

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEURO-LINGUISTIC PROGRAMMING  
TECHNIQUES ON INDONESIAN STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY  
AND WRITING ABILITY IN THE CONTEXT OF  
ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**(A Script)**

**By  
Hendi Nur Pratama**



**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM  
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG  
2019**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEURO-LINGUISTIC PROGRAMMING TECHNIQUES ON INDONESIAN STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY AND WRITING ABILITY IN THE CONTEXT OF ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**By  
Hendi Nur Pratama**

A few studies which conducted to find out the effectiveness of Neuro-linguistic Programming (NLP) proved that NLP techniques could improve students' self-efficacy and writing ability, however the implementation of NLP in EFL context are still limited. This study aims to find out whether there were any improvements of the students' self-efficacy and writing ability in recount text after they have been taught by using NLP Techniques and to investigate which aspects of the students' writing skill improved the most. The study was conducted to 30 students of grade X who have been learning English in EFL context. The instruments were questionnaire to measure the students' self-efficacy and writing test to measure the students' writing ability. The design used was one group pretest-posttest. The data were in the form of scores taken from the pretest and posttest and were analyzed by using Paired Sample t-test.

The results showed; 1) there was significant improvement of students' self-efficacy with significance value 0,00. 2) There was significant improvement of the students' writing ability in recount text which showing significance value 0,00 and mean score from 73 to 78. 3) The aspect of writing which improved the most was vocabulary with significance value 0,00 and gain 1,63 .

Based on the results, it is concluded that NLP techniques improve the students' self-efficacy and writing ability, even encouraged students to practice writing by themselves to get a better result from day to day.

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEURO-LINGUISTIC PROGRAMMING  
TECHNIQUES ON INDONESIAN STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY  
AND WRITING ABILITY IN THE CONTEXT OF  
ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**By  
Hendi Nur Pratama**

**A Script  
Submitted in a Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for S-1 Degree  
in  
The Language and Arts Education Department of  
Teacher Training and Education Faculty**



**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG  
2019**

**Research Title : THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEURO-LINGUISTIC PROGRAMMING TECHNIQUES ON INDONESIAN STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY AND WRITING ABILITY IN THE CONTEXT OF ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**Student's Name : Hendi Nur Pratama**

**Student's Number : 1513042045**

**Department : Language and Arts Education**

**Study Program : English Education**

**Faculty : Teacher Training and Education**

**APPROVED BY**  
Advisory Committee

Advisor

Co-Advisor

  
**Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D.**  
NIP 19590528 198610 1001

  
**Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.**  
NIP 19630302 198703 2 001

The Chairperson of  
The Department of Language and Arts Education

  
**Dr. Nurlaksana Eko R., M.Pd.**  
NIP 19640106 198803 1 001

**ADMITTED BY**

**1. Examination Committee**

**Chairperson : Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D.** .....

**Examiner : Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, S.Pd., M.A.** .....

**Secretary : Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.** .....

**2. The Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty**



**Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M.Pd.**  
**NIP 19620804 198905 1 001**

**Graduated on: July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

Three handwritten signatures are present on the right side of the document. The top signature is in black ink, the middle one is in blue ink, and the bottom one is also in blue ink. Each signature is followed by a dotted line indicating a name.

## LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini, saya:

Nama : Hendi Nur Pratama  
NPM : 1513042045  
Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris  
Jurusan : Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni  
Fakultas : Keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan  
Judul Skripsi : The Implementation of Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques on Indonesian Students' Self-efficacy and Writing Ability in The Context of English as Foreign Language

Menyatakan bahwa skripsi ini adalah hasil karya sendiri. Sepanjang pengetahuan saya, karya ini tidak berisi materi yang ditulis oleh orang lain, kecuali bagian-bagian tertentu yang saya ambil sebagai acuan. Apabila ternyata terbukti bahwa pernyataan ini tidak benar, sepenuhnya menjadi tanggung jawab saya.

Bandar Lampung, 24 Juli 2019  
Penulis,



Hendi Nur Pratama

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

Hendi Nur Pratama was born on June 19th 1997 in Seputih Banyak, Central Lampung, as the second child of three in Javanese-couple family, Suroso and Siti Munawaroh.

He began his education at a small elementary school in his village, SD Negeri 2 Seputih Banyak, Central Lampung in 2003. Graduated in 2009, he continued his study to SMPN 1 Seputih Banyak and accomplished it three years later in 2012. In the same year, he enrolled into SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak for his senior high school education and finished it in 2012. A year later, he was successfully accepted as a student of English Education Study Program of the University of Lampung through SBMPTN program.

During his study, he actively involved in many university organisations namely FPPI FKIP Unila, DPM FKIP Unila, DPM U KBM Unila, and SEEDS FKIP Unila to sharpen his leadership, communication, and networking skills. At the second year of study together with other students established the first English learning community in faculty scope, and was trusted to become the President of this organization for one year presidency.

Hendi completed his community service and teaching practice program at SMPN 2 Sukadana, Lampung Timur, from July to Agustus 2018. During this year, he also had a chance to experience part-time working as an English private teacher of several Junior High School and Senior High School students in Lampung. In January, before finishing his bachelor degree in the University of Lampung, he was chosen to be a delegation of his university to join SEA Teacher project under SEAMEO. He got a chance to experience teaching in one of Junior High School in the Philippines, namely Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College for one month period.



## **DEDICATION**

This script is fully dedicated to:

- ❖ My Parents, Suroso and Siti Munawaroh
- ❖ My Sisters, Nurul Tika Pratiwi, S.H. and Annisa Nur Aulia
- ❖ My Almamater, University of Lampung

## **MOTTO**

*“Allâh will exalt in degree those of you who believe, and those who have been granted knowledge.” [al-Mujaadilah 58:11]*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Bismillaahirrohmaanirrohiim*, to Allah the al-Mighty, the most Magnificent, and the most Merciful I kneel down for His countless blessings, for the strength and patience. He has granted me with to accomplish this script entitled “The Implementation of Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques on Indonesian Students' Self-efficacy and Writing Ability in The Context of English as Foreign Language.”

Exceptional appreciation goes to my advisors, Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D. and Dr. Ari Nurweni, M. A. I am extremely thankful and indebted to them for sharing expertise, sincere and valuable guidance and encouragement extended to me.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my examiner, Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A., for his insightful comments, suggestions and continuous encouragements, which lead me to get better quality results.

Also the Principal of SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak for giving me an opportunity to conduct the research, I Putu Wirya Suta, S.Pd., as my tutor teacher, and the X Science 1 Students of SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak academic year 2018-2019 for being helpful during the research process

I must express my very profound gratitude to my father, Suroso, my mother, Siti Munawaroh, my sisters, Nurul Tika Pratiwi, S.H., and Annisa Nur Aulia for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study.

I thank my friends in the A class for having supportive environment in our learning process and special thank my fellow mates, for working together before deadlines, and for accepting nothing less than excellence from me. For all the fun, we have had in the last four years.

I place on record to my beloved organizations, DPM U KBM Unila, Eternity, FPPI FKIP Unila, and DPM FKIP Unila, The places where I grew and got marvellous experiences, friends, and networking. Thank you for being my new families.

Last but by no means least, my sense of gratitude to one and all, who directly or indirectly have left their hand in this venture. At the end, I hope that this script can be beneficial for the readers and those who want to carry out similar research further.

