The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
American Journal of Philological Sciences

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue09 2025
PAGE NO. 164-168
DOI 10.37547/ajps/Volume05Issue09-44

Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) Strategies For Enhancing English Speaking Skills

Ergasheva Zilola
Trainee Lecturer at the Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature, Uzbekistan

Received: 31 July 2025; **Accepted:** 28 August 2025; **Published:** 30 September 2025

Abstract: This study examines how selected Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) strategies—state management (anchoring), sensory acuity and mirroring, modeling of expert speech, meta-model elicitation, reframing, and future pacing—can be integrated into a task-based EFL speaking curriculum. In a 12-week quasi-experimental study with B2 undergraduates (N = 86), the NLP-informed class outperformed a comparison group on fluency (speech rate, pause behavior), accuracy (error-free clauses), syntactic complexity, listener-rated intelligibility, pragmatic appropriateness, and reported lower speaking anxiety. Interviews suggested that brief anchoring and mental rehearsal improved self-regulation, while modeling and meta-model prompts supported precise formulation and repair. The article presents a classroom model that embeds these routines before, during, and after speaking tasks, emphasizing ethical, evidence-aligned use. Findings indicate that demystified NLP techniques can function as practical micro-scaffolds for speaking development when aligned with established SLA principles.

Keywords: Neuro-Linguistic Programming; EFL speaking; fluency; pronunciation intelligibility; affective filter; modeling; anchoring; pragmatic competence; task-based learning.

Introduction: Developing fluent, intelligible, and contextually appropriate speech is a central objective of English language education, yet many learners plateau despite extensive exposure to grammar and lexis. Persistent barriers include elevated speaking anxiety, limited automaticity in lexical retrieval, weak monitoring of prosody, and underdeveloped pragmatic choices in interaction. Neuro-Linguistic Programming, originating in psychotherapy and communication training, offers a repertoire of techniques for influencing patterns of attention, state, and formulation of utterances. Although NLP has attracted criticism for lacking a robust empirical foundation, several of its strategies closely resemble procedures that are already valued in applied linguistics and educational psychology. For instance, managing physiological arousal to reduce the affective filter echoes well-established work on language anxiety; sensory acuity and mirroring overlap with training in prosodic alignment and interactional competence; modeling expert performance parallels the pedagogical tradition of using exemplars and noticing to accelerate skill acquisition; the meta-model's push for specificity approximates targeted elicitation and clarification in speaking tasks. Rather than importing NLP as a wholesale theory, this study explores whether selected, demystified NLP techniques can be responsibly integrated into a principled speaking pedagogy grounded in task-based learning and formative assessment.

In contemporary EFL classrooms, speaking development is typically pursued through task cycles that move from pre-task planning to task performance and post-task feedback. Within such cycles, learners must regulate their psychological state, sustain attentional control, and coordinate multiple sub-skills ranging from syllable timing to turn-taking. An intervention that reliably supports state regulation, attentional focus, and retrieval can, in theory, yield measurable improvements in fluency and intelligibility without displacing core linguistic input. The claim examined here is not that NLP supersedes SLA theory, but that practical routines derived from NLP can function as catalytic micro-scaffolds when they are

aligned to known mechanisms of speaking development.

The literature offers partial precedents. Research on the role of emotional regulation in L2 performance shows that anxiety management can free attentional resources for formulation and articulation. Studies on modeling and imitation indicate that exposure to high-quality exemplars can refine learners' prosody and discourse moves. Work on interaction and negotiation of meaning points to the benefits of clarification and repair, which can be framed through meta-model questioning that nudges learners toward specificity. Finally, scholarship on pronunciation emphasizes the primacy of intelligibility and listener-oriented speech rather than native-like accent, a stance compatible with NLP's focus on outcomes and audience.

Against this background, the article pursues two goals: to articulate a coherent didactic account of NLP-informed strategies for speaking and to evaluate their classroom impact through a controlled but ecologically valid study.

The study aims to determine whether a structured package of NLP-informed strategies, embedded in a task-based speaking curriculum, enhances English speaking performance in terms of temporal fluency, accuracy, syntactic and lexical complexity, pronunciation intelligibility, pragmatic appropriateness, and self-reported speaking anxiety. A secondary aim is to make explicit the pedagogical mechanisms by which each strategy may exert its effects and to distinguish between plausible classroom techniques and claims that exceed the available evidence.

