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Abstract:
The study was carried out in West Kordofan State in ELfula town – Peace University- Faculty of Education – on Students of the First Year – First Semester during the Academic Years (2012-2015). The study aimed at the implementation of Group Activities as an appropriate technique of Teaching English Language at university level. The question of the study concerned with the students’ practices during the learning process. The study used experimental, descriptive analytical method. Whereas the instrument of the study was composed of achievement tests and a programme which was designed according to first semester objectives. Students benefit from the programme in language usage. The study used books, references and websites. The sample of the study is represented by (228) students of Peace University in Faculty of Education – The First Year - The First Semester (2012-2013). The sample was divided into two equal groups. Control group had been exposed to traditional lecturing. And empirical group had been exposed to group activities technique. Each one includes (114) students. The study has reached results: Students’ successful was (45%) in Pre-test. In the post-test students’ successful was (63%). Empirical group students achieved (46%) in Pre-test. And control group students achieved (44%). Empirical group achieved (67%) in post-test. Whereas control group achieved (61%). Students’ level improvement has been affected by following, continuity and team work. The study recommended the following: Teachers / lecturers can change their traditional ways of teaching English Language to Group Activities technique. Teachers should provide students with extra activities for developing their fluency and accuracy in English Language.
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المستخلص

أجريت هذه الدراسة بولاية غرب كردفان بمدينة الفولة في جامعة السلام - كلية التربية على طلاب السنة الأولى - الفصل الدراسي الأول في الفترة من (2012- 2015). هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تطبيق "أسلوب مجموعة النشاطات التعليمية " كأسلوب مناسب لتدريس اللغة الإنجليزية في مرحلة التعليم الجامعي. إن سؤال هذه الدراسة يتعلق بالأنشطة المهارية أثناء عملية التعلم، اتخذت الدراسة المنهج التجريبي التحليلي الوصفي. بينما استخدمت الدراسة الإختبارات التحليلية وأعدت برنامجاً تحتوي على مفردات مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية للفصل الدراسي الأول. كما استخدمت المراجع والكتب والشبكة الإلكترونية لاستكمال البحث. تمثل عينة الدراسة في عدد مئتين وثمانية وعشرين طالباً وطالبة مسجلين بجامعة السلام - كلية التربية للفصل الدراسي الأول للعام الدراسي (2012-2013). وقد تم توزيعهم في مجموعتين، مجموعة ضابطة (114) طالب وطالبة، استخدم معها أساليب المحاضرة التقليدية ومجموعة تجريبية استخدم معها "مجموعة النشاطات التعليمية " بعد مماثل. حيث توصلت الدراسة إلى نتائج منها: - نسبة نجاح الطلاب في الاختبار التقليدي بلغت (45%)، وفي الاختبار البدعي كانت نسبة نجاح الطلاب (63%). حصل طلاب المجموعة التجريبية على نسبة نجاح (46%) وحصل طلاب المجموعة الضابطة على نسبة (44 %). أما في الاختبار البدعي نسبة نجاح طلاب المجموعة التجريبية (67%) ونسبة نجاح المجموعة الضابطة (61 %). وهناك عوامل أثرت في مستوى الطلاب مثل الأسئلة المستمرة لأعمال الطلاب والعمل في مجموعات. أوصت الدراسة بالآتي: يمكن للأساتذة الذين يقومون بتدريس اللغة الإنجليزية تغيير النمط التقليدي إلى طريقة الطالب محور النشاطات التعليمية. إعطاء الطلاب مزيد من التدريبات والآعمال بغرض ترسيم المهارات اللغوية، الدقة والكلفة في استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية.
Introduction
This study is concerned with implementing group activities in Peace University-Faculty of Education. It examines and applies the previous students’ experience in this approach and their teaching methods applied during their study at secondary level. What is required here, is to focus on the learner his/her needs and the way he/she behaves. Then, the current issue is to support students of the sample to change their learning habits by using the appropriate techniques (i.e. of group activities) (GA). Teaching and learning English Language require great efforts to be done. Hence, it is important for the teachers to master teaching and lecturing techniques to increase teaching effectiveness. The problem of the study is included in English Language use. Students face some difficulties to communicate orally. Within practices students some problems may occur. As a result, teachers will have to change their teaching behaviour from teaching to facilitating. According to constructivism theory that the purpose in education is to become creative and innovative through analysis, conceptualizations and synthesis of prior experience to create new knowledge. So the hypothesis for this research says: If students of the sample are provided by a programme containing group activities that maximises the role of students and minimises the role of the teacher, the performance of the students will get better.