Bandar Lampung, 2019

Hendi Nur Pratama

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
MOTTO.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
CONTENTS.....	viii
TABLES AND FIGURE.....	x
APPENDICES.....	xi
I.    INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Research Question.....	6
1.3 Objective.....	6
1.4 Uses.....	7
1.5 Scope.....	7
1.6 Definition of Terms.....	7
II.   LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Writing.....	9
2.2 Teaching Writing.....	11
2.3 Concept of Self-efficacy.....	13
2.4 Self-efficacy and Writing.....	16
2.5 Neuro-linguistic Programming.....	20
2.6 Neuro-linguistic Programming in Teaching.....	21
2.7 Neuro-linguistic Programming to Improve Students’ Self-efficacy and Writing Ability.....	22
2.8 Procedure of Teaching Writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques.....	26
2.9 Advantages and Disadvantages of Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques.....	28
2.10.Theoretical Assumption.....	29
2.11 Hypothesis.....	30
III.  METHODS	
3.1 Design.....	31

3.2 Variables of The Research .....	32
3.3 Data Sources .....	32
3.4 Instruments .....	33
3.5 Data Collecting Procedure .....	41
3.6 Data Analysis.....	42
3.7 Hypothesis Testing .....	45
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	
4.1 Experiment .....	46
4.2 Result of The Pre-test and The Post-test.....	48
4.3 Discussion .....	54
V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	
5.1 Conclusion .....	59
5.2 Suggestions .....	60

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

## TABLES AND FIGURE

Table 3.1. Writing Self-efficacy Questionnaire Items .....	34
Table 3.2. Assessment Interval on The Students' Self Efficacy Levels .....	35
Table 3.3. Writing Scoring Rubric .....	36
Table 3.4. Reliability Test of Writing Scores .....	40
Table 3.5. Normality Test of Self Efficacy Scores .....	44
Table 3.6. Normality Test of Writing Recount Scores.....	44
Table 4.1. Result of Self-efficacy Before and After being Given The Treatment .....	49
Table 4.2. Self-Efficacy Hypothesis Testing .....	49
Table 4.3. The Result of Writing Pre-test and Post-test .....	50
Table 4.4 Writing Recount Hypothesis Testing.....	51
Table 4.5. The Improvement of Students' Achievement in Writing Recount ....	52
Figure 4.1 The Improvement of Students' Achievement in Writing Recount....	52

## APPENDICES

1. Self-efficacy Questionnaire .....	69
2. NLP Based Lesson Plan .....	72
3. Students' Worksheet .....	77
4. Writing Pre-test .....	78
5. Writing Post-test .....	79
6. Reliability Result of the Self-efficacy Questionnaire .....	80
7. Students' Self Efficacy Scores before being Given The Treatment.....	82
8. Students' Self Efficacy Scores After being Given The Treatment .....	83
9. Normality Test of Questionnaire .....	84
10. Self-efficacy Hypothesis Testing .....	85
11. Reliability of The Writing Pre-test Scores .....	86
12. Reliability of The Writing Post-test Scores .....	88
13. Students' Scores of The Pre-test in Each Aspect of Writing .....	90
14. Students' Scores of The Post-test in Each Aspect of Writing .....	92
15. Normality Test of The Students' Writing Scores .....	94
16. Hypothesis Testing of The Students' Writing Scores .....	95
17. Hypothesis Testing of Content Aspect.....	96
18. Hypothesis Testing of Organization Aspect .....	97
19. Hypothesis Testing of Vocabulary Aspect .....	98
20. Hypothesis Testing of Language Use Aspect .....	99
21. Hypothesis Testing of Mechanics Aspect.....	100
22. Examples of The Questionnaires which Have been Completed by Students .....	101
23. Examples of Students' Writing Works .....	107
24. Surat Izin Penelitian .....	113
25. Surat Keterangan Telah Melaksanakan Penelitian.....	114



## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This chapter discusses about research, research questions, objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research and definition of terms.

### **1.1 Background**

Writing is one of the fundamental skills that students should master in the language learning process. In line with one of the goals of the teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Senior High School of Indonesia, teacher should make students to be able to write texts in English (Permendikbud, 2013). It is important to teach writing for students since writing has a special status in education. The society regards writing as the communication used in higher education. This means that to communicate with the professor, professional, peers, etc., students need a good writing ability. When students want to continue to study abroad or willing to experience students exchange program, they have to show their writing ability in order to prove that they are eligible to go through. Besides much of professional communication is done in writing, such as proposals, memos, reports, applications, preliminary interviews, e-mails, and more are part of the daily life of a college student or achieve successful graduate (Walsh, 2010). Considering the facts mentioned above, mastering writing is crucial for the Senior High School students before they graduate.

In fact, the students feel difficult to achieve the objective. Writing is perceived among EFL students as the most difficult language skill to master (Huwari & Noor Hashima, 2011). Most of students have negative attitude to writing (Setyowati & Sony S, 2016). Not only EFL students, even native speakers feel difficulty in showing a good command of writing (Johnstone, Ashbaugh, & Warfield, 2002). Thus, they often view writing as the difficult task (Setyowati & Sony S, 2016). Within Indonesian context as EFL learners, the students face linguistics problems, cognitive problems in relation to paragraph organization and text structure, and psychological problems, such as moods and difficulty to start writing (Rahmatunisa, 2014). Perception of writing as difficult and boring activity leads the students to dislike the activity of writing (Ismail, Elias, Albakri, Perumal & Muthusamy, 2010). Accordingly, students' beliefs about their capability to succeed in completing the task become low, in other words, they are not confident.

The role of teachers toward students' writing attitude is vital. Many teachers, however, do not consider the strategy that they use in teaching writing. Utami (2010) conducted a research in one of Junior High Schools in Indonesia, she found that the teacher in the school did not use various methods in teaching English. The teacher was explaining the materials taught through the same method. The lesson became teacher-centered and the students were not excited. Their involvement during the class was also limited. It made them looked so bored to follow the lesson. There was no active involvement that encouraged them to finish the task given by the teacher. The method used by the teacher, finally, could not stimulate students' motivation to write (Utami, 2012).

Some teachers give heavy feedbacks to the students when they make mistakes. This might make students think that they are not good enough to writing in English and make their confidence falls apart (Setyowati & Sony, 2016). On the other hand, teachers often to give writing task to the students as homework, which makes them accomplish the task by copying texts they find from the internet. The students do not produce texts based on their writing ability (Sepyanda, 2014). Those negative attitudes obstruct the students to practice writing.

However, to have a good writing ability, students need to really spend time to practice on it (Darus, 2008). Graham et al (1991) assert that in order to master the skill, students need more than four days of writing practice a week. In addition, he also urged the promotion of meaningful and purposeful writing activities which could keep the students' writing enthusiasm active and alive. This could be done if the students have a confidence that they can finish the task well, considered as self-efficacy.

According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy is learners' beliefs in their capability to succeed and acquire new information or complete a task or activity to an appointed level of performance. Self-efficacy helps a student to determine how much effort, persistence and resilience to be put on a task (Hetthong & Teo, 2013). White and Bruning (2005) did a research on the relationship of writing beliefs, including writing self-efficacy and writing performance of the post-secondary learners. They administered a quantitative study through three tests that indicated the learners'

implicit beliefs about the writing hardness, the attitudes toward writing they held, and their writing self-efficacy. The researchers deduced that the learners' beliefs about writing had a great impact on the quality of their writing. As a result, they persuaded writing instructors to pay attention to the self-efficacy perceptions of their learners so that "integrated models of writing" can be designed to meet their individual writing demands.

In a more recent study, Jones (2007) investigated the relationship between 118 freshman learners' writing self-efficacy and their internal sense of control over their writing performance. The participants were from many nations including Asians, African-Americans, Latinos, Whites, and "Other" men and women. The results revealed that there was a significant difference between the learners showing weak writing skills with those having stronger writing skills. "Self-efficacy had a far greater effect on course grade than previous writing achievement for the weaker students than the stronger students" (Jones, 2007).

One of the ways that can be used to enhance students' self-efficacy is Neuro-linguistic Programming (NLP) Techniques. NLP was developed in the 1970s by Richard Bandler and John Grinder in an attempt to create a framework that could be used to model, and thereby recreate the effective communications techniques utilised by a number of renowned therapists including Milton Erickson, Fritz Perls and Virginia Satir as cited in Skinner & Croft (2009). A research was done by Skinner and Croft (2009) whether or not NLP Techniques can effectively improve the self-efficacy of undergraduate dissertation students. They found that NLP

techniques got positive feedbacks from the students and contributed to improving their self-efficacy. The other research was conducted by Sufratna (2018) found that NLP can effectively improve the self-efficacy of guidance and counseling students who experience academic procrastination in UIN Sunan Ampel.

In the context of teaching, NLP is related to education since its origins, as one of its founders, Bandler (1985) stated that NLP explores “the subjective experience of the processes by which people learn things” (p. 117). Therefore, NLP is “an educational process. Basically, we are developing ways to teach people how to use their own brains” (Bandler, 1985, p. 7). Many language teachers have been using NLP and its techniques for many years, although they do it unconsciously (Khalandi & Zoghi, 2017). In addition, Khalandi & Zoghi (2017) believe that NLP has been in a stronger position in education due to its effectiveness in helping learners gain a better understanding of the ways they employ to acquire a new language.