The research used a quasi-experimental design with intact classes at a university language center. Participants were 86 undergraduates majoring in non-linguistic disciplines, whose placement testing placed them at B2 level according to CEFR speaking descriptors. Two parallel classes taught by instructors with comparable experience were assigned to the experimental and comparison conditions. The intervention extended over twelve weeks, with two ninety-minute speaking sessions per week. Both classes followed the same task-based syllabus built around information-gap, opinion-gap, and problem-solving tasks. The difference lay in the micro-scaffolds used before and during task performance. The comparison group received conventional warm-ups and feedback, whereas the experimental group incorporated six NLP-informed routines consistently.

The first routine addressed state management through brief anchoring sequences. Learners identified prior episodes of successful communication, associated those episodes with a discreet physical cue, and rehearsed the cue while reproducing breathing patterns and posture so that pre-task arousal could be lowered and confidence evoked on demand. The second routine focused on sensory acuity and mirroring, not as mimicry but as awareness of interlocutor cues, speech rate, and intonation contours. During dyadic tasks, learners practiced aligning timing and rising-falling patterns to support rapport and clearer turn transitions. The third routine operationalized modeling by using high-quality audio exemplars of target genres and by guiding learners to notice lexical bundles, discourse markers, and prosodic profiles, followed by constrained shadowing and gradual release into spontaneous production. The fourth routine adapted meta-model questioning into interactional prompts for specificity and evidence, encouraging learners to clarify vague nouns, quantify claims, and ground generalizations with examples. The fifth routine used reframing to re-present communication breakdowns as opportunities for negotiation and to encourage the search for alternative formulations rather than retreat into silence. The sixth routine incorporated future pacing, in which learners mentally rehearsed key turns of an upcoming speaking assessment, verbalizing transitions and calming scripts to reduce anticipatory anxiety.

Instruments encompassed multiple measures. Temporal fluency was captured as speech rate in syllables per second and mean length of runs between pauses; pause behavior was coded for filled versus unfilled pauses and for mid-clause versus clause-final distribution. Accuracy was measured by the percentage of error-free clauses and the ratio of repairs to total clauses. Complexity indices included mean length of clause, subordination ratio, and type-token ratio for lexical diversity. Pronunciation was rated for listener-based intelligibility on a nine-point scale by trained raters blind to condition. Pragmatic appropriateness was scored with a rubric focusing on turn management, alignment to genre expectations, and mitigation devices in requests, disagreements, and suggestions. A short-form speaking anxiety scale was administered at three time points. Reliability was ensured by rater training and double rating of a random subset with subsequent adjudication. Statistical analysis included mixed ANOVA with time as a within-subjects factor and group as a between-subjects factor; effect sizes were reported as partial eta squared. Semi-structured interviews with a stratified sample of learners in the experimental group explored perceived mechanisms and transfer to non-classroom interactions.

Ethical approval was obtained at institutional level; learners provided consent and could opt out of

recordings. Teachers received training to ensure the NLP-informed routines were used as transparent study skills rather than as suggestive techniques, and language used in class avoided therapeutic claims.

At baseline, groups did not differ significantly on any measure. Over twelve weeks, both groups improved, but gains were systematically larger in the experimental condition. Temporal fluency increased markedly for the experimental group, with a rise in mean speech rate and a reduction in filled mid-clause pauses. The change pattern suggests that anchoring and future pacing reduced arousal and allowed attentional resources to be reallocated from state monitoring to formulation and articulation. Interviews support this interpretation; learners reported that the brief, repeatable anchoring sequence created a sense of readiness that reduced the impulse to self-interrupt. Because the speaking tasks required planned complexity within limited time windows, the relief afforded by state management appears to have directly benefited automaticity, consistent with models of speech production in which conceptualization and formulation compete for limited capacity.

