DISCUSSION

The main aim of the present investigation was to study the effectiveness of coaches of different levels and games in relation to their personality, motives, quality of working life, occupational stress, impulsiveness, empathy, venturesomeness, burnout and general health status. The secondary aim was to study the effects of types of coaching (viz. individual sports and team sports) and levels of coaching (viz. district level and state level) on Eysenckian dimensions of personality, motives, quality of working life, occupational stress, general (physical) health, impulsiveness, empathy, venturesomeness, burnout, self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness.

t-RATIOS

The means and S.Ds of the total sample on all the variables are presented in Table-1. Table-2 shows the means, S.Ds and t-ratios of individual sports and team sports coaches on all the variables. Table-3 presents the means, S.Ds and t-ratios of district level coaches and state level coaches on all the variables. Table-4 explains the t-ratios of extreme group analysis of 25 per cent high and low scores on self rated effectiveness of the total sample. Table-5 gives the t-ratios of extreme group analysis of 25 per cent high and low scores on athlete rated effectiveness of the total sample.

The t-ratios of individual sports coaches and team sports coaches on all the variables are presented in table-2. The individual sports coaches differed from team sports coaches only on variables of need for affiliation and general life satisfaction at 0.10 level of significance, with individual sports coaches obtaining higher mean score. No difference on other variables were found between individual sports coaches and team sports coaches.
The t-ratios of district level coaches and state level coaches on all the Variables are presented in table-3. The t-ratio analysis showed significant difference at 0.05 level for psychoticism scale of Eysenckian dimensions of personality. The state level coaches score higher mean score on all these variables. On Extroversion, need for affiliation and on general (physical) health the significant differences were at 0.01 level. In general (physical) health lower the score means higher the health status.

The t-ratio of extreme group analysis of 25 per cent high and low scores on self rated effectiveness of the total sample of coaches on all the variables are shown in table-4. The t-ratio analysis of the extreme group showed significant differences at 0.05 level on need for achievement and need for approval. The significance was at 0.01 level on Lie (social desirability) scale (-3.76), need for power (2.54), physical working conditions (-5.41), emotional exhaustion (-2.83), self rated effectiveness (9.40) and athlete rated effectiveness (5.45). The higher mean scores were obtained by high score group on self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness. The low score group obtained higher mean score on Lie (social desirability) scale, physical working conditions and emotional exhaustion.

The t-ratio of extreme group analysis of 25 per cent high and low scores on athlete rated effectiveness of the total sample of coaches on all the variables shown in table-5. The t-ratio analysis of the extreme group shows a significant difference at 0.05 level on empathy (2.29) the mean score was high on the high score group. The significant difference was at 0.01 level on economic benefit (3.54) and athlete rated effectiveness (8.17). A higher mean scores were reached in these variables of high score group.

Fry, et al (1983) found that with in interdependent sports (Basketball, Football, Volleyball and Hockey) successful coaches were perceived to be higher on coordinating and exercising their leadership role and emphasizing production than were the coaches of...
the losing teams. With independent sports (Swimming, Track and field, Golf and Wrestling) however, successful coaches perceived to be more concerned with maintaining closely knit group and resolving conflicts than were unsuccessful coaches.

Ogilvie (1965) while explaining the personality profile of successful coaches commented that "national level coaches are usually more emotionally mature, independent and tough minded. Modern coaching studies have been involved in comparing the behavior of winning and losing coaches (Lambardo, et al., 1983).

Erle's study (1981) showed that more training and instruction, more autocratic behavior, more social support and less democratic behavior from their coaches than did their female counterpart. Ritter (1981) opines coaches effectiveness in training may be maximized if one pays due regard to certain rules. 1) comprehensive analysis of athletes effort capacity and personality development, 2) work adaptation.

According to Danserean (1978) self analysis strategies enable personal determination of psychological readiness and should influence decision to under take responsibilities and how to proceed. Marten (1942) suggested coaches need to know not only that techniques and tactics of their particular sport, but also the methods to teach these things to their athletes. They must possess: psychological skill, energy management, stress management, attentional skill, goal setting skills, leadership skills and communication skills.

