



Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
14.03.2017	08.04.2017	24.04.2017	10.18298/ijlet.1719

**A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON USING SHORT STORIES:
STATISTICAL AND INFERENTIAL ANALYSES ON THE NON-ENGLISH
MAJOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SPEAKING AND WRITING
ACHIEVEMENTS**

*Jaya Nur IMAN*¹

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to find out whether or not using short stories significantly improve the speaking and writing achievements. A quasi-experimental study of non-equivalent pretest-posttest control group design or comparison group design was used in this research. The population of this research was the all first semester undergraduate students of urban and regional planning study program of Indo Global Mandiri University. Forty students were selected as the sample by using purposive sampling technique in which each group consisted of 20 students, respectively. The treatment was given for 14 meetings. This research was primarily concerned on the quantitative data in the form of the students' speaking and writing scores. Rubrics were used to measure the students' speaking and writing achievements. The findings showed that (1) there was a significant improvement on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not, (2) there was also a significant mean difference on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements between the experimental and control groups, (3) the aspect of speaking and writing skill gave high contribution on the students' speaking and writing achievements in the experimental group. The highest contribution of speaking skill (aspects) toward the speaking achievement (total) was fluency. Meanwhile the highest contribution of writing skill (aspects) toward the writing achievement (total) was vocabulary. Hence, it could be concluded that using short stories significantly improve the students' speaking and writing achievements. The pedagogical implication of the research is that the teachers should ponder the integration of literature instruction in the academic classroom as this could develop the EFL learners' motivation to speak and write in terms of the exposure of interesting authentic materials.

Key Words: Short stories, speaking and writing achievement, quasi-experimental

1. Introduction

Recently, there has been a remarkable revival of interest in literature as one of the most motivating resources for language learning (Duff & Maley, 2007). In addition, using literature in language teaching is also very advantageous for it offers four benefits: authentic material, cultural enrichment, language advancement, and personal growth (Collie & Slater, 1991). This is in line with Erkaya (2005) who notes four benefits of using of short stories to teach ESL/EFL, i.e. motivational, literary, cultural and higher-order thinking benefits. The idea is also emphasized by Collie and Slater (1991, p. 196) when they list four advantages of using short stories for language teachers. First, short stories are practical as their length is long enough to cover entirely in one or

¹ English Lecturer, University of Indo Global Mandiri, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Indonesia, jaya.nur.iman95@gmail.com.

two class sessions. Second, short stories are not complicated for students to work with on their own. Third, short stories have a variety of choice for different interests and tastes. Finally, short stories can be used with all levels (beginner to advance), all ages (young learners to adults) and all classes (morning, afternoon, or evening classes). Thus, it is vivid that integrating short stories as one of instructional media is very prominent to be instructed in English teaching and learning environment because this is very potential and effective to empower students' four integrated language skills.

Reading short stories can be an input to practice other language skills. Firstly, short stories can be an input to oral skill practice. After finishing reading, students can be asked to narrate the story in their own words, to give chronological sequences of events in the story, to paraphrase or to give a summary of the story. Besides, students can do the role play, act out some parts of the story, or dramatize the characters in the story (Khorashadyzadeh, 2014, p. 10). Similarly, Short stories allow instructors to teach the four skills to all levels of language proficiency. Murdoch (2002) indicates that "short stories can, if selected and exploited appropriately, provide quality text content which will greatly enhance ELT courses for learners at intermediate levels of proficiency" (p. 9). He explains why stories should be used to reinforce ELT by discussing activities instructors can create such as writing and acting out dialogues.

In addition, the critical thought that short stories are the most appropriate literary genre to use in English language teaching due to its shortness is emphasized by Hirvela & Boyle's (1988) study on adult Hong Kong Chinese students' attitudes towards four genres of literary texts (short story, novel, poetry and drama) indicated short stories as the genre that is less feared and the second most enjoyed (43%; the novel is the most enjoyed with 44%), since short stories are easy to finish and definite to understand. This is also in line with Pardede's (2010) research findings on the interest, perceptions, and the perceived needs of the students of the English teachers training of Christian University of Indonesia towards the incorporation of short story in language skills classes. The research revealed that a majority of the respondents basically found short stories interesting to use both as materials for self-enjoyment and of as components language skill classes. Most of them also agreed or strongly agreed that the incorporation of short stories in language skills classes will help learners achieve better mastery of language skills. They even believed that English teacher candidates should master the skills of employing short stories to teach language skills. In addition, the statistical analysis revealed that the students' interest and perceptions were positively and significantly correlated, and both variables significantly affected each other.

