

Maintenance Strategies in the Coach-Athlete Relationship Used at Batangas State University

Kristine Pecson-Cinco

College of Teacher Education-Graduate School, Batangas State University, Batangas City, Philippines-4217

Email address: Kristine.cinco @ deped.gov.ph

Abstract— The main objective of the study is to identify the Maintenance Strategies in the Coach-Athlete Relationship Used at Batangas State University. The study utilized the descriptive method of research. The respondents of this study include 14 coaches and 135 athletes who competed in the recent State Colleges and Universities Athletic Association Annual Regional Athletic Competition of Region IV-A CALABARZON and Region IV-B MIMAROPA (SCUAA Olympics 2015). Research Instrument "The Coach-Athlete Relationship Maintenance Questionnaire" (CARM-Q) was used and modified which were then statistically treated, analyzed and interpreted. The results suggest that all other sports classifications are equally represented except for the fielding/striking games (baseball). Majority of the coaches and athletes are with less than 3 years or new in their playing and coaching relationship in BSU. There is a very good relationship between coach and athlete in terms of all variables used in COMPASS namely: conflict management, openness, motivational, positivity, advice, support and social network. When the respondents are grouped according to sports event and in terms of number of years as a coach and athlete, their assessment on the relationship between coach and athlete is significant. While when the respondents are grouped according to classification, their assessment on the relationship between coach and athlete differs significantly. In line with the given findings, the researcher recommend a "Relationship Enhancement Program in Sports", that focuses on interventions which aim to develop and maintain the quality of dyadic relationships. Build a workshop and trainings that aims to further enhance the relationship of the coach and athlete using the 7 maintenance strategies contained within the COMPASS model with the integration of mental toughness.

Keywords— Coach-athlete relationship: coach-athlete relationship model: maintenance strategies: sports performance: sports satisfaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term "coaching" is said to have first been used in an instructive sense in the 18th century to describe the actions performed by the person who controlled the team of horses on a stagecoach (Casselman, 2005). The said definition has clear reference to the process of "coaching" an individual to a desired destination. The term "coaching" has retained the essence of this conceptualization over subsequent centuries and has been adapted and applied to a wide range of scientific discipline to define their approaches.

Coaches are, therefore, involved on all aspects of the coaching process including the organizational, physiological, pedagogical, developmental, and psychological elements.

Within the coaching context, the relationship, which is developed between the coach and the athlete, is paramount. Jowett (2005) argued that "The coach-athlete relationship is

not an add-on to, or hi-product of, the coaching process instead it is the foundation of coaching" and that it is therefore embedded in the dynamic and complex coaching process and provides the means by which coaches' and athletes' needs are expressed and fulfilled."

Coaches and athletes establish and maintain their athletic relationships and are motivated by such wide ranging goals as improving performance, achieving success, maintaining fitness, or simply enjoying participation. Clearly, such partnerships occur in a range of situations like different competitive levels and types of sport that are subject to organizational constraints such as organizational culture, goals, and funding pressures.

Thus, maintenance of the coach-athlete relationship is not simple and often necessitates conscious effort from both parties. This is the situation in which coaches' and athletes' emotions, thoughts, and behaviors are mutually and causally inter-connected. It highlights the bi-directional nature of such relationships in a way that the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of the coach are both affected by, and also affect, those of the athlete and vice versa. This also supports the belief that relationship quality is multi-dimensional; hence, one needs to consider the affective (emotions), cognitive (thoughts), and behavioral/interpersonal aspects of relationships.

This sheds light on different factors that both affect, and are affected by the coach-athlete relationship—the maintenance strategies of coach-athlete relationship. Maintenance strategies develop the understanding of the nature and content of this important dyadic relationship within the realm of sport development.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study sought to answer the following questions:

A. What is the Profile of the athletes' respondents in terms of:

- A.1 Sports Event,
- A.2 Classification, and
- A.3 Years as athlete / years as coach?

B. What is the level of agreement on the coach-athletes relationship in terms of:

- B.1 Conflict Management,
- B.2 Openness,
- B.3 Motivational,
- B.4 Positivity,
- B.5 Advice,
- B.6 Support, and

B.7 Social Networks?