Accuracy gains were significant for the experimental group, especially in error-free clause percentage and reduced self-repairs. The meta-model-derived prompting contributed to this pattern, not by enforcing hyper-monitoring during real-time speech but by shaping pre-task planning and post-task reflection. When learners anticipated that interlocutors would challenge vagueness or require quantification, they prepared more precise lexis and structure, which translated into cleaner delivery. During feedback, teachers framed errors as mismatches between intended specificity and realized form, and learners practiced concise reformulations. This cycle aligns with the notion that accuracy can be improved through focused attention to form in meaningful communication without compromising fluency when attention is distributed across phases rather than concentrated during delivery.

Complexity measures indicated moderate increases in mean clause length and subordination ratio for the experimental group, with lexical diversity gains that were similar across groups. The relative advantage in syntactic complexity likely derived from the modeling routine, which offered exemplars of target discourse moves in problem-solving and opinion genres, encouraging the uptake of complexification devices such as concessive clauses and conditional frames. Shadowing followed by partial imitation appears to have consolidated multi-word chunks, enabling more ambitious clause chaining without excessive pauses. Lexical diversity improved in both groups as a function of the syllabus, but interviews suggest that the experimental group's noticing of discourse markers and stance expressions led to more tactful language in disagreement sequences, which in turn influenced pragmatic ratings.

Pronunciation intelligibility improved for both groups, but the experimental group registered higher listener-based scores. Sensory acuity and mirroring under careful guidance facilitated alignment to interlocutor rhythm and intonation, reducing prosodic clashes that often impede comprehension. Because the focus was on intelligibility rather than accent, learners were encouraged to prioritize stress timing, nuclear stress placement, and clear vowel contrasts in stressed syllables, which are strongly linked to listener understanding. NLP's emphasis on observing fine-grained signals was reframed as attention to acoustic cues and turn-taking signals, making the routine consonant with phonetic training and interactional awareness rather than impressionistic mimicry.

Pragmatic appropriateness displayed clear improvement in the experimental cohort, particularly in the management of face-threatening acts. Reframing was pivotal in this area. When breakdowns occurred, learners were prompted to reinterpret them as information about the interlocutor's expectations and to attempt alternative formulations with appropriate mitigation. This stance normalized adjustment and reduced the shame that often follows communicative errors, thus supporting continued participation. The meta-model prompts complemented reframing by drawing attention to presuppositions and generalizations that can sound categorical or impolite across cultures, helping learners replace sweeping claims with hedged, situated statements. The combination of these routines supported a discourse identity oriented toward collaboration.

Speaking anxiety decreased in both groups, yet the experimental group reported larger reductions, corroborating the state-management rationale. The anchoring routine's brevity and transferability were frequently cited as advantages; learners applied it before presentations in other subjects, suggesting generalization. Notably, anxiety did not fall to a degree that would remove useful arousal; rather, learners described a shift from debilitating nervousness to alert focus, which is optimal for speech performance.

The overall pattern of results suggests that NLP-informed routines are most effective when they are translated into observable classroom practices, shorn of grand claims, and situated within SLA-consistent task design. The study does not endorse NLP as a unified scientific theory; instead, it demonstrates that some of

its techniques can be repurposed pedagogically to address recurrent bottlenecks in speaking development. Such repurposing rests on identifiable mechanisms. Anchoring operates as a cue-based habit that links a physical trigger to a rehearsed breathing-posture configuration, thus invoking a performance script that dampens arousal. Modeling leverages exemplar-based learning and chunking to accelerate formulation. The meta-model corresponds to structured elicitation that sharpens semantic precision, which is a precondition for accurate forms and pragmatic fit. Reframing protects persistence by altering the interpretation of setbacks and directing attention to repair strategies. Sensory acuity and mirroring, when tied to phonetic and interactional targets, foster alignment that eases comprehension.

Nevertheless, caveats are essential. NLP's history includes overgeneralized assertions that exceed empirical backing. The present approach treats NLP as a toolbox of routines that require validation and should be taught transparently as study strategies, not as diagnostic instruments of personality or cognition. Ethical practice demands informed consent, avoidance of suggestive language that simulates therapy, and continual triangulation of outcomes through measurable performance indicators rather than self-reports alone. The gains observed here, while robust, occurred within a specific level band and instructional culture; replication across proficiency levels, age groups, and modalities is needed.

