

THE EFFECT OF FEEDBACK AND MOTIVATION ON SERVICE ABILITY IN JUNIOR TENNIS ATHLETES IN WEST SUMATRA

Suci Nanda Sari¹, Juana Wangsa Putri²

¹Universitas Negeri Padang

²Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Email Author: sucinandasari1606@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to test the influence of Feedback giving and motivation on the service ability of junior tennis athletes in West Sumatra. Thirty athletes were randomly divided into four groups (Direct Feedback high motivation n = 10), (Direct Feedback low motivation n = 10) and (Indirect Feedback high motivation n = 10), (Indirect Feedback low motivation n = 10) assigned to complete service training interventions with a feedback approach for 6 weeks, 3 days/week. Serviceability test using Hewwit tennis test. The findings in this study show that there is a significant positive influence from giving feedback in the direct feedback group with high motivation to improve the service ability of West Sumatra junior tennis athletes. obtained the average score of service ability of the high motivation group taught with direct feedback is 28.40 and the low motivation group is 22.00 For the average score of service ability of the high motivation group taught with indirect feedback 23.70 and the low motivation group is 23.80.

Keywords: Feedback, Motivation, Service, Tennis

Introduction

Improving service skills in tennis can be done by doing diligent, disciplined and repetitive exercises and not being quickly satisfied with what can be done. In this study only looked at basic service skills. Skills can be understood as an indicator of the level of proficiency or mastery of things that require gestures (Syahrial, 2010:95). If observed based on the above exposure it turns out that mastery of a motion skill is a process in which a person develops a set of responses into a coordinated and integrated motion pattern so that each movement skill requires good organization of muscle motion. In the approach of training many ways that coaches in training the service skills of athletes, among them is the approach of giving feedback. In the approach of training many ways that coaches in training the service skills of athletes, among them is the approach of giving *feedback* .

Rink (2005:29) "*Motor learning theorists have often addressed the importance of the role of feedback in learning. feedback is information the learner receives on performance. Feedback has been characterized as knowledge of result and knowledge of performance*". Here Rink says that Teori learning Motion has often discussed the importance of the role of feedback in learning. Feedback is information that students receive in performance. Feedback has been characterized as knowledge of knowledge results and knowledge performance. The same thing was also conveyed by Sindetop, (1991:9) *feedback can be defined as information about a*

response that is used to modify the next response. Feedback is necessary for learning". It can be interpreted that umpan balik can be defined as information about the response used to modify the next response and the feedback is needed to learn.

Feedback (*feedback*) directly is an effort made by coaches to improve their abilities by providing corrections regarding the task of direct movement of athletes. According to (Metszler 2005:135) Live feedback is feedback provided directly after the skill effort is complete or at least before the next skill attempt occurs. So instantly the individual performs the task of motion given directly corrected about the movement that has been done. So that the individual immediately knows how the right movement and that should be done. Medium indirect feedback According to (Metszler 2005:135) is the feedback given after all skill efforts have been completed. Metszler also exemplified "for indirect *feedback*, such as 20 minutes later after the learning materials provided by the coach ended, the coach told the athlete, regarding what corrections the athlete had to correct when after completing the overall task of motion. The more motivation is very important for every athlete in training the higher the motivation of an athlete in training, the faster it will increase the ability of athletes in learning techniques, and vice versa. Motivation according to James Tangkudung (2012) is the motivation that arises in a person, conscious or unconscious to perform an action with a specific purpose. In tennis service exercises, psychic factors also greatly affect athletes in every training process especially in materials that have complex difficulty levels. The personality of the athlete will greatly influence the performance and achievement of achievements in training. As stated by Sudiby (2001) that personality is not easily visible and known because personality is a complex unity of mental roundness; personality will be reflected in ideals, dispositions, attitudes, traits, and deeds. Further explained by Heckhausen in Sudiby (2001) motivation is the process of actualizing the source of the drive and driving of individual behavior meets the need to achieve a specific goal.