Smith, et al (1979) investigated the difference between coaches to whom young baseball players respond favourably and those to whom they respond less favourably. Their research showed that an important factor was the frequency with which coaches rewarded desirable behavior. Councilman (1965) opines each coach adopt a coaching style that is designed to fit his unique personality. The coach should have the affection and respect of the athlete.
CORRELATION ANALYSIS

In order to study the relationship of coaching effectiveness with Eysenckian dimensions of personality, motives, quality of working life, occupational stress, general (physical) health, and burnout. Pearson product moment correlations were computed for the total sample of coaches, individuals sports coaches and team sports coaches. The results are given in tables 5-10. Only the significant correlation have been discussed.

Self rated effectiveness in relation to Personality (viz. EPQ. & IVE)

Self rated effectiveness obtained a positive correlation with empathy (Table-6) in the total sample of coaches. In individual sports coaches a negative correlation was secured with Venturesomeness (Table-7). Self rated effectiveness scored a positive correlation with empathy in team sports coaches (Table-8). Self rated effectiveness could not reach significant correlation with any of the other personality dimensions in the present study with district level and state level coaches (Table 9 and 10).

Athlete rated effectiveness and Personality (viz. EPQ. & IVE)

Athlete rated effectiveness secured no significant correlation with any of the personality dimension in the total sample of coaches in the present study. In case of the individual sports coaches a significant negative correlation was obtained between athlete rated effectiveness and venturesomeness. In team sports coaches, athlete rated effectiveness scored a significant positive correlation with empathy. No significant correlation was reached between athlete rated effectiveness and personality dimensions in district level coaches and state level coaches in the present investigation.

Earlier Booth (1958) Kroll (1967) and Werner and Gotheil (1966) have tried to identify certain personality traits present in sports persons. Lockie (1962) says the general
idea do not support the hypothesis that various sports can be distinguished on the basis of different personalities that athletes with certain personality traits tend to gravitate towards specific kind of sports. This is also true with respect to hypothesized difference in the personality traits of coaches in individual versus team sports.

According to Malone (1985) sensation seeking refers to individual differences in the optimal stimulation level required. Stimulus seeking has been identified as a major motivational factor in sports. Personality has a remarkable importance because it is the core of individual differences and has its bearing on human performances.

According to Staub (1980) sensation seeking to be related to participation in sports. Marten (1983) and Koanig (1969) say that personality differences exist between athletes and non-athletes. Sachs (1978) reported that middle and long distance runners scored differently on dominance and introversion when handball and football players were compared with them.

In the present study identified that the individual sports coaches are high in venturesomeness and the team sports coaches are high on empathy. The present study do not supports the opinion of Lockie (1962) and supports the findings of Sachs (1980), Ikegami (1970), Kane (1970), Sperling (1942) and Kroll (1970) in case of individual and team sports coaches.

**Self rated effectiveness and motives** (need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for approval and need for power)

Self rated effectiveness scored a positive correlation to a significant level with need for approval and for power in the total sample of coaches. In case of individual sports coaches, and team sports coaches the self rated effectiveness do not reach any significant level of correlation with motives. The self rated effectiveness scored a
significant positive correlation with need for affiliation in the district level coaches. Self-rated effectiveness do not show any significant correlation with motives in the state level coaches.

**Athlete rated effectiveness and motives:** (need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for approval and need for power)

Athlete rated effectiveness do not show any significant correlation with total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7), team sports coaches (Table-8) and state level coaches (Table-10). In case of district level coaches (Table-9), the athlete rated effectiveness scored a positive correlation with need for affiliation.


Self Rated Effectiveness And Quality Of Working Life

Self rated effectiveness scored a positive correlation with apathy in team sports coaches (Table-8). In case of total sample (Table-6) of coaches, individual sports coaches (Table-7) district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10) self rated effectiveness do not reach significant level of correlation with any other variables in the quality of working life.

