

We Are Reading The Stories We Write

Ali Işık

(ali.isik@istinye.edu.tr)

İstinye University, Turkey

Birgen Işık

(birgen_isik@hotmail.com)

Kabataş Erkek Lisesi, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the effects of learner-generated stories on students' attitudes and English language development in comparison to ready-made readers. Using a mixed-methods research design, the data were obtained from the questionnaire, semi-structured interview, and the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). One hundred and forty English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students from the experimental group and 140 from the control group from two different public high schools participated in the study. The students in the experimental group wrote stories for their peers throughout the academic year. The students in the experimental group read the stories written by their peers and the students in the control group read the stories (readers) published by the international publishers. The results indicated that the students in the experimental group perceived the learner-generated materials more positively in comparison to the control group using the ready-made readers. Moreover, the learner-generated materials also contributed to the students' English development more than the ready-made ones.

1 Introduction

As the evidence indicating the positive effects of pleasure reading on students' language development has accumulated, pleasure reading has been a hot topic in English language teaching (ELT) (Beglar, Hunt, & Kite, 2012; Ellidokuzoglu, 2017; Krashen, 2004; Pruzinsky, 2014). First of all, it helps to expose students to compelling comprehensible samples of a target language, which is a sine qua non of language learning (Isik & Krashen, 2020; Krashen, Lee, & Lao, 2017; Sari, 2013). Moreover, since students choose what they want to read and what they comprehend, they are intrigued by the story while reading. Thus, pleasure reading provides optimal affective conditions for autonomous language learning (Isik, 2000). They read at their own pace and if they have a comprehension problem with certain parts of a story, they can reread that part as many times as they want or refer to the reference (dictionary, grammar books) and ask for help. If the story is difficult or boring, they can just quit reading that book and choose another one. There is no pressure on when and how to read or at what pace to read. There is no external authority dictating what to do and checking comprehension. Furthermore, pleasure reading paves the way for learner autonomy since students choose what, when, how, and how long to read. Hence, pleasure reading individualizes language education and enables students to make more efficient use of their time outside the classroom. (Isik, 2018; Krashen, 2017; Mori, 2015). Moreover, it can be a source of real communicative tasks in which students get involved both cognitively and effectively. They do not need to focus on target language forms in the story, but the story itself, which actually reflects the real use of language. Thus, pleasure reading fosters the real

use of language and helps create an optimal context for language education (Isik, 2018; Krashen,

The research indicating the role of pleasure reading on language proficiency proliferates as well. The first hallmark study gathering the attention on the remarkable role of pleasure reading on language learning is the one carried out by Elley and Mangubhai (1983) who compared the effects of pleasure reading on language development to a form-focused EFL language instruction in Fijian primary schools. They found that the pleasure-reading group outperformed the form-focused instruction group in all language skills. Likewise, the findings of Hafiz and Tudor (1989) supported those of Elley and Mangubhai (1983). In another study, Gradman and Hanania (1991) vigorously pinpointed the role of pleasure reading on language proficiency. They indicated that among all the other factors, pleasure reading accounted for 49% of the TOEFL scores of the students studying at Indiana University, USA. In another study, Beglar et al., (2012) studied the effects of pleasure reading on the reading rate development of Japanese university students. It was found that pleasure reading groups outperformed the intensive reading groups. Moreover, they also found a positive relationship between the amount of pleasure reading and reading rate. Ponniah and Priya (2014) investigated the effects of pleasure reading on the proficiency level of students. They indicated that the pleasure-reading group did better than the control group since they got a more pleasurable input in a low anxiety context. Cho (2017) reported a case study about a Korean middle school student developing English language skills through pleasure reading without any formal education or being in an English-speaking country. In short, the positive findings of pleasure reading in language development in ELT, concurs with the theoretical discussions upon both theoretically and practically.

The word “pleasure” is the essence of pleasure reading; however, it may not be always possible to find story books which address students’ culture, age group, and interests at their linguistic level (Dawkins, 2017). This is a real challenge that needs to be addressed especially in an EFL context. One of the solutions could be learner-generated materials (LGM). These materials are likely to be appreciated by students because both writers and audience (readers) are of a similar background, cognitive and academic level.. Hence, students can find something about themselves in those materials and feel more affiliated with the language and events in LGM (van Djik & Lazonder, 2016). They tend to develop positive attitudes towards those materials and feel more satisfied using them in their learning venture (Brown, Iyobe, & Riley, 2013).

LGM, which also promotes learner autonomy, is also compatible with the social-constructivist view because students are the active participants teaching/learning processes, they are no longer the objects but the subjects and agents of the process (Liu & Lan, 2016). They get cognitively very active because the materials production task is a very demanding process, which requires them to dwell on and activate their pre-existing knowledge concerning content and language to present something appealing to their peers. When they produce materials, they actively engage in a learning process requiring higher mental order processes. In other words, while they are producing materials for the use of others, they operate at the upper limits of learning.

Moreover, it is also pointed out that LGM fosters student ownership both as a writer and an audience (Hudd, 2003). Since students producing materials are familiar with their audience and know their peers in person, they are aware that those materials are of immediate use and serve for a purpose. In addition, they are in the same context and have a chance to receive immediate feedback about their materials. This “here and now” nature of LGM helps students develop a sense of ownership. The peers are more receptive to LGM as well because they acquainted with one another. They are not from an outsider, an authority but are their peers. Since they also develop materials and experience the same hardship, it is highly likely that students respect and appreciate each other’s materials.

The research about LGM is also promising. Chen and Liu (2012) studied the effectiveness of learner-generated multimedia annotations in comparison to instructor-provided ones on the foreign language reading comprehension and attitudes of Taiwanese university students. The results showed that the learner-generated annotation group outperformed the instructor-provided group in reading comprehension irrespective of their cognitive style, field-dependent/independent. Although no significant difference was observed between the two groups at the lower level, the learner-generated annotation group did better at the upper level. Besides, it was observed that students developed

positive attitudes towards the learner-generated multimedia annotations, no matter which cognitive learning style they were. In another study, Mennim (2012) reported a classroom-teaching project in an oral communication course which required Japanese university students to generate and teach a thirty-minute lesson in English. The results indicated that the students showed a positive reaction to both the material development and teaching experience. They also reported the difficulty of material development and teaching. Brown et al. (2013) conducted a study about the materials produced by Japanese university students for their peers. It was found that the students reacted to the materials positively and requested more of such materials. Publishing materials for real use and addressing a wider audience also motivated the students. However, the students, especially the ones with lower proficiency, preferred consuming materials prepared by their fellow students, rather than producing them. In another study, Green, Inan, and Maushak (2014) investigated the impression of students on the learner-generated videocasts in ESL classes. It was found that the materials helped students develop their language. Moreover, the materials production process fostered collaboration among students, which also contributed to language development. Azman, Zaibon, and Shiratuddin (2016) studied the effects of learner-generated comics on student perception. The study carried out in Malaysia with university students indicated that the students evaluated the materials, which positively impacted their comprehension. The materials enabled the students to understand academic content and retain facts better. It was also found that the learner-generated comics boosted student creativity, storytelling, and thinking skills. In short, the research shows that students developed positive attitudes towards LGM, which also helped improve their language skills.

