Developing Can-Do Lists for Stay-over Type Language Programs

MUTO Katsuhiko

Keywords: Can-Do lists, teaching English to children, English immersion camps, program evaluation, Five Proposals and Specific Measures for Developing Proficiency in English for International Communication

1. Background

Spurred by "Five Proposals and Specific Measures for Developing Proficiency in English for International Communication," which was proposed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, 2011), empirical research that examines the feasibility of the proposals and attempts to apply the essentials of them to the language classroom is now on the steady rise (see below for an outline of the five proposals).

Proposal 1.

English ability required of students－assessment and verification of attainment level

Proposal 2.

Promoting students' awareness of necessity of English in the global society, and stimulating motivation for English learning

Proposal 3.

Providing students with more opportunity to use English through effective utilization of ALTs, ICT and other means

Proposal 4.

Reinforcement of English skills and instruction abilities of English teachers/ Strategic improvement of English education at the level of schools and communities

Proposal 5.

Modification of university entrance exams toward global society

Among the five proposals, Proposal 1, which addresses the English ability required of students, has been having the most definitive impact among foreign language practitioners throughout Japan. Specifically, one of the practical suggestions in the proposal, "The Government shall consider establishment of national learning attainment targets in the form of 'Can-Do lists,' while taking into account approaches adopted in foreign countries" (p. 5) seems to be attracting fair amount of attention from language teachers as well as researchers. Originally, this trend of using the Can-Do statements dates back to 2001 when the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) was published by the Council of Europe. As a guideline referred to in describing achievements of learners of second of foreign languages across Europe, the CEFR was introduced with two main aims (1) to encourage practitioners of all kinds in the language field; and (2) to make it easier for them to tell each other and their clientele what they wish to help learners to achieve and how they attempt to do so (Figueras, 2012, p. 478). Used often as the exclusive neutral reference in language learning contexts (Byram & Parmenter, 2012), it has been having a major impact on language education around the world. In Japan as well, the CEFR and the idea of Can-Do statements have been gaining its popularity also in other language education fields including Japanese, producing considerable research being done (e.g., Koike, 2007; Araki, 2014). What still lacks, however, is research on younger learners by means of Can-Do lists and studies on participants in out-of-school programs. In this article, drawing on Can-Do research done over a three-year period on short-term English immersion camps, the procedure of designing Can-Do lists suitable to use in such educational research settings and the research results obtained from data by employing the lists will be addressed.

2. Previous studies

2. 1. Can-Do research on Younger Learners

Compared to the amount of Can-Do research conducted in junior and senior high schools (e.g., Yoshida & Naganuma, 2003) or on students and English teachers (e.g., Yoshida et al., 2004), whether or not practitioners are motivated by the strategic plan (MEXT, 2003) or the guidebook for setting the educational goal in the form of Can-Do lists (MEXT, 2013), it is often pointed out that studies that are aimed at

elementary school students are rather small in number. One of a few studies that addressed the area of interest is Naganuma & Ogawa (2010), where they developed a Can-Do scale for English activities in elementary school. The Can-Do list was comprised of 14 Can-Do statements (hereinafter, CDSs), six for speaking, five for listening, and three for reading. Teachers instructed their students (N=214) to self-evaluate their learning outcome on the scale twice a year (1st and 3rd semester). Analyzing the results, the researchers argue that allowing students to monitor their own learning led to high self-efficacy in terms of language learning and achievement.

Obviously, one of the reasons for the dearth of academic research conducted in elementary school is that it is not an easy task for younger children to reflect on their own learning process on a CDS. Bearing this difficulty in mind, Naganuma (2011) conducted a study on elementary school students, from 1st to 6th grade, by adding a comment section to a Can-Do list in order to elicit qualitative as well as quantitative responses from the students. According to his analysis, although most of the 1st graders could not write a comment, there were some who illustrated with small drawings their impressive moments in the language class. Most of the 2nd graders wrote a comment on their achievements or goals, and the 3rd graders as a whole were able to analyze how they should tackle the language task by recalling their past experience. There were more reflective comments on learning among students in the upper grades. The 5th graders typically made objective comments about where and when to use the grammar that they had been taught, and the 6th graders made self-reflective comments on the learning process and strategies. By including a comment section in a Can-Do list, Naganuma argued in conclusion that children's comments can be diversified according to their stages of development, and even students in the lower grades in elementary school can engage in self-evaluation of their achievements.

2. 2. Stay-over Type English Learning Programs

The effective use of stay-over type English learning programs, namely English camps, is suggested in Proposal 3 in the aforementioned MEXT's propositions.

