

Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching
- Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi -
Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo
- Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali
Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo
- Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig -
Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi
- Ijenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi
- Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo -
Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi
- Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa
Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language
Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali yokuFundisa
iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta
Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo -
Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo
- Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi
- Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig
- Journal for Language
Teaching - Ijenali
yokuFundisa iLimi -
Ijenali yokuFundisa
iiLwimi - Ibhuku
Lokufundisa Ulimi
- Tšenale ya tša
Go ruta Polelo -
Buka ya Thuto
ya Puo - Jenale
ya Thuto ya Dipuo
- Ijenali Yekufundzisa
Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u
Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo
Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig
- Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali
yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi -
Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta
Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya
Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya
u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi
- Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language
Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali
yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi -
Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo -
Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi
- Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa
Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language
Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali yokuFundisa
iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta
Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo -
Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo
- Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig -
Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi
- Ijenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi
- Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo -
Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi
- Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa
Ririmi - - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language
Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - Ijenali yokuFundisa
iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta



Osama Hassanein Sayed Hassanein

Asyut University (Egypt)

An NLP-Based Programme for Developing EFL Student-Teachers' Motivational Language

Abstract

This study attempted to measure the effect of using a suggested training programme based on the most influential Milton model hypnotic language patterns on EFL student-teachers' motivational language. The study used a pre-test/post-test experimental and control group design. An experimental group and a control group were exposed to pre-post means of getting data (a pre-post motivational language test and a pre-post observation sheet). Thirty EFL student-teachers participated in this study. Results revealed a significant improvement in the motivational language

of the experimental group students and in their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language. Based on these findings, it was recommended that direct and explicit teaching of motivational language by using influential hypnotic language patterns should be integrated into EFL pre-service teacher training curricula.

Keywords: Motivational language, Neuro-linguistic Programming, Milton Model

1. Introduction

Motivation, the inner drive that directs behaviour towards acting and performing tasks with the intention of attaining goals, is as necessary to the human soul as fuel is to a car. It is the internal spark for action. Motivation is not something that one “has or does not have but rather something that varies from one moment to the next depending on the learning context or task”(Ellis, 1998: 76). Over the course of time, motivation ebbs and flows and it stems from many sources, both internal and external (Winke, 2005). In the teaching-learning process, motivation not only helps students overcome apathy but also encourages them to work harder, longer, and with more energy and enthusiasm. A close relationship is always present between motivation and achievement in general. In second/foreign language learning in particular, the relationship between motivation and achievement has long been documented (Noels, 2001; Eiko, 2005; Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007; Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; among others).

As long as “motivated students are every teacher’s dream” (Winke, 2005: 3), teachers accept the responsibility that motivating students is their job. As a matter of fact, motivating students and the effect that teachers may have on students’ affective outcomes have occupied educational researchers, teachers as well as teacher trainers for several decades (Brok, et al., 2005). In order to carry out this job, teachers often endeavour to use authentic materials and various interesting and engaging classroom tasks that stimulate their students’ interest.

However, in their persistent attempts to motivate their students, most Arab EFL teachers, as observed by this researcher, often forget that there is something far more important than just selecting authentic materials and creating engaging classroom tasks. Teachers need to mind their interpersonal behaviour with their students and the language they use in managing their classrooms and in maintaining a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere. Research has documented that the interpersonal behaviour of teachers is strongly related to student achievement and motivation in all subject areas and that healthy communication between teachers and their students is emphasized as a prerequisite for engaging students in the learning process (Noels, 2001; Brok, et al., 2004; Brok, et al., 2005; Bernaus& Gardner, 2008; Nugent, 2009;among others).

The language used by teachers inside classrooms can dramatically influence their students’ identities as learners. Denton (2008: 28) states that the language we use with our students can “lift them to their highest potential or tear them down”. She adds that what we say to our students and how we say it “shapes how they think and act and, ultimately, how they learn”. Supporting this, Churches (2010: 15) states that:

The only difference between two teachers delivering the same lesson in the same way, one of which gets positive compliance and successful learning and one which doesn’t, is the way they use language to explain things, introduce topics and encourage learning and Behavior.

Our students are motivated or demotivated depending on which words and language patterns we use to motivate them. We all probably remember a teacher who motivated us when we were in elementary school, or even university. When we think about that teacher again now, as Cullen and Mulvey (2012) point out, we may also be able to remember some of the powerful words used by that teacher, words that motivated us to learn much faster and more easily than our classmates in other classes.

In this respect, Neuro-linguistic Programming (NLP), originally developed by John Grinder and Richard Bandler in the mid-1970s, can be very helpful. As “an art and science of effective communication” (Bozoglan, 2010: 186), NLP comprises a “collection of techniques, strategies, patterns for assisting effective communication, personal growth, change and learning” (Revell & Norman, 1997: 14). NLP has several uses and can be used to improve every aspect of personal and interpersonal relationships in many areas including, business, therapy, counselling, sports, team building, advertising, management training, life coaching and education (Hayes, 2006; Bozoglan, 2010; Lazarus, 2010; Pintos-López, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Kudliskis, 2011).

In the educational context, NLP is used for enhancing learner-teacher congruence through addressing “learners’ cognitive-emotional domain (the ‘neuro’ component) through verbal interaction with the learner (the ‘linguistic’ component)” (Millrood, 2004: 29). Supporting this, Kudliskis and Burden (2009) point out that the use of NLP as a highly effective motivational tool “permits the rewiring of certain cognitive processes thus permitting the development of a positive self-belief system” (as cited in Kudliskis, 2011: 12). In the same vein, Churches and West-Burnham (2008) view NLP as a ‘toolkit’ of techniques for influencing personal development at both interpersonal and intrapersonal levels and it has much to offer, particularly with respect to persuasive language, emotions, beliefs and values. In this context, Churches (2010) argues that adopting influential language patterns, used successfully in hypnosis and therapy, can help teachers to start their lessons more effectively, increase the possibility of their instructions being carried out, be more motivating in the way that they talk about learning and it could enable teachers to spot their students’ use of negative language and to redirect their thinking.

2. Contextualization

Research in the area of student motivation, according to the study of Gorham and Christophel and that of Christophel and Gorham (as cited in Hu, 2011: 88) revealed that teachers are responsible for “two-thirds of the demotivating factors pertinent to instructional communication”. In an earlier study undertaken by Chamber (1993), it was revealed that students’ demotivation was resultant from teachers not giving clear enough instructions, criticizing them, and shouting at them when they do not understand. In a recent study by Soureshjani and Riahipour (2012), it was found that

teachers' mocking of students' mistakes and getting angry and shouting, are the most demotivating affective factors in students' opinions. Instead of getting angry, shouting and using sarcasm, teachers need to use positive language with their students in order to create a positive and respectful community inside their classrooms where students feel safe, appreciated, and motivated to learn. When teachers use positive words to convey faith in their students' desire and ability to do well, their students are more likely to live up to their teachers' expectations (Denton, 2008).

Due to the influence of the potential lack of self-confidence in terms of language ability, most Arab EFL teachers as observed by this researcher, unfortunately, fail to use positive language with their students, except on very rare occasions. They either use the mother tongue (Arabic), for a large proportion of the interaction in the classroom, thereby depriving their students of considerable opportunities to use the foreign language meaningfully, or use a tightly controlled repertoire of stereotyped formulae which in their rigidity are not only inappropriate but also dangerous as a model for the learner. When they give instructions, form groups, set time limits, ask questions, confirm answers, maintain discipline and so on, EFL teachers often use prescriptive rather than permissive language, and direct instructions rather than indirect language.

During supervising some EFL student-teachers in their teaching practice in some of the elementary as well as intermediate schools in the New Valley Governorate, Egypt, it was observed by this researcher that their interpersonal behaviour with their students is "intense" and somewhat aggressive when they cannot get the best out of all their students. In addition, they use much Arabic in giving instructions and in managing their classrooms. When they shift to English, they use blunt and direct words. Their language with their students is not only demotivating, but also damaging and frustrating. In many occasions during the class time they make comments containing derogatory statements such as "stupid" and "idiot", which affect students' self-esteem. More specifically, a lot of their statements are, not only demotivating, but fall into the category of "better left unsaid".