The Problem of the Study
Group Activities (GA) known as a real problem in the field of Teaching Learning English Language. Therefore, the students of the sample have some difficulties in using English Language. What is required, that activities should be done by the learners through practicing. Within practices, students of the sample as initiators of the learning process, some problems may occur. Therefore, teachers will have to change their teaching behaviour from teaching to facilitating. According to constructivism theory that the purpose in
education is to become creative and innovative through analysis, conceptualizations and synthesis of prior experience to create new knowledge.

So, creativity and innovation depend upon students' language use. Thus, learning by doing is the main idea of group activities (GA). Therefore, activities like problem-solving and verbal communication are needed to be practised excessively by the students of the sample. Consequently, students can find suitable ways of using English language to be creative as well.

The question raised is to what extent that students of the sample can engage in Learning English through group activities?

The previous question should be answered below within the hypothesis.

**Research Questions:**

These questions are represented by the following:

1. Does the programme help the students communicate in English orally?
2. Do group activities (GA) help the students to communicate writing?

The next step will illustrate the hypotheses of group activities.

**Hypotheses:** If the students of the sample are provided by a programme includes student-centred activities (GA) that maximizes the role of the students and minimizes the role of the lecturers, the performance will get better.

**Objectives:** The objectives of the research as the following:

1. To shift students to modern techniques which are used in English Language Learning.
2. To help the teachers to update the new techniques in English Language Teaching.
3. To enrich libraries with the new issue.
4. To find suitable solutions for English Language problems which face students.

**Significance of the Study:** This study is significant, because
it would shift the role of the lecturers to cope with techniques which are used in group activities. Therefore, it's very important to answer the needs of students. This is for giving through vast techniques to use the language. The study was designed to add to existing researches in the field of education. This research study was done to find the effects of group activities on students’ participation in English Language at university level. In other words, group activities (GA) facilitate language learning. They also present a chance of exposure through integrated skills. Besides, they deal with the techniques of practising which are done by the students themselves. The lecturer gives instructions, and then students can practise the given activity. Hence, students' participation in activities is the indicator of language in use. In addition to that, students carry out different activities using various techniques of group work.

The students of the sample shared in all activities and played their roles in English Learning. The following section is dealing with research method.

**Research Method:** The study used the descriptive, analytical and experimental method. Besides, two tests and a programme. The procedures which are used to teach the programme depended up on instructions given by the researcher to students of the sample to be followed accordingly. Then, the sample was divided into two groups; control group and experimental group. The former had been taught through lecturing, whereas the latter exposed to group activities. For instance, the exchange of greetings.

In practising, students of the sample are able to present what they told to do in front of their classmates. This should be followed by a discussion for pooling ideas. Thereafter, students of the sample be aware of what is correct.

**Instrument:** Pre-test and post-test are used for data collection. Then, the results were treated statistically.
The sample of the study was represented by the students of Peace University – The First Year – The First Semester in the Academic Year (2012-2013). The number of the sample is two hundred and twenty-eight (228) students.

Delimitations:
The study was limited to investigate the techniques group activities at University Level. Moreover, to what extent the students of the sample deal with that. The study was carried in Elfula Town (Peace University-Faculty of Education - First year - First Semester in 2012). The area worth study, because the researcher had noticed some indicators for searching. Also, a suitable number of population reinforced the researcher to carry out the study.

