Effectiveness of Leadership Coaching – An Integrated Evaluation Framework.

A thesis submitted for the degree of

DOCTORATE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

By

WILLEM JAN HOFMANS

September 24th 2015

Under The Supervision Of

PROFESSORS DOMINIQUE STEILER & CAROLINE STRAUB
**ABSTRACT**

The evaluation of the exact impact of executive coaching on both individuals and organisations is lagging behind. This has been demonstrated by the few empirical studies which link coaching to improved outcomes. This particular research project focuses on the coaching of leaders in organisations. It draws on resources from the fields of Leadership, Management, Psychology and Training & Development. The question this research project aspires to answer is “What does the application of an integrated evaluation framework tell us about the effectiveness of leadership coaching?”

The significance of this study is that it is a mixed-methods pre-/post longitudinal study about leadership coaching with a quantitative emphasis. It has been approached from the field of Business with a focus on the impact of executive/leadership coaching. Only professionally certified external coaches have been involved. The data is based on multi-source feedback from various evaluators. The study reports on multi-level effects and has considered formative evaluations. The relevance of this research project to the field of Management is that it provides a framework for managers to evaluate the effectiveness of executive/leadership coaching through the application of an integrated coaching evaluation model. In terms of the academic fields of Management, Leadership and Psychology, this research aims to provide empirical evidence regarding the impact of executive/leadership coaching engagements on clients.

This project has been completed with a total sample of 30 participants working with six coaches following a longitudinal design in which pre- and post-coaching data has been gathered between July 2011 and November 2014 during a mean time of 8.67 months per coaching engagement. Data was collected using a 360° feedback instrument, that includes a measure of leadership effectiveness, as reported by all evaluators (the boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others) and as a self-assessment, self-assessed Mindfulness, Business Performance data (as reported by the boss and as a self-assessment), achievement of Client’s Coaching Objectives (as decided by the client and his/her boss), an evaluation of the coach by the client and an evaluation by the coach of the client.
This study focuses on the question about the effectiveness of leadership coaching and proposes a framework to test this. The small sample size and issues in 360° feedback rater consistency have had an important impact on the results of this research project. The outcome appears to suggest that leadership coaching has a significantly positive impact on mindfulness. Though positive, the change in leadership effectiveness, as measured by all evaluators, appears not statistically significant. The results also suggest that the client-coach relationship does not have a significant impact on the outcome of the coaching as measured objectively by all evaluators. Whereas coach satisfaction with the client looks like to have a significant impact on the relationship between client and coach, only client satisfaction appears to have a positive impact on the outcomes of leadership coaching. The achievement of the client’s coaching objectives correlates significantly with leadership competencies. Coaching outcomes have not changed significantly enough as a result of the achievement of coaching objectives. Whereas there has been a slight improvement in business results after leadership coaching, the link between the two has proven insignificant.

*Keywords*: coaching, leadership coaching, coaching effectiveness, leadership development, coaching outcomes
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

How many people would visit a doctor who was not qualified and prescribed treatments, therapies and/or medications that had not been clinically proven? The likelihood that anyone would answer “yes” is doubtful. Having asked this exact same question during a number of presentations on this coaching research project no one answered in the affirmative. The reality is that this is a fairly accurate description of the world of coaching, a booming business without regulation in which everyone can freely enter. Anyone can call him or herself “coach”, open up a practice and start coaching. There is no legal requirement for formal training and certification. In addition, as will be discussed in this research project, there is a lack of empirical evidence that coaching actually works or, said in another way, delivers the desired results. In this introduction an overview will be provided from the background to and objectives of this research to a set of conclusions that have been derived from the results of this study.

1.1 Background to the Research

Executive coaching has gained enormously in popularity according to Levenson (2009). A simple search of the literature on “executive coaching” or “leadership coaching” on the database EBSCO Host yielded 2643 Scholarly (Peer Reviewed) Journal articles, 2359 (89%) of which were published since January 2000 and 1234 (47%) in the last 5 years (to date April 9th 2015). It is further noted that 57% of the articles appear in the Psychology literature and related fields (Databases: PsychINFO, Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Collection, PsychARTICLES and SocINDEX with Full Text) and 43% in Business journals (Database: Business Source Complete). This is close to the findings by Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) who conclude in their comprehensive review of the literature on executive coaching that three of the six studies conducted exclusively on executive coaching were from the business-management literature, and three from the psychological literature (one a dissertation); two of the latter three studies that were published in the psychological literature were not outcome studies.

In addition, 70% of organisations with formal Leadership Development Programs include coaching in organisations and only a small proportion actually measure the impact (De
Meuse, Dai, & Lee, 2009; McDermott, Levenson & Newton, 2007), with reports that only one-third of coaching engagements (external and internal) are subject to evaluation for their effectiveness. The author of this dissertation was confronted with this in a personal experience when faced with a large potential multinational client who terminated all coaching engagements because of a lack of evidence as to its efficacy and because effective measurement was absent. Having chosen this profession the problem quickly became clear: there does not appear to be a standard and simple way to measure coaching effectiveness and there also does not appear to be much supportive empirical data.

There are organisations for coaches, like the International Coach Federation (ICF)\(^1\), which actively promote the professionalization of coaching. Formal accredited education, certification of coaches, and academic research are key ingredients in the development of a profession. Inherent in holding a credential are a minimum number of training hours involving supervised practice coaching and actual work with clients upon completion of the training. As of April 2015, the International Coach Federation (2015) reports that 57.8% of ICF members worldwide are credentialed coaches and this number continues to increase. Whereas the certification in itself, like in other professions, does not guarantee quality as such, it is at least a step in the right direction to ensure the establishment of a serious profession. This still leaves the topic of the efficacy of coaching unanswered.

Upon entering the coaching profession in 2007 and enrolling in an Accredited Coach Training Program (ACTP) by the ICF at Georgetown University, the question around the impact of coaching became increasingly interesting for the author. When the opportunity was presented to enrol in a Doctorate in Business Administration (DBA) program it became an ideal moment to focus a research project on this subject.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As will be expanded on in the literature review, the evaluation of the exact impact of executive coaching on both individuals and organisations is lagging behind. This is demonstrated by the few empirical studies which link coaching to improved results. From a

\(^1\) The ICF is the leading global organisation advancing the coaching profession with over 20'000 members worldwide
managerial viewpoint the issue is that the Return on Investment (ROI) of coaching is not easily measurable (AMA, 2008). From an academic perspective, the problem is that “…whether or not [executive coaching] does what it proposes, remains largely unknown because of the lack of empirical studies” (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001, p. 205) and that “…little guidance exists on how to evaluate this unique leadership development practice” (Ely, Boyce, Nelson, Zaccaro, Hernez-Broome & Whyman, 2010, p. 585). Recently an argument has been presented that “…we are unlikely to get robust data on coaching outcomes in the near future but assume that we can expect similar effectiveness for coaching as is demonstrated in rigorous psychotherapy outcome research” (De Haan, Duckworth, Birch, & Jones, 2013, p. 40). An argument can be made that this may be sufficient from the standpoint of the discipline of Psychology. The view from the people involved in Business is presumed to be different, because, in addition to the anecdotal data mentioned above, the practice and ability to measure results is typically required in this field. Therefore, this study aims to propose a mixed-methods approach how to systematically assess the impact of leadership coaching interventions.

1.3 Purpose and Objectives

Coaching is a vast field influenced by different types of disciplines as will be further explained in the literature review. This particular research project is focused on coaching of leaders in organisations. It draws on resources from the fields of Leadership, Management, Psychology and Training & Development. The question this research project aspires to answer is:

“What does the application of an integrated evaluation framework tell us about the effectiveness of leadership coaching?”

The objectives are:

1. To provide an overview of the assessment of leadership coaching,
2. To propose a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of leadership coaching,
3. To show empirical results about the impact of leadership coaching,
4. To propose further targets of research in the area of measuring the effectiveness of coaching.
To achieve these objectives, a conceptual model, representing the integrated evaluation framework, will be presented that includes ‘Coaching Outcomes’, before and after the coaching measured by a combination of Leadership Effectiveness from the 360° feedback (as reported by the evaluators) and Mindfulness (self-reported), and ‘Business Results’, measured before and after coaching by using a Business Performance Index for the respective clients (as reported by the boss). It further includes the moderator variables Client-Coach Relationship and Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement that are presumed to impact the coaching outcomes. The leadership coaching is deemed to have been effective if there has been a positive increase change in the Coaching Outcomes, and subsequently also the Business Results. On the contrary, the coaching is deemed to have been ineffective if there has been no change or even deterioration in the Coaching Outcomes and Business Results, barring external circumstances that will have influenced the results.

The overall hypothesis is that leadership coaching has a positive impact on leadership effectiveness, which positively influences business results. The expectation is that this framework will become a basis for leaders, who receive coaching, to go beyond defining whether they were satisfied with the coaching, and be able to identify what they learned, how it impacted their behaviour and what results they obtained.

1.4 Significance of the Study

As will be shown in the literature review, a significant majority of academic publications about coaching come from the field of Psychology and, as mentioned above, regarding executive/leadership coaching it is 45/55 between the fields of Business and Psychology. Three meta-analyses of the research on the effectiveness of coaching from Ely et al. (2010), De Meuse et al. (2009) and Theeboom, Beersma & van Vianen (2013) have shown that self-reporting by either clients and/or coaches is an issue in many research publications, because it raises the question of the objectivity of the results. The collection of multi-source data, consideration of multi-level effects, and formative evaluations of the client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching process have therefore been recommended in two of these studies. The other issue that is described in the literature to date is that only three publications met a combination of the criteria as defined by De Meuse et al. (2009), i.e. the research had to be focused on executive coaching engagements, provided by an external coach, based on a pre- and post-coaching design, and with reported statistics in the article. Theeboom et al.
(2013) added that the studies had to be quantitative, include professionally trained coaches, could not be cross-sectional, and had to meet their definition of the coaching process.

The significance of this study is that it will be a mixed-methods pre-/post-coaching study with a quantitative emphasis. It will be approached from the field of Business with a focus on the impact of executive/leadership coaching. Also, only professionally certified external coaches will be involved. The data will be based on multi-source feedback and the study will report on multi-level effects and consider formative evaluations. The relevance of this research project to the field of management is that it aims to provide a framework for managers to evaluate the effectiveness of executive/leadership coaching through the application of an integrated coaching evaluation model. In terms of the academic fields of Management, Leadership and Psychology, this research aspires to provide empirical evidence regarding the impact of executive/leadership coaching engagements.

1.5 Definition of Terms

Many different descriptions of coaching have been found and a decision was made to use a definition offered by Grant (2003), i.e. “coaching can be defined as a result-oriented, systematic process in which the coach facilitates the enhancement of life experience and goal-attainment in the personal and/or professional lives of normal, non-clinical clients” (Theeboom, Beersma, & van Vianen, 2013, p. 2), as the basis to further analyse coaching. Distinctions will be made between coaching and therapy, coaching and consulting, coaching and facilitation, and coaching and training. Whereas coaches often take on different roles based on their professional training and background, it is crucial to make these distinctions for clients in order to be clear about what coaching is and what it is not.

There are many different types of coaching. On the one hand differences are characterized by performance-based versus in-depth coaching Thach (2002) or, as presented by Grant & Cavanagh (2004), between skills coaching, performance coaching and developmental coaching. Coaching can further be divided into areas like business coaching, executive coaching, leadership coaching, career coaching and life coaching. The focus of this research will be on leadership coaching and particularly the behavioural changes leaders seek in order to become more effective.
Leadership coaching implies that a coach works with a leader in organisations. A definition of leadership adopted for this dissertation is that “Leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that it important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group”, it continues with “Leadership is persuasion”, and concludes with “… leadership concerns building cohesive and goal-oriented teams; there is a causal and definitional link between leadership and team performance” (Hogan & Curphy, 1994, p. 493). Leadership effectiveness will be referred to as this link between the leader and organisational performance. Various definitions of leadership coaching will be presented and analysed. The following definition will serve as the basis for this thesis: “…leadership coaching is broadly defined in terms of a relationship between a client and a coach that facilitates the client becoming a more effective leader” (Ely et al., 2010, p. 585).

Given the focus of this study on leadership coaching, the subject of leadership will get specific attention. While many theories on leadership will be covered, a decision was made to ground this research in the theory of resonant leadership as introduced by Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee (2013). “Resonant leaders are in tune with those around them. This results in people working in sync with each other, in tune with each others’ thoughts (what to do) and emotions (why to do it)” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 4). This leadership theory is also closely tied to both Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and Mindfulness, as one of the three elements supporting Renewal, which will both be linked to a measurement of leadership effectiveness, not only in the short term, but also from a sustainable, long-term point of view. The definition for Emotional intelligence adopted is “the ability to manage ourselves and our relationships effectively” (Goleman, 2000, p. 80). Renewal “invokes a brain pattern and hormones that changes our mood, while returning our bodies to a healthy state…that allows for restoration or building of resonant relationships so critical to leadership effectiveness” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p.61). Mindfulness will be defined as “…being aware, awake and attending to ourselves and the way around us” (McKee & Boyatzis, 2006, p. 34).

