COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND PERSONALITY

In the following pages, a review of available literature on coaching effectiveness and its major determines will be presented to provide the historical perspective to the present study.

EVALUATION OF COACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Definition of Effectiveness

Drucker (1969) was quite right when he stated, “there is a significant difference between efficiency - doing things right and effectiveness- doing the right things.” In Siedentop’s (1978) words the key ingredients of effective behavior management include defining desirable and undesirable behaviors in measurable terms being consistent when defining and reinforcing behavior and using positive rather than a negative.

An effective teacher is one whose practices result in superior student achievement. In other words, the effective teacher is ultimately defined in what students learn. The body of knowledge is drawn primarily from educational research but where appropriate and possible sports pedagogy research is also used. Effective instruction involves selecting and orchestrating those teaching behaviors that are appropriate to the context and to teacher’s goals rather than mastering and consistently applying a few ‘generic’ teaching skills (Brophy and Good, 1986).

Walter Doyle (1986) opines teaching has two major task structures organized around the problems of
Learning is served by the instructional function; order is served by the managerial function that is by organizing classroom groups, establishing rules and procedures, reaching to misbehaviors, monitoring and placing classroom event and the like.

In Gary Sinclair’s (1989) opinion coaches must concern themselves with whom they are directing their remark in what social setting (Public / Private) these remarks are being made, and whether the remarks are positive or negative in character. They should be aware of the focus of their comments that is whether they are addressing the action of the behavior of the athlete and if the skill is the focus, whether they are centering on a correct or incorrect aspect of the performance. The specificity and generality of any comment is also concern relative to it’s needs to be on task. The timing and the nature of the intent (e.g., evaluative, prescriptive) of any feedback influence the learning process. Ideally the complete interaction procedure should be informative to the athlete.

**Coaching style and effectiveness**

Locke (1982) suggests, it is safe to say systematic observation even with its limitations has indeed played a major role in generating at least some of the answers regarding good teaching and has contributed to the development of that language of teaching. Medlay (1979) opines, it is what a teacher does rather than what the teacher is that matters.

Human beings are notorious for being poor observers. Opinions are based on the observers personal biases and history of experiences. Thus there is a strong tendency on the part of the observer to report on aspects that he/she thinks are important (Jonson and
Disagreement between observers can be minimized when definitions are clear, complete and objective (Hawkins and Dobes, 1977).

Effective teachers have a command of the subject matter and a concern for student competence (Gold Smid, et al., 1977). Good teachers seem to have an enthusiastic attitude toward their subject matter, and students sense that attitude. (Epstein, 1981).

Possibly what is most important for effectiveness are the feelings that develop between a teacher and the students, and between the teacher and the subject matter.

Hamachek (1975) arrived at two basic conclusions:

1. A good teacher is simply a good person. They like life, are at peace with themselves, have a sense of humor, and enjoy other people. They do not have a neurotic, need for power and authority or anxieties which negatively affect their lives.

2. Good teachers are flexible. They are not bound to a single point of view or methodological approach. They are total teachers in that movement by movement changes the job demands. They can be firm when necessary and permissive when appropriate.

According to Walter Doyle (1984) class management is now regarded as not only central to the task of teaching but critically supportive of its effectiveness. Kane (1977) opines, the way in which the teachers make use or manipulate the curriculum content is an important factor to be considered in the planning and learning vary according to teacher’s preferred approaches and to the demands of different aspects of the program.

Woods and Locke (1983) suggest that effective teachers present information clearly and enthusiastically. Clarity of information is a consistent correlate with achievement, but is usually more associated with affective outcomes like self-concept, than with motor skills of cognitive concepts. Smith and Sanders (1981) opine, when concluding
the instruction, the effective teachers will review and summarize the main ideas as the conclusion of the lesson. Further they state that the achievement is higher when information is presented with a degree of redundancy.

According to Hobels Berger (1983) observing people in social situation (Athlete-Coach; Athlete-Spectator; Athlete-Official) distinct behavioral changes during the observation period can be noted. Frequently, the reason is an alteration of the emotional state, a specific emotional state corresponding with a specific behavioral structure. If the coach succeeds in realizing causes and consequences of such alteration in behavior and emotion, acute conflict situations between coach and athlete will be resolved earlier or avoided. Transaction analysis is supposed to contribute to such an avoidance of conflict situations.

Robert Singer (1972) states “the effect of the coach like that of any teacher may be negative or positive. But unlike most relationship between teacher and student, the relationship between the coach and the athlete is extensive and intensive. A maladjusted coach may serve as a poor model and have bad effect on team members. Emotional instability on the part of the coach pose a threat to the personality development of the athletes.”

Rosenshine (1979) ways that direct instruction includes clear learning goals, sufficient time for instruction and practice, monitored student performance, low-level cognitive questions immediate and specific feedback, extensive content coverage, and learning goals and materials appropriate for students ability.

The coach’s behavior is a function of his/her own personal characteristics (performance ability and experience) as well as the influence of situation in which he operates. Since both the athlete and the coach operate in the same environment it can influence the coach as well as the athlete. (Chelladurai, 1984).
Successful coach

Fry, et al., (1983) reports the effect of task interdependence on perceived leader behavior of coaches. It was found that within interdependent sports (Basketball, Foot ball, Volley ball 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 were perceived to be more concerned with maintaining a closely knit group and resolving conflicts than were unsuccessful coaches.

Ogilvie (1965) while explaining the personality profile of successful coaches commented “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).

Democratic behavior and autocratic behavior not elaborated upon here are also significant ingredients in the leadership mix (Chelladuri and Haggarty, 1978; Chelladurai and Arnott, 1983). Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found that males preferred their coaches to be more autocratic but yet more supportive than did the female. 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 counter parts.

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 is necessary to determine his highest limits of effort tolerance.

(2) Work adaptation is function of individual capability.

Astrand and Rodahl (1970) suggest that athletes always need variety in training and the coach should ensure it.
Coaching skills for effectiveness of coaching

Hahn (1970) suggests, the trainer must transfer basic psychological concepts into training. Motivation, observance of learning phases, optimum training times and satisfaction of performance levels are vital for success in training. Gallwey (1976) says, “the ultimate objective to teach learners to acquire the ability to channel their motivation towards concentration in a relaxed manner.

According to Danserean (1978), self analysis strategies enable the personal determination of psychological readiness and should influence decision to under take responsibilities and how to proceed.

Rieder (1983) discussed the internal and external factors determining the learning. Among them, the learning ability and the emotional conditions are important. The trainer's primary duty is to make these conditions optimal. The teaching, learning process is based on trainer and athlete interaction. Reiner Marten (1942) suggested coaches need is to know not only the techniques and tactics of their particular sport, but also the methods to teach these things to their athletes. They must possess:

1. Psychological skills.
2. Energy management.
3. Stress management.
4. Attentional skill.
5. Goal setting skills.
6. Leadership skills.
7. Communication skills.

Patsy Neal (1975) opines, personal requisites of women coaches should be the same as these required by men. i.e. emotional stability ability to handle people well, knowledge in particular sport.
Robert Singer (1972) says, the successful coach is one who gains confidence and comradeship of his athletes. Although most coaches agree on the fundamentals of execution of skills, the method of application and the degree of responsiveness of the athletes may be what separate the successful from the unsuccessful coach.

According to Moore (1970) achievement in athletic performance is not only the objective to be attained by a good coach, for to teach proper habits, attitudes, ideals and appreciation is equally as important as imparting skills and knowledge.

Bandura (1979) says an individual’s actual performance will be predicted by his or her feeling of competence or expectations of personal effectiveness. The feeling of satisfaction and competence derived from attaining from previously set goals provide an important vehicle for the development of perceived levels of self efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Bandura and Schunk, 1981).

Smith and Smoll (1981) derived behavioral guidelines designed to help coaches relate more effectively to child athletes. The series of coaching do’s and don’ts are based primarily on
(a) a conception of success or ‘winning’ as given maximum effort and
(b) a positive approach to social influence that prefers reinforcement and encouragement to punishment and criticism (Smoll and Smith, 1979).

Smith et al., (1979) investigated the difference between coaches to whom young baseball players respond favorably and those to whom they respond less favorably. Their research showed that an important factor was the frequency with which coaches rewarded desirable behavior. The young ball players responded most favorably to the coaches who dispensed frequent rewards.

Allison and Ayllon (1980) says the effectiveness of behavioral coaching with the “technique” (Stand Still where the mistake is committed) for decreasing errors in football,
gymnastics and Tennis; Soccer (Rush and Ayllon, 1984); Sprinting (Shapiro and Shapiro, 1985); and classical Ballet (Filterling and Ayllon, 1983).

Councilman (1965) opines each coach adopt a coaching style that is designed to fit his unique personality, but that, whatever his style, the coach should have the affection and respect of the athlete. According to Singer (1972) the coach must always make allowances for the nature of the athletes (age, sex, past experience and other characteristics) the nature of the task (Simple or Complex, motor or cognitive) and the environmental conditions that affect the learning experience.

In technique teaching coach is constantly faced with problem of adjusting his instructions and measures, to the inner actions of athletes (e.g. open loop control of movement, i.e. planning, movement perception, way of processing movement, i.e. planning, movement experience in memory) as well as the state of learning of athlete (e.g., present state of development of movement program and movement pattern). Athletes way of using the information available to him for movement formation from coach’s point of view, proves to be an interface, which can not be comprehended by means of observable movement behavior of athlete on the other hand (Hug, 1981).

Daniel Gould et al., (1989) conducted two studies to assess strategies elite coaches use to enhance self efficacy in athletes in particular the degree to which coaches use 13 strategies to influence self efficacy and their evaluation of the effectiveness of those strategies. Self efficacy rating differences among categories of coaches were also examined. The techniques judged most effective were instruction drilling, encouraging positive talk, modeling confidence. One self, and liberal use of reward statements. Few between-coach differences were found in efficacy use and effectiveness rating.
Evaluation of coaching effectiveness

Research in coaching setting remains in the formative stages. A review of the coaching related papers in the 1980’s issues of the Journal of Teaching in Physical Education and Research Quarterly for Exercise and Science would support this statement (Locke, 1977; Siedentop, 1983). Modern coaching studies have been involved in comparing the behavior of winning and losing coaches (Lambardo, et al., 1983).

McKenzie (1980) has adopted the Academic learning Time-Physical Education (ALT-PE) instrument for the measurement of practice behavior in elite level coaching setting, in a similar vain to the way in which Tousignant and Siendentop (1983) examined the nature of task an accountability in required Physical Education Classes, using the nature of task developed by Doyle (1980) in studying, reading and writing in the classroom.

According to Hastie (1992), nearly all studies of coaching can be categorized into so few research paradigms demonstrates the narrowness of the research in coaching at the problematic level compared with the sport sciences. A strong argument can be therefore be put forward for the benefit that will occur to researchers in coaching.

