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ABSTRACT

The study aimed to prepare educational units that include the pattern of multi-directional communication and to identify its effect on some offensive handball skills among students of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kut University College. The research hypotheses included that there are statistically significant differences between the post-post tests of the control and experimental groups according to effective teaching according to the multidirectional communication pattern in some offensive handball skills among students of the College of Physical Education and Sports Sciences. The researchers used the experimental approach of equal groups for its suitability to the research problem and by an intentional method, the community identified students of Physical Education and Sports Sciences for the second phase 2020-2021, and their number was (120) students. 2/2021 to 4/25/2021.
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I. INTRODUCTION:

The recent progress in the field of physical education is the result of the development of teaching methods used by those with specializations in the field of teaching, and the identification of the best means and methods where used to develop this field through the progress in the learner's ability to acquire the skill, as the student needs to learn all the details which are related to his skill or effectiveness and to identify all the circumstances and situations those related to that game and effectiveness. Therefore, it is no longer a secret to those who work in the field of sports that the teaching process must be subject to the development that happened, whether in the scientific or technological aspects that are used as means in the learning process.

That effective teaching is one of the methods of teaching, which in turn gains the student learning, so that the student is as a recipient of information, a participant, and a searcher of information in various possible ways, in more precise words, it is a style of teaching that depends on self-activity and positive participation of the learner, through which he may conduct research using a set of activities and scientific processes.

As well as, the multi-directional style of communication is one of the classroom communication styles that work on acquiring and developing the student’s teaching skills, since the communication in it is from the teacher to the student, from the student to the colleague, and then to the teacher, that is, the communication is reciprocal between the student, his colleagues and his teacher, which ensures the transmission of information in various directions between the teacher and the learners. This style is considered more advanced and effective than other styles, as it allows the student to exchange ideas, express opinions, and obtaining the largest amount of feedback. That the current study refers to the employment in increasing scientific and theoretical knowledge of handball, which depends heavily on scientific application in the learning process, since the game of handball is one of the games that has witnessed great development in all of the world and has taken a rapid spread because it contains various technical and planning skills that are interesting to the viewer, also it can be considered one of the games that spread cooperation and unification of the effort for the purpose of reaching a high sporting level, that the
basic skills in handball are the backbone of this game and usually take the longest time in practice. So the importance of this research lies in the researcher's attempt in a field study and by using effective education according to the multi-directional communication style in learning some the offensive skills in handball game.

The problem of the Research:
Through the researchers' interest in the handball game, they noticed that most of the students are at their level and below the required level, although they are highly active during the lecture, as there are some of them have the desire to acquire the skill physically and technically, so the most important requirements to reach athletic excellence is to diagnose weakness in skill performance despite the provision of the requirements that required to conduct the lecture properly.

This is what hinders the student from developing in skill performance, from the above, the researcher resorted to this study in order to identify the extent of the impact of effective education according to the multi-directional communication style in predicting some offensive skills in handball game.

The Objectives of the Research:
1- Preparing educational units that include the pattern of multidirectional communication in some offensive skills in handball among the students of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Al-Kut College.

2- Identifying the impact of the effective education according to the multi-directional communication style on some offensive skills in handball among students of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Al-Kut College.

The Hypotheses of the Research:
1- There are statistically significant differences between the two tests, pre- and post-test, according to effective learning, according to the multi-directional communication style, in some offensive skills in handball among students of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, of Al- Kut College.

1-5 There are statistically significant differences between the two post-tests for the control and experimental groups according to the effective teaching according to the multi-directional communication style in some offensive skills in handball game among students of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, of Al-Kut College.

The Research Domains
The human domain: third-stage students, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Al-Kut University College.

Spatial domain: halls and playgrounds in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kut University College.

Time domain: 1/25/2021 to 4/25/2021

II. METHODOLOGY:
The goals of the research as well as the nature of the problem determine the type of method used in this research, so the researchers used the experimental method in the style of equal groups to solve the research problem and achieve its goals.

The Research community and its Sample:
The research sample was identified as they are the third stage students in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Al-Kut College. That that their number is (120) students who were divided into four study sections. As the sample of the research was chosen, choosing randomly two divisions by lottery method, the number of the sample members reached (40) students, where they were distributed into two groups (control and experimental), that the number of one group reached (20) students, this is after the removal of the failed students, club players, teachers and the absent students from the educational units before starting the educational
curriculum, thus the sample percentage reached (33.33%) from the origin community, then the experimental group used the educational curriculum, the multi-directional communication style in some offensive skills in handball game, while the control group is in the traditional method which followed by the subject teacher.