A study suggested that "the teaching of literature in EFL classes is essential and can be used as a perfect instrument to stimulate and speed up the teaching and learning process." (Carter & Long, 1991, p.126). However, providing opportunities speak and write may give the students motivation to learn during reading activities of the new elements to communicate both in oral and written form. In terms of speaking skill, some researches are found on the use of short stories in EFL classroom teaching. According to Gorjian et al. (2011), the instruction of the cognitive strategy of oral summarizing of short stories did affect the pre-intermediate language learners' speaking

skill. Short stories promote students' motivation and this makes them more interested in classroom participation while students who merely and conventionally read the texts especially true ones like documentary texts choose to sit passively on their seats. Seemingly, it is not easy to stimulate these students to take part in classroom activities since they don't have information about it and they are not interested. Also, many, if not all, students enjoy reading stories at least for fun. In addition, Khorashadyzadeh (2014, p. 14) revealed that the technique of reading simplified short stories can enhance the learners' speaking skill. The results also proved that being exposed to suitable literary texts has significant effect on EFL learners' listening skill. It showed that learners' speaking and listening ability (oral skills) in a second or foreign language can depend on their amount of exposure to written authentic or simplified literary texts like short stories.

In terms of writing skill, researches are found on the use of short stories in EFL classroom teaching. Murdoch (2002) explains why stories should be used to reinforce ELT by discussing activities instructors can create such as writing and acting out dialogues. Instructors can create a variety of writing activities to help students to develop their writing skills. They can ask students to write dialogues (p. 9) or more complex writing activities if students have reached a high level of language proficiency. Also, Oster (1989) affirms that literature helps students to write more creatively (p. 85). Additionally, literary texts help students to practice and develop their reading and writing skills and strategies. This can be said to contribute to the development of their reading fluency and proficiency, and writing accuracy. As a result, there may be an increase in students' reading and writing speed and self confidence, and thus the students are able to pay more attention to the overall meaning of what they are reading (Bamford & Day, 2004). Besides through literature, students learn new vocabulary and expand their understanding of words they knew before, which contributes positively to their reading and writing skills consequently (Ono, Day & Harsch, 2004).

In relation to the description above, this research was therefore aimed to investigate whether the use of short stories significantly improved the students' speaking and writing achievements at University of Indo Global Mandiri. This was carried out to forty first semester undergraduate students of urban and regional planning study program in which twenty students were equally divided into two groups that is experimental and control group.

1.1 Research Questions

The questions that were investigated in this research were as follows:

1. Was there any significant improvement on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not?
2. Was there any significant mean difference on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not?

3. How much did the speaking skill (aspects) and writing skill (aspects) contribute to the speaking skill (total) and writing skill (total)?

1.2 Research Hypotheses

According to the above-mentioned research questions, the following hypotheses were proposed:

- Alternative Hypotheses (Ha1) : There was a significant improvement on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not.
- Null Hypotheses (H₀₁) : There was no a significant improvement on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not.
- Alternative Hypotheses (Ha2) : There was a significant mean difference on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not.
- Null Hypotheses (H₀₂) : There was no a significant mean difference on the non-English major university students' speaking and writing achievements after being taught by using short stories than those who were not.
- Alternative Hypotheses (Ha3) : There were some significant contribution of the speaking skill (aspects) and writing skill (aspects) to both the non-English major university students' the speaking skill (total) and writing skill (total).
- Null Hypotheses (H₀₃) : There were no some significant contribution of the speaking skill (aspects) and writing skill (aspects) to both the non-English major university students' the speaking skill (total) and writing skill (total).

2. Method

In this research, the quasi-experimental design was used and it would be primarily concerned on the nonequivalent groups pretest-posttest-control group design or comparison group design. This method will indeed require two groups that are actually experimental and control groups. In the experimental group, the researcher gave a pre-test, treatment by using short stories and then post-test. Meanwhile in the control group, the researcher only gave a pre-test and post-test without any treatment.