Laura Kenow (1993) using Smoll and Smith’s model of leadership behavior in sports (1989) as a perception and evaluation of coaching behavior. He examined the relationship of trait anxiety, state cognitive and somatic anxiety and state self-confidence to the evaluation of coaching behavior. Athletes from seven collegiate basketball teams (n = 46) were studied in an attempt to replicate the results of Kenow and Williams (1992). Athletes completed the SCAT, CSAI-2, and Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CSQ, Kenow and Williams, 1992). Factor analysis of CBQ with larger player pool (n= 127) resulted in five factors:
(1) Cognitive/attentional effect of coach’s behavior.
(2) Supportiveness.
(3) Emotional control and composure.
(4) Communication and
(5) Somatic effects of coach’s behavior.

Correlational analysis of total CBQ score and the five factor scores with the psychological variables replicated the significant influence of cognitive state anxiety. (p<.05 on athlete’s perception and evaluation of coaching behavior; however the coaching behavior factors influenced were not identical to Kenow and Williams (1992).

Also contrary to Kenow and Williams (1992) he found a significant influence of state anxiety (p < .05) on athletes evaluation of the coaching behavior factors and no influence of anxiety or self-confidence on the total CBQ score (p > .05). Overall the results support and expand on Smoll and Smith’s (1989) model of leadership behavior in sports.

Damon Burton (1993) developed and provided initial validity for the multidimensional Coaching Success Questionnaire (CSQ). The CSQ conceptualized based on five dimensions of Coaching Success: Winning, having fun and developing physically, psychologically and socially. Development of CSQ began by identifying 15 sub dimensions of coaching success and writing 10-12 items of each sub scale. A panel of experts then rated items and face validity. The remaining 42 items were then given to a sample of 139 high school athletes and standard test construction statistics were used to trim each sub scale to four items.

Finally the CSQ version was given to 690 high school athletes in seven sports. Confirmatory factor analysis found eight factors rather than 15, including: Winning, sports skills/strategies, poise/concentration, conditioning/wellness, motivation/
responsibility, social/ cooperation, sports values and fun/ self-confidence. Item analysis demonstrated all sub scales had adequate discriminability and alpha reliability. Co-efficient averaged 0.76. Finally MANOVA results documented preliminary construct validity by showing that coaches with better won/loss records scored higher on coaching success than did coaches with worse records.

Coaching Behavior Observational Recording System (CBORS) (Deborah and Damon, 1989) is an instrument suitable for the use in laboratory or field setting. CBORS was modified from Stewarts (1980) Observational Recording Record of Physical Education Teaching Behavior especially to assess coaching behaviors of youth Basketball coaches. The CBORS designed to identify the:

(a) Specific coaching climate.
(b) Type of interactions.
(c) Specific coaching behaviors typically used by coaches in practice and game situation. The four coaching climate, four types of interactions and six categories of coaching behaviors. Comprising this instrument are clearly defined and differentiated. It could be equally valid for assessing coaching behavior of all.

Qualitative researchers use triangulation as one important way to cross their understanding of gathered data (Denzuin, 1978; Templin, 1983). (Two or more methods to collect the data, e.g., observation and interview). Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose four criterion are more consistent with the naturalist paradigm. Creditability, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Stern, (1985, 1986) suggests specific strategies for implementing each of these trustworthiness criteria. (e.g., How these criterion can be used in a study of the teacher education process in physical education).
Glaxton (1985) has used Arizona State University Observation Instrument (ASUOI) to study high school tennis coaches. But this is only the starting point to understand coaching behavior in many individual sports.

The concept of behavioral intention occupies a prominent position in recent models of interpersonal behavior advanced by Fishbein and Ajzen, (1975) and Triandis, (1977).

Player’s perceptions of their coaches behaviors were more accurate than self ratings made by the coaches. Thus to successfully implement coaching guidelines, we should try to increase coaches awareness of what they are doing as well as their motivation to comply with behavioral guidelines. Two behavioral change techniques are recommended in this regard, namely, behavioral feedback and self monitoring (Smoll and Smith, 1980) Self monitoring is not only an effective procedure for increasing self awareness of behaviors and their antecedents and consequences, but it may also be an effective behavior change procedure in itself. (Kazdin, 1974; Thoresan and Mahoney, 1974).

According to Smoll and Simith (1984) players most accurately perceived punitive behavior, reaction to mistakes and game irrelevant communicative behavior of the coach. However, correlation between players perception of their coaches behavior and the coaches self perceptions were low and generally non-significant. This indicated that there was little correspondence between the way coaches viewed themselves and how their players perceived them. Indeed the players perceived them. Indeed, the players perception to be more accurate in that they correlated more highly with CBAS observed behavior scores. The potential importance of increasing coaches’ awareness of how they behave was thus seen as a key to changing their behavior.
Self analysis thought directed observation can contribute measuring to the improvement of instructional effectiveness. (Mancini, Wvest, et al., 1985). “To measure the effectiveness of his coaching a coach may analyze his own personal and professional equipment and behavior; he may examine his methods of teaching to determine whether or not he has observed certain important concepts of teaching and learning; he may use a checklist to evaluate player improvement; he may also observe player behavior”. (Moore, 1970).

Alex Waigandt (1992) determined whether there was a difference between the leadership styles of head football coaches from traditionally black and white universities and colleges in the NCAA at the Division I-AA level. The assistant coaches were requested to describe their respective head coaches leadership styles according to leader Behavior Description to describe their own leadership styles according to leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). Consideration (democratic) and initiation of structure (autocratic) were the two dimensions of leadership styles subjected to data analysis simultaneously (MANOVA) and independently (Independent). These analysis revealed no statistically significant difference between the leadership styles of head coaches from these conferences. In addition, in the NCAA at the division I-AA Level, although football teams from traditionally white conferences have a distinctively higher winning percentage than those from traditionally black conference. This can not be attributed to their respective head coaches leadership styles.

Tharp and Gallimore (1976) devised a 10 category system to observe John Wooden UCLA Basketball coach and found 50.3% of his behavior fall in to the instruction category. Langsdorf (1979) developed a modified version of Tharp and Gallimore instrument to objectively observe the behavior of Frank Kush football coach of Arizona State University during 18 Football workout. 36% of his behavior were instruction
category. 12% were scold/ reinstruction. Dodds and Rife (1981) completed a descriptive analytic study of a highly successful women’s field hockey coach using an instrument based on the work of Tharp and Gallimore. Lacy and Darst (1988) used an 11 category instrument based on the Langsdorf instrument to research the behavior of a group of 10 winning high school, head football coaches and reported 42.5% of the group’s behaviors were in the instruction category. Model (1983) completed a similar study on high school football matches and found 54.8% of the behavior exhibited were in the instruction category. Major sequence of behavior can be determined by using a matrix system following the guidelines of the Flanders interaction analysis system (Alan Lacy, 1989).

Teacher/coach/pupil observation schedule (TOS, COS, POS) classifies seven groups of behavior: feedback and rewarding; correction and prohibiting; directing, explaining and informing, monitoring, and attending; managing and no activity. These categories based on the work of Breyer and Calchera (1971) provide an assessment of the behavior exhibited by the coach. (Dorothy and Deborah, 1989).

**Eysenckian Theory of Personality**

The study of personality is one of the most interesting areas in psychology. Modern social and behavioral science in general and psychology in particular aims at utilizing and controlling human personality to the full development and progress of the individual and society (Mohan, 1985). Over the years Eysenck (1947, 1960, 1963, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1980) developed and modified a formidable personality theory which contains three independent major dimensions of personality, viz. Extroversion/ introversion (E/I), Neuroticism/ Stability (N) and Psychoticism (P). Eysenck (1963) also proposed a psychological model to parallel these three dimension. (Eysanck, 1969, 1981 and Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). The model is a hierarchical one which conceptualizes that each of the
three broad dimensions are subdivided at a lower level into narrower and more specific traits. Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) contended a large portion of the total common variance produced by the correlation between various personality traits could be accounted for by these three higher order factors, i.e. Extroversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism. Those superfactors have been sufficiently often replicated to suggest stable and permanent dimension of personality structures (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1976; Eysenck and Zuckerman, 1978 and Eysenck, 1981).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1968; 1975) defined Extroversion as the out going uninhibited, impulsive and social inclination of a person. The Neuroticism/ Stability dimension was the second major personality dimension deduced by Eysenck (1947, 1963, 1970). Neuroticism (N) refers to a general emotional over responsiveness, emotional liability and liability to neurotic break down under stress. A high score on Psychoticism may be described as being solitary, hostile, not caring for people, aggressive, he is often troublesome and does not fit any where. He may be cruel and inhumane, lacking in feeling and empathy and altogether insensitive (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). In addition Eysenck's personality Questionnaire also measures Lie (Social Desirability) scale. The Lie (Social Desirability) Scale which was first incorporated in the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) to measure a tendency in the part of the subjects to "fake good", now measures an independent, stable personality factor which possibly denotes some degree of 'social naivete' (Social Desirability) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).

Recently, Perera and Eysenck (1984) further reported that the Lie (Social Desirability) scale which was originally regarded simply as a scale to detect faking, has recently been recognized as a personality dimension of some intrinsic interest apart from faking, the social desirability aspect of the Lie score is probably of the greatest importance in cross cultural projects, because norms on this factor seem to reflect the degree of social
permissiveness of the country or culture under observation and the degree of conformity of the subject. All these dimensions of personality have been found to be cross-culturally valid (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1983 and Mohan et al., 1987).

A number of studies have been conducted to investigate sex differences in Eysenckian dimensions of personality. Several researchers reported males to score significantly higher than females on Psychoticism (Eysenck, 1978; Avtar, 1984; Chen et al., 1985; Bhandari and Sarup, 1987; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987; Tambs et al., 1989 and Wong and Reading, 1989). However, no significant sex differences in Psychoticism have been reported by Mohan and Gulati (1989).


On Neuroticism, females have been reported to score significantly higher than males (Mohan, 1976; Mohan et al., 1981; Gulati 1982; Chen et al 1985; Mohan and Virdi 1985; Sarup, 1986; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987; Mohan and Gulati, 1989; Tambs et al., 1989, and Wong and Reading, 1989). No significant sex differences on Neuroticism were reported by Furnham (1984) and Bhandari and Grewal (1990).

Females have been found to score significantly higher than males on Lie (Social Desirability) Scale (Eysenck, 1959; Guttman, 1966; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975; Avtar, 1984, Chen et al., 1985; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987 and Tambs et al., 1989). Mohan and Gulati (1989), Wong and Reading (1989) and Bhandari and Grewal (1990) reported no significant sex differences on Lie (Social Desirability) scale.
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Mohan and Jain (1984) and Rana (1989) reported no sex differences on all the four Eysenckian personality dimensions, viz., Psychoticism, Extroversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

Inderriaden (1987) reported that recent leadership research has focused on the relationship between individual behavior and effectiveness from the perspective of personality. The contingency of situational leadership theorists also consider the moderating effect of leader’s characteristics, subordinates characteristics and work group factors on the relationship between leader behavior and work group performances (Green et al., 1978; McMahan, 1972 and House and Mitchell, 1974).

Coaching effectiveness and personality

The personality related studies, have generally centered around athletes and few studies have been done on the coaches. However with the help of these related studies, one will be in position to assess, how for these studies will be in a position to enhance the sports performance by contributing for the effective coaching programs. Initially motivation and incentives are some of the concepts were used to explain the pattern of sports personality. e.g. Conscious Volition, instructional energy (Treud, 1943); drive (Hull, 1943) Psychological headonism needs Murrans (1938). Booth (1958); Kroll (1967) and Werner and Gotheil (1966) have tried to identify certain personality traits present in sports persons. Lockie (1962) says, 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 lend to gravitate towards specific kind of sports. This is also true with respect to hypothesized differences in the personality traits of athletes in individual versus group or team sports.
Behrman (1967); Biddurlph (1954); Carter and Shanon (1940); Ikegami (1970); and Ruffer (1965) have put forth evidence suggesting sociability as one of the traits consistently identified in sports persons. Research however is needed to determine in what direction this factor is operating. This is to say participation in sports cause, develop or permit sociability in the sports men or is it that non-sociable individuals are screened out of sports participation at an early stage. How does sociability contribute for performance enhancement. Conventionality (Sehendel, 1965), (Werner, 1960); mental toughness (Booth, 1968; Hunt, 1969; Kane, 1970; Sirotin, 1973; Whiting and Stembridge, 1965) are some of the other traits associated with sports persons.

Kane and Callagen (1965) investigated in to the personality characteristics of world class tennis players and concluded that emotional stability, ego strength and low frustration characterized these players. Bruner (1969); Ikegami (1970); Kane (1970); Sperling (1942) found that extroversion is another trait highly related to dominance and sociability in athletics and sports participants. Kroll (1970) had stated that moving in competitive ladder, one would expect more homogeneity in the personality of the participants. Singer (1969) has identified that wrestlers and footballers were more aggressive and hostile than archers, tennis players and golfers. According to Kane (1970); Marriman (1960); Singer (1969) there is little doubt that dominance is strongly linked with sportsman. Meclancy (1969) found significant differences between high fitness and low fitness college men. New man (1968) found Johnsgard and Ogilvie (1968) against their hypothesis found racing drivers reserved, intelligent, stable, self sufficient, self assumed and well integrated. Darden (1972) found significant differences between body images and self concept variables among Basketball players and football players; Baseball players and weight lifters; Swimmers and gymnasts. Westergren (1966) found close cooperation and friendly relation existed between athletes; competition and cooperation were found to be
important ingredients of sports. Cooper (1969) says that the athletes were clearly more achievement oriented and displayed more self confidence and competitiveness than non-athletes.

Ogilvie and Tutko (1967) studied the personality traits of female swimming champions and found that low aggression, low dominance and high nurturance were their main characteristics. Darden (1972) studied the personality profiles of competitive body builders and weight lifters as compared to the normal population and revealed significant difference in urgency and suspicion. Each particular game inculcates a particular kind of social structure. Much work has been accomplished on team games like hockey (Kroll, 1973) Football (Brown, 1971); Basketball (Johnson, 1972; Pereson, 1973) Baseball (Figone, 1977; Gold Johnson, 1972), Bowling, Body building and Weight lifting (Darden, 1972); Wrestling (Kroll, 1967; Sirotin, 1973) Swimming (Rushall, 1967; Ogilvie, 1974) demonstrated that athletes are more self assertive than non-athletes. Slaughter (1971) analyzed the relationship between somato-type and personality traits of college women. The result showed some relationship between somato-type and variables of personality.

Tutko et al., (1969) contended to share certain traits that typify athletic achievement. Achievement, aggression and affiliation have also been studied in relation to athletes. Butt (1975); Willis (1972), Bard (1973) claims that field independent athletes perform better in individual sports. Internal and external control too has been measured (Lynn, Pheland and Kiker, 1970), decision making (Newell, 1975) risk taking (Ball, 1975; David 1974; Hanis, 1972) have also received some attention in relation to athletes. Marko (1973) studied the relationship of self evaluation and personality profile. Kane (1974) studied the relationship of body concept and performance amongst sportsman. Buller (1974) found differences in adjustment of the sportsmen and non-sports men. Sportsmen were found better adjusted Ogilvie (1974) says that both men and women athletes were
highly sergeant and extroverted. The man also tend to be tough minded and though men and women tended to be more dominant, confident and composed. Figler (1976) studied aggressive response to frustration among sports persons and non-sports persons.

Comor and James (1970) using Catell’s 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire studied the personality traits of 4 groups of inter-collegiate competitors (Basket ballers, Gymnasts, Swimmers and Tennis players). These results indicated that these groups were similar on 12 personality factors but significantly different on intelligence, radicalism, self-sufficiency and control. 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.

**Sports participation and pattern of personality**

Eysenck (1982) summarized the trend of results regarding the participation in sports. They are :-

1. Extroverts are more likely to excell in sports because their low level arousal leads to sensuous stimulation through bodily activities. Through their low arousal tolerate pain, hence better equipped to deal with often painful consequences and side effects of sports activities. Hence one may expect sports men to be more extrovert than non-participants in sports.

2. For Neuroticism (N) a curvilinear relation between sports activity and neuroticism can be predicted. Optimal level of neuroticism act as drive and facilitated performance. Too low neuroticism make poor performance and too high for distraction.
As for Psychoticism (P) is concerned one would hypothesize that a high score has an advantage over a low Psychoticism (P) score is so far as aggressiveness and impersonal attitude are likely to bestow an advantage on a player in most sports. One may say that aggression is a necessary trait in sports men to win. Kamlesh (1988) observed, among athletes, anxiety and neuroticism were higher in them than the general population. Intelligence was lower. They possess some qualities of being extrovert and outgoing, but its effect is comparable to neuroticism. 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 influencing participation in sports and engaging in high risk sports. Personality has a remarkable importance because it is the core of individual differences and has its bearing on human performance.

Anshel (1990) says each one of us possess unique perceptual styles through which we organize, interpret sensory input in a particular way and tend to seek out those sensory environment that are conducive to optimal functioning. Sportsmen also enjoy the challenges presented in competitive sports. Further he opined that use of different inventories and sports terms not with standing, athletes tend to be intelligent, achievement oriented, dominant, stable, tough-minded, aggressive, sociable and adventurous.

Alegaonkar (1989) conducted a study on self concept, emotional, social and educational adjustment and correlated these aspects with physical fitness. He found adjustment uncorrelated with the adjustment of others. Nangia (1989) reported differences in the adjustment of male and female athletes and non-athletes and individual and team game players. Samraj (1991) also highlighted the importance of adjustment in sports.
A profile of successful coaches

The profile of successful coaches are almost identical to that of outstanding athletes. Quoting Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) the coaches as a group found to be:

1. Highly success driven men with outstanding need to be on top.
2. They seemed unusually well equipped by personality and temperament for handling their emotions when under considerable stress.

Levels of coaching and personality

Newman (1968) found differences in personality traits between faster and slower competitive swimmers as well as found significant correlation between rank of swimming performance to correspond with rank performance variable. Kroll and Peterson (1965) found the most powerful attribution for winning in Football, were intelligence, shyness, confidence and self sufficiency.

Berger and Littlefield (1969) attempted to determine whether differences in personality as measured by California Psychological Inventory existed between 30 outstanding Football players, 30 non-outstanding Football players and 30 non-athletes. They found no significant differences between them on any of the 18 items of the inventory. Iso- Ahola (1977) found that failure of the Baseball team did not decrease the subjects judgment of their own internal qualities. Wayner (1977) investigated the personality variables between successful male athletes in Football, Basketball and Track and field. The sample was further divided in to six categories by their coaches. Discriment analysis of six groups revealed that scores on the personality variables used were effective in differentiating successful and non-successful players.

Balazs (1982) studied 24 outstanding female athletes who represented United States in the Olympics in different sports. The psychological dynamics revealed were
strong drive to excell, early goal setting, positive self image, well developed heterosexuality. Sidhu and Sidhu (1989) studied the personality differences between selected and non-selected University level soccer players. Thirty two selected and thirty two non-selected soccer players were administered Cattell’s 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The analysis of the data indicated that in 10 out of 16 Factors, the results were significant which showed that competitions and tournaments improved the personality of individuals.

**COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND MOTIVATION**

Motivation constitutes a key input in any human performance including the sports performance. Psychologists have found that people vary considerably in their ability to behave in certain ways (Porter et al., 1975). With the growing realization of the importance of effective sports coaching, efforts have been directed towards effectively harnessing these resources. One needs coaches who are not only professionally competent but committed and motivated. Motivated behavior is one that ensures peaked performance and one may subsume that coach motivation is the key factor in determining coaching effectiveness.

Coach motivation is also an important determinant of coaching effectiveness. Venkataraman and Valecha (1981) are of the opinion that motivation is very closely linked with job performance. Therefore the topic of motivation has gained considerable importance in sports performance.

The word “Motivation” comes from the Latin word ‘moviere’ which means ‘to move’ and has been defined as all those inner striving condition described as wishes desires and drives etc. It is an inner state that activates or moves (Bernard et al., 1964) and the combination of forces which initially direct and sustain behavior towards a goal (Lindsley, 1957). The study of motivation is concerned with ‘how behavior gets started,
is energized, is sustained, is directed, is stopped and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on (Jones, 1957).

According to Dubin (1974) a simple definition of motivation relevant to work and organization may be that 'it is the complex of forces starting and keeping a person at work in an organization.' Among the diverse factors that influence the behavior, the needs of an individual are most important (Kumar, 1976). It refers to those factors operating within an individual which impel him to act or not to act in certain ways. Motivation is an organization is the willingness of an employee to respond to organizational requirements.

The theories of motivation has been grouped by Rajagopalan (1986) into two major divisions, viz. the content and process theories. The content theories of motivation attempt to determine such needs of an individual that energize and direct his behavior. The process theories of motivation are those which explain how behavior is energized and directed. Content theories of McClelland et al. (1953), Maslow (1954), Herzberg et al (1959), McGregor and Atkinson (1964), bring out an account of what needs, values or expectations are important. Atkinson's theory of motivation is an example of content theory.

Litwin's study (1984) is a systematic research in the field of motivation is based on the theory constructed by McClelland (1962), Atkinson (1964, 1968), and others. Atkinson (1964) developed a formal model of motivational behavior which puts considerable emphasis on environmental determination of motivation. According to Litwin (1984) the assumptions underlying Atkinson's model may be related as follows:

(i) All individuals have certain basic motives or needs. These motives represent behavior potentials and influence behavior only when aroused.

(ii) Whether or not these motives are aroused depends upon the situation or environment perceived by the individual.
(iii) Particular environmental properties serve to stimulate or arouse various motives. In other words, a specific motive will not influence behavior until the motive is aroused by an appropriate environmental influence.

(iv) Changes in the perceived environment result in changes in the pattern of aroused motivation.

(v) Each kind of motivation is directed to the satisfaction of different kinds of needs. The pattern of aroused motivation determines behavior, and a change in the pattern of aroused motivation will result in a change of behavior.

Several motives have been identified and studied (Atkinson, 1958). The most significant of these motives in work settings as identified by Atkinson (1958) are: The need for Achievement, defined as the need to excel in relation to competitive or an internalized standard of excellence; the need for Affiliation, defined as the need for close interpersonal relationships and friendships with other people, and the need for Power, defined as the need to control or influence others and to control the means of influencing others. The present study has also included need for Approval in its purview along with need for Achievement, need for Affiliation and need for Power.

**Need for achievement**

McClelland and his associates (1962, 1984) have studied achievement motivation in both laboratory setting and organizational environments. (Costley and Todd, 1983). These studies led to the identification of achievement motivation as a distinct human need that varies in intensity among people. As the researches advanced, it became clear that need to achieve was the key to success of human performance. Steers and Porter (1979) reviewing the characteristics of an individual high on need for Achievement state that: “He likes situations in which he takes personal responsibility for finding solutions to
problems. Another characteristic of a man with a strong achievement concern is his
tendency to set moderate achievement goals and to take calculated risks. The man who
has a concern for achievement also wants concrete feedback as to how well he is doing."

Costely and Todd (1983) listed few more characteristics of individuals on
achievement motivation viz.

(i) They are more concerned with achievement itself than with any rewards that
results from their success;

(ii) Since people with high achievement motivation are primarily concerned with
individual accomplishment, they tend to have a desire for specific feedback on how
successful they are in reaching objectives and

(iii) Individuals with high achievement motivation spend more time thinking about
performing high level accomplishments than do individuals with low achievement
motivation. According to McClelland (1961) when people begin thinking in terms
of achievement, their levels of achievement increased.

Mohan and Rattan (1987) opined that need for Achievement is a striving to
increase or keep as high as possible one's own capabilities in all activities in which a
standard of excellence is to thrive to play. The need for Achievement is a learned,
internalized desire to perform well and to strive for excellence in a variety of activities”
(Meichenbaum et al, 1989).

The need for Achievement was defined by psychologist Murray (1964) as follows:
“To accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organize physical objects,
human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly and independently as possible. To overcome
obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival and surpass others. To
increase self regard by successful exercise of talent.”
Singh and Srivastava (1983) planned their investigation to study the potential effects of need for Achievement, on the relationship between employees performance and job satisfaction. The following conclusions were drawn from their study:

(i) The need for Achievement appeared to represent an important variable in the job performance job satisfaction relationship.

(ii) Satisfaction level was significantly higher for high need for Achievement group, than their counter part.

(iii) The finding very clearly indicated the presence of a strong relationship between need for Achievement and productivity as also between satisfaction and productivity.

(iv) Performance level for high need for Achievement group was better than low need for Achievement group.

(v) There were no cross-cultural differences between Indian and American workers so far as the effect of need for Achievement on job performance and job satisfaction relationship is concerned.

Landers (1978) opines the contemporary motivational theories conceptualize an individuals behavior as varying along two dimensions: Direction and Intensity. Further motivation may be thought of as drive a person has that serves to arouse, energize and direct his/her goal directed behavior (Carron, 1980; Landers, 1978). People have an innate need to feel competent and self determining concerning their environment. (Halliwell, 1979; Harter, 1978; White, 1959). Alvin Zander’s (1978) model revolves around making pride in the group an important attribute which in turn develops a desire for group success that can be powerful motivating force among individuals with in the group.
Need for affiliation

Misra and Tripathi (1980) gave the following characteristics of individual high on need for Affiliation. According to them, those high on need for Affiliation tend to describe themselves as friendly, warm, trusting, talkative, cheerful, kind, loyal, helpful, praise worthy, accepting and generous.

If a person spends his time thinking about the warm, friendly, compassionate relationships he has, or he would like to have with others, he has a need for Affiliation. Such persons want others to like them, and are likely to pay attention to the feeling of others. (Steers and Porter, 1979).

McClelland (1982) said that affiliation is an important motive as it can reduce the negative effects of stress. Caring for others and being cared for by other’s can counter act some of the potential harm stemming from a high powered life style. Costley and Todd (1983) stated that the need for Affiliation for human companionship and reassurance produces a desire to interact with people. Indications are that everyone has affiliation needs and experience some desire to give and receive attention but the intensity of the Affiliation motivation varies among individuals. Some people have very high affiliation motivation while others are relatively low on this motive.

Generally people prefer to be with other people. This general tendency to stay with other people, is referred to as the affiliation motive (Housten, 1985). Most people need the protection offered by group members. Human beings differ on the need for the company of others. In Meichenbaum (1989), words, people who tend to seek out others, value being with them, and care about them are said to be exhibiting a need for Affiliation. Such people have learned that others can offer comfort and support; can provide informations important to attaining goals and can act as models or activate one on to greater efforts.
Costley and Todd (1983) opined that individuals can satisfy their needs in organizations by

(a) receiving approval and assurances from employees and managers; (athletes and sports administrators)

(b) conforming to the desires;

(c) helping and supporting, others in the organization and

(d) having frequent interpersonal contacts and good interpersonal relations.

Individuals with strong affiliation motivation tend to take jobs characterized by a high level of interpersonal interactions, such as public relations, personal, sales and teaching (Coaching). For individuals with high affiliation motivation, social relationship will usually take precedence over task accomplishment. Trying hard to get along with others and enjoying the company of others are indication of high affiliation motivation.

Costley and Todd (1983) further, stated that the satisfaction of employee’s affiliation needs can be beneficial to an organization. Research findings indicate that when employee’s affiliation needs are satisfied by association with others on the job, there is a decrease in absenteeism and turnover. Most individuals dislike being isolated and desire to have contact with other people.

Few studies have been conducted highlighting the relationship of need for Affiliation with coaching effectiveness. According to Steers and Porter (1979) man with strong need for Affiliation seek out jobs which offer opportunities for friendly interaction. People who have institutionalized helping roles such as teachers, nurses and counselors, also demonstrate strong need for Affiliation.
Boyatzis (1984) observed individuals with a high need for Affiliation would strive for approval from his subordinates and superiors; he would be sensitive to other's facial expressions and their feeling (Atkinson and Walker, 1956).

Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) reported that effective “integrators” (coaches whose function is to integrate the work of various people or units) rank higher in the need for Affiliation than their less effective peers. Boyatzis (1972) tried to resolve these contradictory results by proposing a new theory of affiliation motivation in which he claimed that there are two forms of the motive; one is called affiliative interest. With these two types of affiliation motivation in mind, prior findings are reconciled into clear pattern of behavior; one would lead to effective job performance and the other would not. A preliminary attempt to separate the affiliative assurance motive from the affiliative interest motive demonstrated support for Boyatzis’s theory, but lacked enough substantial results to consider it as a definite theoretical and methodical solution to the problem of measuring affiliation motives. Boyatzis (1984) stated that a manager with a high affiliative assurance motive will basically be concerned about obtaining assurance as to the security and strength of his close relations.

Bock (1980) tried to elucidate the complex of motivation and to analyze it's components with the aim to illustrate difference between self motivation and strange motivation of the coach as well as the changes in the structure of motivation due to the change in age and the degree of occupational involvement.

According to Ouchi (1981) a coach’s major role is to integrate the group into a smooth working unit that perform effectively with a sense of pride, excellence and collective identity. To achieve these ends a coach should be firm but affectionate. He/ She must think in term of philosophy, values, goals and operating procedures set down for the team. A coach needs to realize that individual differences do exist among team members.
According to Carron (1980) sports groups possess a sense of unity or collective identity, a sense of shared purpose or objectives, structural patterns of interactions, structured mode of communication personal and/or task independence and interpersonal attraction.

**Need for power**

McClelland (1975) explained power motivation as the desire of individuals to exert control over the events that affect their lives. According to Steers and Porter (1979) if a man spends his time thinking about the influence to win an argument, to change other people's behavior, or to gain a position of authority and status, then he has a high need for power.

Costley and Todd (1983) reported that power motivation was specifically related to an individual's relationship with other people. Every one has some concern for the impact they have on others and would like to have a degree of control in interpersonal relations. In short, the goal of power motivation is to feel powerful. Power is an important factor in the operation of any organization. An organization cannot function without people who have the motivation to obtain power and to influence the behavior of others. Leadership and power appear to be two closely related concepts.

Dubrin (1985) made a distinction between socialized power, i.e. people who crave power so that they can perform a social good and self-serving power, i.e. those who crave power to serve their own ends. Regins and Sundstrom (1989) stated that power has usually been defined as the property of the individual, of interpersonal relationship, or of a structure of an organization. These three approaches suggest a functional definition of power. They elaborated each of these approaches to need for Power.
(I) Need for Power as a property of the Individual

Early views of power from sociology and political science treated need for Power as an individual’s ability or perceived ability to influence others (Etzion, 1961) or to change other’s behavior (Weber, 1947; Dahl, 1957). These definitions treated power as a personality trait (Mc Clelland, 1975) or as an acquired skill.

(II) Need for Power as the property of Interpersonal relationship

According to Pfeffer (1981) a person only has power with respect to other individuals in specific relationships. Psychologists have viewed power as an aspect of interaction (Cartwright, 1959; Dansereau et al., 1975 and Yukl, 1981). This perspective focuses on dyadic processes and perceptions rather than on the qualities of the person.

(III) Need for Power as the property of the Organization

Mechanic (1962) opined that power results from access to and control over persons, informations and resources, which comes from the individuals position in an organization. Power also has been treated as the capacity to affect outcomes or goals in organizations. (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1974, 1977 and Mintzberg, 1983) and as a structural phenomenon created by the division of labour (Pfeffer, 1981). Regins and Sundstorm (1989) gave functional definition of power as: “Influence by one person over others, stemming from a position in an organization, from an interpersonal relationship, or from an individual characteristic.”

Characteristics of individuals high on need for power

According to Mc Clelland (1975) individuals with a high institutional power orientation have the following characteristics. They feel responsible for developing an effective organization; they like work and doing things in an orderly way;
they are willing to sacrifice some of their self interest for the welfare of the organization; they believe people should receive just rewards for their efforts, and they are more mature and willing to get advice from others.

Foder and Farrow (1979) demonstrated that individuals high on the need for Power showed partiality towards ingratiating followers. Foder and Simith (1982) found that high power motivated individuals inhibit group discussions more than low power motivated individuals. As a result, the number of alternatives considered were fewer and the quality of decisions lower for groups led by high power motivated individuals.

Mc Clelland, (1985) identified that high power motivated individuals became more highly activated when supervising others than low power individuals. Males high on need for Power reported that they had more, had less stable interpersonal relations, favored more assertive foreign policies, experienced more emotional problems and were more impulsively aggressive than males low on need for Power.

Singh’s (1986) results indicated that subjects scoring higher on need for Power tended to be reserved, forth right trusting, conservative group adherents, interested in people, and less interested in economic values. Thus coaches on high need for Power would behave differently than coaches low on need for Power. House and Singh (1987) reviewing concept of power motive and leadership performance and executive success have been recently reported in psychological literature.

Costley and Todd (1983) indicated that power motivation can result in personal power and institutional power. Personal power can be thought as “power over” and institutional power as “power with” others.

Individuals with personal power try to be dominant. They can be inspirational and gain strong personal loyalty from others. They may reject organizational responsibility and focus on their desire to be in a superior position. Personal power has been associated with
being aggressive, acquiring prestige symbols and developing dominance submission relationships.

The individuals with institutional power is concerned with organizational problems and actions that will result in attaining organizational objectives. They concentrate their efforts on influencing others to make commitments of effective performance. They do not try to obtain personal submission or to dominate individuals and wants loyalty to the organizations. Helping people to identify and achieve group goals, and providing support for individual effort, are characteristics of power style.

Some investigators have also investigated the relationship between coaching effectiveness and need for Power.

According to Nesivg (1980) it is important to conduct regular team meetings to allow both positive and negative feeling to be expressed in an open, honest constructive manner. Schein (1980) points out that locomotion of the group is a motivational construct. For efficient locomotion some integrative function from an authority figure is needed to ensure the coordination of group members.

Need for approval

Crowne and Marlow (1964) have developed the construct of the need for Approval. They have described a person high on approval motive as an individual who needs to gain approval constantly from others, who is afraid of rejection if he behaves unlike others and who often conforms to group pressures and cultural norms. The goals and needs of the approval dependent person would appear to include social recognition and status, protection and dependency, love and affection. It is assumed that the high need for Approval individual has learnt that conformity submission and the normative
anchoring of his behavior entail the fewest risks of social rejection and threats to self esteem.

Individuals dependent up on the favorable evaluations of others appear to have difficulty in recognizing and contending with hostility. Individuals with high need for Approval are more “normal” and reflect the values of a particular culture to which they belong. They say the right things about themselves, appear to hold ‘proper’ attitudes, reflect common language usage in their associations, set goals of acceptability intermediate risk, do not show hostility and seem in general to reflect the congeries of virtues defining the ‘adjusted’ individual. On close scrutiny, however, those identified as approval dependent seem to resolve some social and personal conflict in ways that result endearment to themselves (Crowne and Marlow, 1964).

Crowne and Marlow (1964) regarded need for Approval as a single personality characteristics and included in need for Approval both “dependence on evaluation of others” and “avoidance of self criticism.” Other researchers (Jacobson and Ford, 1966; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977) stated that the construct is composed of two components; the approach or the attribution component, which is the tendency to attribute desirable characteristics to oneself, and the avoidance or the denial component, which is the tendency to deny undesirable characteristics in oneself. They argued that it is possible that some people try to defend themselves against negative evaluations but do not try to gain a positive evaluation from others. Several investigators identified moderately significant correlation between the two components. (Ford, 1964; Greenwald and Calusen, 1970; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977) Rum and Court (1971) and Millham (1974) found different relationship between the two components and certain behaviors. These results suggest that the two components are partially independent of each other.
Label (1982) in his review said that it was reasonable to assume that parental practices which emphasize the importance of approval by others and conformity to social norms and conventions would tend to increase need for Approval in their children. It is also logical to assume that child-rearing variables that would foster fear of rejection and low-self esteem would be related to need for Approval. Two groups of child-rearing variables have been identified to increase the child’s need for Approval:

(I) The mother’s use of withdrawal of love and
(ii) Mother’s stress in sex-role appropriate behavior.

Label (1982) hypothesized that the use of withdrawal of love would be positively correlated with need for Approval and tested it in his study. The rationale was that mothers who used withdrawal of love increase their children’s fear of rejection. The children would learn that love is contingent upon approval. They would seek approval by parents in order not to endanger their love. Label (1982) hypothesized that the use of love withdrawal would be related to both components of need for Approval, as it involves both defense against negative evaluation and wish for positive evaluation.

Label’s study found support for this hypothesis for girls only but not for boys. The implication is need for Approval has different meaning for males and females. Crandall (1966) concluded that socially desirable responses were related to social interaction in girls and to achievement motivation in boys. There are studies that suggest that females are motivated by the desire for love rather than mastery even in achievement situation.

Males, on the other hand, are motivated toward mastery (Hoffman, 1972). Sears et al. (1957) found that girls were more often disciplined by love oriented techniques than were boys. Barry et al. (1957) demonstrated that there were pressure towards obedience and nurturance in girls and towards self reliance and achievement in boys. All these studies suggest that females relate approval to love and interaction. Hence, socialization process
dealing with love and interaction are related to need for Approval in females and not in males.

**COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND MOTIVATIONAL PATTERN**

Several studies have been done to investigate the motivational pattern of successful/effective managers. Chatterji et al. (1988) reported that managerial motivation was definitely related with managerial effectiveness. Various researchers still reviewed studies relating managerial effectiveness with a combination of needs, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval.

Steers and Porter's (1979) review of studies of motivation of managers has revealed that although strong achievement motivation differentiated the successful managers from others individuals, the men in top management, and particularly origination presidents were strongly motivated by the need for Power. McClelland and Boyatzis (1982) studied leadership motive pattern. As predicted, the leadership motive pattern (moderate to high need for Power, low need for Affiliation and high activity inhibition) was significantly associated with managerial success.

On the basis of McClelland's (1962) discussion, Wainer and Rubin (1984) tested the proposition that the degree to which an entrepreneur is motivated by need for Achievement directly influence his skill and consequently his performance. The major hypothesis tested concerned the relationship between an entrepreneur’s level of need for Achievement and his company’s performance. In addition to the relationship between need for Achievement and company performance, the authors were interested in the relationship among three needs- need for Achievement, need for Power and the need for Affiliation, with respect to company’s performance.
Wainer and Rubin (1984) proposed that need for Achievement has behavioral manifestations different than either need for Power or need for Affiliation in terms of the individual’s relationship with people. The authors believe that need for Power and need for Affiliation are interpersonal oriented needs. Implicit in their definition is the existence of human beings whom the need for Power or need for Affiliation motivated individual can influence and control, or with whom he can be friends. The need for Achievement, on the other hand, appeared to be a more internalized need. The need for Achievement motivated individual, may need other people to help him satisfy his need for Achievement, but the nature of his relationship with them, or more appropriately his effectiveness with them, will be determined by other needs. The authors concluded that need for Achievement is a primary consideration determining non-interpersonal related behavior which leads to higher performance. It was believed that need for Power and need for Affiliation are primary considerations deterring interpersonal behavior that affects performance. Thus need for Power and need for Affiliation, may be looked upon on as having strong implications of management style.

Yaney (1988) reported that different levels of employees with many different aspiration were influenced by varied motivations.

Veroff (1969) suggested that comparing themselves in sporting activities may be the domain in which young boys utilize social comparison process in order to determine their standing among their pears and thereby determining their self worth. Duda (1981) assessed the perceptions of high school boys and girls relate to their preferred domains of achievement. She looked at both class room and play field contexts and investigated four general categories - team Vs individual context and competitive Vs non-competitive context. Students, then were asked to choose, either the class room or playing field. Boys
preferred class room context. This confirm Coleman (1961), Roberts (1978, 1980); Scalan (1978); and Veroff (1969).

The review seems to be equivocal regarding what would be the motivational pattern associated with coaching effectiveness. There is some direction that different motive patterns are required by coaches in different hierarchical levels to be effective.

**COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE**

**Quality of working life**

People work for a living is one of the basic activities in a man’s life. Quality of work life is connected with quality of life. Those interested in the welfare of employees have been forced to analyze quality of work life and its impact on human well being. Efforts are being made to make work more and more satisfying experience which lead to the development of the “Quality of work life” movement.

Social scientists in general and psychologists in particular, have tried to identify what motivates the people to work. It involves gradual development and application of various concepts such as job enlargement, job enrichment, organizational structure and climate, organizational effectiveness, job design, worker participation, organizational development, etc. Further this leads to the filtering out the concept of Quality of Working Life (QWL) from a variety of studies conducted in industrial and organizational psychology and related fields.

Pomonis and Baumgartel (1980) identified three major problems experienced by the industrial societies. The first was a widespread dissatisfaction among the employees towards the organization in which they were employed. The second was the declining growth of labour productivity. The third was the growing recognition of the role of
individuals “Quality of Work life” in physical and mental health, family and community well being.

The term “Quality of working Life” (QWL) first appeared in the early 1970’s and has since increasingly found it’s ways into the professional management literature. It now commands the attention of every effective supervisor and manager (Mali, 1981). Changes or developments, commonly referred to as job structuring, work organization, job enrichment or job design are apparently incorporated with in the spectrum of humanization of work or quality of working life. (International Labour Organization, Geneva, 1977)

Davis (1972) at an international conference at Arden Hous, New York, has coined the term Quality of Working Life. (Reddy, 1985) The British coal mining industry and the Norwegian shipping industry carried out a lot of profound diagnostic work regarding the impact of job structures, and technology and quality of working life in the 1950’s (Trist and Bramforth, 1957; Herbert, 1954 and Aubert and Arner, 1959). Quality of work life is basically permitting “every employee to develop himself through his work and to take on responsibility” (Gulowsen, 1971).

“The Quality of Working Life is an indicator of how free the society is from exploitation, injustice, inequality, oppression and restrictions on the continuity of growth of man, leading to his development to the fullest” (De, 1975). Thus, Quality of Working Life and the quality of life in society have a direct link.

Spink (1975) defined the Quality of Working Life as “the degree of excellence in work and work conditions, which contribute to the overall satisfaction of the individual and enhances the individual as well as the organizational effectiveness.”

According to Glaser (1976) the term “Quality of Working Life” has become more important, in the recent years, than job security, good working conditions, adequate and fair compensation and more than even equal employment opportunity or job enlargement.
The quality of work life requires an organizational climate and structures which encourage, facilitate, reward or suggest means and methods to improve the existing conditions.

Glaser (1976), further attempted to combine different definitions into whole and outlined quality of work life activities as follows:

Achieving sustained commitment from management to an open non-defensive style of operations that includes sincerely inviting employees to speak up regarding problems or opportunities.

Establishing a work environment that encourages continuous learning, training and active interest regarding both the job and the product or service to which the job contributes.

Making the job itself more challenging by structuring it so that an individual can self-manage and feel responsible for a significant, identifiable output if that kind of responsibility is desired.

Affording opportunities for continued growth, that is, opportunities to advance in organizational or career terms.

Training of supervisors and equip them to function effectively in a less directive, more collaborative style.

Breaking down the traditional status barriers between management and production or support personal achieving atmosphere of open communication and trust between management and the force.

Providing not only feed back with regard to results achieved, the recognition for good results but also financial incentives such as cost-saving sharing where feasible. Evaluating and analyzing results, including failures, leading to revised efforts toward continual improvement.
A typical quality of work life philosophy revolves around creating trust, growth equity and excellence in the organizational setting. (Barnes, 1979).

Nadler and Lawler (1982) stated that there were two “destructive elements” of quality of work life programs. The first is a concern of the impact of work on people and second is the concept of employee involvement and participation in decision and problem solving. According to them the functional definition of Quality of Working Life is a way thinking about people, work and organizations. The focus of Quality of Working Life is not only how people can do work better, but on how work may cause people to be better.

Delamotte and Takezawa (1984) added that the concept of “Quality of Working Life” and “Quality of Life” emerged relatively recently in the industrialized nations where English was the primary language. Several other countries used synonyms like “Humanization of work”, “Improvement of working conditions”, “Workers protection”, “Working environment”, and “Democratization of the work place.”

Sorensen et al. (1985) suggests that quality of working life programs are purposeful efforts to change the organization from a traditional model to one based on new assumptions, behaviors and values.

Van Plestsen and Francois (1987) defined quality of working life as one of the main out puts of the process of mutual interaction between the structural elements of an organization, viz. the individuals, formal managements, dominant coalition environment, task and the social system. The level of Quality of Working Life is a function of personality factors and the consequence of the medium term, and the adaptability of the elements over the long term. Quality of working life forms part of the organizational functioning as well as individual motivation.

According to Wyatt (1988) Quality of Working Life (QWL) is qualitative concept. It is a sense of overall well being with the work process from the perspectives of both
employer and employee. It involves the notion of a quality working experience. Quality of Working Life means, at the upper and a working experience that is physically and spiritually life enhancing. This life enhancing characteristic is from both the perspective of the employee and organization.

Quality of working life in India

Ganguli and Joseph (1971), De (1977) and Sinha (1977) were the few who tried to approach Quality of Working Life from a psychological perspective. Sinha and Sayeed (1980) reported that in the Indian setting work has already been initiated on quality of working life by many, but a major head way is yet to be made. The orientation to quality of working life remained sociological, but gradually shifted towards psychological aspects of quality of working life.

Dimensions of quality of working life

The concept of Quality of Working Life (QWL) is multidimensional. Walton (1972) contributed certain conceptual categories for Quality of Working Life. They are as follows:

(i) Adequacy in compensation;
(ii) Safe and healthy working conditions;
(iii) Immediate opportunity for continued growth of security;
(iv) Social integration in the work organization;
(v) Opportunity to use and develop human capabilities;
(vi) Constitutionalism in the work organization;
(vii) Work and total life space;
(viii) Social relevance of work life;
Joseph (1978) suggested four dimensions; viz. growth, mastery, involvement and self control. Ghosh and Kalra (1982) delineated fifteen dimensions. Sinha and Sayeed (1980) recommended seventeen dimensions in their scale of Quality of Working Life (QWL). These dimensions are: Economic Benefit (EB), Physical Working Conditions (PWC), Career Orientation (EO), Advancement on Merit (AM), Effect on Personal Life (EPL), Mental State (MS), Union Management Relation (UMR), Self Respect (SR), Supervisory Relationship (R.S.), Intra-group Relations (IR), Sense of Achievement Versus Apathy (A), Confidence in Management (CM), Meaningful Development (MD), Control (C), Influence and Participation (IP), Employee Commitment (EC), General Life Satisfaction (GS), and Organizational Climate (OC). The present study also has used the Quality of Working Life inventory (QWL) developed by Sinha and Sayeed (1980).

The importance of studying Quality of Working Life has been identified by several researchers. The Quality of working life was found to be related to job satisfaction and job involvement (Goodman, 1980; Sayeed and Sinha, 1981; Yager, 1981; De Jong and Verghege, 1985; Montgomery, 1986 and Fisher, 1988), greater worker participation, improved product quality, improved working condition, cost reduction, over all workers satisfaction and lower absent rate (Yager, 1981; Ferris and Wagner, 1985; Williamson, 1985; Marks et al, 1986 and Bacialetti, 1987), worker’s health and safety (Becker, 1986), motivation (Yager, 1981).

Coaching effectiveness and quality of working life

Organizational structure plays a vital role in developing the human personality. (Mc Gregor, 1980; Emery and Emery, 1975; Strauss, 1976 and Datta, 1976). Greenberg et al. (1969) found in their study that the corporate culture based on direction and control does not provide adequate authority for making decisions. Such structure lack
democratization and discourage the jobs that allow for individuality, self expression, advancement to the top position. Such structures de-emphasizes self actualization, hinders personal growth and creativity (Argris, 1957; Arkoff, 1974 and Srinivasa, 1976).

Sinha (1980) has exposed the relationship between organizational climate and managerial styles. With the help of factor analysis, he identified certain important climate factors viz. authoritarian task orientation, status acceptance, working conditions, efficiency, involvement, interpersonal relationship, work relationship and bureaucratic climate. He concluded that the organizational efficiency and executive job satisfaction were influenced primarily by the organizational climate and only moderately by the socio cultural values and union strength.

Grosch (1986) studied participative decision making and quality of working life. He found that by the end of his study, operating room staff in the three quality, circles improved significantly in measures of involvement, job stress and burnout due to depersonalization. Randsepp (1987) offered twenty four guidelines for creating an organizational culture that harnesses and focuses employees energies to achieve innovative results. The following are the suggestions: 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.

Nakra (1971) stated that the public sector in India is a victim of the absence of well defined policies and the presence of suffocating atmosphere of suspicion, mistrust, lobbying and patronage. Consequently managerial motivation deteriorates under such circumstances in public sector organizations.

Monga and Maggu (1981) have reported that the perceptions of organizational members about various organizational parameters determines significantly their
commitment to organization and work. They attempted to find out the quality of working life’s influence on the individual and organizational health of the public sector in India. They concluded that the Quality of Working Life in the Indian public sector is poor and there exists a significant gap what managers expect and what they have. They concluded that there was too much bureaucratization, rule-orientation and adherent of traditional management styles in public sector organizations. Monga and Maggu (1981) further opined that the quality of corporate functioning exercise an important influence on individual behavior.

Hartenstern and Huddleston (1984) reported that for Quality of Working Life measures to be successful, management must have shaved values with workers. Leigh and Futrell (1985) administered, to 395 marketing managers enrolled in an executive employment program, the Job Descriptive Index to measure job satisfaction, a demographic questionnaire and measures of perception and attitudes related to social power, management control systems and organizational climate. They reported that subjects at higher managerial levels had more favorable perceptions of their jobs and were more satisfied with them.

Dillon and Shuja (1990) investigated the relationship of age, tenure and job level to perceptions of work and work environment. The data analysis revealed

(a) a significant difference between managers and non-managers in their perception of work and work environment and
(b) perception of work and work environment was found to be positively correlated with age, tenure and job level.

Researches above justify the conclusion that the perception of quality of working life would vary according to the coaching level and the games involved with their coaching.
programs. No such opinions can be made regarding the coaching effectiveness and perceptions of quality of working life.

**COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND OCCUPATIONAL STRESS**

Stress is the state of strain whether physical or psychological. Coaching effectiveness depends on several factors. They are human characteristics, training attitudes, motivation and other type of variables concerning the work and working conditions. The different criteria used for determining the working condition of individuals are physiological, psychological, and work performance (coaching effectiveness).

**Discipline problems and occupational stress**

Good and Brophy (1978) opined discipline problems are often the major source of frustration for teachers the one factor which detracts more than any thing else from instructional effectiveness (Sirotnik, 1982); a major reason why teachers leave the field (Chapmann and Hutcheson, 1982); the most anxious concern expressed by parents of students; (Gallup, 1982) and the public in general (Perry and Tayler, 1982).

According to Manesa and Wright (1980) discipline is not a major factor in teaching effectiveness; not the biggest source of frustration (Glickman and Wolfgang, 1979); nor a major reason why teachers quit (Alley, 1980). Discipline is simply one of the things required by the job, but it can be dealt with through good class management. (Ban, 1982).

**Occupational stress**

Stress and Burnout are words that have recently become associated with teaching. Burnout is chromic, cumulative stress with no relief. One cause can be loss of interest in
the profession. (Derick and Dishner, 1982). In such cases burnout is characterized by lack of energy, a sense of low professional worth and a feeling of helplessness to do anything about it. It is found most commonly in the 35-45 age group (Cardinell, 1980).

Research in variety of profession show that workers generally experience changed feeling and commitment to their work as they progress through life and careers (Hunter, et al., 1980)

**Occupational stress and coaches**

It appears that coaches who leave the profession voluntarily have an active career of only about fifteen years. (Fordham and Leaf, 1978). During those fifteen years typical coach will hold six positions, differing in responsibility (Assistant coach, head coach and so on) or in geographic location (Fuoss and Troppmann, 1981).

Some reasons for leaving the profession are listed in a survey by Lackey (1977) who polled ex-coaches who had quit voluntarily. The major reason given was a desire to enter another field of employment. Other factors cited were personal reasons, jobs pressures and disenchantment with the coach/player relationship.

Married coaches, especially with children, are commonly plagued by the amount of time they must spend away from home, and this, too, may be a principal reason for quitting. A prospective or a novice coach may have a tendency to over look this factor, yet it often produces critical role conflict for men and women who coach (Sabock and Jones, 1978).

Another possible reason coaches leave is because the profession characteristically induces an early “burnout”; coaches can no longer cope with stress. Symptoms include perceiving the job as over wheeling, questioning one’s own coaching effectiveness feeling
helpless and out of control, tiring easily, depression, impatience and generally a negative attitude towards the job. (Malone and Rotella, 1981).

According to Robert E. Gesemer (1984) coaching has a high stress factor that it magnifies all emotions and compresses a normal career span into shorter time frame. While any occupation can sooner or later produce burnout, with coaching it often is sooner. There is evidence that:

1. Most people entering the coaching profession should expect a short tenure and
2. Prospective coaches should also prepare for another occupation, so they are ready for the day when they leave coaching.

One of the reasons why coaches leave the profession before the retirement age is because of difficulties in relating to the athlete themselves. It is also the major reason for being fired (Lackey, 1977). One of the earliest and still widely cited investigations of coaches (Ogilvie and Tutko, 1966) concluded that the personality characteristics of many coaches often made it difficult for them to relate effectively to athletes. They noted the tendency of coaches to be inflexible, conservative and insensitive to emotional needs of athletes.

The role conflict expressed by a coach is at least in part, a product of the human inclination to complain about hard work (Locke and Massengale, 1978). The conflict if compounded by coaches concerned with winning above all else, even with out any pressure from the community, the administration or the student body (Massengale, 1977).

According to Wu ying (1991) a significant relationship was found between the role stress and the occupation of teachers/coaches. Coaches were more likely to experience role stress at a higher level resulting from the coaching role. Excessive time/energy demand was the single greatest source contributing the role stress. Those who coached team sports were more likely to experience role stress at a higher level. To cope with the
Role stress teacher/coaches were more likely to balance their commitment to both roles. In general, gender was not a factor contributing to the role stress.

Marshall and Cooper (1979) suggest seven sources of managerial stress:

(i) Job (working condition, overload)
(ii) Organizational role (Role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility)
(iii) Relationship at work (relationship with superiors, relationship with colleagues)
(iv) Career development (Lack of job security, status incongruity)
(v) Organizational structure and climate.
(vi) Extra organizational matters (mobility)
(vii) The individual (psychosomatic characteristics, behavior pattern, self-help literature).

Kalusner (1968) opines, “success in business, sport and politics depends on stress seeking tendency.” As far as coaching is concerned, job satisfaction arises from the environment, the condition in which he works, availability of sports equipment, ground (play fields) conditions, the availability of potential athletes, and the appropriate efficient sports management.

**GENERAL HEALTH CONDITION AND COACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

“Health is the state of complete physical, mental and social well being and merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (Thomas Parun, 1945). According to More House and Miller (1976), physical fitness is the quality of the whole body in terms of its state of adaptation of physical activity.

Gensemer (1991) defines health as general condition of the body often expressed as a three-dimensional physical, mental, and social make-up but usually meaning physical ‘soundness’ that enables one to function in a state of well being.
Lamb (1975) opines “Physical fitness is the capacity to meet the present and potential physical challenges of life with success. According to Noble (1986) the psychological benefit of exercise is something therapeutic about exercise. Perhaps it is an emotional outlet way to reduce feeling of stress. May be it is the pleasurable sensation of having the body to operate at a high level. Or perhaps it’s the satisfaction of knowledge one is doing something good for oneself. It might even be due to changes in blood or brain chemistry. Whatever the reason the exercise can refresh the mind. It is reported to generate a more positive self-image, a better ability to relax, and a heightened mental alertness.

Wellness is not just a state of being but a life style-a mind-set that implies an active, positive approach to health. In the past, health was commonly defined as the absence of disease. By contrast wellness is a process where by an individual actively pursues an optimal development of the physical self through constructive use and management of all life choices that influence health. It induces self-responsibility for physical fitness, sound nutritional habits, alcohol and drug control, stress management, smoking, cessation, weight management, and all other matters of comprehensive well being. (Rosato, 1986).

**General health condition and work capacity**

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 demands of activity. Certain critical factors determine an individuals work capacity for a given task. It matters not whether the task is ‘work’ or play. Levy, et al., (1946) opines high blood pressure was two and half times more prevalent in army officers who where over weight as in those not over weight.
McArdle and Katch (1986) identified that the health risks of obesity and documented; they include impairment of cardiac function, hypertension, diabetes, renal disease, gallbladder disease, pulmonary disease, several types of cancer, high cholesterol levels and a psychological burden. Haskell (1989) says, persons who are over weight are very likely to have directly correlated low level of fitness indicating that weight problems occur from both over eating and under moving.

Over weight, inactive individuals can achieve a more desired weight by caloric restriction and increased energy expenditure, with best result occurring when both are modified (Zuti and Golding, 1976). Menninger (1948) reports that who participate in hobbies are less apt to suffer mental illness.

According to Blair et al., (1989) attaining a certain level of fitness reduces health risks. Many individuals, especially children are still not at the fitness levels associated with enhanced health (Ross et al., 1985; Ross and Pate, 1987). However, new research efforts have shown that physical activity, even at moderate levels, has positive effect on health (Flectcher, et al., 1992; Casperson, 1987).

McSwegin et al., (1989) define physical fitness as the ability to handle normal physical demands of life engage in a variety of leisure activity and still able to function effectively in emergency situation.

According to Robert, (1991) the executives in-training were getting their leadership skill in readiness but in the mean time their health was being ignored. So the corporations, not wanting to lose their qualified executives, began to channel resources into programs that would keep their employees physically able. Ellis (1988) states that the return of the fitness programs became realized in cost containment of medical care and in 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.

**IMPULSIVENESS, EMPATHY, VENTURESOMENESS AND COACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

Impulsiveness refers to a tendency in individuals to evaluate a situation as being potentially dangerous or risky. Empathy is a unique capacity of human beings to feel the experience as if they were his/her own. It is the trait of being sensitive to others or understand another person’s condition. Venturesomeness refers to a tendency in individuals to perceive risk but to choose to take a gamble.

**Impulsiveness**

Personality theorists regard impulsively as an elusive and controversial concept though it has been widely used by clinicians and lay people. Impulsively is often included as part of the symptom pattern of a wide range of psychopathological learning, social disorders, hyperactivity, violent and aggressive behavior (Kolb, 1972 and Eleftheriou and Scott, 1971) and childhood disorders. Eysenck’s (1947, 1969) three dimensional model of personality is a hierarchical one which conceptualizes that each of the three broad higher order personality dimensions viz., Introversion Extroversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism are subdivided at a lower level in to narrower and more specific traits. Eysenck and Eysenck (1969) have chosen to concentrate on the highest level of analysis i.e. the supertraits of Psychoticism, Extroversion and Neuroticism as they are more replicable across sex, age and nationalities. Apart from these three higher order dimensions of personality, other dimensions of personality such as Impulsively, Empathy
and Venturesomeness (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1977, Barratt and Patton, 1983 and Schalling, et al., 1983) have also been proposed.

Impulsiveness has been defined by Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) as a generalized state of high arousal which is characterized by hasty responsiveness, carefree manner, impatience or low impulse control. In the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental disorders -III (1980), the criteria given for identifying impulsively in an individual are "at least three" of the following:

1. Often acts before thinking.
2. Shifts excessively from one activity to another.
3. Has difficulty in organizing work.
4. Needs a lot of supervision.
5. Frequently calls out in class.
6. Has difficulty awaiting turn in games or group situations."

(American Psychiatric Association, 1980)

Impulsiveness has been shown to be a multidimensional factor. Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) divided impulsiveness into separate oblique factors of narrow impulsiveness, risk-taking, non planning and liveliness. Impulsiveness has been found to be related to the eyelid conditioning performance of subjects (Fracka and Martin, 1987). Subjective well being (Emmons and Diener, 1986); antisocial behavior (Eysenck, 1981) and electroencephalograph defined arousal (O' Gorman and Lloyd, 1987).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) undertook a study to discover the relationship between the factors of impulsiveness and fundamental factors of Psychoticism, Extroversion and Neuroticism. Results showed that the traits of impulsively correlated positively with Extroversion, Psychoticism and Neuroticism. Impulsiveness correlated
negatively with Lie (Social Desirability) scale. Which is probably an indication of low conventionality of high impulsiveness scores.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) concluded that there was enough evidence to establish impulsiveness as primary factor of personality. Eysenck (1981) found that Impulsiveness aligned primarily with Psychoticism and to a minor degree with Extroversion and Neuroticism. Zuckerman (1983) found that persons who scored high on measures of impulsively also tended to score high on Psychoticism. Schalling et al., (1988) reported that Impulsiveness was positively related to Neuroticism and Psychoticism.

**Empathy**

The term empathy is of comparatively recent origin, having been coined by Titchener in his book Elementary Psychology of the thought process (1909). Here he wrote, "Not only do I see gravity and modesty and pride and courtesy and stateliness, but I feel or act them in the mind’s muscle. That is I suppose, a simple case of empathy, if we may coin that term as a rendering of Einfühlung." Conceptually, however, the notion of Empathy, or Einfühlung, grew out of earlier works in aesthetics by Visher (wind, 1963) and in Psychology by Lipps (1903, 1905) and Pandtl (1910).

Lipps (1903) was one of the most important in this connection because he systematically organized the concept of Einfühlung. He meant by it the tendency for the perceivers to project themselves into the objects of perception a kind of animism. This process may blur the distinction between self and object, but Lipps (1903) maintained that it was from one’s feeling of various inner activities in connection with both social and physical objects of perception that one become aware of such experiences as the ponderousness of the huge objects, the nobility in one’s bearing, and so forth. These
subjective qualities were experienced by the person as being in the object rather than about it. Objects were felt as well as seen.

When Titchener (1909) translated Lipp’s (1903) notion of Einfühlung as empathy, by way of the Green empatheia, it meant to preserve the idea of the self projected into the perceived object. Although eventually he shifted his emphasis from internal acts to content, what he meant by empathy was complicated and changeable. Who he coined the term, Titchener thought one could not know about the consciousness of another person by reasoning analogically from one’s own behavior to those of the other person. One could do this only by a kind of inner kinesthetic imitation, as he wrote, in the mind’s muscle. By the time his book “A Beginner’s Psychology” (1915) was published the concept of empathy had grown in importance. He wrote, “empathic ideas are psychologically interesting because they are the converse of perception. Their core is imaginable, and their context is made up of sensations that carry the empathic meaning.”

Empathy then referred to subjects awareness in imagination of the emotions of another person. But he went on to write that empathic tendencies were also “gross general tendencies to humanize and personalize our surroundings.” that provided for a kind of “free-masonry among all men.” Titchener (1909) thus harbingered two different concepts of empathy as a way of knowing.

In the past, the cognitive ability to discern others’ internal states was sometimes called “sympathy” (Mead, 1934; Cooley, 1902, 1956) as well as empathy, although the term sympathy was also used to denote the affective response to another’s emotional state (e.g., Mc Dongall, 1908, 1923, 1950 and Smith, 1759, 1948). Over the decades, empathy has been defined in a variety of ways. Some theorists and researchers have viewed empathy as social insight (Dymond, 1949, 1950). Others have defined empathy as the ability to comprehend the affective (and some times cognitive) status of another, that is, as
a cognitive accomplishment (Hogan, 1969; Broke, 1971, 1973; Deutsch and Maddly, 1975). Thus two of the words, which are very commonly and interchangeably used in literature, are 'sympathy' and 'empathy'. According to Webster's Third New International Dictionary, sympathy is the act or capacity of entering into or sharing the feelings or interests of another. The character or fact of being sensitive to or affected by another's emotions, experience or especially sorrows.” Empathy is defined as “the capacity for participating in a vicarious experience of another's movements to the point of executing bodily movements resembling his, “where as sympathy implies a sharing of the state of mind or feeling of another, empathy allows one to know what the other is experiencing, without actually feeling it (Macfarland, 1985).

Clark (1980) has identified four degrees of empathy:

(a) A complete lack of empathy, as in the egocentric person, the more such person focuses on self, the less empathic he is.

(b) A slight movement of empathy away from self to include close relations, or some of them.

(c) Empathy for others who have qualities and characteristics similar to those of the person who displays this type. Into this category fall the majority of the people. They display a eliqueishness that is characterized by empathy for people of the same race, religion, language, sex or status as themselves.

(d) Empathy characterized by sensitivity to the condition as feeling of all others. People at this level share the joys, sorrows, anguish, anger of those who rejoice, grieve, hurt or rage.

According to Davis (1983) empathy refers to the reactions of one individual to the observed experience of another. Eisenberg and Lennon (1983) opined that empathy involves feeling the same emotion as another person is feeling. According to Hickson
Ohbuchi (1988) defined empathy as the response process where perception of the suffering of a victim leads to sympathy.

Meaningful interactions among people requires that they be willing to construe each others point of view. Empathy—this tendency to apprehend another persons condition of state of mind is therefore a central concept in many theories of social behavior (Meeed, 1934; Dymond, 1950; Kelly, 1955; Greenson, 1960). Brull (1977) believed that empathic understanding is the foundation on which dialogic relationship of an intimate encounter between two individuals can be built. Franceson and Luisa (1985) opine that empathy is central to the development of social self and provides basis for all social communications.

Various researchers have found that the following characteristics (all indicative of maturity) are displayed by people with a high degree of empathy:

(i) The ability to enter, temporarily, into the imagination or identify feelings another and to identify with him.

(ii) The ability to accept what the other person says without making a judgment about it.

(iii) A wide variety of experiences and interactions with people, familiarity with books, theater, art, music, which will provide a fund on which to draw when trying to understand other’s experiences.

(iv) The ability to remain outside the other persons feelings, even while, understanding them empathically, this is necessary if one is to objective in looking at problems, and evaluating the other persons and oneself.
Coaching effectiveness and empathy

Empathy is the cornerstone of any intimate relationship between two individuals. The premise is that coach’s quality is equally an important factor like athlete factor in a coaching context in explaining the athlete performance. The coach is expected to possess certain qualities which are essential to facilitate learning in the sports fields. Maintaining proper relationship with athletes and other fellow coaches, being sensitive to the needs of the athletes empathizing with them is considered as an important criterion of coach effectiveness. Macfarland (1985) in a study also found that teachers who demonstrated a high level of empathy in their dealing with their students were more positive in their attitude to themselves, used more praise in the classroom, encouraged more student participation in class, and used the lecture method less often, than teachers who manifest low empathic relationships. When students need help, they look for those adults who have good helping qualities. They need some one who will listen patiently and with understanding and empathy.

Empathy of course should be two way according to Sutherland (1986). Possibly the perception that another is trying, however, unsuccessfully, to understand and enter into the individuals situation may be of some assistance, even if the other’s ‘empathy’ is very poor. Hence education which at least encourages the habit of emotional decentring, of trying to enter into the feeling of others, may be a positive gain, even if individuals (some more than others) still remain considerably limited by their own personality background and degree of cognitive control.

Research studies reviewed also clearly show good teachers to be empathic. Based on a factor analysis of student rating of college teachers on 19 descriptive phrases, Coffman (1954) extracted four factors which the considered important to effective teaching:
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One proposed description of effective teacher characteristics was offered by Mowrer (1960), who views the teacher primarily as a stimulus object who arouses emotional responses from his students. The teacher’s words, ideas, and content become conditioned stimuli for these responses: thus, the effective teacher, according to Mowrer, is one who arouses positive emotional reactions which, among other things, facilitates independent student involvement with the learning material.

Rayns (1960) demonstrated that the warm, systematic, stimulating teacher was the most effective teacher when the total population of children was examined. Veldman and Kelly (1965) reported that the effective teachers were friendly, admired, and exercised strict control and had a positive attitudes towards self, authority and reality were observed in the effective teacher group.

Pal and Bhagoliwal (1987) in their study of personality characteristics associated with Teacher Effectiveness, found through Ronschech Technique that more effective teachers had a higher intellectual level expression through their empathic and imaginative function.

The review unequivocally reveals that one of the most effective components of effective coaching is empathy. The present study is examining the same.

Venturesomeness

Venturesomeness is to take a gamble. Venturesomeness, which is defined as the tendency of people to perceive risk but to choose to take a gamble (Rawlings, 1984), is
regarded as subtrait of Extroversion (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) reported Venturesomeness to be a unidimensional scale. However, Pearson et al., (1986) and Heaven (19890 have recently questioned the unidimensionality of this scale by showing evidence of the existence of two factors, namely, risk taking and sensation seeking as components of venturesomeness scale in factor analytic studies.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) undertook a study to discover the relationship between the factors of Venturesomeness and the fundamental factors of Psychoticism, Extroversion and Neuroticism. Results showed that although the traits of Venturesomeness correlated positively with Extroversion and Psychoticism. No relationship emerged between Venturesomeness and Neuroticism. Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) concluded that there was enough evidence to establish Venturesomeness as one of the primary factors of personality.

COACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND BURNOUT

"Burnout is a disorder of professional individuals engaged in helping others characterized by impaired performance, loss of concern, poor morale, emotional problems and drug abuse. Burnout is presumed to be the result of prolonged high levels of demand and stress suffered by the victim" (J.P. Chaplin 1985)

Definition and Meaning of Burnout

One of the major obstacles in identifying the antecedent of burnout is lack of theoretical framework, including a functional operational definition of burnout. The burnout literature reveals that there is no single, accepted definition of burnout but rather a definition seem to fall in to three distinct categories symptom pattern of burnout
(Freudenberger, 1974) Stress related definition of burnout (Moracco, 1978) and both stress and symptom definition (Daley, 1979).

According to Webster International Dictionary (1976) burnout means “to fail, wear out or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy strength or resources. This definition suggests that burnout is the state of emotional exhaustion related to over load.

In definitions based on symptoms five categories of burnout symptoms have been included: cognitive, affective, emotional, behavioral and physical symptoms. The dimension on which there is most agreement is that exhaustion is present (Pines 1982) on the other hand, the work situation may be perceived and appraised as threatening which in turn causes an emotional response of stress. In the stress related definitions of burnout, burnout has conceptually been considered to be a consequence of that stress (Mattingly, 1977). Another group of researchers has included both symptoms and stress in the definition, Daley (1979) whose definition defined burnout as a reaction of job-related stress that varies in nature with the intensity and duration of stress itself. This reaction may result in workers becoming emotionally detached from their jobs altogether. They may suffer from high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and low levels of personal accomplishment. These one all associated with high levels of burnout.

The literature on burnout suggests that burnout is a multidimensional construct and which must be studied with in an interactional approach in order to gain as much as knowledge as possible. An interactional approach must look at the nature of the individual and the inter personal relationship within the social structure as contributors to the burnout problem.

Some investigators have looked at both individual and organizational causes of burnout (Berkeley Planning Associated, 1977; Gann, 1979). But many have focused on
only one of these aspects. The studies on individual factors related to burnout have not only examined personality (Fielding, 1982; Nagy, 1982), but other psychological factors (Pines, 1982) and democratic traits as well (Maslach and Jackson, 1978). Individual factors may determine how soon burnout begins and the severity of burnout, environmental, organizational and situational factors may be more important in determining the likelihood and incidence of burnout among all workers.

Several psychological and organizational factors have been linked the onset of burnout in helping professionals. For example role conflict and role ambiguity have consistently been found to be correlates of burnout (Pines and Kafry, 1978). Role conflict is defined as the degree of perceived conflict between expected role behavior. For example when the coach is pressurizing the athletic trainer to allow an athlete to return to action before the doctors has given the athlete clearance, giving the coach conflicting messages. Conflict may occur further, when the required behavior for the coach is not compatible with his/ her motives; abilities or moral values, e.g. having too many other duties (making travel arrangements, equipment manager, etc ) besides those for which the individual is specifically trained, and for which he/she entered the profession.

Maslach(1976) defined burnout as the “loss of concern for the people with whom one is working” in response to job related stress. For Maslach, many things can happen when job-related demands become excessive; burnout refers to one particular kind of response- the tendency to treat clients in detached mechanical fashion.

Though several literature is available on burnout, little has focused on professionals in athletics, such as coaches, trainers and athletes. The athletic trainer in particular, may be the one who is ‘at risk’ when it comes to the potential for burnout.
Teacher burnout

In recent years teacher burnout and teacher stress have become topic of public and professional concern. According to the Concise Dictionary of Education (1982) teacher burnout means "colloquial expression for conditions of teacher marked by several loss of professional enthusiasm, personal energy and possibly even mental or physical health due to acute stress and over work." It has been shown that when teachers needs for self actualization and self esteem are unfulfilled, there is higher probability of burnout.

Teacher burnout is the result of such stresses as student discipline problems, student apathy, over crowded class rooms, and shortages of available support staff, excessive paper work, excessive testing, involuntary transfers, inadequate salaries, lack of promotional opportunities, demanding parents, lack of administrative support, role conflict and role ambiguity and public criticism of teachers (Alshuler, 1980; Cichon and Koff, 1978; Dillon, 1978; Dunham, 1977; Feshback and Campell, 1979; Hensickson, 1979; Hunter, 1977; Johnson, 1979; Kyericou and Sutcliffe, 1977, 1978; Lorfite, 1975; Pratt, 1978; Read, 1979 and Scrivens, 1979.)

Predispositional factors may also contribute to teacher burnout. Bloch (1977) reports that teachers who are obsessional, passionate idealistic and dedicated (as measured by MMPI) are more prone to Ballered teachers syndrome.

Coaching effectiveness and burnout

The competitive athletics can be a highly demanding one from both physical and psychological perspective and one which is therefore capable of eliciting high levels of stress in participants. From youth setting to the professional level athletes and coaches must cope with the demands placed on them. Though very few scientific work has been done on this area it is evident that the burnout caused from the excessive stress do affect
the sports performance negatively. Coaching is characterized as a volatile profession involving many pressures. To keep their positions, coaches must win games and spend many long hours preparing for competition. “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).

Burnout has been studied since the early 1970’s. Freudenberger (1980) defined burnout as “a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward.” According to Capel (1986) there is no single operational definition. Many of the research studies completed on burnout have been limited to the helping professions, such as property lawyers, psychiatric nurses, police officers and social welfare workers” (Fender, 1989). In the recent years, a few studies have been completed on determining the burnout of coaches in four year colleges and high school coaches. (Caccese and Mayberg, 1984; Dale Weinberg, 1989; Sisley, et al., 1987); burnout in coaches of women’s team sport (Donna et al. 1992).

Coaches at different levels have begun to discuss the dangers of burnout in their profession. Elite athletes have dropped out of sports at the peak of their careers maintaining that they are “burned out” and the participation has become too aversive for them to continue. Concern about the large number of athletes who drop out of sports training during the adolescent years has been fueled by speculation that years of inappropriately intense competitive pressures during childhood may cause some youngsters to burnout and abandon sport participation (Orlich and Botterill, 1975). At situational level, a number of factors have been shown to contribute to burnout (Beehr and Newman, 1978; Berkely Alanning Associates, 1977; Pines and Arson, 1981; Shinn et al, 1984).
Burnout is a reaction of chronic stress (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1980) at the physiological level chronic stress produces tension, fatigue and irritability. Victims of Burnout begin to feel emotionally depleted and difficulty in experiencing positive emotions. Sleep related disorders increased susceptibility to physical illness and lethargy tend to occur. (Freudenberger, 1980). Team building program can increase team cohesion and the amount of social support available from teammates (Nideffer, 1981).

Burnout among athletic trainers and team physicians has also been addressed (Gieck, et al., 1982). As in the case of stress, certain individual difference variables increase the risk of burnout by influencing the balance between rewards and costs. To this point researchers have been more concerned with situational factors than with individual difference variables predictive of increased burnout potential. (Perlman and Hartman, 1982). Lack of autonomy created by autocratic coaches and low solidarity and social support are among the factors that have been associated with dropout in high school athletes (Robinson and Carron, 1982).

All these factors are capable of increasing the demand and costs of athletic participation for athletes and these factors may also relate in a direct manner to the stresses experienced by other members of the athletic community, such as coaches, administrators and trainers. On the other hand low levels of success and accomplishments reduce to reward value of participation (Gould et al., 1982).

According to Smith (1986) the burnout syndrome also has physical, mental and behavioral components and its development represent complex interactions, environmental and behavioral components and it develops personal characteristics. It’s notable feature is a psychological, emotional and at times physical with drawal based on a change in interest. An incompatible preferred alternative or a value reorientation, burnout results from an increase in stress induced costs.
Parents, coaches and team mates are important potential sources of social support for athletes and intervention programs which increase the amount and/or quality of support for athletes and intervention programs which increase the amount and/or quality of support can help tip the balance of the demands/resources scale in a positive direction. These may take the form of training program or resource materials that five parents and coaches behavioral guidelines for creating a more positive environment for young athletes (Smith, et al., 1979 and 1988). Among the most important and environmental resources is the availability of social support. Substantial empirical evidence indicates that social support act as an important buffer against stress in its own right. (Heller and Swindle, 1983; Sarason and Sarason, 1985).

In the ever-growing process of literature it is difficult to put a stop but it is necessary for the date bound projects like the one at hand. Because the main purpose is simply to highlight the problem, develop a reasonable background and to systematically collect and analyze the data to understand the coaching effectiveness and its correlates.