3. Statement of the Problem

In managing their classrooms, most EFL basic education student-teachers at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Asyut University, do not use positive language with their students. They use either Arabic or a very direct language that is not motivating and often perceived as being rude or perhaps a little blunt. Therefore, this study attempted to use the Milton model that fosters hypnotic language patterns for building a training programme that develops motivational language among those students.

4. Hypotheses of the Study

The researcher hypothesized the following:

- 4.1 Post-test scores on the test of motivational language would be significantly better for the experimental group than for the control group.
- 4.2 Post-measurement scores of teaching behaviour (aimed at using motivational language) on the observation sheet would be significantly better for the experimental group than for the control group.

5. Objectives of the Study

The current study attempted to achieve the following objectives:

- 5.1 Exploring if using the Milton model hypnotic language patterns would have any effect on the EFL basic education student-teachers' use of motivational language.
- 5.2 Exploring if using the Milton model hypnotic language patterns would have any effect on the EFL basic education student-teachers' teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language.

6. Potential Contribution of the Study

The potential contribution of the study includes at least the following issues. The study is considered as a pioneering study that attempted to use NLP hypnotic techniques in developing an aspect of teachers' competencies in the Arabic context. In addition to this contribution, the study resulted in the development of an NLP-based programme that, if translated to Arabic, can be used in developing the motivational language of teachers of other specializations in this context. Lastly, the findings of this study may direct the attention of teachers and curriculum developers to the importance of incorporating Milton model hypnotic language patterns in pre-service teacher preparation courses.

7. Delimitations of the Study

The study has clear delimitations. The findings of the study cannot be generalized beyond the group of third-year EFL basic education students (both males and females) at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Asyut University in Egypt. The third-year EFL basic education students were selected as participants because there is a widely voiced

complaint of their English language proficiency in general and their classroom language in particular. Hence, the suggested programme was intended to help them before their graduation. Another delimitation is that the study only focused on eleven language patterns¹ were selected to be focused on in the suggested programme. The rationale behind this selection was that these language patterns are the most used in NLP literature and, therefore, could easily be incorporated into the suggested programme for explicit instruction.

8. Theoretical Background of NLP

NLP is not widely used in language teacher education. Therefore, a brief discussion of its origin, elements and criticism is required.

NLP, the basis for Neuro-Linguistic Psychotherapy, is an approach co-founded by John Grinder and Richard Bandler at the University of Santa Cruz in California in the mid-1970s. It is the “study of modeling and creating excellence in our lives” (Gibson, 2011: 27). According to Tosey and Mathison (2003: 380), modelling is described as “pretending to be someone else’, ‘copying what one is aware of – often ‘surface’ features of another person’s Behavior”. Bandler and Grinder, the founders and principal authors of this approach claim that if the effective patterns of behaviour of exceptional people could be modelled, they could easily be acquired by people. Accordingly, their ground breaking approach (NLP) comprised techniques that were modelled on the work of the family therapist Virginia Satir, the therapeutic language interventions of the successful psychiatrists Fritz Perls and Milton Erickson. At the same time, the approach drew upon the general semantics theories of Gregory Bateson and Alfred Korzybski together with Noam Chomsky’s transformational grammar theory (Tosey & Mathison, 2003; Yemm, 2006; Hayes, 2006; Lazarus, 2010; Pintos-López, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Kudliskis, 2011; Allan, et al., 2012; Knight, 2012).

The basic principle underlying NLP is that excellence can be created in our lives by increasing positive habits or behaviours and reducing negative ones. Such positive habits might belong to the individual himself or a model of habits demonstrated by exceptionally successful people. NLP refers to “purported systematic links between a person’s internal experience (neuro), their language (linguistic) and their patterns of Behavior (programming)” (Tosey & Mathison, 2003: 373). According to Hayes (2006: 14), “The actual term ‘Neuro-Linguistic Programming’ arises from three main areas of study: (1) Neurology: the mind and how we think. (2) Linguistics: how we use language

1 The eleven language patterns that were selected for inclusion in the analysis were: presupposition, mind reading, lost performative, comparative deletion, double bind, unspecified referential index, cause and effect, complex equivalence, universal quantifier, nominalization and tag questions.

and how it affects us. (3) Programming: how we sequence our actions”. Hayes (2006: 14) puts it simply that NLP is “a process of helping people to learn how to use their brains more effectively – to run their brains rather than letting their brains run them”.

8.1. Milton Model

The Milton Model, named after Milton H. Erickson (1901-1980), is one of the techniques used for NLP or Neuro-linguistic Psychotherapy, which was co-founded by John Grinder by collaborating with Richard Bandler at the University of Santa Cruz in California in the 1970s (Tosey & Mathison, 2003; Yemm, 2006; Hayes, 2006; Lazarus, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Allan, et al., 2012; Carey, Churches & Hutchinson, 2012). After a series of studies of the patterns of hypnotic techniques employed by Milton Erickson, the highly respected hypnotherapist, John Grinder and Richard Bandler used concepts and ideas from General Semantics (particularly those of Lauri Kartunnen about presupposition in language and Chomsky’s proposed concept of surface and deep structure of language) to describe and name the different language patterns that can be used to make suggestions in a therapeutic context. The NLP Milton Model was applied to a much wider range of contexts later on in its development, including counselling, family relations, teaching and learning, sales and management (Gibson, 2011; Carey, Churches & Hutchinson, 2012).

The Milton Model is a way of using key parts of speech and key patterns to subtly and successfully direct another person’s line of thinking. When speaking to someone, according to this model, we deliberately delete, distort and generalize what we are saying to him so that he has to fill in what is missing from his internal world. The main assumption that Erickson worked from was that everyone knows how to solve their own problems. Drawing on this assumption, Erickson did not give his patients direct solutions to their problems. Instead, he deliberately gave them ambiguous suggestions that motivated them to access their own internal and external resources and to direct these resources towards finding solutions to their problems (Lazarus, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Kudliskis, 2011; Carey, Churches & Hutchinson, 2012).

According to the Milton Model one can use influential language patterns (i.e. deliberate combinations of ambiguous words) in one’s communication with people. These combinations of vague words confuse the logical side of their conscious mind or induce a very light kind of trance. When they are in trance (not fully asleep), one can talk directly to the unconscious part of their mind as they become very suggestible. Supporting this, Gibson (2011: 34) adds that according to the Milton model, language patterns are used to change a state of consciousness or create a trance via “omitting or generalizing some of the details normally included when sharing information”. She explains that when the information is missing, the addressee must search in his own world for the meaning that is not verbally conveyed. The search for this information leads him to focus on internal representations of the real world instead of what happens externally. This process creates a kind of trance within the addressee, where his conscious mind is at rest, and in this state, the addressee becomes very obedient and most receptive to the speaker’s suggestions.

Artfully vague language is the language of influence and persuasion. It is the language of presidents and statesmen. It is the language used by Martin Luther King, Hitler and Gandhi to pursue their very different goals. What makes this language a very powerful one, if used with intention, is that it uses words that have no specific meaning and which anyone can believe (Molden, 2007).

In order to reach the unconscious mind and to create a seamless and deep trance experience on his clients, Erickson deliberately used the three universals (deletions, distortions and generalizations) in order to be intentionally and artfully vague (Molden, 2007; Gibson, 2011; Lazarus, 2010; Knight, 2012). By using the three universal modelling processes, the addressee is given only a general message while allowed to apply his own specific meaning. Supporting this, Gibson (2011:243-244), states that with the Milton model, “the speaker is deliberately vague, which invites the listener to search his or her own mind to fill in any blanks using his or her own feelings and experiences”. She illustrates this idea by comparing the Milton model with ‘a blank, fill-in-the dot picture’. The way the addressee colours that picture and connects its dots will vary depending on that addressee’s experience. As the addressee is searching for information to fill in the blanks left by the speaker, he enters a trance state while leaving the conscious mind to inhabit the unconscious one. In the unconscious mind, the addressee searches for any information that gives individual meaning about the statement or the question being considered.