Key words: group, activities, technique, pair – work.

Literature Review

Grouping:
Harmer (2001: 114) says that there is no real limit to the way in which teachers can group students in a classroom/hall. Though certain factors such as overcrowding, fixed furniture and student’s attitudes may make things problematic. While teaching / lecturing a hall as a whole group, getting students to work on their own or having them perform tasks in pairs or group all have their own advantages and disadvantages, each is more or less appropriate for different activities.

Focusing on group work is important. Students might share in different activities without hesitation. Hess (2001: 112) argues that the group as a natural framework of learning it seems to be worked within the real world learners, in class enjoy sharing ideas, learning from one another and cooperating. Learning habits often require the use of reality and practising different activities. In addition to group work for strengthen the linking between information knowledge, ideas and practical experience of the students of the sample. Valentino (2000:1) presents different sorts of grouping
represented by flexible grouping used in rural school house in America. Where students varying ages, backgrounds and abilities were grouped and regrouped to satisfy instructional needs. She says that the idea of grouping is changed according to culture in cities and growth. The claim that students of the same age learned at about the same rate led most schools to divided students in classes by their ages, a practice which lasts nowadays. She argues that teachers tend to use informally grouping and regrouping students in various ways through school days can enable teachers role and job easier and students more productive. What Harmer (2001: 114), Hess (2001: 112) and Valentino said is very important when students are grouped according to their ages. They might learn easily. So, students of the sample are expected to participate positively in group work. This technique will let students engage in learning English.

Types of Grouping:
Some techniques should be used for encouraging students of the sample to practise their learning activities. These types of grouping include different sorts as follows:
- Teacher –Led Groups: Valentino (2000: 1) argues that, these groups are most common configuration exploited in classrooms now. They include Whole-class, small groups, and individual instruction. Interaction in these types is between teacher and student considered exclusively. Besides, these groups support students and teaching learning processes in an effective and efficient way of introducing material, confine up and conclusions made by individual groups, meeting the common needs of a large or small group and providing individual attention or instruction.
As Valentino argued, this type of grouping she puts some concern on the teacher to deal with instruction. Then, the role of students is to interact with each other to do their activities.
- Whole –Class Instruction: Valentino (2000:1) Continues to
describe that the whole –class instruction is often used to introduce new materials and strategies to the entire class. Therefore, working with this sort of grouping by means of new concepts can build common experiences and provide participation basis for further exploration, problem solving, and skill development. Also, this way of grouping can help identify students’ previous knowledge and experiences that will affect new knowledge acquisition. Whole-class instruction as described by Valentino is suitable for presenting new knowledge for students. Harmer (2001:114) mentions that it is still the most common teacher –student interaction in many cultures. There are advantages and disadvantages accompanied with these.

**Advantages of Whole-Class Grouping:**

Harmer (2001:114) presents a number of advantages related to whole -class grouping as follows:

a- It reinforces a sense of belonging between students in the same group. Something like this can change learning atmosphere when group members share and engage the same emotion as happiness.

b- It is appropriate for activities where the teacher is performing as a controller.

c- It is the popular way in different educational settings where students and teachers feel secure and the whole class working in close step and under immediate control of the teacher.

d- It allows teachers to measure the mood of the class in general.

The above advantages of whole –class grouping which mentioned by Harmer, reinforce “learning by doing”.

**Disadvantages of Whole-class Grouping:**

Harmer (2001:115) suggests that whole-class grouping has the following disadvantages:

a- It prefers the group and neglects the individual.

b- No much time for individual students to share or say anything on their own.
c-It may not encourage students to be responsible for their own learning.
d-It is not the ideal way to organize communicative language teaching or special task based sequences. e-Many students do not tend to participate in front of their class-mates, this may indicate public failure. As Harmer indicates, disadvantages of whole-class grouping might result some defects. These could embed learning for the students of the sample to share in activities accordingly.