Athlete Rated Effectiveness And Quality Of Working Life:

Athlete rated effectiveness scored a negative correlation at significant level with employee commitment and meaningful development in individual sports coaches (Table-7). In case of the total sample of coaches (Tale-6) team sports coaches (Table-8), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10), the athlete rated effectiveness do not score significant level of correlation with any other variable in the quality of working life.

According to Wyatt (1980) quality of working life is a qualitative concept. It is a sense of overall being with the work process from the perspectives of both employer and employee. It involves the notion of a quality working experience.

Glasser (1976) outlined quality of working life as breaking down the traditional status barriers between management and production or support personal achieving atmosphere of open communication and trust between the management and the force.

Sorensen, et al., (1987) defined quality of working life program are purposeful efforts to change the organization from a traditional model to one based on new assumptions, behaviors and values. Nadler and Lawler (1982) stated that there were two distinctive elements of quality of work life programs. The first is concern of the impact of work on people and second is the concept of employee involvement and participation in...
decision making and problem solving. The present study supports the findings of Glaser (1976), Wayatt (1988), Sorrensen et al., (1985) and Nadler and Lawler (1982). Randeep (1987) offered twenty four guide lines for creating an organizational culture the harness and focus employees energies to achieve innovative results. The following are the suggestion: create an interactive climate in which employees can stimulate ideas in each other, promote responsible individuality and maturity and allow creative people to take part in decision making and long term planning.

**Self Rated Effectiveness And Occupational Stress And Burnout**

Self rated effectiveness do not score significant level of correlation with the variables of occupational stress and burn out in the total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports (Table-7) coaches, team sports coaches (Table-8), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10).

**Athlete rated effectiveness and occupational stress and burnout**

Athlete rated effectiveness scored a significant negative correlation with emotional exhaustion in case of the team sports coaches (Table-8). In case of the total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10), the present study do not find significant level of correlation with any other variables.

Grosch (1986) studied participative decision making and quality of working life. He found that by the end of the study, operating room staff in the three quality, circles improved significantly in measures of involvement, job stress and burnout due to depersonalization. The present study identified the cause for burnout in coaches is due to emotional exhaustion.
During the competitive season the demands of the job can exceed coaches' endurance and abilities to cope (Sisley, et al., 1987). Coaches may become so physically and emotionally exhausted, they experience burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1986). The present study supports the findings of Maslach and Jackson in case of the team sports coaches.

In recent years few studies have been completed on determining the burnout of coaches in four year colleges and high school coaches (Caccese and Mayberg, 1984; Winberg, 1989; Sisley, et al., 1987) burn out in coaches of women team sport (Donna, et al., 1992). Burnout aiming athletic trainers and team physicians has also been addressed (Gieck, et al., 1982).

**Self Rated Effectiveness And General Health Status:**

Self rated effectiveness scored a negative correlation at significant level with general health status in team sports coaches (Table-8). In case of the total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7) district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10), self rated effectiveness do not reach significant level of correlation with general health status.

**Athlete Rated Effectiveness And General Health Status:**

Athlete rated effectiveness do not score significant level of correlation with general health status in case of the total sample for coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7), team sports coaches (Table-8), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10).
Coaching Effectiveness And General Health Status:

Johnson (1966) states that "though the physiologists have not identified the exact mechanisms involved in determining the working capacity of human beings, much has been learned about the adjustments that are made to the standards of activity. Ellis (1988) state that the return of the fitness programs became realized in cost containment of medical care and decreased employee absenteeism, improved morale, increased productivity, job satisfaction, a feeling of well-being an improved sense of community and a feeling that the management cared about its personal. The present study supports the findings of Ellis (1988), Johnson (1966), and Lamb (1978) in case of team sports coaches.

Overall Common Correlations In Self Rated Effectiveness:

Self rated effectiveness scored a significant positive correlation with empathy in the total sample of coaches (Table-6) and team sports coaches (Table-8). In rest of the variables the present study do not find commonness in the total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7), team sports (Table-8), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10).