For the purpose of the article, a brief account of the three universal modelling processes used in the Milton model is necessary (Molden, 2007; Lazarus, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Knight, 2012). The descriptions will be accompanied by examples of the techniques and how they are used in the Milton Model.

8.1.1 Deletions

In the Milton Model, deletion is used clearly in language patterns such as “unspecified referential index”, “presuppositions”, “unspecified verbs”, “nominalizations” and “comparative deletions”. “Comparative deletion”, for example, occurs when we make a comparison but do not explain what we are comparing. There is some kind of standard or judgment involved, but it is not made clear because the thing, person or standard to which the comparison is made is not mentioned. When we say for example, “*he’s a better person*”, we do not specify “*Better than what? Better at what? Compared to what or whom?*” The information deleted means that we can neither prove nor disprove the claim made in the comparison. In this type of comparison, the addressee accepts a certain judgment without understanding what is behind it or without questioning the standard against which this judgment is made. As long as the addressee does not know the standard against which this judgment is made, he can neither accept nor refuse it and he is left to fill the information blanks by answering the questions related to the standard against which this judgment is made with content from his own world model (or mental map). Any answer that may come to his imagination to these questions will make this claim or judgment true and it will be accepted by him.

8.1.2 Distortions

As with deletions, we all distort information in our minds. Distortion allows us to manipulate, exaggerate, adjust, diminish, or change the perceptions that we get through our sensory experiences. It allows us to describe an experience in the way that it seemed to have happened to us, which might not be the same as how it actually happened. Distortions can take a number of forms (Lazarus, 2010; Gibson, 2011; Knight, 2012).

Distortion is used in the Milton Model in language patterns such as “mind reading”, “presuppositions”, “nominalizations”, “cause and effect”, “complex equivalence” and “lost performatives”. If we, for example, look at “*wise people*”, at the beginning of the utterance that says “*wise people agree that all boys should speak English fluently*”, we automatically exercise some sort of confusion at the conscious level over who “*wise people*” actually are, and “*wise*” according to whom? Then, silently we wonder and think about questions like “how do we know they are wise?” and “how do we know that all boys should speak English fluently?” While the conscious mind is occupied to figure this out, the message, whether positive or negative, inherent in the utterance that says “*wise people agree that all boys should speak English fluently*” will straight past the conscious mind and into the unconscious mind, where the change is instigated. In this example, the inherent message is “speaking English fluently is good”.

8.1.3 Generalizations

According to (Lazarus, 2010: 25), a generalization is “when we take one piece of data or information and assume that other things within that category are the same or that the pattern will be repeated”. Generalizations are considered a common shorthand. While we generalize, we use a piece of information or a perception we got under one circumstance and apply it to every similar circumstance. That is to say, we carry a previous perception into play in a different scenario (Gibson, 2011). This enables us to respond to new situations on the basis of what we have learned from similar ones in the past (Knight, 2012).

Generalization is used in the Milton Model in language patterns such as “modal operators of possibility”, “modal operators of necessity” and “universal quantifiers”. A “universal quantifier”, for example, is an absolute generalization with no referential index. It is generally used to displace resistance. Universal quantifiers always have an element of exaggeration. When using universal quantifiers, we are saying that there are no exceptions and therefore there are no choices. The utterance that says, “*every smart student knows that the key to success and the rich rewards that it brings is the regular study of his lessons*”, is an example of how universal quantifiers might be used. Upon hearing such an utterance, the addressee directly thinks of the following questions: “*Would he like to be considered a smart student? Would he like to be successful? Is the idea of rich rewards appealing to him?*” It is highly probable that his answer to these questions would be “Yes”. In addition, because every “*smart student*” “*knows*” that regular study of his lessons is the key to success and he himself is desirous of being

“successful” and in receipt of the *“rich rewards”*, his unconscious mind probably accepts, as true, the idea that regular study of his lessons is the key to success, without a scrap of proof or even evidence to back up that claim. It is improbable that the addressee even imagined exactly what those *“rich rewards”* would be and how exactly this would lead to him being *“successful”*. What kind of *“rich rewards”* specifically? *“Smart”* compared to who or what? Who says that *“every smart student knows these things”*?

The answers to such questions are not found anywhere in the original utterance and that is fine because in order to simply understand the speaker’s message inherent in this utterance, the addressee supplies the answers himself from his own model of the world which further adds to the credibility of what the speaker is saying. If we repeat this message to him consistently over a period of time, we can program his unconscious mind into believing that this message is, in fact, true for him. That is how universal quantifiers work and that is how they can be very effective in producing positive change.

8.4. Criticism of NLP

NLP achieved some popularity as a method for communication and personal development since the 1970s. It also has some supporters in the field of language teaching (Millrood, 2004: 28). At the same time, scholars from a wide range of disciplines like linguistics, psychology and psychotherapy have levelled criticism against NLP particularly questioning its worth and legitimacy (Yeager, 1985; Salas, Degroot & Spanos, 1989; Roderique-Davies, 2009; Tosey & Mathison, 2010). Some of the critics against NLP refer to it as *“cargo cult psychology”*. NLP is criticized for being *“eclectic”*, lacking theoretical coherence, and demonstrating weak links to contemporary academic work in relevant fields. One of the more serious concerns is that critics believe that NLP scholars do not apply rigorous evaluation of its practices and that there is a lack of professional training standards among users or proponents of NLP (Harman & O’Neill, 1981). In addition, there are some serious concerns related to the ethical implications of NLP. Harman & O’Neill, 1981) raise two ethical concerns; first of all, they believe that *“unscrupulous people could use NLP to take advantage of others”* (Harman & O’Neill, 1981: 453); and they reject the NLP practice of *“anything for an outcome”* as problematic in the counselling context (Harman & O’Neill, 1981: 453).

In my view, the main criticism that NLP have to address if it is to become accepted as a theory and practice in the field of teaching and learning is the current lack of empirical support and research evidence that proves some of its claims (Sharpley, 1987; Roderique-Davies, 2009; Witkowski, 2010; Sturt, Ali, Robertson, Metcalfe, Grove, Bourne & Bridle, 2012; Murray, 2013; among others). In this respect, the claims made by practitioners like Bandler (in Witkowski, 2010) and Grinder, the co-founders of NLP, are not helpful to the scientific community. Bandler and Grinder claim that they do not depend on any specific scientific evidence to quantify their research findings. They state that they rather depend on the position that *“people say that it works”* (Wohlman, 2010: 44). Bandler, claims that NLP represents an *“art, not science, hence testing its assertions are pointless or even impossible”* (in Witkowski, 2010: 59). The supporters

of NLP claim that it involves more than one discipline, that NLP draws on sources from academe and from elsewhere, and that it has been “generated through application more than being deduced from axioms (Tosey, 2003: 380).

Despite the criticism against NLP discussed above, it is currently used as a management technique and it is studied and practiced by a range of professionals in a wide range of settings amongst which is management, education, training and language teaching (Tosey & Mathison, 2003; Millrood, 2004; Churches & West-Burnham, 2008; Churches, 2010; Kudliskis, 2011; Knight, 2012; among others). As a language teacher and researcher, I would argue that in-depth discussions of NLP concepts and its applications in the language teaching and research domains are necessary. Scholars like Millrood (2004: 28) argues that “there is little evidence of the impact that NLP techniques in teachers’ discourse can have on learners”. The presentation and discussion of findings from NLP-based research projects like the one reported on in this article would enable the scientific community to understand NLP better and to evaluate the empirical evidence in a systematic way. This is the only way for the field to consider the “scientific burden” on NLP scholars to provide empirical evidence for the claims made by its very enthusiastic supporters across a variety of disciplines. I appreciate the opportunity to present some empirical evidence in this article.