-Small-Group Instruction
Valentino (2000:1) argues that small-group instruction is popular to most teachers. This can provide chances for working with students of common needs like reinforcement or enrichment. Wrench and et al (2009:44) say that small-groups typically involve two to six students working together on a common task. They provide an opportunity to maximize students’ active involvement in class, to develop their interpersonal communication and cooperation skills and to reinforce their knowledge through peer teaching. As a result, studies provide evidence that students retain information longer than when they have an opportunity to verbalize it, especially to their classmates. Michael and Harold (2013:9) say that students working together in groups may learn more than students working individually.
Wrench (2009:45) agrees that, no two students learn exactly the same way. Now, this does not mean that we have to determine each and every student’s learning style. It does not mean that we need to be aware of the various learning styles preferences and learning steps for our students above a variety of instructional approaches, to teach lesson. Ebank (2010:18) says that small-group instructions enable the teacher’s effort to determine different instructions. So, that it is simple to teach a small group of students than large class. Therefore, students show less teacher-dependency at independent activities than
under achieving students do.

Valentino (2000:1), Wrench (2009:44-45), Michael and Harold (2013:9) Ebank (2010:18) emphasized on small-group techniques rather than whole-class grouping. They agreed that students could be able to work in small-group comfortably. Then students will have the ability to remember the information in short time.

-Student-led Groups:
Valentino(2000: 2) argues that student control the group dynamics and maintain a voice in setting the objectives for the group to follow. Student-Led groups provide opportunities for divergent thinking and encourage students to be responsible for their own learning. These types of groupings are useful and they represent model of real life adult’s situations when students work together, not individually, to solve problems. So, students learn to work with each other from different backgrounds and various experiences and developing a sense of confidence in their own abilities. Activities which are related to student-led groups such as below:

1-Collaborative Groups:
Valentino (2000:2) says that these types depend upon the team spirit that motivates students to participate and contribute to the learning of others on the team. Team success depends on individual learning, sharing of member’s ideas and reinterpret instructions to help each other. In this way, students join to one another the opinion that learning is fun and valuable. Collaborative groups facilitate learning when students share ideas to work. As this technique requires the team spirit, the students of the sample will benefit from it.http://faculty.academy art.edu.(2013:1) mentioned that collaborative learning involves students to work together-in pairs or small groups- to create, explore, concepts, come up with solutions and lastly further their understanding and skills. There is also that setting can be changed from interaction
between teacher and students to one in which students interact productively and intentionally with others to build knowledge and capacities. From this point, collaborative learning and lecturing are differ on a continuum, the former relies heavily on student participation and the latter is generated by the teacher. Effective Collaborative learning has the following aspects: 

a- advances the learning outcomes and produces deeper understanding rather than simple transmission of information.

b- reflects the team work required in creative professions.

c- requires engaged participation of all group members.

d- encourages students to be autonomous, articulate and thinking learner.

e- students can learn by teaching each one another.

What is said above can help and maintain the students of the sample to share in group activities, respectively.

2- Performance-based Groups:

Valentino (2000:2) illustrates that, sometimes groups of students with the same needs benefit from extra help to complete their task. This type of groups form for a short time and respond to the dynamic nature of learning. Performance-Based groups are most effective when formed on the basis of a particular need rather than response to predetermined performance levels. They provide a means for increasing students’ access to a certain concept or skill. Acceptable strategies for these groups include introducing language, using concrete models, playing a concept game for practicing strategies. These strategies may include group study and interview for options. In the former, students can be grouped into small groups after given instructions. Then, they can do the determined activities such as to complete an assignment that reinforces, expands on or test their knowledge. Performance-based groups consolidate knowledge and concepts of learning activities. Hence, students build their practice up on performing. They do their activities and engage practising autonomously.
Students-Dyads/Pairs:
Harmer (2001:116) says that students can practise language together, negotiate a text or share information gap activities. It is clear that pair work technique plays a great role in student-centred activities. Valentino (2000:3) says that this type of grouping often forms the basis for peer and cross-age programme. Many strategies used for student pairs include the following:

1-Partner Turns: students are grouped before presentation is made. Then, pairs can be given a chance to share ideas or information and plans or strategies for problem solving. This strategy provides a suitable way to reinforce active listening and individual (Indv.) way of problem solving.