The research on LGM in Turkey is not abundant. Kilickaya and Krajka (2012) conducted a study to investigate the effects of student-produced web-based comic strips on students attending a private language institution in Turkey. Students reported that they enjoyed the materials and were willing to produce them. Some participants also reported that comic strips improved their grammar and reading skills. Engin (2014) investigated how LGM affected the English language learning experience of students in a flipped ESL writing class. It was observed that since they found and worked on the content, and wanted their materials to be comprehensible and accurate, student-generated materials contributed to their English language learning process. However, the students also reported that they found teacher-generated materials more reliable and preferred them to learner-generated ones. Bakla (2018) investigated what university EFL students think about LGM on pronunciation in a flipped class. It was observed that the students developed positive attitudes towards these materials and found them valuable and user-friendly.

The summary above indicates that the discussion about LGM in ELT is scarce. Although the topic is attention-grabbing, a thorough, full-fledged theoretical knowledge base is missing. Likewise, the research about it is also far from being sufficient. The pre-existing research is related to the use of digital technology in ELT (Dowling, 2013). Moreover, they are too narrow in focus and consist of short hypertexts and related tasks (Mennim, 2012). Thus, the problem of insufficient level-appropriate materials still exists. Another problem is finding culturally relevant and appealing materials, which needs to be handled. Thus, this project is promising and contributes to solving these problems, at least in its local context. It is also innovative and unique. First of all, it is not limited to a specific task for a limited period of time but is comprehensive and consecutive throughout the academic year. It combines writing and reading as well. The students did not write for the sake of practicing writing in English, but they had a real purpose in their minds and a target audience. Moreover, it situated the student at the center of attention. They actively participated in the materials development process and had a voice in the ELT program. Unlike the LGM mentioned above, it is not digital in nature. It does not require any computer skills, and everybody could participate in the story writing process. Moreover, it combines two current popular topics in ELT, pleasure-reading and LGM. In short, the project brings a unique practical perspective to ELT. Although the program was not strictly research-oriented but rather designed to help students improve their English, it was necessary to evaluate its efficiency and revise it considering the data obtained. Hence, this study was born out of the need to investigate the effectiveness of the project and aimed at examining the effects of LGM on the attitudes and English language development of EFL students who receive a general English course in a public high school in Turkey. More specifically, the study tried to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. How do the learner-generated stories affect the attitudes of EFL students in comparison to the ready-made graded readers?

RQ2. How do the learner-generated stories affect the English language development of EFL students in comparison to the ready-made graded readers?

2 Methodology

2.1 *The participants*

One hundred and forty EFL students from the experimental group in a public high school and 140 from the control group from another public high school participated in the study. In each group, 35 students from each grade, 9, 10, 11, and 12 took part in the study. The students in the experimental group were chosen from among 974 EFL students and the ones in the control group from among 1128 EFL students through random cluster sampling. The students in both groups took the same entrance exam and the qualified ones were assigned to one of the schools randomly. Thus, it can be concluded that the students in both groups were similar in terms of academic background and level of English. Moreover, both groups were administered the online Oxford Placement Test (OPT) at the beginning of the academic year. The OPT was given to only the 9th graders as a pre-test and post-test for the sake of practicality. The English level of the students in both the groups at the beginning was similar (see Table 8). At the end of the academic year, all the students in both groups, in every grade were administered the questionnaire and semi-structured interview.

2.2 *The ELT context*

Both schools in which the experimental and control groups studied English were run by the same institution which decided to implement a comprehension-based approach in ELT, an approach maintaining that learners acquire a target language only when they receive ample amount of compelling comprehensible input in non-threatening contexts in which the target language is used as a means of communication (Isik & Krashen, 2020; Krashen, 2013). To realize the adopted methodology, three academicians were assigned as teacher trainers. At the start, the teacher trainers organized a one-week workshop to train all teachers on the theoretical and practical aspects of the methodology. The trainers also visited the schools throughout the academic year to continue teacher training on the spot and scaffold them when needed. Moreover, the teacher trainers also trained one teacher at each school as a local teacher trainer with whom the rest of the teachers could easily collaborate. At the end of each academic year, the teacher trainers reorganized a one-week teacher-training workshop with the participation of all teachers. The in-service teacher-training program, which was practiced as an ongoing process, was repeated each year in the same format. In every teacher training session, the role of pleasure reading was rigorously underlined, and the teachers were urged to practice it fervently in their ELT practice. Hence, in both schools, the same language teaching methodology was implemented. Additionally, the teachers got to know each other well via teacher training and other ELT-related projects and tasks. Moreover, the institution that ran both schools appointed the teachers from one school to another or the teachers demanded to be transferred to the other school. Thus, the teachers in both schools shared a similar background. In addition, the same ELT materials were used in both schools following the same ELT curriculum. Finally, the teachers in each school sharing the same language teaching philosophy taught the experimental and the control groups. In short, other than the student-generated story writing process, the experimental and the control groups were exposed to the same ELT process in almost identical education contexts.

2.3 *The story writing process*

Each student in one class from the experimental group was required to write a story in a particular week. Thus, 24 stories for each grade (9, 10, 11, and 12) on average were written for each week. Each

student wrote one story throughout the academic year. To maintain a level-appropriate grammar and vocabulary content for the students, the stories had to be written during class time without referring to any ELT resources (grammar book, coursebook, dictionary, etc.). In other words, they were on their own and had to depend on their current level of English while creating their stories. In this way, the students were discouraged from using the language beyond their current level of competence, which would guarantee an optimal level of difficulty for their fellow readers. The students' stories were inspired from their personal experiences or the books and movies they have been ex-posed to. When the stories were completed, the teachers collected and edited them only for accuracy without changing the language. They were then edited by native speaker teachers following the same principle-accuracy. Later, all the stories were compiled in the form of a reader and printed indicating the names of the student who authored the stories (see Appendix 1). Their audiotapes were prepared, and the stories were distributed for student use. The number of the weeks, which signaled the level of the stories, was marked on each book to help students find books of the appropriate level in that academic year or for the following academic years. Thus, a 34-staged (one set of stories per week) array of learner-generated readers were provided for the appreciation of other students in the same school. As an appreciation for their efforts, the students were awarded "performance grades" for their stories, which directly affected their final English grade. The authorship of the stories was also another source of motivation for the students.

