THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEURO-LINGUISTIC PROGRAM
IN TEACHING WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT
FOR ELEVENTH GRADER OF SMA NEGERI 1 KREMBUNG

Nuzul Amrullah, Dra. Theresia Kumalarini, M.Pd.

Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Alamat e-mail: no_jolt@ymail.com

Abstrak

Tugas seorang penulis ketika ia menulis tidak hanya mengumpulkan dan mengorganisasikan ide, namun ia juga harus mampu untuk menuangkannya dalam bentuk teks yang dapat dibaca oleh pembaca. Itulah mengapa kegiatan menulis dikategorikan sebagai kegiatan yang sulit bagi para siswa, khususnya pelajar yang menggunakan bahasa inggris sebagai bahasa asing. Hal ini menuntut guru untuk mengembangkan cara mengajar agar dapat membantu siswa untuk mencapai tujuan dari kemampuan menulis. Maka dari itu, Neuro-Linguistic Program diasumsikan dapat digunakan dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar menulis.

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk medeskripsikan bagaimana hasil dari penerapan Neuro-Linguistic Program sebagai teknik dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar menulis untuk siswa SMA kelas XI. Selain itu penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendapatkan respon siswa terhadap penerapan Neuro-Linguistic Program dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar menulis.

Jenis penelitian ini adalah deskripsi kualitatif. Subjek penelitian ini adalah guru dan murid SMA Krembung 1 kelas XIS-1. Instrument yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah observasi dalam bentuk checklist and field-note, kuesoner, dan hasil kerja siswa.

Hasil dari penerapan Neuro-Linguistic Program dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar terbilang sukses. Hal ini dikarenakan hasil dari respon siswa menunjukkan respon yang positif dari penerapan Neuro-Linguistic Program dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar menulis. Selain itu dapat dilihat dari reaksi siswa yang menunjukkan keinginan mereka untuk menulis narrative teks.

Sebagai kesimpulan, dengan menerapkan Neuro-Linguistic Program sebagai teknik dalam kegiatan belajar mengajar menulis teks narrative dapat memberikan motivasi bagi siswa, antusias, dan dapat membuat mereka kreatif sehingga kelas menjadi menyenangkan dikarenakan mereka mengakui bahwa teknik yang digunakan sangan membantu mereka untuk menyusun dan menulis cerita dalam bentuk teks narrative.

Kata Kunci: writing narrative, Neuro-Linguistic Program

Abstract

The role of the writer is not only collecting and organizing ideas, but also transferring the ideas into a well arranged text which can be read. Therefore, writing activity is considered the most complicated skill for the students, especially for ESL learners. This condition demands the teacher to vary their teaching strategies in order to help the students' to achieve the goal of writing skill. Neuro-Linguistic Program can be recommended to be used in teaching writing.

The purpose of this study was to describe how the implementation of Neuro-linguistic Program as a technique in the teaching writing a narrative text to the eleventh grade students and how the students' responses toward the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching narrative text.

The design of this research is a descriptive qualitative research. The subjects were the teacher and the students of XIS-1 SMA Negeri 1 Krembung. The instruments used in this research were observation checklist, field-notes, students' work, and questionnaires.

The result of the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching writing a narrative showed that the students gave the positive response during the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program as a technique during the teaching and learning process. Besides, it can be seen from the student's reaction that they were willing to compose a narrative text.

To conclude, the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program as a technique to teach writing a narrative text can improve the students' motivation, enthusiasm, and creativity so as to make the class more interesting and enjoyable since they admitted that the technique used (Neuro-Linguistic Program) was very helpful for their writing a narrative text.