C. Is there a significant difference between the level of agreement of the respondent on the coach-athletes relationship by profile when grouped according to

- C.1 Sports Event,
- C.2 Classification, and
- C.3 Years as athlete / years as coach?

III. METHODOLOGY

The study utilized the descriptive method of research. The respondents of this study include 14 coaches and 135 athletes who competed in the recent State Colleges and Universities Athletic Association Annual Regional Athletic Competition of Region IV-A CALABARZON and Region IV-B MIMAROPA (SCUAA Olympics 2015). The sample size was determined utilizing the Slovin's formula: It is computed as $n = N / (1+Ne^2)$. With the use of this formula, the number of the needed athlete-respondents were determined and included in the distribution table for analysis. Research Instrument "The Coach-Athlete Relationship Maintenance Questionnaire" (CARM-Q) was used and modified which were then statistically treated, analyzed and interpreted. To enable the researcher to interpret and analyze the data, the following statistical methods were used: frequency, percentage, weighted mean, one way anova, and f test. Analyses were conducted using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Profile of the Respondents

A.1. Sports Event

Table I shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents by sports event. Net/Wall/Racket Games (tennis, table tennis, beach volleyball, volleyball, and badminton) had 47 or 31.5% of the respondents, Target Sports (taekwondo, karate, and arnis) have 40 or 26.8% of the respondents, Invasion Sports (basketball, soccer, and futsal) have 36 or 24.2% of the respondents, Athletics (track and field, athletics, and swimming) have 24 or 16.2% of the respondents, and Fielding/Striking Games (baseball) have 2 or 1.3% of the respondents. The results show that with exemption to fielding/striking games, all other sports classifications are equally represented.

TABLE I: Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Respondents by Sports Event

Sports Event	Frequency	Percent
Invasion Games	36	24.2
Net/Wall/Racket Games	47	31.5
Fielding/Striking Games	2	1.3
Athletics	24	16.2
Target Sports	40	26.8
TOTAL	149	100.0

This result affirms the study by Kralj (2001) in the aspect that coaching is typically a long-term relationship. Some definitions are specific for coaching teams, while others call for an expansion of the definition to include individual, team

and organizational interventions that are strategy-driven on a group level in order to stimulate individual and group change.

A.2. Classification

TABLE II: Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Respondents by Classification

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Coach	14	9.4
Athlete	135	90.6
TOTAL	149	100.0

Table II presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents by classification.

The data clearly indicate that athletes had a frequency of 135 and a percentage of 90.6 while the number of coaches is 14 or 9.4% of the total respondents. There are 149 coach/athlete respondents all in all.

A.3. Number of Years as Coach/Athlete

Table III presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents as to the number of years of their being athlete or coach.

It can be noted that the most number of athletes and coaches are more than 2 to 3 years playing/coaching in BSU with a frequency of 43 and a percentage of 28.9, followed by those playing/coaching for 1 to 2 with a frequency of 42 and a percentage of 28.2. Third are those within 1 or less with a frequency of 29 and a percentage of 19.5. Fourth on the ranks are respondents who are with BSU as a coach and athlete for 3 to 4 years with 16 or 10.7%. Next are the ones who have been athletes/coach for 4 to 5 years with 10 or 6.7. In the lowest rank are those with 5 years and more with frequency of 9 or 6.0 percent. This only shows that most of the athletes and coaches are new or with only 2 to 3 years in playing/coaching relationship stay in BSU in their respective events.

TABLE III: Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Respondents by Number of Years as Athlete/Coach

Number of Years	Frequency	Percent
1 or less	29	19.5
More than 1 to 2	42	28.2
More than 2 to 3	43	28.9
More than 3 to 4	16	10.7
More than 4 to 5	10	6.7
More than 5	9	6.0
TOTAL	149	100.0

B. Degree of Coach and Athlete Relationship

B.1. Conflict Management

Table IV shows the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of conflict management. Two items under conflict management obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.34. These are "*I apologize when I am wrong*" and "*I listen to my coach/athlete during disagreements*". This is followed by the item "*I am patient during disagreements*" which had a weighted mean of 4.18. Third highest is the item "*I cooperate in how I handle disagreements*" with 4.15 WM. The responses were interpreted as **agree/very good**.