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) point out that nonequivalent groups of pretest-posttest-control group design or comparison group design is very prevalent and useful in education. Because it is often impossible to randomly assign subjects. The researcher uses intact, already established groups of subjects, gives a pretest, administers the intervention condition to one group, and gives the post test. The following is the research design used:

Nonequivalent Groups Pretest Posttest Control Group Design			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Intervention</u>	<u>Posttest</u>
A	O1	X	O2
B	O3	-	O4



Time

Source: McMillan and Schumacher, 2010, p.278

Where,

- A : Experimental Group
- B : Control Group
- O1 : Pretest of experimental group
- O2 : Posttest of experimental group
- O3 : Pretest of control group
- O4 : Posttest of control group
- X : Intervention
- : No treatment

2.1 Population and Sample

The research was conducted at the Indo Global Mandiri University. The population of the research was the all first semester undergraduate students of urban and regional planning study program of University of Indo Global Mandiri in the academic year of 2014/2015. Forty students were selected purposively as the research sample in which each group consisted of 20 students, respectively. The undergraduate students involved in this research were all in the same academic year and taught by the same English lecturer and were not having English course during the research was carried out. In order to see the different result of the students' speaking and writing achievements after the given intervention, it would be more effective and efficient if the total number of the sample was not too big. The researcher therefore took one class only for each group that is experimental and control group.

2.2 Instrumentations

In order to collect the data, the speaking and writing tests were used in this research. Pertaining to the speaking test, the students were asked to choose one of the speaking topics provided in the form of monologue. Since both classes were given a pre-test and a post-test, each group was given the same speaking topics for the speaking test. To assess the students' speaking achievement, the researcher used SOLOM (Student Oral Language Observation Matrix) which comprising of the aspects of speaking ability such as, comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation grammar, and fluency. The SOLOM is a rating scale that teachers can use to assess their students' command of oral language on the basis of what they observe on a continual basis in a variety of situations. The teacher matches a student's language performance in comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, grammar, and pronunciation to descriptions on a five-point scale for each. Pertaining to the writing test, the students were asked to write their own story. Since both classes were given a pre-test and a post-test, each group was given the same writing activity for the writing test.

To assess the students' writing achievement, the researcher used analytical writing rubric suggested by Hughes (2004, pp. 91-93) which comprising of the aspects of writing ability, such as: grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, organisation, and fluency. Analytical writing rubric is a rating scale that teachers can use to identify students' strengths and weaknesses in writing and assess their writing product. The teacher matches a students' language production in grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, organisation, and fluency to descriptions on a six-point scale for each.

2.3 Instructional Material and Procedure

The material instructed in this research consisted of some short stories which were taken from Intermediate Stories for Reproduction 1 by L.A. Hill (1973). By selecting stories appropriate to students' level of language proficiency, instructors avoid "frustration reading" (Schulz, 1981, p. 44). In terms of instructional procedure, the control group had a routine teaching procedure in English class. Meanwhile, the task of reading short stories was implemented in the experimental group as the English teaching activity. The instructional procedures are explained as follows: (a) the researcher asked the students to read the short story silently and loudly with their peers in a group, (b) the students made an oral summary in individually from the short story read in front of the class, (c) after the students have read the whole story and have made an oral summary, they are asked to write out three to four paragraphs (written summary) from the short story read. This experiment occurred in 12 teaching sessions in which each session lasted for 90 minutes.

2.4 Validity and Reliability

Pertaining to pursuing a high degree of content validity, the writer administered tests in relation to measure the students' speaking and writing achievements. In order to know whether the topic

about speaking and writing test given were valid, the writer formulated the topic for speaking and writing test by considering the English curriculum and English instructional materials used.

In order to know the result of speaking test in pre-test and post-test, the writer asked two raters to assess students' speaking and writing achievements in both experimental and control group. The raters were chosen on the basis of the three qualifications (a graduate from Magister or Master Degree of English study program, achieving the TOEFL score above 525, and having more 5 years English teaching experiences). Inter-rater reliability for speaking and writing achievements was used to figure out the reliability of the tests. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to check the inter-rater reliability. The result of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient showed that there was a significant correlation between two raters' judgments for both speaking and writing meaning that the two raters' judgments for speaking and writing achievements were reliable.

2.5 Technique of Data Analysis

The data analysis was taken from the tests. The students' scores were divided into two groups that is actually Group A (the scores of the pre-test and post-test of the students who learned through short stories) and Group B (the scores of the pre-test and post-test of the students who learned without short stories). In addition, to interpret the students' score individually, the range of speaking skill used is as follows: excellent (21-25), good (16-20), average (11-15), poor (6-10), and very poor (<6). Meanwhile, the range of writing skill used is as follows: excellent (25-30), good (19-24), average (13-18), poor (7-12), and very poor (<7). In analyzing the data of students' speaking and writing, rubrics were used in this research. Paired sample t-test was used to see whether there was improvement between the students' pretest and posttest for each group. Independent sample t-test was used to see the significant difference between the students' posttest of the two groups. And the Stepwise regression analysis was used to see the contribution of each aspect of speaking and writing skill to both students' speaking and writing achievements.