The third proposal, which discusses providing students with more opportunities to have contact with English, clearly states in the following section that "Education boards and schools shall provide students with opportunities for intensive contact with practical English, such as English camps with ALTs and people from the private

sector" (p. 9). In a similar vein, a suggestion for English camps can be found in a more recent proposal by the Prime Minister's Cabinet Office, namely, "The Third Proposal for University Education and Global Human Resource Development for the Future" (The Education Rebuilding Implementation Council, 2013). In the proposal, the Council advocates that "The national government and local governments should... increase opportunities for students to come into contact with English through the holding of 'English camps' and so on" (p. 7).

Despite the two official proposals, it must be candidly acknowledged that research on English camps has not been conducted sufficiently due mainly to the limitations posed on the researcher. One of the recent few studies is Onaka's (2013) research conducted at a two-day English immersion camp in Iwate, in which junior high school students (N=22) participated. According to the research, almost all the students at the end of the program answered on a questionnaire that they became more motivated to study English. Based on the results obtained from the post-questionnaire, she argued that even a short program is effective in increasing intrinsic motivation.

Another study is a five-day summer camp for 6th graders (N=150) implemented by the Arakawa Ward Board of Education. Higashi (2008) developed so called the situational syllabus where students learn English with cartoons that depict daily situations where characters are using English phrases. Through the close examination of the results of the camp program, she demonstrated how effective it was in promoting speaking in natural contexts, arguing that providing authentic situations in English conversation at the elementary school level is essential.

Though not empirically, Shiratori (2012) in a brief report discusses a series of three camps held in Hokkaido, which were provided with elementary, junior high and high school students (N=301). With over 50 ALTs and international students taking care of the students, the program was highly evaluated by the participants and camp staff on a questionnaire. Shiratori, therefore, argues that foreign language practitioners need to consider how to connect the camp and English education in school.

Taking the educational point of view discussed above into consideration, I conducted a series of Can-Do research on the development of children's language learning in English camps (Muto, 2014a; Muto, 2014b; Muto, 2015). In what follows, beginning with an overview of the research setting, two of my studies will be

discussed in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of English camps in fostering children's confidence in language skills and the validity of using Can-Do lists to study stay-over type language programs.

3. Research setting

Both of the two studies were conducted in short-term English immersion camps (hereinafter, EICs) provided by one of the largest private educational institutions in Japan. The EICs are a series of stay-over type programs that have been offered annually in summer since 2001, and each of the present studies were conducted in the camp programs held in 2013 and 2014. As short-term foreign language experience (FLEX) programs, the EICs are committed to fostering individuals who will contribute to world peace with their abilities to communicate in English (Muto, 2012). Therefore, most activities are designed so that children, who are encouraged to use English as a tool throughout the camp, can build confidence by communicating with camp leaders who are from diverse backgrounds (see Figure 1).

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6
	Morning Exercise	Morning Exercise	Morning Exercise	Morning Exercise	Morning Exercise
	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast
	English Festival	Traveling Around the World	World Food Market	Studying about the EIC Website	Graduation Ceremony
	Sign Game		My Hometown	Drawing My Dream Poster (cont'd)	
	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
Reception	Love Chain	Wonder-Land -Listening to a Presentation -Discussion	Group time	Writing Impression about Camp	Leave Camp
Entrance Ceremony				Preparation for Drama, Show Biz & Graduation	
Making Friends -Sign Game -Team Building		Eco-Heroes -Postcard Writing -Making an Eco Bag	Outdoor Games	Reading Camp Impression (in front of all)	
	Diary Reading	Diary Reading			
Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner (BBQ)	Dinner (Party)	
		Talent Show		Drama Skit Performance & Show Biz	

Figure 1. Outline schedule of the 6-day English immersion camps

The following is a summary of four key camp activities.

Love Chain (Day 2)

This activity enables participants to learn about and accept differences in cultures. Camp leaders explain typical differences related to culture, such as food and greetings. This activity is particularly concerned with two of the camps' aims, to share a communal lifestyle with people from different countries, and to realize the importance of understanding each other.

Traveling Around the World (Day 3)

In this activity, participants learn about the different countries and cultures of the camp leaders. The presentations are hands-on. Participants experience national dance, food, traditional clothes, and so on. By doing this, participants are able to expand their views, learn more, and boost their interest in other countries of the world.

Wonder-Land (Day 3)

Participants listen to a presentation about world problems, such as global warming and poverty. They learn about the reality of what is happening in the world. They start to think about what they can do for society and take self-motivated action.

World Food Market (Day 4)

Participants learn how to negotiate in English as well as have fun and discover different foods of the world. They are given a set amount of money and a recipe for one international dish. Camp leaders work at a market, selling ingredients for the foods at stalls. Participants go shopping and buy the necessary ingredients by negotiating for a lower price.