TABLE IV: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Conflict Management

Conflict Management	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I apologize when I am wrong	4.34	Agree / Very Good
2. I cooperate in how I handle disagreements	4.15	Agree / Very Good
3. I am understanding during disagreements	4.12	Agree / Very Good
4. I listen to my coach/athlete during disagreements	4.34	Agree / Very Good
5. I am patient during disagreements	4.18	Agree / Very Good
6. I tell my coach/athlete what I expect from him/her	3.70	Agree / Very Good
7. I tell my coach/athlete when he/she has not met my expectations	3.68	Agree / Very Good
8. I try not to lose my temper during disagreement	4.07	Agree / Very Good
GRAND MEAN	4.07	Agree / Very Good

The overall weighted mean of the degree of relationship between coach and athlete conflict management obtained 4.07 which is verbally interpreted as **agree/very good**. These results may imply that the coaches/athletes recognize that there is a need to apologize when they hurt somebody—accidentally or otherwise. This finding was given weight by Scott (2014) who argued that apologizing allows others to feel safe knowing one agrees that hurtful behavior isn't OK, re-establishes dignity for those who were hurt helps repair relationships by getting people talking again, and makes them feel comfortable with each other again, allows one to let people know he/she is not proud of what was done and won't be repeating the behavior.

B.2. Openness

TABLE V: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Openness

Openness	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
9. I encourage my coach/athlete to share his/her feelings with me	4.02	Agree / Very Good
10. I simply tell my coach/athlete how I feel about our relationship	3.81	Agree / Very Good
11. I disclose what I want from the coach-athlete relationship	3.48	Somewhat Agree / Good
12. I like to have regular talks about our relationship	3.87	Agree / Very Good
13. I am open about my feelings	3.78	Agree / Very Good
14. I talk about where we stand	3.73	Agree / Very Good
15. I show my coach/athlete that he/she can talk to me about anything	3.83	Agree / Very Good
GRAND MEAN	3.79	Agree / Very Good

Table V shows the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of openness.

It can be observed that the first in rank is with the weighted mean of 4.02 which states that "I encourage my coach/athlete to share his/her feelings with me". Next is the item "I like to have regular talks about our relationship" with 3.87 WM, followed by "I simply tell my coach/athlete how I feel about our relationship" with 3.81. All of the said responses are verbally interpreted as **agree/very good**.

Almost all of the items had a verbal interpretation of **agree/very good** except for the item "I disclose what I want from the coach-athlete relationship" which had a WM of 3.48

and a verbal interpretation of **somewhat agree**. The overall weighted mean for the responses is 3.79 which is interpreted as **agree/very good**. This means that all the athletes and coaches are with agreeable openness in their degree of relationship.

Openness strategies within the coach-athlete relationship involved the discussion of topics outside of the sporting environment like work and family life. Communication related to training or competition was categorized within the advice dimension discussed below.

The findings agree with the interview by Gould et al. (2007) in American football coaches who had all received awards for their ability to facilitate their athletes' personal development. They were all found to have good interpersonal or communication skills. In the interviews, these coaches emphasized the importance of having open lines of communication with their athletes, possessing clear expectations, and holding their players accountable to them, avoiding punishment or criticisms that were directed to their players' character or personality, and showing that they cared, trusted, and respected their players as people. These enacted communicative acts parallel the relationship maintenance strategies labeled as positivity, openness, and assurance.

B.3. Motivational

Table VI presents the degree of relationship between coach and athletes on motivational aspect. The highest score was garnered by the statement "*I show that I am passionate about our sport*" with 4.50 weighted mean and a verbal interpretation of **strongly agree**. This was followed by the item "*I show my ability as an athlete/coach*" with 4.48 WM. Third are the items "*I show that I am motivated to work hard with my coach/athlete*" and "*I show that I am motivated to achieve*" with 4.46 WM. Almost all items have a verbal interpretation of **agree**. The general weighted mean of degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of motivational is 4.43 which had a verbal interpretation **agree**.