With NLP, everyone can sharpen his/her edge, can write more creatively, efficiently, and prolifically (Pearson, 2013). In line with that, the research was done by Wikanengsih (2013) to find out whether or not Neurolinguistic-programming can improve the students’ writing ability. The samples were 11 Junior High School in Cimahi City, West Java, which categorized as low and middle in academic. This was done in order to get the objective result. She found that the students’ writing ability improved after the treatment. Another research is *Experimental writing: neuro-linguistic programming techniques in innovative writing* by Katz (2013)

proves that NLP techniques serve the creative piece of writing effectively and provide an extensive theoretical framework in which to work.

As can be seen, the role of Neuro-linguistic Programming in education is important. However, the use of NLP techniques to improve students' self-efficacy and their writing ability in the EFL context, moreover in Indonesia have not been widely studied yet. Considering the explanation above, the researcher tried to find out whether NLP techniques could improve the students' self-efficacy and writing ability.

## **1.2 Research Question**

The research question is formulated as follows:

1. Do students' self-efficacy and writing ability improve after students were taught through Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques?

## **1.3 Objective**

This research aims at achieving the following objective:

1. To find out whether self-efficacy and writing ability improve after students were taught by using Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques.

#### **1.4 Uses**

The uses of this research are:

1. Theoretically, this research would enrich the current theories and could be used as one reference for the next researchers who want to conduct a research in the same field.
2. Practically, the result of this research hopefully could be used as a consideration for English teacher in using the techniques to improve writing ability and self-efficacy of students.

#### **1.5 Scope**

This research is a quantitative research and was conducted at the First Grade of SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak who have been learning English in the EFL context. It focused on Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques to improve students' self-efficacy and writing performance. The researcher taught recount text writing. The depth of this study was limited to the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

#### **1.6 Definition of Terms**

The researcher includes some operational definitions of key terms to support the readers' understanding of this research. They are as follows:

1. Writing

Writing is a skill in learning language acquired by an individual to write meaningful words or sentence grammatically correct and well organized.

## 2. Recount Text

Recount text is a text that telling the reader about one experience, action or activity which happened in the past.

## 3. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is students' belief that they can do their writing task based on the assumption of their ability.

## 4. Neuro-linguistic Programming

Neuro-linguistic Programming is the practice of understanding how people organise their thinking, feeling, language and behaviour to produce the results they do.

This is the end of chapter one. In this chapter the researcher has discussed the introduction of the research used in this study, including background, research question, objective, uses, scope, and definition of terms.



## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter discusses the concepts and theories from related literature which are expected to contribute to the finding of the research. Those are the definition of the definition of writing, aspects of writing, teaching writing, concept of self-efficacy, Neuro-linguistic Programming, Neuro-linguistic Programming in teaching, Neuro-linguistic Programming to improve students' self-efficacy and writing ability, procedure of teaching writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques, advantages and disadvantage of Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques, theoretical assumption and hypothesis

### **2.1 Writing**

Writing is one of the language skills while in doing this skill, the students need to gather the ideas then put them in form of written words. By performing writing, the students share their ideas and indicate how far their language ability. We regard writing as an essential learning tool because it helps students to better understand idea and concepts.

Raja (2013) states that writing is not a natural activity. Without formal school or any teaching, human cannot write, moreover in case of academic writing. It is a complex activity. Kane (2000) mentions that there are three components in writing

namely grammar, usage, and mechanics. Grammar means the rules which structure of the language. While usage is the way a researcher designates the rules of less basic and binding sort, concerning how he/she should use the language in certain situations. Then, mechanics refers to the appearance of words to how they are spelled or arranged on paper. The rules gathered under the heading of mechanics attempt to make writing consistent and clear. Along with mechanics it includes punctuation.

In order to make a good writing, there are five aspects that should be considered in the process of making a composition. Below are the five aspects of writing according to Jacobs et al (1981).

1. Content

It refers to the substance of writing, the experience of the main idea identified by seeing the topic sentence. The topic sentence should express the main idea and reflect the entire paragraph.

2. Organization

It refers to the logical organization of content that stick together so that ideas run smoothly within paragraph.

3. Grammar/Language use

It refers to the use of the correct grammatical forms and syntactical pattern.

It is identified from the construction of well-formed sentence.

#### 4. Vocabulary

It refers to the selection of words that are suitable for the content. It can be identified by seeing the words choice or diction in order to convey ideas to the reader.

#### 5. Mechanics

It refers to the use of graphic conventional of the language. It is identified by seeing the usage of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization within the paragraph.

Those concepts basically state that writing is a process organizing the idea, opinions, and feelings into written form. It is a complex activity with the control language both of the sentences level (content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics) and beyond the sentence rank (organizing and integrating information into cohesive and coherent paragraph or text).

## **2.2 Teaching Writing**

Teaching writing is to teach the students how to express the idea or imagination in written form. In order to be success in writing, the material should be relevant to their needs, interest, capacities, and ages until they are able to make composition with view or even no errors (Finnochiaro, 1964). Teaching is showing or helping someone to learn how to do something providing with knowledge, causing to know or to understand. Additionally, teacher should be able to encourage the students to write and make them believe that they can do the task of writing well.

Nunan (2003) says that there are four principles for teaching writing which can be adapted to many different learning situations. They are:

1) Understanding your students' reasons for writing

The greatest dissatisfaction with writing instruction comes when the teacher's goals do not match the students, or when the teacher's goals do not match those of the school or institution in which the student works. It is important to understand both and to convey goals to students in ways that make sense to them.

2) Providing many opportunities for student to write

Writing is a productive skill. So, it requires a lot of practice to produce their writing. The teacher should provide students with different types of writing. So, the students have opportunities to write something.

3) Making feedback helpful and meaningful

Students need feedback on their writing. Give feedback that can be understood by the students and that can help them to develop their writing skill. If the teacher writes comment on students' writing paper, make sure they understand the vocabularies and symbols used. Then feedback should entail "correcting" a students' writing. The teacher can provide summary comments that instruct students to find their problems and correct them on their own to foster independent researchers.

- 4) Clarifying, for yourself and for the students, how their writing will be evaluated

Students often feel the evaluation of their writing is completely subjective.

To avoid this, discuss with the students about what is valued in their writing.

In short, teaching writing refers to teach the students to endure the writing Process, started from planning their writing, guide the students to start writing, revising, and editing their writing to be a proper text. High self-efficacy will help students to bear the process of writing practice.

### **2.3 Concept of Self-efficacy**

Bandura (1994) defines self-efficacy as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. He says that self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. It is the reason why in the area of academic achievement, most researchers agree that academic self-efficacy beliefs are related to and predictive of academic performance (Pajares and Johnson, 1993).

Additionally, Bandura (1982) states that judgment of self-efficacy determine people's behaviour, thought patterns, the emotional reactions they experience in taxing situation, the expending of effort, the length of time to persist in the face of obstacles. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach of difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set

themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of difficulties. They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude it does not require many failures for them to lose faith in their capabilities.

Zimmerman (2000) states that self-efficacy measures focus on performance capabilities rather than on personal qualities, such as one's physical or psychological characteristics. Self-efficacy beliefs are not a single disposition but rather are multidimensional in form and differ on the basis of the domain of functioning. For example, efficacy beliefs about performing on a history test may differ from beliefs about a biology examination. Self-efficacy measures are also designed to be sensitive to variations in performance context, such as learning in a noisy lounge compared to the quietude of the library. In addition, perceptions of efficacy depend on a mastery criterion of performance rather than on normative or

other criteria. For example, students rate their certainty about solving a crossword puzzle of a particular difficulty level, not how well they expect to do on the puzzle in comparison to other students. Finally, self-efficacy judgments specifically refer to future functioning and are assessed before students perform the relevant activities. This antecedent property positions self-efficacy judgments to play a causal role in academic motivation.

Efficacy beliefs vary in three key areas (Pajares, 2003), namely levels, generality, and strength. Levels refer to the varying degrees of difficulty in achieving a task. Those levels can be measured by giving the 'yes/no' questions which will have low accurate pictures, and by presenting a specific task and asking the students to rate their confidence in doing the task on a scale with multiple points, which will produce more accurate picture of efficacy belief itself. Generality refers to the level of people's efficacy when evaluating different tasks. Strength refers to the ferventness to which people believe in their ability.

