge they had received through lecture about iambic pentameter, euphuism, and blank verse. Dr. Skupin strictly enforced correct pronunciation — not accent, but simple enunciation — through the line readings.

When satisfied with students’ ability to pronounce “comprehensible” words in a relatively comfortable pace and with an appropriate rhythm, the host speaker then focused on the emotional delivery of the target text. At this point the “micro-reading strategy” most resembled a theater group rehearsal reading session. Students attained an awareness of how lines can be delivered with different emotional emphases, and negotiated with the classmates on appropriate spoken-emotional responses. “We really focus on the language and the implications behind each utterance,” Dr. Skupin says.

When explaining and defending their approaches to the text during the line “rehearsal readings,” students must also expound on how they would set the stage for the actors who might be speaking those lines. They take on the roles of directors, if only in their mind’s eye. “While we concentrate on the spoken,” says Dr. Skupin, “we also focus on the visual aspects by keeping the stage setup, their preferences, always at the forefront of their thoughts.” With this modification of the traditional approach to close reading, host speaker Dr. Skupin set a firm foundation for students upon

which they might some day be able to step forward more boldly toward a full application of the performance approach.

It was the project director's decision to respect the choices of the host speaker regarding the conduct and management of class sessions. To impose alternative methods would irreparably damage working relations among the project team, and might even have done a disservice to the students.

Alternatively, the project should examine the pedagogical results of the host speaker's micro-reading and theater reading methodology. The latter approach can be viewed as "innovative" insofar as so very few professors in Taiwan advocate these approaches, possibly due to opinions that close reading is "old fashioned" or simply "too much work." Others may criticize close reading as "teacher centered," but this is remedied by the dual emphases on "reader rehearsal" emotive delivery and the steady emphasis on theatrical staging, both of which give the onus to students to create, negotiate, perform, explain and defend their oral enactments.

6.2 Comparative "Readings"

Another stated goal of the original project proposal was the goal of exposing students to a wide array of cinematic interpretations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This was to be achieved through an extracurricular activity, a weekly showing of different productions of the play. Included in this list was Laurence Olivier's 1948 production, Nicol Williamson's 1969 film, the BBC production starring Derek Jacoby, Franco Zeffereilli's 1990 *Hamlet* with Mel Gibson, Kenneth Branagh's massive 1996 film, Campbell Scott's 2000 Hallmark cable television production, Michael Almereyda's 2000 film starring Ethan Hawke, Peter Brook's 2001 film of his controversial theater staging, Will Houston's 2003 production for British television, and Alexander Fodor's 2007 postmodern *Hamlet*. The project director collaborated with theater instructor Don Gilleland of Soochow University in offering the weekly film showings at Soochow's theater classroom.

It was expected, based on a past experience of a similar extracurricular film viewing activity, that students attending these cinema offerings would practice their critical thinking skills in post-viewing discussions as they compare the separate productions. Soochow University was chosen as a site given the school's emphasis within the Department of English on theatre and acting. The university was also selected for its close location to Chinese Culture University, and for the availability of a comfortable theater for the weekly viewings.

Unfortunately, the extracurricular evening event was cancelled after only two weeks due to student lack of interest. The first night drew only two students from the *Hamlet* project, and one of these showed a great lack of interest by spending more time in the cafeteria than at the screening. On the positive side, a graduate student of

the Soochow University Department of English also attended, and brought to the evening his passionate expertise in film production theory achieved through private study.

The second week saw only one of the previous week's project enrollees return to Soochow for the next showing, although she was accompanied by two other students from Chinese Culture University who had heard about the film event in their English Literature course. The Soochow University graduate student also returned. This poor rate of attendance led to the project director's decision to cancel the activity, given the mismatch between energy and money invested in the event and the lack of returns from the students for whom the activity was organized.

The cancellation was truly heartbreaking, especially as the conversation following the second showing gave proof to his original assumptions that the activity would enhance students' critical thinking skills. Indeed, when the lights came on at the end of the second film showing, the two returnee participants responded with comparisons between the two films. Instructor Gilleland likewise contributed his observations. The insights offered in this half-hour exchange were thrilling. It was heartbreaking and embarrassing for the project director that so few project participants were motivated enough to attend the Thursday evening viewings, especially after Instructor Gilleland had made a number of sacrifices and contributions to the activity.

6.3 Intercollegiate Attendance.

While not a strongly emphasized goal, it was expected that the project — as an authentic for-credit undergraduate course — would draw a number of interested registrants from universities throughout Taipei City. Certainly the current project co-director, in her position as chairperson of the Chinese Culture University Department of English, was excited about the prospect of Chinese Culture University students interacting with students from other schools. It was hoped that students would learn from each other and grow from the “exchange.” Unfortunately, two email notices failed to draw interested applicants. It was a sad failure of the project directors that students from other universities were not drawn to participate in this course.

第七部份：執行過程遭遇之困難 (Difficulties in Execution)

7.1 Crisis of Representation.

A major problem arose when the project director was accepted employment at National Ilan University. It is Ministry of Education policy that the project “follows” the director, but moving the *Hamlet* project to Ilan would have proved difficult given the unlikelihood of being able to bring host and guest speakers to the coastal city located some 50 kilometers from Taipei. In retrospect, however, it is regrettable that the project director did not more aggressively try to bring the project to Ilan, for

weekly transportation could have been arranged for the host speaker and the quality of students enrolled at National Ilan University far outshines that of the poorly motivated students of Chinese Culture University.

The then-chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature at National Ilan University offered to cooperate with Chinese Culture University, allowing registration through Ilan but class sessions to be held at Chinese Culture University. Sadly, the chairperson of the Department of English at Chinese Culture University in mid-May 2008 reacted with strong negativity to this proposition. She argued that there would be no cooperation of any sort with National Ilan University, for the MOE funding and more importantly the “recognition” for the project must remain within Chinese Culture University control. Although an employee for over a decade with the university, the project director was shocked to recognize such pettiness and a near-total lack of intellectual or professional concern for either the students or the professors — most especially Dr. Skupin — who would benefit from participation in this project.

The project director’s disheartenment with the “working culture” of Chinese Culture University was increased by a subsequent experience of plagiarism and assault by a graduate student of Chinese Culture University’s graduate program in English. Both the plagiarism and the assault drew very little response or criticism from the chairperson of the graduate program. His argument regarding the project director’s evidence of a graduate student having stolen the work of a student from another university was mediocre, suggesting that a failing grade is punishment enough. His personal response to the student’s assertion that “everybody does it, so what’s the big deal?” was similarly indifferent. Nor did he attempt to sanction the same student who twice verbally assaulted the project director—once in the presence of the chairperson himself—with profanity that legally could have been the cause of legal action. Criminal charges were not filed, but a review committee was established. Evidence was gathered of further plagiarism in another professor’s class. A week prior to the scheduled date, the hearing was cancelled on the basis of the student having been expelled due to his tardy payment of tuition. It has since been discovered that this student has paid his overdue tuition, and is back in the program without any questions regarding his proven plagiarism.