Keywords: writing narrative, Neuro-Linguistic Program

INTRODUCTION

Teaching language skill is teaching about four skills that somebody should be able to use properly. They are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. In which listening and reading are belonged to receptive skill, meanwhile, speaking and writing are belonged to productive skill. The problem whem ESL learners learn writing is because they are taught English just for academic success. Brown (2004) stated that the students just need academic English competence in which can support them to use English for they daily activity rather than students' academic success. Thus, whenever teacher teaches English for ESL or EFL student, they should consider about student's need regarding English language skill so that it demands the teacher make an innovative and creative way to teach ESL/EFL learners.

Thuy (2008) also stated that the another factor of writing difficulties for ESL learners is that the teacher just gives the students task without giving them such kind of guide of the step what student will write when he teaches writing. The teacher just gives the sample of the material without practicing first. In addition the teacher sometimes does not explain the step how to write well when he asks the students to compose writing. Therefore, the guideline from the teacher is important thing for the students to know when they would like to write. Otherwise, they might write something that is out of topic it will become worse if they do not know what they should write. Thus, the teacher has role to make the students get motivation to compose writing, according to Kellogg (1994).

Those problems will affect the student when they do the task. It will make students confused and they often do cheat when they do the task or else they will just do the task based on what they know even at a glance. It might cause the student do the task inappropriately. Some of them might copy and paste from internet, or they might ask other student which has better English proficiency or better understanding of the plot of the story to do their task. They might also feel that students who take English course outside will be better than themselves since they never get a model from the teacher how to write well.

The implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program for teaching writing research has been implemented by Maguire (1996). Maguire (1996) stated that by implementing NLP technique for writing, the students are supposed to get an idea what they should write. It is because when the teacher uses Neuro-linguistic Program, he will give such kind of stimulation by bringing certain condition to the students and giving some question as clue. After giving stimulation by giving certain condition to them, the teacher can ask the students to compose the writing from the several given questions from the teacher. As the result, it will make the class more interesting.

Based on the phenomena above, the writer needs to answer the following research question:

1. How is the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program technique in teaching narrative writing text for eleventh graders?
2. What are the students' responses toward teaching and learning process?
3. How is the result of the students' work after the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in teaching narrative writing text?

METHODOLOGY

The researcher chose descriptive qualitative research design in this research. Marshall and Rossman (1999) stated that the purpose of qualitative research is for giving exploration of process and meaning events. As the consequences from the statement above, the researcher described how the process of the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in teaching writing narrative and student's response regarding the implementation of it in teaching learning process as it was stated in chapter one.

In this research, the teacher was the one who conducted the class taught narrative text writing using Neuro-Linguistic Program as technique, while the researcher or the author observes all the activities occurred in teaching and learning process. Therefore, the researcher relied on the teacher's performance in using Neuro-Linguistic Program.

This research was conducted in SMAN 1 KREMBUNG which was located in Jl. Raya Kecamatan No.2 Krembung. This school was chosen because the research objects the researcher needed to be observed were available. It had the teacher that uses Neuro-Linguistic Program in teaching narrative text in learning process in the classroom.

There were four instruments used in this researcher, those are; Observations (checklist and field-note) to get information that happened in the class during the teaching and learning process, Questionnaire to get the information about students' responses, and student's work to get information about students' writing ability after implementing NLP as technique.

In conducting the observation in this research which was designed as descriptive qualitative research, the researcher only did the observation when the teacher conducting teaching and learning process involving writing a narrative text activity since the researcher is a non-participatory observer. In the first meeting of the observation, the teacher taught the basic knowledge of narrative text before teaching writing a narrative text.

The teacher taught writing a narrative in the second and third meeting. In this meeting the researcher filled the observation checklist to get information regard the teacher and students' activity. Besides, the researcher used field-notes to support the information and data that is not listed in the observation checklist.

The next data for data collection technique was that the students were asked to compose a narrative text by using Neuro-Linguistic Program which would be submitted. To know the students ability in composing a narrative text, the researcher analyzed the students' work by using ESL Composition Profile. This ESL Composition Profile could be used for analyzing several components from students' work in the form of a

narrative text. Those components are; content, language use, organization, vocabulary, mechanic.

