



Technical Skill Analysis of Badminton Blow on Teenager Players of Pendowo Club Semarang

Mohamad Wahyudi[✉], Mugiyo Hartono & Achmad Rifai RC

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

June 2018

Accepted:

July 2018

Published:

August 2018

Keywords:

analysis,
phases of technical blow,
success and failure rate

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.15294/jpes.v7i2.24166>

Abstract

Teenager players of Pendowo club still ignore the success and failure aspect in the blow technique skills done during the game. The purpose of this research is to find out how big the success and failure rate of badminton blow technique at teenager players of Pendowo club and to analyze the motion performance in badminton blow technique, which has the highest failure rate at teenager players of Pendowo club. This was descriptive research that, used survey method with observation sheet as the data collection technique. The population included were 16 teenager players of Pendowo club Semarang. Samples taken from the total sampling were 8 male and 8 female players. The results of this research are: the success rate of teenager players Pendowo club in short service is 97.74%, long service is 95.56%, lob is 94.10%, dropshot is 68.01%, and smash is 77.57%, while at the failure rate short service is 2.26%, long service is 4.44%, lob is 5.90%, dropshot is 31.99%, and smash is 22.43%, other result shows that the highest failure rate is the dropshot blow. The performance of this blow results that teenager players of Pendowo club in the preparation phase enters "Sufficient" category amounted 76.7%, the implementation phase includes "Sufficient" category amounted 73%, and the advanced phase enters "Sufficient" category resulted 70%.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[✉] Correspondence address:
Campus Unnes Kelud Utara III, Semarang, 50237
E-mail: wdhi2696@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2252-648X
e-ISSN 2502-4477

INTRODUCTION

Badminton is a kind of sport played using rackets, net, and balls (shuttlecock) with a variety of blow techniques ranging from slow to very fast accompanied by deceptive movements (Afrizal Fatkhurreza, 2015). Meanwhile, according to Widiyanto (2008), core of the game is to get point by plugging into the field of opponent field which is limited by net of 1.55 m tall from the floor surface and the game itself is done used certain rules.

Sapta Kunta Purnama (2010) argues that basic techniques should be mastered include stance, racket holding techniques, ball-blowing techniques, and footwork techniques. Herman Subarjah (2004), explains that basic techniques that must be mastered such as how to hold the racket, standing attitude, foot motion, and blow techniques. Ghazali Indra Putra (2016) adds that there are some types of badminton blows to be mastered include service, lob, dropshot, smash, netting, underhand, and drive.

Badminton is a kind of sport that is not only physically dependable but also need thinking skill to design a game, from emotion control and playing skills. The techniques should be understood is when performing basic techniques, so the others techniques will be easy to master. Hendra Sutiyawan's Tutur (2015), explains that skill is the ability to use reason, thought, and creativity in working and changing or making things to be more meaningful from the work done. Needed good skill to be able to play badminton well and able to maintain the form of the game. Skill in badminton game is a degree of maturity to perform a basic technique precisely and effectively, so skill is very helpful to form a game, and become an important part in reaching victory. Some cases found in various matches are a lack of skill in blow technique and many immature participants of blow technique in the early stages.

Habib Angga Perdana (2017), argues that every player in a running event wants to win the game, showcase a good and effective game, take point by point, keep psychological stability, and consistency of blow technique in the game to beat

the opponent. However, during the process, there is success and failure in getting points experienced by the athlete. If the success is greater than the failure of the achieved blows, the participant is decided to win the game.

In Semarang, there are many badminton clubs looking for, fostering and developing the talent of badminton players. One of them is Pendowo club. Many achievements have been achieved by the club (Dwi Sri Kuspriyani, 2014). On preliminary observations, the researchers observed the game of Pendowo players following the USM Cup XII matches held on 19–24 February 2018 and USM Blibli.com Protech I match held on 27 February – 3 March 2018. In the game process, the Pendowo players was quite good in doing attack or defense. However, there are some blows that should be easy to get the points but fail, like dropshot blow that cannot pass through the net, lob blows and service accuracy that is not on target, and smash blow that is easily restored. It is still ignored by the players in terms of successful blow technique that has been done and also how big the success of a blow done in case of the player is able to control and minimize the failure.