In order to identify the sample homogeneity, the researcher extracted the homogeneity of the sample members and the relative difference coefficient was extracted for each of the height, weight, age and some offensive skills in handball after finding the arithmetic mean, median and standard deviation for each one, as the results showed the homogeneity of the sample because it was confined between (±1) and according to the table (1),(2)and (3).

Table (1). Shows the homogeneity of the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Arithmetic mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Coefficient of torsion</th>
<th>Difference coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the weight</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>4.693</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>height</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.363</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting from shoulder level</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting from jumping high</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dribbling</td>
<td>14.710</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deception</td>
<td>4.834</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2). Shows the homogeneity of the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Arithmetic mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Coefficient of torsion</th>
<th>Difference coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the weight</td>
<td>67.100</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>-0.972</td>
<td>5.360</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>height</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td>6.100</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting from shoulder level</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting from jumping high</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>21.157</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dribbling</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deception</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>homogeneity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3). Shows the equivalence of the control and experimental groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>control group</th>
<th>experimental group</th>
<th>Accounted T</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the weight</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>3.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>height</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting from shoulder level</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot from high jump</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dribbling</td>
<td>14.710</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deception

Tools, devices and means used in the research:

The Research Tools:
1. Noticing.
2. Personal Interviews: The researcher conducted a number of personal interviews with experts and specialists.
3. Test and measurement.

Devices:
1. Stopwatch type (Smtwtf).
2. A laptop computer (DEL).
3. A medical device for measuring height and weight.

3-2-3 The means which used in the research.
1. A legal handball court.
2. Hand balls(10)
3. Tape measure.
4. Adhesive tape (5 cm) wide.
5. Plastic poles.(7)
6. Four iron targets measuring 40 x 40 cm, four iron targets measuring 50 x 50 cm, and four iron targets measuring 60 x 60 cm.
7. References and sources

Research Tests in the Field:
The offensive skills under study were selected by reviewing the researchers' previous sources, taking into account the objectivity of the test.

The name of the test: the shoulder-level shooting test.

Description of the test: the accuracy of shooting from the pivot.

Tools used: (8) hand balls, (4) iron squares 40 x 40 cm installed at the corners of the target.

The way of performance:
1. The student stands behind a throw line of (7) meters, holding the ball.
2. When the signal is given, the student shoots at the square (1), then (2), then (3), then.(4)
3. The performance is repeated again.

The Conditions: - One of the student's feet should be stable and not moved during the performance of the throw.
- The ball is played within three seconds of hearing the signal.

Scoring: One score is calculated for each shot inside the designated box and zero for a shot outside the box.
- Zero for a shot is counted if the student commits a legal violation such as moving his second foot or not shooting within (3 seconds) of hearing the signal. As in Figure (5)

- The total score represents the overall accuracy of the experimenter, which ranges between (zero - 8) degrees.

The name of the test: the high jump shot test.

Description of the test: Measure the accuracy of shooting from high jump.

Tools used: handball goal, handball court, legal handballs, 4 iron squares measuring 60 x 60 cm, 7 plastic bars.

Way of performance: The student stands behind the first of the bar that are perpendicular to the target (the distance between the bars is 1 meter). Upon hearing the instruction, the student performs the dribbling between the bars until he reaches the L (9 m) area, then he jumps high from a barrier 40 cm high and shoots at the four hanging targets at the corners of the target, starting from the upper right corner, then the upper left corner, then the lower right corner, then the lower left corner and repeats the performance twice.

Test management: man as register by calling the names of students and recording the results.

Scoring: Two scores are calculated when the ball enters any square, one score when touching the boundary of the square, and zero if the ball is outside the square.

- The total score represents the overall accuracy of the experimenter, which ranges between (zero - 16) degrees.

Name of the test: A test of shooting accuracy from jumping forward.

Test description: Measuring the accuracy of shooting close to jumping forward.

Tools used: (10) handballs, a handball goal drawn on the wall with five circles (60 cm) in diameter, four of them drawn in each corner and the fifth drawn in the middle of the bottom of the crossbar. As shown in Figure (7).