At last, the researcher gave questionnaires to the students to gain information about their responses toward the teacher's application of Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching writing a narrative text.

The researcher analyzed all the gathered data from the observation checklist, field-notes, students' work, and questionnaire to analyze the data of the study. All those data were analyzed descriptively. The result of observation checklist and field-notes were analyzed to give information to the researcher about teacher's idea in applying Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching writing a narrative text. The data also gave information to the researcher about the problems that occurred during the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching writing a narrative text.

In line with the analyzing of the observation checklist and field-note, the researcher also analyzed the gathered data from students' work that analyzed by ESL Composition Profile by Jacobs, et.al (1981) and questionnaire which were done by the students. From these data, the researcher got the information about students' response toward the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program in the teaching writing a narrative text. Besides, the researcher also had the idea whether their response were as expected by the teacher or not.

After analyzing all the data, the researcher interpreted the conclusion about how the theory of Neuro-Linguistic Programming technique can be applied in the teaching writing a narrative text (how the way of implementation of the technique used, students' responses toward the implementation of the technique used, and the result of students' work from composing a narrative text by using the technique used). These points were discussed further in the next chapter in which would be able to answer research questions.

RESULT
The Implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program as Technique to Teach Writing Narrative Text.

In this study the researcher found that the teacher did not conduct the teaching writing activity so that the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program had not been conducted yet. In this meeting, she just taught the basic knowledge of narrative text itself, starting from the purpose of the narrative, generic structure of narrative, language features and the grammar used in narrative. The researcher found that the students' condition was interested in teacher's explanation. It was because the teacher gave small game during explaining the material such when she explained about grammar of past verb tense so as to make the students got interested to play the game which related to the material.

Meanwhile, the second and third meetings were different from the first one. In the second and third meetings, the teacher followed the three of four principles of Neuro-Linguistic Program by O'Connor (2001) when she implemented it in teaching writing text. There were different activities in second and third meetings somehow. In the second meeting, the teacher

conducted teaching writing for a factual narrative story and teaching writing for fictional narrative for third meeting. She also used different media from each of those meetings.

For the first principles of Neuro-Linguistic Program the teacher followed when she implemented NLP as technique to teach writing a narrative text in the second meeting, the researcher found that the teacher mattered about how well the students would focus on their belief and knowledge to determine what activity the students would decide for completing the story based on the questions as clue (presupposition). Secondly, the teacher let the students to determine their story goal, whether it went with bad or sad ending. Besides, the teacher also insisted that the students to make coherent story one paragraph to another after from the activity for their story in which they had chosen from the guided questions (outcome). Third, the teacher let the students to choose as many as guided question as clue to compose their narrative story as long as they thought and asked themselves before answering the questions coherently with the story they made since their answer from the guided questions would determine how their story would be, whether it became coherent story or not (feedback).

The researcher also found that the teacher followed four of five steps in conducting teaching writing a narrative text which stated by Breutel and Spencer (2012). For the first step, the teacher asked the students to gain the detail information they need for each generic structure of narrative based on the guided question given as clue related the topic the students got, starting from the orientation, complication, and resolution (collecting the detail of narrative). Secondly, the teacher asked the students to make draft of their story as to make the students did not forget what they were going to write (the first draft:shapping the narrative). After making the draft of their narrative, the teacher let the students to compose their full essay of narrative story. The teacher allowed the students if they wanted to add some dialogues as to make the story alive (developing the characters). The last four of five steps, the teacher asked the students to revise their work after they complete their factual narrative (revising the narrative). The teacher did not follow the fifth step (sharing the work) because she was the one who checked and evaluated students' work herself.