Overall Common Correlation In Athlete Rated Effectiveness:

Athlete rated effectiveness do not find common correlation in the total sample of coaches (Table-6), individual sports coaches (Table-7), team sports coaches (Table-8), district level coaches (Table-9) and state level coaches (Table-10).
The Correlations Of Effectiveness For Self Rated Effectiveness And Athlete Rated Effectiveness In Different Sports:

Self rated effectiveness scored a significant positive correlation with empathy, need for approval and need for power in the total sample for the coaches (Table-6). Athlete acted effectiveness failed to score significant correlation with any of the variables in the total sample for coaches (Table-6).

Self rated effectiveness scored a significant negative correlation with venturesomeness in individual sports coaches (Table-7). Athlete rated effectiveness reached a significant negative correlation with venturesomeness. Meaningful development and employees commitment.

Self rated effectiveness in team sports coaches (Table-6) obtained a significant positive correlation with apathy and empathy and a negative significant correlation with general health status. Athlete rated effectiveness secured a significant positive correlation with empathy in team sports coaches (Table-8).

The Correlation Effectiveness For Self Rated Effectiveness And Athlete Rated Effectiveness In Different Levels Of Coaching

Self rated effectiveness in district level coaches (Table-9) obtained a significant positive correlation with need for affiliation. Athlete rated effectiveness in district level coaches (Table-9) secured a significant positive correlation with need for affiliation. In self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness the present study do not reach significant correlation with other variables.

Self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness in State level coaches (Table-10) failed to reach significant correlation with any other variables in the present investigation.
FACTOR ANALYSIS

The intercorrelation among many of the variables did reach an acceptable level of significance, yet the information can best be considered more or less suggestive. This is because of the possible existence of unknown overlap among variety of variables included in the study, which may tend to conceal the true relationships existing between different measure. Therefore inorder to have a clearly structured and precise picture of the genuine relationship existing between different variables, the technique of factor analysis was used. Only factors with effectiveness have been discussed in detail.

Factor loadings for the total sample of coaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor V Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Factor V Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>Athlete rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n for approval</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>n for approval</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n for power</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>n for power</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor V of the total sample for coaches accounted for 4.22 per cent of variance in case of self rated effectiveness. In the total sample for coaches factor loading for the self rated effectiveness comes to .92. Factor V of the total sample for coaches accounted for 4.22 per cent of variance in athlete rated effectiveness. In the total sample for coaches factor loading for the athlete rated effectiveness comes to .92. In the total sample for coaches the need for approval secured a factor loading of .23, need for power obtained a factor loading of .22 and the emotional exhaustion scored a factor loading of -.29. Since
self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness achieved the same factor loading.

Similar factor structure emerges for athlete rated effectiveness.

**Factor loadings for the individual sports:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental State</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor V</td>
<td>Athlete rated effectiveness</td>
<td>- .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venturesomeness</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor VI of individual sports coaches accounted for 5.37 per cent of variance for self rated effectiveness. Factor loading for the self rated effectiveness was .61. In the individual sports coaches physical working conditions achieved a factor loading of -.32, mental state .31, general life satisfaction -.38 and emotional exhaustion .84. Factor loading for athlete rated effectiveness was 0.82. In individual sports coaches 4.64 per cent of variance was accounted for athlete rated effectiveness. General life satisfaction obtained a factor loading of .31, empathy -.57 and venturesomeness .48. Except for one factor structure i.e. general life satisfaction the direction was different. For self rated effectiveness the factor loading for general life satisfaction was in the negative direction. For athlete rated effectiveness the factor loading for general life satisfaction was in the positive direction.
Factor loadings for the team sports coaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Athlete rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for approval</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>Confidence in Management</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Advancement on Merit</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Venturesomeness</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor III of the team sports coaches accounted for 7.28 per cent of the variance in case of self rated effectiveness. In the team sports coaches factor loading for the self rated effectiveness reached .90. In team sports coaches the factor loading for need for approval reached .52, emotional exhaustion .84 and depersonalization .64 in case of self rated effectiveness.