The Conditions:
- Each experimenter is given ten attempts to insert the balls into the circles, with two balls for each circle, knowing that each circle has a test value.
- Two trial attempts are allowed before the start of the test.
- The shot is after taking three steps and then jumping, and it is not allowed to touch or go beyond the shooting line that is farther away.

Scoring:
1- The experimenter awards two marks for each ball that enters the circles in the upper right and left corner, and one degree for each ball that enters the middle circle, also three marks for each ball that enters the lower right and left circles.

2- The total score for the ten attempts represents the total accuracy of the laboratory, which ranges between (zero - 22) degrees.

Dribbling
Continuous dribbling in a zigzag direction (30)m

The purpose of the test: To measure the skill level of the dribbling.

Tools: (5) plastic poles, stopwatch, handball.

Performing way: Five poles are fixed on the ground in a straight line, the distance between each pole and the last three meters, the starting and ending line is drawn at a distance of three meters from the first pole. At the start
signal, the student dribble the ball while running in a zigzag way between the poles back and forth from the moment of the start until the player crosses the finish line.

**Deception test:**

The aim of the test: To measure the skill of deception

**Tools:** (2) legal handballs, handball court, electronic stopwatch, defensive player.

**Performance way:**

1. The tested player stands holding the ball behind the starting line 1 meter long, while the defender stands in front of him at a distance (120) cm from the starting line and behind the (50) cm line.

2. The launcher stands behind the start and gives the start signal (a deal) or (a whistle).

3. The temporary recorder stands to the right of the experimenter, as shown in the figure, where the time is recorded for each attempt.

4. The three arbitrators sit to the left of the experimenter, and their task is to monitor the correct performance of the deception movement, so that the test player touches the ground within the three circles, as they have the right to ask the scorer to retry an incorrect attempt. With a signal from the giver of the signal, the tested player performs the simple deception by taking a step with his left foot to touch the circle No. (1), then a step with his right foot to touch the circle No. (2), then the third step with his left foot to touch the circle No. (3), the diameter of each circle is (25) cm.

Recording: The recording to the experimenter the time he takes to move from one circle to another.

**The exploratory experience:**

The exploratory experiment was conducted on Monday 1/25/2021, on a group of the research sample and their number was (15) students. An educational unit was prepared using effective education according to the multi-directional communication style, for the purpose of:

1-Identifying the appropriateness of the educational curriculum and tests with the level of the sample members

2- The safety of the devices to avoid the difficulties that may face the researchers’ work when implementing the curriculum.

3- Identifying the efficiency and adequacy of the assistant work team. The results of the exploratory experience were as follows:

1- The suitability of the educational unit to the students.

2- The efficiency of the work team.

3- The required time has been identified.

**Scientific foundations of the test**

**Honesty:** The researchers used content honesty by defining tests and that honesty is an estimate to find out whether the test measures what we want to measure, and nothing other than what we want to measure by it.

**Stability:** The researchers tested the exploratory experiment sample, and then repeated the tests on them after seven days, and then processed the data of the two tests statistically through the simple correlation coefficient (Pearson), as shown in Table (4)

**Objectivity:** The researchers extracted the objectivity value of the tests by calculating the two experts’ measurement degrees and treating them using the simple correlation coefficient (Pearson) and the objectivity of the tests was extracted, as shown in Table (4).
Table (4). Shows the scientific coefficients for the used tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>stability coefficient</th>
<th>Objectivity coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shooting from shoulder level</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shoot from high jump</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dribbling</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>deception</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main experience:

The main experiment was conducted in the period from (1/2/2021 to 7/4/2021), and it included pre-tests, the educational curriculum, and post-tests.

The Pre-tests:

The skills under study were presented through an educational unit to clarify the skills to be learned. The Pre-tests tests were conducted on 4/2/2021 (Thursday) at ten in the morning for the experimental and control sample.

The Educational Method:

The researchers also have prepared the educational units for the application of the educational curriculum for the skills of handball under study, following the steps of the educational (method) curriculum followed in the college in terms of the number of educational units approved and the timings of the lesson by (16) educational units distributed over (8) weeks, at a rate of two units per week starting from the date (6/2/2021 until 6/4/2021), that the time of the educational unit reached (90) minutes, while the educational unit is divided into the following sections:

Preparatory section: (25) minutes - Main section: (61) minutes. - Closing section: (4) minutes.

Post tests: The post tests were conducted on 4/8/2021 after the sample finished the educational curriculum, that for each of the skills under study, the tests were conducted according to what is in the pre test with the same procedures.