Once again with the benefit of hindsight, this incident of plagiarism, assault, and questionable ethics should have led to either the cancellation of the project or the removal of the project from Chinese Culture University to National Ilan University. Indeed, the project director drew up a letter of revocation to the Ministry of Education on June 12, 2008.

This letter was never mailed, however, due to the diligent efforts of the project

Administrative Assistant, Instructor Lin, who negotiated with both the chairperson of Chinese Culture University, the Ministry of Education's appointed representative, and the project director. The result of his efforts was an agreement to allow Chinese Culture University to maintain full control over the project by the placement of the Dean of the College of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Dr. Lucy Yao Chung-kuen (姚崇昆), as the project co-director.

Dr. Yao has since proven a strong supporter of the project, overseeing the selection of an appropriate classroom and providing hospitable welcomes for guest speakers. National Ilan University, meanwhile, has demonstrated great professionalism and goodwill in respecting the project director's decisions and not pursuing any further claim to the project. In this they should have struggled more for removal of the project to their control.

Nevertheless, the experience has had powerfully marred the motivation of the project director. This change in working relationships, in combination with unexpected scheduling conflicts, resulted in a good deal of project oversight being ceded to the project administrative assistant, whose enthusiasm was crucial to the ongoing success of the project. It was administrative assistant Lin who oversaw the mechanics of videotaping weekly class sessions, arranged the taping of the guest speakers' pre-recorded lectures, managed the project website, and gathered weekly feedback from the host speaker and students.

A good deal of the problem arose directly from the lack of flexibility in the Ministry of Education's operational guidelines. Specifically, the MOE demands that the project funding follow the project director. When the project director moved his full-time employment to National Ilan University, however, a crisis occurred insofar as the research funds had already been officially allocated to Chinese Culture University. There seemed to be very little room to negotiate a sharing of funds between the two universities, while the budgeting of the money had been fixed and would not be available for the renting of a classroom so that the course could be taught by Dr. Skupin in Yangmingshan or the payment of transportation to bring Dr. Skupin to and from Ilan every week. Hopefully this experience, as reported here, will lead to an expansion and perhaps a loosening of MOE guidelines in reference to the link between the project director and the university awarded with oversight of the funds awarded. Such a loosening would allow, for example, a course to be offered at a university not associated with the project director, but the selection of which would ensure a greater variety of student participants from different institutions. Part of the problem of enrollment may have been solved had this project been offered through a school located closer to the Downtown area of Taipei City. It can be surmised that part of what prevented students from other universities throughout Taipei from registering

for this course was the distance to the Chinese Culture University's Yangmingshan campus. Of course, an institution not related to either the project director or the guest lecturer would want financial compensation for classroom use. It would be difficult to ask a university administration to weigh finances against the larger and more important educational benefits for students.

It might also be suggested that the MOE guidelines be loosened somewhat to allow changes in the pre-determined host speaker. While Dr. Skupin is eminently qualified to teach this intensive course, had another professor been available to teach it at National Ilan University and such a change allowed under MOE guidelines, this would have been the best course of action. In hindsight, funds might have been procured for Dr. Skupin's transport, while respectable professors of Shakespeare were indeed available as replacement host speakers at National Ilan University. The project director's unfamiliarity with his new colleagues led to a blindness in recognition of this as a potential option.

7.2 Syllabus Unsuitability.

One of the results of this feedback is the sad realization that the syllabus as prepared during the project planning stage is inappropriate for the undergraduate students of Chinese Culture University. Despite their acceptance by host speaker Dr. Skupin as "good students," the class registrants display a lack of motivation, so much so that halfway through the semester most had not even taken it upon themselves to read the entire play or procure a video performance just to see "where it's going" or "how it ends." "They aren't even curious," noted Skupin.

The original syllabus was put together with the assumption that participating students would arrive already familiar with the drama. Both the project host speaker and the administrative assistant now agree the syllabus as originally drawn up was more appropriate for a graduate student from a quality institution of higher education. Sadly, two email announcements calling for registrants — one sent out in late August and another in early September — drew no interest from students at other universities. This was a failure on the part of the project director who should have been more aggressive in recruitment of students from other universities. Dr. Skupin confessed to having been disappointed about lack of interest from other university students. "We should have done a better job getting them interested," he said

It may be offered as a suggestion for the MOE that the ministry itself play a stronger role in recruiting students for future projects such as this. Having students from different institutions cooperate in a class is intellectually and socially beneficial for all involved.

Student selection for participation in the class was undertaken on the first scheduled class session, when Dr. Skupin rejected three interested applicants and

allowed 14 others to register. Of these 14, four dropped out and only nine seniors of Chinese Culture University continued to attend weekly class sessions. Their maturity and intellectual progress improved, according to the project host speaker who said of them halfway through the semester: “They’re skill ‘kids,’ but they’re starting to open up and become more motivated.” He warned the students at the start of the semester: “You gotta be hungry” for the task ahead of them.

Project host speaker Dr. Skupin and project administrative assistant Lin are in agreement with the assessment that the students enrolled in the class without a real understanding of the challenge that lay ahead of them. “They simply are not prepared for such an intensive class,” Dr. Skupin said, noting their lack of discipline, their inexperience with close reading, and their overwhelmingly obvious lack of confidence in themselves. Nevertheless, they are improving.

Evidence of their improvement comes in demonstration that students have been accessing the recorded weekly sessions as a form of review. Equally important, they prepared quite enthusiastically for their in-class interactions with the guest speakers through repeated viewings of their recorded lectures, which were made available a week prior to their scheduled arrivals. Early on these pre-recordings were provided in the form of DVDs, and later uploaded for viewing online. Student survey responses generally support the use of DVDs rather than online viewing.

7.3 Speaker Scheduling Conflicts.

Difficulties in scheduling guest speakers have effectively reversed the order of the syllabus as originally planned and submitted with the project proposal. The syllabus calls for guest speakers to have occupied most of the first half of the semester, leaving host speaker Dr. Skupin to finish the second half of the semester with a heavy emphasis upon student performance and dialogue. The realities of demanding teaching schedules and conference plans have resulted, however, in most of the guest speakers now being scheduled for the second half of the semester. Two speakers also pulled out of the project, arguing that scheduling conflicts prevented them from offering a Tuesday afternoon lecture.

It is here suggested that the MOE and the host institution recognize the possibility of an undergraduate course being offered during weekend hours. This project may have drawn more guest speakers in line with the proposed syllabus if it had been offered on a Saturday afternoon at, perhaps, the Chinese Culture University’s adult division campus. Greater flexibility in terms of classroom location and time should be allowed.