3. Findings and Discussion

This section discussed the descriptive statistics, the progress analysis (Paired sample t-test), the mean difference analysis (Independent sample t-test), and the percentage analysis of each aspect contribution (Stepwise regression analysis).

3.1 The Descriptive Statistics Analysis

In Table 1, the results showed there was a significant difference in students' Speaking Achievement (SA) and Writing Achievement (WA) in the experimental and control groups. In the experimental group, the SA results showed that 6 students (30%) who were in excellent level with the mean score 21.83, 9 students (45%) who were in good level with the mean score 17.00, and 5 students

(25%) who were in average level with the mean score 14.30. Based on the achievement level presented in Table 1, it could be concluded that the students' speaking achievement of the experimental group was in good category.

In addition, the WA result showed that 2 students (10%) who were in excellent level with the mean score 25.00, 11 students (55%) who were in good level with the mean score 20.31, and 7 students (35%) who were in average level with the mean score 15.50. Based on the achievement level presented in Table 1, it could be concluded that the students' writing achievement of the experimental group was in good category. On the other hand, for the control group, the SA results showed that there was no students in excellent level, 5 students (25%) were in good level with the mean score 16.80, 10 students (50%) were in average level with the mean score 13.85, and 5 students (25%) were in poor level with the mean score 9.20. Based on the achievement level presented in Table 1, it could be concluded that the students' speaking achievement of the control group was in average level.

For WA results, there was no students in excellent level, 3 students (15%) were in good category with the mean score 20.66, 12 students (60%) were in average level with the mean score 15.87, and 5 students (25%) were in poor level with the mean score 11.20. Based on the achievement level presented in Table 1, it could be stated that the students' writing achievement of the control group was in average level.

Table 1. The Result of Speaking Achievement (SA) and Writing Achievement (WA) in Experimental and Control Groups (N=20 each group)

Variable	Level of Achievement	Experimental Group			Control Group		
		Mean Score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)	Mean Score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)
SA	Excellent	21.83	1.211	6 (30%)	-	-	-
	Good	17.00	1.118	9 (45%)	16.80	1.095	5 (25%)
	Average	14.30	1.036	5 (25%)	13.85	0.914	10 (50%)
	Poor	-	-	-	9.20	0.908	5 (25%)
	Very Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Mean		17.77	1.121	20 (100%)	13.28	0.972	20 (100%)
Variable	Level of Achievement	Experimental Group			Control Group		
		Mean Score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)	Mean Score	SD	Frequency and Percentage (%)
WA	Excellent	25.00	0.707	2 (10%)	-	-	-
	Good	20.31	1.632	11 (55%)	20.66	1.040	3 (15%)
	Average	15.50	1.802	7 (35%)	15.87	1.245	12 (60%)
	Poor	-	-	-	11.20	0.570	5 (25%)
	Very Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Mean		20.27	1.380	20 (100%)	15.91	0.951	20 (100%)

Additionally, as presented Table 2, the SA results showed that the mean scores of the students were in the excellent level (21.83), in the good level (16.92), in the average level (14.00), and in the poor level (9.20) respectively. Meanwhile, the WA results showed that, the mean scores of students were in the excellent level (25.00), in the good level (20.11), in the average level (15.73), and in the poor level (11.20) respectively. Moreover, the mean scores of students' speaking and writing achievements in both groups were 15 and 18. It can be concluded that the mean score of the students' speaking and writing achievements were in good level category.

In terms of frequency and percentage, the SA results in both groups showed that 6 students (15%) were in excellent level, 14 students (35%) were in good level, 15 students (37.5%) were in average level, and 5 students (12.5%) were in poor level. Thus, it could be concluded that most of the students' speaking achievement was in good and average levels (72.5%). On the other hand, the WA results in both groups showed that 2 students (5%) in excellent level, 14 students (35%) in good level, 19 students (57.5%) in average level, and 5 students (12.5%) in poor level. Therefore, it could be concluded that most of the students' writing achievement was in average level (57.5%).

