Modifying Think-Pair-Share based on Suggestopedia Principles to Teach Speaking

Fania[1], Ag. Bambang Setiyadi[2], Flora[3]

[1]Student of Master of English Education, University of Lampung, Indonesia
[2]Professor of English Education, University of Lampung, Indonesia
[3]Professor of English Education, University of Lampung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Every teaching method has their own disadvantages, but if they are integrated, it will make a great solution. This current research aims to intently find out the significant difference in the speaking achievement of the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share. This is a quasi-experimental research design that conducts a quantitative method. Subjects of this research are two classes of SMK N 3 Bandar Lampung. The finding shows that there is a significant difference in the increase of the score of experimental and control class after the students are taught through the methods. The t-value is 2.687 at the significant level of 0.009 which is lower than 0.05. Hence, it is concluded that applying the method of the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia principles can increase the students' speaking achievement.

KEYWORDS: Game, Perception, Speaking Achievement, Suggestopedia, Think-Pair-Share.

INTRODUCTION

Students in Indonesia still have problems with speaking in English due to speaking needs the ability to share ideas, how to use grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation as well as listening to and reacting to the person he/she communicates with. English for Indonesian people is considered a foreign language, this is particularly difficult for students. It is in line with the previous research by Munisah (2021) that finds that with different language structures, different pronunciations, it will create problems for students. The problem that is often faced by students is the difficulty of learning a foreign language. Sometimes students are reluctant to learn English. When students hear the 'English' word, it becomes a scourge for them because it is considered that English is a very difficult language to learn.

There are many methods in teaching English, especially in speaking. Two of them are think-pair-share and suggestopedia. Think-pair-share is a classroom-based active learning technique, in which students work on a problem posed by the teacher or instructor, while suggestopedia is an approach, which focuses on how to deal with the relationship between mental potential and learning ability. As every technique has disadvantages, one of the weakness of TPS is that not all students focus on the topic (questions) given, because they can share everything with their partner out of the topic (questions) given (Lyman,1981). The difficulty of concentrating while studying is caused by anxiety that the students feel.

To overcome this problem, the researcher assumes that suggestopedia can cover this weakness of TPS. Suggestopedia has principles that hopefully can make the weakness not appear. The aim of this research is to intently find out the significant difference in the speaking achievement of the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Burns & Joyce (1997) in Torky (2006), speaking is defined as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Speaking is the most important skill of all the four language skills because individuals who learn a language are referred to as the speakers of that language (Ur, 1996). Based on rubric of Brown (2001), there are five aspects of speaking. They are grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency and pronunciation. Both TPS and suggestopedia methods can be implemented in teaching speaking. Cahyani (2018) has done a research about think-pair-share to

improve speaking performance. It's concluded that the students' got a better score and result in their speaking performance after they got some treatments. This research shows that think pair share technique successfully improves the students' speaking ability. Dharmayanti (2016) shows that the students gave their positive responses to the implementation of suggestopedia in learning speaking.

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is a collaborative learning technique first proposed by Frank Lyman from the University of Maryland in 1981. Think-Pair-Share, abbreviated as TPS, is designed to differentiate instruction by providing students enough time and structure for thinking on a given topic, enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with a peer. TPS is helpful because it structures the discussion so that the students follow a prescribed process that limits off-task thinking and off-task behaviour and builds accountability in their pair. Think Pair Share is one of cooperative learning that has three steps which are think, pair and share. Kagan (1994) describes the procedure of think pair share to three steps, as follows:

1. Think: In this stage, the student must think individually. A teacher poses a question to the students and gives them a minute to think independently for their response, forming ideas of topic. The advantage of this stage is that the teacher gives time or opportunity to the students to think about their own answer before questions answered by other students.
2. Pair: In this stage, the students are grouped in pairs to discuss their thinking or ideas. It allows students to articulate their ideas to consider those of others. The students share their thinking with their partner. They should tell their opinions orally with their partner.
3. Share: In this stage, the teacher may select the students randomly to share their ideas to the whole group clearly with public speaking voice. So, the students must present their work to other groups in class.

All techniques are not perfect, there are always advantages and also disadvantages. According to Lyman (1981), Think-Pair-Share technique as one of the cooperative language learning models has some advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages is that think-pair-share technique is quick and does not take much preparation time, while one of the disadvantages is that not all students focus on the topic (questions) given, because they can share everything with their partner out of the topic (questions) given. To overcome the disadvantage, the researcher proposes an approach, i.e. suggestopedia, that it is hopefully able to cover this weakness, because suggestopedia can decrease the anxiety of the students that makes them not focus to the topic. Tthe difficulty of concentrating while studying is caused by anxiety that the students feel. Therefore, the researcher assumes that suggestopedia can cover this weakness of TPS.