8.5. Literature Review of NLP Studies in the Domains of Education and Language Teaching

This brief review of related studies aims at connecting the present study with the work already done in the field. It also aims at giving the reader a chance to appreciate the evidence that has already been collected by previous research on NLP and on using hypnotic strategies and techniques in language teaching and learning.

Allan, et al. (2012) investigated the combined effect of NLP influencing strategies on math attainment in adult numeracy learners. Teachers were randomly allocated to three treatment conditions, these were: (1) teachers given no training (control condition); (2) teachers trained in innovative math pedagogy; and (3) teachers trained in both NLP² and the innovative math pedagogy. Results of data analysis clearly indicated that the addition of NLP training to innovative math pedagogy successfully effected a change in the relationship between the teacher and the learners which significantly enhanced math attainment compared to both control and innovative math pedagogy conditions. The study of Kudliskis (2011) aimed at investigating the effect of the teaching and learning of NLP techniques on students’ ability to break through self-imposed mental barriers

2 The NLP training included the use of influential language patterns modelled from the Milton model, using spatial anchoring for emotional state management, creating positive presuppositions and suggestions, and using language patterns related to cause and effect, complex equivalence, modal operators, double binds, embedded commands, linkage language, pacing and leading, universal quantifiers, “yes” set and “yes” tags.

and belief systems in relation to learning. Among the numerous important findings that emerged from the study, NLP techniques of change were perceived as having various levels of merit. These techniques proved to be a highly motivational tool which is potentially capable of improving the learning experience of young people through developing their belief in their ability to succeed.

Villalobos (2008)'s study aimed to identify the effects of NLP on anxiety, self-esteem, and second language acquisition of high school students at a high school located at the border with Mexico. Statistics showed that the mean score gains for pre- and post-inventories for both control and experimental groups on the three variables were positive. Karen (2006) explored the utilization of NLP strategies and techniques for establishing better communication between teachers and their students. In addition to the positive effects that NLP strategies had on classroom management, results of the study revealed that the majority of the students became motivated to learn, achieve, and conform because the techniques created both a connection to the NLP adept teacher and the impetus for change. Esterbrook (2006) attempted to investigate the effectiveness of using NLP techniques as an intervention to help under-prepared and underachieving community college students alter undesirable or negative preconceptions and behavioural patterns that would prevent successfully completing a planned community college degree or certification program. The intervention group demonstrated statistically significant and positive change in the areas of self-reported anxiety or depression and social assertion.

The evidence reported in these studies clearly indicate that there is some empirical evidence for the claims that NLP supporters make for its potential to improve the relationships and communication settings in different educational contexts.

9. Methodology

The methodology used in this study is described in this section.

9.1. Participants

All third-year EFL basic education students, at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Asyut University, Egypt, volunteered to participate in this study. After excluding drop-outs, the number of the students who successfully completed the experiment was 30, and they were equally divided between the control and experimental groups of the study.

-
6. We would like to thank Prof. Ron Simango (Rhodes University) for originally pointing out the correspondence between relative development and LOLTs.

9.2. Experimental Design

The study used a pre-test/post-test experimental and control group design. An experimental group and a control group were exposed to pre-post means of getting data. In addition to attending their usual classes, experimental group students attended a suggested NLP-based programme that trained them in eleven selected Milton model hypnotic language patterns. The control group students did not receive the NLP training. They attended their usual classes that had no specific component dealing with direct teaching of motivational language patterns.

9.3. Research Instruments

An NLP-based programme, a pre-/post-test of motivational language and a pre-/post-observation sheet were developed and used in the study.

9.4. The NLP-based Programme Used in the Study

A programme for developing EFL student-teachers' motivational language was designed. See Appendix A for a sample lesson of the programme.

9.4.1 Objectives of the programme

Objectives of the suggested programme were specified in the light of the language patterns selected for student-teachers to be trained in. Eleven language patterns of the Milton Model were included in the training of the EFL student-teachers that participated in the project. These language patterns constituted the general objectives stated for the programme. Behavioural objectives were derived from these general objectives.

9.4.2 Content of the programme

The content of the programme was designed to achieve the stated objectives. A teacher's guide book and a student's book were developed. It comprised eleven lessons that were to cover the eleven (11) objectives of the suggested programme. Each lesson dealt with a different language pattern:

Lesson One	The Presupposition Pattern
Lesson Two	The Mind Reading Pattern
Lesson Three	The Lost Performative Pattern
Lesson Four	The Cause and Effect Pattern

Lesson Five	The Universal Quantifier Pattern
Lesson Six	The Complex Equivalence Pattern
Lesson Seven	The Double Bind Pattern
Lesson Eight	The Unspecified Referential Index pattern
Lesson Nine	The Comparative Deletion Pattern
Lesson Ten	The Nominalization Pattern
Lesson Eleven	The Tag Question Pattern

9.4.3 Teaching methodology

Teaching the suggested programme followed a three-phase instructional sequence that was situated in a task-based approach to language teaching:

9.4.3.1 Pre-task phase

In the pre-task phase, the experimental group students were introduced to the topic of the lesson at hand. Through whole-class interaction, they were presented with a definition of the hypnotic language pattern at hand and the way it is used successfully both in hypnosis and therapy and in instilling motivation in their students.

9.4.3.2 The actual task phase

In the actual task phase, the teacher stepped back and let the experimental group students autonomously do their work, whether individually or in groups. Students in this phase were, first, asked to make groups of five and to work together in each group and to identify the language pattern, targeted by the lesson, in a given list of utterances. After that, students were asked to work individually to identify motivating versus non-motivating or demotivating language patterns. Having completed the task, whether individually or in groups, students were asked to report to the whole class on the outcome and the teacher was ready to advise and to facilitate learning during that phase.

9.4.3.3 The post-task phase

In the post-task phase or the language focus, students were given the opportunity to work on the language pattern learned. They were asked to work in groups or in pairs to produce as much language patterns as they can and to identify motivating versus non-motivating or demotivating patterns. At the end of the task cycle, knowledge of the target language pattern was evaluated through asking students to finish a two-part written quiz. In the first part of the quiz, students were asked to write five classroom-related

utterances expressing the learned pattern that can be used to motivate students. In the second part of the quiz, they were asked to mark a list of utterances, representing the learned pattern, as motivating or demotivating.

9.4.4 A Pre-post-test of Motivational Language

A pre-post achievement test on hypnotic language patterns, prepared by this researcher, was developed to measure EFL student-teachers' motivational language. The self-designed test is presented in Appendix B.

9.4.4.1 Objectives of the test

The objectives of the test were based on the objectives of the suggested programme. It was aimed at measuring student-teachers' motivational language. More specifically, the test aimed at identifying student-teachers' ability to produce instances of classroom-related language utterances representing the eleven patterns included in the suggested programme.

9.4.4.2 Construction of the test

Eleven areas were specified to be measured by the test. The areas measured focused on the hypnotic language patterns (discussed in the introductory sections of the article) that can be used to instil motivation in students. The test included 11 items, each of which required 4 appropriate responses.

9.4.4.3 Validity and reliability measures of the test

The construct validity of the test was determined by a panel of teaching English foreign language (TEFL) experts. Measures of test reliability and its duration, were calculated through piloting it with a group of 15 third-year EFL general education students by using the test re-test method. The stability coefficient was ($r=.81$) and the optimum time for finishing this test was sixty (60) minutes.

9.4.4.4 Scoring the Test

Scoring written situational tests can be done easily by using a marking key or a marking protocol. As in the world of diplomacy, according to Underhill (1987: 94), "a marking key or marking protocol has the same aim: to save time and uncertainty by specifying in advance, as far as possible, how markers should approach the marking of each question or task". Drawing on Underhill's recommendation, a clear and specific marking protocol was prepared by the researcher for the test used. It included a comprehensive list of anticipated appropriate and correct responses to each test item.

