The Effect of Learning Strategies and Confidence Toward Learning Outcomes Basketball Chest Pass
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Abstract-The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between learning strategies Enquiry and Strategy Problem Based Learning (SPBM) as well self confidence of Chest pass on learning outcomes basketball. This research was conducted in class X (Ten) SMAN 14 Pekanbaru. This study used a treatment by level 2 x 2. The sample consisted of 56 students. Data analysis technique is the analysis of variance of two lanes (ANOVA) and then followed by Tukey test at a significance level α = 0.05. The results showed that (1). Chest pass the value of learning outcomes in the treatment of learning strategies basketball Inquiry (A1) is higher than the value of Strategy Problem Based Learning (SPBM) (A2) at SMAN 14 Pekanbaru (2). There is an interaction between learning strategies (A) and confidence (B) on learning outcomes Chest pass basketball in SMA 14 Pekanbaru, (3). The value of learning outcomes inquiry learning strategies (SPI) in the treatment of learning Strategy Problem Based Learning (SPBM) self confidence High (A1B1) is higher than the value of enquery learning strategies (SPI) High self confidence (A2B1) at SMAN 14 Pekanbaru, (4). Chest pass the value of learning outcomes in the treatment of learning strategies basketball Inquiry lower self confidence (A1B2) is lower than the value of learning Strategies Problem Based Learning (SPBM) Low self confidence (A2B2) at SMAN 14 Pekanbaru.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Learning outcomes are often used as a measure to find out how far a person has mastered the material already taught. To apply the learning outcomes requires a series of measurements using a good evaluation tool and qualify. Evaluation is intended as a mirror to see if the established goals have been achieved and the learning process that has been effective to obtain the learning outcomes.

In the input-process-output cycle, the results can be clearly distinguished from the inputs due to changes by the process. Similarly, in teaching and learning activities, after learning the students changed behavior compared to before. According to Gagne in Sagala (2013: 17-18) the study consists of three important components namely "(1) external conditions, (2) internal conditions, and (3) learning outcomes".

Exercise in school consists of several branches of the sport studied by the students, especially on the curriculum one of them sporting big balls. Big ball sports there is learning basketball. Basketball sport has been implemented in schools that have complete facilities and infrastructures.

Basketball played on the field with a hard surface. This applies to existing indoor or outdoor courts [1]. The basic attitude in basketball ensures that you will usually move quickly in all directions, the attitude is "(1) the wide shoulders are open (2) the knees bend (3) the weight is stacked on the heel of your feet (4) the waist is slightly bent (5) straight back, and (6) head ups".

Learning basketball chest pass in high school SMA 14 Pekanbaru has not developed and not good at because teaching staff who do not understand the basic techniques of basketball and students while doing basketball sport many wrong doing movement chest pass. In this case, there needs to be a continuous change in the learning strategy of the basketball branch with a systematic and directed program, as well as the attention and revision of the use of teaching strategies that have been applied to students in general without any special method for gifted children, the expected impact on the learning outcomes obtained will not lead to optimal play outcomes especially for basketball learning in schools.

The objective of this technical aspect in the basketball game is that the ball bearer immediately passes the ball of another player who has a better position than his position, without giving a chance to the opponent to seize the ball [4]. In higher level skills, players can receive the ball still in the air and directly on the feed back.

The mode of chest pass (chest pass) is most often used in basketball games [2]. Technique pass the ball that is "(1) hold the ball at the chest with open fingers holding the ball and the position of the thumb above the ball, (2) Elbow hand in pull out, wide at the side of the body, (3) step one foot then throw towards the chest of a friend, (4) move your thumb down, and spread your arms completely while throwing, and (5) use both hands in a balanced way".
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II. METHOD

The method used in this study is a field experimental method. This study aims to determine the difference of independent variables to the dependent variable. In this study are involved three variables, namely: (1) namely: free variable is a learning strategy consisting of Inquiry Learning Strategy (SPI) and Problem Based Learning Strategy (SPBM) (2). The dependent variable is the result of learning basketball chest pass and (3). Attribute variables are confident of low self confidence level and high confidence level. design used in this research is treatment by level 2 x 2. The design of treatment is units experimental into cells in a random manner, so that units experiment in each cell are relatively homogeneous.

To measure the validity of chest pass using correlation technique by Pearson done in two ways namely; 1)correlation technique Product moment with deviation, 2) correlation technique with crude numbers. Further more, test performed reliability with measurement was test-retest. The process of developing a confident instrument begins with the preparation of the statement items with five choices of answers provided as a measure by likert scale. then performs the instrument calibration by analyzing the result data from the test to determine the validity of the instrument. The validity of students' confident instrument items were analyzed by using the formula product moment from pearson.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis testing using analysis of variance (ANAVA two-way) [5]. Complete anova calculations can be seen in the appendix. The summary can be seen in the table below.

![Table I. Summary of ANAVA Score Calculation Result of Learning Chest Pass Basketball at Level α = 0.05.](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Dk</th>
<th>JK</th>
<th>KT</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between line (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114,286</td>
<td>114,286</td>
<td>5,968*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between column (k)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77,786</td>
<td>77,786</td>
<td>4,062*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (b*k)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>4,569*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,275,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
* = significant at the real level α = 0.05.