TABLE VI: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Motivational

Motivational	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
16. I show that I am motivated to work hard with my coach/athlete	4.46	Agree
17. I show that I am passionate about our sport	4.50	Strongly Agree
18. I show that I am motivated to achieve	4.46	Agree
19. I state my opinions when we are setting goals	4.37	Agree
20. I work hard to achieve our goals	4.46	Agree
21. I try to motivate my coach/athlete	4.27	Agree
22. I show my ability as an athlete/coach	4.48	Agree
GRAND MEAN	4.43	Agree

These data reveal that the athletes are in high motivation in terms of their athlete-coach relationship. As Rhind and Jowett (2010) implies, coaches need to show that they have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to help the athletes achieve their goals and athletes need to show that they have the abilities to meet the expectations of the coaches. Thus, the fact

that both sporting partners were motivated to work with each other should help to maintain the quality of the relationship.

The results also agree with Wasylshyn (2003), who reported that the most positive coaching outcomes result from clients who are highly motivated to learn and are willing to adjust behaviors and attitudes to succeed. Kilburg (2001) agreed that motivation is a contributing factor and a "commitment to the path of progressive development" is valuable for a successful outcome. Adherence is also reported to be a factor contributing to sustained behavioral change and positive outcomes for the client. Attendance at regularly scheduled appointments (Kilburg, 2001; Maurer et al., 2001) promotes and supports continued growth for the client.

B.4. Positivity

Table VII displays the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of positivity. The item which states "*I show good sportsmanship*" and had a mean of 4.59 and a verbal interpretation of **strongly agree**. This was followed by the item "*I show that I am a fair person*" with 4.44 WM. Third is the item "*I am positive when I am around my coach/athlete*" with 4.32 WM. The rest of the statements got a verbal interpretation of **agree** in affirmation of the positive statements in terms of coach-athlete relationship with the general weighted mean of 4.31.

TABLE VII: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Positivity

Positivity	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
23. I am positive when I am around my coach/athlete	4.32	Agree
24. I try to be upbeat when we are together	4.18	Agree
25. I adapt my behaviours to suit the preferences of my coach/athlete	4.17	Agree
26. I show that I am a fair person	4.44	Agree
27. I show good sportsmanship	4.59	Strongly Agree
28. I am considerate of events in my coach's/athlete's personal life	4.16	Agree
29. I try to be flexible when scheduling training sessions with my coach/athlete.	4.28	Agree
GRAND MEAN	4.31	Agree

These data confirm the claims of Stafford and Cannary (2002). Rather than focusing on acting cheerful and being upbeat when around the partner, however, positivity in this study referred to the importance of adaptability, fairness, and acting positively regarding issues that were outside of the sporting arena (that often and inevitably influence sport related activities). The key was not just being aware of an issue, but taking positive measures to deal with it and ensuring that it did not have a negative effect on the sporting relationship.

Effective coaching is the ability to develop trust and friendship within the coaching relationship, providing appropriate feedback and ensuring there is sufficient contact between coach and the athlete. Coach must have positive regard for the client, accurate empathy, authenticity, genuineness, ability to playfully challenge the client, and tactfulness.

B.5. Advice

Table VIII shows the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of advice. In advice, all items have a verbal interpretation of agree. Item No. 34 which states "*I accept my coach's/athlete's constructive feedback*" which has a mean of 4.21 at rank 1. Item 35 which state "*I try not to be negative when giving feedback*" has a mean of 4.12 and third is the item "*I give my coach/athlete praise when appropriate*". The remaining items implies positivity in terms of coach-athlete relationship with the general weighted mean of 3.93 and were given the verbal interpretation of **agree**.

These findings confirm the study of Smith & Smoll (2000), stressing that advice is an important strategy through which coaches and athletes could maintain the quality of their relationships. Advice played a significant role in giving both rewarding and constructive feedback, as well as in communicating in general about sport. This dimension related to the advice category within Stafford et al.'s (2000) model.

The nature of advice given within a romantic relationship was different to that given within the coach-athlete relationship. Advice was a more central process within a sporting relationship because it was viewed as a key element of coaching. Thus, the meaning of advice went beyond simply giving opinions regarding problems and included rewarding, praising, and constructive feedback to the coach/athlete.