As will be seen from the literature review, and is also supported by findings in therapy (De Haan et al., 2013), the relationship between the leader and the coach is regarded as a key ingredient for a successful engagement. Since most leaders work in organisations, questions

2 Also refer to (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2013)
need to and will be answered regarding the contractual relationships between the leader, or client, and the organisation, or sponsor, as often represented by the leader’s boss and/or the Human Resources (HR) department. Many leadership coaching engagements are initiated based on feedback either from the direct manager, HR and/or other sources in the organisation. Feedback will therefore be extensively discussed as well as the related pitfalls in obtaining feedback. As a result of this feedback, leadership coaching engagements usually include specific objectives for the coaching and, based on work from De Meuse et al. (2009), the contribution of clear objectives to the outcome of coaching will also be discussed.

The studies on the measurement of the impact of executive coaching as documented by Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) have shown that both the executive and the company benefitted, learning was increased and that it had contributed to changes in behaviour. As will be described, additional studies proposed that impact appeared higher as a result of changes in behaviour linked to coaching objectives and, in addition to changing behaviour (key for leadership effectiveness), coaching contributes to improving emotional competence. Furthermore, it is important for organisations to have an organized and integrated approach to manage coaching and measure coaching impact.

1.6 Methodology

Findings from the meta-analysis of research projects on the impact of coaching from Ely et al. (2010), De Meuse et al. (2009) and Theeboom et al. (2013), in combination with the work by Donald Kirkpatrick (1996) on evaluating training programs and Chen (1989) on evaluation of program theory, have supported the development of the integrated evaluation framework and methodology to collect data. It became clear from their work that an effective evaluation of the impact of coaching requires an integrated approach.

- It is important to introduce the notion of multi-source feedback to assess impact and to be able to separate the impact from the feedback and from the impact of the coaching.
- A control group should be used to establish a comparison of impact.
- The issue of self-reporting and using observations by coaches to measure impact needs to be addressed.
- The same issue with how clients evaluate themselves (see also previous point) and how to introduce a sense of objectivity in measuring impact needs to be covered.
- The duration and frequency of a coaching program needs to be analysed in terms of how this produces impact.
- Rater consistency, when using multi-source feedback, needs to be considered.

As a result of the above for the development of the methodology of this study it has been concluded that, when possible, one needs to look at the outcome not only through self-reporting, but preferably through data that is as objective as possible as reported by other evaluators. For coaching multi-source feedback appears to be the most appropriate. Next, the collection of this data before and after the coaching seems to generate the best indication of the effectiveness of the executive coaching. Third, the outcome should not be seen in isolation and it is therefore key to also focus on the relationship and process, in particular the role of coaching objectives, as part of coaching engagements.

From the literature nine criteria have been derived that should be considered in the methodology to obtain empirical evidence about the impact of leadership coaching. They include the use of:

1. Coaching engagements provided by professionally trained external coaches,
2. A pre- and post-coaching within-subject control group design,
3. Multi-source data based on high quality psychometric instruments,
4. Consideration of multi-level effects,
5. Isolation of the unique contribution of coaching as compared to other leadership development interventions,
6. Reported statistics,
7. Formative evaluations of the client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching process,
8. Objectives that correspond directly to business or organisational requirements,
9. Plans to include distal outcomes like leadership retention, adequate pipeline to fill senior positions and others that are deemed valuable by the organisation.

Given the nature of this research and as per the second criteria, a randomized or true experiment would be the preferred design for this project, because it usually is the strongest in linking cause(s) and effect(s) (Trochim, 2006). Random assignment, multiple groups (e.g. treatment and control group) and multiple waves, i.e. a pre-post design, are conditions for such an experiment. One of the challenges in doing research in this field is the lack of readily available data. What is required is to identify coaches and clients who are willing to participate. As pointed out by De Haan & Duckworth (2013) a rigorous study is costly and cumbersome, and coaches prioritize their clients over research. Therefore, both given the context of this research, i.e. applied research as part of a Doctorate in Business Administration (DBA), and the practical realities to complete this research, a decision was made to use a pre-post design without random assignment and the use of a control group, making this a within-subjects quasi-experimental design.

The main concern with quasi-experimental designs is that internal validity, i.e. the independent variable being responsible for the results, may be in doubt (Bryman, 2001; Meltzoff, 1998). It is recognised that by not using a control group extraneous variables like history, maturation and testing can further jeopardise internal validity and be plausible reasons for changes between the pre- and post-coaching results. This will be addressed both in chapters 4 and 5. In parallel, qualitative data will also be collected and, upon reviewing Creswell (2003) this seems to fit with the Concurrent procedures, i.e. bringing together both quantitative and qualitative data to comprehensively answer the research question. Therefore, the research method applied to this project is characterized by a combination of instrument-based questions, performance data, statistical analysis along with open-ended questions and interview data.

The methodology is split into two parts. The first one deals with the identification and selection of coaches, who fulfil defined criteria, to participate in the research. The second part involves the identification and selection of participants (the clients of the coaches), fulfilling the requirement of being managers with responsibility for people, setting the direction and being responsible for the results delivered by their respective
department/function/organisation, and the implementation of the coaching program in which pre- and post-coaching data will be collected.

The original goal was to collect data for 100 coaching engagements with ten coaches. As will be explained in Chapter 5 it proved much more difficult to, first, recruit ten coaches in the study and, second, get to the 100 clients within the timeframe for completing this thesis. This project has been completed with a total sample of 30 client engagements with six coaches following the longitudinal design in which pre- and post-coaching data has been collected between July 2011 and November 2014. The mean time per coaching engagement was 8.67 months. The data collected includes 360° feedback, including a measure of leadership effectiveness, as reported by all evaluators (boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others) and as a self-assessment, self-assessed Mindfulness, Business Performance data (as reported by the boss and a self-assessment), achievement of Clients’ Coaching Objectives (as decided by the clients and their bosses), an evaluation of the coach by the client and by the coach of the client. Chapter 4 provides all of the details in terms of this approach as well as the measures and tools that have been used.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

The first delimitation of this study is that, whereas coaching is a very broad topic, the focus of this study is only on individuals in leadership roles in organisations who received coaching to improve their leadership. Next, all coaching has been provided by six external coaches who are certified by the ICF and hold a certification in The Leadership Circle Profile™ 360° feedback instrument. Third, as mentioned in section 1.6, a decision was made not to include a control group in the research design for practical and timeliness reasons given that this research has been conducted within the context of a DBA. Fourth, whereas Mindfulness, Hope and Compassion have been identified as the elements of Renewal leading to sustainable effectiveness of leaders, it has been decided to only focus on Mindfulness in this thesis to provide one measure possibly supporting a longer term impact of changes in leadership effectiveness as a result of leadership coaching and because of its topical relevance to both the corporate world and coaching.
1.8 Limitations of the Study

As already indicated in section 1.6 one of the major limitations of this study is its sample size, i.e. data for 30 coaching engagements was collected against a goal of 100. Whereas arguments will be presented that a case can be made that a sample of N = 30 is large enough, there is a recognition that many counter-arguments will be valid as well. This will significantly impact the generalizability of the results of this dissertation.

A further limitation that will be discussed is rater consistency. This refers to how many evaluators were the same in providing the pre- and post-coaching data, because this could have an impact on the results. Linked to this is that, as a result of the tool that has been chosen, the level of detail required to compare scoring patterns between old (pre-coaching) and new (post-coaching) raters is limited.

Even though it will be shown that the differences are statistically insignificant, another limitation that will be considered is the fact that two-thirds of the participants received the coaching as part of a leadership development program that also included five days of workshops during the period. As will be discussed, it cannot be excluded that the other clients also participated in other leadership development activities.

The change in the level of mindfulness will be shown to make a significant contribution to the changes in the Coaching Outcomes. Since the data for this has only been obtained as self-assessed data, this will also be discussed as a potential limitation in this study.

A final limitation that will be considered is how events outside of the realm of the coaching have impacted the outcome. Changes of bosses and in organisations for the participating clients will be described. It will be shown that the impact of the changes of bosses has not impacted the results; the same cannot be said with certainty about the impact of the organisational changes.

1.9 Conclusion and Outline of the Study

This study focuses on the question about the effectiveness of leadership coaching and proposes a framework to test this. The results appear to show that leadership coaching has a
significantly positive impact on mindfulness. Though positive, the change in leadership effectiveness, as measured by all evaluators, is not statistically significant; the difference, as assessed by the bosses of the clients and the clients themselves seem positive and significant. The results also give an indication that the client-coach relationship does not have a significant impact on the outcome of the coaching as measured objectively by all evaluators. Whereas coach satisfaction with the client appears to have a significant impact on the relationship between client and coach, only client satisfaction seems to have a positive impact on the outcomes of leadership coaching. The achievement of the client’s coaching objectives appears to correlate significantly with leadership competencies. Coaching outcomes have not changed significantly enough as a result of the achievement of the coaching objectives. Whereas there has been a slight improvement in business results after leadership coaching, the link between the two has proven insignificant.

Chapter 2 will provide a detailed review of the literature on coaching and related factors that can influence coaching outcomes. It will also provide a review of leadership, leadership effectiveness, emotional intelligence, renewal and mindfulness as contributors to the effectiveness of a leader. Finally, various studies on the impact of coaching will be analysed both in terms of their reported results and the methodologies that have been applied.

The identified gaps in the literature as well as the conceptual model that has been developed to answer the key question of this study will be covered in Chapter 3. It will also cover the hypotheses that this research project will focus on.

Chapter 4 will describe the rationale for the chosen methodology and provide insights into the instruments used to collect the data. Both the qualitative and quantitative methods for analysing the data will be reviewed. It will also contain a section on the results of a limited pilot study.

A detailed analysis of the results from the study of the sample of 30 coaching engagements will be shown in Chapter 5. These results will be discussed and contrasted to other studies found in the literature in the rest of the chapter.
Finally, Chapter 6 will specifically focus on the implications of this study on management and Chapter 7 will conclude with a summary of the conclusions of this study and describe the specific contributions and limitations of it as well as suggest areas for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Boote and Beile (2005) a literature review should accomplish several objectives, including:

- Setting out a broad context of the research,
- Putting an existing literature in a broader scholarly and historical context,
- Not only reporting claims made in current literature but also critically examining the research methods used to better understand whether the claims are warranted,
- Stating what has been learned and accomplished, and what still needs to be learned and accomplished in the area.

They conclude that “…a good literature review is the basis of both theoretical and methodological sophistication, thereby improving the quality and usefulness of subsequent research” (Boote & Beile, 2005, p. 4). To achieve this it is suggested that a review of the literature should meet the following criteria: "…to present results of similar studies, to relate the present study to the on-going dialogue in the literature, and to provide a framework for comparing the results of a study with other studies" (Creswell, 1994, p. 37). He recommends five steps to fulfil these: "…identifying terms to typically use in your literature search; locating literature; reading and checking the relevance of the literature; organizing the literature you have selected; and writing a literature review" (Creswell, 2002, p. 86).

In the following section the key terms, i.e. coaching, types of coaching and executive/leadership coaching will be reviewed and defined first. Thereafter, with the focus on leadership in this study, the next section will concentrate on analysing and defining key leadership concepts and related topics like theories of leadership, leadership effectiveness, emotional intelligence, renewal and mindfulness. This will be followed by a section in which the ingredients of an executive/leadership coaching engagement, i.e. client-coach relationship, contract, multi-source or 360° feedback and coaching objectives will be identified. Next, an analysis of the literature on the impact of executive coaching and the measurement methodologies that have been used, and limitations thereof, will be presented. All identified gaps in the literature will be summarised in section 3.1.
2.1 Coaching

According to a Global Coaching Study (International Coach Federation, 2012) total revenues generated by approximately 47’500 estimated coaches worldwide is evaluated at around $2B. People who are not familiar with coaching tend to associate the term with sports and/or confuse it with counselling/therapy or consulting. Analysis of much of the literature reviewed reveals that out of 9746 scholarly (peer-reviewed) journal articles on the EBSCO Host database (April 9th 2015) using the search criteria “coaching” 23% came from the Business literature (Database: Business Source Complete) and the remainder from the field of Psychology (Databases: PsychINFO, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, SocIndex with Full text and PsychARTICLES). As also reported by Theeboom et al. (2013), this is consistent with the finding by Grant, Passmore, Cavanagh & Parker (2010) that the field of psychology has produced the most research on coaching. It also means that the generic term “coaching” is written about more often in the psychology literature than in business journals. Within the context of the confusion between coaching, therapy and consulting it is significant that there is little agreement as to who makes the best coach, i.e. those with a psychology background or those coming from the business world (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001). One could argue that, based on the number of articles published in the different disciplines, there is more of a scholarly interest in researching and writing about coaching in the field of Psychology. This study aims to contribute to closing this gap by approaching coaching, and in particular leadership coaching, from a business point of view.