Thus, self-efficacy is the important factor of a person in performing their task because by having high self-efficacy, a person will have high motivation, confidence, control, commitment, and effort toward his or her capability.

## **2.4 Self-Efficacy and Writing**

McLeod as cited in Pajares and Johnson (1993) defines writing as much an emotional as a cognitive activity, affective components strongly influence all phases of the writing process. It means that in doing writing, a researcher involves not only the cognitive aspects but also the affection and many practices to gather researchers' ideas into a piece of writing. It means that in writing, students also involve their affection and emotion.

Writing self-efficacy means to students' beliefs in their ability to perform written English task successfully. Such tasks include composition, correctly punctuating writing and creating grammatically correct samples of writing (Hashemnejad, F et al., 2014). Another definition of writing self-efficacy is proposed by Chea and Shumow (2014) who consider writing self-efficacy as students' ability to perform in writing tasks that can be form of paragraph. Therefore, writing self-efficacy would imply a high sense of efficacy and confidence for the task of writing. L2 learners are expected to have writing self-efficacy in terms of content, design, unity, and accuracy, punctuation (Kirmizi and Kirmizi: 2015).

Flores (2013) states that self-concept and self-efficacy beliefs as constructs would have an equal impact on the students' writing performance because both involve students' beliefs in their capabilities and attitude required to attain a given task. Moreover, Bandura (1994) mentions that students who evaluate themselves as poor researchers tend to perform being reluctant to engage in writing works and making brief or incomplete pieces of writing while students with higher writing self-



efficacy have been found to complete writing tasks at a higher standard. It means that self-efficacy affects the performance of someone's writing.

Shah et al. (2011) believes that individuals who hold positive perceptions of themselves as good researchers are more likely to pursue opportunities to write, expend more effort during their writing process and demonstrate greater persistence in seeking writing competence generally; thus, a high sense of self-efficacy or agency is likely to contribute to the production of good-quality writing, as opposed to low-efficacy.

Pajares (2003) says that sometimes, self-efficacy belief can be low and overinflated levels which can disturb the learning process. Students with low efficacy will have the problem in their learning if they do not apply effort to believe that they can master the task. Students with overinflated levels of self-efficacy have the risk of being overconfident and not employing the appropriate means needed to be successful, such as they may not take time to learn proper structure, format, and rules for their writing tasks.

Moreover, Lavelle as cited in Kirmizi and Kirmizi (2015) states that students with a high level of writing self-efficacy possess strong confidence in writing ability. Those who have a reduced or low level of writing self-efficacy do not have sufficient confidence in the writing skill. Therefore, individual with high level of writing self-efficacy view difficult writing tasks a challenge and work accordingly to resolve the problems that they face.

So, it is almost imperative to ensure the cognitive, behavioral and motivation engagement of students which is facilitated by increased writing self-efficacy in the teaching of writing skill.

Pajares (2003) says that there are three ways of measuring writing self-efficacy:

1. Assessing students' confidence that they possess specific writing skills such as their grammar usage, composition, and mechanical writing.
2. Assessing students' confidence in completing writing tasks such as writing term paper, authoring a short fiction story, or writing a description about something.
3. Using items providing a rating of students' beliefs in the form of A, B, C, or D according to their language class.

A few studies on self-efficacy have been resulted in finding out the relation between self-efficacy and writing performance. The first research was done by Musthapa (2013) who finds that when Arabic learners believe that they are good readers, researchers and able to use correct grammar in their communication, the effect of these beliefs is observed in the improvement of their performance. Positive reinforcement and motivation towards students' capabilities in learning, without focusing too much on their failure, will eventually ease the learning tasks such as writing and reading task. Shah et al. (2011) conducted a study about self-efficacy in the writing of Malaysian ESL learners. Then their findings confirm that there is

a significant positive correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance in English.

However, the correlation between general self-efficacy and writing performance is found to only have a medium positive correlation. Another study was also done by Chea and Shumow (2014). They found that writing self-efficacy was significantly and positively correlated with writing achievement. The results reveal that writing self-efficacy was related to writing mastery goal orientation and writing achievement.

Moreover, Pajares (2003) in his study demonstrates that students' confidence in their writing capabilities influences their writing motivation as well as various writing outcomes in school. The assumption of beliefs which students create, develop, and hold to be true about themselves are vital forces in their success or failure in school. The thing that makes this study is different from these previous studies was that in this study, the correspondents were the senior high school students. Meanwhile, in the previous studies, the correspondents were university students. From this, the researcher assumes that this research will enrich the teachers' reference related to their students writing performance toward self-efficacy.

Thus, the previous studies above prove that the assumption of someone's self-efficacy can affect his or her writing performance by having motivation, reinforcement, and confidence in their own writing ability.

## 2.5 Neuro-linguistic Programming

NLP was developed in the 1970s by Richard Bandler and John Grinder in an attempt to create a framework that could be used to model, and thereby recreate the effective communications techniques utilised by a number of renowned therapists including Milton Erickson, Fritz Perls and Virginia Satir as cited in Skinner & Croft (2009). The term refers to the three areas that NLP has brought together (O'Connor and Seymour, 1994, p25):

- 'neuro': refers to our neurology, our thinking patterns.
- 'linguistic': is language, how we use it and how we are influenced by it.
- 'programming': refers to the patterns of our behaviour and the goals we set.

NLP is based upon four main principles of:

- rapport with ourselves and with others;
- knowing what you want by setting goals and outcomes;
- sensory acuity to check progress towards goal achievement; and
- behavioural flexibility to adjust and change behaviour in response to feedback (O'Connor and McDermott, 1996, pp1–2).

Therefore, it can be concluded that Neuro-linguistic Programming is the practice of understanding how people organise their thinking, feeling, language and behaviour to produce the results they do.

## **2.6 Neuro-linguistic Programming in Teaching**

Neuro-Linguistic Programming has been constantly revolving, which results in the appearance of new applications of the theory in question. It offers teachers help to build rapport and communicate effectively with their students. Learners, on the other hand, are offered a positive, practical and original view of learning that is presented as a conscious process of becoming more effective in the world (Craft 2001; Sumrall 2010). Richards and Rodgers (2001) demonstrate NLP as a supplementary technique in teaching a second language. One should also point to O'Brien (2012) who guides educators through the principles of Neuro-Linguistic Programming via presenting them both with the underlying theory and practical techniques that can be effectively used while working with students in the classroom. Generally speaking, NLP is supposed to help achieve excellence of performance in language teaching, which means that the application of the framework under analysis to the field of education can improve classroom communication, optimise learners' attitudes and motivation, facilitate their personal growth or even change their attitude to life.

Important and interesting research into the impact of NLP on English language teachers' educational success was carried out by Pishghadam, Shayesteh and Shapoor (2011). The researchers, in a two-phased study, examined such NLP factors as flexibility, anchoring, elicitation, modeling, individual differences, leading, establishing rapport, and emotional and cognitive boosters and their application in language classrooms. The number of teachers who took part in the study (173 teachers in the first phase, and 93 educators in the second phase) was

satisfying, which enables one to conclude that the results of the research may be treated as reliable. Most importantly, the influence of NLP on teachers' success has been confirmed.

### **2.7 Neuro-linguistic Programming to Improve Students' Self-Efficacy and Writing Ability**

Naeem (2011) cites three principles related to NLP that can be used to improve the writing skill of learners:

- Learners must have a clear idea of their goals;
- Learners must be active regarding what they are gaining;
- Learners must be flexible and willing to change their behavior until they get what they want.

To support those principles, the teacher would apply the reframing technique and guide the students to set goals of learning English.

Reframing is the technique that the teacher utilizes by relating to personal experiences and makes it concrete and tangible for the learners. It can be used to modify students' conception of themselves or of the language, which makes it a powerful motivational tool. Reframing can also be used for creating artificial contexts to be used in the classroom and thus provide the students with a wider array of learning opportunities without the need of material support (Lashkarian & Sayadian, 2015).

Goal setting employs the SMART framework (or similar heuristic), in which a goal is commonly designed to be specific, measurable, achievable/agreed upon, realistic

and time-based (Doran 1981; Fielding 1999; Wade 2009). SMART goals commonly draw upon established principles of good practice from goal-setting theory; that is, according to Locke and Latham (2002), that goals are specific, challenging but realistic, proximal in time, and engage the learner's commitment. For goals to be realisable, learners greatly benefit from formative feedback that informs them of progress towards meeting their goal.