2.4 Treatment

The students across all grades in both groups received ten hours of EFL instruction per week. At the beginning of the academic year, all the students were given a persuasive talk about how a foreign language could be learned. In this talk, the role of pleasure reading was strongly emphasized. Hence, the students were academically and psychologically prepared and oriented for the language instruction. The students in both groups practiced pleasure reading in their free time. On average, the students in the experimental group did about 120-page pleasure reading per week for 36 weeks, and the control group about 50. For the control groups, a classroom library consisting of about 400 graded readers of different stages published by international ELT publishers was available for students to choose from, to match their levels and interests. Other pleasure reading-related tasks implemented in the experimental group are summarized as follows: The students read the stories written by their peers. For each story they read, they filled out the book report and filed them in their pleasure reading folder in a chronological order (see Appendix 2), which served for both self-evaluation and teacher-student collaborative evaluation. The cumulative pleasure reading page average was written on the classroom board each week and kept there for that particular week so that the students could check their cumulative average with that of the class. It served as a benchmark and motivated the students to read more to keep up with their class average. In addition, for each week, one pleasure reading chart was used in the classroom depending on the level of the students (see Appendix 3). These got increasingly more complex, and linguistically and cognitively more demanding as the students improved their English levels. For example, in the very early stages of the instruction, the students were required to write down only the title of the reader and characters in the story in Task 1, whereas, in the later stages, they were asked to compare two characters in Task 14 (see Appendix 3). The tasks were not time-consuming and helped create a genuine interactive context in the classroom. One of the charts considering the level of the students was distributed to the students and a class hour a week was allotted to complete it. In that class hour, the students reflected on what they read and expressed their ideas about it within a group using the distributed chart. Since each student shared what they read with the other group members, the chart completion turned into real information-gap activities and communicative tasks. After completing the chart, each group posted it on the bulletin board for a week and the rest of the class were welcome to write their comments about the stories on the posted charts. Thus, the group work evolved into classwork. It turned into an interactive task because some students might have read the same books and were encouraged to add their reflections on the weekly charts of other groups. One-to-one teacher-student individual conferences with the students were also held about their pleasure reading process and the teachers guided the students about their pleasure reading process based

on pleasure reading and student self-report folders. During the academic year, the guidance and emphasis on pleasure reading were handled as an ongoing issue.

2.5 Data collection

A mixed-methods design was implemented to collect both qualitative and quantitative data to draw a more informed conclusion about the impact of LGM on the attitudes and English development of the students.

2.5.1 Reader evaluation questionnaire

To obtain the attitudes of the students towards the stories for pleasure reading, the reader evaluation questionnaire was administered to both experimental and control groups in week 33 of the 36-week academic year (see Appendix 4). The questionnaire was developed by Dawkins in 2010 (cited in Dawkins, 2017) and used for economically disadvantaged African American students in California (Dawkins, 2017). The experimental group answered the questionnaire for the learner-generated readers, the control for the graded readers published by the international publishers. Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire, which was found to be 90.5.

2.5.2 Follow-up semi-structured interview

To triangulate the data obtained from the questionnaire, a follow-up, a semi-structured interview was carried out with the experimental group about the stories they wrote and the ones they read which, were constructed by their peers (see Appendix 5). Follow-up interviews were conducted in weeks 34 and 35.

2.5.3 OPT

OPT is an online computer adaptive test which adjusts the difficulty level of questions considering the responses given by test takers. The responses of the learners are automatically marked and instant results showing the level of test-takers, ranging from Pre-A1 to C2 CEFR levels, are provided. To see the effect of learner-generated stories on the language development of students, OPT was used as a pre-test and post-test for both the groups in the 9th grade. It was administered as a pre-test in the first week and as a post-test in the final week of the academic year.

2.6 Data collection

SPSS was used to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaires and OPT. To see if there was a significant difference between the responses given by the experimental group and control group one-way ANOVA (between subjects 2X12) was used. The same analysis was also carried out to investigate if the grade levels (9, 10, 11, 12) of the students affected their responses to the questionnaire. To investigate the effects of pleasure reading within each group, paired sample T-test was used to compare the pre-test and post-test scores, independent samples T-test was used to compare pre-test and post-test scores between the two groups. Finally, the semi-structured interview was transcribed, and the content analysis was done. The data obtained from the semi-structured interview was categorized and coded.

3 Results

3.1 Reader evaluation questionnaire

The experimental group evaluated LGM and the control group evaluated the graded readers from international publishers. The results below summarize the cumulative evaluation of both types of materials.

Table 1 and Table 2 present one-way ANOVA results to test if there is a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in terms of their attitudes towards the materials.

Table 1. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	1254107,220	1	1254107,220	45383,601	,000
Group	52312,405	1	52312,405	1893,080	,000
Error	6576,770	238	27,633		

P<0.05

Table 1 indicated that there was a significant difference between the responses given to the questionnaire by the experimental and control group at the p<.05 level for the conditions [F (1, 1) = 1.893, p=0.00].

Table 2. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Including Grades (9, 10, 11,12)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	1242051,822	1	1242051,822	46922,827	,000
Grade	290,135	3	96,712	3,654	,013
Group	52187,532	1	52187,532	1971,565	,000
Grade * Group	168,353	3	56,118	2,120	,098
Error	6141,063	232	26,470		

P<0.05

Table 2 indicated that there was no significant difference between the responses given to the questionnaire by the grades (9,10,11,12) of the students in the experimental and control group at the p<.05 level for the conditions [F (1, 3) = 2.120, p=0.98].

Table 3 summarizes the questionnaire results for the 9th graders.

Table 3. Questionnaire results for the 9th graders

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Storyline	Experimental	35	91,6735	3,88128	27,422	48,374	,000
	Control	29	57,9310	5,60594			
Character Elements	Experimental	35	89,7143	6,73356	25,171	61,496	,000
	Control	33	43,2323	8,35351			
Vocabulary	Experimental	34	81,1765	7,60482	28,369	45,893	,000
	Control	34	40,5882	3,42997			
Accuracy	Experimental	35	84,7619	7,85014	24,499	65,229	,000
	Control	34	34,9020	8,99814			
Size & Shape	Experimental	35	88,2857	10,70616	7,259	67,327	,000
	Control	35	70,5714	9,68409			
Font	Experimental	35	86,5714	6,03561	-,723	52,000	,473
	Control	33	88,0303	9,99526			

Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	91,4286	7,72424	1,861	63,633	,067
	Control	35	87,4286	10,10034			
Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	92,0000	7,97053	4,264	62,363	,000
	Control	35	82,2857	10,86974			
Length	Experimental	35	96,5714	9,05631	21,782	67,576	,000
	Control	35	47,4286	9,80482			
Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	87,4286	9,80482	23,683	66,703	,000
	Control	35	35,4286	8,52086			
Activities	Experimental	35	88,0000	9,94100	22,275	67,987	,000
	Control	35	35,4286	9,80482			
Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	72,5714	13,79319	13,865	60,789	,000
	Control	35	33,1429	9,63188			

P<0.05

The data showed that in terms of the items related to “storyline, character elements, vocabulary, length, vocabulary and language, activities, a window into fiction, accuracy, size, and shape, and supplemental materials” a significant difference was observed between the two groups. On the other hand, in terms of “font and the appearance of the pages and the front cover” no significant difference was observed between the two groups.

Table 4 summarizes the questionnaire results for the 10th graders.