Suggestopedia is a teaching method, which focuses on how to deal with the relationship between mental potential and learning ability and it is very appropriate to use in teaching speaking for young language learners (Xue, 2005). The approach is based on the power of suggestion in learning, positive suggestion would make the learner more receptive and, in turn, stimulate learning. Lozanov holds that a relaxed but focused state is the optimum state for learning.

Besides, the learners must be assured that they have *anti-suggestive barriers* and they have to remove them in order to open the access of the suggestion. The three anti-suggestive barriers are critical logical, intuitive-affective, and ethical (Lozanov, 1982). The first anti-suggestive barrier is critical anti suggestive barrier. This barrier rejects suggestion through reasoning. If the learners think that it is impossible to learn a foreign language, as Lozanov believes, the possibility to be successful learners is very slim. This barrier is the conscious critical thinking. The second anti-suggestive barrier is intuitive affective barrier. This seems to be emotional barrier. This barrier is believed to come from anything that may produce a feeling of lack confidence or insecurity. If the learners feel that they will loose their confidence or selfesteem, they are likely not to reach the success in learning. The third anti-suggestive barrier is ethical barrier. The learners will reject everything that is not in harmony with the ethical sense they have. The ethical sense may have been established from family or society.

There are six main principles of suggestopedia. They are authority, infantilization, dual (double) planedness, intonation, rhythm, and pseudopassivity. The principles that are used in this research are authority, double-planedness and infantilization. As cited in the journal of Jia (2017), below are the explanations of each principle :

1. Authority

Lozanov (1978) claims that nearly all of suggestive methods are based on authority, no matter whether it is leaders personality authority, faith authority, or experience authority.

2. Double-planedness

Double-planedness refers to the unconscious stimulus from the environment where the instruction takes place (the decoration, furniture, and arrangement of the classroom and the musical background) and teachers behaviors (gesture and expression). All of these elements are called peripheral stimulus and have a great impact on the learning process.

3. Infantilization

Teachers seize the psychological characteristics and cognitive bases of students ; then they design corresponding teaching plans and play suitable roles like parent to accomplish their infantilization. The relationship between the teacher and the students is like a parent with his or her children. They can do anything with their teacher, like role playing, songs, games and gymnastic exercises.

The researcher adds the three principles of suggestopedia to the steps of TPS. The modification is elaborated in the difference procedures between the original TPS and the modified one in the table below :

Table 1. The difference between original TPS and modified TPS

The original TPS	The modified TPS
1. Think A teacher poses a question to the students and gives them a minute to think independently for their response, forming ideas of topic.	**1. Think** The researcher change the question to be a text to the students as the example of recount text, containing an event which happened in the past. The source of the event is from an authoritative source. The researcher mentions the clear source. It's one of the principles of suggestopedia, i.e. authority. The students are asked to read the text and think about what they will say to their pair.
2. Pair The students are grouped in pairs to discuss their thinking or ideas. It allows students to articulate their ideas to consider those of others. The students share their thinking with their partner. They should tell their opinions orally with their partner.	**2. Pair** The researcher spreads the posters, consisiting pictures of theme and grammar towards those, as well as the information about those. In the principle of double-planedness, the students could easily talk to their pair because they know what and how to talk and share their ideas with their partner by seeing the posters around.
3. Share Teacher may select the students randomly to share their ideas to the whole group clearly with public speaking voice. So, the students must present their work to other groups in the class.	**3. Share** Applied with the principle of infantilization, students stand in a big circle. They have a doll and music played, and then, the modified *just a minute game* is started. Through this game, each student is asked to tell his/her experience.

Game is one of the examples of the principle of suggestopedia, i.e. infantilization. The researcher uses a game at the last stage of think-pair-share. Bylieva & Sastre (2018) define game as media which makes an important contribution to the acquisition of vital skills in the history of mankind, and gaining an increasingly important role in the modern information society. The game used in the last stage of the modified TPS based on suggestopedia is *just a minute* game. According to Gayathri (2016), *Just a Minute* game is a suitable practice for students with good communication in order to increase their creativity. But in this research, the game is modfied with a doll and music. it's call *the modified just a minute game*. The rule is :

1.   Students stand in a big circle
2.   Music is played
3.   A doll is thrown around

4. Teacher stops the music
5. Any student with the doll gets caught. He/she must speak about his/her experience in the past
6. It is repeated until the last student
7. There is no win or lose. It is genuinely to practice their speaking.