Grant (2003) offers the following definition of coaching, i.e. “coaching can be defined as a result-oriented, systematic process in which the coach facilitates the enhancement of life experience and goal-attainment in the personal and/or professional lives of normal, non-clinical clients” (Theeboom et al., 2013, p. 2). Whereas in practice coaches are usually equipped to assume different roles, i.e. facilitator, consultant (giving advice), trainer or, if properly trained, therapist, this definition provides the opportunity to clarify distinctions between coaching and these other types of interventions.

First, this definition clearly distinguishes coaching from therapy by implying that coaching only focuses on non-clinical clients. To provide further clarification on the distinction between coaching and therapy a study by Hart, Blattner & Leipsic (2001) is deemed useful. They surveyed 30 professionals who practice coaching, therapy, or both, and identified
differences as well as overlaps between coaching and therapy. Coaching is described as more goal-oriented, focused on action, and forward looking. Therapy is more commonly associated with a “damaged” client, in crisis, functioning at a lower level and needing to focus on understanding the past as it presents in current behaviour. It was felt that looser boundaries exist in coaching. Participants reported that they rely more on expert-subject relationships with clients during psychotherapy. Contracting has been reported as another area of difference, i.e. in coaching the contract looks more formal than in therapy. On the other hand, confidentiality was seen by some to be somewhat looser in coaching. Some overlaps between coaching and therapy were reported in terms of the similar methods of inquiry, propensity for advice giving, boundary issues, and potential for power differentials that exist in both (Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001).

Two of the above-mentioned findings require further comment:

- Propensity for advice-giving,
- Confidentiality being looser in coaching.

The first one, i.e. propensity for advice-giving, is helpful in differentiating coaching from therapy as well as in making a second key distinction as it relates to coaching and consulting, because coaching is not about giving advice. Whereas in consulting the consultant uses his/her expertise to give the client advice, in coaching it is all about the client using his/her expertise, through the work with the coach, to come up with the answers (“advice”) for him/herself. In coaching it is critical to be aware of this distinction in order to serve clients in the best possible way, because if clients are not clear on what constitutes coaching and confuse it with consulting or advising misunderstandings could appear which in turn may lead to expectations not being met. An example could be a client who continuously asks for advice is faced with a coach who focuses on the client to find their own answers, as coaches should. Nevertheless, there may be moments when it is clear that the coach can and should act as a consultant and give advice. However, in that situation, the coach is expected to clearly manage boundaries and declare that s/he will switch roles to avoid confusing the client.

As it pertains to confidentiality, this comes back to the professionalization, education and credentialing of coaching. Confidentiality is of the utmost importance for coaches and many
professional associations, e.g. ICF, EMCC\(^3\) and AC\(^4\), require coaches, as a condition for membership, to agree to and sign a code of ethics that clearly spells this out. However, in addition to a code of ethics, confidentiality needs to be grounded in a deeper understanding of the role of helping others. Confidentiality creates a safe environment for the client. With this boundary in place clients may disclose and explore material that they have never shared before. This will lead to a powerful relationship in which the client can make progress. Without it, this will more than likely not happen. Therefore, confidentiality is as crucial in coaching as it is in therapy.

An alternative defines coaching as “a Socratic based dialogue between a facilitator (coach) and a participant (client) where the majority of interventions used by the facilitator are open questions which are aimed at stimulating the self-awareness and personal responsibility of the participant” (Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011, p. 74). Whereas this is a broader definition of coaching, the focus on the usage of open questions to stimulate self-awareness and personal responsibility is helpful both from a practice, i.e. coaching is not advising nor mentoring, and a leadership point of view as we will see below. One limitation of this definition is the use of the terminology “facilitator”, because this again allows for possible confusion with other professions. The second limitation is that it implies that coaches only ask open questions whereas coaches do a lot more, including providing feedback to clients through sharing of observations, co-designing actions and holding clients accountable.

One of the leading professional coaching associations, the International Coach Federation (ICF), defines coaching as “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential” (International Coach Federation, 2015). This very broad definition can be applied to many different types of domains of coaching, e.g. business coaching, executive coaching, career coaching, life coaching, as will be discussed in the following section. This definition also implies that there is a relationship between a “coach”, the one doing the coaching, and a “client”, also referred to as “coachee”, the one being coached. From this point onwards the term “client” will be used exclusively.

\(^3\) EMCC is the European Mentoring and Coaching Council
\(^4\) AC is the Association for Coaching
2.1.1 Types of Coaching

There are differences between types of coaching. Thach (2002) refers to two major types of coaching, i.e. performance-based - a focus on practical and specific issues related to the business, and in-depth coaching - concentrated more on deep-seated issues, personal values, motivation and the like. A further distinction is made by Grant & Cavanagh (2004) between skills coaching – a focus on specific behaviours and performance coaching - emphasizing the process to set goals, overcome obstacles and monitor performance, and developmental coaching - a broader view dealing with personal and professional questions. In her study, Wasylyshyn (2003) goes one step further and concludes that executives are seeking the following changes in behaviour as a result of coaching: personal behaviour change, enhancement of leader effectiveness, fostering stronger relationships, personal development and work-family integration. The significance of these different types of coaching is how the purpose impacts the effectiveness of the coaching as will be illustrated in this thesis.

Coaching can also be broken down into the topics that are being addressed. A first distinction can be made between business – and life coaching with the former being more focused on coaching in an organisational context, and usually paid for by the organisation, and the latter being more focused on the personal circumstances of an individual and most likely being funded by the individual themselves. One could argue that this distinction is fairly blurry, because one impacts the other. Within business coaching, a further distinction can be made between executive/leadership coaching, career coaching and skill coaching, e.g. communication, conflict resolution, presentation and the like. Executive/leadership coaching is the focus of this study.

2.1.2 Executive/leadership coaching

The field of executive/leadership coaching sometimes referred to as the “Wild West” (Sherman & Freas, 2004) has grown tremendously. One definition of executive coaching that frequently appears in the literature comes from (Kilburg, 1996, p. 142):

“Executive coaching is defined as a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organisation and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioural techniques and methods to help the client achieve a
mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client's organisation within a formally defined coaching agreement".

Whereas this definition will be used as the basis for this research project it also presents an opportunity, as per the description of the distinctions in the previous section, to suggest an improvement to this definition by substituting the word “consultant” with “coach”, “professional coach” or “executive coach” because, as illustrated earlier, this avoids confusion and supports the distinction between the work of a consultant as opposed to the work by a coach. This despite the reality that coaches can and will switch roles in line with the needs of their clients. It is vital for coaches to declare this to their clients to ensure it is clear to the client what role the coach is taking on.

More recently executive coaching was defined “as a form of leadership development that takes place through a series of contracted one-to-one conversations with a qualified ‘coach’” (De Haan & Duckworth, 2013, p.41). Whereas the focus on leadership development and using the terminology “coach” are helpful, coaching is more than just a set of one-to-one conversations as illustrated earlier. In addition to communicating effectively during the conversations, coaches co-create the relationship with the client, facilitate learning and results by creating awareness, designing actions, engaging in planning and goal setting, and managing the progress of clients by holding them accountable (please also refer to Appendix K: Core Competencies for coaches).

In the literature the words executive coaching and leadership coaching are used interchangeably. Leadership coaching builds on the definition of executive coaching, however, more emphasis is put on the leadership aspect. For this thesis the following definition is preferred: “…leadership coaching is broadly defined in terms of a relationship between a client and a coach that facilitates the client becoming a more effective leader” (Ely et al., 2010, p. 585). Leadership and effectiveness of leaders will be covered more in-depth in the following section.

From here onwards the term leadership coaching will be used based on the rationale that leadership coaching is both similar, i.e. executives in organisations are associated with being the leaders, and complementary to executive coaching, i.e. the focus is on improving the
leadership competencies of executives. The term “leadership coaching” also allows for a broader target audience. In practice, many executive coaches work with managers at different levels in organisations (Baron & Morin, 2009) and the work is mostly characterized by improving the leadership skills of these managers. In this sense, the term executive can be misleading as it may imply only a reference to the top of the management structure. The term “leadership coaching” is going to be used in this document except for cases in which where there is a specific literature reference to the term “executive coaching”.

2.1.3 Summary

Coaching is a very broad subject that has been researched most in the field of psychology. Various definitions of coaching are used throughout the literature. A review of these definitions has helped distinguish coaching from other types of helping relationships and narrowing down what coaches actually do. Different types of coaching have been reviewed, both in terms of the type of content and client. It has been clarified that this research project focuses on the coaching of leaders as clients. Before going into more depth about leadership coaching, the next section will review the topic of leadership and key aspects as they relate to coaching of leaders.

2.2 Leadership

The literature on the subject of leadership reveals a multitude of theories. As described by Kreitner & Kinicki (2010) what many leadership definitions have in common are references to what goes on between leaders and followers, the notion of influence that leaders assert, that leadership occurs at many levels in organisational structures and that it involves achieving goals and objectives. Leadership can be described as the leader setting a direction, inspiring and motivating others to follow and ensuring the implementation of said direction. Many theories have been developed for leadership based on different approaches. These include trait, behavioural, situational, transformational and other emerging approaches (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2010).

The trait theory developed as a result of the “great man” theory. Historian Thomas Carlyle popularized the “great man theory” grounded in the belief that leaders were just born with the
ability to lead. The trait theory, predominantly developed by Stogdill in 1948 and Mann in 1959, argues that leadership can be taught and learnt. Daniel Goleman’s work on emotional intelligence, which will be described later in this dissertation, is an example of one of the many trait theories. The trait theory led to the development of a more behaviourally focused theory based on the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies. The emphasis shifted from personality traits of leaders to what behaviours leaders display to influence followers. The development of leadership styles (refer also to Goleman, 2000) was a direct result of the focus on behaviour. Since neither trait nor behavioural theories delivered consistent explanations, the situational leadership theories emerged arguing that a leader’s style is directly linked to the situation. Fiedler’s contingency theory (1967) and House’s path-goal (1971) are examples of situational leadership theories. What the situational theories have in common is that they stress the importance of defining outcomes, what leadership behaviours are required, being clear on the different situations, aligning the behaviour to the situation and deciding what fits best. Bass and Avolio came up with a new approach to leadership theory in 1991, referred to as the full-range model, i.e. from laissez-faire (not take responsibility) to transactional (emphasize roles and responsibilities, and reward based on performance) to transformational leadership. The latter is defined as “engender trust, seek to develop leadership in others, exhibit self-sacrifice and serve as moral agents, focusing themselves and followers on objectives that transcend the more immediate needs of the work group” (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2010, p. 485). Further emerging leadership theories are leader-member exchange, shared leadership, servant-leadership and follower theory. What these four theories have in common is that they go further into depth into the relationship between the leader and the follower. The thread that holds all of these leadership theories together is that they attempt to explain what makes the most effective leader. Therefore, before describing and explaining the leadership theory that has formed the basis for this study, the subject of leadership effectiveness will be reviewed next.

2.2.1 Leadership effectiveness

One definition of leadership that has been proven helpful for discussing leadership effectiveness describes that “Leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a
period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that it important for the
responsibilities and welfare of a group”, it continues with “Leadership is persuasion”, and
concludes with “… leadership concerns building cohesive and goal-oriented teams; there is a
causal and definitional link between leadership and team performance” (Hogan & Curphy,
1994, p. 493). Apart from encompassing the various elements of leadership as described in
the previous section, this definition makes the link between the leader and team, or one could
read “organisational”, performance. The question then becomes what does it take to be the
most effective leader? In addition to intellect, technical skills and experience, characterized as
problem-solving-oriented competencies, Russell (2001) puts forward that one increasingly
encounters the notion that “people-oriented” competencies are significant. This is
complemented by Yukl (2012) who reviewed over more than half a century worth of research
about effective leadership. He describes taxonomy of leadership behaviours “used to
influence the performance of a team, work unit, or organization” (p. 68). These include Task-,
Relations- and Change-oriented as well as External leadership behaviours. A total of 15
behaviours have been identified and he found that all are relevant for effective leadership.

This is also supported by work from Goleman (2000) on both “people-oriented”
competencies, or emotional intelligence (as will be described in more detail below), and the
correlation of leadership styles to an organisation’s working environment (or climate) and
how this affects financial results. While being clear that this cannot be regarded as the sole
driver, he suggests that “climate accounts for nearly a third of results” (p. 82). Four of the six
leadership styles, i.e. the authoritative (leading people to a vision), democratic (leading by
building consensus), affiliative (leading by creating bonds and harmony) and coaching
(leading by developing people for the future) styles of leadership, which require higher levels
of emotional intelligence, show a significantly more positive effect on climate and
organisational performance than the two other styles, i.e. coercive (leading by demanding
immediate compliance) and pace-setting (leading by expecting excellence and self-direction)
leadership, which do not require this as much. In line with the situational theories of
leadership described above the best leader does not just stick to one style, but flexes his or her
style based on the situation or the person they are facing. Given the significance attributed to
emotional intelligence for effective leadership, the next section will further review what is
actually meant by it.
2.2.2 Emotional Intelligence

Goleman (2000) quotes the late David McClelland, a noted Harvard University psychologist, who “…found that leaders with strengths in a critical mass of six or more emotional intelligence competencies were far more effective than peers who lacked such strengths” (p. 80). Emotional intelligence of leaders is seen as significant as their intellect and technical skills.