Table 4. Questionnaire results for the 10th graders

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Storyline	Experimental	35	89,6327	5,84250	13,271	47,167	,000
	Control	31	62,4885	9,97253			
Character Elements	Experimental	34	84,5098	9,53047	16,388	65,703	,000
	Control	34	47,8431	8,90966			
Vocabulary	Experimental	34	93,5294	3,84385	32,931	49,617	,000
	Control	35	44,5714	7,88337			
Accuracy	Experimental	35	89,9048	7,29785	21,524	58,526	,000
	Control	35	41,3333	11,17888			
Size & Shape	Experimental	35	88,2857	9,54424	4,532	67,677	,000
	Control	35	78,2857	8,90661			
Font	Experimental	34	89,1176	7,12131	-,500	62,289	,619
	Control	35	90,1429	9,73817			
Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	81,1429	8,66753	-3,589	65,519	,001
	Control	35	89,4286	10,55597			
Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	80,2857	11,75378	-2,298	66,349	,025
	Control	35	86,2857	10,02518			
Length	Experimental	34	97,6471	6,54070	22,594	58,986	,000
	Control	35	52,0000	9,94100			
Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	88,0000	9,94100	20,027	67,932	,000
	Control	35	41,1429	9,63188			
Activities	Experimental	35	85,7143	14,20143	15,367	59,817	,000
	Control	35	41,1429	9,63188			
Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,881	62,724	,000
	Control	35	41,1429	13,67080			

P<0.05

The data reflect a significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the items about “storyline, character elements, vocabulary, length, vocabulary and language, activities, a window into fiction, accuracy, size, and shape, the appearance of the pages, and the front cover and supplemental materials”. In terms of “font”, there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Table 5 summarizes the questionnaire results for the 11th graders.

Table 5. Questionnaire results for the 11th graders

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)																																																																																																																																
Storyline	Experimental	33	88,9177	5,87964	13,001	45,807	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	32	59,2857	11,52037				Character Elements	Experimental	33	88,2828	6,87796	19,794	60,449	,000	Control	35	47,2381	10,01586	Vocabulary	Experimental	33	89,4949	7,45920	22,564	64,966	,000	Control	35	44,3810	8,99424	Accuracy	Experimental	34	84,1176	7,15668	18,165	54,507	,000	Control	35	39,8095	12,47069	Size & Shape	Experimental	34	89,7059	8,69876	4,919	61,374	,000	Control	35	77,1429	12,26459	Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000
Character Elements	Experimental	33	88,2828	6,87796	19,794	60,449	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	47,2381	10,01586				Vocabulary	Experimental	33	89,4949	7,45920	22,564	64,966	,000	Control	35	44,3810	8,99424	Accuracy	Experimental	34	84,1176	7,15668	18,165	54,507	,000	Control	35	39,8095	12,47069	Size & Shape	Experimental	34	89,7059	8,69876	4,919	61,374	,000	Control	35	77,1429	12,26459	Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965								
Vocabulary	Experimental	33	89,4949	7,45920	22,564	64,966	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	44,3810	8,99424				Accuracy	Experimental	34	84,1176	7,15668	18,165	54,507	,000	Control	35	39,8095	12,47069	Size & Shape	Experimental	34	89,7059	8,69876	4,919	61,374	,000	Control	35	77,1429	12,26459	Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																				
Accuracy	Experimental	34	84,1176	7,15668	18,165	54,507	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	39,8095	12,47069				Size & Shape	Experimental	34	89,7059	8,69876	4,919	61,374	,000	Control	35	77,1429	12,26459	Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																
Size & Shape	Experimental	34	89,7059	8,69876	4,919	61,374	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	77,1429	12,26459				Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																												
Font	Experimental	34	88,3824	6,93264	,061	52,197	,952																																																																																																																																
	Control	34	88,2353	12,24017				Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																								
Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	34	89,4118	8,85615	,764	61,468	,448																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	87,4286	12,44821				Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480	Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																				
Supplemental Materials	Experimental	34	75,5882	11,06213	-3,244	64,350	,002																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	85,4286	14,00480				Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224	Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																																
Length	Experimental	35	87,4286	12,91211	11,268	66,689	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	54,8571	11,21224				Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407	Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																																												
Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	89,7143	10,14185	16,842	64,276	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	42,8571	12,96407				Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158	Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																																																								
Activities	Experimental	34	79,4118	14,34239	11,396	66,791	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	38,2857	15,62158				Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																																																																				
Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	88,0000	11,06133	15,45	62,663	,000																																																																																																																																
	Control	35	39,4286	14,93965																																																																																																																																			

P<0.05

The results reveal that a significant difference between the two groups about “storyline, character elements, vocabulary, length, vocabulary and language, activities, window into fiction, accuracy, size and shape, and supplemental materials” No significant difference was observed between the two groups in terms of “font and the appearance of the pages and the front cover”

Table 6 summarizes the questionnaire results for the 12th graders.

Table 6. Questionnaire results for the 12th graders

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)																																																																																
Storyline	Experimental	35	89,1429	7,55293	12,760	48,228	,000																																																																																
	Control	30	57,4286	11,68072				Character Elements	Experimental	34	90,0000	9,17470	20,599	66,691	,000	Control	35	45,3333	8,82658	Vocabulary	Experimental	31	87,7419	9,28508	22,801	55,771	,000	Control	35	40,9524	7,07437	Accuracy	Experimental	35	79,2381	8,20831	19,971	64,480	,000	Control	35	34,4762	10,41438	Size & Shape	Experimental	35	94,5714	8,16840	8,001	57,018	,000	Control	35	73,7143	13,08023	Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001
Character Elements	Experimental	34	90,0000	9,17470	20,599	66,691	,000																																																																																
	Control	35	45,3333	8,82658				Vocabulary	Experimental	31	87,7419	9,28508	22,801	55,771	,000	Control	35	40,9524	7,07437	Accuracy	Experimental	35	79,2381	8,20831	19,971	64,480	,000	Control	35	34,4762	10,41438	Size & Shape	Experimental	35	94,5714	8,16840	8,001	57,018	,000	Control	35	73,7143	13,08023	Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910								
Vocabulary	Experimental	31	87,7419	9,28508	22,801	55,771	,000																																																																																
	Control	35	40,9524	7,07437				Accuracy	Experimental	35	79,2381	8,20831	19,971	64,480	,000	Control	35	34,4762	10,41438	Size & Shape	Experimental	35	94,5714	8,16840	8,001	57,018	,000	Control	35	73,7143	13,08023	Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																				
Accuracy	Experimental	35	79,2381	8,20831	19,971	64,480	,000																																																																																
	Control	35	34,4762	10,41438				Size & Shape	Experimental	35	94,5714	8,16840	8,001	57,018	,000	Control	35	73,7143	13,08023	Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																																
Size & Shape	Experimental	35	94,5714	8,16840	8,001	57,018	,000																																																																																
	Control	35	73,7143	13,08023				Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060	Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																																												
Font	Experimental	34	92,6471	8,09370	1,685	65,877	,097																																																																																
	Control	34	89,2647	8,45060				Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758	Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																																																								
Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	Experimental	35	92,8571	9,25820	1,376	67,743	,173																																																																																
	Control	35	89,7143	9,84758				Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																																																																				
Supplemental Materials	Experimental	35	74,8571	12,68891	-3,430	66,556	,001																																																																																
	Control	35	84,5714	10,93910																																																																																			

Length	Experimental	35	86,8571	11,82506	13,690	66,393	,000
	Control	35	50,8571	10,10865			
Vocabulary & Language	Experimental	35	81,1429	10,78436	16,067	66,341	,000
	Control	35	36,0000	12,64911			
Activities	Experimental	35	73,7143	13,52247	13,087	65,745	,000
	Control	35	34,8571	11,21224			
Window into Fiction	Experimental	35	83,4286	11,36115	17,210	67,818	,000
	Control	35	35,4286	11,96634			

P<0.05

The results indicate that with respect to the items about “storyline, character elements, vocabulary, length, vocabulary and language, activities, a window into fiction, accuracy, size, and shape, and supplemental materials” a significant difference was observed between the two groups. On the other hand, in terms of “font and the appearance of the pages and the front cover” no significant difference was observed between the two groups.