The trainer's active role in evaluating the athlete's achievement should be noted. Therefore, the trainer must find out and know where the successes and failures of his athlete blow technique to improve in the next training and reducing the failure caused by himself in a game.

Pendowo club training has already programmed and scheduled the activities well, such as physical exercises, techniques, tactics and mental. This is a good chance to win, both regional and national level. In order to achieve the good achievement in the championships, needed a good preparation such as techniques, tactics, physical and mental to avoid error blows done by the athlete.

METHODS

This was quantitative descriptive research. The method used was survey method to find out a systematic, factual and accurate description of the nature facts, and the relationship of studied

events (Nazir, 2009). The population included were all teenager players in the simulation match amounted 8 men and 8 women of Pendowo Club Semarang. Data collection technique of this research used total sampling technique by including all populations into samples.

Data collection was done by observing and recording the match simulation images with international regulations. During the game, each player performs three matches with different opponents. In this research, the data analysis techniques used percentages to find success and blow failure in the game, and the blows that have the lowest success rate or the highest failure rate will be analyzed from the motion performance side.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on data analysis, the percentage of success rate and failure rate of blow technique achieved by players in game simulation are showed in table below:

Table 1. Average Percentage of Badminton Blows

Blow technique	% Forehand	
	Success	Fail
Short service	97.74	2.26
Long service	95.56	4.44
Lob	94.1	5.9
Dropshot	68.01	31.99
Smash	77.57	22.43
Total average	86.60	13.40

Table 1, shows that the average of success rate of blow technique achieved by players in simulation game is 86.6% and the average of blow failure rate is 13.4%. The highest success rate of blow technique is 97.74% (short service) included into an "Excellent" category with a failure rate is 2.26%. While the blow technique that has low success rate is dropshot blow amounted 68.01% entered in "Less" category with the highest failure rate is 31.99%.

The blow that has the highest failure rate will be analyzed from the motion performance side to know problem that affects the blow result. The mentioned blow is dropshot blow. According to James Poole (2008), the drop blow is a slow blow which falls right in front of the net, on your

opponent's surface, and preferably in front of the short service line. During dropshot blow, players must pay attention to several phases of the movement i.e. preparation, implementation and follow-up phase, as follows:

Table 2. Analysis of Dropshot Blows Phase

Phase	Real score	Maximum score	%
Preparation	1049	1368	76.7
Implementation	1498	2052	73
Advanced	956	1368	70

Table 2, shows that the percentage of dropshot blow analysis based on the preparation phase is 76.7%, the implementation phase is 73%, and the advanced phase is 70%.

Table 3. Analysis of Dropshot Blows Based on The Preparation Phase

Preparation phase	Real score	Maximum score	%
Grip handshake	328	342	95.9
Return to position of waiting or receive	285	342	83.3
Raise your hand upward with a racket head pointing upwards	157	342	45.9
Weight balanced on the front of the foot	279	342	81.5
Total	1049	1368	76.7

The preparation phase of table 3 shows that the lowest preparation phase in the movement "Raise your hand upward with a racket head pointing upwards" is 45.91% enters into the "Very Poor" category. This is because during the movement, the bent arm that is the elbow and shoulders less lifted upward. This is still too close to the *musculus serratus anterior*. Basically, this arm should be bent into 45° so the *musculus biceps brachii* and *musculus brachioradialis* contract shorten. Then the left hand is still passive.

The preparation phase of table 4 shows that the lowest implementation phase of the "forward swing movement to hit the ball" is 44.7% enters into the "Very Poor" category. It means that in this movement, the player is late to anticipate the ball arrival, so the ball has fallen too low, even a ball that has passed over the head. In motion of "Racket reaches up to hit the ball, which is a block, not a blow", is 63.2% falls into

the "Very Poor" category. This means that in this movement, the player blows the ball with full force, whereas in a dropshot blow the player just touched the ball by blocking.