Emotional intelligence, abbreviated both by EQ and EI that will both be used in this study, is defined as “the ability to manage ourselves and our relationships effectively. It consists of four fundamental capabilities: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skill” (Goleman, 2000, p. 80). Each one of these capabilities is composed of specific sets of competencies that Goleman (2000) describes as follows:

- **Self-awareness is made up of:**
  - Emotional self-awareness, i.e. the ability to read and understand your emotions as well as recognize their impact on work performance, relationships, and the like.
  - Accurate self-assessment, i.e. a realistic evaluation of your strengths and limitations.
  - Self-confidence, i.e. a strong and positive sense of self-worth.

- **Self-management means:**
  - Self-control, i.e. the ability to keep disruptive emotions and impulses under control.
  - Trustworthiness, i.e. a consistent display of honesty and integrity.
  - Conscientiousness, i.e. the ability to manage yourself and your responsibilities.
  - Adaptability, i.e. skill at adjusting to changing situations and overcoming obstacles.
  - Achievement orientation, i.e. the drive to meet an internal standard of excellence.
  - Initiative, i.e. a readiness to seize opportunities.

- **Social awareness includes:**
  - Empathy, i.e. skill at sensing other people's emotions, understanding their perspective, and taking an active interest in their concerns.
• Organisational awareness, i.e. the ability to read the currents of organisational life, build decision networks, and navigate politics.
• Service orientation, i.e. the ability to recognize and meet customers' needs.

Social skill refers to:
• Visionary leadership, i.e. the ability to take charge and inspire with a compelling vision.
• Influence, i.e. the ability to wield a range of persuasive tactics.
• Developing others, i.e. the propensity to bolster the abilities of others through feedback and guidance.
• Communication, i.e. skill at listening and at sending clear, convincing, and well-tuned messages.
• Change catalysts, i.e. proficiency in initiating new ideas and leading people in a new direction.
• Conflict management, i.e. the ability to de-escalate disagreements and orchestrate resolutions.
• Building bonds, i.e. proficiency at cultivating and maintaining a web of relationships.
• Teamwork and collaboration, i.e. competent at promoting cooperation and building teams.

In putting Yukl’s (2012) leadership behaviours next to Goleman’s (2000) components of emotional intelligence one could argue that Self-management, Social awareness and Social skill appear to match, whereas not completely, with the 15 leadership behaviours of Yukl’s (2012) hierarchical taxonomy. The significance of EQ is further supported by research from Zenger & Folkman (2002). They describe leadership as a conceptual framework based on Character, Personal Capability, Focus on Results, Interpersonal Skills and Leading Organisational Change. Three out of these, i.e. Character, Personal Capability and Interpersonal Skills are closely linked to emotional intelligence. In their research they state that, “In examining the relationship between leadership effectiveness and desirable outcomes, the consistent finding in all our research was the impact of the best and worst leaders on achieving bottom line results” (p. 30). They report conclusive evidence that leaders with poor leadership skills generate poor results. Their research is equally clear that good leaders tend to produce good results for their organisations. One of their important findings is that leaders have a significant positive impact if they move from being bad leaders to being good leaders.
In addition, they point out that a key skill for all successful leaders is to continuously improve themselves. When discussing how individuals improve themselves the authors offer 25 suggestions amongst which the fourth suggestion is “Find a coach” (p. 235).

It is also worthwhile to mention that not everyone is convinced about emotional intelligence. “To advance, does leadership as a science need EI (emotional intelligence)? I answered yes, because to understand which individual-differences predict leadership effectiveness we have to, of course, identify correlates of leadership. To succeed, do leaders need EI? Given the paucity of evidence, this question is purely theoretical……I vote no” (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009, pp. 248 & 250). The main criticism that underpins this alternate view revolves around the methodology that has been used to test the emotional intelligence framework. Apart from questions around validity, it is noteworthy that some of the same issues that will be raised regarding the studies on the impact of executive coaching (see section 2.4.4) are raised regarding EQ. Methodological issues that are mentioned include “…(6) avoid gathering leader self-reported measures of leadership……., (7) obtain leadership measures from one source (e.g. subordinates, peers, bosses) and leader individual differences from another (e.g. leader IQ, EI, personality)……., (8) use measures that were specifically designed to tap into EI, (9) use practicing leaders in real-world contexts, (10) have an acceptable sample size…….” (p. 249). With the possible exception of (10) this study may be able to fill this gap in the literature.

If effective leadership is built on emotional intelligence and effective leaders produce better results for organisations, the question arises, what does it take to ensure sustained effective leadership? Based on the review of the literature this leads to the topic of Renewal as will be discussed in the next section.

2.2.3 Renewal

According to McKee & Boyatzis (2006) a disturbing trend has been observed where leaders, whom they worked with, found it difficult to stay on top of their game as characterized by a decrease in being effective, showing signs of deteriorating health and becoming unhappier. One clue they identify for this loss of effectiveness is referred to as “a phenomenon that we call power stress: the unique brand of stress that is simply part of being a leader” (p. 30). Within this context it is useful to refer to Lazarus and Folkman’s Transactional Model (1984)
as described by Passmore & Marianetti (2007) in which stress is defined “as the interaction between the environment and the individual as moderated by their appraisal, acceptance and coping strategies” (p. 132). Over time, if this power stress is not managed, leaders may face a phenomenon know as the Sacrifice Syndrome. This has been defined by McKee, Johnston, & Massimilian (2006) as the leader losing the ability to see possibilities, having reduced self-confidence and experiencing effects on physical health. This is close to the notion of burnout, which has been defined “as a psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001, p. 399). The response is characterised by exhaustion, cynicism and detachment, and a feeling of ineffectiveness and lack of accomplishment. One would expect that an effective leader with strong emotional intelligence would recognize these responses. The case can be made that self-awareness is a start, but that the leader has to go a step further and deliberately focus on renewal as defined as practices, i.e. habits of mind, body and behaviour, which make them sustain themselves in the face of continuous challenges. McKee & Boyatzis (2006) identify mindfulness, hope and compassion as three key elements leading to renewal, which “invokes a brain pattern and hormones that changes our mood, while returning our bodies to a healthy state…that allows for restoration or building of resonant relationships so critical to leadership effectiveness” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p.61).

Mindfulness is defined as “…being aware, awake and attending to ourselves and the way around us, i.e. it enables us to pay attention to what is happening to us, and to stop the Sacrifice Syndrome (see above) before it stops us” (McKee & Boyatzis, 2006, p. 34). They continue by describing hope as an element that “enables us to believe that the future we envision is attainable, and to move toward our visions and goals while inspiring others toward those goals as well” (p. 34). This is grounded in a social science definition of hope by Snyder, Rand & Sigmon (2000) “as a combination of clearly articulating goals, charting a course of action or a path, and arriving at the goal while experiencing a sense of well-being as a result of the process (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 151). Compassion is defined as “understanding and empathy for others’ feelings and experiences, caring for others, and willingness to act on those feelings of care and empathy” (p. 179). McKee & Boyatzis (2006) describe that “the experiences of mindfulness, hope, and compassion foster and provoke arousal of the PSNS (the body’s parasympathetic nervous system) and the condition of renewal. A positive cycle is triggered: being in renewal feeds hope, compassion, and mindfulness while it counters the detrimental effects of stress. Therefore, sustainable, effective leadership occurs only when we
wake up and ensure that the sacrifice and stress of leadership are interchanged with experiences of renewal” (p. 33).

Whereas Mindfulness alone is not sufficient, it is one of the elements that supports renewal, and is presented as contributing to sustained leadership effectiveness. Mindfulness has also evolved as an important topic in coaching as discussed by Passmore & Marianetti (2007). They suggest that coaches “make use of the concept of mindfulness in their coaching practice to enhance their coaching practice as well as to contribute towards overall performance improvement” (p. 135). On the basis of this suggestion and since this study aspires to provide both a short- and longer term answer to changes in leadership effectiveness as a result of leadership coaching, the decision has been made to focus on Mindfulness as one of the three elements of renewal.

2.2.3.1 Mindfulness

The origins of mindfulness stem from Buddhist philosophy and are focused on the significance of consciousness. Being alert to mental contents as well as accepting and not judging these are key parts of mindfulness. One definition reached through consensus is:

“We see mindfulness as a process of regulating attention in order to bring a quality of non-elaborative awareness to current experience and a quality of relating to one’s experience within an orientation of curiosity, experiential openness, and acceptance. We further see mindfulness as a process of gaining insight into the nature of one’s mind and the adoption of a de-centred perspective… on thoughts and feelings so that they can be experienced in terms of their subjectivity (versus their necessary validity) and transient nature (versus their permanence)” (Bishop et al., 2004, p. 234).

It is the conscious awareness of ourselves, others and our surroundings both at home and at work. The assertion is that people who are mindful tend to be faster, have better ideas, are happier in life and, most crucially within the context of this research, are usually more effective. Passmore & Marianetti (2007) report that mindfulness is used in different fields, amongst those is the corporate world. They also mention various studies in which the significant benefits of mindfulness training, amongst which improvements in physiology (e.g. well-being, reduced blood pressure and cortisol levels), satisfaction (with the job),
communication, creativity and productivity were reported. These research projects also showed a decrease in stress, tension and anxiety.

As one of the three elements of renewal Mindfulness supports renewal and this contributes to sustainable effective leadership. Emotional intelligence, renewal and mindfulness bring us to the leadership theory that will serve as the basis for this research project.

### 2.2.4 Resonant Leadership

As discussed in section 2.2 there are numerous leadership theories. From the review of the literature on leadership effectiveness, emotional intelligence and mindfulness, the conclusion was drawn that the most fitting emerging leadership theory for this research project is the theory of “resonant leadership”. It is grounded in the work on the theory of primal leadership in which research found “that of all the elements effecting bottom-line performance, the importance of the leader’s mood and its attendant behaviours are most surprising” (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2001, p. 44). The term primal leadership comes directly from these findings and suggests that a leader’s first-and-foremost or primal task is emotional leadership. This implies that the leader needs to focus on building relationships that are resonant.

“Resonant leaders are in tune with those around them. This results in people working in sync with each other, in tune with each other’s thoughts (what to do) and emotions (why to do it)” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 4)\(^5\). As can be derived, this leadership theory is closely tied to both Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and Mindfulness. The starting point for mindfulness is self-awareness, i.e. knowing yourself, and, through self-awareness, being consistent and authentic. Interestingly enough an increase in self-awareness is one of the most frequently cited outcomes of leadership coaching (Ely et al., 2010). Later work states that

“…a potent way of becoming a better leader is to find authentic contexts in which to learn the kinds of social behaviour that reinforce the brain’s social circuitry. Leading effectively is, in other words, less about mastering situations – or even mastering social skill sets - than about developing a genuine interest in and talent for fostering feelings in the people whose cooperation and support you need. The way to develop

\(^5\) Also refer to Primal Leadership by Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2013
your social circuitry is to undertake the hard work of changing your behaviour” (Goleman & Boyatzis, 2008, p. 76).

Changing behaviour to become a better leader is at the source of leadership coaching engagements.

2.2.5 Summary

A brief review of various leadership theories has been presented. The best measure for the effectiveness of leaders has also been discussed and the proposal for this study is that it is the performance of the organisation that the leader is responsible for. This implies that a leader needs to work with followers. This requires more than intellect and technical skills. It implies that leaders require important people skills, often referred to as Emotional Intelligence. In addition, Mindfulness, as one of the three elements of Renewal, is required of the leader to ensure sustainable results. Based on this it has been decided that the resonant leadership theory is the most applicable to serve as the basis for the purposes of this dissertation. To be in tune with him/herself, others and the surroundings, a resonant leader needs to be emotionally intelligent and mindful. This means that a leader needs to be willing to change behaviour. This is what leadership coaching focuses on. In the next section the goal will be to evaluate the different aspects of what constitutes leadership coaching to support and challenge leaders in becoming more effective.

2.3 Key elements of a Leadership Coaching Engagement

From the review of the literature there are a number of items that stand out in terms of their importance to leadership coaching engagements. They include the relationship between the client and the coach, the contract between them, the use of multi-source or 360° feedback, and the objectives for the coaching. These will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

2.3.1 Client-coach relationship

Leadership coaching reflects an evolving dynamic between the client and coach that needs to be evaluated throughout the coaching engagement. The client-coach relationship gets referred
to as one of the most critical aspects of coaching. Ely et al. (2010) characterize it as the rapport, collaboration, commitment, trust and confidentiality between the client and the coach. It also gets referred to as the chemistry between both parties. While popular in its use, Hooijberg & Lane (2009) did not find a good definition for “chemistry” and further explained this by “coach-coachee fit”, “a good match”, “forming a strong connection”, “clear and open communication”, “a safe and supporting environment” and “understanding the coachee’s culture and business”. The most recent literature appears not to have evolved on this definition. Over and above the relationship between client and coach, other relationships should be considered as well. These include the relationship between the coach and the organisation, as represented by either someone in Human Resources and/or the client’s boss(es), and the relationship between the client and his/her boss(es), which will be discussed in the next section.