Table 7 summarizes the percentages given to the items on the questionnaire by the experimental and control groups.

Table 7. Percentages given to the items on the questionnaire by the experimental and control groups

		1= Poor, 2= Below Average, 3= Average, 4= Good, 5= Excellent									
(1) Story Elements		1		2		3		4		5	
		E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C
Storyline	Storyline is funny, contains age-appropriate humor	0	2.1	0	56.4	2.8	41.4	46.4	0	50.7	0
	Story line contains material most young readers will find interesting and engaging;	0	2.8	0	61.8	2.1	35.2	47.4	0	50.3	0
	Storyline contains suspense	0	0	0	6.5	2.8	29.1	44.2	40.1	52.8	24.0
	Storyline offers opportunities for prediction	0	5.1	0	51.4	5	41.1	40	2.2	55	0
	Plot is well-developed, well-rounded, multidimensional	0	0.7	0	55.6	3.5	36.8	37.4	3.0	58.9	3.7
	Story contains a logical sequence of events	0	0	0	10.7	4.2	26.6	49.2	42.4	46.4	20.1
	Storyline contains action	0	0.7	0	15.9	2.8	25.3	40.7	37.6	56.4	20.2
Character Elements	Characters are well-rounded and multi-dimensional	0	5	0	55.7	10.8	36.4	47.8	2.1	41.3	0.7
	Character roles demonstrate equality with leadership roles and decision-making	0	6.5	0	58.6	5.0	34.7	48.5	0	46.3	0
	Characters of varied genders, races, and ages serve as leaders	0	5.0	0	66.9	2.8	28.0	45.7	0	51.4	0
Vocabulary	Vocabulary is age-appropriate for the age/grade level of the students	0	3.5	0	78.5	2.2	17.8	59.2	0	38.5	0
	Vocabulary is developmentally-appropriate for the age/grade level of the students	0	2.8	0	81.2	3.5	15.1	38.8	0.7	57.5	0
	Vocabulary contains rhyme and rhythmic content	0	2.8	0	82.1	14.5	15	43.0	0	42.3	0
Length	Length of the book is appropriate for the age/grade level	0	0	0	45	4.3	53.5	30.9	1.4	64.7	0
(2) Cultural Content											
Vocabulary & Language	Book contains vocabulary and language that match the culture of the reader	0	19.2	0	67.1	2.8	13.5	61.4	0	35.7	0

Activities	Book contains story content or illustrations depicting activities or traditions consistent with the culture of the reader	0	25	0	62.8	20.8	12.1	49.6	0	29.4	0
Window into Fiction	Book provides a window into fiction, imagination	0	28.5	0	56.4	15	15	52.8	0	32.1	0
Accuracy	Book contains story content and pictures that accurately depict the culture of the reader	0	34.2	0.7	51.4	16.4	14.2	50	0	32.8	0
	Book contains story content and/or pictures that accurately depict physical environment	0	25.8	0	60.4	10.7	12.9	46.0	0.7	43.1	0
	Book contains story content and/or pictures that accurately depict social interaction from members of the reader's culture	0	21.4	0	61.4	17.1	17.1	45.7	0	37.1	0
(3) Book Elements											
Size & Shape	Book is large in size	0	0	0	18.5	5.0	49.2	41.0	29.2	53.9	2.8
	Book has a nice shape	0	0	0	0.7	1.4	9.2	43.8	46.4	54.6	43.5
Font	Font type is attractive	0	0	0	0.7	2.1	6.4	42.0	44.6	55.7	48.2
	Font is clearly readable and not covered by illustrations	0	0	0	0.7	15.1	5	48.2	44.2	36.6	50
	Font is large and easily readable or interpretable by the reader	0	0	0	0.7	0.7	2.8	47.4	45.6	51.7	50.7
	Font color is easy to view by reader	0	0	0	1.4	0.7	3.5	42.7	47.4	56.5	47.4
Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	The appearance of the book pages is glossy, not matte	0	0	0	0.7	1.4	4.2	55.3	47.8	43.1	47.1
	The appearance of the book cover is glossy, not matte	0	0	0	0.7	2.8	1.4	48.9	51.4	48.2	46.4
Supplemental Materials	Compact disc or media accompanies the book;	0	0	0	0.7	20.1	5	54.6	61.4	25.1	32.8
	Compact disc or media supports or extends book/story content;	0	0	0	0.7	25.8	7.8	46.0	62.1	28.0	29.2

The table summarizes the whole picture of the responses given by the experimental and control groups. The data divulge that in terms of “storyline, character elements, vocabulary, length, vocabulary and language, activities, a window into fiction, and accuracy” the difference between the responses given by both groups was clearly observed. These constructs were positively evaluated by the experimental group. With respect to “size and shape” the responses given by both groups were similar. Finally, the responses provided to the “font, the appearance of the pages and the front cover, and supplemental materials” were similar.

3.2 Semi-structured interview

The data obtained from the experimental group through the follow-up semi-structured interview is summarized as follows:

3.2.1 The ideas of story writing

All the students reported that the idea of writing stories for their peers and reading the stories written by their peers was a great one. Majority of the students (77%) said that they felt lucky and privileged in taking part in the project. Most of the students (63%) stated that they had never imagined that they would write a story in English.

3.2.2 The initial reactions of the students about story writing

An overwhelming majority of students (94%) mentioned when they heard about the project at the beginning, they felt frustrated and had doubts about whether they could manage the task. Especially when they heard that they would write the stories without referring to any references it placed great pressure on them. Moreover, 40% of the students reported that the stories would be printed with their names on them and their peers and teachers might not appreciate what they would write, which was a cause of stress for them.

3.2.3 The Challenges the Students Faced

Regarding the challenges faced during the story writing process, 94% of the students said that they were not allowed to exploit any resources in English and that their teachers did not help while they were writing the stories, which was challenging for them. Furthermore, 37% of the students indicated that they experienced problems with finding a story to write about.