7.4 Administrative Anxieties.

Early on in the project, the administrative assistant experienced minor yet emotionally jarring difficulties in overcoming unexpected misunderstandings on the

part of the separate offices responsible for handling the funds allotted to them by the Ministry of Education. One such problem was the demand for receipts prior to a release of payments, a perfectly understandable and legally necessary requirement. As a matter of courtesy, the project director has been pre-financing the guest speakers' transportation fees, but on occasion guest speakers have forgotten to procure receipts for taxi transportation. In these instances the project director now expects no reimbursement from the project funds, even though these have been accounted for in the original budget.

Another deeply disturbing incident was the Accounting Office's decision not to release the full funds for the host speaker, forcing the project administrative assistant to seek a letter from the MOE demanding release of the money. It is disappointing that the project administrative assistant's time should have been wasted, as well as his anxiety heightened, in having to deal with crises of administrative error on the part of the Accounting Office at Chinese Culture University.

More positive has been the support and enthusiasm for the project on the part of the Department of English once the decision was made to keep the project within their control. Through the invaluable assistance of the department's teaching assistant, Dr. Skupin was offered a teaching schedule that allowed him to teach this special course without negatively affecting his regular course load. The department also offered appropriate classroom facilities, and as already noted dean of the college has displayed tremendous hospitality to the guest speakers.

Personal and professional demands on both the project director and the project administrative assistant have slowed their negotiations with the website host, delaying the production of the project site. The project administrative assistant compensated for this with assistance from his colleagues at Fu Jen Catholic University, who assisted him in the editing and production of video disks of recorded class sessions that were distributed to students. However, negotiations with the website host were completed and a fully functioning website is online and accessible to students.

A further recommendation for the MOE is the establishment of ministry technical support services. Rather than asking project directors to independently oversee the establishment of a fully functioning website, the MOE would do well by offering a site for the project and technical aid in maintaining that site. Alternatively, the ministry might enable a cooperation between the project director and the host university for the establishment and maintenance of a website within the university's system.

Another recommendation for the ministry might be to offer training courses in both website design and video editing for project participants. A lack of real knowledge in the former led to a slowness in getting a website properly functioning

and materials uploaded in good time. A lack of training in the latter led to video that falls far short of the quality that most of today's students expect. This disjoint results in a discomfort for students when reviewing the videotaped lectures or class sessions.

A final recommendation may be to loosen guidelines that restrict the project director from serving as the host speaker. That separation of duties severely restricted this project, which was conceived according to the interests and pedagogical training of the director. Demand for a separate host speaker led to the selection of a colleague with dissimilar interests (*vis-à-vis* "innovative teaching" and technology) and pedagogical experience. It is the project director who displays the greatest familiarity with and passion for the project goals, and so it should be the project director who takes over the primary role of host lecturer.

In closing, gratitude must be expressed to the Ministry of Education for funding this research project. Despite the tremendous difficulties encountered and errors made along the way, the project suggested strong benefits through the teaching of a canonical text using both innovative and traditional approaches.

Works Cited

- Gibson, Rex. "Introduction: 'The Play's the Thing.'" *Teaching Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP (1998).
- Graham, Ginny. "'To Perform or Not to Perform?' A Question Worth Exploring." *English Journal* 92.1 (2002) 80-87.
- Manzo, Kathleen Kennedy. "The Play's the Thing." *Education Week*. 8 August 1998.
- McCann, Thomas M. and Joseph M. Flanagan. "A *Tempest* Project: Shakespeare and Critical Conflicts." *English Journal* 92.1 (2001) 29-35.
- McDonald, Russ. "Shakespeare Goes to High School: Some Current Practices in the American Classroom." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.2 (1995) 145-156.
- McGinn, C. *The Power of Movies: How Screen and Mind Interact*. New York: Vintage Books (2007).
- Metzger, Mary Janell. "'The Villainy You Teach Me...': Shakespeare and AP English Literature." *English Journal* 92.1 (2002) 22-28.
- Robbins, Bruce. "Using *The Original Approach* to Teach Shakespeare." *English Journal* 95.1 (2005) 65.
- Rocklin, Edward L. "Shakespeare's Script as a Cue for Pedagogic Invention." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.2 (1995) 135-144.
- Rozett, Martha Tuck. "Creating a Context for Shakespeare with Historical Fiction." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.2 (1995) 220-27.
- Sauer, David Kennedy. "'Speak the speech, I pray you,' Or Suiting the Method to the Moment: A Theory of Classroom Performance of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.2 (1995) 173-182.
- Sklar, Stacey M. "Shall we Bury Caesar or Praise Him? Ideas for the Revitalization of an Old Standard." *English Journal* 92.1 (2002) 36-40.
- Tabers-Kwak, Linda, and Timothy Kaufman. "Shakespeare through the Lens of a New Age." *English Journal* 92.1 (2002): 69-73.
- Townsend, Jane S., and Barbara G. Pace. "The Many Faces of Gertrude: Opening and Closing Possibilities in Classroom Talk." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 48.7 (2005) 594-605.
- Walton, Brenda. "Thank You, Kenneth Branagh." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 49.7 (2006) 556-559.
- Weltsek, Gustave. "Using Process Drama to Deconstruct *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *English Journal* 95.1 (2005), 75-81.

第九部分：改進建議 (Advices/Propositions for Improvement)

本計畫主持人胡迪教授(Timothy R. Fox)已於計畫開始執行當學期，轉任國立宜蘭大學外國語文學系，並由文化大學英國語文學系主任姚崇昆擔任計畫共同主持人。由於本計畫邀請國內多位知名相關領域學者擔任客座主講人，對於英美文學領域學生而言，機會誠屬難能可貴，因此若將本經典研讀課程開設為跨校選修課程，相信對於英美文學領域學生將為一大福音。然計畫主講人(Michael J. Skupin)周德客教授任教文化大學英國語文學系，與計畫主持人胡迪教授分屬不同單位，未來若繼續執行本計畫，勢必面臨經費歸屬問題及兩校會計室請款問題（由於申請計畫時期胡迪教授仍任教中國文化大學，故本學期經費核撥至中國文化大學，下年度若胡迪教授繼續申請計畫，則經費將核撥至國立宜蘭大學）。

敬請貴辦公室對於：

- 一、計畫主持人、計畫主講人、選修課程學生若分屬不同學校時，補助款歸屬問題；
 - 二、若將「經典研讀課程」開設為跨校選修課程之相關規定；
- 能有更為清楚的條款說明，俾便在下學年度繼續申請計畫時能有所依據。

第十部分：統計表 (Statistical Charts)

說明：1. 經典研讀活動請填表一，經典研讀課程請填表二。

2. 年度成果總報告再填報此表格，期中報告不必填寫。

表一：經典研讀活動填報

計畫主持人：				
計畫名稱：				
研讀經典	研讀次數	教師參與人數	學生參與人數	計畫助理
<input type="checkbox"/> 中文經典 <input type="checkbox"/> 外文經典	_____次	男____人 女____人	男____人 女____人	<input type="checkbox"/> 兼任助理 (男____人，女____人) <input type="checkbox"/> 無