In terms of definitions, the client in this project is defined as a leader in an organisation with management responsibility for people. S/he also sets the direction for his/her department and is responsible for the results. S/he is formally involved in an engagement with a leadership coach for the specific purpose of becoming a more effective leader. The “leadership coach”, sometimes also referred to as “coach” or “executive coach”, is “a trained professional who has a formal one-on-one relationship with the client for the purpose of improving his or her leadership effectiveness” (Ely et al., 2010, p. 587). Coaches can be both internal, i.e. from within the client’s organisation, as well as external, i.e. coming from outside the client’s organisation. De Haan & Duckworth (2013) reported that in 2004 the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) in the United Kingdom indicated that 64% of organisations use external coaches.

Many authors, e.g. De Haan et al. (2013), De Haan & Duckworth (2013), Boyce, Jackson & Neal (2010), De Haan, Culpin & Cird (2011), Baron & Morin (2009), Feldman & Lankau (2005) and Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) have noted the importance of trust and chemistry between client and coach as a possible predictor for coaching outcome. Comparisons have been made with psychotherapy and, as reported by De Haan et al. (2013) in discussing what is common to therapy approaches, the quality of the client-therapist relationship is one of those dominating factors. A study by the International Coach Federation (2009) shows that “personal rapport” (83%) and “personal compatibility” (80%) were the highest-ranking variables in Importance of Coach Attributes for clients.
In leadership coaching the question of matching the right client with the right coach therefore receives significant attention once it has been decided that coaching is the chosen intervention. In practice the organisation usually presents the client with a few, two to three, coaches for the client to choose from. As pointed out by Boyce et al. (2010) client-coach matching faces some practical limitations, e.g. an organisation may have a fixed number of coaches in their coach-pool or there may be time constraints.

During their investigation of correlations between rapport, trust and commitment between clients (military cadets) and coaches (also military personnel, i.e. senior leaders and not external, professional coaches), Boyce et al. (2010) report noticing high, positive correlations for the client as well as significantly lower positive ones for the coaches. They also mention that leadership performance was predicted by client-coach commitment ($t (66) = 1.97, p < .05$) and not by rapport nor by trust between client and coach. However, they discuss finding that relationship processes mediated match conditions on outcomes. In addition, their study shows that “relationship processes fully mediate the relationship between client-coach compatibility scores and coaching satisfaction” (p. 923).

Baron & Morin (2009) found that the client-coach relationship mediated the number of sessions of coaching and how the manager’s self-efficacy had developed, claiming that the quality of relationship therefore determines how effective the coaching will be. Another aspect that sometimes gets overlooked is the role of the client’s boss. Supervisory support to implement newly developed skills as a result of the coaching was also seen as a predictor of the client-coach relationship as far as the client is concerned. Both De Haan et al. (2013) and Baron & Morin (2009) used adapted versions of the Working Alliance (originally from Horvath & Greenberg), an instrument that is frequently used in therapy to assess the quality of the relationship between client and therapist. De Haan et al. (2013) also found evidence that the client-coach relationship, as measured via the working alliance, showed a high correlation with the client-rated measure of the coaching outcome. Another interesting aspect they brought in is that personality has no significant influence on client-coach matching.

The importance of the quality of the relationship and its impact on the coaching outcome seems evident. As mentioned by De Haan et al. (2013) each one will have a different experience of this relationship and the more pertinent question becomes how they will ensure that they are continuously aware of how each one of them experiences the relationship in
order to ensure the best possible outcome. In the next section the mechanics of the relationship, as usually defined in a contract, will be discussed further.

2.3.2 Leadership coaching contract

According to Thach (2002) a typical leadership coaching engagement involves contracting, data collection and coaching. Contracting involves the establishment of an agreement describing objectives, timeframe and costs. Data collection refers to establishing a baseline for coaching-relevant data, e.g. interviewing people who work with the client and reviewing performance evaluations of the client. Coaching itself is determined by the actual sessions spent together by coach and client. A more complete description of a coaching engagement should, first, include the intake, or matching process (see also the previous section) as a first step. This is when a client evaluates various coaches to establish a good match; this evaluation is just as significant for the coach. To enhance the probability of a good outcome, the potential client and the purpose of the coaching should be a good match for the coach as well.

To be able to establish objectives for the coaching program, the next part of the contract usually describes how data will be collected to determine the basis for the coaching. Section 2.3.3 will provide more details about the various processes for data collection. The objectives are used to define a timeframe for the coaching, the number of sessions and the duration of said sessions. It is at this point that a determination is made about what the involvement of the client’s boss will be to support the client in his/her development during the coaching engagement.

The next part of the contract deals with the question of costs. In coaching there are usually two scenarios, i.e. the clients pays for the coaching, so-called private coaching, or the employer of the client agrees to pay, which is usually called corporate coaching. The paying corporation will be referred to as “sponsor” from here onwards. For the purpose of this study only corporate coaching engagements are considered.

---

6 It should be noted that there could also be a scenario in which the coaching is provided for free, so-called pro-bono coaching. For the purposes of this paper this has not been deemed relevant.
Other key parts of the contract usually include the evaluation of the coaching itself by the client and a final step in which a determination is made about what the effect of the coaching has been. The latter, as will be explained later, is the focus of this paper. Because the relationship between the client and the coach is such a crucial factor, as described in the previous section, coaches often complement a formal contract with the organisation with a simple agreement between the client and the coach with a particular focus on what the final objectives are, what the coaching plan is to achieve these and how the client and the coach will hold each other mutually accountable for the relationship between them.

As mentioned before, data collection before the actual determination of the coaching objectives is a key ingredient of a leadership coaching engagement. Apart from getting inputs from the client’s boss(es), a Human Resources representative, gaining access to and reviewing performance appraisals and prior relevant assessments, obtaining feedback from multiple sources, referred to as 360° feedback, is another approach that is often used. The next section will describe in detail what is involved in obtaining this.

2.3.3 360° Feedback

There have been a number of studies on the use of multi-source or 360° feedback in combination with an (executive) coach (Hooijberg & Lane, 2009; Luthans & Peterson, 2003; Nieminen, Smerek, Kotrba, & Denison, 2013; Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003; Thach, 2002). Multi-source or 360° feedback has its origins in the 50s and 60s as part of the human relations movement (Waldman, Atwater & Antonioni, 1998). The idea has been, as part of the organisational development movement, to find mechanisms to develop better communication between managers, their direct reports, peers, bosses and other stakeholders in order to improve the way the organisation works as a whole. 360° feedback provides a platform for providing people with feedback, which otherwise may not be forthcoming. This is then helpful in the development of the person concerned.

Whereas 360° feedback has proven to be very useful, it is also important to consider some important pitfalls. Waldman et al. (1998) have raised three key issues. First, the question of what is being measured and, second, how is it going to be used. A third issue has to do with how raters are trained. As it relates to both first points the proposition is that the 360° feedback has to be in line with competencies, behaviours and skills that are both linked to the
organisational strategy and objectives, and are valued by said organisation. The third point has to do with the question of how to prevent raters from being either too lenient or too tough. As pointed out by Nieminen et al. (2013) raters may give higher ratings if they fear the possible effects the ratings may have on the participant, or as a result of a need for possible self-preservation. The flipside may also be true, i.e. raters give much lower ratings to cause a specific outcome. Participants may also have a tendency to rate themselves either too harsh, because the results from others will make them look better, or too lenient out of self-serving reasons. The immediate thought that comes to mind is that the 360° instrument should be designed in such a way that it is clear what is expected from the raters as well as is supported by clarifying instructions that raters can turn to. Further, it should be clear which rater information will be made available to the participant and whose ratings will be visible at the individual level. A fourth point should be added regarding who is going to use the 360° feedback data, i.e. will this be the boss for a performance appraisal or the person to whom the 360° feedback has been given for their development. This also may influence how raters will complete the 360° feedback. Particularly in an initial stage, the recommendation is to solely use 360° feedback for developmental purposes (Thach, 2002). A clear plan and subsequent implementation of a 360° feedback process appear to be prerequisites to ensure that the benefits of a 360° are maximized.

Another aspect of 360° feedback is how the feedback is received by participants in such a feedback process. Brett & Atwater (2001) studied this with a group of 125 MBA (master’s in business administration) students and found that recipients reacted negatively and found feedback less helpful if they received less favourable ratings as compared to their own ratings. This was contrary to the expectation that this would actually motivate developmental change. As recognized by the authors, the fact that they did this study as part of an education and not in organisational setting had an impact on the outcome. Another argument could be made that students may not be as mature, ready and developed yet to receive critical feedback. For organisations to truly benefit from 360° feedback processes it is suggested by Brett & Atwater (2001) that the support from an external person, e.g. coach, could particularly help those who need to deal with the negative feedback most. In their study of 1361 senior managers, Smither et al. (2003) found that for 404 managers who worked with a coach, as opposed to those who did not, the likelihood was higher that they set clear and specific goals, asked their bosses for how they could improve and received higher ratings from their bosses and those people who worked directly for them after one year. This has been corroborated by another study by
Luthans & Peterson (2003) of 20 managers in which it was found that using a coach in combination with 360° feedback overcame issues related to better understanding the data, the differences between self- and other ratings, and what to do next with the data from the 360°.

A final issue with 360° feedback has to do with rater consistency. Particularly in longitudinal designs, in which there are Time 1, e.g. before coaching, and Time 2, e.g. after coaching, measurements, there is a high probability that raters in a 360° feedback process are not the same. This has been well documented by MacKie (2014). To test scores between original and new scorers a paired sample t test was performed and no significant differences were found.

Obtaining multi-source feedback can be done in different ways. It may either consist of interviews by the coach with the people chosen by the client or by means of an instrument either chosen by the coach or the organisation the client works for. The use of a, usually, web-based, tool normally requires training and certification of the coach, particularly when it comes to the explanation and interpretation of the output from the tool. The report from either the interviews or the instrument is the basis for the definition of the objectives for the coaching. The next section will address the role of these coaching objectives in a leadership coaching engagement.

2.3.4 Coaching objectives

The role of objectives has been discussed in the literature by various authors (Bowles, Cunningham, De La Rosa, & Picano, 2007; Evers, Brouwers, & Tomic, 2006; Orenstein, 2006; Smither et al., 2003). As mentioned in the previous section, it was found that “managers who worked with an EC (Executive Coach) were more likely than other managers to set specific (rather than vague) goals” (Smither et al., 2003, p. 23). This raises the question about what the role of goal setting is in coaching. Evers et al. (2006) showed in a study of 30 coached managers and 48 non-coached managers in a government agency that the coached managers had significantly higher scores in self-efficacy in setting their own goals.

Whereas based only on one case study, Orenstein (2006) shows that the client, who was coached, had an increase in scores for behaviours directly related to the objectives of the coaching (mean difference of 0.9) versus behaviours indirectly related to the objectives (mean difference of 0.6). In examining the effectiveness of coaching between middle (30) and
executive (29) managers in a military recruiting organisation Bowles et al. (2007) found that there were no substantial differences between the two groups in terms of the percentage of objectives achieved, particularly in terms of those related to the improvement of leadership. They concluded therefore that coaching based on goals is an essential ingredient of any coaching engagement. De Meuse et al. (2009) further corroborated this by proposing that, in order to get a better return on investment of coaching, the objectives for the coaching should directly correspond to business and/or organisational requirements.

2.3.5 Summary

Several core ingredients to a leadership coaching engagement have been reviewed. The relationship between the client and the coach is usually seen as crucial for a successful outcome. It has been discussed that this relationship is usually solidified in a coaching contract. Additional relationships, e.g. with the sponsoring organisation, the leader’s boss and Human Resources, are also significant. Feedback is the source of most leadership coaching contracts and this is usually the basis for the formulation of objectives, which have also been recognised as a key component. Multi-source feedback presents its own challenges, particularly in terms of possible bias by the evaluators and, particularly in the use of this feedback in a longitudinal study, evaluator consistency need to be considered. This is a good lead into the topic of measuring leadership coaching and related limitations that will be covered in the next section.

2.4 Impact of executive/leadership coaching

The review on the impact of executive/leadership coaching has been split into five sections on the basis of the literature. The first section will focus on the initial question of impact only. The second part will describe two theoretical frameworks to analyse impact, followed by the third section that will review subsequent coaching impact studies. In the fourth part the focus will be on the methodological approaches used to evaluate what leaders get out of coaching. The fifth section will conclude with the limitations of these methods.
2.4.1 Initial review of coaching impact

In their review of the literature on empirical evidence regarding the impact of executive coaching, Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) presented six studies (Garman, Whiston & Zlatoper, 2000; Gegner 1997; Hall, Otazo & Hollenbeck, 1999; Judge & Cowell, 1997; Laske, 1999b; Olivero, Bane & Kopelman, 1997) that delivered support for illustrating the impact of coaching. For the purpose of this thesis three of the five ideas discussed in Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson’s (2001) comprehensive review are pertinent. These three ideas are that executive coaching benefits both the executive and the company, increases learning and contributes to changes in behaviour. Whereas these relate directly to the impact of coaching, the other two ideas mentioned deal more with the educational background of coaches and the methods coaches use. Therefore, these have been deemed less relevant for this research project. It is worth mentioning at this moment that, whereas references are made in later publications, Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) do not mention the work of Peterson (1993) who first presented “Measuring Change: A Psychometric Approach to Evaluating Individual Coaching Outcomes” at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology. One explanation could be that the results do not appear to have been published in a peer-reviewed academic journal.