2-Think, Pair, Share after instruction, students should write down their opinions. Then, in pairs (PW) students meet so as to share ideas and strategies. This approach supplies students encourage various thinking and provides them with feedback on problem solving. Therefore, flexibility of grouping (GW) is required. But the results might worth effort. What Catherine said is the key to start doing activities by students. It concentrates on the students’ participation. Therefore, students-dyads/pairs could be used in activities regularly. It is normally that not all techniques thoroughly ideal. There would be advantages and disadvantages a companied with.

Advantages of Pair Work: Harmer (2001: 116) presents the following advantages of pair work:

a - It increases the length of speaking time for students.
b - It allows students to work independently.
c - It maximizes cooperation help.
d - It is associated with quick and simple to organize.

Pair work has its advantages as mentioned above. These advantages could be used in group activities because students invest time practising activities to promote their role-play. Then language learning will become easily.
Disadvantages of Pair work:
Harmer (2001:116) clarifies that pair work has different disadvantages as follows:
a - Very noisy, teachers worry about losing control in class. b - Students may miss the way to a target point, besides; they tend to use their mother tongue. c - It is not favourite always with students when they feel that classmates are weak to communicate.

Harmer shows that pair work has negative effects on students when they want to do their activities. Thus, an activity done by a group of three or more will be better than pair work.

- Group Work: (GW)
Harmer (2001:117) says that students can be put in groups each composed of more than three. This can allow them to participate in different tasks. They can write a group story or role-play a situation which includes five members. Therefore, a group of small number of participants is greater involvement and participation than larger ones. The group work which is composed of five members is seemed to be the suitable one. Students meet their classmates to share ideas and participate accordingly. When working with students, teachers remind them that their ability to work well with other is going to be one of the most important skills they will learn in classroom. Group work emphasizes creativity and students can work to ensure their attempts in language learning.

Hess (2001: 112) mentions that it seems to be worked within the real world learners, in class enjoy sharing ideas, learning from one another and cooperating.

Students are encouraged to do their tasks and activities through reality. They help each other to work or communicate in English Language. So this participation could motivate them to develop their learning skills. On other hand, when they fell free they would be more active to share with each other.
Types of Activities:
Students have to be aware of how to deal with activities, because teaching learning process requires paying more attention and considerable focusing. Richards (1986:76) says that the types of activities and exercises concord with a communicative approach is unlimited provided that such exercises support students to achieve the communicative objectives of the curriculum, engage students in communication. In addition to they require the use of such communicative process as information sharing, negotiation of meaning and interaction. In other words, he shows that class-room activities are often designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated through language or participation. Functional communication activities include such tasks as students compare a set of pictures and noting similarities and differences, besides ranging or organizing events in a set of pictures. In addition to that, discovering missing features in a map or picture, one student can communicating behind a screen to another student and giving instruction how to draw a picture or shape, or how to complete a map following discussion, and solving problems for shared clues.

Then Richards sums up activities due to social interaction which include conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role-plays, simulations, skills, improvisations, and debates. Jones, L. (2007:28) says that some activities, like discussion and role play are clearly appropriate as working-together activities. So, these can represent by adding writing tasks or multiple choice and fill the blank exercises may be effective and enjoyable when done in groups or pairs.