Camp leaders, who not only conduct camp activities but also take care of all of the children's needs, are undergraduate and graduate students from overseas, aged from approximately 18 to 30. Regularly, almost all of them are composed of nonnative speakers of English, who have acquired English as their official or second language in

their home countries. Before participation they are required to receive an intensive training provided by the educational institute, and therefore their skills, though not as adequate as licensed language teachers, are considered essentially sufficient. The diversity of their background offers children valuable opportunities to listen to a wide variety of English, or World Englishes (Kachru, 1985), and use English as an international language (McKay, 2002).

4. Can-Do studies in English camps
4. 1. Studies by means of the EIKEN Can-Do List

Employing the EIKEN Grade 4 Can-Do list (STEP, 2008), Muto (2014a) studied the changes in confidence of elementary school children ranging from 3rd to 6th graders (N=223) participating in the EIC camps held in 2013, and the relationship between their confidence in each Can-Do statement and the language activities at the camp. The rationale behind opting for the EIKEN Grade 4 Can-Do list (see Appendix 1) for the study (Muto, 2014a) is that all the seven EIKEN Can-Do lists, including that of Grade 4, are assumed to offer a general picture of what typical language learners believe they can do (Naganuma, 2010). Therefore, the lists are not customized exclusively for language activities in the classroom, but for real-life situations (Yanase, 2014) which are embodied in an out-of-class learning environment such as the target English camp. Moreover, there is a practical reason for the use of the Grade 4 Can-Do list. Prior to participation, all camp participants are required to have passed EIKEN Grade 4 and/or finished studying the worksheets equivalent to the EIKEN grade, which are provided by the educational institution. Twice, before and after the program, participant children were instructed to self-evaluate their confidence in the same questionnaire on a four-degree Likert scale: *None, Little, Some*, and *A lot*. Tables below, divided according to language skills, show the results obtained from the questionnaires. In each of the following table, the number of valid data (*n*) varies depending on an item. This is because out of all participants (N=223) those who reported having previous experience regarding an item in the first (pre-camp) questionnaire are subjects of the analysis. The reason behind this is that without any prior experience one cannot assert he or she is confident in performing the language activity described in the Can-Do statement.

Table 1. Level of Confidence about Reading Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
R-1. Can understand short letters and emails.	47	Before	1 (2%)	9 (19%)	27 (57%)	10 (21%)
		After	2 (4%)	6 (12%)	27 (57%)	12 (25%)
R-2. Can understand simple stories that include illustrations or photographs.	110	Before	0 (0%)	16 (14%)	59 (53%)	35 (31%)
		After	0 (0%)	14 (12%)	49 (44%)	47 (42%)
R-3. Can understand sentences describing familiar activities from everyday life.	111	Before	0 (0%)	14 (12%)	57 (51%)	39 (35%)
		After	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	44 (39%)	59 (53%)
R-4. Can understand simple signs and notices in public facilities.	110	Before	0 (0%)	7 (6%)	40 (36%)	63 (57%)
		After	0 (0%)	6 (5%)	32 (29%)	72 (65%)
R-5. Can understand simple English menus.	71	Before	1 (1%)	15 (21%)	27 (38%)	28 (39%)
		After	1 (1%)	9 (12%)	36 (50%)	25 (35%)
R-6. Can understand the information in an invitation to a party, etc.	46	Before	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	27 (58%)	13 (28%)
		After	0 (0%)	12 (26%)	24 (52%)	10 (21%)

Table 2. Level of Confidence about Listening Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
L-1. Can understand the information in a simple self-introduction.	97	Before	0 (0%)	13 (13%)	46 (47%)	38 (39%)
		After	0 (0%)	7 (7%)	36 (37%)	54 (55%)
L-2. Can understand the content of simply constructed sentences.	112	Before	0 (0%)	10 (8%)	43 (38%)	59 (52%)
		After	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	34 (30%)	76 (62%)
L-3. Can understand the content of simply constructed sentences.	112	Before	0 (0%)	12 (10%)	42 (37%)	58 (51%)
		After	2 (1%)	4 (3%)	28 (25%)	78 (69%)
L-4. Can understand descriptions of the location of people and things.	94	Before	0 (0%)	8 (8%)	39 (41%)	47 (50%)
		After	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	41 (43%)	50 (52%)