In addition, there are some other NLP techniques that will be undertaken by the teacher in order to improve students' self-efficacy and writing ability that proposed by Siddiqui (2018).

1. Anchoring

Anchoring in NLP is a technique to create a positive mental image with the help of "anchors" or "triggers". Anchoring helps in motivating the learners in building positive attitude towards learning. With the help of mental images, positive emotions are installed in learners by certain gestures, various expressions, and different body movements. By recalling these anchors the language learners can be guided to achieve confident state of mind. Anchoring has proved to be a highly beneficial technique for second language learners.

2. Building rapport

In the Oxford dictionary, Rapport has been defined as "a close and harmonious relationship in which the people or groups concerned understand each other's feelings or ideas and communicate well." By

establishing rapport with learners, the English language teaching and learning process can be accelerated. Fostering rapport between learners will lead to fill up the gaps in communication, provide a conducive environment, thus leading to an interactive class filled with activities.

### 3. Mirroring

Effective communication can be achieved by adopting Mirroring technique in the classroom. An individual's posture, gestures, facial expressions, breathing patterns, weight shifts, and paralanguage can be mirrored to achieve rapport between learners. Using these patterns in the classroom enhances verbal and non-verbal communication among the learners. Modeling and mirroring the study patterns of academically good performers in the class will help the learners to perform well in the examination. Modeling and mirroring the study patterns of academically good performers in the class will help the learners to perform well in examination.

The teacher will also implement some mindsets of NLP, commonly referred to as NLP presuppositions.

#### 1. **“Mind and body are interconnected: they are parts of the same system, and each affects the other” (Revell, & Norman 2009a: 15)**

It is the teachers' role to choose how the learners' feel. If students are upset or tired, the teacher will break the above state by doing something different than established routines, something that will bring about laughter and smile (Rogozińska, 2016). Those activities are playing game, music, say tong twister, and hand clapping together.



**2. “The map is not the territory” (Bavister & Vickers 2010:19)**

Churches and Terry (2007:605-607) stress that teachers’ and learners’ maps are full of values, beliefs and memories. Revell and Norman (2009:27) suggest that teachers have to be open to the fact that people are different from each other, so are learners. Considering the fact that the students are different, in this case, they have different representational system. In NLP the system is called VAKOG and consists of five senses: visual (seeing), auditory (hearing), kinaesthetic (feeling), olfactory (smelling) and gustatory (tasting). Everybody uses the above senses, however, people naturally tend to use one of them predominantly. So the teacher will create strong and powerful internal representation in the classroom with the more visual, auditory, and kinaesthetic information to facilitate these differences.

**3. “Feedback is information; there is no such thing as failure” (Bavister, & Vickers 2010:24; Revell, & Norman 2009a:47)**

Making mistakes mean experimenting and changing, so instead of concentrating on the mistakes, the teacher will focus on why the students making them. The students will be guided to eliminate something does not work on their learning process and change it into a new and effective way. Students will get constructive feedback from the teacher. Mistakes are the process of learning Harmer (2007:137). The teacher will convince the students that they already have all resources they need to

succeed, so mistakes will not stop them to try their best in the process of mastering writing skill. Here failure should discourage neither teachers nor learners from achieving their outcome. In fact, it can only make them change the plan of how to get to the desired point (Revell, & Norman 2009a, 2009b).

## **2.8 Procedure of Teaching Writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques**

In teaching writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques, the researcher will use the following procedures:

### **Pre-Activity**

1. The teacher comes to the class and greets the students using English
2. The teacher asks the students to pray together before studying
3. The teacher checks the students' attendance
4. The teacher asks the condition of the students

### **Whilst Activity**

1. The teacher applies the reframing technique of NLP to motivate the students in learning English
2. Build the rapport (NLP rapport building) with the students by getting to know each other and asks some activities that they have done last week.
3. Guide the students to set SMART Goals in Learning English by using NLP technique

4. The teacher asks the students to clap their hands whenever they become not focus (Mind and body are interconnected: they are parts of the same system, and each affects the other)
5. The teacher explains the social function, generic structure, and language features of recount text in brief using anchoring technique of NLP and visual, auditory, and kinaesthetic information to facilitate the different representational system of the students.
6. The students read the example of recount text aloud (using modelling technique)
7. The teacher asks the students to analyse the social function, generic structure, and language features of the example text (using rapport building and anchoring technique)
8. The teacher gives the students the task that asked the students to use the language features in recount text (using rapport building technique)
9. The teacher asks the students to answer the task by using talking stick game (using anchoring and rapport building technique)
10. The teacher asks the students to choose a partner (using rapport building technique)
11. Alternately, the students ask their partner to tell the best experience that had happened to him/her in the past (using rapport building technique)
12. The teacher guides the students to do NLP mirroring technique while listening to their partner. They have to mirror the posture, gestures, facial expressions, breathing patterns, and weight shifts of their partner.

13. The teacher guides the students to write a recount text about the best experience of their partner (using anchoring and rapport building technique)
14. The teacher asks the students to give their homework to their partner (using rapport building technique)
15. The teacher asks the students to check and correct their friends' work (using anchoring technique)
16. The teacher guides the students in checking and correcting the writing (using anchoring and modelling technique)
17. The teacher asks the students to revise their writing then submit it to the teacher (using rapport building technique)

### **Post Activity**

1. The teacher gives constructive feedback to the students and telling that there is no such thing as failure
2. The teacher asks the students to conclude the material of the day and end the class

## **2.9 Advantages and Disadvantage of Neuro-linguistic Programming**

### **Techniques**

The advantages and disadvantage of Neuro-linguistic programming techniques are as follows:

1. May enhance students' writing ability in the aspects of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.
2. Improving the students' self-efficacy

3. Increasing students' enthusiasm in the teaching and learning process of writing
4. Encouraging both teacher and students to do their excellence performance
5. Motivating students to always improve their writing ability by practice (self-improvement)

However Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques have disadvantage that the use of NLP techniques in teaching writing still lacks of study and practice, especially in Indonesia in the context English as Foreign Language.

### **2.10 Theoretical Assumption**

Neuro-linguistic programming techniques are effective to improve writing ability and self-efficacy of students. As stated before, in the field of education, NLP can improve classroom communication, optimise learners' attitudes and motivation, facilitate their personal growth or even change their attitude to life.

As some previous researchers have proved that NLP techniques can improve both students' self-efficacy level and writing ability, the researcher wanted to confirm whether it can improve the self-efficacy level and writing ability of students at one time. Writing is a skill that needs a lot of practice. To endure the students in the process of writing practice, they need to believe that they can pass every obstacle in it. Students should have a good self-efficacy level to get a good writing score.

The researcher assumes that teaching writing using NLP techniques can improve both self-efficacy and writing ability of the students.

### **2.11 Hypothesis**

Based on the theoretical assumption above, the researcher formulates the hypotheses as follows:

1. Students' self-efficacy and writing ability will improve after students are taught through Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques.

This chapter has discussed the concepts and theories from related literature which are expected to contribute to the finding of the research. Those are the concept of writing, teaching writing, concept of self-efficacy, Neuro-linguistic Programming, Neuro-linguistic Programming in teaching, Neuro-linguistic Programming to improve students' self-efficacy and writing ability, procedure of teaching writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques, advantages and disadvantage of Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.

### III. METHODS

This chapter discusses about the research design, variables of the research, data sources, instruments, data collecting procedure, data treatment, and hypothesis testing.

#### 3.1 Design

This research was quantitative research based on pre experimental method. This study applied one-group pretest-posttest design of pre-experimental design (Setiyadi: 2006a). In this research, the students were given self-efficacy questionnaire and writing recount pre-test before the treatment to find out the students' initial ability then they were given self-efficacy questionnaire and writing recount post-test after the treatment. The researcher used one class as the sample of the research. It can be illustrated as follows:

<b>T1 X T2</b>
----------------

T1 : pre-test

X : treatment (using Neuro-linguistic programming techniques)

T2 : post-test

The researcher conducted five meetings. Each meeting spent two hours lesson (2 x 45 Minutes). The first meeting was pre-test session, then the next day is the

treatment for the students which will be conducted three times and the last day is post-test. The pre-test was done to find out the students' basic ability in writing recount text and their self-efficacy level before the treatment. Then, treatment were done to guide the students in order to enhance the students' self-efficacy and writing ability in recount text. The last, post-test was done to find out the students' improvement in writing recount text and their level of self-efficacy.