As reported by Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) the results of Olivero et al. (1997) support the first idea that executive coaching benefits both the executive and the company. Executives experienced coaching as a positive endeavour, and they gained increased satisfaction and productivity in their work. In Hall et al.’s study (1999), executives reported being "very satisfied" with their coaching experiences, as did the executives in Gegner's (1997) study. Garman et al. (2000) also reported that professional publications concerning executive coaching practice were generally positive and the executives in Laske (1999b) were chosen because they had been identified as experiencing meaningful change as a result of coaching. This contributes to the third idea that coaching contributes to changes in behaviour.

A closer look at this literature reveals support for the idea that an increase in learning happens with executive coaching. Only the study of Olivero et al. (1997) provided a bottom line of increased productivity in a public agency while comparing training-only and training-with-
coaching found that whereas training increased productivity by 22.4%, coaching increased productivity by 88%. Further to this, another idea discussed in the practice-based literature and supported by the results of Gegner (1997) and Laske (1999b) as described by Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) are the behavioural changes that occur as a result of executive coaching. All of the executives in both studies reported behavioural changes, in terms of awareness and responsibility and Laske (1999b) provided support for the hypothesis that the developmental level of the client and coach is necessary for effecting developmental change.

In summary the impact of executive coaching, based on this part of the literature, has been seen as:

- Benefitting both the executive and the company,
- Increasing learning,
- Contributing to changes in behaviour.

2.4.2 Theoretical frameworks for measuring impact

Before embarking on answering the question of how to evaluate the effectiveness of executive coaching the literature has been reviewed for approaches that have been selected in the evaluation of similar types of interventions, specifically training and treatment, because they appear to be closely related to coaching. The first one describes a model that has been developed for the evaluation of training programs. Its principles can be used to inform the evaluation of leadership coaching as suggested by Ely et al. (2010). The second one provides a conceptual framework based on normative and causal theory for the evaluations of programs that involve treatment, an approach thought to be worthwhile to consider as well for the purposes of analysis in this project.

First, Donald Kirkpatrick (1996) carried out a review on Evaluating Training Programs. His model is made up of four levels:

- Level 1: Reaction, which is a measure of how participants feel about the various aspects of a training program, including the topic, speaker, schedule, etc.; this is basically a measure of satisfaction.
- Level 2: Learning, which is a measure of the knowledge acquired, skills improved or attitudes changed due to training.
- Level 3: Behaviour, which is a measure of the extent to which participants change their on-the-job behaviour because of the training.
- Level 4: Results, which measures the final results that occur due to training, including increased sales, higher productivity, bigger profits, reduced costs, less employee turnover, and improved quality.

It was concluded that “…evaluation becomes more difficult and expensive as it progresses from level 1 to 4 and more important and meaningful” and “…understanding all four levels is necessary and there are no easy answers for knowing how to measure results” (p. 56). He further recommends the following in evaluating training programs in terms of behavioural changes:

a. Review performance on a pre- and post-training basis,
b. The performance appraisal should be done on the basis of a 360° feedback and include (the more the better): trainees; trainees’ supervisors, subordinates, and peers; and others familiar with the trainees’ on-the-job performance,
c. Conduct a statistical analysis to compare pre- and post performance and relate changes therein to the training,
d. Perform a post-training evaluation three months or more after training so that trainees can put into practice what they have learned; appraisals thereafter may add to validity of the study,
e. Use a control group.

Whereas the merits of d) are recognized, the difference between training and a leadership coaching engagement is that training usually is a one-time event whereas coaching takes place over a longer period of time. In itself coaching includes continuous learning, i.e. practice, feedback, learning as long as the coaching engagement lasts. Therefore, it can be argued that recommendation d) is already built into the coaching process.

To continue building on theory for the purposes of this research it was helpful to consider (Chen, 1989) and his description and evaluation of program theory. He defines a social or intervention program as “…an organized effort to intervene in an ongoing social process such
as solving a social problem or providing a service” (p. 391). He continues by describing the “normative theory”, which provides some theoretical guidance on how to design and implement a program. It provides the rationale and justification, and the “causal theory”, which specifies how the program works and under what conditions it will have what kind of consequences or processes. It describes the underlying causal mechanisms which link, mediate, or condition the treatment variable(s) and outcome(s) variables in a program. The normative theory assists in better understanding the conceptualization and assumptions of a program as well as identifying crucial issues in its design and implementation. The causal theory supports getting insights into the worthiness of a program or diagnosing problems in its causal processes from which future improvements can be derived. The worthiness of a social program is difficult to evaluate without the context and/or intervening factors that can be the key factors in determining success or failure.

Six domains in program theory are further described which are at the root of basic and composite types of theory-driven evaluations (Chen, 1989):

- **Treatment Domain**, i.e. the essential element which provides the intended changes in a domain, e.g. the purpose of the leadership coaching; this allows for Normative Treatment Evaluation, which focuses on identifying the normative structure of the treatment, examining the actual treatment delivered, and/or assessing the congruence between the normative and implemented treatment.

- **Implementation Environment Domain**, which attempts to understand under what environment the treatment is implemented, e.g. the organisations in which the leaders/clients work for the purposes of this research; the Normative Implementation Environment Evaluation focuses on identifying the normative and actual implementation environment, and assessing the congruency between theory and actual.

- **Outcome Domain**, i.e. goals or intended outcomes which are used to guide activities and resource allocations and are used to assess the effectiveness of the program, e.g. for this research the achievement of coaching objectives, change in 360° feedback and improvement of business results; Normative Outcome Evaluation involves systematically identifying or clarifying outcomes for facilitating the processes of planning and management.
• Impact Domain, which is concerned with assessing the impact of treatment on the outcome, e.g. the effect of leadership coaching on achieving objectives, change in 360° and business results; Impact Evaluation assesses the impact of treatment on intended outcome.

• Intervening Mechanism Domain investigates the causal processes which link the implemented treatment to outcomes, e.g. what are the key ingredients that cause a leadership coaching engagement to create the desired effect; Intervening Mechanism Evaluation attempts to expand the impact of the evaluation by incorporating intervening processes.

• Generalization Domain, which helps evaluators to indicate to what type of situation the results can be generalized, e.g. the significance of the client-coach relationship; Generalization Evaluations attempts to integrate the issues of generalization into evaluation processes.

The first three are part of the general normative theory, whereas the last three are related to the general causal theory. Chen describes two types of theory driven evaluations, i.e. basic, which have been included and described above, and composite, further described below.

Different combinations of the basic types drive the definition of composite types. As described by Chen, the topic of this research lends itself well to the three composite types that he describes, i.e.

1. Normative Treatment-Impact Evaluation – this pinpoints crucial components in the treatment that affects the outcome; for the purposes of this paper this could refer to the purpose of the coaching and, for example, the change in 360° feedback after coaching,

2. Normative Implementation Environment-Impact Evaluation – this is constructed from an integration of implementation environment evaluation with an impact evaluation; in light of this thesis this could for example relate the organisation in which the client works and the change in 360° feedback after leadership coaching,

3. Normative Outcome-Impact Evaluation – the integration of normative outcome evaluation and an impact evaluation to be sensitive to both intended and unintended outcomes; an example in the context of this dissertation could be achievement of coaching objectives, change in 360° feedback and improvement of business results.
It is further interesting to note that Chen (1989) advocates that evaluators take a more active role in the evaluation and allow them to provide information, which stakeholders might otherwise ignore or misconstrue, because the plan in this project is that the author will actively participate during the collection of the data.

With these two theoretical frameworks as background for evaluating impact, the next section will focus on the results that have been found in various additional studies on the impact of executive coaching.

2.4.3 Coaching impact studies

Since Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson’s publication in 2001, a number of academic peer-reviewed articles have been written to date (April 2015) that have been deemed relevant for this work in terms of studying the impact of executive/leadership coaching, i.e. the impact itself, the methodologies used and the limitations of said methodologies. In this section the focus will be on the published results from these studies.

Thach (2002) published the outcome of an action-research study on executive coaching and leadership effectiveness in which multi-source feedback was used as well. “…the results suggest that the combination of multi-rater feedback and individual coaching do increase leadership effectiveness up to 60% - according to direct report and peer post-survey feedback” (p. 205). Smither et al. (2003) have further explored the use of multisource feedback and the impact of working with an executive coach. In their quasi-experimental field study they began with 1’361 senior managers, all receiving feedback, 404 of whom then worked with a coach. A year later 88% of the original senior managers then received more 360° feedback. The hypotheses used revolved around 1) setting specific goals, 2) sharing feedback and soliciting suggestions for improvement, 3) executive coaching positively improving multisource ratings and 4) reactions of feedback recipients to the coach and coaching to be positive to improvements in multisource ratings. The research shows that those working with a coach were more likely to set specific goals (H1), solicit ideas for improvement from their supervisors (H2) and, although the effect size was small, improved in terms of ratings by their direct report and supervisor ratings (H3) with a reported effect size of
Their results fail to prove their fourth hypothesis (reactions to the coach and coaching engagement relate positively to changes in 360° feedback ratings).

The question of using 360° assessment instruments during coaching has further been addressed when Luthans & Peterson (2003) discovered that to strengthen the effectiveness of 360°s may be to use them in combination with coaching focused on improving self-awareness and behavioural management. They describe two key lessons that they could derive from the study-results. “First, for 360 programs to have a positive impact, the target managers may need systematic coaching along with the 360-degree feedback in order to gain self-awareness and have a positive impact on self- and others' work satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to turnover” and further they found specifically “that archivally gathered organisational performance (i.e., sales revenue, unit-level production quality, and customer satisfaction ratings) significantly increased from right before the feedback-coaching (Time 1) to the three-month period following the feedback coaching (Time 2)” (p. 252).

A quasi-experimental study by Evers et al. (2006) has analysed the effects of coaching two different groups, i.e. one followed a coaching program and one did not. They found that “…the coached group scored significantly higher than the control group on two variables: outcome expectancies to act in a balanced way and self-efficacy beliefs to set one’s own goals” (p. 174). The reported effect size has been $d = .5$ for some self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies in the coached versus the control group. This finding supports the notion that coaching promotes understanding and achieves behavioural change.

Orenstein (2006) has published a case study that claims executive coaching efficacy can be measured empirically. By applying Alderfer’s & Brown’s (1972) Empathic Organic Questionnaire to executive coaching it has been found that the coaching client changed most the behaviours directly related to stated coaching objectives; next, behaviours indirectly related to objectives, and least, behaviours not addressed in coaching. Grounded in organisational psychology the added value of this work is illustrating the importance of ownership of the data-collection process by the client as opposed to his or her boss. Another strand is the formulation of coaching objectives and their relevance in evaluating the efficacy of coaching. As has been mentioned by Orenstein (2006), the method she used is not for everyone and the question is how to simplify a data-collection process to support the definition of clear coaching objectives that will produce improvement in the client’s
behaviour. Some insight on this has been drawn out in another study from Bowles et al. (2007). Here the influence of participant buy-in and a clear definition of coaching goals on coaching effectiveness have been researched. The authors conclude that managers who received coaching did better than those who didn’t receive coaching even though these were experienced/incumbent counterparts. They have also found that both groups of participants demonstrated growth on some dimensions of leader competencies and achievement of self-set goals. This strengthens the argument for establishing clear coaching objectives.

In a survey Wasylyshyn et al. (2006) have focused on the effectiveness of a coaching program commissioned by a global company for high potential employees who wanted to develop their emotional competence (see also Goleman, 1998). Survey results indicate sustained learning and behaviour change among program participants over an extended period. Amongst the benefits of this coaching program to the company cited by the participants have been “becoming more effective leaders (providing vision and inspiration to others), improved interpersonal skills (enhanced listening, achieving more buy-in and alignment, ability to relate to a more diverse group of people) and positive impact on the company’s bottom line (better negotiating ability in high stress situations)” (p. 74). Their managers and HR partners indicate more effective leadership and better interpersonal skills. The participants also cite as most helpful in the program them achieving greater self-awareness and deeper insight of the impact of their behaviour on others. Their bosses and HR partners indicate that participants achieved better results as a result of the program. The significance of this work is that it supports the case that a coaching program can help in the development of emotional competence (self-awareness). As discussed earlier (see Leadership effectiveness) this is a key attribute for effective leaders.