Those are the steps of modified *just a minute* game that hopefully could make the class alive.

METHODS

This current research is a quasi-experimental design and it conducts a quantitative method. Its goal is to intently find out whether there is a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share. It is calculated through Independent Samples T-Test with Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. Subjects for this research are two classes of SMK N 3 Bandar Lampung. They seem to be in the beginner level of English and still have problems in speaking English. Two culinary art classes are chosen in which each class consists of 33 students for both control and experimental class. The data analysis is using inter-rater. The first rater is the researcher herself and the other is a teacher of that school. The researcher collects the data with an instrument, i.e. speaking test. The test is administered at the beginning as the pre-test and at the the end as the post-test. The instructions of both instruments are the same. The students are asked to tell their experience in learning cooking in their school in two minutes. Because the test is a monologue speaking test, it covers the aspects of speaking by Brown (2001). As cited in Karlina & Sudirman (2020), the elaboration is as follows :

Table 2. Rubric of Speaking (Brown, 2001)

	Grammar	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Fluency	Pronunciation
1	Error in grammar are frequent, but speaker can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.	Speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs.	Within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase.	(No specific fluency description. Refer to other four language areas for implied level of fluency).	Error in pronunciation are frequent but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.
2	Can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.	Has speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions.	Can get the gist of most conversations of non-technical subject (i.e., topics that require not specialized knowledge).	Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations, including introductions and casual conversations about current events,	Accent is intelligible though often quite faulty.

				as well as work, family, and autobiographical information.	
3	Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.	Able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word.	Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.	Can discuss particular interests of competence with reasonable ease. Rarely has to grope for word.	Errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. Accent may be obviously foreign.
4	Able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Errors in grammar are quite rare.	Can understand and participate in any conversations within the range of his experience with a high degree of precision of vocabulary.	Can understand any conversation within the range of his experience.	Able to use the language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can participate in any conversation within the range of this experience with a high degree of fluency.	Error in pronunciation are quite rare.
5	Equivalent to the of an educated native speaker.	Speech non all levels is fully accepted by educated by educated native speakers in all its features including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, colloquialisms, and pertinent culture references.	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.	Has complete fluency in the language such that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speakers.	Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speakers.

There are five scales for each element in which the number five is the highest score. After the pre-test, the students are given treatments. For experimental class, the researcher taught them through the modified TPS based on suggestopedia, while for control class, the students are taught through the original TPS. Then, the researcher calculates the scores of the tests. It is to find out the mean difference between pre-test and post-test in experimental class, the pre-test and post-test in control class and the post-tes in both experimental and control class.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The research question is : '*Is there any significant difference in the students' speaking achievement between the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share ?*'. The researcher calculated the data of the post-test and pre-test in experimental class, post-test and pre-test in control class, and post-test in both experimental and control class. Through Indpendent Samples T-Test, the data were truly computed to seek whether there was a significant difference in the students' speaking achievement of the students who were taught through the modified TPS based on Suggestopedia and those who were taught through the original TPS. The following tables are the result of Independent Samples T-Test :

Tables 3. Increase of Score in The Experimental Class

Group Statistics					
	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Result	Post-test Experiment	33	64.67	9.996	1.740
	Pre-test Experiment	33	47.58	10.353	1.802

Independent Samples T-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Result	Equal variances assumed	.103	.749	6.822	64	.000	17.091	2.505	12.086	22.096
	Equal variances not assumed			6.822	63.921	.000	17.091	2.505	12.086	22.096

From the table above, the mean score of post-test is 64.67, while the pre-test is 47.58. It means that score in post-test is higher than the pre-test. It is also showed in the mean difference between post-test and pre-test is 17.091. The t-value is 6.822 at the significangt level of 0.000 which is lower than 0.05. These mean that there is a significant difference in the students' speaking achievement from the pre-test and the post-test in experimental class through the modified TPS based on suggestopedia.