Discussion can be created within brain storming and comparing answers, but they have to be in English. So, teachers have to persuade students that this is acceptable when using English Language in participating ideas and answers.
Content-Based Exercises: Michael (2012:12) says that scholars interested in the language used in various social and cultural situations. As a result, they paid more attention to focusing on general and integrated works/activities, rather than discrete structures. So, it is clear that communication cannot take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumption about how language works. Then, he shifted to say that communicative language teaching enables students to perform spontaneously, but not guarantee linguistic accuracy of the linguistic utterance. Hence, students may benefit from the based approaches which focus on the linguistic and grammatical structures, which make the speech grammatically accurate. But students lack the ability to produce spontaneous speech. This requires increasing activities so as to encourage students to the step-by-step procedures to use the language. Michael contribution has clarified the role of linguistic exploitation in the activities which should be done by students.

Reading: Puchta and Crystal (2013: 3) say that the best pre-reading activity is when a student picks up a book, looks at the cover, flips through the book and then settles down to read. Identifying this technique is very important. Because students are required to be familiar with reading skills. Jones (2007:28) presents some types of activities to be used by the teachers and students as language use. She says that reading a text is something people favour to do on their own, without interruptions and at their own speed if possible, taking out new words in a dictionary each time. Because reading requires enough time, we can ask the students to read the text before the lesson. The relevant questions should be done at home. Meanwhile, reading together in class can be enjoyable with students helping one another to understand and sharing reactions. Therefore, multiple-choice questions are the main activity for discussion in pairs. It is very interesting for
students to discuss their answers than to just to be told them. Reading as learning skills depend on personal understanding. So students have to do more activities to develop reading. Harmer (2001:215) gives examples of reading activities to show the variety of using or applying ideas in intensive reading for a number of reasons. Students may expose to practise certain skills such as reading to get specific information or reading for general understanding. Besides, students get to read texts to identify specific use of language or read texts for communicative purpose as a part of other activities.

**Speaking Activities:** [http://www.cal.org/cael/](http://www.cal.org/cael/) is said that, although dialogues and conversations are the most obvious and most often used speaking activities in language classrooms, a teacher can select activities from a variety of tasks. Brown (1994) lists six possible task categories:

a-**Imitative**- Drills in which the learner simply repeats a phrase or structure (e.g., "Excuse me." or "Can you help me?") for clarity and accuracy;

b-**Intensive**- Drills or repetitions focusing on specific phonological or grammatical points, such as minimal pairs or repetition of a series of imperative sentences;

c-**Responsive**- Short replies to teacher or learner questions or comments, such as a series of answers to yes/no questions;

d-**Transactional**- Dialogues conducted for the purpose of information exchange, such as information-gathering interviews, role plays, or debates;

e-**Interpersonal**- Dialogues to establish or maintain social relationships, such as personal interviews or casual conversation role plays; and

These tasks are not sequential. Each can be used independently or they can be integrated with one another, depending on learners' needs.

**Discussion and Sharing Ideas:** Jones (2007:30 -31) mentions
that the best discussion joins students talking about personal experiences and giving options. They can be worked best in pairs or small groups, because of more people can review their ideas. Through this, one of whole-class or large group can give his or her view, one else can only agree or disagree. Richards (1976:76) says that activities are often designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated through language or involve negotiation of information and information sharing. The group members then negotiate a given idea to reach a certain point.

**Role Play:**

Jones (2007:32) says that students feel different if they have a role to play, they may escape from doing for a while Role plays may include student playing a tourist/customer/boss, interacting with his partner playing a tour guide/sales assistant/post office clerk/employee. Therefore, pretended roles can be problematic for some students but fun for others. The example here is to clarify the role play through a short conversation using the phone call by means of ‘making a good impression’. In pair work students imagine that both of them want to meet later. They sit back to back role play a phone call. They use these questions:

Where are you? Who are with you? What are you doing? Where should we meet?