For example, the first item of the test required testees to provide 4 different classroom-related language utterances expressing the presupposition pattern. Anticipated appropriate and correct responses contained in the marking protocol for that test item

included items like the following;

- Good students will be rewarded.
- Most students like learning.
- You finished many difficult courses last year.
- Actually, you've improved a lot.
- Your answers are a lot better than before.
- Your English became good.
- Your answer is almost right.
- Who wants to share their answers with the class?
- Who prefers to talk before his colleagues?
- Last year, you finished many assignments like this.

Based on the marking protocol, two marks were given to each appropriate and correct response, one mark was given to each relevant but not entirely acceptable response and a zero was given to each inappropriate or incorrect response. Some awkwardness of expression and non-impeding errors in spelling and grammar were ignored in scoring this test. In general, the marking protocol gave latitude to raters to award marks whenever an examinee gave an acceptable response, even when it differed from that of the protocol. The maximum score for each item is eight (8) marks and the test maximum score is eighty-eight (88) marks.

9.5. A Pre-post Observation Sheet

A pre-post observation sheet, prepared by the researcher, was developed to measure EFL student-teachers' teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language to instil motivation in their students.

9.5.1 Objective of the observation sheet

The observation sheet, developed by the researcher, aimed at measuring EFL student-teachers' teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language to motivate students during the following phases of the lesson: beginning, during textbook activities, while maintaining control and discipline, handling students' responses and at the end of the lesson.

9.5.2 Content of the observation sheet

EFL student-teachers' effective use of motivational language to motivate students was measured by this observation sheet during the five main stages of the lesson mentioned above. Each stage constituted a separate area in this sheet; the first area was about *using motivational language to motivate students in the beginning of a lesson*. The second area was about *using motivational language to motivate students during textbook activities*. The third area was about *using motivational language to motivate students while maintaining control and discipline*. The fourth area was about *using motivational language to motivate students while students' responses were handled*. The fifth and last area was about *using motivational language to motivate students at the end of a lesson*. Thus, the observation sheet included 5 items.

9.5.3 Scoring system

To capture student-teachers' teaching behaviour into comparable scores, a three point scale was used where "2" referred to the most effective use of motivational English language utterances to motivate students, "1" referred to fairly acceptable use that needs improvement, and "0" referred to unacceptable language use for motivation or no use at all. The most effective use means that the student-teacher uses a variety of appropriate and correct English language utterances to instil motivation in students. "Fairly acceptable use" means that the student-teacher employs a limited repertoire of relevant but not entirely appropriate nor correct language utterance to instil motivation in students. "Unacceptable use" means that the student-teacher uses seriously inappropriate and incorrect English language utterances.

9.5.4 Validity and reliability of the observation sheet

The construct validity of the observation sheet was determined by the same panel of TEFL experts who judged the tools of the study. As for the reliability of the observation sheet, it was determined in two ways:

9.5.4.1 Inter-rater Reliability

The researcher and another trained observer used the observation sheet to analyse ten recorded lessons taught by EFL student-teachers during teaching practice. The correlation between scores awarded by the two observers was calculated. The reliability coefficient for the observation sheet was ($r = .71$). This value means that the observation sheet displayed reasonable reliability.

9.5.4.2 Intra-rater Reliability

The researcher analysed another ten recorded lessons using the observation sheet. After 15 days, the attempt was repeated. The correlation coefficient between the scores of the first and the second analysis was calculated and it was ($r = .73$). This value assures the intra-rater reliability of the observation sheet.

9.6. Pre-testing and Pre-measurement of Teaching Behaviour

Taking into consideration the big effort required in observing the teaching behaviour of each student-teacher, the researcher, asked the help of one of his experienced colleagues to administer the observation sheet with the participants of the study, two weeks before the observations. The researcher acquainted his colleague with the objective of the observation and the procedures to be followed. On 14 September, 2013, a day before beginning the intervention, the pre-test of motivational language was administered to the participants of the current study. This step was intended to ascertain the equivalence of the two groups of the study. An Independent Samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the participants of the two groups. Results of comparisons showed that there is no statistically significant difference between means of scores obtained by students of the control and experimental groups neither in the pre-measurement of motivational language ($t=.49, p<0.05$) nor in the pre-measurement of their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language to motivate students ($t=.49, p<0.05$). This result shows that the two groups of the study are equivalent both in motivational language and in their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language with their students.

9.7. Intervention

On 15 September, 2013, the teaching of the suggested programme with the experimental group began. The teaching programme lasted about 11 weeks and almost one lesson was done per week. Each language pattern was taught in four hours. Thus, the total time of teaching the suggested programme was forty-four (44) hours.

9.8. Post-testing and Post-measurement of Teaching Behaviour

On 12 December, 2013, a day after finishing teaching the suggested programme, the test of motivational language was re-administered to the participants in order to measure their motivational language after attending the suggested programme. After that, this researcher and his experienced colleague started re-administering the observation sheet to the participants of the study to measure their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language to instil motivation in students.

10. Results of the Study

This section presents the results obtained from this study. Results are presented in terms of the study hypotheses.

10.1 Testing the first hypothesis

Independent sample t-tests were used to test the first hypothesis. The findings are presented in Table 1 below.

Table1: “T” value of the control and experimental groups in the post-test of motivational language

Group	N	M	SD	“T” Value	Sig
Control	15	31.4000	3.542	-6.85**	0.001
Experimental	15	43.2000	5.659		

The results in Table1 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores obtained by students of the control and experimental groups in the post-test of motivational language in favour of the experimental group. The experimental group got a higher mean (43.2000) than that obtained by the control group (31.4000). The result of the t-test shows that the t-value = (-6.61) and the difference is significant at (0.001) level. Thus, the first hypothesis is affirmed.

10.2 Testing the second hypothesis

Independent t-tests were also used to test the second hypothesis. The findings are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: “T” value of the control and experimental groups in the post-measurement of teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language

Activity	N	Mean Score		SD		“T” value
		Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental	
Beginning a Lesson	15	.8667	1.4667	.352	.516	-3.72**
Managing Textbook Activities	15	.6667	1.1333	.488	.516	-2.54**
Handling Pupils Responses	15	.9333	1.4000	.258	.507	-3.18**
Maintaining Control and Discipline	15	.7333	1.3333	.458	.617	-3.02**
Ending a Lesson	15	.9333	1.4000	.458	.507	-2.65**
Total	15	4.1333	6.6667	1.642	1.447	-4.48**

The results in Table2 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores obtained by students of the control and experimental groups in the post-measurement of teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language, in

favour of the experimental group. The experimental group got higher mean scores than those obtained by control group. They obtained a mean score of (1.4667) in measuring their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language in beginning a lesson; (1.1333) in managing textbook activities; (1.4000) in handling pupils' responses; (1.3333) in maintaining control and discipline; (1.4000) in ending a lesson; and they obtained an overall mean score of (6.6667) in measuring their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language throughout the different stages of the lesson. Conversely, control group students obtained lower mean scores for each stage of the lesson evaluated.

11. Discussion of the Results

Although it is notoriously difficult to prove "cause and effect" in educational intervention research, the findings of this study does indicate that an NLP programme is promising in the context of developing motivational language and behaviour in an EFL context. According to the post-test scores, direct teaching of the Milton model hypnotic language patterns is capable of improving student-teachers' motivational language use in practice. Experimental group students were able to produce effective motivational language utterances whereas participants in the control group were not able to produce such utterances. These remarkably high gains shown by the students of the experimental group on a pre-test, post-test comparison could be attributed to the effect of the systematic instruction and training the student-teachers had in the effective use of the Milton model hypnotic language patterns, and their exposure to the especially prepared and appropriately tuned authentic materials used in the suggested programme. Student-teachers' mean scores on the post-test of motivational language displayed an enhanced ability to use motivational language and a considerable inspiring ability to instil motivation in their students; they displayed a rich repertoire of sound motivational language utterances they were able to draw on in the lessons that were observed and analysed.