Tables 4. Increase of Score in The Control Class

Group Statistics					
	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Result	Post-test Control	33	58.24	9.418	1.639
	Pre-test Control	33	47.45	9.890	1.722

Independent Samples T-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Result	Equal variances assumed	.061	.806	4.538	64	.000	10.788	2.377	6.039	15.537
	Equal variances not assumed			4.538	63.847	.000	10.788	2.377	6.038	15.537

From the table above, we can see that from 33 students, they have different scores in the post-test and the pre-test. The mean score of the post-test is 58.24, while in the pre-test is 47.45. The post-test is higher than the pre-test due to the mean difference is 10.788. Then, the t-value is 4.538 at the significant level of 0.000, which lower than 0.05. So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the students' speaking achievement in the control class through the original TPS.

In the control class where the original of TPS was applied, the students joint the learning activity. It was not like the conventional methods that their teacher used to give. At the first stage, when they asked to think about the given question, they tried to think about it. In the next stage, i.e. pair, most of the students were shy to speak even with their seat-mate. They tried hard, and were afraid to make a mistake. They also didn't focus in the dialogue. Only a few students showed their talking. At the last stage, i.e. share, by the guidance of the teacher, they began to be eager to learn and tried to speak to the class. Voluntarily, the teacher asked the students one by one to tell their speech. It's about what they had thought about the question and what they had talked to their pair. Students started to show off their performance, especially in the last meeting. Consequently, their speaking ability was trained and increased. It was supported by Cahyani (2018) that had done a research about think-pair-share to improve speaking performance. It's concluded that the students' got a better score and result in their speaking performance after they got some treatments. This research shows that think pair share technique successfully improves the students' speaking ability.

Tables 5. Significant Difference of Score in The Experimental Class and The Control Class

Group Statistics

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Result	Post-test Experiment	33	64.67	9.996	1.740
	Post-test Control	33	58.24	9.418	1.639

Independent Samples T-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Result	Equal variances assumed	.032	.860	2.687	64	.009	6.424	2.391	1.648	11.200
	Equal variances not assumed			2.687	63.774	.009	6.424	2.391	1.648	11.200

In this case, the post-test in experimental class and post-test in control class are compared. As indicated above, the mean score of post-test in experimental class is 64.67 and the post-test in control class is 58.24. The mean difference is 6.424. It means that the experimental class shows a higher score than the control class. Also, the t-value is 2.687 at the significant level of 0.009 which is lower than 0.05. Equally, it proves that there is a significant difference in the students' speaking achievement of the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original TPS, and the method of the modified TPS results better.

It is reasonable why the finding regarding the use of both the modified TPS and the original one in the speaking achievement has the differences, especially in the experimental class that has the significant difference more than in control class. Because, the steps of TPS were supported by the principles of suggestopedia. The first principle,. i.e. authority, was put in the first step, i.e. think. Unlike the original TPS, the students were given a text to read and understand. They not only think, but also read, even with the clear source that made them encourage to know the intent of the text. In the second step, i.e. pair, the students were given pictures around the class. They wondered and tried to see the pictures consisiting of vocabulary, generic structure of recount text and formula

of simple past tense. It eased them to form a sentence. At the last stage, the sharing session was colaborated with a game, i.e. the modified just a minute game. They played the game with a doll and music while they practiced their speech. Apparently, they really enjoyed it. They had fun, happy and energetic in following the lesson. They slowly put off their embarrassment and began to be brave to speak. Although at the first treatment, most of them only said about three sentences. But at the last, their fluency began to increase. The treatment of modified TPS more results better than original TPS. By those learning acitivities, the students showed an increase in their English speaking ability.

Theory of Lyman in 1981 said that Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is a collaborative learning technique that is designed to differentiate instruction by providing students enough time and structure for thinking on a given topic, enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with a peer. Lyman (1981) adds that TPS is helpful because it structures the discussion so that the students follow a prescribed process that limits off-task thinking and off-task behaviour and builds accountability in their pair. Meanwhile, Lozanov emphasizes the importance of experiencing language material in "whole meaningful texts" and notes that the suggestopedia course directs the student not to vocabulary memorization and acquiring habits of speech, but to acts of communication (Lozanov 1978). It is also supported by Astutik (2019) that found that using suggestopedia method in increasing students' speaking ability was effective. Provenly, the mix of TPS technique and Suggestopedia principles is a great combination.

From the three principles of suggestopedia applied in the modified TPS, the most favorite activity was playing the game. They were really fun. Especially in the late meeting, they had been brave to speak, so the learning process ran smoothly. No doubt, modifying TPS based on suggestopedia was a perfect combination. It gave effects on students' understanding in learning English, especially in speaking.