3.2.4 Overall Student Impression about Story Writing

The majority of the students (89%) stated that they discovered their potential as writers. Besides, 54% of the students visualized their peers and other students reading their stories in the following years and it fascinated them. Likewise, 80% of the students said that they enjoyed the process of writing a story and generating an imaginary plot and characters. Finally, 34% of students indicated self-satisfaction, the feeling that they were able to write a story in English.

3.2.5 The Learners' Impression on their Printed Stories

All the students reported that seeing the books composed of their stories printed with their names made them very happy. About one-third of the students (31%) stated that they were proud of themselves as a whole group because they overcame a very demanding project. They were all writers and they all felt special and privileged. Finally, 1% of the students said that story writing in English symbolized their mastery over English.

3.2.6 The Feedback They Got from their Peers about their Stories

As 80% of the student mentioned that their friends congratulated them about the stories they authored, 21% of the students indicated that their friends gave some suggestions about their stories. Only 12% of them said that they would revise their stories based on their friends' suggestions.

3.2.7 Student Motivation to Continue Story Writing

While 91% of the students said that they would like to continue writing stories in English, 1% of the students indicated that the task was too demanding and preferred not to write stories again.

3.2.8 The Ideas of the Learners about the Stories Written by their Peers

The majority of the students (83%) mentioned that they find something from themselves in each story and identified themselves with them. On the other hand, 1% of the students reported that some stories were too simple.

3.2.9 The Impact of Story Writing on English

All the students said that they felt an inner desire to read all the stories written by their peers at once. Thus, they read more than usual, which contributed to their English. The project increased their motivation for English learning and felt more positive about English. Most of the students (65%) reported that writing helped them organize their ideas better while writing in English.

3.3 OPT

The OPT results showing how learner-generated stories and ready-made ones affected the language development of students are summarized in Tables 8, 9, and 10.

Table 8 summarizes the comparison of the pre-test scores of the experimental and control group.

Table 8. Pre-test scores of the experimental group and control group

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Pre-test	Experimental	35	4.2857	1.17752	.221	65.660	.826
	Control	35	4.2286	.97274			

$P < 0.05$

The data comparing the pre-test scores of both groups show that the scores of the groups were not significantly different, experimental ($M=4.28$, $SD=1.17$) and control ($M=4.22$, $SD=.97$) conditions; $t(65.66)=.221$, $p=.826$.

Table 9 summarizes the comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group and control group.

Table 9. Pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group and control group

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Pre-test	Experimental	35	-17.74286	1.70368	-61.613	34	.000
	Control	35	-16.11429	2.13888	-44.572	34	.000

$P < 0.05$

The data indicate that the pre-test scores of the experimental group were significantly different from its post-test scores, conditions, $t(34)=-61.61$, $p=.00$. The data indicated that the pre-test scores of the control group were significantly different from its post-test scores, conditions, $t(34)=-44.57$, $p=.00$.

Table 10 summarizes the comparison of the post-test scores of the experimental and control group.

Table 10. Post-test scores of the experimental group and control group

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Post-test	Experimental	35	22.0286	2.14868	3.078	67.031	.003
	Control	35	20.3429	2.42466			

$P < 0.05$

The data comparing the post-test scores of both groups reveal that the scores of the groups were not significantly different, experimental ($M=22.02$, $SD=2.14$) and control ($M=20.34$, $SD=2.42$) conditions; $t(67.03)=3.07$, $p=.003$.

The data about OPT reveal that the scores obtained on the pre-test by both groups were not significantly different from each other. When the pre-test and post-test scores were compared within each group, it was observed that the scores of both groups were significantly different from their pre-test scores. However, the comparison of the post-test scores of each group revealed a significant difference between the groups.

4 Discussion

This study investigated the effects of learner-generated stories on students' attitudes and development in their English language skills in comparison to the attitudes towards the readers published by international publishers. The results indicated that the learner-generated stories raised more interest among the students than those

published by the ELT publishers, which aligns with the findings of Azman et al. (2016), Brown et al. (2013), Chen and Liu (2012), and Mennim (2012). The story elements section, which includes the storyline, character elements, vocabulary, and length, impressed the students in the experimental group who read learner-generated stories more than the control group who read the ready-made ones. The students in the experimental group found the events told in the stories, their sequence, and the characters more appealing. They also found the stories more appropriate for their age and language level. Moreover, the story length was also another factor, which provided further satisfaction to the experimental group students.

In terms of cultural content, which covers vocabulary and language, activities, a window into fiction, and accuracy, the experimental group was more positively impressed by the learner-generated stories than the control group reading ready-made readers. The content, vocabulary, and language employed in learner-generated stories were more culturally relevant and pictured the lives of the students, which increased student satisfaction.

The results obtained from the third section, book elements, yielded a different result. In the first two sections, the attitudes towards the learner-generated readers were clearly evaluated more positively than the ready-made ones. However, in the third section, which is about the validity of the stories rather than the content, no clear-cut differences were observed between the learner-generated stories and ready-made ones. Even in terms of page layout and illustrations, the ready-made ones were also evaluated positively as they are designed by professional designers. Besides, they were also supported by international companies and accompanied by periphery materials such as CDs, posters, and quizzes, which might not be supported by individual schools. Thus, the third section looked appealing and provided positive evidence in favor of the ready-made readers.

From the findings given above, the answer to the first research question can be summarized as follows: In terms of the story elements (storyline, character elements, vocabulary, and length) and cultural content (vocabulary and language, activities, window into fiction, accuracy) the students in the experimental group displayed positive attitudes towards the learner-generated stories. However, in terms of book elements (size and shape, font, the appearance of the pages and the front cover, and supplemental materials) both groups demonstrated positive attitudes for both learner-generated stories and ready-made ones.

The experimental group did better than the control group on OPT. Although, both the control and experimental groups got similar results on the pre-test, the post-test results differed significantly. At the end of the academic year, the OPT was administered as a post-test and it was observed that the students in the experimental group did better than the control group. These findings corroborate those of Beglar et al., (2012), Chen and Liu (2012), Cho (2017), Elley and Mangubhai (1983), Hafiz and Tudor (1989), Gradman and Hanania (1991), and Green, Inan, and Maushak (2014). Thus, the OPT results provide the answer to the second research question: The learner-generated materials helped the students in the experimental group improve their English more than the control group reading ready-made materials.

5 Conclusion and limitations

5.1 Conclusion

Firstly, the students in the experimental group were enthusiastic knowing that they would pioneer the learner-generated reader development process. It made them feel special and privileged. Engaging the whole school in the project created a novelty effect. The results of the study also supported the positive atmosphere at the school. It indicated that the learner-generated readers created a positive

impact on the EFL students. Generally speaking, they were fascinated with writing their own stories. Knowing that their stories were being circulated around and read by their peers made them proud and happy. Addressing a larger audience in the given academic year and the following academic years motivated and made them invest more time and energy in the tasks. Managing a real task in the target language, English, provided self-satisfaction. Moreover, they also favored reading the stories written by their friends who spoke the same language as them. The plot of the story was from their own world, with which they felt affiliated. In addition to the culturally relevant and appealing content employed, the language and vocabulary use at their level deemed the stories compelling and comprehensive for them.