Table 2. Frequency and Mean of Students' SA and WA Based On Students' Achievement Level (N=40)

Variables	Level of Achievement	Mean	Total Frequency and Percentage	Standard Deviation
SA	Excellent	21.83	6 (15%)	1.211
	Good	16.92	14 (35%)	1.071
	Average	14.00	15 (37.5%)	0.944
	Poor	9.20	5 (12.5%)	0.908
	Very Poor	-	-	-
Total		61.95	40 (100 %)	4.134
Mean		15.48	-	1.033
WA	Excellent	25.00	2 (5%)	0.707
	Good	20.11	14 (35%)	1.964
	Average	15.73	19 (57.5%)	1.437
	Poor	11.20	5 (12.5%)	0.570
	Very Poor	-	-	-
Total		72.04	40 (100 %)	4.595
Mean		18.01	-	1.169

3.2 The Progress Analysis (Paired Sample t-test)

In relation to the result of paired sample t-test in experimental group, the mean score of students' speaking achievement in pre-test of experimental group was 12.80 (see Table 3) with the standard deviation was 2.6026. Meanwhile, the mean of the students' speaking achievement in post-test of experimental group was 17.22 with the standard deviation was 3.1308. Additionally, the output data showed that the mean difference of speaking achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group was 4.975 with the standard deviation was 1.3810.

On the other hand, the mean score of students' writing achievement in pre-test of experimental group was 14.60 with the standard deviation was 3.412. Meanwhile, the mean of the students' writing achievement in post-test of experimental group was 19.10 with the standard deviation was 3.4282. The output data showed that the mean difference of the writing achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group was 4.500 with the standard deviation was 1.1002. Since the Sig. value (2-tailed) of both speaking and writing achievements were less than 0.05, therefore, it could be stated that the null hypotheses (H01 and H02) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted. This means that there was a significant improvement made by experimental group.

In relation to the result of paired sample t-test in control group, the mean score of students' speaking achievement in pre-test of control group was 11.12 (see Table 3) with the standard deviation was 2.8044. Meanwhile, the mean of the students' speaking achievement in post-test of control group was 13.42 with the standard deviation was 2.9347. Additionally, the output data showed that the mean difference of speaking achievement between pre-test and post-test in control group was 2.300 with the standard deviation was 0.7847.

In addition, the mean of the students' writing achievement in pre-test of control group was 12.87 with the standard deviation was 3.2641. Meanwhile, the mean of the students' writing achievement in post-test of control group was 15.42 with the standard deviation was 3.2005. The output data showed that the mean difference of writing achievement between pre-test and post-test in control group was 2.550 with the standard deviation was 0.8255. Since the Sig. value (2-tailed) of both speaking and writing achievements were less than 0.05, therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (Ho1 and Ho2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted. This means that there was a significant improvement made by control group.

3.3 The Difference Analysis (Independent sample t-test)

As presented table 2, it showed the result of the independent sample t-test: the mean difference speaking post-test between the experimental and control group was 4.350 and the t-obtained was 4.533 ($p < 0.000$). While, the mean difference writing post-test between the experimental and control group was 3.675 and the t-obtained was 3.504 ($p < 0.000$). Since the p value of speaking and writing

achievements (0.000) were less than 0.05. Hence, the null hypotheses (Ho1 and Ho2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted. It means that there was a significant mean difference in speaking and writing skill achievements between the students who were taught through short stories and those who were not.

Table 3. The Results of Paired Sample and Independent t-Test

S t r a t e g y	V a r i a b l e	Pretest		Posttest		Mean difference pre and posttest Exp within	Mean difference pre and posttest Cont within	T-value posttest between Exp and Control	T value of Gain between Exp & Control	The value of Sig.2- tailed Exp within	The value of Sig.2- tailed Cont within	The value of Sig.2- tailed between Exp and Control
		Mean Exp	Mean Cont	Mean Exp	Mean Cont							
SS	WA	14.60	12.87	19.10	15.42	4.500	2.550	3.675	3.504	.000	.000	.000
SS	SA	12.80	11.12	17.77	13.42	4.975	2.300	4.350	4.533	.000	.000	.000

Note:

SS : Short Stories WA : Writing Achievement Exp : Experimental
SA : Speaking Achievement Cont : Control

3.4 The Stepwise Regression Analysis

Stepwise regression is an analysis that is used to see the relationship between one continuous dependent variable and a number of independent variables or predictors. In the model summary table presented, the R Square variable gives the proportion of variance(s) that could be predicted by the regression model using the data of the aspect and total score of speaking and writing achievements. It is commonly presented in the form percentage. This value indicates that a particular percentage of the variance in the speaking skill variable was comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar and the variance in the writing skill variable was grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, organization, and fluency.