A study of 55 companies by McDermott et al. (2007) has been conducted to find out how they manage and measure coaching. “The good news from the study is that coaching programs seem to make significant difference in overall organisational effectiveness by improving teamwork and ability to execute strategy. We found this to be particularly true when coaching is focused on driving behavioural change rather than cultural change and when the emphasis is on positive performance outcomes rather than remedial issues” (p. 32). A key conclusion has been that the use of external coaches for the executives (CEO, SVP’s and GM’s) correlated well with perceived overall coaching effectiveness, because it set a positive tone for the rest of the organisation, i.e. everyone is able and should work on improving
him/herself. Further, this article also shows the need for a more rigorous and integrated approach to managing and measuring coaching within organisations despite showing encouraging results regarding coaching effectiveness for organisations. Whereas goal-setting, 360° feedback and follow-up have been illustrated before to be key in coaching, the contribution of this work reinforces the importance of this.

Kombarakaran et al. (2008) have followed a different approach in another study to empirically prove that executive coaching is an effective method of leadership development. The findings of this study show that coaching resulted in positive change in five areas: people management, relationship with managers, goal setting and prioritization, engagement and productivity, and dialogue and communication. It has been reported that, “…executives increased their people effectiveness by building on strengths and working through their blind spots, strengthened their relationships with their manager, direct reports, and others, and developed the skills and experience to coach others. Executive coaching assisted in attaining a higher level of executive performance” (p. 89).

Since leaders spend a significant portion of their time in meetings a study has been done by Perkins (2009) to determine what the impact of executive coaching is on the effectiveness of how leaders manage meetings. Based on a pre- and post-coaching measurement for 21 leaders in combination with a survey, the results indicate that “more productive meeting leadership behaviours can be identified by means of observation and subsequently changed via an executive coaching process involving the provision of positively framed, objective feedback. Results generally supported the hypotheses regarding coached behavioural changes by meeting leaders, and survey responses suggested that changes led to increased understanding of meeting leadership, improved skills in meeting leadership, and more positive meeting outcomes” (p. 311-312). An effect size of $d > .95$ for 9 out of 11 measures regarding leadership behaviours in meetings has been reported. This study contributes to the assessment that executive coaching contributes to behavioural change.

Building on earlier work to both getting as objective measurements as possible and separating the impact of multisource feedback and executive coaching, a quasi-experiment with a sample of 469 managers in a large government agency Nieminen et al. (2013) have aimed to establish the specific impact of executive coaching in addition to just providing the feedback by means of a workshop. They found that “both interventions were associated with similar
improvements according to outside rater perspectives, whereas executive coaching was associated with a unique positive effect on self-perceptions” (p. 164) with effect sizes ranging from $d = .17$ (mission-focused behaviours) to .27 (adaptability-focused leadership behaviours).

Most recently, results have been published from a study by MacKie (2014) in which the impact of a specific (strength-based) executive coaching process was measured in a between-subjects non-equivalent control group design in which a multi-source feedback tool has also been used. The claim is that “the results clearly demonstrated a significant increase in the other-rater feedback on transformational leadership behaviours” (p. 132).

These studies confirm by and large the three conclusions raised in the review by Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson (2001) as documented in section 2.4.1. In addition, the publications reviewed in this section suggest that executive coaching has the following impact:

- It contributes to an increase in leadership performance and effectiveness,
- It supports increased organisational performance and effectiveness.
- It leads to a strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs to set one’s own specific goals,
- It facilitates the coaching client to change most the behaviours directly related to stated coaching objectives,
- It leads to clients soliciting ideas for improvement from their supervisors,
- It contributes to improved ratings by direct reports and supervisors.

In itself this can be regarded as good news for coaching. What needs to be done next, in order to determine the significance and limitations of these outcomes, is to review the literature for how these results have been obtained and this will be subject for the following section.

### 2.4.4 Coaching impact measurement methodologies

Over and above the literature describing coaching impact results, three meta-analyses, i.e. from De Meuse et al. (2009), Ely et al. (2010) and Theeboom et al. (2013), have been selected to further review the methodologies used for evaluating the impact of executive coaching empirically. Where appropriate, references will be made to the two theories on evaluating impact, i.e. Kirkpatrick (1996) and Chen (1989), as discussed in section 2.4.2.
When it comes to the evaluation of the empirical evidence related to the effectiveness of executive coaching Ely et al. (2010) conclude, after a review of 49 studies, that 67% of these used a survey methodology; 49% used interviews and 14% used a case study approach. 98% of every study included self-report data from clients with significantly fewer studies reporting data from subordinates (20%), peers (16%), superiors (24%) or coaches (12%). As it relates to the Kirkpatrick model (see section 2.4.2) they continue to report that in their review of studies evaluating leadership coaching Level 1 (Reaction) has been measured through satisfaction with coaching (27% of the studies) and perceived coaching effectiveness (49%). Level 2 (Learning) has been measured through self-awareness and self-efficacy (both 22%) and job satisfaction (10%) and cognitive flexibility (7%). At Level 3 (Behaviour) engagement in key behaviours (86%) and assessment of goal-progress (41%) have been used with the majority of these being self-reported. Return on investment (ROI) (10%) and retention (4%) have been used to measure Level 4 (Results). The issue with ROI is that data usually only relied on the estimates by clients.

Ely et al. (2010) present an integrated framework of coaching evaluation based on their review of evaluation methodologies in the 49 leadership coaching studies. They suggest that future evaluation studies need to examine changes in outcomes (e.g., pre- to post-performance, as well as the effects of different aspects of coaching (i.e., client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching processes) on coaching outcomes. They assert this to be particularly valuable in understanding the relative contribution of specific elements of the coaching process to overall effectiveness. Their review also suggested three main areas that reflect significant implications for the advancement of future research on leadership coaching — collection of multi-source data, consideration of multi-level effects, and formative evaluations (see section 2.4.2) of the client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching process.

They describe two types of evaluations, i.e. summative, which focuses on measuring the outcome of an intervention (refer also back to Chen’s Normative Outcome Evaluation), and formative (refer back to Chen’s Intervening Mechanism Evaluation), which assesses areas for improvement and is process-oriented, which are being discussed in the literature. They further mention regarding leadership coaching that it is interesting to note that both types of
evaluations are used and that there is an argument that a combination of the two is required to obtain meaningful insight.

Additionally, based on their (Ely et al., 2010) review of summative coaching evaluations, the following three recommendations emerged. First, evaluation efforts should collect multi-source data. Particularly in regard to assessing changes in clients' behaviour, multi-source data (e.g., subordinates, peers, and superiors) will help to bring added validity to the coaching evaluation literature, especially measures of business impact. It is interesting to note that Kirkpatrick (1996) makes exactly the same recommendation regarding the evaluation of training programs. Second, the nature of leadership as social influence calls for a multi-level perspective of coaching outcomes that include changes in the attitudes, performance, and retention of both the client and the client's subordinates. A link can be made to Chen’s composite types of evaluations. Third, evaluation plans should include distal outcomes. Some of the most valuable outcomes to the organisation (e.g., leadership retention, adequate pipeline to fill senior positions) may not be observable until months or years after the coaching intervention has ended. Kirkpatrick recommends that evaluations three months after a training program and beyond will really add the required validity to the results.

Particularly building on the first point mentioned above it was significant to come across the position (Hogan et al., 1994) that leaders should be evaluated in terms of the performance of their teams. It is further pointed out that it is difficult to obtain the data or that external factors contaminate it. They further state that perhaps the best alternative is to ask subordinates, peers and superiors to evaluate a leader. Further they refer to the empirical literature suggesting these sources, taken together, are moderately but significantly correlated. The approach described here is typically referred to as multisource or 360° feedback as discussed in section 2.3.3. In addition to what has been discussed earlier it is important to make reference to another study (Hooijberg & Lane, 2009) in which it was reported that multisource feedback research has shown that the extent to which improvement occurs depends on a variety of personality variables and that researchers have both suggested and to some extent shown that providing coaching in addition to giving the multisource feedback increases the amount of performance improvement.

De Meuse at al. (2009) have identified twenty-two studies during a meta-analysis of the research evaluating the effectiveness of executive coaching, of which only six were deemed to
be empirical studies according to the criteria they defined. These criteria were that they had to be executive coaching engagements, provided by an external coach, based on a pre- and post-coaching design, and with reported statistics in the article. They describe the following key issues related to the evaluation of executive coaching and elaborate on three measurement and methodology issues:

1. The purpose of the coaching evaluation – their suggestion is that coaches should continuously monitor the coaching process, identify problems in a timely manner, and adjust and readjust their coaching activities as the process unfolds,

2. Criteria used to evaluate coaching – they make a case that the single best outcome criterion is the coaching objective and that the ROI (Return on Investment) largely depend on how directly the objective corresponds to business or organisational requirements,

3. The rigor of the coaching evaluation – they state that it is generally agreed upon that the research design with the highest methodological rigor is a pre-post, control group design, whereas a pre-post design is probably the most appropriate study with an adequate level of methodological rigor. In addition they focus on the assessment instrument used and the need to improve the psychometric quality of these instruments. Last, from a research perspective, they stress the importance of carefully isolating the unique contribution of coaching as compared to other leadership development interventions.

Further, they describe three factors that moderate the effectiveness of coaching:

1. The type of coaching, i.e. to address derailment as opposed to development,
2. The content of the coaching engagement,
3. Coaching methodologies.

As their meta-analysis indicates, there is an inconsistent relationship between executive coaching and coaching outcomes. They propose researchers should systematically investigate how coaching effectiveness is moderated by the purpose, content, and type of coaching.

Theeboom at al. (2013) has performed the third meta-analysis with a focus on the efficacy of coaching within organisations by trained professional coaches. Out of a 107 potential
abstracts they arrived at 18 that fulfil their criteria. These included that the studies had to be quantitative, include professionally trained coaches, could not be cross-sectional (using different groups), and had to meet their definition of the coaching process. For the latter reference is made to the definition of coaching by Grant (2003) “as a result-oriented, systematic process in which the coach facilitates the enhancement of life experience and goal-attainment in the personal and/or professional lives of normal, non-clinical clients” (p. 1). They sharpened their criteria further by the notion that, apart from having to be professionally trained, the coach could not have formal authority over the client. The fact that their definition of coaching effectiveness includes factors of well being, coping, work and career-related attitudes, and goal-directed self-regulation over and above performance measures can explain why there is only an overlap of 3 studies (Luthans & Peterson, 2003; Peterson, 1993; Smither et al., 2003) between their meta-analysis and the one by De Meuse et al (2010). The large majority of the 18 studies depended on self-reported data. They have concluded that “coaching, in general, has a significant positive effect across the range of outcome measures we examined” (Theeboom et al., 2013, p. 10). They also found that study-design could have an impact on results with within-subject design showing better results possibly due to not controlling as much as mixed-design studies for other biases. A second interesting finding of this study is that they concluded that more coaching sessions do not automatically mean better results from the coaching process.

In summary, it is derived from the above that a methodology to obtain empirical evidence about the impact of leadership coaching should include:

1. Executive coaching engagements provided by professionally trained external coaches,
2. A pre- and post-coaching within-subject control group design, whereas a pre-post design is probably the most appropriate study with an adequate level of methodological rigor,
3. Collection of multi-source data based on high quality psychometric instruments,
4. Consideration of multi-level effects, including changes in the attitudes, performance, and retention of both the client and the client's subordinates,
5. Isolation of the unique contribution of coaching as compared to other leadership development interventions,
6. Reported statistics,
7. Formative evaluations of the client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching process,
8. Objectives that correspond directly to business or organisational requirements,
9. Plans to include distal outcomes like leadership retention, adequate pipeline to fill senior positions and others that are deemed valuable by the organisation

Before concluding this literature review, the final section will describe the limitations of the empirical research regarding the impact of leadership coaching to date.

2.4.5 Limitations

As documented in the previous section, the first limitation in some of the studies, i.e. Kombarakaran et al. (2008), McDermott et al. (2007), Perkins (2009) and Wasylyshyn et al. (2006), relates to data being based on self-ratings and/or coach-ratings. Despite making a contribution to the perceived positive effects of coaching, as mentioned by Wasylyshyn et al. (2006), their study relies too heavily on self-reporting by the participants. McDermott et al. (2007), in their study of 55 companies focusing on how they manage and measure coaching, also shows encouraging results regarding coaching effectiveness for organisations. One potential issue is that the survey also relies on self-reports. Kombarakaran et al. (2008) recognises that, even though their study confirms that coaching appears to work, the study was limited to the reports from forty-two coaches and one hundred fourteen clients and that no objective and/or independent review took place of their replies. In addition, Perkins (2009) also mentions the limitations of rater bias both by the person designing the study (in his case the coach who did the research) and evaluating the clients, as well as the objectivity in how the leaders rated themselves.