Besides the story-generating process, the project encouraged the experimental group to read more either due to interest in their peers' work or the appealing nature of the stories. Whatever their reason was, they read more and were consequently exposed to more comprehensible samples of English, which consequently fostered their English language development.

The project, which put the students in the center, complies with the current educational philosophy. They actively participated in the task and forced themselves to do better knowing that their stories had a real audience. The majority of the students had never thought of generating stories before, thus the project also helped them discover their own potential. They also received feedback from their peers to some extent and planned to revise their stories. This created a collaborative atmosphere, which the modern education philosophy preaches. Most probably, the pleasure of achievement and self-satisfaction triggered self-discovery.

To the knowledge of the researcher, there is no such a comprehensive project carried out by the whole school to produce their own language learning materials. It is hoped that this project also inspires others to implement such projects to develop their local LGM, customized for their own context.

5.2 Limitations

The study is accompanied by limitations. First of all, the reader evaluation questionnaire was answered by two different groups, control and experimental. The nature of the groups might have affected their answers. It would have been better if the experimental group had answered the same questionnaire, one for the learner-generated readers and one for the ready-made readers separately. However, in that case, it would have not been possible to study the effects of different readers on the English language development of participants. Moreover, there was the risk that the students in the experimental group might have been prejudiced and evaluated their stories more positively.

The experimental group read more in comparison to the control group. It may have not stemmed from only the type of materials but from the more and continuous emphasis put on the story writing process and the role of pleasure reading in the experimental group. The difference in the amount of reading between the two groups might have affected the OPT score, not only the LGM themselves. Thus, the difference in success must have definitely been affected by the amount of reading not only the type of readers, learner-generated versus ready-made. Moreover, the students also followed an EFL program and during the period between the pre-test and post-test, many factors did have an effect on their English Language development. In other words, pleasure reading was one of the factors affecting language development. Thus, it was impossible to calculate to what extent pleasure reading contributed to the exam scores the control and experimental groups.

References

- Azman, F. N., Zaibon, S. B., & Shiratuddin, N. (2016). A study on user's perception towards learner-generated comics. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(8S), 37–42.
- Bakla, A. (2018). Learner-generated materials in a flipped pronunciation class: A sequential explanatory mixed-methods study. *Computers & Education*, 125, 14–38.
- Beglar, D., Hunt, A., & Kite, Y. (2012). The effect of pleasure reading on Japanese university EFL learners' reading rates. *Language Learning*, 62(3), 665–703.
- Brown, H., Iyobe, B., & Riley, P. (2013). An evaluation of the use of student-generated materials. *Language Teacher*, 37, 3–10.

- Chen, C. J., & Liu, P. L. (2012). Comparisons of learner-generated versus instructor-provided multimedia annotations. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET)*, 11(4), 72–83.
- Cho, S. K. (2017). A student in Korea discovers the power of reading. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 12(2), 9–14.
- Dawkins, B. K. (2010). *Book selections of economically disadvantaged African American students*. ProQuest/UMI Dissertation Publishing, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Dawkins, B. K. (2017). Need help choosing good books for students? A book selection study, book selection checklist, and a discussion of how educators can select books that engage young readers of color and possibly improve reading achievement. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 4(49), 1–10.
- Dowling, S. (2013). Using blogs to share learner-generated content. *TESL-EJ*, 17(2), 1–22.
- Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53–67.
- Ellidokuzoglu, H. (2017). Towards a receptive paradigm in foreign language teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 2(1), 20–39.
- Engin, M. (2014). Extending the flipped classroom model: Developing second language writing skills through student-created digital videos. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 14(5), 12–26.
- Gradman, H. L., & Hanania, E. (1991). Language learning background factors and ESL proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(1), 39–51.
- Green, L. S., Inan, F. A., & Maushak, N. (2014). A case study: The role of student-generated videocasts in K-12 language learner academic language and content acquisition. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 46(3), 297–324.
- Hafiz, F. M., & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and the development of language skills. *ELT Journal*, 43(1), 4–13.
- Hudd, S. S. (2003). Syllabus under construction: Involving students in the creation of class assignments. *Teaching Sociology*, 195–202.
- Isik, A. (2000). The role of input in second language acquisition: more comprehensible input supported by grammar instruction or more grammar instruction? *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 129, 225–274.
- Isik, A. (2018). *Yabancı dil nasıl öğrenilmez? Nasıl öğrenilir?* Ankara: Elma Yayınevi.
- Isik, A. & Krashen, S. (2020). The long-term effects of comprehension-based instruction. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 62(3), 3–8.
- Kilickaya, F., & Krajka, J. (2012). Can the use of web-based comic strip creation tool facilitate EFL learners' grammar and sentence writing? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(6), 161–165.
- Krashen, S. (2004). *The power of reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann and Westport: Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (2013). *Second language acquisition: Theory, applications, and some conjectures*. Mexico City: Cambridge University.
- Krashen, S. (2016). Compelling reading and problem-solving: the easy way (and the only way) to high levels of language, literacy and life competence. In *Epoch making in English language teaching and learning. Twenty-fifth International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp. 115–125).
- Krashen, S. D. (2017). The role of input (reading) and instruction in developing writing ability. *Lenguas Modernas*, 9–10, 23–35.
- Krashen, S. Lee, S. Y., & Lao, C. (2017). *Comprehensible and compelling: The causes and effects of free voluntary reading*. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited. ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Liu, S. H. J., & Lan, Y. J. (2016). Social Constructivist Approach to web-based EFL learning: Collaboration, motivation, and perception on the use of Google Docs. *Educational Technology & Society*, 19(1), 171–186.
- Mennim, P. (2012). Peer teaching and learner-generated materials: Introducing students to new roles. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(2), 230–242.
- Mori, S. (2015). If you build it, they will come: From a "field of dreams" to a more realistic view of extensive reading in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 129–135.
- Ponniiah, R. J., & Priya, J. (2014). Pleasure reading and the acquisition of second language by adult ESL students. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 4(1), 16–22.
- Pruzinsky, T. (2014). Read books. Every day. Mostly for pleasure. *English Journal*, 25–30.
- Sari, R. (2013). Is it possible to improve writing without writing practice? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1), 6–10.
- van Dijk, A. M., & Lazonder, A. W. (2016). Scaffolding students' use of learner-generated content in a technology-enhanced inquiry learning environment. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 24(1), 194–204.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Learner-generated story samples

Sample 1. Emir was a cadet. He loved a girl. One day he decided to escape from the school and meet his girlfriend. His girlfriend lived in Arnavutköy but Arnavutköy was on the other side of the Bosphorus. It was not a problem for Emir because he was a good swimmer. Emir decided to escape but there was a problem. Captain Zafer counted the cadets, and then saw that Emir was not there! Captain Zafer was not surprised. He smiled. "I will find him", said Captain Zafer. Emir was waiting for his girlfriend in Robert College. Suddenly, Captain Zafer jumped down from a tree. Emir was scared. "Sir?", said Emir. "I know you are here", said Captain Zafer. "How?", asked Emir. "Because I am Jake's father. I read her WhatsApp messages", replied Captain Zafer.