These data show that advice was, therefore, an important strategy through which coaches and athletes could maintain the quality of their relationships. Advice played a significant role in giving both rewarding and constructive feedback, as well as in communicating in general about sport. The nature of advice given within a romantic relationship was different to that given within the coach-athlete relationship. Advice was a more central process within a sporting relationship because it was viewed as a key element of coaching. Thus, the meaning of advice went beyond simply giving opinions regarding problems and included rewarding, praising, and constructive feedback to the coach/athlete.

TABLE VIII: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Advice

Advice	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
30. I tell my coach/athlete what I think he/she should do about their problems	3.70	Agree
31. I give him/her my opinions on things going on in his/her life	3.62	Agree
32. I give my coach/athlete praise when appropriate	4.03	Agree
33. I give my coach/athlete constructive feedback	3.92	Agree
34. I accept my coach's/athlete's constructive feedback	4.21	Agree
35. I try not to be negative when giving feedback	4.12	Agree
36. I change my behaviour based on my coach's /athlete's feedback	3.93	Agree
GRAND MEAN	3.93	Agree

B.6 Support

Table IX shows the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of support. All of the items had a verbal interpretation of **agree**. The highest mean score is for the item

"I give my coach/athlete support when things are going well" has a mean of 4.19 followed by Item No. 41 which says *"I give my coach/athlete support when they are going through difficult times"* with a mean of 4.16. Item No. 43 is third which states *"I show my coach/athlete that he/she can rely on me even when things are not going well"* with a mean of 4.15. The general weighted mean for the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of support is 4.08 and is interpreted as **agree**.

According to the research of Dieffenbachia et. al (2002), an important aspect of a good coach-athlete relationship is the coach's ability to understand each athlete as an individual and to tailor his/her coaching style and attention to suit those needs. Multiple coach goals for their athlete are three goal focus categories that included fun, development goals and winning. Fun-based goals included emphasizing fun, creating fun environment for training and focusing on fun. Development goals included focus on tactical, skill and technique development.

The above-findings clearly implied that the importance of supporting the coach/athlete regarding both sporting and non-sporting issues. Coaching is different from consulting and counseling in a sense that primarily involves the teaching of new skills and is most useful when used to improve relationship skills.

TABLE IX: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship In Terms of Support

Support	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
37. I imply that our relation has a future	4.09	Agree
38. I talk about our plans for the future	3.91	Agree
39. I stress my commitment to my coach/athlete	3.96	Agree
40. I give my coach/athlete support when things are going well	4.19	Agree
41. I give my coach/athlete support when they are going through difficult times	4.16	Agree
42. I show my coach/athletes that he/she can count on me	4.09	Agree
43. I show my coach/athlete that he/she can rely on me even when things are not going well	4.15	Agree
GRAND MEAN	4.08	Agree

B.7. Social Networks

Table X presents the degree of relationship between coach and athlete In terms of social network. Item No. 21 which says *"I celebrate our success with my coach/athlete"* and had the highest mean of 4.54 and a verbal interpretation of **strongly agree**. This was followed by the item *"I try to spend time with my coach/athlete during competitions"* with 4.25 WM, and the third highest is *"I socialize with my coach/athlete"* with 4.20 weighted mean. The rest of items had a verbal interpretation of **agree**. The general weighted mean is 4.20.

Results of the study agrees the findings of Jowett & Chaundy, (2004) emphasized that the importance of spending time together in social events that occur outside of the sporting environment. Such activities appeared to contribute toward developing and maintaining the quality of the coach-athlete relationship. It may be the case that the use of these strategies not only maintained the coach athlete relationship, but also

had positive outcomes for related factors such as group cohesion.