That is to say: Hi!, this Peter. Could I speak to Marc?- "Speaking. Hey Peter, where are you? ‘I’m still at home .What are you doing?"

Teacher can focus on how students perform the activity during the role play. Then, teacher’s feedback will appear as: Is it a successful phone call? Do students make a good impression? After this discussing how students can improve their performance, they wish to attempt the conversation again, perhaps switching roles. Role –play can provide students of the sample with powerful activities to maintain language
acquisition. On the other hand, they will be motivated to participate easily in discourse with each other.

**Game Types and Associated Vocabulary:**
Kohl (1977:35) says that language should be learnt through games in general. Games can be controlled by rules and have players. There is an indication that rules are very essential for games to be done through within activities.

**Data Analysis and Discussion**
The study tried to clarify and analyze data which collected previously. According to tools which are mentioned in research methodology data was divided via tabulating which was designed accordingly. During analysis and discussion there is a comparison between the Pre-test and the Post-test, the control group and the empirical group. Data is treated as follows.

**Table No. (1) General Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Empirical Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Test**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2014

It is clear from the above table no. (1) that, the number of students who passed the pre-test is one hundred and four (104) with percentage of (45%). Whereas the number of those who failed is one hundred and twenty-four (124) with percentage of (55%). According to Wrench (2009:45), that no two students learn exactly the same way. We cannot determine each and every student’s learning style. It may indicate misunderstanding of students to deal with activities which presented to them. Another indicator, some students have
problems in English Language. They complained that they lack basic information like how to communicate, to write and even alphabetical order. Some of them argued that they could read, but they did not express words’ meaning. Therefore, the difference is noticeable between the successful and failure. When grouping students, it is observed that students face difficulties in practical activities. In the pre-test, some students were asked to make a bit clarification for them. The result of the pre-test is failure. The difference between the pre-test and the post-test marks is forty-one (41), this due to less marks obtained by students in the pre-test. On the other hand, the number of students who failed in the pre-test more than that of the post-test. The difference is forty-one (41). The more practice the more successful. The increasing of numbers resulted of engaging students to do variety of tasks by means of fluency and accuracy. Therefore, competence and performance take place. Thus, the role of group activity is appeared clearly. Students in the pre-test ignored simple information.

Table No.(1) Control Group Analysis: Pretest

It is clear that from the above table no. (1) shows that the number of students sample in Control Group who success in the pretest is fifty-one (51). It means that they achieved less marks in this test compared with those who fail in the same test (63). In other words, control group faced some difficulties to carry out this test adequately. This might be referred to students’ background of knowledge. Besides, they lack information about fundamental grammar rules and vocabulary. This test is carried out individually. So, students of the sample might use trial and errors to solve this test. They depended upon their selves in the pretest according to their previous experiences. So, this resulted in their weak marks. As Valentino (2000:18) … students must learn to work independently. This result of failure denotes that students must
be imposed to intensive practical activities to support them maintain their language learning. So, they can formulate their personal strategy for skills development.

**Table No. (1) Empirical Group Analysis: Pretest**

It is clear that from the above table no. (1) that (53) of the respondents in the empirical group represented by (46%) have passed the pre-test. Hence, the number of the respondents who have failed the pre-test is sixty-one (61) which represented by (54%). Students faced some difficulties in reading skills. So they suffered more from vocabulary. This might refer to their bit experience. Some students tried to solve test questions completely, but they missed some parts of the answers. The majority of students of the sample complained about vocabulary and meaning. That resulted in lexical challenge which embed students of the sample understanding. According to [http://faculty.academyart.edu](http://faculty.academyart.edu) (2013:1) that if students involved to work together in pairs or small groups to create, explore concepts, come up with solutions and lastly further their understanding and skills. Students’ marks estimated over (50) to (65). Whereas some questions are missed to be answered.