表二：經典研讀課程填報

計畫主持人：國立宜蘭大學外國語文學系 胡迪副教授 (Timothy R. Fox) 中國文化大學英國語文學系 姚崇昆教授				
計畫名稱：Report Me and My Cause Aright: Teaching <i>Hamlet</i> in Taiwan				
研讀經典	開課對象	參與授課教師數	修課學生數	計畫助理
<input type="checkbox"/> 中文經典 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 外文經典	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 大學部 <input type="checkbox"/> 碩士班	男 四 人 女 一 人	男 二 人 女 八 人	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 博士生教學助理 (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 男 <input type="checkbox"/> 女) <input type="checkbox"/> 兼任助理 (<input type="checkbox"/> 男 <input type="checkbox"/> 女) <input type="checkbox"/> 無

APPENDIX 1

Pre-Semester and Post-Semester Vocabulary Evaluation

Thirteen reading passages — all but one taken from William Shakespeare's Hamlet — were offered to students as part of a TOEFL-style reading comprehension exam. The exam was administered at the start of the semester, and again as a part of the final examination grade at the close of the semester. The results of the exam, tabulated as the number of correct answers provided by students in both the pre-semester and post-semester sittings of this test, are offered in tabular form in Appendix 2. Below are the questions as they were given to the students.

PASSAGE ONE (Questions 1-5)

It faded on the crowing of the cock.
Some say that ever 'gainst that season comes
Wherein our Savior's birth is celebrated,
The bird of dawning singeth all night long:
And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad;
The nights are wholesome; then no planets strike,
No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
So hallow'd and so gracious is the time.

- 1. What is the “bird of dawning” referred to in this passage?**
 - a.) the sparrow
 - b.) the owl
 - c.) the rooster
 - d.) the rising sun

- 2. What is “that season ...wherein our Savior's birth is celebrated”?**
 - a.) Winter
 - b.) Christmas
 - c.) Halloween
 - d.) New Year

- 3. What time is generally considered unwholesome?**
 - a.) evening
 - b.) holidays
 - c.) morning
 - d.) daytime

- 4. In this passage, “singeth” means:**
 - a.) dancing
 - b.) merriment
 - c.) singing
 - d.) crowing

- 5. If witches “charm,” then what do fairies do?**
 - a.) steal babies
 - b.) sing lusty songs
 - c.) cast wicked spells
 - d.) dress as women

continued

PASSAGE TWO (Questions 6-10)

O, that this too too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew!
Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter! O God! God!
How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world!

6. The person who said this can best be described as:

- a.) upbeat and confident
- b.) depressed and suicidal
- c.) joyful and optimistic
- d.) philosophical and shallow

7. Which of these words, as used here, means “useless?”

- a.) unprofitable
- b.) weary
- c.) flat
- d.) stale

8. As used here, “canon” means:

- a.) big guns
- b.) angry eye
- c.) military weapon
- d.) divine law

9. “The Everlasting” is a reference to:

- a.) social authority
- b.) the Judeo-Christian deity
- c.) the rule of thumb
- d.) forever and always

10. The physical thing “dew” as used here suggests which other word:

- a.) money due
- b.) adieu
- c.) dog doo
- d.) overdue

continued

PASSAGE THREE (Questions 11-13)

Frailty, thy name is woman!

11. As used here, “thy” means:

- a.) possessive singular “you”
- b.) plural possessive “they”
- c.) present perfect “we”
- d.) passive voice “he, she, it”

12. Say this to a female classmate, and she will feel:

- a.) noticeably impressed
- b.) obviously delighted
- c.) somewhat heartened
- d.) less than pleased

13. In *Hamlet*, who said this line, and to whom was it spoken as indirect reference?

- a.) Hamlet, Ophelia
- b.) Polonius, Claudius
- c.) Hamlet, Gertrude
- d.) Polonius, Ophelia

PASSAGE FOUR (Questions 14-16)

A countenance more in sorrow than in anger.

14. “Countenance” may be understood as:

- a.) personal hygiene
- b.) facial expression
- c.) financial losses
- d.) self-posture

15. Put more simply, this line comes closest to meaning:

- a.) He seemed forlorn, not irate.
- b.) He appeared pathetic, and not jovial.
- c.) He came across as calm, not really sad.
- d.) He struck the observer as obviously incensed.

16. This line was spoken in reference to:

- a.) Prince Hamlet
- b.) Philosophical Horatio
- c.) Rougish Yorick
- d.) King Hamlet

PASSAGE FIVE (Questions 17)

Foul deeds will rise,
Though all the earth o'erwhelm them, to men's eyes.

17. This could carry a meaning similar to the Taiwanese saying:

- a.) Walk softly, but carry a big stick.
- b.) Kill the chicken to scare the monkey.
- c.) Bury my heart at wounded knee.
- d.) You can't wrap fire in paper.

PASSAGE SIX (Questions 18-21)

Do not as some ungracious pastors do,
Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven;
Whiles, like a puffed and reckless libertine,
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,
And recks not his own rede..

18. What professional class is noted here as being ungracious?

- a.) the police
- b.) the clergy
- c.) the military
- d.) the historian

19. What does "libertine" suggest in this passage?

- a.) immorality
- b.) freedom
- c.) right thinking
- d.) independence

20. What does "dalliance" suggest as it used in this passage?

- a.) to behave rightly
- b.) to think deep thoughts
- c.) to obey divine instruction
- d.) to flirt and seduce

21. Put more concisely, this passage is saying:

- a.) Don't be a hypocrite
- b.) Don't be a whore
- c.) Don't be a politician
- d.) Don't be a pastor

continued

PASSAGE SEVEN (Questions 22-23)

Give thy thoughts no tongue.

22. Who would give such advice?

- a.) your professor, in class while asking for feedback
- b.) your lawyer, over the phone while en route to see you in jail
- c.) your mother, right after asking: "Does this dress make me look fat?"
- d.) your therapist, while encouraging you to self-analyze a dream

23. Put simply, this line suggests:

- a.) don't express your opinions unguardedly
- b.) don't think too much about things
- c.) don't try to figure out what to do
- d.) don't go against your inner emotions

PASSAGE EIGHT (Questions 24-25)

The friends thou has, and their adoption tried,
Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel.

24. What is being encouraged here?

- a.) you should adopt children.
- b.) you can't trust anybody but your friends.
- c.) a friend in deed is a friend in need.
- d.) learn who you can trust and call them your friends.

25. What shape does a "hoop" usually take?

- a.) a binding
- b.) all over
- c.) made of steel
- d.) circular in form

PASSAGE NINE (Question 26)

Neither a borrower nor a lender be.

26. Who in today's business world would NEVER give you this advice?

- a.) priests
- b.) bankers
- c.) politicians
- d.) carpenters

PASSAGE TEN (Questions 27-29)

But to my mind, though I am native here
And to the manner born, it is a custom
More honored in the breach than in the observance.