Methods

This research method uses experimental treatment by level 2 x 2 this design statement based on sudjana statement. Research design is a design that is used to facilitate the research process. The design that will be used is the design of treatment by level 2x2. In simple terms the research design is described as follows:

Table 1 Research design treatment by level 2 x 2

FEEDBACK (A)		
	Direct Feedback (A₁)	Indirect Feedback (A₂)
Motivation to Practice (B)		
High Motivation (B ₁)	A ₁ B ₁	A ₂ B ₁
Low Motivation (B ₂)	A ₁ B ₂	A ₂ B ₂
Total	A ₁	A ₂

The implementation of the research in the form of tests, as well as the treatment was carried out at the Semen Padang tennis court and PTL UNP and gor Agus Salim tennis court. Because it is a means and place to play tennis in October 2019. The population in this study is all Padang City Tennis Athletes who are divided into several clubs such as PTC, Setra Tennis, Semen Padang, PTL UNP, Sekora Tennis *School*. Based on the picture contained in the

population, sampling is determined by proportional random *sampling* techniques, so forty athletes are randomly divided into four groups (Direct Feedback high motivation n = 10), (Direct Feedback high motivation n = 10) and (Indirect Feedback high motivation n = 10), (Indirect Feedback high motivation n = 10) assigned to complete service training interventions with a *feedback* approach for 6 weeks, 3 days / week. Serviceability test using *Hewwit tennis test*. And this research data analysis technique using data obtained in this study will be processed and analyzed using variance analysis technique (ANAVA), and continued with tukey test and using IBM SPSS v.26

Results and Discussion

With the test of normality and homogeneity of research data, the requirements for variance analysis (ANAVA) have been met. Hypothesis testing using two-way variance analysis (ANAVA)

There is a difference between direct feedback and indirect feedback on the serviceability of junior tennis athletes in West Sumatra

Variance analysis calculation of the difference in effectiveness between the two forms of overall feedback refers to Sudjana. The summary can be seen in table 2. Based on the results of anava calculation, it can be seen that F observation between columns (FA) = 8.02 turned out to be greater than the table F, which is 5.18 ($F_o = 8.02 > F_t = 5.18$), so H_0 was rejected and H_1 was accepted.

Thus it can be concluded that overall there is a significant difference in influence between direct feedback and indirect feedback on the ability of tennis services. In other words, the improved serviceability of junior tennis athletes using direct feedback ($= 2 \bar{X} 4.50$ and $s = 4.69$) is better than the indirect feedback group ($= 23.75 \bar{X}$ and $s = 2.47$). This means that the first research hypothesis to suggest that there is a difference in the influence between direct feedback and indirect feedback on serviceability has been tested.

Interaction between feedback and motivation to the service ability of junior tennis athletes.

Based on the summary of variance analysis calculation results, obtained the price of F_{count} interaction (FAB) = 23.2 and $F_{table} = 4.04$, it appears that $F_{calculates} > F_{table}$, so that hypothetical zero (H_0) which states there is no influence of interaction between feedback and motivation on serviceability is rejected and alternative hypotheses (H_1) are accepted. In other words, it can be stated that the achievement of service capabilities is influenced by the interaction between feedback and motivation.

There is a difference between direct feedback and indirect feedback on serviceability for highly motivated students.

Calculation of advanced variance analysis with *Tukey* test to compare the high motivation group of both feedback refers to *Gane V. Glass's* opinion. Calculation of the difference in the effect of serviceability for high motivation groups taught with direct feedback and Indirect feedback ($P_1 : P_2$) can be seen in the appendix. A summary of the results of the *Tukey* test calculation as shown in the following table:

Table 3. Summary of *tuckey* test results

No.	Compared Groups	Q _{count}	Q _{table 0.05}	information
1	P1 to P2	8.76	3.58	Significant

Based on table 4.11, shows that the price of $Q_{\text{calculate}} (Q_h) = 8.76$ greater than $Q_{\text{table}} = 3.58$ or $Q_{\text{calculate}} > Q_{\text{table}}$ at a significant level $\alpha 0.05$, thus the zero hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted, meaning that the serviceability for the high motivation group taught with indirect feedback ($= \bar{X} 23.70$ and $s = 2.88$) was higher than that taught by direct feedback ($= 28.40 \bar{X}$ and $s = 2.07$). This means the third research hypothesis that states that: There is a difference between direct feedback and indirect feedback on serviceability for highly motivated students has been tested.