Table 3. Level of Confidence about Speaking Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
S-1. Can give a simple self-introduction.	92	Before	1 (1%)	19 (20%)	43 (46%)	29 (31%)
		After	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	36 (39%)	53 (57%)
S-2. Can ask simple questions.	101	Before	2 (1%)	17 (16%)	39 (38%)	43 (42%)
		After	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	39 (38%)	54 (53%)
S-3. Can ask for repetition when he/she does not understand what the speaker says.	72	Before	2 (2%)	10 (13%)	33 (45%)	27 (37%)
		After	5 (6%)	18 (25%)	25 (34%)	24 (33%)
S-4. Can say dates and days of the week.	84	Before	6 (7%)	19 (22%)	30 (35%)	29 (34%)
		After	3 (3%)	17 (20%)	29 (34%)	35 (41%)

Table 4. Level of Confidence about Writing Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
W-1. Can write sentences using English word order, provided that the sentences are short.	120	Before	4 (3%)	30 (25%)	52 (43%)	34 (28%)
		After	4 (3%)	24 (20%)	46 (38%)	46 (38%)
W-2. Can write short messages by putting words and phrases together.	57	Before	1 (1%)	15 (26%)	24 (42%)	17 (29%)
		After	1 (1%)	15 (26%)	26 (45%)	15 (26%)
W-3. Can write sentences joining clauses with conjunctions.	107	Before	9 (8%)	31 (28%)	45 (42%)	22 (20%)
		After	4 (3%)	15 (14%)	49 (45%)	39 (36%)
W-4. Can write dates and days of the week.	101	Before	4 (3%)	29 (28%)	38 (37%)	30 (29%)
		After	1 (0%)	25 (24%)	34 (33%)	41 (40%)

Additionally, in order to determine whether there might be a significant change in the nominal data (i.e., the number of responses) before and after the target camps, a McNemar's test (exact significance, 2-tailed) was applied after creating two groups by combining *None* and *Little* into Negative, and *Some* and *A lot* into Positive. As is obvious from Table 5, only two statements, S-1 ($p = .015$) and W-3 ($p = .005$) were found to demonstrate a significant change ($\alpha < .05$).

Table 5. Results of McNemar's Test Comparing Responses Before and After Camp

Reading		Listening		Speaking		Writing	
R-1	.757	L-1	.430	S-1	.015	W-1	.478
R-2	.840	L-2	.316	S-2	.139	W-2	1.000
R-3	.383	L-3	.462	S-3	.080	W-3	.005
R-4	.946	L-4	.512	S-4	.488	W-4	.360
R-5	.356						
R-6	.251						

With the relationship between the results and the camp activities closely examined, S-1 and W-3, both of which are concerned with productive skills related to activities done repetitively during the camps, were shown to have the potential to strengthen confidence. The change in S-1 (Can give a simple self-introduction) is attributed to activities named *Sign Game* (conducted on Day 1 and Day 2) and *My Hometown* (Day 4). In the game, while freely walking around in the room, children introduced themselves to each other and wrote down what they learned about other participants. Similarly, in *My Hometown*, each participant with prepared notes and pictures introduced his or her hometown to other members in their groups. Activities

that can be considered to have triggered the rise in W-3 (Can write sentences joining clauses with conjunctions) are ones named *Diary Writing* (conducted from Day 1 through Day 5), *Writing a Postcard* (Day 3), *Camp Impression* (Day 5) and *Dream Poster* (Day 4 and Day 5). In all four activities, though their purposes differed, children were encouraged to write English in sentences, if possible, with conjunctions.

Providing repetitive lessons that focus on a particular language skill (e.g., writing) is feasible in regular intensive language courses, however, dealing with a wide variety of topics is often limited due to resources available in the classroom. In this regard, it may be argued that stay-over type language programs have an advantage in offering meaningful real-life activities (e.g., keeping a diary every day).

On a final note, the EIKEN Can-Do list could be a possible powerful tool to elucidate the relationship between confidence in language use and the nature of language activities. The list, however, may not be sufficient to cover the unique characteristics that the camp program had. This reflection leads to the necessity of the following research.

4.2. Research by use of the EIC Can-Do list

Based on the results of and reflections on the previous study, in Muto (2014b) an original Can-Do list was developed and employed to study the changes in self-evaluation of confidence of participants (N=189) in the EIC camps held in the following year. The original Can-Do list, namely the EIC Can-do list (see Appendix 2), was developed with reference to the EIKEN Grade 4 list (Appendix 1) and by breaking down the elements of each activity conducted in the camp program.

As with the previous study, a question was added to each CDS in order to inquire about their previous experience and confidence with regard to each statement. In an exactly similar way, participants were instructed to self-evaluate their confidence on a four-point Likert scale: *None, Little, Some,* and *A lot.* Again, the same questionnaire was carried out twice in the study: one month before and one month after the program. Results are shown in Tables 6 to 9 below.