The result of multiple regression analysis of speaking achievement (SA) was as follows: (1) the correlation of each aspect of speaking skill toward speaking achievement was 0.900 for fluency, 0.977 for pronunciation, 0.993 for vocabulary, 0.995 for comprehension, 1.000 for grammar, (2) the influence of contribution of the whole aspects of speaking skill was 99.9%, and (3) the partial contribution of each aspect of speaking skill toward speaking achievement was 81% for fluency, 14.5% for pronunciation, 3.2% for vocabulary, 0.4 % for comprehension, and 0.9% for grammar. Apart from that, the result of multiple regression analysis of writing achievement (WA) was as

follows: (1) the correlation of each aspect of writing skill toward writing achievement was 0.953 for vocabulary, 0.979 for organization, 0.990 for mechanic, 0.995 for grammar, 1.000 for fluency, (2) the influence of contribution of the whole aspects of writing skill was 100%, and (3) the partial contribution of each aspect of writing skill toward writing achievement was 90.0%% for vocabulary, 5% for organization, 2.1% for mechanic, 1.1 % for grammar, and 1% for fluency.

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

4.1 Conclusions

Based on the results and interpretation, the following conclusions could be drawn. First of all, the results of *t*-test statistical analysis showed that using short stories statistically improved the students' speaking and writing achievements. This could be clearly seen from the result of descriptive statistic, where it could be seen from the mean score, frequency and percentage obtained by the two groups, and the result of paired sample *t*-test experimental group made higher improvement than the control group in the pretest and posttest. Second of all, there was a significant mean difference in speaking and writing achievements between the students who were taught using short stories and those who were not. This could be clearly seen from the mean gained between the two groups. Third of all, the result of the Stepwise regression analysis showed that the aspect of speaking and writing skill gave high contribution on the students' speaking and writing achievements in the experimental group. The highest contribution of speaking skill aspect toward the speaking achievement was fluency. Meanwhile the highest contribution of writing skill aspect toward the writing achievement was vocabulary. Thus, it could be concluded that using short stories significantly improved the students' speaking and writing achievements.

4.2 Suggestions

In relation to the above-stated conclusions, some suggestions are drawn to develop the teaching and learning activities in the EFL classroom. Firstly, the students should be given more exposure pertaining to the speaking and writing activities in English teaching and learning environment in order to motivate and stimulate the students to be accustomed to speaking and writing more actively. Secondly, the teacher should be able to select appropriate short stories on the basis of the students' language proficiency level. Last of all, the future researchers are strongly recommended to conduct the similar research in conjunction with the use of literature in EFL classroom.

5. References

- Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (2004). *Extensive reading activities for teaching language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R., & Long, M. N. (1991). *Teaching literature*. United States of America: Longman.
- Collie, J., & Slater, S. (1991). *Literature in the language classroom*. (5th ed.). Glasgow: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, A., & Maley, A. (2007). *Literature*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erkaya, O. R. (2005). Benefits of using short stories in the EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8, 38-49. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED490771.pdf>
- Gorjian, B., Moosavinia, S. R., & Shahramiri, P. (2011). Effects of oral summary of short stories on male/female learner' speaking proficiency. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(1), 34-50.
- Hill, L. A. (1973). *Intermediate stories for reproduction 1*. Tokyo: Oxford University Press.
- Hirvela, A., & Boyle, J. (1988). Literature courses and student attitudes. *ELT Journal*, 42(3), 179-184.
- Hughes, A. (2004). *Testing for language teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khorashadyzadeh, A. (2014). Why to use short stories in speaking classes? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching in the Islamic World*. 2(1), 9-15.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Murdoch, G. (2002). Exploiting well-known short stories for language skills development. *IATEFL LCS SIG Newsletter* 23, 9-17.
- Ono, L., Day, R., & Harsch, K. (2004). Tips for reading extensively. *English Teaching Forum Online*, 42(4), 12-18. Retrieved from http://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/04-42-4-g.pdf
- Oster, J. (1989). Seeing with different eyes: Another view of literature in the ESL class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 85-103.
- Pardede, P. (2010). Short stories use in language skills classes: Students' interest and perception. *The Proceeding of the 4th International Seminar 2010: Bringing linguistics and literature into EFL classrooms* (pp. 1-17). Salatiga: Satya Wacana Christian University.
- Schulz, R. A. (1981). Literature and readability: Bridging the gap in foreign language reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 65(1), 43-53.