### **3.2 Variables of The Research**

There are three variables in this research, those are Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques, students' self-efficacy, and the writing. Where NLP techniques are the independent variable, self-efficacy and students' writing are the dependent variable. So, the data of this research are Neuro-linguistic programming techniques, students' scores of self-efficacy and writing.

### **3.3 Data Sources**

Data sources are from population and sample which are necessary for research. The researcher chose SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak as the population, while the sample of the population was one class of the first-grade students that was taken randomly.



### **3.4 Instruments**

The data of this research used two instruments as follows:

#### **3.4.1 Questionnaire**

In order to measure self-efficacy level of the students, the researcher used a questionnaire consisted of 15 items. The questionnaire was adopted from Wening (2016) to identify the self-efficacy levels of students in writing recount text. Wening combined and modified questionnaire, which was previously constructed by Magogwe et al. (2015), Chea et al. (2014) and Flores (2013). Some questions in the questionnaire were modified, one of them, for example, “I can put ideas together in a paragraph in such a way that they are clear to the reader” was modified to “I can write a recount text with the clear idea”. These were done to adjust the learning material which was recount text and to make students easier in understanding the questions.

The questionnaire measures writing self-efficacy by providing choices ranging from “never true of me” to “always true of me” and the scores range from 1 to 4. To avoid misunderstanding, it was translated into Indonesian before being administered. The students should fulfil the questionnaire before and after the treatment. Thus, there are 15 items for self-efficacy questionnaire where for items number 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 represent the level area of self-efficacy. While, the generality area of self- efficacy is represented by the items number 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Then, the items number 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 represents the strength area of self-efficacy.

The table below is the writing self-efficacy consisting of three areas:

**Table 3.1. Writing Self-Efficacy Questionnaire Items**

<p><b>Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can write a recount text with the clear idea.</li> <li>• I can elaborate an idea in a recount text well.</li> <li>• I can write a recount text with complete generic structure.</li> <li>• I can write simple, compound and complex sentences in form of past tense correctly.</li> <li>• I can write using effective choice of words and words form.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Generality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can do revision in writing independently or in group well.</li> <li>• I can plan my paragraph well.</li> <li>• I expect good grades on text I write.</li> <li>• I read to improve my writing.</li> <li>• I consider the reader when I write a text.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strength</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If I can't do my writing task for the first time, I keep trying until I can.</li> <li>• When I have something unpleasant to do in my writing task, I stick to it until I finish it.</li> <li>• Getting a low score in my writing task just makes me try harder.</li> <li>• I can do writing assignments at the last minute and still get a good grade.</li> <li>• If the assignment calls for 250 words, I try to write just about that many.</li> </ul>

**Adopted from Wening (2016)**

After being calculated, the students' self-efficacy scores were classified into several categories. The categories are listed as follows:

**Table 3.2. Assessment Interval on The Students' Self-efficacy Levels**

No.	Category	Criteria
1.	<b>High</b>	$X > \text{Mean} + \text{SD}$
2.	<b>Average</b>	$\text{Mean} - \text{SD} \leq X \leq \text{Mean} + \text{SD}$
3.	<b>Low</b>	$X < \text{Mean} - \text{SD}$

#### **3.4.1.1 Validity of Questionnaire**

This questionnaire is based on the theory of self-efficacy brought by Pajares (2003) which states that there are three key areas of self-efficacy namely levels, generality, and strength. Wening (2016) counted on the validity of the questionnaire only based on this theory since it has been used by some previous studies.

#### **3.4.1.2 Reliability of Questionnaire**

To measure the reliability of this questionnaire, the researcher used Cronbach alpha for the internal consistency of the 15-items scale. From the SPSS analysis, it was found that 15 items of the questionnaire are reliable (0,871) (**See appendix 6**). It is stated that if the Cronbach's alpha score is  $>0,6$ , it means that the reliability of the item is accepted and can be used (Arikunto, 1998).

### 3.4.2 Writing Task

To find out which aspect of writing improve the most and whether or not their self-efficacy improve, pre-test before the treatment and post-test after the treatment were conducted. The task was about writing a best experience in the past. The students should write their own recount text according to its social function, language features, and structure of the text, which consists of 100-150 words for each test.

The scoring system used in this test is as follows:

**Table 3.3 Writing Scoring Rubric**

Aspects of writing	Score	Criteria
<b>Content</b>	<b>30-27</b>	<b>Excellent to very good:</b> knowledgeable; substantive; thorough development of thesis; relevant to the assigned topic.
	<b>26-22</b>	<b>Good to average:</b> some knowledge of the subject; adequate range; limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail.
	<b>21-17</b>	<b>Fair to poor:</b> limited knowledge of the subject; little substance; inadequate development of topic.
	<b>16-13</b>	<b>Very poor:</b> does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; or not enough to evaluate.
<b>Organization</b>	<b>20-18</b>	<b>Excellent to very good:</b> fluent expression; ideas clearly stated / supported; succinct; well-organized; logical sequencing; cohesive.
	<b>17-14</b>	<b>Good to average:</b> somewhat choppy; loosely organized but main ideas stand out; logical but incomplete sequencing.
	<b>13-10</b>	

	<b>9-7</b>	<p><b>Fair to poor:</b> non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development.</p> <p><b>Very poor:</b> does not communicate; no organization; or not enough to evaluate.</p>
<b>Vocabulary</b>	<p><b>20-18</b></p> <p><b>17-14</b></p> <p><b>13-10</b></p> <p><b>9-7</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent to very good:</b> sophisticated range; effective word / idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate register.</p> <p><b>Good to average:</b> adequate range; occasional errors of word / idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>.</p> <p><b>Fair to poor:</b> limited range; frequent errors of word / idiom form, choice, usage; meaning or obscured.</p> <p><b>Very poor:</b> essentially translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; or not enough to evaluate.</p>
<b>Language Use</b>	<p><b>25-22</b></p> <p><b>21-19</b></p> <p><b>17-11</b></p> <p><b>10-5</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent to very good:</b> effective complex constructions; few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order / function, articles, pronouns, preposition.</p> <p><b>Good to average:</b> effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors in agreement, tense, number, word order / function, articles, pronouns, prepositions <i>but meaning seldom obscured</i>.</p> <p><b>Fair to poor:</b> major problems in simple / complex constructions, frequent errors of negation; agreement, tense, number, word order / function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and / or fragments, run-ons, deletions; meaning confused or obscured.</p> <p><b>Very poor:</b> virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors; does not communicate; or not enough to evaluate.</p>

<b>Mechanics</b>	<b>5</b>	Excellent to very good: demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing.
	<b>4</b>	<b>Good to average:</b> occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, <i>but meaning not obscured.</i>
	<b>3</b>	<b>Fair to poor:</b> frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, <i>meaning confused or obscured.</i>
	<b>2</b>	<b>Very poor:</b> no mastery or conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible; or not enough to evaluate.
<b>Total score</b>		

Adopted from Jacob (1981)

#### 3.4.2.1 Validity of Writing Task

To measure the validity of the test, the researcher used content validity and construct validities. Content validity means the test is sufficiently representative and comprehensive Hatch and Farhady (1982:50). The material of the test is recount text, so it is suitable with the curriculum 2013. Moreover, the students were the first grade of Senior High School in which recount text as the text that they should comprehend. It means the test is considered as valid in content. While, for the construct validity is the process of determining the extent to which test performance can be interpreted in terms of one or more constructs (Gronlund, 1985:83). The technique of scoring in this research considers five aspects of writing suggested by Jacob (1981); content, organization, vocabulary,

language use, and mechanics. Thus the test meets with the construct validity criteria.