Table 6. Level of Confidence about Reading Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
R-1. Can understand the information given on schedule.	70	Before	0 (0%)	6 (8%)	38 (54%)	26 (37%)
		After	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	23 (32%)	44 (62%)
R-2. Can understand signs and notices.	78	Before	1 (1%)	12 (15%)	42 (53%)	23 (29%)
		After	1 (1%)	6 (7%)	31 (39%)	40 (51%)
R-3. Can understand English on presentation slides.	57	Before	0 (0%)	16 (28%)	31 (54%)	10 (17%)
		After	1 (1%)	7 (12%)	22 (38%)	27 (47%)
R-4. Can understand the information given on a price list.	61	Before	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	30 (49%)	28 (45%)
		After	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	13 (21%)	44 (72%)
R-5. Can understand short messages.	79	Before	1 (1%)	5 (6%)	49 (62%)	24 (30%)
		After	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	24 (30%)	52 (65%)

Table 7. Level of Confidence about Listening Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
L-1. Can understand the information given in self-introduction.	118	Before	0 (0%)	9 (7%)	55 (46%)	54 (45%)
		After	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	43 (36%)	70 (59%)
L-2. Can understand the meaning of simple instructions or requests.	110	Before	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	46 (41%)	59 (53%)
		After	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	40 (36%)	66 (60%)
L-3. Can understand short skits.	84	Before	0 (0%)	22 (26%)	35 (41%)	27 (32%)
		After	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	32 (38%)	48 (57%)
L-4. Can understand the information given a presentation.	74	Before	1 (1%)	22 (29%)	34 (45%)	17 (22%)
		After	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	32 (43%)	34 (45%)
L-5. Can understand English spoken by people from various countries.	72	Before	6 (8%)	19 (26%)	35 (48%)	12 (16%)
		After	0 (0%)	6 (8%)	29 (40%)	37 (51%)

Table 8. Level of Confidence about Speaking Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
S-1. Can give a simple self-introduction.	136	Before	1 (0%)	11 (8%)	62 (45%)	62 (45%)
		After	1 (0%)	2 (1%)	36 (26%)	97 (71%)
S-2. Can ask simple questions.	123	Before	2 (1%)	10 (8%)	57 (46%)	54 (43%)
		After	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	34 (27%)	83 (67%)
S-3. Can answer simple questions.	123	Before	2 (1%)	9 (7%)	52 (42%)	60 (48%)
		After	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	37 (30%)	84 (68%)
S-4. Can ask for repetition when I do not understand.	87	Before	2 (2%)	14 (16%)	40 (45%)	31 (35%)
		After	1 (1%)	11 (12%)	26 (29%)	49 (56%)
S-5. Can make a presentation about myself if I'm prepared.	73	Before	1 (1%)	13 (17%)	36 (49%)	23 (31%)
		After	1 (1%)	6 (8%)	14 (19%)	52 (71%)

Table 9. Level of Confidence about Writing Can-Do Statements

Can-Do statement	n	Time	None	Little	Some	A lot
W-1. Can write down information about his or her self-introduction.	51	Before	1 (1%)	14 (27%)	20 (39%)	16 (31%)
		After	1 (1%)	4 (7%)	21 (41%)	25 (49%)
W-2. Can write in my diary.	47	Before	2 (4%)	13 (27%)	23 (48%)	9 (19%)
		After	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	14 (29%)	30 (63%)
W-3. Can write an explanation about my future dream.	56	Before	1 (1%)	16 (28%)	24 (42%)	15 (26%)
		After	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	13 (23%)	39 (69%)
W-4. Can write my impression about events.	37	Before	1 (2%)	10 (27%)	17 (45%)	9 (24%)
		After	1 (2%)	3 (8%)	10 (27%)	23 (62%)
W-5. Can look at information and write it down in my notebook.	49	Before	3 (6%)	7 (14%)	26 (53%)	13 (26%)
		After	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	19 (38%)	25 (51%)

Although applying a McNemar's test produced no significant results, as can be seen from the four tables, seven out of the 20 CDSs indicated significant increase (more than 30% increase in the *A Lot* category) in the confidence level. The following is the seven CDSs, the names of activities pertaining to them, and the day(s) the activity was conducted.