TABLE X: Degree of Coach-Athlete Relationship in Terms of Social Network

Social Network	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I like to spend time with our mutual friends	4.11	Agree
I talk about our mutual friends and affiliations	3.97	Agree
I socialize with my coach/athlete	4.23	Agree
I spend time outside of training with my coach/athlete	4.17	Agree
I travel to competitions with my coach/athlete	4.10	Agree
I try to spend time with my coach/athlete during competitions	4.25	Agree
I celebrate our success with my coach/athlete	4.54	Strongly Agree
GRAND MEAN	4.20	Agree

C. Significant Difference in the Respondents Assessment on the Degree of Relationship Between Coach and Athlete

C.1. Sports Event

As shown in Table XI, "Support" has an F value 2.629 with p-value of .037. Since the p-value is less than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that, the assessment of support given by the athletes/coaches bears significant difference when the respondents are grouped according to sports event.

"Motivational" has an F-value of 2.309 with p-value of .061. because the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of motivational aspect given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped according to sports event.

The third aspect, "Positivity", had a F value of 2.245 with p-value of .067. Since the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of positivity given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped according to sports event.

"Openness" had an F-value of 1.246 with p-value of .294. Since the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of opennes given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped accorfig to sports event.

The aspect "Conflict Management" had a 1.143 f-value with p-value of .339. Since the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of conflict managment given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped accorfig to sports event.

As for "Advice", the test had a F-value of .727 with p-value of .575. Since the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of advice given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped accorfig to sports event.

The last aspect which is “Social Networks” had an F-value of .685 with p-value of .603. Since the p-value is higher than the .05 acceptable level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, the assessment of social networks as given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped according to sports event.

These results contradicts the findings of Rees (2007) that the importance of the role played by support is both perceived and received, therefore very vital. This implies that coaches' behaviors must be supportive and encouraging to have a positive impact on athletes' development particularly when the athletes are less confident about themselves.

TABLE XI: Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on the Degree of Relationship Between Coach and Athlete in Terms of Sports Event

Aspects	value	value	Decision	Remarks
Conflict Management	.143	.339	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Openness	1.246	.294	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Motivational	2.309	.061	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Positivity	2.245	.067	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Advice	.727	.575	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Support	.629	.037	Reject Ho	Significant
Social Networks	.685	.603	Accept Ho	Not Significant

C.2. Classification

TABLE XII: Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on the Degree of Relationship Between Coach and Athlete in Terms of Classification

Aspects	t-value	t-value	Decision	Remarks
Conflict Management	2.896	.004	Reject Ho	Significant
Openness	3.789	.001	RReject Ho	Significant
Motivational	2.628	.010	RReject Ho	Significant
Positivity	3.307	.001	RReject Ho	Significant
Advice	4.404	.000	RReject Ho	Significant
Support	2.539	.012	RReject Ho	Significant
Social Networks	1.920	.057	AAccept Ho	Not Significant

Table XII displays significant difference in the respondents' assessment on the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of classification as coach or athlete.

“Motivational” had an F value of 2.628 with p value of .010.; “Positivity” had a F-value of 3.307 with p-value of .001; “Openness” had a F-value of 3.789 with p-value of .000; “Conflict Management” had a F-value of 2.896 with p-value of 004; “Advice” had a F-value of 4.404 with p-value of .000; and “Support” had a F-value 2.539 with p-value of .012. It can be gleaned that the p-value for the above aspects are lower than the .05 acceptable level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that, the assessment of motivational aspect, positivity, openness, conflict management, advice, and support given by the athletes/coaches bears difference significantly when the respondents are grouped according to their classification as either coach or athlete.

“Social Networks” has an F-value 1.920 with p-value.057. Since the p-value is higher than .05, the assumed level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that, when the respondents are grouped according to

classification, their assessment on the difference between coach and athlete is relatively significant.

C.3. Number of Years as Coach/Athlete

Table XIII shows the significant difference in the respondents' assessment on the degree of relationship between coach and athlete in terms of number of years as coach/athlete.

“Motivational” had p value of .158.; “Positivity” had an p-value of .124; “Openness” had a p-value of .812; “Conflict Management” had a p-value of .684; “Advice” had a p-value of .202; “Support” had p-value of .012; and Social Networks had a p-value of .202. All of the p-values are above the .05 acceptable level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that, the assessment of motivational aspect, positivity, openness, conflict management, advice, social networks, and support given by the athletes/coaches bears no significant difference when the respondents are grouped according to their year of being athlete/coach.