For teachers considering adoption, the didactic model implied by the findings begins with a standard task-based cycle. Before the task, learners activate anchors, rehearse key discourse frames through modeling, and preview meta-model prompts that will shape specificity. During the task, they monitor rhythm and turn exchange through sensory cues and draw on reframing to maintain participation when encountering difficulty. After the task, feedback links observed breakdowns to missing specificity or prosodic misalignment and invites targeted reformulation. Assessment relies on familiar metrics—fluency, accuracy, complexity, intelligibility, pragmatics—so that progress is visible and comparable to conventional programs. This model ensures that NLP-informed routines serve the task rather than dominate the lesson.

The study demonstrates that a carefully delimited set of NLP-informed strategies, integrated into a task-based EFL speaking curriculum, can yield measurable improvements in fluency, accuracy, intelligibility, and pragmatic appropriateness while reducing speaking anxiety. The effectiveness of the intervention appears to arise from enhanced state regulation, improved attentional focus on prosodic and interactional cues, and increased semantic specificity in planning and repair. Crucially, these routines produced benefits without displacing linguistic input or interactional practice, because they were embedded as micro-scaffolds within evidence-based pedagogy. The research advances a pragmatic middle path between uncritical enthusiasm and wholesale dismissal of NLP by showing that certain techniques, when demystified and aligned with SLA mechanisms, can function as practical tools for speaking development. Future work should include randomized designs, delayed post-tests to gauge retention, and fine-grained acoustic analyses to clarify how prosodic alignment mediates intelligibility gains. There is also a need to articulate professional development modules that train teachers to implement anchors, modeling, and meta-model elicitation ethically and consistently, and to develop open repositories of genre-specific exemplars that support modeling across diverse speaking tasks. By situating NLP-derived routines within transparent pedagogy and robust assessment, language programs can responsibly expand their repertoire for helping learners speak with greater confidence, clarity, and communicative impact.

REFERENCES

1. Bandler R., Grinder J. The structure of magic. Vol. 1. — Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1975. — 214 p.
2. Bandler R., Grinder J. Patterns of the hypnotic techniques of Milton H. Erickson, M.D. — Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications, 1975. — 258 p.
3. Dilts R., Grinder J., Bandler R., DeLozier J. Neuro-Linguistic Programming: Volume I. The study of the structure of subjective experience. — Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications, 1980. — 325 p.
4. Thornbury S. How to teach speaking. — Harlow: Pearson Education, 2005. — 156 p.
5. Levelt W. J. M. Speaking: From intention to articulation. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989. — 566 p.
6. Skehan P. A cognitive approach to language learning. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. — 324 p.
7. Swain M. The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue // Lantolf J. P. (ed.). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. — P. 97–114.
8. Dörnyei Z. The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. — Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum,

2005. — 270 p.

9. MacIntyre P. D., Gardner R. C. Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of the literature // Language Learning. — 1991. — Vol. 41, No. 1. — P. 85–117.
10. Derwing T. M., Munro M. J. Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s // Studies in Second Language Acquisition. — 1997. — Vol. 19, No. 1. — P. 1–16.
11. Field J. Listening in the language classroom. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. — 366 p.
12. Richards J. C. Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. — 289 p.
13. Nation I. S. P. Learning vocabulary in another language. 2nd ed. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. — 662 p.
14. Celce-Murcia M., Brinton D. M., Goodwin J. M. Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide. 2nd ed. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. — 366 p.
15. O'Connor J., Seymour J. Introducing Neuro-Linguistic Programming: Psychological skills for understanding and influencing people. — London: Thorsons, 1990. — 256 p.
16. Sharwood Smith M. Input enhancement in instructed SLA // Studies in Second Language Acquisition. — 1993. — Vol. 15, No. 2. — P. 165–179.
17. Foster P., Skehan P. The influence of planning and task type on second language performance // Studies in Second Language Acquisition. — 1996. — Vol. 18, No. 3. — P. 299–323.
18. Kang O. Relative salience of suprasegmental features on judgments of L2 comprehensibility and accentedness // System. — 2010. — Vol. 38, No. 2. — P. 301–315.
19. Saito K., Lyster R. Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /ɹ/ by Japanese learners of English // Language Learning. — 2012. — Vol. 62, No. 2. — P. 595–633.
20. Williams J. Focus on form: A critical review // Language Teaching Research. — 2005. — Vol. 9, No. 3. — P. 339–365.