27. What is another way of saying “but to my mind?”

- a.) “as far as I’m concerned...”
- b.) “you won’t catch me doing that.”
- c.) “don’t tell me what I already know.”
- d.) “let me tell you something:”

28. The speaker in this passage is NOT:

- a.) a local boy
- b.) home-grown
- c.) from the area
- d.) a newcomer

29. In this passage, what is the speaker saying about the “custom?”

- a.) it is a good custom
- b.) it ought to be done more
- c.) it should be abandoned
- d.) it can be a source of greatness

PASSAGE ELEVEN (Questions 30-31)

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

30. What is the speaker suggesting about the world we live in?

- a.) it is a dull place
- b.) it is an amazing place
- c.) it is not very philosophical
- d.) it is like being an accountant

31. What subject does Horatio seem to excel at?

- a.) philosophy
- b.) cartography
- c.) filmography
- d.) metalphysics

continued

PASSAGE TWELVE (Questions 32-36)

It goes so heavily with my disposition
That this goodly frame, the earth,
Seems to me a sterile promontory.
This most excellent canopy, the air,
Look you, the o'erhanging firmament,
This majestical roof fretted with golden fires,
Why it appears no other thing to me
Than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapors.

32. The second half of this passage addresses what geographical feature?

- a.) the planet
- b.) the mountains
- c.) the oceans
- d.) the sky

33. Which of these word pairs can share the same space, having similar meanings?

- a.) dirt and water
- b.) sterile and o'erhanging
- c.) majestical and vapors
- d.) canopy and firmament

34. Which meaning of "fretted" is preferred for this passage?

- a.) vexed
- b.) patterned
- c.) bothered
- d.) destroyed

35. In today's world, which of these is NOT caused by "foul and pestilent vapors?"

- a.) fresh air
- b.) global warming
- c.) summertime smog
- d.) asthma

36. The speaker of this passage expresses what lamentation?

- a.) he cannot see the stars on a cloudy night.
- b.) he has no good ear for music
- c.) he has forgotten the names of the stars
- d.) he cannot appreciate the beauty of the world

PASSAGE THIRTEEN (Questions 37-40)

A Lecture:

The protagonist Hamlet has been interpreted variously throughout the centuries. German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe saw Hamlet as a symbol of weakness in a world of political conniving. Psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud saw Hamlet as exemplary of the Oedipus Complex, his actions arising from his desire to kill his father and sleep with his mother. Freud notes that Hamlet shrewdly replaces the father whom he desires to kill with the man who has indeed killed his father, and in this way he is killing himself. Modern scholar Michael Shapiro scoffs at both these interpretations, as he argues for a reading of Hamlet as a strong hero dedicated to making a mockery of the weak forms of romantic love that were so popular in Shakespeare's day.

37. What is the primary purpose of this passage?

- a.) to introduce various scholarly analyses of Hamlet's personality
- b.) to teach students about famous scholars and their love of *Hamlet*
- c.) to challenge readers and help them see new ways of reading drama
- d.) to question today's predominant theories about Shakespearean theater

38. Which of these famous scholarly authorities is not mentioned in this passage?

- a.) Michael Shapiro
- b.) Mikhail Bakhtin
- c.) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe
- d.) Sigmund Freud

39. The reading of Prince Hamlet as an Oedipal figure is endorsed by:

- a.) Sigmund Freud
- b.) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe
- c.) Sir Thomas Mallory
- d.) Britney Spears

40. To "scoff" at somebody's ideas or beliefs means you:

- a.) agree with them
- b.) give them your endorsement
- c.) remain skeptically silent
- d.) refute them scornfully

Please turn in the questions and your marked answers.

APPENDIX 2

Tabulation of Correct Answers for Pre- and Post-Semester Exams

The following 13 tables display the number of correct answers provided by nine students participating in the intensive Hamlet course.

Table 1: Correct Answers for Reading Passage One					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Pre-Semester	3	5	4	2	1
Post-Semester	2	5	5	2	2
Difference	-1	0	1	0	1
Table 2: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Two					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Pre-Semester	6	5	4	4	2
Post-Semester	7	7	2	3	3
Difference	1	2	-2	-1	1
Table 3: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Three					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q11	Q12	Q13		
Pre-Semester	7	4	3		
Post-Semester	7	3	3		
Difference	0	-1	0		
Table 4: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Four					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q14	Q15	Q16		
Pre-Semester	6	3	2		
Post-Semester	6	4	0		
Difference	0	1	-2		
Table 5: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Five					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q17				
Pre-Semester	5				
Post-Semester	6				
Difference	1				
Table 6: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Six					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	
Pre-Semester	3	2	2	4	
Post-Semester	4	2	1	4	
Difference	1	0	-1	0	
Table 7: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Seven					

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q22	Q23			
Pre-Semester	1	4			
Post-Semester	7	6			
Difference	6	2			

Table 8: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Eight

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q24	Q25			
Pre-Semester	3	4			
Post-Semester	4	4			
Difference	1	0			

Table 9: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Nine

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q26				
Pre-Semester	6				
Post-Semester	4				
Difference	-2				

Table 10: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Ten

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q27	Q28	Q29		
Pre-Semester	2	5	0		
Post-Semester	1	7	2		
Difference	-1	2	2		

Table 11: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Eleven

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q30	Q31			
Pre-Semester	3	4			
Post-Semester	0	6			
Difference	-3	2			

Table 12: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Twelve

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q32	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36
Pre-Semester	1	0	1	1	0
Post-Semester	3	5	4	7	6
Difference	2	5	3	6	6

Table 13: Correct Answers for Reading Passage Thirteen

Correct Answers (n=9)	Q37	Q38	Q39	Q40	
Pre-Semester	0	0	0	0	
Post-Semester	5	7	7	6	
Difference	5	7	7	6	

APPENDIX 3

Pre- and Post-Semester Character Recognition Evaluation

As an evaluative tool to determine whether or not participation in the semester-long intensive study of William Shakespeare's drama Hamlet resulted in a greater basic knowledge about the play, students were offered a character recognition test. The test offered 10 cloze-format questions requiring them to identify, based on brief descriptions, 10 protagonists from Hamlet. The exam was administered at the start of the semester, and again as a part of the final examination grade at the close of the semester. The results of the exam, tabulated as the number of correct answers provided by students in both the pre-semester and post-semester sittings of this test, are offered in tabular form in Appendix 4. Below are the questions as they were given to the students in the pre-semester version.

GENERAL COMPREHENSION EVALUATION

PART ONE

How Much Do You Remember About Who's Who in Hamlet?

Time Limit: 5 Minutes

For each question (ignore the numbers) name the persons in Prince Hamlet's life.

Fill in the names on the "chart" below. Spelling is important.

PRINCE HAMLET: What is the name of...