Factor XIII of the team sports coaches accounted for 3.86 per cent of the variance in case of athlete rated effectiveness. In the team sports coaches factor loading for the athlete rated effectiveness was .75. Athlete rated effectiveness in the team sports coaches scored a factor loading for confidence in management -.32, advancement on merit -.35 and venturesomeness 0.47. The factor structures for self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness are different.
Factor loadings for the district level coaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor IV Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need for Affiliation</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General life satisfaction</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (physical) health</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor IV of the district level coaches accounted for 7.66 per cent of the variance in self rated effectiveness. In the district level coaches the factor loading for the self rated effectiveness comes to .84. In the district level coaches factor loading for the athlete rated effectiveness comes to .91. It accounted for 7.66 per cent. Of the variance in the athlete rated effectiveness. In the district level coaches the need for affiliation scored a factor loading of .73, general life satisfaction obtained a factor loading of -.27 and general (physical) health shows a factor loading of -.28 in case of self rated effectiveness. Since self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness achieved the same factor loading similar factor structure emerged for athlete rated effectiveness.

Factor loadings for the state level coaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor II Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self rated effectiveness</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Working</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational stress</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor VII Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete rated effectiveness</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Working Conditions</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra Group Relations</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Development</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturesomeness</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor II of the state level coaches accounted for 6.46 per cent of the variance in case of self rated effectiveness. In state level coaches factor loading for the self rated effectiveness is -.57. In state level coaches the factor loading for economic benefits is .38, for physical working condition .43, for occupational stress .66.

Factor VII of the state level coaches accounted for 4.77 per cent of the variance in athlete rated effectiveness. In state level coaches factor loading for the athlete rated effectiveness was .77. The factor loading for physical working conditions .29, Intra group relations .32, meaningful development-.31 and venturesomeness -.48 respectively. Except one factor structure i.e. the physical working conditions, all other factor structures were different for self rated effectiveness and athlete rated effectiveness in state level coaches.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

For regression analysis, following Guilford (1956) only those variables were kept as predictors which correlated significantly with criterion variable. An attempt was also made to include suppressor variables. This was done in view of Mc Namar (1969) who said that, "It is possible to increase prediction by utilizing a variable which shows no or low correlation with criterion, provided it correlated well with the variables which does correlate with the criterion.

There were two criterion variables viz. SELF RATED EFFECTIVENESS and ATHLETE RATED EFFECTIVENESS. The regression analysis were carried out for the total sample of coaches, individual sports coaches, team sports coaches and the state level coaches for the dependent variable.

The results have been presented in tables 21-28. The detailed multiple regression equation (vide Barrett, 1951) have been given. Multiple R² for each of the groups reveals
the exact proportion of variance explained in the criterion variable which is attributable to the joint action of all the independent variables.

**CRITERION : SELF RATED EFFECTIVENESS**

Tables 21-24 show the multiple regression equations for the criterion measure self rated effectiveness for the total sample of coaches, individual sports of coaches, team sports coaches and state level coaches respectively. In these analysis when self rated effectiveness was taken as the dependent variable, all the variables except athlete rated effectiveness were considered as independent variables (33). There are psychoticism, extroversion, neuroticism, Lie (social desirability) scale, need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for approval, need for power, economic benefits, physical working conditions, mental state, career orientation, advancement on merit, effect on personal life, union management relations, self respect, supervisory relationships, Intra group relations, sense of achievement versus apathy, confidence in management, meaningful development, control, influence and participation, employees commitment, general life satisfaction, organizational climate, occupational stress, general (physical) health, impulsiveness, empathy, neventuresomeness, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment.

Table 21 showing the regression analysis for the total sample of coaches revealed that thirteen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 41 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. There are empathy (β=.30), need for power (β=.29), Intra group relations (β=.33), need for approval (β=.29), emotional exhaustion (β=-.13), supervisory relations (β=-.58), self respect (β=.19), occupational stirs (β=-12), venturesomeness (β=-.13), general (physical) health
(β=-.12), mental state (β=.11), economic benefits (β=.12) and meaningful developments (β=.12).