### 3.4.2.2 Reliability of Writing Task

In order to ensure the reliability of scores and to avoid the subjectivity of the test, the researcher uses inter-rater reliability. Hatch and Farhardy (1982: 243) establish that the reliability of a test could be defined as the extent to which a test produces consistent result when it administered under similar conditions. Inter-rater reliability is used when the score on the test is independently estimated by two or more judges or raters. In this research, the first rater is the researcher, and the second rater is the English teacher of the school. To measure how reliable the scoring is, both raters used the same criteria of scoring. This study used Rank – order Correlation of Hatch and Farhady (1982) with the formula:

$$R = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

R : Reliability of the test

N : Number of students

D : The difference of rank correlation (mean score from Pretest and Posttest)

1 – 6 : Constant number

In this case, the coefficient of rank correlation is analysis with the standard of reliability as follows:

1. 0,80000 – 1,00000 : very high reliability
2. 0,60000 – 0,79000 : high reliability
3. 0,40000 – 0,59000 : medium reliability
4. 0,20000 – 0,39000 : low reliability
5. 0,00000 – 0,19000 : very low reliability

Based on the standard of reliability above, writing tests would be considered reliable if the tests reached the range of 0,60-0,79 (high reliability).

After calculating the students' writing tasks using the formula above (see **appendix 11 and 12**), the results of writing tasks reliability are as follows;

**Table 3.4. Reliability Test of Writing Scores**

<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>
	0,758	0,931

Considering the criteria stated above, the writing score in pre-test has high reliability (0,60000 – 0,79000) and the writing score in post-test has very high reliability (0,80000 – 1,00000).



### **3.5 Data Collecting Procedure**

The procedures of the research are as follows:

#### **1. Determining the population and sample**

The researcher chose SMAN 1 Seputih Banyak as the population. One of the classes of the first-grade students was chosen as the sample of the research.

#### **2. Selecting the questionnaire and materials**

The researcher chose a questionnaire and provided the task for the pre-test.

#### **3. Administrating the questionnaire and pre-test**

The students were asked to fulfil the questionnaire and make recount text based on the topic given by the researcher. It takes 10 Minutes for fulfilling the questionnaire, and 60 minutes for the writing test.

#### **4. Conducting the treatment by using Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques**

In the treatment which were given three times, Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques were applied to improve the students' self-efficacy and writing ability. This treatment focused on communicative learning so teacher-centred was avoided.

#### **5. Administrating the questionnaire and post-test**

Questionnaire and post-test were administered on the last meeting to find out the improvement of the students' self-efficacy and achievement in writing after the treatment.

## 6. Scoring the students' questionnaire and writing

After the post-test, the researcher scored the students' questionnaire. For writing, the scoring based on the five aspects of writing. They are content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Two raters scored the students' writing in order to avoid the subjectivity. The first rater is the researcher and the second rater is the English teacher of the class.

## 7. Analysing the data

After scoring the students' self-efficacy and writing, the researcher compared the results of students' pre-test and post-test. It was done to find out any improvement in students' self-efficacy and which aspects of writing skill improves. If the scores after the treatment was better than before the treatment, it means there are improvements on students' self-efficacy and writing ability after being taught by using Neuro-linguistic programming techniques.

### 3.6 Data Analysis

The data in this research are in the form of scores. There are some steps in data analysis as follows:

1. The *Raters* scored self-efficacy level and students' writing task in pre-test and post-test
2. Inputting the scores into the table scores (**Appendix 12 and 13**)

3. Finding the mean of the pre-test and post-test by using this formula:

$$Md = \frac{\sum d}{N}$$

Md refers to mean.

$\sum d$  relates to the total score of the students.

N refers to the number of the students.

4. Analysing whether there were significant improvements on students' self-efficacy level and writing scores of students
5. Analysing the aspect of writing improve the most

To find out whether there were significant differences on students' self-efficacy level and recount writing scores, the researcher used Paired Sample T-Test.

According to Setiyadi (2006a:168-169), using T-Test for hypothesis testing has three basic assumptions that can be described as follows:

- a. The data are interval.
- b. The data are taken from random sample in population.
- c. The data are distributed normally.

Before the hypothesis testing using T-test, it is necessary to find out whether or not the data in the experimental class were normally distributed. In this case, the researcher used *Shapiro-Wilk* methods to find the normality of the data.

The hypotheses of the normality tests are:

$H_0$  : the distribution of the data is normal (sign > 0,05)

$H_1$  : the distribution of the data is not normal (sign < 0,05)

The hypothesis is accepted if the result of the normality test is higher than 0,05 (sign >  $\alpha$ ).

In this case, the researcher used the level of significance of 0,05. To find out whether or not the data were distributed normally, test of normality was used as follows:

**Table 3.5. Normality Test of Self-efficacy Scores**

	Self Efficacy	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Scores	Pretest	0,108	30	,200*	0,97	30	0,548
	Posttest	0,119	30	,200*	0,972	30	0,59

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

**Table 3.6. Normality Test of Writing Recount Scores**

	Recount Text	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Scores	Pretest	0,108	30	,200*	0,96	30	0,318
	Posttest	0,156	30	0,06	0,968	30	0,478

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

From the table, it is known that the value of normality for self-efficacy in the pre-test was 0,548 and in the post-test was 0,59, while the value of normality for writing recount scores in pre-test was 0,318 and post-test was 0,478. Therefore, because all of the values are higher than 0,05, it could be concluded that  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_1$  was rejected. Alternatively stated, the data of the pre-test and the post-test were distributed normally.

### **3.7 Hypothesis Testing**

The hypothesis is as follows:

$H_1$  : Students' self-efficacy and writing ability improve after they learn writing through Neuro-linguistic Programming techniques.

$H_1$  would be accepted if the significance value is lower than 0,05 (Sign. < 0,05).

This chapter has discussed about research design, variables of the research, data sources, instruments, data collecting procedure, data treatment, and hypothesis testing.

## **V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

This final chapter presents the conclusion of the research findings and suggestions for English teachers who want to try to use Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques in teaching writing and for those who want to conduct similar research.

### **5.1 Conclusion**

1. The implementation of NLP is effective to improve students' self-efficacy and writing skills. It could be seen by the results of SPSS analysis of two-tailed significance which showing 0,00 ( $0,00 < 0,05$ ) which meant there were significant improvements. NLP techniques also improve the students' skill in five aspects of writing namely, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic by seeing the analysis of the students' works in the posttest in each aspect.
2. The most improvement aspect of writing is vocabulary because NLP encourages the students to always improve their English ability. When they find some words that they have not understood, they will find the meaning in the dictionary. This helps them to use English vocabulary appropriately when they produce a text.

3. The implementation of NLP techniques could improve students' self-efficacy and writing ability. It happens because the use of NLP could help the students enjoy the learning process, understand the material easily, and encouraged the students to always practice in writing. NLP techniques increased students' enthusiasm in the teaching and learning process of writing.

## **5.2 Suggestions**

In reference to the conclusion above, the writer gives some suggestions as follow:

### **1. Suggestions for English teachers**

- a. Considering the advantages of NLP, the researcher suggests that English teachers apply NLP as an alternative way in English teaching. Perception of writing as a difficult and boring activity can be solved by teaching using NLP techniques. NLP not only help the students to improve students' self-efficacy, but also increase the students' writing ability. It helps both the teacher and students to do their excellent performance. NLP improves classroom communication, optimise learners' attitudes and motivation, facilitate their personal growth or even change their attitude to English.
- b. The teacher should estimate the time in NLP based lesson plan well, so various techniques of NLP can be implemented without exceeding the provided time.
- c. Because NLP techniques were not specifically designed to teach

writing, teachers should comprehend the NLP techniques first before deciding which techniques they will implement in the class. NLP techniques will not work if the teacher does not understand and could not use them properly.

- d. The teacher should be creative in adapting NLP techniques in their lesson plan according to the students' need and condition in order to get the maximum result.

## **2. Suggestions for further research**

- a. This research focused to apply few NLP techniques such as rapport building, reframing, set SMART GOALS, anchoring, and mirroring, therefore the further research is suggested to find out the effectiveness of the other techniques such as well-formed outcomes, flexibility of response, state induction, etc.
- b. This study was conducted in Senior High School level. Therefore, further researchers can try to find out the effect of using NLP in different levels of school.
- c. The research objectives were to find out the improvement on students' self-efficacy and recount text writing, hence further researches are suggested to find out the effects of NLP on the other influencing aspects and writing types.



- d. The students' scores were still low in the mechanics aspect. Thus, the researcher suggests finding a way to improve students' mechanic aspect by using NLP techniques.