At the same time, the direct teaching of Milton model hypnotic language patterns proved capable of improving, not only student-teachers' motivational language, but also their teaching behaviour aimed at using motivational language to motivate their students during actual teaching. According to the results of the observation sheet, the experimental group students became better able to use motivational language utterances and to motivate their students throughout the different stages of the lesson than those of the control group. These remarkably high gains shown by students of the experimental group on a pre-post comparison could also be attributed to the effect of the systematic instruction and training the student-teachers had in the suggested programme. Student-teachers' mean scores on the post-measurement displayed an ability to instil motivational behaviour and a substantial inspiring ability to motivate their students; they demonstrated a rich repertoire of effective motivational language utterances on which they could draw during the demonstration lessons to instil motivation in their students throughout the different stages of the lesson.

Thus, results of the post-test of motivational language are compatible with those of the post measurement of teaching behaviour. They all indicated that training in Milton model hypnotic language patterns can improve both motivational language and the teaching behaviour aimed at using it in actual teaching to motivate students. In addition, the findings of this study addressed the somewhat controversial issue of whether explicit classroom-centered instruction has any effect on language competence. Some linguists as well as language teachers hold the view that some types of competence are not teachable, where competence is seen as a type of knowledge that learners possess, develop, acquire, use or lose. As indicated by the results of this study, competence can actually be systematically developed through well-planned classroom activities. Thus, the findings of this study are in line with those of Kasper (1997), Sayed (2001, 2008), Shearer and Davidhizar (2003), Silva (2003), Martinez et al. (2006), and Carter-Black (2007). These studies, together with the present one, indicated that competence, whether linguistic, cultural or pragmatic may be teachable.

12. Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of the study, some important recommendations related to teaching in general, and EFL teaching in particular, are presented. The results of the study indicate that motivational language teaching could be successful. This is an indication that in appropriate EFL contexts, such as those of this study, the teaching of motivational language could be integrated with great success in EFL pre-service teacher curricula. The suggested NLP-based programme is recommended to be used for developing in-service EFL teachers' motivational language as well as their interpersonal skills since it proved to be potentially effective with EFL student-teachers. After translating the NLP-programme into Arabic, the suggested NLP-based programme is recommended to be used in developing the motivational competence of teachers of other specializations in this context.

Further research is needed to investigate the effectiveness of using other language patterns, modelled in the field of NLP, in the development of motivational language and interpersonal skills among pre-service and in-service teachers. More contrastive studies are needed to assess how far functional similarity is possible between Egyptian Arabic language patterns and NLP hypnotic patterns.

In conclusion, one needs to re-iterate the limitations of the study reported on here. This remains a small scale study that does not enable generalizing results beyond this population. Furthermore, it remains difficult to claim "cause and effect" in the case of any educational intervention. However, the similarities of the control and experimental groups on the measures reported on before the intervention, and the differences in scores after the intervention, provides some indication that it is possible that the intervention contributed to the improved abilities of the experimental group students. These empirical findings in the EFL teaching setting at least indicate that NLP could be potentially useful in this context. Roderique-Davies (2009: 59) claims that "after three decades, there is still

no credible theoretical basis for NLP, researchers having failed to establish any evidence for its efficacy that is not anecdotal". Although it is not possible to prove beyond all doubt that there were no confounding variables that influenced the enhanced performance of the experimental group in this study, I do believe that the findings go some way to contribute more than anecdotal evidence of the potential of NLP.

References

- Allan, F., Bourne, J., Bouch, D., Churches, R., Dennison, J., Evans, J., Fowler, J., Jeffers, A., Prior, E. & Rhodes, L. 2012. *Training in influencing skills from Neuro-Linguistic Programming (modeled from hypnosis and family therapy), in combination with innovative maths Pedagogy, Raises maths attainment in adult numeracy learners*. Paper presented at the 3rd International NLP Research Conference, Hertfordshire, UK.
- Austin, V., Shah, S., & Muncer, S. 2005. Teacher stress and coping strategies used to reduce stress. *Occupational Therapy International* 12(2): 63-80.
- Bernaus, M. & Gardner, R. 2008. Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *Modern Language Journal* 92(3): 387-401.
- Bozoglan, B. 2010. Is NLP applicable to ELT? *Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin* 12(1): 185-195.
- Brok, P., Brekelmans, M. & Wubbels, T. 2004. Interpersonal Teacher Behaviour and Student Outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 15(3): 407-442.
- Brok, P., Levy, J., Brekelmans, M. & Wubbels, T. 2005. The effect of teacher interpersonal Behaviour on students' subject-specific motivation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction* 40(2): 20-33.
- Carey, J., Churches, R. & Hutchinson, G. (2012, March). *Neuro-linguistic programming and learning: Teacher case studies on the impact of NLP in education*. Paper prepared for the Education Show, Birmingham, UK.
- Carter-Black, J. 2007. Teaching cultural competence: An innovative strategy grounded in the universality of storytelling as depicted in African and African American storytelling tradition. *Journal of Social Work Education* 43(1): 31-50.
- Chamber, G. 1993. Taking the 'd' out of demotivation. *Language Learning Journal* 7(1): 13-16.

- Cheng, H-F. & Dörnyei, Z. 2007. The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 1(1): 153-174.
- Churches, R. 2010. *Effective classroom communication pocketbook*. Hampshire, UK: Management Pocketbooks Ltd.
- Churches, R. & West-Burnham, J. 2008. Leading learning through relationships: The implications of neuro-linguistic programming for personalization and the children's agenda in England. *CfBT Education Trust*. <http://www.cfbt.com>. Date of access: June 13, 2013.
- Cullen, B. & Mulvey, S. 2012. Language patterns and embedded suggestions for motivating learners. *Humanising Language Teaching* 14(6). <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/dec12/sart02.htm>. Date of access: June 15, 2013.
- Denton, P. 2008. The Power of our words. *Educational leadership: The Positive Classroom* 66(1): 28-31.
- Eiko, U. 2005. The role of students' attitudes and motivation in second language learning in online language courses. *CALICO Journal* 23(1): 49-78.
- Ellis, R. 1998. *Second Language Acquisition: Individual differences in L2 acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esterbrook, R. 2006. Introducing Russian neuro-linguistic programming Behaviour modification techniques to enhance learning and coping skills for high-risk students in Community College: An investigation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. George Mason University.
- Gibson, B. 2011. *The complete guide to understanding and using NLP: Neuro linguistic programming explained simply*. Ocala, Florida: Atlantic Publishing Group Inc.
- Harman, R.L. & O'Neill, C. 1981. Neurolinguistic programming for counselors. *Personnel & Guidance Journal* 59(7): 449-453.
- Hayes, P. 2006. *NLP coaching*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Karen, D. 2006. Neuro-linguistic applications to classroom management: Reach them to teach them. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Capella University.
- Kasper, G. 1997. Can pragmatic competence be taught? <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/default.html>. Date of access: September 14, 2013.

- Knight, J. 2012. Deletion, distortion and data collection: The application of the Neuro-linguistic Programming (NLP) meta-model in qualitative interviews. *Australasian Journal of Market & Social Research* 20(1): 15-21.
- Knight, J. 2012. Deletion, distortion and data collection: the application of the Neuro linguistic Programming (NLP) meta-model in qualitative interviews. *Australasian Journal of Market & Social Research* 20(1): 15-21.
- Kudliskis, V. 2011. The potential for examination success in the sixth form lies in belief: The application of Neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) in a learning context. *Practical Research for Education* 44: 12-19.
- Kyriacou, C. 2001. Teacher stress: directions for future research. *Educational Review* 53(1): 27–35.
- Lazarus, J. 2010. *Successful NLP for the results you want*. Richmond, UK: Crimson Business Ltd.
- Linder-Pelz, S. & Hall, L. 2007. The theoretical roots of NLP-based coaching. *The Coaching psychologist* 3(1): 1-10.
- Martinez, F., et al. 2006. Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 600-604.
- Millrood, R. 2004. The role of NLP in teachers' classroom discourse. *ELT Journal* 8(1): 28-37.
- Molden, D. 2007. *Managing with the power of NLP neuro-linguistic programming: A model for better management*. (2nd edition). UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Mousavi, E. 2007. Exploring teacher stress in non-native and native teachers of EFL. *ELTED* 10: 33-41.
- Murray, L. 2013. Limited evidence that neurolinguistic programming improves health-related outcomes. *Evidence Based Mental Health* 16(3): 79.
- Noels, K. 2001. Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning* 51(1): 107–144.
- Nugent, T. 2009. The Impact of teacher-student interaction on student motivation and achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Central Florida Orlando.