In the third meeting, the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program was not far different from the second meeting. The small difference was because the activity in this meeting used fictional narrative entitled "Turtle's Flute". The teacher used same principles of Neuro-Linguistic Program by O'Connor (2001) for implementing it as technique to teach writing a narrative text. For the first principle; presupposition, the teacher let the students to trust their belief to decide what action they would make to continue based on the condition given in this case was unfinished narrative story. Besides, to continue the story the teacher gave the students guided questions to answer. The second principle of NLP the teacher conducted was by giving the students chance to determine whether the story entitled "Turtle's Flute" went bad or happy ending. The important thing was the

students needed to make the story became coherent. The teacher also did not matter if the story of the students would be same with the original or not, she just needed the students to continue the given narrative story became their version (Outcome). The third, the teacher insisted that the students needed to re-check if the answers from the guided question leaded them to make the story coherently.

In this meeting, the teacher used same steps in teaching writing a narrative text suggested by Breutel and Spencer (2012) just like in the previous meeting. However, since in this activity the students were just asked to continue from unfinished narrative story (the teacher just played the orientation part; being told the characters and setting of intro), so the students just needed to get detail of complication and resolution part. Making draft and developing the story afterwards was the students need to do before having revision. The last, the teacher asked the students to revise their work when they completed in composing narrative story.

The researcher found the obstacles when the teacher conducted teaching and learning process especially in writing a narrative text used Neuro-Linguistic Program as technique. The obstacles were from the number of the students in that class pretty big. As the result the teacher could not cover all of the students. Only students who wanted to ask briefly if they had difficulties would have the teacher's attention. Another obstacle was from the use of internet from students' cell phone. Although not all of the students used it, there was more or less one till two students who used it to copy and paste for their work from the internet.

The result of the students' response from the questionnaire

Question 1 up to 3 focused on the students' opinion about learning process in writing narrative. For the first question was asking about the student's opinion about writing activity. More than seventy percent the students responded that writing activity was very interesting. Meanwhile, more than twenty percent responded that writing activity is interesting enough and no one responded uninteresting. The second question was about students' response in learning narrative. Unluckily, three percent or one student responded that he was not interested in learning narrative. However, that number had different gap from those students who responded that they were interested in learning narrative. From the data, it showed that more than seventy percent students were interested in learning narrative and followed by the students who interested enough in learning narrative were more than twenty percent. For the next question was about the students' feeling in learning to write narrative text. From the data which had been analyzed, more than eighty percent students felt that they were interested in learning to write narrative text, thirteen percent student responded that they were interested enough, and three percent or one student who were not interested in learning to write narrative text.

The next elaboration was about the students' response of their feeling toward the implementation of Neuro-

Linguistic Program as technique to compose narrative text. The representative numbers of this elaboration were question number 4 and 5. For the question number 4 which was about students' response about the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program, more than sixty percent from the number all students responded that it was interesting technique to use to write narrative text. more than twenty percent students claimed that they were interested enough to use Neuro-Linguistic Program, and one students stated that he was not interested to use NLP as technique to compose narrative text. The 5th question was about the students' response toward the instruction of the teacher when she asked the students to compose narrative text by using NLP. The data showed that two students were not interested in the instruction of the teacher when she asked to compose narrative text by using NLP. Meanwhile, forty five percent from the number of the students responded that they were interested enough, and more than fifty five percent claimed that they were interested in the NLP instruction from the teacher to write narrative text.

The role of the NLP was asked in the 6th question. This question was aimed to find out the students' response how useful this NLP to help them to compose narrative text. Around ninety percent the number of the students responded that NLP was helpful as technique to help them to compose narrative text. There percent students assumed that NLP was helpful enough, and less than ten percent students responded that NLP was not helpful for them to compose writing narrative.

In conclusion, the researcher found most of students give positive response toward the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program as technique to compose narrative text. It was because most of them gave their answer for "a" and "b" options which indicated positive response instead of and "c" option which had negative response indication.