Table 4. The Analysis of Dropshot Blows is Based on The Implementation Phase

Implementation phase	Rill score	Maximum score	%
Grab the ball with the dominant leg	288	342	84.2
Rotate and turn the body towards the ball	268	342	78.4
Backswing puts the wrist in a bent position	286	342	83.6
Forward swing to blow the ball	153	342	44.7
The racket head moves in the direction of the ball which is a block, not a blow	216	342	63.2
The racket head moves in the direction of the ball	287	342	83.9
Total	1498	2052	73

Table 5. Analysis of Dropshot Blows Based on Advanced Phase

Advanced phase	Real score	Maximum score	%
Continue straight movement with ball movement	271	342	79.2
Swinging motion follows the angle of ball movement	270	342	78.9
Using your feet, push your body into the center of the field	178	342	52.0
Back to the center of the field	237	342	69.3
Total	956	1368	70

The preparation phase of Table 5, shows that the lowest advanced phase of movement "Using your feet, push your body to the center of the field", is 45.45% falls into "Very Poor" category. This means that in this movement, the player does not make a cutting motion and push the body with both feet forward and the position of the foot parallel to the net. This condition will make the player difficult to return to the middle of the field. In the motion, "Use the swinging motion momentum to return to the center of the field" is 57.1% enters into "Very Poor" category. It means that the player focused on the shuttlecock that has not passed the net, so the

players just stay on the point and do not go back to the middle of the field.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion can be concluded that: (1) the success rate of teenager players Pendowo club in short service is 97.74%, long service is 95.56%, lob is 94.10%, dropshot is 68.01%, and smash is 77%, 57%, while at the failure rate short service is 2.26%, long service is 4.44%, lob is 5.90%, dropshot is 31.99%, and smash is 22.43%, (2) The highest failure rate is dropshot blow, the motion performance of teenager players Pendowo club dropshot blow in the preparation phase in the "Sufficient" category is 76.7%, the implementation phase in the "Sufficient" category is 73%, and the advanced phase of "Sufficient" category is 70%.

REFERENCES

- Fatkhurreza, A., & Taufiq, H. (2015). Survei Pembinaan Prestasi Klub Bulutangkis PB. Sinar Mutiara Pemalang Tahun 2014/2015. *Journal of Sport Sciences and Fitness*, 4(4). Retrieved from https://jurnal.unnes.ac.id/artikel_sju/jssf/1_0091
- Kuspriyani, D. S., & Henny, S. (2014). Survei Motivasi Prestasi Atlet Klub Bulutangkis Pendowo Semarang Tahun 2014. *Journal of Physical Education, Sport, Health and Recreation*, 1(2). Retrieved from http://jurnal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/jpe_hs/article/view/3209
- Nazir, M. (2009). Metode Penelitian. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Perdana, H. A. (2017). Analisis Pertandingan Tenis Lapangan falam Permainan Tunggal Atlet Putra dan Putri Pada Kejuaraan Nasional Tenis CBR Junior Mini 2017 di Bojonegoro. *Pend. Kepelatihan Olahraga-S1*, 1(5). Retrieved from <http://journal.student.uny.ac.id/ojs/index.php/pko/article/view/8263/0>
- Poole, J. (2008). Belajar Bulutangkis. Bandung: Pioner Jaya.
- Purnama, S. K. (2010). *Kepelatihan Bulutangkis Modern*. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.

- Putra, G. I., & Sugiyanto, F. X. (2016). Pengembangan Pembelajaran Teknik Dasar Bulu Tangkis Berbasis Multimedia pada Atlet Usia 11 dan 12 Tahun. *Jurnal Keolahragaan*, 4(2), 175-185. Retrieved from <https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jolahraga/article/view/10893>
- Subarjah, H. (2004). *Bulutangkis*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Sutiyawan, T. H., Yunitaningrum, W., & Purnomo, E. (2015). Keterampilan Teknik Dasar Pukulan pada Proses Pembelajaran Bulu Tangkis. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 4(8). Retrieved from <http://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jpdpb/article/view/11059>
- Widiyanto. (2008). *Bulutangkis*. Ganeca Exact.