R-3. Wonder-Land (Day 3)

R-5. Camp leaders' comments in diary (from Day 2 through Day 6)

L-5. Interaction with others throughout camp (from Day 1 through Day 6)

S-5. My hometown (Day 4)

W-2. Diary writing (from Day 2 through Day 5)

W-3. Dream poster (Day 4 and Day 5)

W-4. Writing impression on Camp (Day 5)

As previously explained, *Wonder-Land* is an activity in which children listen to a presentation and take notes of what they understand in their booklets. With only 57 participants who had reported having prior experience, this activity might have been new and interesting for most of the participants. Though cognitively challenging, the activity is argued to have been successful in building confidence, while bringing a sense of accomplishment. In *My hometown*, which boosted their confidence in S-5, each participant child often with notes and pictures introduced his or her own hometown in front of friends in a group. Among the five CDSs in Speaking, S-5 was

the least experienced activity among all participants (*n*=73). Considering their ages, the activity was so demanding that they felt a fair amount of accomplishment after they had done the activity, and rated their confidence higher than before.

More noteworthy is that there are three CDSs related to writing, W-2, W-3, and W-4. This is largely because almost all participants were children who would regularly study reading and writing in the *juku* (private cramming school) run by the same institution, and their English skills were much higher than those of average children of the same age. With such previous experience, their confidence in writing is considered to be reinforced in writing activities during the six days on camp.

Obviously, this exceptionality can also explain the increase in confidence level in R-5. In each day of the program, they were supposed to write a short diary and receive feedback from their camp leaders. Due probably to the nature of the comments camp leaders wrote in simple English, children might have felt it easy to read English different from what they usually read in the worksheet.

Last but not least, the escalation in L-5 is largely due to the distinctive nature of the EIC program. With international students as camp leaders who speak English as an official or a second language, children were allowed to listen to a wide variety of English, or World Englishes, throughout the program. Evidently, this is one of the most important outcomes of the program.

5. Conclusion and Implications

As detailed above, in a language program, such as English camps, where neither a pre-test nor a post-test can often be administered, it is feasible to prove program validity by research employing Can-Do lists. Recently, the number of short-term language immersion programs conducted in Japan has been increasing, however, few if any of the organizers or coordinators attempt to verify their effectiveness by other means than the use of a casual questionnaire that occasionally tends to ask for responses as to whether participants like the program, how they feel about their English skills after the program, and so forth. Elaborating a Can-Do list can be begun with referring to established lists such as the CEFR, CEFR-J, the EIKEN list and the GTEC for STUDENTS Can-Do statements. If conditions permit, doing a pilot study by making use of them as they are or with minor changes may bring about beneficial results. Through reflection on the outcome and by revising and customizing those lists

to fit the characteristics of the target program, the researcher may develop a Can-Do list that can do the job of measuring students' achievement more precisely. Unlike regular language classes, this procedure should be all the more important for out-of-classroom programs and stay-over type camps because of the uniqueness they boast.

As a matter of course, Can-Do studies would produce the best results if conducted on students immediately after each language activity or at the end of each day. Taking the findings from Naganuma (2011) into consideration, I developed a set of Can-Do statements with a comment section for children to fill in for each camp day (see Appendix 3, for a sample completed form), and conducted a survey in the same program setting in the subsequent year. The results being analyzed at present, I will set discussion for another occasion.

References

Araki, F. 荒木史子（2014）．『外国語コミュニケーション力に情動が及ぼす影響―CEFR 自己評価に基づく分析から―』広島：溪水社．

Byram, M., & Parmenter, L. (2012). Introduction. In Byram, M. & Parmenter, L. (eds.) *The Common European Framework of Reference.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

The Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Education Rebuilding Implementation Council 教育再生実行会議 (2013). University Education and Global Human Resource Development for the Future (3rd proposal) (「これからの大学教育等の在り方について」［第三次提言］)．Retrieved from http:///www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/kyouikusaisei/pdf/dai3_en.pdf

Figueras, N. (2012). The impact of CEFR. *ELT Journal*, 66, 477-485.

Higashi, H. 東仁美（2008）．「アウトプットを促進させる高学年でのスキット活動―荒川区ワールドスクールでの取り組み― Promoting Output in English through Skit Activities: The Arakawa Project」聖学院大学論叢，第21巻，第2号，155-169.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle, in R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (eds.) English in the World: Teaching and Learning Language and Literatures. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 11-30.

Koike, I. 小池生夫（2007）.「第二言語習得研究を基盤とする小、中、高、大の連携をはかる英語教育の先導的基礎研究」『企業が求める英語力調査報告書』千葉：明海大学.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 文部科学省 (2003). A Strategic Plan to Cultivate 'Japanese with English Abilities'（「英語が使える日本人」育成のための行動計画）. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/004/siryo/04031601/005.pdf

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 文部科学省（2011）. Five Proposals and Specific Measures for Developing Proficiency in English for International Communication（国際共通語としての英語力向上のための5つの提言と具体的施策）. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2012/07/09/1319707_1.pdf

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 文部科学省（2013）.『各中・高等学校の外国語教育における「CAN-DOリスト」の形での学習到達目標設定のための手引き』Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/__icsFiles/Afieldfile/2013/05/08/1332306_4.pdf

Muto, K. (2012). Roles English Immersion Camps Play: Through the Outcome of Kumon EIC.『言語文化の諸相』. 大阪，メディアイランド. 190-202.