Those are the conclusion of this study after the research, also the suggestions for both English teachers and further research in using NLP techniques.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1998. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Bandler, R. 1985. *Using Your Brain for a Change*. Utah: Real People Press.
- Bandura, A. 1982. Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122 - 147.
- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive View*. Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. 1994. Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, 4, 71-81.
- Bavister, S., & Vickers, A. 2010. *Teach Yourself Essential NLP*. London: Hodder Education.
- Chea, S. and Shumow, L. 2014. The Relationships among Writing Self- Efficacy, Writing Goal Orientation, and Writing Achievement. *Journal of Language Education in Asia*, 5(2), 253-269.
- Churches, R., & Terry, R. 2007. *NLP for Teachers: How to Be a Highly Effective Teacher*. Carmarthen: Crown House Publishing.
- Craft, A. 2001. Neuro-linguistic Programming and learning theory. *The Curriculum Journal*, 12(1), 125-136.
- David, Nunan. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Doran, G.T. 1981. There's a S.M.A.R.T. Way to Write Management's Goals and Objectives. *Management Review*, 70(11), 35-36.
- Fielding, M. 1999. Target setting, policy pathology and student perspectives: learning to labour in new times. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 29(2), 277-287.

- Finocchiaro, M. 1964. *English as a Second Language: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Flores, E. R. 2013. Self-Concept and Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Predictors of Writing Performance of College Freshman Students. Research Congress 2013.
- Graham, S., Harris, KR, MacArthur, C., & Schwartz, S. 1991. Writing and writing instruction with students with learning disabilities: A review of a program of research. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. 1(4), 89-114.
- Gronlund, N. E. 1985. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. London: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Longman: Harlow.
- Hashemnejad, F., Zoghi, M. and Amini, D.. 2014. The Relationship between Self-efficacy and Writing Performance across Genders. *Academy Publisher*, 4(5), 1045-1052.
- Hatch, E and Farhady. 1982. *Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistic*. University of California: Los Angeles pers: Roeley, London, Tokyo.
- Hetthong, R & Teo, A. 2013. Does Writing Self-efficacy Correlate with and Predict Writing Performance?. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. 2(1), 157-167.
- Huwari, I. F., & Noor Hashima, Abd. Aziz. 2011. Writing Apprehension in English among Jordanian Postgraduate Students at Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). *Academic Research International*, 1(2), 190-198.
- Ismail, N., Elias, S., Albakri, I. S. M. A., Perumal, P. D., & Muthusamy, I. 2010. Exploring ESL Students' Apprehension Level and Attitude Towards Academic Writing. *International Journal of Learning*, 17 (6), 475-483.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition; a practical approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Johnstone, K. M., Ashbaugh, H., & Warfield, T. D. 2002. Effects of Repeated Practice and Contextual-writing Experiences on College Students' Writing Skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94 (2), 305-315.
- Jones, E. 2007. Predicting Performance in First-semester Basic Writers: Revisiting

The Role of Self-beliefs. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*.

Kane, T. 2000. *Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Berkley Publishing Book.

Katz, LS. 2013. *Experimental Writing: Neuro-linguistic Programming Techniques in Innovative Writing*. Unpublished thesis, University of Bedfordshire.

Khalandi, C & Zoghi, R. 2017. The Effect of NLP (Accelerated Learning) on Iranian EFL Learner's Listening Comprehension. *Academy Publication*. 7(11), 1139-1148.

Kırmızı, Ö and Kırmızı, G. D. 2015. An Investigation of L2 Learners' Writing Self-Efficacy, Writing Anxiety and Its Causes at Higher Education in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education*. 4(2), 57-65.

Lashkarian, A., Sayadian, S. 2015. The effect of Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) techniques on young Iranian EFL Learners' motivation, learning improvement, and on teacher's success. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199 (2015), 510-516.

Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. 2002. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717.

Magogwe, J. M., Ramoraka, R. T., and Monyepi, R. M. 2015. Developing Student-Writers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 5(2), 20-28.

Millrood, Radislav. 2004. The Role of NLP in Teachers' Classroom Discourse. *ELT Journal*. 58. 10.1093/elt/58.1.28.

Mustapha, N. H., Mustapha, N. F., Daud, N., and Wahab, M.A. 2013. Arabic Language Efficacy Questionnaire (ALEQ): Assessing Self-Efficacy and Achievement. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1), 155-165.

Naeem, P. 2011. NLP and English Language Teaching. Retrieved December 6, 2018, from: <http://neoenglishsystem.blogspot.com/2011/02/nlp-and-english-language-teaching.html>

O'Brien, G. 2012. *NLP Essentials for Teachers: The Art of Encouraging Excellence in Your Students*. Bloomington: BalboaPress.

- Pajares, F. 2003. Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Motivation, and Achievement in Writing: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19, 139 – 158.
- Pajares, M. F and Johnson, M. J. 1993. Confidence and Competence in Writing: The Role of Self-efficacy, Outcome Expectancy, and Apprehension. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GS, April 12-16, 1993). Retrieved December 9, 2018, from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED358474.pdf
- Pearson, JE. 2013. *Improve Your Writing with NLP*. Carmarthen: Crown House Publishing
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 68 Tahun 2013. 2013. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Pishghadam, R., Shayesteh, S., & Shapoor, M. 2011. Validation of an NLP Scale and Its Relationship with Teacher Success in High Schools. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 909-917.
- Rahmatunisa, W. 2014. Problems Faced by EFL Learners in Writing Argumentative Essay. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 41-49.
- Raja, P. 2013. *Sentence Writing Enhancement*. Aura Printing and Publishing: Bandar Lampung.
- Revell, J., & Norman, S. 2009a. *In Your Hands. NLP for Teaching and Learning*. London: Saffire Press.
- Revell, J., & Norman, S. 2009b. *Handing Over*. London: Saffire Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogozińska, E. 2016. Neuro-Linguistic Programming for Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Linguistic Intercultural Education*, 9(2), 149 – 159.
- Sepyanda, Marsika. 2014. The Effect Of Picture Word Inductive Model (Pwim) and Students' Self-Efficacy Toward Their Writing Skill of Descriptive Texts at Grade X of SMA NEGERI 1 IX Koto Sungai Lasi. *Lingua Didaktika*. 7 (2). 113-120.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006a. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa*

Asing. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006b. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Setyowati, L & Sony S. 2016. EFL Indonesian Students' Attitude toward Writing in English. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(2), 365-378.

Shah, P. M., Mahmud, W. H. W., Din, R., Yusof, A., and Pardi, K. M. 2011. Self-Efficacy in the Writing of Malaysian ESL Learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 15, 8-11.

Siddiqui, Z. 2018. English Language Teaching through NLP: Techniques And Methods. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, 6 (2), 181-184.

Skinner, H & and Croft, R. 2009. Neuro-Linguistic Programming Techniques to Improve The Self-Efficacy of Undergraduate Dissertation Students. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. 1(1), 29-38.

Sufratna, N. 2018. *Efektivitas Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) untuk Meningkatkan Self-Efficacy Mahasiswa yang Mengalami Prokrastinasi Akademik pada Mahasiswa Prodi Bimbingan Konseling Islam UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya yang Mengalami Prokrastinasi Akademik*. Unpublished Script, UIN Sunan Ampel Yogyakarta.

Sumrall, S. 2010. NLP and Education. Retrieved December 9, 2018, from <http://www.healthsurvey.com/nlpeducation.htm#nlpeducation>.

Utami, AB. 2012. *Improving Students' Writing Skills on Recount Texts Through Collaborative Writing Technique*. Unpublished thesis, Yogyakarta State University.

Wade, D.T. 2009. Goal Setting in Rehabilitation: an Overview of What, Why and How. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 23, 291–295

Walsh, K. 2010. *The Importance of Writing Skills: Online Tools to Encourage Success*. Retrieved December 1, 2018, from <https://www.emergingedtech.com/2010/11/the-importance-of-writing-skills-online-tools-to-encourage-success/>

Wening, P. 2016. *The Correlation between Students' Self-Efficacy and Their Writing Performance at SMAN 1 Kalirejo*. Unpublished Script, Lampung University.

- White, M. J., & Bruning, R. 2005. Implicit Writing Beliefs and Their Relation to Writing Quality [Electronic version]. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30, 166-189.
- Wikanengsih. 2013. Model Pembelajaran Neurolinguistic Programming Berorientasi Karakter bagi Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis Siswa SMP. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*. 19(2), 177-186.
- Zimmerman, B. J. 2000. Self-Efficacy: An Essential Motive to Learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 82–91.