The Result of Students' Work

The result of the students' work showed positive responses since almost all of them were able to express their idea in form of writing. The positive responses also could be from the 5 aspects in writing as designed by Jacob (1981). They are; content, language use, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics. Besides, they could arrange their writing of narrative text with complete generic structure.

The first aspect the researcher would like to elaborate is content aspect as stated in ESL composition which designed by Jacob et al (1981). The analysis of this part focused on the students' on their work. It is important since it can measure whether the elaboration of their writing relevant to their topic or not. The result of it showed that among 31 students, 7 students were categorized in "excellent to very good" criteria, 11 students were categorized in "good to average" criteria, 8 students were categorized in "fair to poor" criteria, and 5 students were categorized in "very poor" criteria.

For the organization aspect is also important to see how far the students could make coherent one sentence to another or one paragraph to another. The error of it can

make distraction which leads the story become senseless. The result showed that among 31 students, 9 students were categorized in "excellent to very good" criteria, 12 students were categorized in "good to average" criteria, 6 students were categorized in "fair to poor" criteria, and 4 students were categorized in "very poor" criteria.

The third aspect is about vocabulary. Basically, the analysis focused on the word choice of students' work. It is important to evaluate this aspect since the students might change the meaning as the result when they use inappropriate words. In this aspect, the result showed that among 31 students, 5 students were categorized in "excellent to very good" criteria, 10 students were categorized in "good to average" criteria, and 13 students were categorized in "fair to poor" criteria, and 3 students were categorized in "very poor" criteria.

For the next aspect is about language aspect. This part, the analysis focused on the grammar such as; past tense form, pronoun, and preposition. The result showed that among 31 students, 8 students were categorized in "excellent to very good" criteria, 14 students were categorized in "good o average" criteria, 5 students were categorized in "fair to poor" criteria, and 4 students were categorized in "very poor criteria"

The last aspect was mechanic. As Jacob et al (1981) stated that some points need analyzing, those are; spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing. The result of this aspect showed that among 31 students, 11 students were categorized in "excellent to very good" criteria, 9 students were categorized in "good to average" criteria, 8 students were categorized in "fair to poor" criteria, and 3 students were categorized in "very poor" criteria.

DISCUSSION

In every opening activity from three meetings, the teacher always kept checking the students' knowledge. The purpose of the teacher did so was to make the students tried to share the information or knowledge briefly before starting the lesson. The teacher did not only do the similar to opening activity but also in closing activity. However, the main activity among first, second, and third meeting were different. In the main activity of first meeting, the teacher conducted pre-writing by teaching the students about the general knowledge about narrative text. The purpose of it was to make the students understood everything about narrative before they compose a narrative writing. To attract and help students' understanding the material such in understanding the grammar of verb used in narrative text, the teacher made a small game. Besides, in the whilst activity of main activity, the teacher gave exercise to the students in form of reading activity and asked the students to answer the questions afterwards in form of "True or False" exercise which related to the passage. The teacher discussed the students' work when she conducted the post activity.

In the second and third meetings, the main activity the teacher conducted was different from the first meeting. It was because in the second and third meetings, the teacher conducted the writing a narrative activity. When the teacher conducted the main activity of writing a narrative

text, the teacher let the students to pick the topic they were interested in. Making an outline after getting the topic was important to organize the students' story development. The writing composition could be done after those processes were ready. When the students finished composing their writing, the teacher asked them to revise and edit their work. This process was important for the students to know their mistake so that they could enhance their writing ability. These processes the teacher conducted above was in line with Langan (2008) theory with purpose to make the writer to be good in writing.

Although the teacher conducted same process writing activity in the second and third meeting of main activity by using same technique; Neuro-Linguistic Program, the teacher used different media so as to make different steps as well in conducting the main activity since the material given was different. In the second meeting was about factual narrative text and for the third meeting was about fictional narrative text. However, it did not change the pattern of the steps in implementing Neuro-Linguistic Program as technique to teach writing a narrative text in which the students were given certain condition and guided question as clue for them to determine the action they would choose related the topic given for composing their narrative text which was in line the process Maguire (1996) conducted writing activity.