TABLE XIII: Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on the Degree of Relationship Between Coach and Athlete in Terms of Number of Years as Coach/Athlete

Aspects	-value	-value	Decision	Remarks
Conflict Management	.621	.684	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Openness	.451	.812	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Motivational	1.623	.158	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Positivity	1.765	.124	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Advice	1.475	.202	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Support	1.690	.141	AAccept Ho	Not Significant
Social Networks	1.421	.220	AAccept Ho	Not Significant

The results of the study of Gould, Greenleaf, Chung, and Guinan (2002) contradict the results of the present study. They studied about a team that did not achieve the performance that they had expected when going into the games. This is because they lack in relationship maintenance that has also been linked with poor performance. As a result the athletes within these teams attributed a range of factors to their disappointing performances. These factors primarily related to either the relationship they had developed with their coach or to the coaching that they had received.

The relational factors included having to work with an unfamiliar coach or not having sufficient contact with the coach, which led to their having a lack of insight within the relationship. There was a poor communication within their coach-athlete relationship, which contributed to there being a lack of trust and the presence of conflict within the dyad.

V. CONCLUSION

The results suggest that all other sports classifications are equally represented except for the fielding/striking games (baseball). Majority of the coaches and athletes are with less than 3 years or new in their playing and coaching relationship in BSU. There is a very good relationship between coach and athlete in terms of all variables used in COMPASS namely: conflict management, openness, motivational, positivity, advice, support and social network. When the respondents are grouped according to sports event and in terms of number of years as a coach and athlete, their assessment on the relationship between coach and athlete is significant. While

when the respondents are grouped according to classification, their assessment on the relationship between coach and athlete differs significantly.

In line with the given findings, the researcher recommend a “Relationship Enhancement Program in Sports”, that focuses on interventions which aim to develop and maintain the quality of dyadic relationships. Build a workshop and trainings that aims to further enhance the relationship of the coach and athlete using the 7 maintenance strategies contained within the COMPASS model with the integration of mental toughness.

REFERENCES

- [1] Canary, D. J., Stafford, (2002). A panel study of the associations between maintenance strategies and relational characteristics. *Journal of Marriage and The Family*, 64, 395-406.
- [2] Casselman, W. (2005). Coaching started as a Hungarian town. Retrieved January 4, 2015, from <http://www.bllcasselman.com/wordmgroom/coach.htm>
- [3] Diffenbachia K., Gould D., & Moffett A. (2002) The coach's Role in Developing Champions. *Olympic Coach*, Vol. 12(2), 2-4
- [4] Gould, D., Collins, K. B., Louer, L. A & Chung, Y. C (2007). Coaching life skills through football: A study of award-winning high-school coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 19, 16-37.
- [5] Gould, D., Greenleaf, C., Chung, Y. & Guinan, D. (2002). A survey of U.S. Atlanta and Nagano Olympians: Variables perceived to influence performance. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73, 175-186
- [6] Jowett, S., & Chaundy, V. (2004). An investigation into the impact of coach leadership and coach-athlete relationship on group cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(4) 302-311. Jowett, S. & Timson-Katchis, M. (2005). Social networks in sport: Parental influence on the coach-athlete relationship. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 267-287.
- [7] Kilburg, R. R. (2004). When shadows fall: Using psychodynamic approaches in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 56(4), 246-268.
- [8] Kralj, M. M. (2001). Coaching at the top: Assisting a chief executive and his team. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53(1), 108-116.
- [9] Rees, T. (2007). Influence of social support on athletes. InS Jowett & D. Lavallee (Eds.) *Sacral psychology in sport* (pp. 223-233) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- [10] Rhind, D. J. A. & Jowett, S. (2010). Relationship maintenance strategies in the coach-athlete relationship: The development of the COMPASS model. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22, 106-121.
- [11] Scott (2014). The Importance of Apologizing. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2015 from <http://stress.about.com/od/relationshipskills/a/The-Importance-Of-Apologizing.htm>
- [12] Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (2000). Self-esteem and children's reactions to youth sport coaching behaviors: A field study of self-enhancement processes. *Developmental Psychology*, 26, 987-993.
- [13] Wasylshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 55(2), 94-106.