According to the findings, the modified TPS was believed to be effective to enhance the students' speaking achievement, compared to the original TPS. The modified TPS based on Suggestopedia broke down the awkward atmosphere of the class. It made the class alive. It effected their speaking skill. Lozanov in Setiyadi (2020: 91) claims that memorization in learning by the suggestopedic method will be accelerated 25 times over than in learning by conventional methods. As it was proven, the students in experimental class were happy, fun and eager to join the learning process. They finally succeeded to increase their speaking performance.

Thus, both the modified TPS and the original TPS gave the increased results in the post-test of speaking ability of the students, but the modified one more influenced the result of the test. So, it can be concluded that the modified TPS based on Suggestopedia is more effective compared to the original one, in enhancing the students' speaking ability.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The students go through the learning process with the modified TPS in the experimental class and the original TPS in the control class. The integration of the two methods bring positive impact in enhancing students' speaking achievement, especially in the experimental class. In control class, the technique of original TPS increases the students' achievement in speaking skill. In experimental class, the modified TPS based on suggestopedia successfully enhances the students' speaking achievement more than with the original TPS. It ststistically proves that there is a significant difference in students' speaking achievement of the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share based on suggestopedia and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share. But, the modified TPS based on suggestopedia results better than the original TPS. The chosen principles of suggestopedia covers the weakness of TPS. Moreover, the students in experimental class become happy, focused and confident in following the learning activity. They put off their anxiety, fear and embarrassement. They absorb the materials quickly, especially in speaking. Finally, they increase their achievement of speaking ability.

This modified method is a very good choice to break down the awkward atmosphere at class. So, it is suggested for teachers to apply it to the students in any level in classes to increase students' speaking achievement. Since think-pair-share deals with the sharing session and suggestopedia boosts the process, a great result will be obtained. Teachers should make a relaxed situation, so that the students want to take a part in the learning activity without any force.

This current research was conducted only in a certain condition of one of vocational high school, namely SMK N 3 Bandar Lampung, so the results cannot be generalized. Therefore, it is suggested for further researchers to conduct similar research. Moreover, the further researchers may add the other principles of suggestopedia to the technique of think-pair-share to make a greater integration. Since suggestopedia method needs extra tools to apply, such as : the comfortable chair, the dim lighting, music, and pictures, the researchers must adjust the needs to the condition of classes, so that an increase of students' speaking ability can be achieved.

REFERENCES

1. Astutik, Y.P. (2019). The effect of Using Suggestopedia Among Students' Speaking Ability. *English Language in Focus (ELIF)*, 1(2), 137-144

2. Bylieva, D and Sastre, M.(2018). Classification of educational games according to their complexity and the player's sklils. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences,* 2018.12.02.47

3. Cahyani, F. (2018). The Use of Think Pair Share Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Performance. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 3(1), 76-90

4. Dharmayanti, P. A. (2016). Improving Speaking Skill through Suggestopedia. *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, Volume 6, Nomor 2, Juli 2016 ISSN 2087-9016

5. Gayathri, S. (2016). Just a Minute (Or JAM): A Joyous Communication Enhancement Game. *International Journal of Communication and Media Studies (IJCMS)* Vol. 6, Issue 1, Feb 2016, 13-16

6. Jia, L. (2017). Principles and Teaching Applications of Suggestopedia's 6 Technical Characteristics. *校园英语上旬* 2017-12-21

7. Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente: Kagan Publications

8. Karlina & Sudirman, A. (2020). The Effect of Application Guessing Game Pic-Pow Strategy Towards Students' Speaking Mastery at the First Class of SMA Mathla'ul Anwar Menes. *JEES: Journal of English Education Studies*, 2020, Vol. 2 No. 2

9. Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy*.New York : Gordon and Breach

10. Lozanov, G. (1982). Suggestology and Suggestopedia. In Robert W. Blair (Ed). *Innovative Approaches*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc

11. Lyman,F. (1981). *Strategies for Reading Comprehension*. http://www. teachervision.fen.com/groupwork/cooperative learning/48547.html Retrieved on June 17, 2023

12. Munisah, E. (2021). Peningkatan Kemampuan Bahasa Inggris Siswa Sekolah Dasar Melalui Program Teras Belajar. *Jurnal Elsa,* Volume 19, No.1, April 2021

13. Setiyadi, A. B. (2020). *Teaching English As A Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

14. Torky,S.A.E.F. (2006). The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students. A Thesis. Ain Shams University

15. Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

16. Xue, J. (2005). Critical Review on Suggestopedia. *Division of Language and Communication*