Table 22 showing the regression analysis for the criterion variable self rated effectiveness of individual sports coaches. It revealed that twelve variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 58 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. The predictors are venturesomeness (β=-.33), physical working conditions (β=-.47), empathy (β=.46), advancement on merit (β=.61), personal accomplishment (β=-.33), control, influence and participation (β=-.27), emotional exhaustion (β=-.2.13), confidence in management -.39), intragroup relations (β=.19) sense of achievement versus apathy -.21), depersonalization (β=-.16) and need for power (β=.14).

Table 23 showing the regression analysis for the team sports coaches revealed nineteen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 61 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are general physical health (β=-.34), psychoticism (β=.16), need for power (β=.31) career orientation (β=-.40), need for approval (β=.26), supervisory relationships (β=-.14), Intra group relations (β=.30), emotional exhaustion (β=-.08), advancement on merit (β=-.37), empathy (β=.03), effect on personal life (β=.15), employee commitment (β=.42), meaningful development (β=.54), Lie (social desirability) scale (β=.22), physical working conditions (β=.11), personal accomplishment (β=.39), need for achievement (β=-.26), confidence in management (β=.37) and impulsiveness (β=-.21).

Table 24 presents the regression analysis for the criterion variable self rated effectiveness of the state level coaches. It revealed fourteen variables turned out to be predictors. They explained 49 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are Intra group relations (β=.58) organizational climate (β=-.27), general life satisfaction
(β=.30), effect on personal life (β=-.50), control, infinance and participation (β=-.17),
need for approval (β=.33), emotional exhaustion (β=-.20), supervisory relationships (β=-.30),
neuroticism (β=-.16), empathy (β=.25), meaningful development (β=-.23),
impulsiveness (β=-.18), confidence in management (β=.17) and personal accomplishment
(β=-.13).

Common Predictors For Self Rated Effectiveness:

In the present investigation empathy, Intra group relations and emotional
exhaustion emerged as common predictor in the total sample of coaches, individual sports
coaches, team sports coaches and state level coaches.

Predictors for self rated effectiveness in the total sample of coaches:

The regression analysis of the total sample of coaches shows the following
predictor variable for self rated effectiveness of the total sample of coaches. They are:
need for power, supervisory relationships, need for approval, self respect, occupational
stress, venturesomeness, mental state, economic benefits and meaningful development.

Predictor for self rated effectiveness in individual sports coaches:

The regression analysis of individual sports coaches revealed the following
predictor variables as specific predictor variable for individual sports coaches. They are:
venturesomeness, physical working conditions, advancement on merit, personal
accomplishment, control, influence and participation, confidence in management, sense of
achievement versus apathy, depersonalization and need for power.
Predictor for self rated effectiveness in team sports coaches:

The regression analysis of team sports coaches indicated the following predictor variables as specific predictor variables for team sports coaches. They are: Psychoticism, need for power, career orientation, need for approval, supervisory relationships, advancement on merit effect on personal life, employee commitment, meaningful development, lie (social desirability), scale, physical working conditions, personal accomplishment, need for achievement, confidence in management and impulsiveness.

Predictor for self rated effectiveness in state level coaches:

The regression analysis of the state level coaches revealed the following predictor variables as specific predictor variables for the state level coaches. They are: organizational climate, general life satisfaction, effect in personal life, control, influence and participations, need for approval, supervising relationships, neuroticism, meaningful development, impulsiveness, confidence in management and personal accomplishment.

CRITERION: ATHLETE RATED EFFECTIVENESS:

Tables 25-28 shows the multiple regression equations for the criterion measure athlete rated effectiveness for the total sample of coaches, individual sports coaches, team sports coaches and state level coaches respectively. In these analysis when athlete rated effectiveness was taken as the dependent variable. All the variables except self rated effectiveness were considered as independent variables (30).

Table 25 showing regression analysis for the total sample of coaches revealed that fifteen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 31 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are need for power (β=.25), empathy (β=.20), emotional exhaustion (β=-.19), need for approval (β=.26), supervisory
relationship ($\beta=-.43$), self respect ($\beta=.26$), Intra group relations ($\beta=.16$), employee commitment ($\beta=-.13$), occupational stress ($\beta=.18$), economic benefits ($\beta=.18$), impulsiveness ($\beta=-.08$), meaningful development ($\beta=-.17$), extroversion ($\beta=-.18$), psychoticism ($\beta=12$) and general (physical) health ($\beta=-.11$).