**Table no. (1) Control Group: Post-test Analysis:**

It is clear from the above table no. (1) shows that the number of the respondents who have passed the post test in Control Group is sixty-nine (69). It is represented by sixty-one percent. Therefore, the researcher could contribute this success to Students individual role in understanding programme information. According to Richards (1986:76) that the types of activities and exercises concord with a communicative approach could support students to achieve the communicative objectives of the curriculum and engage students in communication. This might be accompanied with student’s ability and his/her readiness. However, the more practice the more appropriate fluency. In other hand, students of the
sample did well in post-test. Therefore, that might give a clear indicator to the programme and its procedures. Another point, students of the sample may be motivated when they were instructed to specific activities. Hence, this might reveal good results. This group made some efforts to pass the examination, perhaps students of the sample thought that they would be treated roughly if their work is not so proper. Or in other word, they focused listening to instructions and practised individually their assignments. This group depended up on lecturing, but students were carried out different assignments after each lecture.

**Table No.(1) Empirical Group: Post -test**

It is obvious from the above table no.(1) shows that the number of the respondents in empirical group is seventy-seven (77). This may illustrate that they benefit from practical sides of Group Activity (GA). The percentage (63%) hints to successful group. Therefore, students of the sample respond to instructions which have exposed to during activities. Hence, the number of the respondents who fail in the post –test is thirty –seven (37). It is represented by (33%) and it shows that the students of the sample have engaged in group activities, so they achieved high marks. According to Graham (2001:1) that group activities put more responsibility on the learners for their own learning. It involves students in more decision-making processes. In addition to that students had performed positively, because student-centred activities become relevant to their own lives and experiences.

Also, according to Valentino (2000: 1) that small group instruction can provide chances for working with students of common needs like reinforce or enrichment. Group activities (GA) could satisfy students needs, if they intend and accept the idea of how work with these activities. Hence, team work is the origin of student-centred activities. Because, students might remember what they did in interactions.

As Richards (1986:76) says that exploiting different activities
support students to engage in communication. This activities include; information sharing, negotiation meaning and interaction.

Another point, students paid attention and listened to instructions, so they achieved suitable marks in the post-test. Jones (2007:29) says that listening is something required to be done always by learners as an individual activity. So, students may feel with engagement if they pay attention and listen to instructions to do tasks.

**Conclusions:**

According to the results which obtained from the previous treatment, the study aimed to conclude that group activities considered as important as learning by doing. Therefore, practical sides can maintain students’ capacity to use the language in appropriate way. Yet, the current studies are increasing all over the world to update language learners’ needs. It is very difficult to determine whether students be able to participate in group activities or not before grouping. Consequently, the researcher suggested some activities through the programme to help students of the sample to practise learning skills in an ideal way. Concisely, group activities had played a great role in this research, because students of the sample were encouraged and responded to the activities to some extent. In conclusion, the researcher had suggested some recommendations and hoped to be applied at university level in common. And/or it might be specified for English Language Teaching ELT.

**The Results**

The results of this study are obtained from the pre-test and the post-test that given to students according to the suggested programme. The results are as follows:

1- Students achieved weak marks in the pre-test. They represented by (45%).
2- Students gained high marks in the post-test and they
represented by (55%).
3- Controll group’s students got weak marks in the Pre-
test(44%).
4- Controll group’s students got high marks in the post-test
(61%).
5- Empirical group’s students their marks estimated by(46%)
in the pre-test.
6- Empirical group’s students had successfully passed the
post-test and they represented by(67%) .
10-Group Activities maximized the role of students and
minimized the role of the teacher ,this occurred in their
marks.

5.3: Recommendations:
The study recommended that:
1- Teachers/Lecturers can change their traditional ways of
teaching English Language to group activities (GA).
2- Courses and academic programmes could be designed
according to group activities (GA).
3- Students should be exposed to extra activities by means of
developing their competence and performance, fluency and
accuracy.
4- The use of multi-media in presentation is required to
motivate students and encourage them to be language users.
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