(1) His Real Father—
(2) His Mother—
(3) His Uncle—
(4) His Best Friend—
(5) His Uncle's Favorite Advisor—
(6) His Uncle's Advisor's Son—
(7) His Uncle's Advisor's Daughter—
(8-9) His Two "Disloyal" School Classmates—
(10) A Neighboring King (surname only)—

Please return this to Professor Skupin, and remember to write your...

English Name/Chinese Name	Student Number

Dr. Skupin will give you a 40-question multiple choice style reading test.
Don't worry, this test has NOTHING to do with your grade in this class.

Next up...

GENERAL COMPREHENSION EVALUATION PART TWO

Part Two Time Limit: 20 Minutes (40 Questions)

APPENDIX 4

Tabulation of Correct Answers for Pre- and Post-Semester Exams

The following two tables display the number of correct answers provided by nine students participating in the intensive Hamlet course. These tables represent the 10-item Pre-semester and Post-semester character identification section of the test.

Table 14A: Correct Answers for Character Identification					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Pre-Semester	1	3	4	4	1
Post-Semester	6	6	6	6	5
Difference	5	3	2	2	4

Table 14B: Correct Answers for Character Identification					
Correct Answers (n=9)	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Pre-Semester	0	5	0	0	0
Post-Semester	5	6	1	1	6
Difference	5	1	1	1	6

APPENDIX 5

Post-Semester Student Opinion Survey

At the close of the semester students were asked to share their responses in writing to a series of questions designed to elicit student opinions on various aspects of the semester-long intensive course on Hamlet. Below are the questions as they were given to the students, followed by copies of students' actual written responses. Student names have been covered over to respect their privacy.



HAMLET CLASS

END-OF-SEMESTER

RETROSPECTIVE INTROSPECTION

1. Before attending this course, how much did you know about *Hamlet*?
2. Why did you want to take this course?
3. What were your expectations of this course before you actually started attending classes?
4. Were your expectations (question 3) based in any way upon your experiences as a student of Professor Michael Skupin?
5. How did you benefit from this course? (In what different ways did it help you?)
6. How were you disappointed by this course as it actually was carried out (in comparison with your expectations [question 3])?
7. What did you like about and learn from the guest speakers? (And who was your favorite guest speaker—what was his/her special quality?)
8. Did you feel like this course provided you enough opportunities to think through problems, ideas or interpretations of *Hamlet*?
9. Did this course offer you satisfying experiences of participating through discussions, performances, sharing of ideas, etc.?
10. Now that the semester is over, do you end the course feeling you know more about *Hamlet* and Shakespeare?
11. What were the advantages of having an “intensive” class devoted to only one text (*Hamlet*)?
12. What was missing from this course? (How can we make it different and better in the future?)
13. What in this course could have been better for you, personally?
14. Are you satisfied with the “evaluations”—the midterm, the essays, the mp3 assignment, the tests, etc.
15. What was your experience and opinion of the course website? Was it easier to copy CDs than to watch streaming video at the website?
16. Was Professor Michael Skupin the “right” teacher for this class? What did you see as his strengths and weaknesses as displayed only in the teaching of this particular course?
17. How would you describe your Motivation as a student?
18. How would you describe your abilities/skills as a literature reader/student?

1. Before the course, I only know *Hamlet* is a masterpiece by Shakespeare.
2. To take this course is because I want to know more about every character's thought.
3. My expectation is we have different teachers come to the class to share their perspectives.
4. Yes.
5. Guest teachers came to the class tell their opinions and we can read line by line in the class.
6. I am disappointed by my laziness.
7. When professor Peng illustrated what monologue functions in *Hamlet* and he acted in the class, it left me an unforgettable impression.
8. I think yes because we have more time to discuss what we read from the plot and to revise the tone when we speak out.
9. We share our ideas in the class, but it is a little pity that we do not perform a short play in the class.
10. Yes, I feel Shakespeare is amazing because he creates *Hamlet* with different facet and each scene is intensive.
11. We can focus on the only one work and know it deeper.
12. Maybe we can do some activities like drama.
13. I hope that we can have one more teacher in every class, in this way we will get more inspirations.
14. I am terribly satisfied by them though they are quiet difficult.
15. It is cool we can see photos on the website. ???
16. I have no idea if he is the "right" teacher in the class. But I think he is a teacher who is patient and enthusiastic to guide students, although some of students do not like him because of being bored in his class.
17. I can say that is I am always curious about everything and always try to ask some questions.
18. I like to read and I like to speculate a thing if I interested in it.

國立宜蘭大學

題目 _____ 姓名 _____

_____ 科年別 _____

目標 _____ 班組別 _____

_____ 年月日 _____

1. a little more I and some are not out of the...
2. I want to know more about "Harvest" and the meaning of the culture.
3. more different
4. Nose
5. They are of line and know were detailed
6. kinda, but among students
7. professor I; different opinions of a topic
8. not really
9. yeah
10. nope
11. For now we are not going to (to know or do it well)
12. add more activities like drama, singing
13. Gauth's speech give me different content and towards it
14. Nope, that's not a good idea, not sure if it's...
15. The words are good
16. I can't say he is right or wrong, but we did learn his class
17. At the beginning, I'm not interested in previewing his class and full of energy. But little by little, I'm losing it. I almost give it up.
18. I would say I have more to see, and that the lecture is the best.

國立宜蘭大學

題目 _____ 姓 _____
_____ 科 _____ 年 _____
目標 _____ 班級 _____
_____ 年月日 _____

1. It's a tragedy play. The famous line "To be or not to be, that is the question"

2. credits

3. Just read Hamlet

4. I have to read much as I can.

5. I understand Hamlet's story.

6. I have a premonition that I can't afford this course.

7. Dr. Lei, she shows something different about Hamlet play
Ex: In ~~the~~ way

8.

9. Yes

10. Yes, reading Hamlet is really a big work.

11. You can have any questions ~~to~~ your teacher at ~~any time~~ ^{any time}.
Because the class is small enough.

12. I don't know

13.

14. the mp3 assignment.

15. It's fine

16. It's Depends, he likes to correct the pronunciation.

17. Attending almost every class?

18. Book Dictionary

題目 _____
_____ 年班
目標 _____ 班組別 _____ 班 _____ 組
_____ 年月日 _____ 天候 _____

1. Although not total case, but it help me realize this play. At least, I understand that some cartoons and movies are transfered from this.
2. I have taken Dr. Skupin's "Shakespeare" last semester, and I knew all his teaching style, so I think it could lead me understand Hamlet easily.
3. Depends on whatever Dr. Skupin would show.
4. I must say = Yes.
5. I have known some famous lines in this play.
6. Just a little students took this course.
7. Pro. Lay showed Chinese Opera about Hamlet, and it impressed me.
8. Yes. indeed.
9. Yes, and I have showed my idea in my mp3.
(Act 5, Scene 2)

I have known about Hamlet more than before,
but still a little about Shakespeare.

We could read the play sentence by sentence,
word by word, and it made us think more details.

Maybe it could appeal more student to
take this course.

Realizing Hamlet and Shakespeare's writing
style as "foreshadowing" and "euphuism".

It is a chance for me to show my idea
with my voice.

No. All my voice based on my thinking about
Hamlet.

Absolutely yes. I must say that he is a
great teacher.

¶ A literature student like a notebook, we could
draw some pictures and write key words on
whatever we learned, heard and looked.

— Hamlet Class

國立宜蘭

習報告

題目 _____

虎 95/2/11/28

目標 _____

_____ 年班

_____ 組

笑 _____

1. I've already watched Kate Winslet's movie of Hamlet, and read some acts. However, it was ~~at~~ when I was a freshman, after 2 years ~~and~~ I don't remember too much of it.

2. Because I hope to listen to lectures from different scholars.

3. I expected to meet different teachers and learn from different to degree to view Hamlet.

4. I've already studied with Dr. Skupin since I was a sophomore. Therefore, I know his style. I think his teaching helps students' pronunciation and lines. But I take this course is not because of him.

5. I think I understand how to read Shakespeare better, because I realize that the reason I couldn't understand is because the words have different meaning from nowadays English.

6. I feel kind of disappointed that some professor didn't visit our class.

7. I learned types of monologue from Pr. Peng and ~~and~~ ~~my~~ stood in the character's shoe from Pr. Beatrix. My favorite professor is Pr. Beatrix. Perhaps she is more theatre oriented. In the class short acting and her questions, I can start to feel the story character's situation. Her specialty is theatre and feminism.

8. Yes. When I listen to professor Beatrix's challenge question such as
9.

題目 _____ 姓名 林品妤 座號 95291128
 _____ 科年別 _____ 科 _____ 年班 _____
 目標 _____ 班組別 _____ 班 _____ 組 _____
 _____ 年月日 _____ 天候 _____

How would you feel if you're Hamlet, things suddenly go wrong? and perhaps I'm too young and innocent. I've never thought of that perhaps Polonius told Ophelia keep distant from Hamlet is to try elevating her "price" (value), until pr. Beatrix give us this idea.

What's another interesting idea I got from pr. Beatrix is the analyses and imagination of characters. ^{Is Gertrude happy to marry old Hamlet?}
 > Of course!! I not only understand words better but also be able to grasp ~~the~~ the wisdom or ^{the} experience from the play.

We can be more focused and won't forget what we have just learned easily.

Personally, I'm interested in learning read lines in rhythm, and the psychology of characters, or their survival way. ^{or} Or how
 Oh, I like it. Hamlet transform or influence arts.

I love it!! Maybe it's easier to watch copy CDs, because the net is not stable and the speed of downloading is not always fast.

I think Dr. Skupin is ok. Even if my ideal teacher is Dr. Tim Fox. He is able to explain lines and sources. And He is skilled in European or I should say all kinds of language. Therefore, He can see something which we may not learn from other teacher. ^{Go} Fortinbras. bras in French means arm and Fortin means strong. He also explained one of the

國立宜蘭大學

題目 _____ 姓 _____
_____ 科年 _____ 班
目標 _____ 班組 _____ 組
_____ 年月日 _____ 大候

1 ~~Before I attended this course, I have already watched Kenneth Branagh's movie version of Hamlet. I also have read Hamlet part of Hamlet's scene. But I don't~~

sources of Hamlet is a German play "Der Bestrafte Brudermord"
He's very knowledgeable, but maybe not very systematic.

Because when I was at Tim's class, He always follow schedule and use every minute well in class. But Dr. Skupin may talk whatever comes to his mind. He is very good at music, so the musicality of poems in Shakespeare's iambic pentameter he is also be able to display it well.

17 I'm really interested in learning all kinds of things. But I've to be more organized. Because if I feel overwhelmed, I will want to get rid of every assignments. I want to be as good as the people I admire someday.

18 I think I'm able to think but sometimes maybe I'm too young ^{and innocent} or not have enough life experiences. Therefore, sometimes if I read the literature by myself, my understanding is limited.

HAMLET CLASS

END-OF-SEMESTER

RETROSPECTIVE INTROSPECTION

1. Before attending this course, how much did you know about *Hamlet*?

"To be, or not to be? That is a question." is a famous sentence. And I have seen the movie in senior high. Some of the plot of the movie is cut. So I didn't know all of *Hamlet*.

2. Why did you want to take this course?

I want to get more elective credits. And among Shakespeare's writing, *Hamlet* is the only article that I'm interesting in.

3. What were your expectations of this course before you actually started attending classes?

I want to know more about *Hamlet*.

4. What were your expectations (question 3) based in any way upon your experiences as a student of Professor Michael Skupin?

Professor Michael Skupin can give us some relative information to the article which we're talking about.

5. How did you benefit from this course? (In what different ways did it help you?)

Actually, this is my bad. I never have had a book in my hand during this semester. But because I don't have a book, I'll concentrate on what teacher's saying. And I found out that I can answer questions much easier than I have a book because I'll think what we have said so far instead of looking into the book when teacher's asking question. I don't mean that we shouldn't have books in class. But in my own case, without books around, I'll feel sorry and listen to teacher harder as making up for my mistake.

6. How were you disappointed by this course as it actually was carried out (in comparison with your expectations [question 3])?

"To be, or not to be? That is a question." is really a famous sentence. Teachers all like to talk about that part.

7. What did you like about and learn from the quest speakers? (And who was your favorite quest speaker—what was his/her special quality?)

Did Hamlet really want to break up with Ophelia for no more love or to protect her?

Professor Lei is my favorite quest speaker. Her thought is totally creative to me. Before her speaking, Hamlet is pretending to be crazy to find the chance to kill Claudius. But after the speaking, Hamlet's crazy behavior means more to me. He might plan a lot and being crazy is one of them. By crazy behavior, something becomes to be done necessary and undoubtedly. Nobody would like to spend time on a crazy man but laugh at what the crazy man is doing. In my opinion, Hamlet is using this to make people not care about what he's doing. All in all, I think Professor Lei gives me a different point of view to take a look in Hamlet's world.

8. Did you feel like this course provided you enough opportunities to think through problems, ideas or interpretations of *Hamlet*?

I did think many when Professor Lei's talking. Her issue attracted me.

9. Did this course offer you satisfying experiences of participating through discussions, performances, sharing of ideas, etc.?

The discussion and the sharing of ideas are more than a normal class. But it's not that much since it's a small class. Maybe the reason is that all students are shy.

10. Now that the semester is over, do you end the course feeling you know more about *Hamlet* and Shakespeare?

Now I know what "To be, or not to be? That is a question." really means. About Shakespeare, I've learned some from Professor Tim Fox when I was a sophomore. About *Hamlet*, I can't say that I know many but I do know more than the time before I take this course. I think a semester is too short to understand *Hamlet* because it's a long drama.

11. What were the advantages of having an "intensive" class devoted to only one text (*Hamlet*)?

In my opinion, if you really want to learn something, intensive class is absolutely necessary. In the class, I only have to care about one subject but not everything with a slightly touch. I don't think that can really learn something.