Sample 2. One day Mr Mudo was sitting in his office. It was raining. Mr Mudo was looking at the wall and he was thinking about his life, his wife, cases and murders. He was drinking coffee when somebody knocked the door. A fat man entered. He was worried.

"May I learn why you came here?", Mr Mudo said.

He sat on a chair near the fireplace. The fireplace was creating some strange noises. He started to explain the case. Meanwhile, Jack, Mr Scott's brother, was thinking of his mother and crying. He was playing with a pencil. "When I went to Mr Scott's house, I saw a dead boy on the floor. I was very shocked, because he was Mr Scott", said the man.

"Who is he?", Mr Mudo asked him.

"Mr Scott inherited his mother's fortune. He is a rich man. He has a brother, Jack. He was jealous of him, because when their mother died, Mr Scott inherited their mother's whole fortune.", William replied.

"Do you think Jack killed his brother?" Mr Scott asked him.

"Maybe, but I am suspicious of Peter. He was Mr Scott's enemy", William replied.

"Why did you suspect him of killing Mr Scott?", Mr Mudo asked him.

"Although they were good friends, they have fallen out with each other because of money", William replied.

"Mr Scott lent him some money. After a long time, he wanted the money back. Although Peter promised to give his money back, but he did not give it back so they fought with each other and Peter's arm was broken", he continued.

Then, Mr Mudo went to Scott's house with William. When they reached Scott's home, Mr Mudo found a wallet in front of the door. When he looked in the wallet he was surprised, because the wallet belonged to Peter. He entered the house. When he was walking in the house, he searched everywhere. He saw a mark on Mr Scott's body.

This mark was made with a pencil. He took that pencil and he returned back to his office. Policemen arrested Peter.

While Mr Mudo was thinking about this event, a man came in.

"You made a mistake, because Peter was not a murderer. That day, I saw Jack at Mr Scott's house. An hour later he ran away from the house. He looked very worried", he said. Then Peter came home. When he saw Mr Scott's dead body, he began to run for stop. Meanwhile he dropped his wallet in front of the door. Mr Mudo was not wrong. At that moment, Jack understood everything, and decided to escape. Mr Mudo decided to arrest Jack. While he was escaping from the town, the policeman caught him. Jack confessed everything about the murder. The judge sentenced him to 10 years. Mr Mudo solved yet another case.

Then Mr Mudo was drinking coffee. He was thinking about his wife, his life, cases and murders and the pencil. While he was thinking about these, somebody knocked on the door ...

Appendix 2. Book report

Date: _____ Title: _____ Level: _____ Total number of pages: _____

Brief summary:

What did you like about the book?

What didn't you like about the book?

What did it remind you of?

The new words you have learned in the book:

The new expressions or idioms you have learned in the book:

The words or expressions you did not understand:

Book rating: (a) Good. (b) Fair. (c) Poor.

The book was: (a) too easy for me. (b) at the appropriate level for me. (c) too difficult for me.

Further comments:

12. EXTRA ENGLISH WORK REPORT

What did you read?	
Who is the author?	
What is the source of material?	
What is the main idea of reading material?	
Any personal thoughts or comments you have	

13. THE STORY MAP

Event → Plot → Time → Main Characters

↓

at the beginning	Name	Personality	Behavior
in the middle			
at the end			

↓

Conclusion → Moral of the story

14. COMPARISON OF TWO CHARACTERS

What is she like?
(The Big Character)

What is common?

What is different?

15. GROUPING

ONE
TWO
THREE OR MORE

16. QUESTION MARK

17. REWRITING

1. Rewrite the story on page(s) _____ in the form of _____.

2. Rewrite the lesson on page(s) _____ in the form of a _____.

18. ENDINGS

Write a different conclusion to the story.

19. PERSONALIZATION

Imagine that you are one of the main characters in the story. Read the story from your perspective.

20. COMPARISON

Compare the story with another story (if possible with a Turkish one).

21. WORD STUDY

WORDS	DEFINITION	SYNONYM	ANTONYM	CONTEXTUAL MEANING	CONNOTATIONAL VALUE	ASSOCIATIONS

22. ARTICLE/ NEWSPAPER ARTICLE/ MAGAZINE REPORT

Author of the article	
Title of the article	
Genre of the article	
Date the article was published	
Main idea of the article	
Write "to do" from the article	
Please share any personal thoughts or comments you have about the article	

Appendix 4. Reader evaluation chart

The checklist below is designed to evaluate the quality of readers. Rate each reader on a scale of 1 to 5 based on the criteria and description below. Thank you for your cooperation.

- 1- Poor
- 2- Below average
- 3- Average
- 4- Good
- 5- Excellent

	(1) Story Elements	1	2	3	4	5
Storyline	Storyline is funny, contains age-appropriate humor					
	Story line contains material most young readers will find interesting and engaging.					
	Storyline contains suspense					
	Storyline offers opportunities for prediction					
	Plot is well-developed, well-rounded, multidimensional					
	Story contains a logical sequence of events					
	Storyline contains action					
Character Elements	Characters are well-rounded and multi-dimensional					
	Character roles demonstrate equality with leadership roles and decision-making					
	Characters of varied genders, races, and ages serve as leaders					
Vocabulary	Vocabulary is age-appropriate for the age/grade level of the students					
	Vocabulary is developmentally-appropriate for the age/grade level of the students					
	Vocabulary contains rhyme and rhythmic content					
Length	Length of the book is appropriate for the age/grade level					
(2) Cultural Content						
Vocabulary & Language	Book contains vocabulary and language that match the culture of the reader					
Activities	Book contains story content or illustrations depicting activities or traditions consistent with the culture of the reader					
Window into Fiction	Book provides a window into fiction, imagination					
Accuracy	Book contains story content and pictures that accurately depict the culture of the reader					
	Book contains story content and/or pictures that accurately depict physical environment					
	Book contains story content and/or pictures that accurately depict social interaction from members of the reader's culture					
(3) Book Elements						
Size & Shape	Book is large in size					
	Book has a nice shape					
Font	Font type is attractive					
	Font is clearly readable and not covered by illustrations					
	Font is large and easily readable or interpretable by the reader					
	Font color is easy to view by reader					
Appearance of the Pages and the Front Cover	The appearance of the book pages is glossy, not matte					
	The appearance of the book cover is glossy, not matte					
Supplemental Materials	Compact disc or media accompanies the book;					
	Compact disc or media supports or extends book/story content;					

Appendix 5. Semi-structured interview questions

- a) What do you think about the idea of writing stories for your peers?
- b) What did you feel at the very beginning of the project?
- c) What was challenging while writing your stories?
- d) What was enjoyable while writing your story?
- e) What did you feel when your story was printed?
- f) What were your reflections of your friends about your story?
- g) did the story writing process help your English?
- h) Would you like to write a story again?
- i) What do you think about the stories written by your peers?
- j) How did the stories written by your peers help your English?