The Statistical means:

1. Arithmetic mean
2. Torsion
3. Standard deviation
5. T for symmetrical samples.
6. T for independent samples.

Presenting, analyzing the results and discussing them:

Table (5). It shows the differences in the pre and post tests of the control group for the variables under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>measuring unit</th>
<th>Pre test</th>
<th>Post test</th>
<th>Accounted T</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shooting from shoulder height</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shooting from high jump</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>1.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5) shows the following: There are significant differences between the pre and post tests of the control group in the variables under study and tend to the post test, where the arithmetic mean of the shooting test from the shoulder level reached (4.100) and with a standard deviation of (1.021) for the pre-test, while the post test, the arithmetic mean was (5.750) with a standard deviation (0.639), the accounted (t) value was (6.128) which below the significance level (0.045), lesser than an error rate (0.05). As for shooting from jumping high, the arithmetic mean of the pre-test reached (3.700) with a standard deviation of (0.571), while in the post-test, the arithmetic mean reached (5.500) with a standard deviation of (0.639), and the accounted (T) value reached (6.128) below the level of significance (0.031), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05) which indicates that there are significant differences tend to the post test. As for the accuracy of shooting from jumping forward, the arithmetic mean was (4.350) with a standard deviation (0.813) in the pre-test, while in the post-test, the arithmetic mean was (5.250) with a standard deviation (1.293), as the accounted (T) value was (2.636) below of the level of significance (0.033), which is lesser than the error rate (0.05), that indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for the dribbling, the arithmetic mean reached (14.710) with a standard deviation (3.066) for the pre-test, as for the post test, the arithmetic mean reached (4.834) with a standard deviation (0.662), the accounted (T) value was (6.128) below the level of significance (0.000), which is lesser than the error rate (0.05) which indicates that there are significant differences tend to the post test. As for deception, the arithmetic mean reached (4.834) with a standard deviation of (1.107) for the pre-test, while in the post-test the arithmetic mean (4.384) with a standard deviation (1.142), the accounted (T) value was (1.560) below the level of significance (0.014), which indicates the presence of Significant differences tend to the post test.

Presenting the results of the differences between the pre and post tests of the experimental group for the variables under the study.

Table (6). It shows the differences in the pre and post tests of the experimental group for the variables under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>measuring unit</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shooting from the shoulder level</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>6.900</td>
<td>14.034</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shooting from high jump</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4.450</td>
<td>8.600</td>
<td>6.271</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dribbling</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>13.984</td>
<td>12.296</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>deception</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>4.433</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>6.865</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance level is under error rate (0.05)

Table (6) shows the following: There are significant differences between the pre and post tests of the control group in the variables under study tend to the post test, where the arithmetic mean of the shooting test from the shoulder level was (4.250) and with a standard deviation (0.716) for the pre-test, as for the post test, it reached the arithmetic mean (6.900) with a standard deviation of (0.447), the accounted (T) value was (14.034) below the level of significance (0.006), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for shooting from high jump, the arithmetic mean of the pre-test reached (5.400) with a standard deviation of (1.142), while in the post-test, the arithmetic mean reached (6.050) with a standard deviation of (1.538), the accounted (T) value reached (1.517) below the level of significance (0.024), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for deception, the accuracy of shooting from jumping forward, the arithmetic mean was (4.350) with a standard deviation (0.813) in the pre-test, while in the post-test, the arithmetic mean was (8.600) with a standard deviation (3.068) the accounted (T) value reached to (6.271) below the level of significance (0.000), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for the dribbling, the arithmetic mean reached (13.984) with a standard deviation (3.036) for the pre test, while the post test the
arithmetic mean reached (12.296) with a standard deviation of (1.183), the accounted (T) value was (2.318) below the significance level (0.000), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for deception, the arithmetic mean reached (4.443) with a standard deviation of (0.307) for the pre-test, while the post-test reached the arithmetic mean (3.100) with a standard deviation (0.662), the accounted (t) value reached (6.865) is below the significance level (0.000), which indicates the presence of Significant differences tend to the post test.

4.2 Presenting the results of the differences between the two groups (control - experimental) for the post-test of the variables under the study.