- Pintos-López, I. 2010. Choices and responsibility in counseling: Looking into neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) and reality therapy (RT) for a common thread. *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* 30(2): 23-35.
- Revell, J. & Norman, S. 1997. *In your hands: NLP in ELT*. London, UK: Safire Press.
- Roderique-Davies, G. 2009. Neuro-linguistic programming: cargo cult psychology? *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 1(2): 58 – 63.
- Salas, J., Degroot, H. & Spanos, N. 1989. NLP and hypnotic responding an empirical evaluation. *Journal of Mental Imagery* 13(1): 79-90.
- Sayed, O. 2001. A suggested program for developing classroom language among prospective teachers of English at the Faculty of Education, Assiut University. Unpublished master's thesis. Cairo University.
- Sayed, O. 2008. A Suggested Pragmatics-based Program for Developing EFL Majors' Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of New Valley Faculty of Education* 1(1): 1-65.
- Sharpley, F. 1987. Research findings on neurolinguistic programming: Nonsupportive data or an untestable theory? *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 34 (1): 103–107.
- Shearer, R. & Davidhizar, R. 2003. Using role play to develop cultural competence. *Journal of Nursing Education* 42(6): 273-276.
- Silva, A. 2003. The effect of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies* 22(1): 55-106.
- Soureshjani, K. & Riahipour, P. 2012. Demotivating factors on English speaking skill: A study of EFL language learners and teachers' attitudes. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 17(3): 327-339.
- Sturt, J., Ali, S., Robertson, W., Metcalfe, D., Grove, A., Bourne, C. & Bridle, C. 2012. Neurolinguistic programming: A systematic review of the effects on health outcomes. *British Journal of General Practice* 62(604): 757–764.
- Tosey, P. & Mathison, J. 2003. Neuro-linguistic programming and learning theory: A response. *The Curriculum Journal* 14(3): 371–388.
- Tosey, P. & Mathison, J. 2010. Neuro-linguistic programming as an innovation in education and teaching. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 47(3): 317-326.

- Villalobos, J. 2008. The effect of Neuro-linguistic programming on anxiety, self-esteem, and second language acquisition of high school ELD students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University.
- Winke, P. 2005. Promoting motivation in the foreign language classroom. *CLEAR* 9(2): 1-11.
- Witkowski, T. 2010. Thirty-five years of research on neuro-linguistic programming. *Polish Psychological Bulletin* 41(2): 58-66.
- Wohlman, K. 2010. Neuro-linguistic programming and aural skills pedagogy: A paradigm shift from teaching to learning. Unpublished master's thesis. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Yeager, J. 1985. Thinking about Thinking with NLP. Cupertino: Meta Publications.
- Yemm, G. 2006. Can NLP help or harm your business? *Industrial and Commercial Training* 38(1): 12-17.

Appendix A: A sample lesson of the suggested programme

Presupposition

General Objective

By the end of this lesson students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the presupposition pattern.

Branching objectives:

By the end of this lesson students will be:

1. Acquainted with what the presupposition pattern is.
2. Acquainted with the different forms that a presupposing utterance can be placed in.
3. Acquainted with the difference between motivating and demotivating presupposing utterances.

4. Able to state instances of classroom-related motivating presupposing utterances.

The Pre-Task Phase

(1) Lecturing

Introduce the following to the students asking them to pay attention to you;

A presupposition is an implicit assumption about the world or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. A presupposition must be reciprocally known or assumed by the speaker and the addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context. It will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question, and can be associated with a specific lexical item or grammatical feature (presupposition trigger) in the utterance.

In the classroom, every sentence we say also has presuppositions. However, we should consider whether these presuppositions are positive or negative; motivating or demotivating our learners. Positive or motivating presuppositions are very subtle, but very powerful in creating a safe and trusting environment. They focus attention on the positive. By using positive presuppositions we send a message that we have faith in the capacity of the person. Conversely, negative presuppositions focus attention on the negative and allow the mind to create negative pictures.

It is good to always try to include useful presuppositions in our classroom language. As the course proceeds, we will notice that our students will begin to accept those presuppositions as *“people accept the reality that they are presented with”*. Linguistically this reality is contained in the presuppositions that we use in our language. If we include positive motivational presuppositions consistently through our classes, students will begin to accept these presuppositions as the reality of the classroom, and of learning English.

(2) Whole-Class Discussion

The aim of this discussion is to help students share their knowledge gained from the above lecture on the presupposition pattern.

(i) Discuss the following questions with the students. Ask them to take notes.

- What is the presupposition pattern?
- How does a presupposition work?
- What are the different forms that a presupposing utterance can be placed in?

- What is the difference between a motivating and a demotivating presupposing utterance?

(ii) Discuss with the students answering the following exercise giving corrective feedback and encouragement:

Mark the following statements true {√} or false {X}:

1. A presupposition is an implicit assumption about the world or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. { }
2. A presupposing utterance can be placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question. { }
3. Positive or motivating presuppositions create a safe and trusting environment as they focus attention on the positive. { }
4. By using positive presuppositions we send a message that we have faith in the capacity of the person. { }
5. Negative presuppositions focus attention on the negative and allow the mind to create negative pictures. { }

The Actual Task or the Task Cycle

(1) Group work

The aim of this activity is to help students share their knowledge on the nature of presuppositions.

- (i) Ask the students to make groups of five. Each group elects a spokesman.
- (ii) Ask them to work together in each group and to read the following utterances:
 - (a) Ibrahim no longer writes fiction.
 - (b) Have you stopped reading poetry?
 - (c) You can choose to write the paragraph before or after you finish reading.
 - (d) Which part of the lesson did you find most interesting?
 - (e) This unit is very easy because it's secondary school material.

- (iii) After finishing reading, ask them to work together and to identify the main presuppositions presupposed by these utterances.
- (iv) When finished, ask the spokesman of each group to say out loud the presuppositions identified by his group.
- (v) Give continuous encouragement and corrective feedback.
- (vi) You can help them with the following answers;
 - (a) *Presupposition is: Ibrahim once wrote fiction*
 - (b) *Presupposition is: You had once read poetry?*
 - (c) *Presupposition is: You will write the paragraph at some time.*
 - (d) *Presupposition is: At least one part of the lesson was interesting.*
 - (e) *Presupposition is: You learned it already at secondary school, so you know it.*

(2) Individual work

The aim of this activity is to help students understand the difference between motivating and demotivating presuppositions.

- (1) Ask your students to work individually and to answer the following exercise:

Mark the following presuppositions as motivating (M) or demotivating (D):

- a) *Who didn't do their homework? { }*
- b) *Who wants to share their answers with the class? { }*
- c) *Who don't like essay writing? { }*
- d) *Who prefers not to talk before his colleagues? { }*
- e) *Many students hate composition writing. { }*
- f) *You wrote many essays last year. { }*
- g) *I will reward good students. { }*
- h) *Terrific! You've improved a little. { }*

- i) *You were almost right that time.* { }
- j) *Your answer is a lot better than before.* { }
- (ii) When finished, ask them to justify their answers and to say out loud why they marked some presuppositions as motivating or demotivating.
- (iii) Give continuous encouragement and corrective feedback.
- (iv) You can help them with the following answers:
- (a) *Who didn't do their homework?* Is demotivating as it presupposes that some students will always forget or neglect to do their homework. By using such a negative presupposition, we focus the attention of the addressees on the negative and allow their minds to create negative pictures. As the course proceeds, addressees will begin to accept such presuppositions as true since people often accept the reality that they are presented with, and this reality is linguistically contained in the presuppositions that we use in our language.
- (b) *Who wants to share their answers with the class?* Is motivating as it presupposes that all students are active as they have completed the job. By using such a positive presupposition, we create a safe and trusting environment and we send a message that we have faith in the capacity of the addressees. In addition, we focus their attention on the positive. As the course proceeds, addressees will begin to accept such presuppositions as true since people often accept the reality that they are presented with, and this reality is linguistically contained in the presuppositions that we use in our language.
- (c) *Who don't like essay writing?* Is demotivating as it presupposes that some students do not like essay writing.
- (d) *Who prefers not to talk before his colleagues?* Is demotivating as it presupposes that some students do not prefer/like talking before colleagues.
- (e) *Many students hate composition writing* is demotivating as it presupposes that some students do not like essay writing.
- (f) *You wrote many essays last year* is motivating as it presupposes that essay writing is a familiar and easy job for those students.
- (g) *I will reward good students* is demotivating as it presupposes that some students are not good.
- (h) *Terrific! You've improved a little* is demotivating as it presupposes that the addressee was bad at some time.

- (i) *You were almost right that time* is demotivating as it presupposes that the addressee was not right most of the time.
- (j) *Your answer is a lot better than before* is demotivating as it presupposes that the answers of the addressees were bad at some time.

The Post-Task or the Language Focus

(1) Group Work: (A Competition Game)

The aim of this activity is to see how students work harder to produce as much and accurate classroom-related presupposition patterns as possible.

- (i) Divide your students into groups of five and ask them to sit in a circle.
- (ii) Sit among them as you are the judge.
- (ii) Tell them that the aim of this game is to see how they can work harder to produce as much and accurate classroom-related presupposition patterns as possible.
- (iv) Ask each group to select a leader whose job is to make a note of how many classroom-related presuppositions his group has produced.
- (v) Tell them that the winner is the group that produces the most, but accurate, classroom-related presupposition within the specified period.
- (vi) When finished, give the turn equally to the leaders in all groups to say out loud the presupposition patterns produced by their groups.
- (vii) Do not forget to give continuous encouragement and corrective feedback.
- (viii) When all group leaders have finished presenting their produced patterns, announce the winner group.

(2) Pair Work: A Five-Minute Game

The aim of this activity is to see how students work harder to produce and to identify motivating versus demotivating accurate classroom-related presupposition patterns.

- (i) Pair up your students and ask the partners in each pair to sit facing each other.

- (ii) Tell them that they are going to play a five-minute game with classroom-related presupposition patterns.
- (iii) Tell the partners in each pair that when you announce the start time of the game, they are to write ten accurate classroom-related presuppositions in a separate sheet of paper.
- (iv) At the end of the game time, ask the partners in each pair to exchange their sheets and to correct each other's by marking the written patterns on each partner's sheet as motivating or demotivating.
- (v) When finished, collect students' sheets and comment on them clearing up any misconception about presuppositions patterns and giving encouragement and corrective feedback.
- (vi) Finally announce the names of the top ten student-assessors who accurately managed to identify motivating versus demotivating classroom-related presupposition patterns.

(3) Role-play (micro-teaching session):

- (i) Ask your students to arrange their chairs to make separate groups of five, each like a mini classroom.
- (ii) Give out five Role-play cards, face down. Ask them not to look at each other's. One card says "teacher".
- (iii) Tell them that whoever gets the card which says "teacher" acts the teacher's role first then passes it on at the end of his turn. The remaining students act the role of students, each behaving according to the characteristics on his card.
- (iv) Students' cards say, PRETEND HAVING LESS OR NO DESIRE TO LEARN, PRETEND BEING DISRUPTIVE, PRETEND SHOWING LACK OF INTRST IN WHAT THE TEACHER SAYS, and PRETEND BEING PASSIVE.
- (v) Ask the one who gets the role of the teacher, in each group, to begin his role-play at the point where the teacher motivates his students using the presupposition pattern by saying motivating classroom-related presupposing utterances. Ask him to vary his utterances as best as he could.
- (vi) Ask the students who play the role of students to observe their colleague's teaching Behaviour and fill in the appraisal guide.

	1	2	2
Using the presupposition pattern to motivate students			

- (vii) Make sure that they understand the marking system, “2” refers to the most effective use of English in expressing that language pattern, “1” refers to the fairly acceptable use, and “0” to unacceptable use.
- (viii) After the role-play session, discuss with the students their notes on the appraisal guide.
- (ix) Ask them to take turns playing the role of the teacher, changing all the role-play cards and thinking of new motivating classroom-related presupposing utterances.

EVALUATION:

- (1) Ask the students to finish the following quiz:
 - (a) Write five classroom-related presupposing utterances that can be said to motivate students.
 - (b) Mark the following presuppositions as motivating (M) or demotivating (D):
 - a) *Who didn't know the answer to the question?* { }
 - b) *Who likes to say out loud his answer?* { }
 - c) *Who hates studying Grammar?* { }
 - d) *Who doesn't prefer to talk before his classmates?* { }
 - e) *Most learners hate listening.* { }
 - f) *Last year, you finished many assignments like this.* { }
 - g) *Good students will be rewarded.* { }
 - h) *Terrific! You English became good.* { }
 - i) *Your answer is almost right.* { }
 - j) *Your answer is much better than before.* { }

After finishing this quiz, discuss with the students their answers giving corrective feedback and encouragement.

Appendix B: Pre-post Motivational Language Test

Name:

Level:

.....

Read the following situation:

“You had a class the majority of its students were demotivated for one or more reasons; they might have been placed in a level way above their proficiency level owing to the educational policy adopted. As a result, they were struggling, and some of them were clearly about to given up hope of ever understanding anything that goes on in class. Their attitude toward schoolwork screamed, “I don’t care!” They often seemed highly motivated to avoid any schoolwork. Instead, they used to chat with their classmates, make no efforts to learn, demonstrate poor concentration, produce little or no homework, and do not bring materials to the class or lose them. When given an assignment, they used to shrug their shoulders and complain, “Why do we have to do this?” They give up at the first sign of a challenge and they are content with just getting by. (You are required to instil motivation in those demotivated students: **Provide four different classroom-related language utterances expressing each of the following patterns that can be used to motivate those students).**)

(1) Presupposition

(1.1)

(1.2)

(1.3)

(1.4)

(2) Mind Reading

(2.1)

(2.2)

(2.3)

(2.4)

(3) Lost performative

(3.1) -----

(3.2) -----

(3.3) -----

(3.4) -----

(4) Cause & Effect

(4.1) -----

(4.2) -----

(4.3) -----

(4.4) -----

(5) Universal Quantifier

(5.1) -----

(5.2) -----

(5.3) -----

(5.4) -----

(6) Complex Equivalence

(6.1) -----

(6.2) -----

(6.3) -----

(6.4) -----

(7) Double Bind

(7.1) -----

(7.2) -----

(7.3) -----

(7.4) -----

(8) Unspecified Referential Index

(8.1) -----

(8.2) -----

(8.3) -----

(8.4) -----

(9) Comparative Deletion

(9.1) -----

(9.2) -----

(9.3) -----

(9.4) -----

(10) Nominalization

(10.1) -----

(10.2) -----

(10.3) -----

(10.4) -----

(11) Tag Question

(11.1) -----

(11.2) -----

(11.3) -----

(11.4) -----

End of Test

About the author

Osama Hassanein

Department of Curriculum & Instruction
New Valley Faculty of Education
University of Asyut

Arab Republic of Egypt.
Phone: +20-88-293635

Fax: +20-92-7925393

Email address: u_zedan555@yahoo.com

Osama Hassanein is an associate professor of applied linguistics and foreign language pedagogy in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, New valley Faculty of Education, University of Asyut. He currently works as the consultant to the rector of the Northern Borders University in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. His research focuses on developing foreign language skills, methodology of language teaching, pragmatics, integration of digital technologies into the EFL classroom, psycholinguistics (motivation), and EFL instructional design.