Table 26 presents the regression analysis for the criterion variable athlete rated effectiveness of individual sports coaches. It revealed seventeen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 77 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are employee commitment ($\beta=-.32$), venturesomeness ($\beta=-.45$), occupational stress ($\beta=.27$), physical working conditions ($\beta=-.35$), advancement on merit ($\beta=.63$), empathy ($\beta=24$), neuroticism ($\beta=.48$), extroversion ($\beta=-.41$), general (physical) health ($\beta=-.45$), supervisory relationships ($\beta=-1.01$), organizational climate ($\beta=.55$), confidence in management ($\beta=-.41$), effect on personal life ($\beta=.26$), union management relations ($\beta=.28$), economic benefits ($\beta=.28$), Intra group relations ($\beta=.32$) and need for approval ($\beta=.19$).

Table 27 showing the regression analysis for the criterion variable athlete rated effectiveness of team sports coaches. This analysis revealed that nineteen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 63 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are general (physical) health ($\beta=-.25$), psychoticism ($\beta=.13$), need for power ($\beta=.30$), emotional exhaustion ($\beta=-.15$) need for approval ($\beta=.28$), Lie (social desirability) scale ($\beta=.28$), sense of achievement versus apathy ($\beta=-.29$), career orientation ($\beta=.65$), personal accomplishment ($\beta=.63$), employee commitment ($\beta=.73$), impulsiveness ($\beta=-.53$), effect on personal life ($\beta=-.41$), confidence in management ($\beta=-.52$), control influence and participation ($\beta=-.28$), meaningful development ($\beta=-.58$), need for achievement ($\beta=-.28$), economic benefits ($\beta=.21$), supervisory relationships ($\beta=.22$) and occupational stress ($\beta=.18$).
Table 28 represents the regression analysis for the criterion variable athlete rated effectiveness of the state level coaches. This analysis has expressed that fourteen variables turned out to be relevant and were retained as predictors. They explained 44 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. They are general life satisfaction ($\beta=.42$), employee commitment ($\beta=-.17$), effect on personal life ($\beta=-.61$), need for approval ($\beta=.27$), emotional exhaustion ($\beta=-.36$), impulsiveness ($\beta=-.30$), career orientation ($\beta=-.24$), psychoticism ($\beta=.11$), need for affiliation ($\beta=-.28$), empathy ($\beta=.31$), physical working conditions ($\beta=-.37$), confidence in management ($\beta=-.21$), personal accomplishment ($\beta=-.16$), and venturesomeness ($\beta=-.15$).

**Common predictors of athlete rated effectiveness:**

The present study identified the need for approval as a common predictor of athlete rated effectiveness. The need for approval was active with the total sample of coaches, individual sports coaches and team sports coaches.

Empathy and employee commitment emerged as a common factor in total sample of coaches, individual sports coaches and state level coaches.

Intragroup relations and general (physical) health become a common predictors for total sample of coaches, individual sports coaches and team sports coaches.

Psychoticism, emotional exhaustion and impulsiveness successfully emerged as common predictor for athlete rated effectiveness in total sample of coaches, team sports coaches and state level coaches.

**Specific predictors of athlete rated effectiveness:**

The present study identified self respect and occupational stress as specific predictors for athlete rated effectiveness in the total sample for the coaches.
The regression analysis of the individual sports coaches revealed six independent variables as specific predictors for the athlete rated effectiveness in individual sports coaches. They are advancement on merit neuroticism, organizational climate, effect on personal life, union management relations and confidence in management (-).

The present study identified the following five independent variables as specific predictors for the athlete rated effectiveness in the team sports coaches. They are lie (social desirability) scale, supervisory relationships, sense of achievement versus apathy (-), confidence, influence and participation (-) and need for achievement(-).

The personal study identified need for affiliation (-) and general life style as specific predictors for the athlete rated effectiveness in state level coaches.