There is no difference between direct feedback and indirect feedback on serviceability for low-motivation students.

Calculation of advanced variance analysis with *Tukey* test to compare low motivation groups. Calculation of mengenai differences in the effect of service capabilities taught with direct feedback and Indirectfeedback (P4 : P3) can be seen in the appendix. A summary of tuckey test calculation results as shown in the following table:

Table 4. Summary of *Tukey* test calculation results

No	Yang Group Than	Q _{count}	Q _{table 0.05}	information
1	P4 to P3	5.54	3.58	Insignificant

Based on table 4, shows that the calculated Q price (Q_h) = 5.54 is smaller than the $Q_{\text{table}} = 3.58$ or $Q_{\text{calculates}} < Q_{\text{of the table}}$ at a significant level $\alpha 0.05$, thus the zero hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is rejected, meaning, that the serviceability with direct feedback ($= \bar{X} 22.00$ and $s = 1.70$) is higher than that with indirect feedback ($= 23.80 \bar{X}$ and $s = 2.66$). This means a fourth research hypothesis that states that; There is no difference between direct feedback and indirect feedback on serviceability for low-motivation students.

Based on the data of the results of the study, obtained the average score of service ability of the high motivation group taught with direct feedback is 28.40 and the low motivation group is 22.00 For the average score of service ability of the high motivation group taught with indirect feedback 23.70 and the low motivation group is 23.80.

From the results of the fourth test hypothesis formulation, the results showed that the hypotheses 1 (one), 2 (two), 3 (three) were tested. While the formulation of the 4th hypothesis (four) shows that statistically there are no significant differences. On average, the direct feedback score was higher for low-motivation groups. This indicates that the two forms of feedback have the same different effect on service capabilities. The fourth hypothesis shows that it is not proven or untested because it is not supported by the collected data.

Overall, direct feedback has a better influence than indirect feedback. While for those who have high motivation should choose direct feedback as an exercise approach if you want to improve service capabilities. As for those who have low motivation, can be given both

feedback to improve service capabilities, but it tends to be better if given indirect feedback, this is due to the difference in the average amount.

Conclusions

Based on the results of data analysis, hypothetical test results and the results of research discussions that have been obtained, it can be explained some conclusions, as follows:

1. Overall there is a difference between direct and indirect feedback on serviceability.
2. There is an interaction between *feedback* and motivation to service capabilities.
3. For highly motivated student athletes, direct feedback gives a better influence compared to indirect feedback on improving the serviceability of junior tennis athletes.
4. For athletes with low motivation, indirect feedback gives a better influence compared to direct feedback on improving the serviceability of junior tennis athletes.

References

- Bakhtiar, Syahrial. 2010. *Belajar Motorik Lanjutan*. Padang: Sukabina
- Brown, Jim. (2001). *Tenis Tingkat Pemula*. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada
- Metzler, M. (2011). *Instructional Models For Physical Education-Second edition*. Holcomb Hathaway. Scottsdale Arizona.
- Unj Postgraduate Program, *Thesis Writing Guidelines and Dissertation* (Jakarta: 2012), p.27
- Rink, Judith. (2005). *Teaching Physical Education For Learning*. University Of South California
- Siedentop, Daryl. (1991). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Ohio State University. California
- Sudibyo Setyobroto, *Mental Training* (Jakarta: Printing "Solo" 2001), p. 21.
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Research Method of Education Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Approach*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Syafruddin, 1999. *Sports Coaching Basics*. Padang: UNP
- Syahara, Sayuti. (2011). *Growth and development of motor physical*. FIK Press
- Tangkudung James and wahyuningsih puspitorini, *Sports Coaching Sports Achievement Coaching*. Jakarta : Cerdas Jaya, 2012.