

# ‘Book in a Week’ - Can Creative Writing Enhance Language Learning and Learner Confidence in Students?

Masda Yuka\* and Yvonne Skipper\*\*

\*Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Sciences

*masda@toyaku.ac.jp*

\*\*University of Glasgow

*yvonne.skipper@glasgow.ac.uk*

## Abstract

We report the process and outcome of the first English fiction writing camp organised for students in Japan during the summer following the coronavirus induced state of emergency. ‘White Water Writers’ is an intensive course giving a group of participants the opportunity to co-author a work of fiction and publish it in 5 days. The 7 Japanese participants wrote 97 pages, approximately 7000 words in English, their second language, about university students fighting a pandemic. All the text and ideas they produced were entirely their own and they even designed the cover. The camp was facilitated by a group of researchers from universities in the UK and Japan. The project focuses on learner autonomy, with the participants planning, writing and proofreading the novel themselves. In this camp, which was the first to be conducted online and with writers producing text in a second language, we encouraged the target language use through fluency activities and meaning-focused input and output rather than language focused learning. Based on the data we collected from participants and our own observations we argue that this approach effectively developed participants’ language skills, improved intrinsic motivation and self-perceived efficacy, especially in their command of English.

**Keywords:** language skills development, learner autonomy, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, creative writing

## 1. The outline

In August 2020 we organised an intensive creative writing programme, ‘White Water Writers’ (WWW) at Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Sciences. WWW gives groups of people the opportunity to collaboratively write and publish a full length work of fiction in just one week. The programme was initially designed for native English language speakers and delivered as a face to face workshop. However, we were interested to explore whether the programme would be accessible to and facilitate language learning for students with English as an Additional Language (EAL). Furthermore, due to the restrictions resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic, we modified the programme to allow us to deliver it online. Seven students successfully produced a novel (or a short story in the strict definition) of around 7000 words. The authors produced all the text, edited it themselves and even designed the cover art. The book is available to buy on Amazon. This paper outlines the process in more detail and evaluates the impact of the project on our participants.

### 1.1 White Water Writers

White Water Writers (WWW), as mentioned earlier, is a project which gives groups of people the opportunity to

collaboratively write and publish a full length novel in a week. The writers plan, write, proofread and publish the book entirely by themselves. Facilitators take them through the stages of the project but do not offer comments on the ideas or edit the text, meaning the finished novel is entirely the work of the writers. WWW has facilitated more than 200 novels to date. The project has a demonstrable positive impact on writers’ writing skills, feelings of control and attitudes towards group members (Skipper, Reddington & Leman, in prep). The novels also provide a safe space for writers to explore issues which are important to them, e.g. bullying. However, all our previous authors have written in their native language. In this bilingual camp, we were interested to explore whether the project could also be used to enhance second language learning. This project was facilitated by two British psychology academics from the WWW programme and two Japanese researchers, one with a research background in the psychology of language and the other in language pedagogy.

## 2. Objectives

Our aim in this project was to enhance participants’ skills mainly in the following areas through the process of working towards the challenging goal of producing a novel

in a week:

1. English language skills in any of the basic skills of writing, reading, speaking, listening, and vocabulary
2. Intrinsic motivation
3. Self-efficacy in English and other more general areas

### 2.1 Developing language skills through use

The four strand theory is an established theory in building an effective language curriculum, originally put forward by Nation and his colleagues. For example, Nation & Macalister (2010) state the four strands should be balanced in the amount of time spent in a language curriculum. The four strands are:

- 1) Meaning-focused input
- 2) Language-focused learning
- 3) Meaning-focused output
- 4) Fluency activities

Meaning-focused input and output (1 and 3 above) occur in activities where learners' main attention is on the meaning of the language. Examples include reading for pleasure (meaning-focused input), or talking to a friend about enjoyable hobbies (meaning-focused output). In these activities, learners comprehend or produce language to fulfil their own personal, authentic needs.