Table (7) It shows the differences in the post-test of the two experimental and control groups for the variables under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measuring unit</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>experimental</th>
<th>Accounted T</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shooting from the shoulder level</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shoot from high jump</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shooting accuracy from jumping forward</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dribbling</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>deception</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance level is under error rate.(0,05)

Table (7) shows the following: There are significant differences between the pre and post tests of the control group in the variables under study tend to the post test, where the arithmetic mean of the shooting test from the shoulder level reached (5.75) with a standard deviation of (0.64) for the pre-test, while the post test, the arithmetic mean was (6.90) with a standard deviation (0.45), the accounted (t) value was (6.596) below the significance level (0.026), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for shooting from high jumping, the arithmetic mean of the pre-test reached (5.50) with a standard deviation (0.89), while in the post-test, the arithmetic mean reached (6.05) with a standard deviation (1.54), the accounted (T) value reached (1.385) below the level of significance (0.002) which is lesser than the error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for shooting from jumping forward, the arithmetic mean was (5.25) with a standard deviation (1.29) in the pre test, while in the post test it reached as the arithmetic mean (8.60) with a standard deviation of (3.078) and the accounted (T) value was (4.500) below the level of significance (0.001), which is lesser than an error rate (0.05), which indicates the existence of significant differences tend to the post test. As for the dribbling, the arithmetic mean reached (13.14) with a standard deviation (2.01) for the pre-test, while the post-test reached the arithmetic mean (12.30) with a standard deviation (1.18), the accounted (T) value was (1.625) below the level of significance (0.041), which is lesser the error rate of (0.05) indicating that there are significant differences tend to the post test. As for deception, the arithmetic mean reached (4.38) with a standard deviation (0.66) for the pre-test, while the post-test reached the arithmetic mean (3.10) with a standard deviation (0.31), accounted (T) value was (7.866) below the level of significance (0.014), which indicates the presence of Significant differences tend to the post test.

Discussing the results of the differences between the two groups (control - experimental) for the post-test of the variables under study

We noticed from the tables (7,6,5) for the control and experimental groups that there are significant differences between the pre and post tests of the research sample according to the control group, as the results of the pre and post tests indicated the specific skills in the research, that the control group has followed the usual educational curriculum by the teacher, as this is the result of repeated performance of the skills as usual in the process of learning the skills under study, since the repetitions of each skill with the emergence of the teacher's role significantly in the method followed by him, he directs students during the period of education to learn the skill "as the guidance factor is one of the most important factors in the student's acquisition of movement."
In the case of the experimental group, the skills under study were acquired, which the researchers attribute to effective teaching according to the multi-directional communication style.

Also (Abdul Salam 2006) sees that effective education is that learning in which learners are engaged in the processes of reading, writing or solving problems which are related to what they learn or that it is an experimental process. Also it can be said more deeply that it is learning that requires learners to use higher thinking tasks such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation. That is, it can be said that it is a teaching method that engages the learners in doing things that force them (make them) to think about what they are learning.

The researchers believe that the style of teaching that activates the role of the learner in learning, in which he is not only a recipient of information, but also a participant and a searcher about the information in various possible ways. In more precise words, it is a style of teaching that depends on self-activity and positive participation of the learner, through which he may conduct research using a set of activities and scientific processes such as observation, making hypotheses, measurement, reading data and conclusion, which help him to reach the required information himself and under the supervision of the teacher, his guidance and evaluation.

Also, effective teaching involves effective communication, also it is not possible to differentiate between the purpose of improving teaching and the purpose of improving communication or interaction, so he makes every effort to improve his ability or verbal skill, speaks directly, with confidence and familiarity, making his words use appropriate expressive movements and signs with them, and diversifies tone of his voice, he also plans and organizes his message in a logical and easy to understand manner and uses the art of persuasion as well as identifying the needs and possible abilities of students to listen well and trying to eliminate noise and confusion that distract students from paying attention to the lesson. This may be by speaking louder than normal or by engaging students in other activities that are not related to listening.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Conclusions
The post test in both groups outperformed the post test in learning some offensive skills in handball

Effective education according to the multi-directional communication style is more effective than the method which used by the teacher in learning some offensive skills in handball.

The experimental group outperformed the control group in learning some offensive skills in handball.

Recommendations:
The necessity of using effective education according to the multi-directional communication style within the teaching methods.

Conducting similar studies based on scientific foundations that help teach other study subjects.

The necessity for the physical education teacher to know more than one teaching method and to use the best method for the appropriate educational situation.

REFERENCES: