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The Coaching Summit

First European Executive Coaching Summit White Paper

Katrina Burrus, Ph.D., MA, MCC

As the European’s First Executive Coaching Summit, one of the key themes discussed was what could be the European contributions to executive coaching and what some of the different cultural perceptions of coaching were. Best practices in defining coaching processes and measuring success and how executive coaching links with leadership or organizational develop were debated. Another group analyzed, who is the client: the coachee or the organization? Where does executive coaching start? Is it linked to the leadership development or to the organizational development? Participants also were concerned with how to help formalize and legitimize executive coaching’s contribution to society and they debated the usable frameworks for operational results and socially responsible, sustainable development. Finally, the executive coaches present discussed the executive coaching of tomorrow and what topics needed to be further researched. The summit had a group of stimulating and experienced individuals that debated in a relaxed and congenial environment.

Background and Objectives
In response to the rapid growth of executive coaching in Europe, a number of executive coaches wanted to tap into their collective experience and insights to promote executive coaching as a profession for the service of society. After attending the first Executive Coaching Summit in North America, Philippe Rosinski proposed launching a European counterpart, building on the American experience while adding European insight. The First European Executive Coaching Summit was birthed with the sponsorship assistance of the International Coaching Federation (ICF). The Summit executive team consisted of Philippe Rosinski, President and Katrina Burrus, Vice President; committee members Jane Creswell, Stephan Oberli, Dominique Ringler, Michael Sanson and Bernard Sténier; and an advisory board composed of Maryvonne Lorenzen, Danièle Darmouni and Anita Hussl-Arnold.

For one and a half days, leading executive coaches would share best practices, and continue to form a community of executive coaches with a focus on European executive coaching. The venue was a resort hotel in Stresa, Italy.

Process and Design
The First European Executive Summit was designed to share best practices for coaches throughout the many countries on the European continent. On Monday, May 5th, 2003 the Summit was launched by a lunch with all the participants. That afternoon, participants were invited to create a collage depicting the changing demands that impact executive coaching today. Philippe Rosinski used an artistic activity to facilitate cultural intermixing and a means to reach a meaning beyond any particular cultural bias.

To give the readers a flavor of the collage experience, the
content of two collages with three bullet points summarizing the creators’ key messages are shown below. This exercise was to engage coaches authentically and help them identify what specifically was important to them. The implicit assumption was that coaches integrate their inner motives and values to how they perceive the executive coaching profession. Later on in day, participants took a motor boat to the island of the region “Isola Pescatore” for dinner. Interestingly enough, it was a U.S. participant who remarked on how many opportunities there were for participants to bond during the European Executive Coaching Summit.

The core of the exchange between coaches was on Tuesday, May 6th when key questions were distributed amongst teams. Coaches had signed their initials next to the questions of interest and the organizer tried to accommodate them by assigning a participant’s first or second choice to the different teams. After debating the topic within their teams, participants were asked to present their findings in the plenary session. This gave the opportunity to all participants to present, debate or add any comments to the current findings. The major portion of this white paper is a readout of each of the team reports. (Editors’ note: Though there were numerous graphics generated during the Summit and included in the original white paper, it was impossible to recreate them effectively for this journal article. As a result, we have tried to capture both the content and relationships amongst content for our readers.)

A large number of nationalities were present. Six participants were from France, five from U.K., five from Switzerland, four from Belgium, three from the U.S., two from Germany, and one each from Austria, Spain, Canada and China. Judy Feld, the ICF President in 2003, was invited to be present at the beginning of the summit and welcomed this opportunity to support and recognize the European executive coaching community.

Collages

Below are the verbal descriptions of the two collages that were created during this exercise. (Editors’ note: The accompanying visuals have not been included in the version of the white paper that appears in this journal.)

Collage 1

- Contrasts between professional demands for hard, impersonal performance and personal needs for inner peace and strength.
- Coaching draws male and female inner forces, between the fine (high heel shoes) and the sophisticated and the rough, brute force (racing car). Tensions in corporate life are depicted by ‘you eat me and/or I eat you’ (predators at the swamp).
- The coach’s role is to sharpen the executive’s focus of her/his options, to take risks by challenging the executive and by mirroring key observations and messages.
- The coach’s role is also to share the coach’s perceptions and it might be very hard for the executive to hear at times (man holding a woman’s face that is uncomfortable). The coaching dialogue is depicted by a close, confident and confidential relationship (man and woman face to face).
- The gem symbolizes both the coach’s positive regards towards his client and the gem within the person that is drawn toward serenity, purpose and one’s full potential.

Collage 2

- The eye sees everything: the big picture, the shocks (lightning), the human shortcomings...
(corporate and leadership ethics—“Men Confess”, the warlike approach of competition), the desire of people in industrialized countries for an easy and comfortable business life often now at a very high cost of all that for humanity (especially women, children, and people of color) as presently structured. Our opportunity is to develop a greater consciousness of how we relate to one another globally so that we can equalize the improvement of life, eliminate hunger and poverty, and create a more sustainable future.

There is a window onto another world, a vision of something much better that is possible, requiring leaders and executives to “wake up” and work interdependently in “teams” and cross culturally. The coach’s role is to stand with the leader on behalf of the big picture: how to handle and absorb the shocks (lightning), holding the vision of creating a sustainable human environment (the light of the candle). The wisdom of our ancestors (small ancient figures at the bottom) reminds us that we are part of a greater system and also stewards of this world (children). We need to leverage the developed relational skills of women (woman putting on her shoes) for more successful leadership (Goleman, Tom Peters, etc.) and for international assignments (Catalyst for Women Research Project). By Hannah S.Wilder, PhD., MCC

European Contributions

What are and could be the European contributions to executive coaching? The following suggestions were offered.

Cultural Sensitivity

Continental Europeans tend to have a heightened sensitivity to cultural differences due to many neighboring countries with different languages and customs. The European executive coaches in attendance at the summit had experience working with executives from very different geographical areas and nationalities. European coaches tend to bring this cultural sensitivity to their coaching work. As the CEO of Nestle, Peter Brabeck-Letmathe, stated, “Additionally, being a global company, our international managers need to be exposed to various cultural backgrounds. You cannot limit yourself to knowing just one culture, for you need to have an understanding of and respect for different national cultures.”

Exactly what this cultural sensitivity brings to the coaching community needs to be explored further. However, Philippe Rosinski, a cultural expert, mentioned, “traditional coaching has implicitly reflected particular norms, values, and basic assumptions that reflect the originating culture of the field of coaching, the United States, and do not necessarily hold true universally”4. He also defined culture as follows; “A group’s culture is the set of unique characteristics that distinguishes its members from another group …. And this encompasses both visible (behavior, language, artifacts) and invisible manifestations (norms, values, and basic assumptions or beliefs)”5. A coach who was culturally trained or multicultural could distinguish and make the most of alternative worldviews within the coaching process.
Conceptual vs. Pragmatic
North Americans are perceived as more entrepreneurial and with marked ability to popularize concepts and theory. UK coaches tend to be more academic than their North American counterparts. One executive coach expressed this in the following terms, “North Americans would set things in motion, whereas the English are keen to structure models and then bring those models to North America to popularize them.”

Work-Life Balance
Some executive coaches thought that Europeans were said to keep strong boundaries between work and leisure. North Americans talk about work-life balance but have more difficulty on average to implement it. Other participants perceived the work-life balance to be more integrated in the European culture in comparison to U.S. culture. For example, a U.S. coach added the following: “The summit was designed to let participants have a lot of room to bond at social events such as lunches and dinner and a half day was designed to have participants share what was more personal through exercises and collages.”

National Cultural Awareness
It was felt that there was more global awareness outside of North America of international/global connections and complexity. This complexity is the environment of many European executives. This global and cultural awareness is a source of strength that European coaches need to capitalize on. It is easier to be culturally aware when different countries, with different languages and cultural heritage are at your doorstep. It was felt that one of the top European contributions is the seriousness with which they take global executive coaching. This lends seriousness and sustainability to the profession. “Coaches, in general, need to be more culturally aware of their biases,” said Philippe Rosinski. The participants expressed their desire to create more cohesion among European ICF members so that executive coaches can have an impact as European group.

Earning Professional Credentials
Continental Europeans underpin the importance of having “earned” professional credentials through formal study. According to Margarete Krigbaum, a member of the board in charge of ICF credentialing, “There is more cultural acceptance of continuous professional education in Europe than in the US or in Australia.” Credibility is also more readily looked for through academic avenues in Europe. A question asked by several executive coaches was whether there should be a credentialing track for executive coaches.

Role of the State
The government’s influence is higher in continental Europe than in North America. This is particularly true in France: an example is France Telecom, a state-owned company. Gradually becoming privatized, France Telecom has at times had conflicting interests between the interest of the state and the interest in improving bottom-line shareholder value. This adds complexity to the executives’ decision-making process. Questions asked by the break-out team included ‘Should the CEO improve the company’s profitability as a top priority or should the objective be to keep as many civil servants as possible employed?’ However, it was also mentioned that in Singapore, where many organizations are government owned, coaches are even selected by the government. If the primary stakeholder is the government, the primary objective is most probably not the economic interest of the company but the political objectives of the government. Coaches need to be aware of the organization’s multiple stakeholders which might not be apparent initially.
Executive coaching is defined differently in different countries. On the one hand, the definition of “Executive” in French, Italian, or Spanish has a different connotation than in English. In English, the word executive emphasizes execution and implementation. “Dirigents,” in French or “dirigente” in Italian, on the other hand, emphasizes the management and direction. Implicit in the latter is the importance of hierarchy. A manifestation of this difference might be that French and Italian environment appear to be more hierarchical. Philippe Rosinski, a European coach, defines coaching as pragmatic humanism and distinguishes between the “being” that emphasizes self-care, quality of life and human growth with the “doing” that emphasizes getting results. “Doing”, being the dominant cultural orientation in American society, requires focused achievements with measurable standards whereas “Being” stresses living, development of talents, values and obtaining meaning in what one does. Latin Americans would tend to lean towards the latter orientation.

Confidentiality

There is a stronger tendency towards secrecy in Continental Europe than in the U.K. or U.S. In the U.K., executives are more public about having a coach. “The U.K. executive that has his/her coach often is perceived as having a perk. In Continental Europe, executives are often more secretive about having a coach as it might be perceived as the client having problems” said Katrina Burrus, a Swiss American executive coach. “This attitude is tangibly different between the Swiss/French and the U.K. executive.” She continued, “My U.K. executives give me constant referrals and introduce me readily if they were to meet a colleague at the office, while many French executive rarely introduce me to any passer-by that greets us as they might have to explain why they have a coach.” There are different attitudes within the different European countries about coaching.

Best Practices:
Defining and Measuring Success

Several best practices were frequently mentioned by participants, including those used by Kirkpatrick, Manchester, Phillips, and Kaplan and Norton. The first two are described below, along with a brief description of the Goldsmith behavioral coaching model. In addition, best practices as implemented by other coaches were shared. These included the Global Scorecard from Philippe Rosinski, an organizational coaching approach used by Eva Wong, a leadership profiling assessment suite used by Wendy Sage-Hayward, and others. Their summaries follow.

The Kirkpatrick Levels of Evaluation Model

Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation was suggested as the most effective way to determine the full impact of an organization’s return on investment of coaching dollars spent. The four levels can be described as follows:

1. Self report of reaction to coaching. The coachee is asked how the experience was and their assessment of whether the coaching was successful. The data collection procedures are interviews and/or questionnaires. This measures how participants reacted to the coaching and whether or not the client liked the coaching. The coach requires specific know-how to implement this phase.

2. Peer evaluation of what was learned. The coachee goes through a 360 degree feedback session. The data collection procedure is through interviews and the coach requires emotional intelligence.

3. Observation of new skills and performance on the job. This is done through role plays or by an
assessment by HR, within a coaching process as observed by the coach, or by another institution. The outcome should be new decisions and new behaviors.

4. Impact of coaching on business results are evaluated through operational data and business performance figures.

According to some participants, the process takes at least half a year. Influences outside the coaching process need to be considered. Due to an accelerating rate of change, a subjective and qualitative evaluation such as “I am feeling better and more serene then before” may have to be sufficient. Successful qualitative outcomes need to be perceived and validated by others. Katrina Burrus proposed that the success criteria be negotiated ahead of time. “Not all benefits can be documented in financial terms. However, because such intangible benefits as customer satisfaction are valuable to the business they are noteworthy.”15

The Manchester ROI Model
Manchester Inc.16 conducted one of the first major study that quantified the business impact of executive coaching. The study includes data on executive behavior change, organizational improvements achieved and the return on investment (ROI) from Manchester’s executive coaching programs. Their study was on the impact of coaching on more than 100 executives, mostly from Fortune 1000 companies. The executives took part in coaching programs that were a mix of change-oriented coaching aiming to change behaviors/skills and growth-oriented coaching aimed at increasing performance. The Manchester study quantified the business impact as follows:

- How much did coaching play a role in reaching the executive’s goals?
- How confident were the executives in the numbers they were giving?
- For example, calculate the impact of prioritization

\[
\text{Estimated cost of coaching time spent on prioritization} = \$1,000 \\
\text{Estimated at 2 hours/week} \\
2 \text{ hrs} @ \$80 / \text{hour} \times 48 \text{ weeks} = \$7,680 \\
\$7,680 \times 70\% \text{ (due to coaching)} \times 75\% \text{ (level of confidence in ROI estimate)} \\
\text{Net benefit} = \$4,032 - \$1,000 = \$3,032 \\
\text{ROI (\%)} = \frac{\$4032 - \$1000 \times 100}{\$1000} \\
\text{ROI (\%)} = 303\% \\
\]

So in this example, the company received over three times its coaching investment.

Marshall Goldsmith Behavioral Coaching Model
Marshall Goldsmith’s approach17 was mentioned as coaching executives on skills and behavior change. He had internal raters evaluate the degree of behavior change. Goldsmith “tells his clients that he doesn’t care about their past, doesn’t care about how they feel, and doesn’t care about their inner psyche—all he cares about is their future behavior. He provides them with a tightly structured program of things to do and a money-back guarantee that, if they do exactly what he tells them, they will get better” (MacFarguhar 2002, p. 120). Goldsmith’s approach to coaching is similar to a medical model of treatment. A diagnosis is made and a treatment prescribed. However, it differs from traditional psychotherapy in that its focus is not retrospective, or dealing with the unconscious, but more prescriptive and addressing observable behavior.
Rosinski’s Global Scorecard
Philippe Rosinski recommended the Global Scorecard\textsuperscript{18} as a tool designed to facilitate the goal-setting process. “It includes two types of objectives: the projected outcomes and the drivers of success…”\textsuperscript{19} “It allows you to set targets, which are truly indicative of both high performance and high fulfillment, in the service of the four sets of stakeholders: self, family and friends, organization and community and world.”\textsuperscript{20} The Global Scorecard also integrates the coachee’s contribution to the community into her result.

Some participants recommended that clients measure opportunity cost, answering the question ‘If coaching were not used what would be the consequences for the client?’ According to Katrina Burrus, “This underlines the problem issue. Moreover, there is no need for a hard sell because the client realizes the issue and consequences if she/he does not resolve the issue. It is ethical. If the client does not require coaching, this process will not work.”

Other participants described their approaches to defining and measuring success, as seen below.

Eva Wong
Eva Wong described the approach she applied in China, entailing pre- and post- evaluations during the coaching process. For example, Wong coached the boss of a small to medium size company.

1. The boss needed to experience a coaching process first.
2. The boss and his managers then went through a series of training experiences to learn how to coach.
3. Then the coaching process was cascaded down through the organization, triggered when the boss made a statement about what would be the company’s goals for the next three months and how these goals would be reviewed in six weeks.

When she coached the managers, Wong was allowed to play the “bad guy,” able to fire a coachee if he did not meet the three months goals or the desired business results. Of course, the objective was not to fire the coachee but to support her achievements. Wong wanted to ensure success, not promote failure. If the coachee obtained the business results within the coaching process, the coachee and the coach received extra bonus points for the extra results.

360 degree feedback surveys were used at periodic intervals. At the end, feedback was received from a self-evaluation, the team, and from the manager as to whether the client and coach reached their goals.

The managers were asked to propose other members in the company to go through the coaching process. The boss was then asked if he wanted to invest in these managers’ development or not. The external coaches gave their opinion about this matter.

Eva Wong’s approach contrasted in the formal authority given to the coach and in the financial participation in the business results. This contrasted with the Global Scorecard’s more holistic approach or other more developmentally focused approaches.

Katrina Burrus
Katrina Burrus’ approach is to first meet with the executive to evaluate the rapport and fit between coach and executive. The following ‘reunion’ is with the coach and executive and also with his boss and any other stakeholders to clarify expectations and desired outcome from the coaching process. What is discussed and decided
on is put into the coaching contract. There are two main objectives for this reunion. The first is for the coach to get an immediate and independent perspective of the dynamics between the stakeholders. Secondly, the stakeholders discuss the coaching program’s success criteria. Stakeholders are to make conscious choices of metrics and measurements they are going to use to evaluate the coaching program intervention. If the stakeholders are not conscious of their criteria, the coach helps them define their evaluation system. A post meeting takes place after the coaching process finishes or at six month intervals to determine, according to their evaluation criteria, observable behavior changes, results achieved, and/or leadership competences developed. Between these two sessions, the coaching process is confidential. As Wendy mentioned, any information given to the client is first approved by the coachee and the individual executive measures results against objectives set at the start of the process.

During the coaching process, the client undergoes a patch of cross culturally tested psychometric inventories and a 360 degree feedback report done by a questionnaire and/or by individual interviews to gain as concrete and specific feedback possible. Concrete and specific feedback is important for the executive to gain clarity and to be able to take action on the feedback given. This being said, the feedback is not to be identifiable to any specific person. This is the coach’s challenge.

**Wendy Sage-Hayward**

Wendy Sage-Hayward measures change on the individual level by the Emotional Intelligent Quotient and is developing a proprietary coaching process. She initiates coaching with a process called Leadership Profiling. Leadership profiling is a process whereby the client completes a series of tools to assess their leadership competency. Tools she uses include the Emotional Intelligence Inventory, Work Values Questionnaire, Leadership Practices Inventory (360 Degree version) and Insights Discovery. The Leadership Profiling process may also include interviews with key individuals to augment the test results and help the coach better understand the environment, expectations, and culture of the organization. The profiling provides an overall frame of reference for the coach and client to begin the coaching process. The profiling is a confidential process for the client. Information can be shared with the organization if the client provides explicit permission at the start of the initiative.

The coaching process itself begins by developing goals or desired outcomes for the coaching process. Goals are established based on the client’s leadership vision, specific performance targets defined by the organization and/or personal development objectives. This typically occurs within the first one of two sessions. These goals are intended to provide a guidepost for the coaching process.

The coach combines the profiling results with the leadership goals and objectives to design a coaching curriculum that meets the needs of the leaders and organization, if applicable.

**General Good Practices**

These were identified as effective practices to implement and perspectives to take in a coaching context:

- Fifty percent of the payment is paid before the process and the balance is paid mid-term through the process.
- A coaching program throughout the organization educates the system.
- Leverage coaching by asking where the biggest impact will come from. Then link its achievement to a compensation “perk” or “goodie” (let
people witness the coached person’s successes, and it will foster or encourage more coaching).

- Start with the high potential managers, then work with the second layer that will be the organization’s future leaders.
- Work with multiple levels to align vision and values.
- To successfully incorporate coaching into the company’s culture, align coaching with Human Resources’ goals. To leave them out would cause resistance.
- Coaching should benefit both the person and the organization.

**How does Executive Coaching Link with Leadership and OD?**

The next team of executive coaches discussed what were the likely situations and potential targets for executive coaching within an organization. With small businesses, where processes are less defined, an organizational development (OD) intervention or executive coaching process usually takes place through the CEO. In large organizations, a coaching intervention can come through organizational processes or through an identified need for leadership development. On the one hand, primary targets for organizational development would be culture development or change, management development, change projects, training, personal development planning and team development. On the other hand, leadership development would be targeted for derailed executives, outplaced executives, high potential managers, and other key people and leaders. It was concluded that organizational development and executive coaching can be linked in any of the ways mentioned above.

**Coaching and Consulting: Who is the Client?**

The answer proposed to the division between executive coaching and organizational development was in recognition of the different needs and offers between the client being coached and the commissioning organization. It can be a tension that the coach needs to hold and deal with by identifying and managing each stakeholder’s expectations. Executive coaching can come through any one of these avenues and the intent is to align and consolidate client (coachee) and organizational needs.

Some participants mentioned that executive coaching by its very nature treats the individual executive as his client, whereas long-term change may need to be driven deep within the organization where the analytical and consulting skills of an organizational change consultant may be more appropriate. Whilst some coaches may be able to work in both dimensions, some may not wish to or be able to do so, and coaches need to be clear on the boundaries between the two types of interventions. Where does the work as coaches end and where does that of a consultant start? It can be a holding tension that the coach needs to deal with.

Areas discussed where coaching can help develop executives were in the person’s decision making process, creativity, awareness, and, generally, a coach’s support of executives and an organization to reach a higher level of functioning on the model of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. This being said, we recognized and assessed that this model has a cultural bias.

**Front End and Back End Linkage**

Executive coaching links to leadership development and organizational development through “front” and “back” avenues.

This team of coaches categorized their help to executives in two different ways. On the one hand, coaches help executives create and develop ideas and bring more awareness. The coach’s role is to encourage a shift in
mindset, to think out of the box and work within a new paradigm. This was labeled as coming at the ‘front end’ of an organization’s thinking and decision making process.

On the other hand, executive coaches help executives implement strategies. This was labeled as coming at the ‘back end’ of the organization’s thinking and decision making process. However, the coaching process is iterative between these two choices and this model identifies two avenues by which the executive coach can enter the organization. The coach’s role can also be to help surface and distinguish organizational themes for the organization.

**Are We in a State of Transition?**

**How can we help formalize and legitimize executive coaching’s contribution to society?**

Participants expressed their concern that for companies to grow in the 21st century and beyond, executives need to focus not only on their bottom-line, but on what organizations bring to society. The public is becoming more vocal and active and many do not feel served by the current system that focuses on short-term profits and shareholder value. “The world has changed and “business as usual” is not an option,” said Hannah Wilder. After Enron and other fiscal scandals, there is a greater general awareness that executives need to deeply care about ethics, justice and the impact of present day actions on future generations.

Executive coaches have their role to play in this transition by building a greater awareness within their executives of what actions and mind frame can build sustainable economic development both for their companies and for the community at large.

How should the coaching profession be legitimized?

“Legitimization of the coaching profession should be done by the executive’s output and by the testimonials given by the clients,” stated Stephan Oberli. To legitimize executive coaching, it should be used in both private and public sectors, such as academia, humanitarian associations, European institutions, etc. Legitimization implies demonstrating the benefits of executive coaching and providing evidence indirectly versus direct intervention as might be the case with consulting. In either case, executives will accept the coaching process only if they feel that the process contributes both to the organization’s bottom line and to “making a difference” for them as leaders and their organizations. Participants stated their concern that change be holistic and systemic in its approach and that it not be one-dimensional. “One needs to take a more systemic, holistic approach to help shift clients’ consciousness to a broader perspective,” stated Mike Turner.

Melinda Beckett Hughes reminded participants to assess and develop values at work that help leaders transform. Stephan Oberli suggested linking coaching to the organization’s structure, strategy and to its leadership to help legitimize the coaching process. Dominique Ringler recommended gathering success stories in order to give concrete examples and provide evidence that executive coaching can create more long term profits and be coherent with public interests. Judy Feld speculated that there is confusion in the marketplace because life coaches may not feel as responsible for producing concrete results as do executive coaches.

**What are usable frameworks for operational results and socially responsible, sustainable development?**

This brought us to our next topic of discussion: What frameworks could be used by executive coaches to address their executive client’s needs to both improve operational results and lead their organizations towards
socially responsible and sustainable development? Melinda Beckett Hughes suggested Richard Barrett’s model\textsuperscript{22} of the seven levels of organizational consciousness. Another participant mentioned Rosinski’s Global Scorecard\textsuperscript{23} as a means to gain operational results and to make a difference within the community at large. The models’ underlying assumptions are that coaching can make a difference by leaving a free rein for personal and professional growth by helping individuals satisfy their mental and spiritual needs within an organization. Barrett’s approach is briefly overviewed below.

Barrett asserts that the new frontier of competitive advantage is increasing market value by leveraging the intangibles. To attract and keep talented people, increase shareholder value, and enhance creativity and productivity, organizations need to build cultural capital. Barrett defines cultural capital as a group of individuals’ values, beliefs and behaviors. When an individual joins a company, the person may identify with the organization’s values. If so, the person’s values are aligned; if not, the values are misaligned. Research provides evidence to suggest that there is a strong link between values alignment and organizational success. Richard Barrett’s instrument measures the degree of alignment between personal values, current corporate culture values, and desired corporate culture values.

The methodology asks employees three questions:

- Which values represent who the person is, and not what s/he desires to become? (Personal values)
- Which values and behaviors represent how your organization operates? (Current Corporate culture values)
- Which of the values and behaviors most represent an ideal, high performance organization? (Desired corporate culture values)

Many executive coaches adhere to Barrett’s statement that who you are as an organization, and what you stand for is becoming just as important as what you sell. The values that an organization enacts are important to the following stakeholders:

- **Society.** A company needs to fulfill society’s expectations such as environmental stewardship and social responsibility.
- **Shareholders.** A new type of shareholder is investing in quality-oriented companies that meet socially responsible investment criteria and are good to their people.
- **Potential employees.** They choose to work in an organization that stands for and is consistent with their values.
- **Existing employees.** The organization needs this to retain the best people and support their personal fulfillment.

Furthermore, there are four components to employee fulfillment:

1. **Physical:** wages, facilities, and external incentives such as bonuses, vacations and promotions, etc.
2. **Emotional:** open communication, friendliness, professional growth, etc.
3. **Mental:** accountability, opportunity to express personal creativity and learn.
4. **Spiritual:** work that has personal meaning, a sense of making a difference.

Barrett’s model has seven levels of consciousness:

1. **Survival consciousness** is the organization’s need to survive financially.
2. **Relationship consciousness** is the organization’s need to provide harmonious interpersonal relationships and good communications.
3. **Self-esteem consciousness** is the organization that
wants to be the biggest or best at what it does. It seeks to improve its effectiveness, its efficiency and its competitiveness.

4. Transformation consciousnesses are the organization’s shifts in belief system variables from self-interest to the common good, from control to trust, from fear to truth, and from exploitation to ownership. The organization’s success is measured against a broader set of hard and soft indicators.

5. Internal cohesion consciousness focuses on the needs of its people and encourages higher levels of personal productivity and creativity.

6. Inclusion consciousness involves the care for the employees’ physical, emotional, mental and spiritual needs.

7. Unity consciousness entails ethics, justice, human rights and actions that are taken in pursuit of sustainable development. Unity necessitates the respect and goodwill both of employees and society-at-large.

Executives need to transition from a cost-cutting mindframe and open their perspective to developing human and social capital. Coaches can contribute by helping their executives go beyond surface reasoning and tap into their deeper motivations that fundamentally are linked to our life purpose or to the way we find meaning in our lives. When what fundamentally motivates us at a deeper level is made known to us, it sets free unlimited commitment to the common good.

**Executive Coaching of Tomorrow?**

Executives are dealing with uncertainty and turbulence. Amidst this uncertainty, executives need to keep their motivation and passion alive. At times, the executive’s self-esteem has been found to be fragile in an insecure economic environment. European executives are usually multi-cultural and often have to deal with dispersed teams. Leaders are likely to have increasingly more social, ethical, and ecological responsibility for their actions and those of their organization.

Executive coaches are required to integrate the executive’s multifaceted roles in an organization: her role as a person, as a team leader and as a leader. The executive’s global environment needs to be integrated in the coaching programs as well.

Some coaches anticipated that tomorrow’s executives will need to increase their competence in applying ethical business policies and in providing security for their employees. The coach’s supportive role to executives will continue to enable them to make the transition from the urgent to the sustainable and to tap into greater sources of awareness and knowledge.

This might entail not always being rational or action-driven but being more aware of and accessing other ways of knowing (for example, solving problems in their sleep, unconscious creativity, and the acceptance and willingness to leverage it).

The coach’s role in the future might further emphasize the need of executives to use all parts of their brain and their multiple intelligences, including emotional intelligence. Coaching will continue to aid executives to further integrate lessons of the past and further incorporate the future into their time perspectives.

To date, coaching summits have been concerned essentially about keeping the physical world (the rational and externally observable) in good shape and using the physical as a source of information. Tomorrow coaching might further be about integrating our body as a source of in-
formation and knowledge. Moreover, coaches might have to aid executives to think of the world systemically and as interconnected. The SARS disease in China was offered as an example of the connectedness of the world. In the future, the coach’s role might also be to bring more awareness of the connections between the executive’s conscious and unconscious or bring cellular awareness, that is, be more conscious of what and how information was stored in one’s physical memory or, as some say, in one’s cellular memory.

Hannah Wilder shared a quotation from Albert Einstein to epitomize some of the challenges executives and their coaches have faced and will continue to face in the future:

“A human being is part of the whole called by us universe, a part limited in time and space. We experience ourselves, our thoughts and feelings as something separate from the rest, a kind of optical delusion of consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from the prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive.”

What Needs to be Further Researched?

Coaching and Consulting

The division between executive coaching and organizational development was in the different needs between the client being coached and the commissioning organization. Where does the work as coaches end and where does that of a consultant start?

Coaching and Corporate Culture

As many companies have restructured and slimmed down to their core, will corporate culture make for real differentiation in the marketplace?

Corporate Responsibility in Leadership, Post Enron

Enron and WorldCom are just two examples of situations where the ethics of the boardroom did not correspond to the stated organizational values, e.g., of ‘integrity’. Are today’s executives prepared to be held (more) accountable and will they want to use their coach as a sounding board of their conscience?

Coaching and Spirituality

The word ‘spirituality’ would not have been acceptable within boardrooms in the recent past. There now appears to be more openness in some quarters to this level of discussion and debate – an acceptance that all cannot be explained by the physical and material. Are today’s executive coaches ready and prepared to be able to work with our clients in this dimension?

Coaching and the Next Generation

There is a new breed of corporate employee emerging which may well be the ones who are running our organizations in ten years’ time. If Gen Y executives are seeking meaning and purpose, will Gen X, our future leaders, looking for their place in the universe and not just a job? What will the Gen X agenda be in the future when they have the mandate for change?

Participants

Participants at the First European Executive Coaching Summit included Hermann Bayer, Katrina Burrus, Mary Wayne Bush, Olga Chiappini, Danièle Darmouni, Michèle Darmouni, Pierre Jean De Jonghe, Bill Ford, Silke
Foth-Reiter, René David Hadjadj, Lindsay Hoyer Miller, Anita Hussl-Arnold, Jurg Krebs, Margarete Kriegbaum, Viviane Launer, Maryvonne Lorenzen, Annie Martinez, Stephan Oberli, Philippe Rosinski, Dominique Ringler, Wendy Sage-Hayward, Michael Sanson, Eugene Shmid, Wolfgang Steger, Chantal Victor, François Viquesnel, Hannah Wilder, and Eva Wong.
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These were the references identified by summit participants:


Working Definition of Executive Coaching

Executive Coaching is a facilitative, mutually designed relationship between a professional coach or coaches and a key contributor, team, or executive group with powerful positions in the organization. This relationship occurs in areas of (diverse businesses) government, not-for-profit, and educational organizations where there are multiple stakeholders and organizational sponsorship for the coaching. The coaching is contracted for the benefit of a client (individual, team, corporation) accountable for highly complex decisions with wide scope of impact. Coaching is usually focused on optimal organizational evolution, through personal or team development. The results produced from this relationship are observable and measurable, commensurate with the requirements the organization has for the performance of the person, group or team being coached within a multi-cultural regional or global context.

Dr. Katrina Burrus, MCC

Website: www.mkbconseil.ch

Dr. Katrina Burrus is the founder of an international consulting company founded in 1994 and based in Switzerland. MKB Conseil is affiliated with a network of international experts, professional practitioners and academics. MKB Conseil specializes in Executive and Team Coaching and Leadership Development for multinational companies and non-profits. Dr. Burrus is both Swiss and from the United States. She coaches in French, English and Spanish and has been involved in multiple projects in US, Europe and Asia.
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The IJCO Logo: What Does It Represent?

The co-executive editors of IJCO have been asked about the logo that adorns all covers of the journal as well as subscription forms, policy statements, etc. This logo comes from a much larger work of art—a statue called Kabala—that was created by Julian Harr. The logo represents two birds (vision), two hands (support) or two flames (energy). We think that vision, support and energy are three of the key ingredients in effective organizational coaching practices.

- William Bergquist
- John Lazar
Resource Center for Professional Coaching in Organizations
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