In fluency activities (4) the focus is on developing fluency, such as reading or speaking faster in the above examples. These include speed reading where learners read a piece of text they can easily understand repeatedly to increase speed, or they repeat their conversation in a shorter time span.

Finally, language-focused learning is what typically takes place in the formal language classroom. Learners are encouraged to pay attention to language forms and explicitly learn the rules of the language or vocabulary.

Language teachers are frequently observed to prioritise language-focused learning out of the four strands. This is notable especially in the formal education classroom, where a teacher typically lectures, often in the learners' first language, on the linguistic rules learners are to depend on both in comprehension and production. The trend continues even after the 2008 announcement of a new policy to teach English through English, made by MEXT, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

Such a classroom puts significant emphasis on grammar accuracy and students practise solving grammar problems like they would practise mathematical problems. By doing this, the other three strands, which are also necessary for skill development tend to be neglected. In this paper for simplicity's sake we call these three strands – meaning-focused input and output and fluency activities – 'the missing three strands'.

The general public often holds a simplistic view that study abroad programmes are the only way to true language skill acquisition. This may be because it is seen as the best way to provide these missing strands which can be very difficult in a classroom. Mainstream university entrance examinations may encourage an excessively heavy emphasis on language-focused learning. Furthermore, language-

focused learning has been a traditional, and therefore more accessible, approach to teaching. For these reasons, it is difficult to provide the three missing strands.

One realistic solution to this is to provide the missing three strands outside of the formal classroom by utilizing approaches such as study abroad programmes, and CLIL and other similar teaching methods which have recently received attention. CLIL stands for content and language integrated learning, where learners study specific topics using the target language so that both the subject content and the medium language are acquired (Costa & D'Angelo, 2011). Somewhat similarly to study abroad programmes, learners are placed in an environment where they must use the target language for authentic reasons.

Characteristically, these programmes develop language skills through use; learning is expected to occur implicitly. In other words, they enhance language skills by supplementing the missing three strands that are difficult for the formal language classroom alone to provide. In this project, we expected our learners to develop language skills through use just as study abroad, CLIL and other such programmes often do.

### 2.2. Intrinsic motivation

Intrinsic motivation refers to doing a task for enjoyment or intellectual interest, rather than because of an external force (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation means that learners engage in a task because it is enjoyable, interesting or relevant to meeting needs. Learners who have intrinsic motivation for a task tend to perform better, enjoy it more and engage more with challenges than those who are extrinsically motivated and performing a task for a reward (Patall, Cooper, & Robinson, 2008).

Intrinsic motivation can be increased by giving learners autonomy and choice. In order to maximise learner autonomy in the current project, the facilitators began the week by setting tasks for the students to do, but as the week progressed and student confidence increased, we removed this scaffolding. Furthermore, students planned every element of the novel, produced all the text and proofread the novel themselves. Facilitators did not offer any suggestions and importantly did not produce or edit any text. The students even decided on the price the book should sell for. This meant that the novel was the students' own work, meaning they had high levels of autonomy.

### 2.3. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is "the belief in one's ability to execute successfully a certain course of behaviour" (Busch, 1995, p.1). It is often referred to as being domain specific (Muris, 2001) and therefore students will have perceptions of their self-efficacy in a range of different subjects. Low-self efficacy is associated with negative outcomes such as reduced self-esteem (Baiocco, Verrastro, Fontanesi, Ferrara & Pistella, 2019) anxiety (Muris, 2002) and depression (Muris, 2001). People often avoid tasks when they have low self-efficacy, but undertake tasks when they have high self-efficacy. Having self-efficacy slightly higher than our

ability leads us to take on challenges and gain experience. Therefore, encouraging students to increase their self-efficacy in a foreign language is likely to lead them to improve in this domain.

According to Bandura (1994, p.2) 'the most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. Successes build a robust belief in one's personal efficacy.' WWW involves students working hard to achieve a challenging goal in a short space of time. This is particularly challenging when writing in a second language. However, we provide the scaffolding and support to help them to achieve this successfully. Achieving this challenging goal is likely to enhance students' self-efficacy in English.

To conclude, we expected our programme to:

- 1) develop English language skills by providing the missing three strands of meaning-focused input and output and fluency activities,
- 2) strengthen intrinsic motivation by providing learner autonomy and an opportunity to work for a clear personal objective, and
- 3) enhance self-efficacy by providing an opportunity for a successful learning experience.

We believe that if the programme is effective it could be an innovative way to give more students the opportunity to enhance their language-, learning- and life skills.

### 3. Method

A key guiding principle of the project is writer autonomy. The writers make all the decisions about their novel and the facilitators' role is to guide them through the tasks needed to create their novel. As mentioned earlier, this was the first time we invited writers to produce a novel in their second language, so we needed to consider how best to modify the project to make it most effective.

#### 3.1. Participants

We advertised the programme to students on the facilitator's First Year compulsory English classes at Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Sciences, and also through the Students' Society of English. Participants were seven Japanese undergraduate students, five female and two male from First Year to Third Year. Four came from the compulsory English classes and three from the English language society.

Those from the compulsory English classes had some experience in extensive reading in English, having read more than 10,000 words (13,400-214,500), required in the preceding semester. None of the participants had lived outside of Japan for an extensive period of time.

#### 3.2. Process

The typical White Water Writers process is as follows. On the first day, students plan out their novel. To begin, there is a brainstorming session where each student works individually and then shares their ideas. Each writer then takes responsibility for a character and makes all the

decisions about that characters' journey through the novel. The students then collaboratively plan a timeline for the novel, so at the end of the day the full novel is planned at the chapter level.

On the second and third day, students write the novel using specialised software which we have developed. Students bullet point the chapters, check each others' bullets and then write around 100 words under each bullet.

On the fourth day, students proofread their novel, checking for spelling and grammatical errors.

On the final day, students complete the final proofreads, design the cover and blurb and decide how much they want to sell their book for. The book is then put on Amazon for sale as a Kindle and paperback book.

We also have a small celebration. A few weeks later we typically hold a book signing event where friends and family and the local press come together to celebrate their achievement.

The camp met at 3 PM Japan time and closed at about 8PM. Out of these hours, writers spent approximately 20 hours writing and proofreading and the rest of hours listening to the bilingual instructions or discussing the plot with other writers, usually in Japanese. The time they spent listening to English instructions amounted to 2-3 hours approximately. The amount varied depending on the stages of the process; for example, on the writing days of Tuesday and Wednesday there were relatively fewer instructions but more discussion. Each participant took charge of one character each, they therefore owned characters, but shared the writing of chapters. Because of this, they spent the same amount of time on the task, while the number of words produced differed depending on the writer.

##### 3.2.1. Online delivery

The project is typically delivered as a face to face workshop with facilitators and students being in the same physical space. Due to the spread of Covid-19, writers and facilitators were unable to meet in person. We therefore opted for online delivery of the programme. This involved using technologies such as Zoom to allow people to communicate in a large group and in small breakaway groups. Other new technological additions included online tools such as online White Boards to allow storyboarding online. The writing of the novel itself has always been done online, so despite the several tactical changes the online delivery did not present a major problem in terms of the technology.

We did not explicitly forbid the use of translation tools or online dictionaries, but encouraged students to write in their own, preferably plane English out from the start. Because the writing took place online at least one of the four facilitators could and did observe the process synchronously. From these observations it was clear the participants engaged in planning and writing in English without depending on translation tools.

##### 3.2.2. Bilingual camp

In a typical camp, facilitators and writers share the same

first language. This was an ideal situation for us to provide meaning focused input, as well as output when our writers wanted to discuss with facilitators in English. The lead facilitators spoke in English to set out tasks for the writers. At the same time, the supporting facilitators freely provided translation whenever it was necessary so the students would fully understand the task ahead, use their initiative and make informed decisions.

Initially we were faced with two options for the planning process: monolingual, i.e. writing only in English from early planning stages through to the final draft, or bilingual writing, i.e. planning the novel in Japanese and switching to writing in or translating into English in later stages. We opted for the monolingual approach for the following reasons. Writing in Japanese would have made the planning stage easier for writers, only at the cost of a more effortful and time-consuming process of translating the ideas, freely produced in their first language into their second language. We thought that this may lead them to produce more complex sentence structures and ideas in their first language which they would struggle to translate into their second language with less advanced production skills. It would be frustrating to plan a novel in your native tongue and then realise that you do not have the language to express your ideas in English.

On the other hand, writing in English from the start, we expected, would encourage writers to think in English, reducing L1 interferences, and produce text in plain English, the preferred choice of style for fiction writing. L1 interference can be defined as errors which occur due to the speaker's first language interfering in second language production. For example, a speaker of Japanese as their L1 may choose to use the word bike to mean a motorcycle because that is what the Japanese loan word 'baiku' means.

### 3.2.3. Building rapport

We also found rapport building between the facilitators and the writers to be more important than in other camps. This may have been because the camp was taking place online, which is expected to make it more difficult to build rapport than in a physical space. Another explanation may come from the finding that working memory capacity tends to be poorer in the second language (Thorn & Gathercole, 1999). To overcome this, we tried to create a safe space for the writers (Skipper & Pepler, 2020) giving them opportunities to speak on basic topics, e.g. introducing themselves, but never pushing them to do this. The English facilitators also spoke a little Japanese to normalise failures of communication.

## 3.3 Measures

The main aim of this project was to examine whether it would be successful online and working in a second language. However, we did include some measures to explore the impact that it had on writers.

In order to measure the impact that the project had on students, we asked them to complete a language test and to answer some short qualitative questions while noting our

observations as facilitators.

### 3.3.1. Vocabulary tests

Language proficiency can be measured in any, some or all of the six basic skills of listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary. The main activities the participants were engaged in were those requiring writing, reading, vocabulary and grammar skills. Amongst these four we chose vocabulary as an effective way to measure the overall language proficiency development because vocabulary growth is known to be influenced by reading and writing, as well as by listening and speaking. Nation (2001) points out the bidirectional associations between reading and vocabulary growth, in which growth in one contributes to that in the other and vice versa.

Vocabulary was also the preferred choice over reading or writing because measuring proficiency of those skills often requires a complicated and time-consuming process, which was not practical in a project with a stringent time limit such as this project.

The students completed a vocabulary size test (Nation & Beglar, 2007) on Monday and Friday in order for us to explore the impact of the project on their English vocabulary sizes. We used a computerised online adaptation (<https://www.lexutor.ca/tests/vst/index.php?mode=test>). The vocabulary for the test was chosen based on frequency data from the British National Corpus. In order to reduce test-taking time and the participants' stress, we selected only the 10 questions from the batch named 'the sixth 1000 level' of this test. The lexical items used are available to view in full at the above URL. Due to technical issues, we failed to save the Test 1 scores of three participants and had to request them to retake the test. Four participants, including one whose record was saved, repeated the test. We will take this into account in the analyses below.

### 3.3.2. Questionnaire

On Friday, students completed a short open ended questionnaire where we asked them: How do you feel about the workshop? What did you enjoy the most? What did you enjoy the least? Was the workshop like you expected? Why/Why not? Would you recommend the workshop to others? Why/Why not? What skills do you think you improved the most during the workshop? Students answered this anonymously.

### 3.3.3. Observations

At the end of each day, the facilitators held a short meeting to discuss their views of how the project was progressing and if we needed to make any adaptations based on this for the following day. In the results we reflect on these observations.

## 4. Outcomes

### 4.1. Vocabulary size test scores

Table 1 summarises the average test scores of all the three tests conducted (Test 1, Test 1 retake, and Test 2) and the average score of Test 2 with adjusted data for comparison

purposes (Test 2 corrected).

Table 1

*Mean test scores of estimated vocabulary size*  
*\*Tests with the same set of participants*

Test timing	Test name	N	Average vocabulary size
Day 1	Test 1	4	3450*
Day 2-3	Test 1 retake	4	3725 (Includes one participant from Test 1)
Day 5	Test 2	7	3785 (Results from all the participants)
Day 5	Test 2 corrected	4	3800* (Only participants who took Test 1)

As mentioned above, in all these tests, the same set of vocabulary was tested. While this controls for variables such as the word frequencies, phonetics, spelling, meaning and other linguistic complexities, order effects, and test-retest stability, it also means that the learning effect may be confounded with vocabulary size improvement; participants may have simply memorised the answers from the previous sitting of the test and so got higher scores (learning effects) rather than the test scores reflecting the actual improvement in their overall vocabulary sizes (vocabulary size improvement).

However, we theorized the larger the periods of time between two tests are, the less likely participants were to remember the answers. On this assumption Test score improvements between Test 1 and Test 2, with a gap of 4 days, more likely demonstrate vocabulary size expansion than improvements between Test 1 and Test 1 retake do. On the contrary, the seeming score improvements between Test 1 and Test 1 retake, with a gap of only a day or two, may be more due to the simple learning effect. This is the assumption on which we analysed these results.

In comparing tests, we must keep in mind the differences of test takers between all the three tests conducted (Test 1, Test 1 retake, Test 2), as mentioned above. Test 2 is the only test taken by all the seven participants, while Test 1 has data from only four whose data were intact and Test 1 retake has three whose data were missing from Test 1 and one whose data are included in Test 1. For this reason we added a new category called 'Test 2 corrected', which uses results from only those four who took Test 1.

We first look at the general trends across the three tests regardless of the differences in the test takers. The mean score was the highest in Test 2. The score improvements were larger between Test 1 and Test 2 than between Test 1 retake and Test 2, suggesting the vocabulary size improvement was larger than the simple learning effect.

Below we analyse score improvements between various pairs of tests.

Pair 1: Test 1 and Test 2

The average score improvement between these two tests was 335. As mentioned above we assume this reflects largely vocabulary size growth. However, we need to be cautious as this test pair compares data from overlapping but partially different set of participants, i.e., Test 2 includes 3 participants whose data are missing in Test 1.

Pair 2: Test 1 and Test 2 corrected (same participants)

We can look at the improvements achieved by the same set of individuals during the five days. To do this we removed from Test 2 the data of the students whose scores we lost on Day 1 (Test 2 corrected). The average score of Test 2 corrected was 3800. The mean score improvement was 350. Again we assume this largely demonstrates vocabulary size expansion, in the same set of participants this time.

Pair 3: Test 1 and Test 1 retake

The Test 1 and Test 1 retake pair have data from 2 different sets of participants. There is only one out of the four test takers of Test 1 only one in order to make assumption on the simple learning effect (answer memorization). The mean score difference in this pair was 275.

The score difference in Pair 3, assumed to demonstrate the simple learning effect (answer memorisation), was smaller than the vocabulary size growth demonstrated in Pair 1 or 2. This pattern of mean score differences, although from a small pool of data, indicates that the vocabulary size growth over the five days was likely larger than the simple learning effect over the two or three days. If the test score improvement was solely due to participants' remembering the test answers, the score pattern should have been reversed, i.e., the average improvement in Pair 3 should be the largest. From the above, we conclude the participants' vocabulary size grew larger during the five days on our programme.

#### 4.2. Questionnaire

With regard to the participants' thoughts about the workshop, the questionnaire results suggested that the participants felt very positive about the workshop. They found it engaging and fun: "I feel really happy and excited". The things they enjoyed the most seemed to be related to the autonomy inherent in the project. They enjoyed: "Making the story by ourselves" and "seeing the words pile up". However, some did mention that they did not enjoy the "proofreading" and "finding mistakes."

The authors felt that the project had enhanced their English skills based on such remarks as "I think my English vocabulary and write skill [sic] up!", "the ability of listening to English", and "I think a sentence skill improves a bit. I always think how I can tell the sentence more easily." and "This workshop made my English skill better than before". All the students said they would recommend the project to others.

#### 4.3. Observations from facilitators

On day 1, students appeared very nervous. As mentioned before, the students did not know each other, or any of the facilitators before the project. They were understandably apprehensive about what the project would be like and their ability to complete the project. They were very quiet on the first day and did not talk very much, particularly to the English facilitators, though they were more confident in speaking Japanese to the Japanese facilitators. This anxiety made us feel that we had made the right decision in only including a light touch English test rather than a long battery of tests of varied skills, which might have increased participant anxiety and dropout.

However, as the week progressed, students started to show more confidence in talking to the English facilitators and talking to each other in English. As they became more invested in the project they started to communicate more with each other, rather than talking to the facilitator. For example, writers would have quick discussions to clarify plot points and information about characters they were writing about. By the final day, the students appeared much more confident in speaking, they also required less translation and responded directly to the English facilitator's instructions.

The writers also chose to produce a book exploring the impact of a virus which was spreading across the country and killing many people. This suggests that the writers were exploring something that they were personally experiencing due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This may have made the project more engaging for the writers and also given them a safe space to explore this upsetting topic.

##### 4.3.1. Translations

As we mentioned earlier, we adjusted how much we translated for the students according to their needs. We found a general reduction in the amount of translation needed as the week progressed.

Initially on Day 1, students struggled to respond to English instructions without full verbatim translation. This continued until around Wednesday, when participants started to appear relaxed and confident enough to initiate talking to facilitators in English when they had questions. Seeing this we tried occasionally giving partial translations at first. Finally on the last day on some occasions we stopped translating simple instructions. However, the participants continued demonstrating accurate responses to instructions.

Several reasons for these observed changes may include:

- 1) the participants' growing familiarity with their facilitators and peers as well as increased familiarity with communicating in English and
- 2) the tasks students were asked to do were arguably more complex in the early stages, requiring more language skills to understand the instructions.

However, the most noticeable was:

- 3) their enhanced confidence in their own language skills, as demonstrated in voluntary communication in English and accurate responses to instructions.

#### 4.4. Media reactions

The project has received unusually extensive media attention for an educational project. Two articles were published both online and in paper, and a local cable television has featured our project.

#### 4.5. Book promotions by students for English use

WWW writers often organise a book signing event. We turned this into an opportunity for continued use of English for authentic purposes by encouraging our writers to promote their book on the Internet for a future book signing event online. As a result, they now advertise their book by tweeting about it from their group account (@ChangedDLife). Students choose topics and write content themselves, both in English and Japanese.

### 5. Discussion

#### 5.1. Language skills development through use

Based on the results of our vocabulary test and student and staff perceptions, we believe that the programme was successful in enhancing participants' English language skills. We observed a general trend of significant development in all the skill areas of vocabulary, speaking, listening, writing and reading, but it was clear especially in vocabulary and writing. The students picked up a lot of errors from their first draft of the novel to the last draft, suggesting that they improved their ability to recognise spelling and grammatical errors. They also became more confident in communicating orally in English, especially with the English facilitators.

#### 5.2. Intrinsic motivation and learner autonomy

Based on questionnaire and observation data, we believe that the programme also successfully enhanced intrinsic motivation in our participants. They were observed to be highly motivated, often requesting to start early or work later to produce extra text. The writers were not observed engaging in off-topic chatting; they were task focussed. The students also enjoyed the process and were very likely to recommend the project to others. This suggests that students had high levels of intrinsic motivation. The reason for this is likely to have been the high level of autonomy students enjoyed. WWW gives the authors full control over their novel.

Learner autonomy is frequently associated with intrinsic motivation in psychological research (i.e., Deci et al., 1981) and in language learning studies (i.e., Little 1998). According to Deci et al. (1981), pupils with controlling teachers are reported to be less motivated and have lower self-esteem than pupils in an autonomy-supporting environment.

#### 5.3. Perceived self-efficacy

Based on questionnaire and observation data, we believe that the programme also successfully enhanced self-efficacy and confidence in our participants, particularly in their language skills. The writers stated that they were much more confident in their English skills after the project and

we also saw them becoming more confident in communicating with us and with other students. Self-efficacy in language is also vital, as students with low self-efficacy are unlikely to push themselves into challenging situations which may help them improve.

#### 5.4. Online delivery

While we believe that the project was very successful when run online, we must note that conducting the project online may have had a detrimental impact and the project may have been even more successful if the facilitators and writers had been able to meet in a physical space. Meeting in person may have increased rapport between students and facilitators. This may have led to higher levels of confidence in communication. In her review of speech learning, Kuhl (2004) illustrates the importance of social interaction for language learning. Learning of new 'foreign' sounds in infants older than nine months occurred only when they heard the sounds directly from humans; even video did not suffice to teach these sounds. Therefore, we recommend face-to-face delivery in future where it is realistically possible.

#### 6. Conclusions and future directions

The overall results strongly indicate the programme developed the participants' language skills and improved their self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. From this we propose a bilingual creative writing programme such as ours can serve as an ideal project to enhance English language for many students. The programme was successful, in that writers produced a novel in their second language, and we have some preliminary evidence that it improved language abilities and confidence. In future we intend to run the project again, using a more robust evaluation procedure to explore different facets of language development.

While language classrooms often struggle to meet the 'missing three strands', our approach manages to do this in a more accessible way than programmes such as study abroad. Furthermore, the project can be effectively delivered online which again increases the number of students who can be involved and reduces barriers such as cost. It also requires very few additional resources or infrastructures, putting less pressure on teaching and administrative staff, as the programme is already established, unlike developing a new CLIL programme. All the above makes the English novel writing camp accessible and ideal for use during the current pandemic and beyond.

This was the first White Water Writers' camp run in Japan. In future we intend to run more camps with a range of students with different levels of English. This will allow us to explore in more depth the impact that White Water Writers can have on students' English language skills, and self-efficacy.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> The novel the students produced, entitled 'Changed Daily Life' is available at the below URL. Any profits go to the authors:

[https://www.amazon.co.jp/gp/product/B08H45885S/ref=db\\_s\\_a\\_def\\_rwt\\_hsch\\_vapi\\_taft\\_p1\\_i0](https://www.amazon.co.jp/gp/product/B08H45885S/ref=db_s_a_def_rwt_hsch_vapi_taft_p1_i0)

#### Acknowledgements

We thank Hoshino Yuko for her help in writing this paper. This camp was made possible thanks to generous support from many of the staff, including Joe Reddington, Daniel Boatwright and Hagiwara Akiko.

#### References

- Baiocco, R., Verrastro, V., Fontanesi, L., Ferrara, M. P., & Pistella, J. (2019). The contributions of self-esteem, loneliness, and friendship to children's happiness: The roles of gender and age. *Child Indicators Research*, 12(4), 1413-1433.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of mental health*. Academic Press, 1998).
- Costa, F. & D'Angelo, L. (2011). CLIL: A suit for all seasons. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 4(1),1-13.
- Kuhl, P.K. (2004). Early language acquisition: cracking the speech code, *Nature Reviews Neurosciences*, 5, 831-843.
- Muris, P. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youths. *Journal of Psychopathology and behavioral Assessment*, 23(3), 145-149.
- Muris, P. (2002). Relationships between self-efficacy and symptoms of anxiety disorders and depression in a normal adolescent sample. *Personality and individual differences*, 32(2), 337-348.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I.S.P. & Beglar, D. (2007) A vocabulary size test. *The Language Teacher*, 31(7),9-13.
- Nation, I.S.P. & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Patall, E. A., Cooper, H. & Robinson J. C. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: a meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 270-300.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Skipper, Y. & Pepler, D. (2020). Knowledge Mobilization: Stepping into Interdependent and Relational Space. *Action Research Journal*.
- Skipper, Y., Reddington, J. & Leman, P.J. (in Prep). The impact of writing a collaborative novel in one week on the development of literacy and self-concept.
- Thorn, A.S.C. & Gathercole, S.E. (1999) Language-Specific Knowledge and Short-Term Memory in Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Children. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 52A, 303-324.