Muto, K. (2014a). Can-do self-evaluation by English camp participants. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (eds.), JALT2013 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT, 78-87.

Muto, K. (2014b). Creating a can-do list for an English Camp. Paper presented at JALT2014 conference. Tsukuba, Ibaraki.

Muto, K. 武藤克彦（2015）.「児童を対象とした Can-Do リストの作成 —英語キャンプでの実践から—」『日本児童英語教育学会 第35回 秋季大会資料集』, 44.

Naganuma, N. (2010). The range and triangulation of can do statements in Japan. In M. G. Schmidt, N. Naganuma, F. O'Dwyer, A. Imig & K. Sakai (eds.) *Can do Statements in Language Education in Japan and Beyond: Applications of the CEFR*. Tokyo: Asahi Press, 19-34.

Naganuma, N. 長沼君主（2011）.「小学校英語活動における自律性と動機づけを高める

Can-do 評価の実践」『ARCLE REVIEW』第5号，65-74.

Naganuma, N. & Ogawa, T. 長沼君主・小川隆夫（2010）．「小学校英語教育における Can-Do 尺度の開発とスキル指導の効果の検証—スキルと情意のバランスを求めて」『第33回全国英語教育学会東京研究大会発表予稿集』，358-359.

Onaka, N. 尾中夏美（2013）．「グローバル人材基礎力育成事業の一例［Nurturing global competence through an English immersion program］」．In N. Sonda & A. Krause (eds.), JALT2012 Conference proceedings. Tokyo: JALT.

Shiratori, K. 白鳥金吾（2012）．「イングリッシュキャンプで国内留学」『英語教育』61 (9)，18-19.

The Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP). (2008). The EIKEN can-do list (English translation). Retrieved from
http://www.eiken.or.jp/eiken/exam/cando/pdf/Eiken_CandoList_translation.pdf

Yanase, K. 柳瀬和明（2014）．「Can-do への関心の高まりと「英検 Can-Do リスト」」．『英語展望』No.121，32-37.

Yoshida, K., & Naganuma, N. 吉田研作・長沼君主（2003）．『英語 can-do アンケート調査分析報告書』東京：ベネッセコーポレーション．Retrieved from
http://berd.benesse.jp/berd/center/open/kokusai/report/2003/07/pdf/cando_rep.pdf

Yoshida, K., Watanabe, Y., Negishi, K., & Naganuma, N. 吉田研作・渡部良典・根岸雅史・長沼君主（2004）．『日・韓・中の英語教育の現状と今後の課題：学生 CAN-DO ／英語教員意識調査より』『英語教育』53 (8)，66-72.

Appendix 1: EIKEN Grade 4 Can-Do Statements (English translation)
Reading

R-1. Can understand short letters and e-mails (e.g. introducing the writer's family, about memories of a trip.).

R-2. Can understand simple stories that include illustrations or photographs (e.g. picture books for children.).

R-3. Can understand sentences describing familiar activities from everyday life (e.g. "Ken went to the park and played soccer with his friends.").

R-4. Can understand simple signs and notices in public facilities (e.g. "No Smoking," / "Closed" / "No Dogs").

R-5.   Can understand simple English menus (e.g. in a fast-food restaurant).

R-6.   Can understand the information in an invitation to a party, etc. (e.g. date, time, place).

Listening

L-1.   Can understand the information in a simple self-introduction (e.g. the speaker's name, where the speaker lives, about the speaker's family).

L-2.   Can understand the content of simply constructed sentences (e.g. "I like dogs, but she likes cats.").

L-3.   Can understand the meaning of simple instructions (e.g. "Open your textbook." / "Close the door, please.").

L-4.   Can understand descriptions of the location of people and things. (e.g. "The book is on the TV.").

Speaking

S-1.   Can give a simple self-introduction (e.g. name, where he/she lives, about his/her family).

S-2.   Can ask simple questions (e.g. the time, someone's likes, name).

S-3.   Can ask for repetition when he/she does not understand what the speaker says (e.g. "Pardon? / "Could you speak more slowly?").

S-4.   Can say dates and days of the week.

Writing

W-1.   Can write sentences using English word order, provided that the sentences are short (e.g. "I went to the park yesterday.").

W-2.   Can write short messages by putting words and phrases together (e.g. "birthday party at 6 p.m.").

W-3.   Can write sentences joining clauses with conjunctions (e.g. and, but, so, when, because).