A. There is a difference between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) on learning outcomes chest pass basketball.

Based on the summary of calculation results (ANOVA) at level significanta = 0.05 obtained Fo = 5.968 and Ft = 4.01 thus Fo > Ft so Ho rejected. So it can be concluded that overall there is a significant difference of influence between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) with problem based learning strategy (SPBM) to learning result of basketball chest pass . In other words, the result of basketball chest pass using inquiry learning strategy (= 30.07 and s = 5.03) is better than learning result of chest pass basketball using problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) ( = 24.71 and s = 4.05). This means the first research hypothesis that there is a difference in the influence of inquiry learning strategies (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass has been tested.

B. Interaction between Inquiry Learning Strategy (SPI) and Problem Based Learning Strategy (SPBM) on learning outcomes Chest pass Basketball.

Based on the summary of the results of the calculation of a two-way analysis of variance, the interaction between the strategy of inquiry learning (SPI) and problem-based learning (SPBM) on learning outcomes chest pass basketball ANOVA calculation shown in the table above. Price is calculated Fo interaction (FAB) = 4.569 and Ft = 4.01, it appears that the Fo> Ft, so that H0 is rejected and H1 accepted. Thus it is concluded that there is an interaction between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass. The summary of the advanced test results can be seen in the table below.

![Table II. Summary of Calculation Result Test Tukey Score Results Learn Chest Pass Basketball on the Level of α = 0.05.](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couples groups compared</th>
<th>Q count</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With P1 P2</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 P4</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 to P6</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Qhit> Qtab significant at the real level α = 0.05
P1 = Group of inquiry learning strategy
P2 = SP2 Group of problem-based learning strategies (SPBM)
P3 = Group of inquiry learning strategy (SPI) with high confidence
P4 = Group strategy problem-based learning (SPBM) with high confidence Inertial
P5 = Learning strategy group (SPI) low
P6 = Group of problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) with low confidence

Thus the second research hypothesis that there is an interaction between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass can be seen in the following figure.
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Fig. 1. Interaction of inquiry learning strategy (ILS) and problem-based learning strategy (PBLS)

C. There is a difference between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of chest pass basketball for students with high confidence.

Calculation of advanced variance analysis with Tukey post hoc test to compare high confidence groups of both learning strategies. The calculation of the difference in learning effect of chest pass basketball for high confidence group taught by inquiry strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategy (SPBM). Q count (Qh) = 4.030 greater than Q table or Q = 3.17 at significant level α 0.05, so the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted, it means that the results of learning Chest pass basketball for high confidence group taught by inquiry strategy (SPI) ( = 30.07 and s = 5.03) higher than that taught with problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) ( = 25.21 and s = 4.06). This means a third research hypothesis which states that: There is a difference between inquiry learning strategies (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of chest pass basketball for students who have high confidence tested.

D. There is no difference between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass for students with low self-esteem.

Calculation of advanced variance analysis test Tukey post hoc to compare low confidence groups. The calculation of the differences in learning outcomes of chest pass basketball is taught by inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategy (SPBM). Low confidence group value with inquiry learning strategy (SPI) than the low confidence group with the problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) Q count (Qh) = 0.172 is smaller than Q table = 3.34 or Q count < Q table. That is, the data there is no reason to accept Ho, so it can be interpreted that there are differences in inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) with low confidence in the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass.

From the results of testing the four hypothesis formulations it turns out that the hypothesis 1 (one), 2 (two), 3 (three) are tested. While the formulation of the hypothesis to 4 (four) shows that there is no statistically significant difference. On average, the scores of inquiry learning strategies (SPI) higher to the learning outcomes of the chest pass basketball for the group that has confidence. This suggests that both forms of learning strategy give the same effect to the learning outcomes of the chest pass basketball. The fourth hypothesis shows unproven or untested because it is not supported by the data collected.

The findings of the research conducted as set forth in the above conclusions show that there are significant interactions between Inquiry Learning Strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) on learning outcomes chest pass basketball. With the discovery of this interaction effect, it can be interpreted that both learning strategies give different effects on the learning outcomes of chest pass on basketball games. When it is associated with confidence in groups of students who have high confidence, inferior learning strategy (SPI) is better compared to the problem-based learning strategy (SPBM), whereas in groups of students who have lower self-confidence lesson-based learning (SPBM) both when compared with inquiry learning strategy (SPI).

IV. CONCLUSION

Overall there is a difference between inquiry learning strategy (SPI) and problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) to learning outcomes of basketball chest pass. There is an interaction between inquiry learning strategies (SPI) and problem-based learning strategies (SPBM) to the learning outcomes of basketball chest pass. For students who have high confidence, the provision of Inquiry Learning Strategy (SPI) gives a better influence compared with the problem-based learning strategy (SPBM) to the learning outcomes chest pass basketball. For students with low self-esteem, the provision of Problem-Based Learning Strategy (SPBM) has a better effect than the inquiry learning strategy (SPI) on the learning outcomes of the chest pass basketball.
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