12. What was missing from this course? (How can we make it different and better in the future?)

It would be better if teachers can talk more about the article but not the only famous part.

13. What in this course could have been better for you, personally?

Fewer students mean more interaction between teacher and students. And because of fewer students, the possibility of being asked question will increase. And I'll have to concentrate and think all the time. That'll make not feel bored in class.

14. Are you satisfied with the "evaluations" – the midterm, the essays, the mp3 assignment, the test, etc.

The essay is too difficult to me. And it's a little too late to tell me that there's an essay as assignment because writing a paper needs to read a lot. And I also have other homework or readings to be done. So I hope I can know the essay assignment as early as possible. The mp3 assignment is fun because I can work with my friends and learn together.

15. What was your experience and opinion of the course website? Was it easier to copy CDs than to watch streaming video at the website?

It's good. I can review what I've learned before.

16. Was Professor Michael Skupin the "right" teacher for this class? What did you see as his strengths and weaknesses as displayed only in the teaching of this particular course?

Professor Michael Skupin can teach us many information related to the article or what is quoted from the article. But I think teacher should stop the student who makes the noise. Maybe he/she think that it's fun or something like that, but it does annoy other students sometimes.

17. How would you describe your Motivation as a student?

I'm lazy. I don't like to preview or review after class unless I want to do it. Sometimes I appreciate my laziness because I'm not prepared for the class, and I have to listen very hard in class. I often learn more or memorize better in that situation.

18. How would you describe your abilities/skills as a literature reader/student?

Learning literature can use English better than those who only learn English. Because we learn the source of some English word, sentence, or saying, we can say the right English in the right place at the right time. And learning literature can build a better foundation of language.

HAMLET CLASS
END-OF-SEMESTER
RETROSPECTIVE INTROSPECTION

1. Before attending this course, how much did you know about *Hamlet*?

Hamlet is a famous drama in the world, and the playwright is William Shakespeare. Hamlet is a tragedy about a prince whose father is killed by his uncle.

2. Why did you want to take this course?

I want to know more specific details about Hamlet. Why Hamlet is so famous, why hamlet is the one of four tragedies while there are so many dramas written by Shakespeare.

3. What were your expectations of this course before you actually started attending classes?

Know more about Hamlet.

4. What were your expectations (question 3) based in any way upon your experiences as a student of Professor Michael Skupin?

Details. He's the only teacher who teaches literature word by word. It helps me a lot.

5. How did you benefit from this course? (In what different ways did it help you?)

This course helps me to understand what Hamlet is talking about. And Shakespeare's plays provide us a large space to think and imagine; there are many different ways to percept. It's really interesting ^{to} understand that. I think that's the one of reasons why Shakespeare success~~es~~.

6. How were you disappointed by this course as it actually was carried out (in comparison with your expectations [question 3])?

Sometimes I was worried about the details. I know there are more things which are more difficult than understanding the meanings of words. Even

though I am thrilled about learning that, I know it's not enough. How about isms of Hamlet?

7. What did you like about and learn from the quest speakers? (And who was your favorite quest speaker – what was his/her special quality?)

Dr. 雷碧琦. She provides us many interesting things and she teaches us that there are many different views of Hamlet. While playing Hamlet, we can not only play it in a theater but also combine the modern sources to make it more interesting.

8. Did you feel like this course provided you enough opportunities to think through problems, ideas or interpretations of *Hamlet*?

No, Hamlet's a big erudition. ^{One} semester is not enough to know the whole Hamlet. However, I've got the keys to open the door. I understand what Hamlet's story is talking about.

9. Did this course offer you satisfying experiences of participating through discussions, performances, sharing of ideas, etc.?

Performances are impressed. But I hope classmates can share more ideas in the class.

10. Now that the semester is over, do you end the course feeling you know more about *Hamlet* and Shakespeare?

Yes. I know more about Hamlet and Shakespeare.

11. What were the advantages of having an "intensive" class devoted to only one text (*Hamlet*)?

Not only the outline we learn but more specific things we learn.

12. What was missing from this course? (How can we make it different and better in the future?)

Taking one more semester can make it better. We can learn details at the first semester, then discussing the ideas and the influences of Hamlet

next semester.

13. What in this course could have been better for you, personally?

After going to this course, I am not tired of reading Shakespeare. I guess this course expands my interesting to read more famous plays in the world.

14. Are you satisfied with the "evaluations" – the midterm, the essays, the mp3 assignment, the test, etc.

The mp3 assignment is really fun. While playing the character, I try to imitate what the character's thinking and what kind of reaction that he will do. And before doing that, I must know what the person's character is.

15. What was your experience and opinion of the course website? Was it easier to copy CDs than to watch streaming video at the website?

We can put more links about studying Hamlet. Yes, it was.

16. Was Professor Michael Skupin the "right" teacher for this class? What did you see as his strengths and weaknesses as displayed only in the teaching of this particular course?

Yes, he teaches me a lot about the skills and new words. He's smart. He doesn't let us to know more about the influences of Hamlet like in humanism etc.

17. How would you describe your Motivation as a student?

I study Hamlet not only for scores. I'm really interested in reading Shakespeare. But sometimes I can't find the right time to study. It's a big problem to me. And I am trying to arrange a good schedule to study.

18. How would you describe your abilities/skills as a literature reader/student?

The skills. I never get tired of knowing what skills the author use, and the background. I always want to know the connection between ages and literature.

APPENDIX 6

Hamlet film-showing flyer.



Laurence Olivier as Hamlet, 1948
September 25



Nicole Williamson as Hamlet, 1969
October 2



Derek Jacobi as Hamlet, 1980
October 9



Mel Gibson as Hamlet, 1980
October 16



Kenneth Branagh as Hamlet, 1996
October 23 & 30 (Parts I and II)



Campbell Scott as Hamlet, 2000
November 6



Ethan Hawke as Hamlet, 2000
November 13



Adrian Lester as Hamlet, 2001
November 20



Will Houston as Hamlet, 2003
November 27



Alexander Fodor as Hamlet, 2007
December 4

HAMLET REDUX

A CINEMATIC EXPERIENCE!

紀澤然老師的「莎士比亞：表演戲劇」課程
邀請你參加課外活動
每週不同的《哈姆雷特》電影版本
並於電影後深入討論

地點：哲生樓 H101 教室
時間：每週四晚間六點至十點

Join Soochow University Professor Don Gilleland's
"Shakespeare: Performing the Drama" students
for a special free film viewing and discussion series.

Your participation is welcome.
Watch 10 different versions of Hamlet, and afterwards
discuss each production and the diverse approaches to
Shakespeare's troubled Prince of Denmark.

Participants who attend every Thursday evening event will
Be eligible for a special prize drawing on the night of the last
film screening.

For more information and weekly updates visit
<http://hamletintaiwan.blogspot.com>