W-4.   Can write dates and days of the week.

Appendix 2: The EIC Can-Do Statements (English version)

Reading

R-1.   Can understand the information given on schedule.

R-2.   Can understand signs and notices.

R-3.   Can understand English on presentation slides.

R-4.   Can understand the information given on a price list.

R-5.   Can understand short messages.

Listening

L-1.   Can understand the information given in self-introduction.

L-2.   Can understand the meaning of simple instructions or requests.

L-3.   Can understand short skits.

L-4.   Can understand the information given a presentation.

L-5.   Can understand English spoken by people from various countries.

Speaking

S-1.   Can give a simple self-introduction.

S-2.   Can ask simple questions.

S-3.   Can answer simple questions.

S-4.   Can ask for repetition when I do not understand.

S-5.   Can make a presentation about myself if I'm prepared.

Writing

W-1.   Can write down information about his or her self-introduction.

W-2.   Can write in my diary.

W-3.   Can write an explanation about my future dream.

W-4.   Can write my impression about events.

W-5.   Can look at information and write it down in my notebook.

Appendix 3: Daily Can-Do Sheet (a completed sample)

Let's write comments in English or Japanese!
英語か日本語で質問の答えを書いてみよう。

What did you learn today?
今日何を学びましたか?

New things 初めて知ったこと: India is Namaste.
Brazil is saying ola. Uganda is
saking hands.

New words and phrases 新しく覚えた単語やフレーズ:
English Festival

What could you do today? Anything is OK!
今日、自分ができたことは何ですか?何でもOK!

write DIARY

What do you want to try tomorrow?
明日、チャレンジしたいことは何ですか?

many speak English

Please circle the face that matches your confidence.
質問を読んで自分の思うところに〇をつけてね。

DAY 2

INSTRUCTIONS

今日の活動 Today's activities	できなかった None	あまりできなかった Little	まあまあできた Some	とてもできた A lot
① 言い換えって、キャンプリーダーたちの話す英語がわかりましたか? Could you understand the Camp leaders' English today?	☺	☺	☺	☺
② 言い換えって、英語で質問されたとき、がんばって答えられましたか? Did you try to answer a question from a Camp leader today?	☺	☺	☺	☺
③ 言い換えって、キャンプリーダーや友だちにがんばって自分から英語で話せましたか? Did you try talking to a Camp leader or a friend today?	☺	☺	☺	☺
④ 日記を書くことができましたか? Could you write in your diary?	☺	☺	☺	☺
⑤ 日記をキャンプリーダーの前で読めましたか? Could you read today's diary entry to your Camp leader?	☺	☺	☺	☺
⑥ 日記に書かれたキャンプリーダーのコメントを理解できましたか? Could you understand the comments on your diary entry?	☺	☺	☺	☺
⑦ ラブチェーンで、キャンプリーダーたちの寸劇やスキットを理解できましたか? Could you understand the skits in Love Chain?	☺	☺	☺	☺
⑧ ストーリーメイキングで、キャンプリーダーの説明を理解できましたか? Could you understand the explanation given for Storymaking?	☺	☺	☺	☺
⑨ ストーリーメイキングで、キャンプリーダーに物語の一部を説明できましたか? Could you explain a part of the story to Camp leaders in Storymaking?	☺	☺	☺	☺

-4-

-3-

滞在型外国語プログラムのためのCan-Doリストの開発

武藤　克彦

　文科省提言「国際共通語としての英語力向上のための5つの提言と具体的施策」（文部科学省，平成23年）を受けて、外国語教育の専門家や教育現場はそれに基づく実践や研究に鋭意努力している。5つの提言のうち、教育現場においては、生徒に求められる英語力に言及した提言1が最も多くの関心を集めている。提言1の「学習到達目標を「Can-Doリスト」の形で具体的に設定する」という文言に基づき、中高を始めとする多くの教育現場ではCan-Doリストを作成し、使用する試みが行われている。しかしながら、提言3「ALT、ICT等の効果的な活用を通じて生徒が英語を使う機会を増やす」、より具体的には「教育委員会や学校は、ALTや民間人材等を活用してイングリッシュ・キャンプなど、生徒が集中的に英語に触れる機会を設ける」といった具体的施策を踏まえると、学校外での外国語学習活動においてもCan-Doリストを用いた到達目標の設定を行うのが望ましいと考えられる。残念ながら現状では、イングリッシュ・キャンプの実践もさることながら、学術的な実証研究は皆無である。本稿では著者自身がイングリッシュ・キャンプにて行ったCan-Doリストを用いた調査研究を元に、滞在型外国語プログラムにおけるCan-Doリストの開発およびデータ収集の結果について論じたい。