There were nine stages could be taken in teaching and learning process of writing a narrative text by using Neuro-Linguistic Program according to the discussion above. They were; explaining the narrative text to the students, giving exercise regarding narrative text to the students, giving certain condition and guided questions related to the topic to the students, letting the students to choose the action they would choose from the question, asking the students to make the outline from the chosen and answered question, asking the students to make the writing composition from the outline, guiding the students to compose their work, asking the students to revise their work, and asking the students to edit their work if it is necessary.

As explained before in the previous sub chapter, the questionnaires were focused on three aspects, which were students' responses about writing activity in the classroom, students' opinion about the implementation of NLP and also how useful NLP was to help them compose their writing. Based on the result of the questionnaire, it showed that most of the students got interested in the teaching and learning technique and it indicated positive response.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
Conclusion

In conclusion, the implementation of Neuro-Linguistic Program as a technique for teaching writing a narrative text was able to make the students more creative and reduce the student's boredom. The teacher believed that by imagining certain condition derived from several questions given made the students willing to compose the narrative text. Indeed, the teacher did not use a conventional way of the teaching learning process. She applied a creative way instead.

Therefore, the researcher concludes that teaching writing a narrative text by using Neuro-Linguistic Program as technique was successfully applied by the teacher. The teacher also gave interesting materials so that the students were gladly involved in the learning activity. Besides, the teacher kept motivating the students when they got difficulties and they also asked when the students found something they did not understand. It shows that both the teacher and the students had a good interaction and cooperation during the teaching learning process.

Suggestion

After concluding the result of the study the researcher would like to give suggestion dealing with the implementation Neuro-Linguistic Program as a technique to teach writing a narrative text.

The researcher found that the teacher had been quite creative to make the students willing to compose the narrative text. It was seen in the student's creativity and interest to write narrative text. Meanwhile, since the students' cognitive ability varied and the numbers of the students was big it is necessary that the teacher finds better way e.g using *jigsaw* method which integrated with the implementation of NLP so as to make the students satisfied having been treated equally well.

REFERENCES

Ary, Donald. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*, 8th edition. Canada: Wadsworth

Brown, C. L. (2004). Based ESL Curriculum and Academic Language Proficiency. *The Internet TESL Journal, 10*.

Brown, H. D. *Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (Second ed.): Longman..

Einspruch, E. L., Forman, Bruce D. (1985). Observations concerning research literature on neuro-linguistic programming. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32(4).*

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen N.E (2000). How to design and evaluate research in education, 4th edition. U.S.A:McGrow-Hill

Holly L. Jacobs, S. A. Z., Deanna R. Wormuth, V. Faye Hartifel, Jane B. Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach. Rowley*. Rowley: Newbury House Publisher, Inc.

Maguire, T. (1996). Reading and Writing through Neuro-Linguistic Programming. *The Internet TESL Journal, 2*(6).

Marshall, C., and Rossman, G. B. 1999. *Designing Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks:* SAGE Publications.

O'Connor, J. (2001). *NLP Workbook*. Fulham Palace Road: HarperCollins.

PDy, T. (2013). *Buku Saku NLP*. Yogyakarta: Pohon Cahaya.

Raimes, A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*: Cambridge University Press.

Richard Bandler, J. G. (1979). *Frog into Princes: Neuro Linguistic Programming*. Moab: Real People Press.

Spencer, R. B. a. L. (2012). *Writing a Narrative*. New York: Rosen Central.

Thuy, N. H. H. (2008). Teaching EFL Writing in Vietnam: Problems and Solution - A Discussion from The Outlook of Applied Linguistics. *VNU Journal of Science, 25*.

Varghese, R. (2012). An Integrated Teaching Model to Develop English Proficiency of ESL Management Students. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Studies, 18*(2).