To get around the self (or coach)-rating bias the usage of multi-source feedback has been recommended. Over and above the important aspects that have been covered in section 2.3.3 there are other limitations that need to be considered. First is the question how to separate the impact of this feedback and the coaching itself as documented by Thach (2002). Second, rater bias has to be considered as illustrated by Smither et al. (2003). They recognize that results could have been impacted by the fact that a copy of the multisource reports was made available to the manager's immediate supervisor. Apart from possibly influencing the results, it should also be mentioned that there could be an additional concern with this in the context
of confidentiality as discussed earlier (section 2.1). The third limitation has been well documented by MacKie (2014) and has to do with rater consistency. In their study 11 coaches worked on a pro-bono basis with 37 executives and senior managers in a non-profit organisation. Each client received 9 hours of coaching during 6 sessions over 3 months. A 360°-report (MLQ) was also used. Over and above the claim that “the results clearly demonstrated a significant increase in the other-rater feedback on transformational leadership behaviours” (MacKie, 2014) the author raises the issue of rater turnover. It is asserted that moderate turnover in raters (rater consistency of 92.5% and 88.8% (MacKie, 2014) does not have a negative effect on assessing leadership effectiveness and that this validates the usage of multi-rater tools.

Another one of the limitations has to do with the samples themselves. First, as pointed out by McDermott et al. (2007) in their study of how 55 companies manage and measure coaching, many coaching impact studies are only focused on one organisation or case only. Second, the organisation itself should be considered as pointed out in a critique of the study performed by Nieminen et al. (2013) in which the sample of managers in governmental organisation is seen as a “less fertile ground for leadership/management development” (Egan, 2013, p. 181). A similar concern could be raised for studies that focused on preliminary military samples, e.g. Boyce et al. (2010), or students, i.e. Brett & Atwater (2001).

Even though Theeboom et al. (2013) concluded that more coaching sessions do not automatically mean better results from the coaching process, a further limitation needs to be considered relates to the number of coaching sessions that are used in an impact study. In the research by Thach (2002) the relatively few coaching sessions, i.e. each participant had only four, has been questioned in terms of its true impact. The same issue was raised by Egan (2013) in his review of the study by Nieminen et al. (2013) in which coached managers only received 4 to 5 one-on-one sessions for 60’ each over a period of 15 months.

A final limitation regarding measuring impact has been illustrated in the outcome study by Luthans & Peterson (2003) in which encouraging data was published regarding their study on the impact of executive coaching be it for the retrospective nature of the organisational performance data as their measure of analysis and the fact that it could not be related specifically to individual performance.
2.4.6 Summary

From the initial review of the research on the impact of executive/leadership coaching the common themes regarding outcomes are that the coaching has been seen to benefit both the executive and the company, increase learning and contribute to changes in behaviour. Additional research shows that it contributes to an increase in leadership performance and effectiveness, supports increased organisational performance and effectiveness, leads to a strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs to set one’s own specific goals, facilitates the coaching client to change most the behaviours directly related to stated coaching objectives, leads to clients soliciting ideas for improvement from their supervisors, and contributes to improved ratings by their direct report and supervisor ratings. Two theoretical frameworks have been introduced to support the evaluation of the impact of coaching. Several limitations have been identified in the literature with self and/or coach-ratings, rater bias and consistency, and the sample itself being amongst the most significant. Based on the literature the use of a pre-post (coaching) design with professional external coaches, the use of multi-source feedback and both summative and formative evaluations of results are key items to consider from a methodological point of view to obtain empirical results.

2.5 Conclusion of the Literature Review

Coaching has been predominantly studied in the field of Psychology. For executive/leadership coaching the ratio between research in the field of Business versus Psychology is a bit more balanced even though the majority (57%) of the studies are still in Psychology. For coaching to be regarded as a profession in its own right, the distinctions between other types of helping relationships and coaching as well as different types of coaching, both in terms of type of content and clients, have been clearly spelled out as documented in this literature review.

Leadership coaching focuses on leaders changing behaviour. Since resonant leadership implies a willingness by the leader to change behaviour, this leadership theory has been chosen to serve as the basis for the purposes of this dissertation. The relationship between the client and the coach, feedback (ideally multi-source) and objectives for the coaching have been identified as key ingredients of a leadership coaching engagement.
Common themes regarding outcomes are that the coaching has been seen to benefit both the executive and the company, increase learning and contribute to changes in behaviour. An increase in leadership performance and effectiveness, supporting increased organisational performance and effectiveness, leading to a strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs to set one’s own specific goals, facilitating the coaching client to change most the behaviours directly related to stated coaching objectives, leading clients soliciting ideas for improvement from their supervisors, and contributing to improved ratings by their direct report and supervisor ratings are additional reported outcomes.

However, most of these outcomes have been based on self and/or coach-ratings. For empirical results key items to consider from a methodological point of view based on the literature are the use of a pre-post (coaching) longitudinal design with professional external coaches, the use of multi-source feedback and both summative and formative evaluations of results.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH GAPS, MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

After having provided the context for this research and put the current literature in a broader scholarly and historical context, this chapter will first cover the research gaps that have been uncovered. Next, a research (conceptual) model that has been developed based on the literature review will be presented. Finally, the research hypotheses that have evolved from the research model will be posited.

3.1 Research gaps

The review of the literature indicates that there is a lack of empirical evidence regarding the measurement of the effectiveness of executive coaching (De Meuse et al., 2009; Ely et al., 2010; Evers et al., 2006; Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Hooijberg & Lane, 2009; Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Kampa & White, 2002; Theeboom et al., 2013; Wasylyshyn et al., 2006). On the one hand it is expressed that “by 2021 we hope researchers across the globe will have completed fifty to hundred large sample size studies….” (Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011, p. 78) and on the other hand there is even a suggestion that it is unlikely that robust data is obtainable (De Haan et al., 2013).

In terms of getting empirical evidence it has been pointed out by Levenson (2009) that the measurement challenge is figuring out which behaviours matter for business success, and under which circumstances coaching improves those behaviours and, ultimately, positively impacts the business. A first meta-analysis on measuring coaching outcomes shows that “there is an inconsistent relationship between executive coaching and coaching outcomes. Researchers should systematically investigate how coaching effectiveness is moderated by the purpose, content, and type of coaching” (De Meuse et al., 2009, p. 129). A second meta-analysis reports that “future evaluation studies need to examine changes in outcomes (e.g., pre to post performance), as well as the effects of different aspects of coaching (i.e., client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching processes) on coaching outcomes. This will be particularly valuable in understanding the relative contribution of specific elements of the coaching process to overall effectiveness” (Ely et al., 2010, p. 596).
It has also been proposed that “future examination in which measurement at Time 2 would be followed by measurement at Time 3, some four months later, in order to examine the long term effects of coaching” (Evers et al., 2006, p. 181). Regarding multisource feedback, Kombarakan et al. (2008) propose that future research should include the perspectives of managers, peers, direct reports, and customers. Adding their perspectives may produce new insights and understanding that leads to better program implementation and outcomes. It has further been suggested (Bowles et al., 2007) that future studies of the perceived value of coaching by clients will likely add greatly to the literature that seeks to link coaching interventions to improvements in productivity. As illustrated, coaching can develop competencies beyond the point where initial training can often take leaders; this may not be directly captured if productivity is the only outcome of interest. Another outcome to consider is an increase in leadership effectiveness through changes in behaviour.

In addition it should be noted that research regarding executive/leadership coaching is split between the domains of Psychology and Business (see section 1.1) with a stronger emphasis found in the Psychology literature (see section 2.1). This study aims to close this gap by approaching coaching, and in particular leadership coaching, from a business point of view. This is important because business typically looks at measurable results. Given the growth in investment in coaching (Sherman & Freas, 2004) the more the coaching profession is able to document these type of results, the more likely it will be that organisations will continue to invest in coaching.

Even though this is not the main emphasis of this research, a side benefit of this study may be that a contribution will be made in closing some of the gaps as mentioned by Antonakis et al., 2009 (see also section 2.2.2) in the critique of “emotional intelligence”. Their review raised similar issues, like self-reported measures, obtaining multi-source measures, using practicing leaders and having an acceptable sample size. Measures of emotional intelligence are a vital part of this research and therefore this study may contribute by addressing some of these gaps.

Considering these findings and the gaps in the literature reviewed it has been noted that some studies have presented conclusions on how to establish that coaching works. Other studies have indicated why coaching seems to work. Then there is a final category of studies that has focused on partial elements of what seems to make coaching produce outcomes. The main issue is that, to date, an integrated insight into the question of the effectiveness of
executive/leadership coaching appears to not have been reported. From the literature review it has become clear that, first, one needs to look at the outcome as such, not through self-reporting, but preferably through as objective as possible data. For coaching multi-source feedback appears the most appropriate. Second, the collection of this data before and after the coaching seems to generate the best indication of the effectiveness of the executive coaching. Third, the outcome should not be seen in isolation and it is therefore important to also focus on key aspects of leadership coaching engagements, i.e. the relationship between client and coach, and the coaching process, particularly coaching objectives. This leads to the presentation of the research model, which will be covered in the next section.

3.2 Research model

In this research project the integrated evaluation framework as provided by Ely et al. (2010) is combined with the suggestions from De Meuse et al. (2009) as well as the body of knowledge surrounding the use of 360° feedback, leadership, and evaluation of impact to attempt to provide an integrated approach to the question of effectiveness of leadership coaching. In addition, as described in the literature review, both summative and formative types of evaluation are applied to the evaluation of coaching effectiveness.

The fundamental question this research attempts to answer is how leadership coaching influences the link between leadership effectiveness and business results. Within the context of this research leadership effectiveness, which will be looked at from a sustainable point of view, is the independent variable whereas business results are the dependent. Leadership effectiveness and business results are examples of summative evaluations.

Based on the literature review this thesis further investigates how the client-coach relationship and the achievement of a client’s coaching objectives impact the link between leadership coaching and leadership effectiveness. The client-coach relationship and client’s coaching objectives (as part of the coaching process) are formative types of evaluations.
Figure 1 shows the conceptual model:

Leadership Coaching is the intervention. It is hypothesized that there will be a significant change in the study variables Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness before and after leadership coaching. The moderator variables that, based on the literature review, are presumed to impact coaching outcomes are the Client-Coach Relationship and the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement. ‘Coaching Outcomes’ before and after the coaching are measured by a combination of Leadership Effectiveness from the 360° feedback (as reported by the evaluators) and Mindfulness (self-reported). Further, ‘Business Results’ are measured before and after the coaching by using a Business Performance Index for the respective clients (as reported by the boss). The leadership coaching is deemed to have been effective if there has been a positive increase in the Coaching Outcomes, and subsequently also the Business Results. On the contrary, the quality of the leadership coaching is deemed to have been ineffective if there has been no change or even deterioration in the Coaching Outcomes and Business Results.

The conclusions from the earlier review of the literature have also led to considering both Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness as measures of Coaching Outcomes. A change in Leadership Effectiveness is only meaningful if it is accompanied by an increase in
Mindfulness. Whereas an increase in Leadership Effectiveness is positive, it may be short-lived according to McKee & Boyatzis (2006). Regular renewal is required and Mindfulness is one of the three elements that support renewal. Through Mindfulness the change in Leadership Effectiveness is more likely to become sustainable.

This model fits with the earlier mentioned theories of Kirkpatrick (1996) and Chen (1989) in the following ways:

- Applying Kirkpatrick’s (1996) theory for evaluating training to leadership coaching:
  - Level 1 (Reaction): level of satisfaction with the leadership coaching as measured by both the client and the coach,
  - Level 2 (Learning): level of achievement of the coaching objectives as set out at the beginning of the coaching engagement,
  - Level 3 (Behaviour): change in pre- and post coaching leadership effectiveness and mindfulness,
  - Level 4 (Results): change in pre- and post business results data.

- The research model is also consistent with Chen’s (1989) composite theory driven evaluation:
  - Normative Treatment-Impact Evaluation: the outcome of the coaching as affected by the coaching process or methodology as applied to the coaching objectives,
  - Normative Implementation Environment–Impact Evaluation: while not separately described in the model, the implementation environment will be considered in the analysis of the results of the outcome of the coaching and is expected to pinpoint to the impact of external factors,
  - Normative Outcome-Impact Evaluation: based on the outcome of the coaching the expectation is that the above model assists in identifying and clarifying what could be improved in the respective leadership coaching engagements.

The assertion is that this research model is built on groundwork presented in the literature review as well as theories that have been applied to other domains. This model is expected to validate the hypotheses that will be described in the next section.
3.3 Research hypotheses

Following the definition of the conceptual model the hypotheses that have been defined are:

1. **(H1) There exists a significant difference between the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H1.i) and Mindfulness (H1.ii) before and after leadership coaching.**

The research to date suggests that leadership coaching is effective. However, there is a lack of empirical evidence. In addition, the published results for coaching outcomes have been predominantly based on subjective assessments, e.g. the client’s or the coach’s. The first hypothesis is that, by using an as close to as possible objective measurement, it can be shown empirically that leadership coaching has a positive effect on coaching outcomes. As discussed in the literature review, there are two components to coaching outcomes. The first is the short-term change as measured through the Leadership Effectiveness from the 360° instrument that will be used before the coaching starts and after the coaching has been completed. The second measures the change in Mindfulness of the leader that will contribute to the sustainability of the change in leadership effectiveness.

2. **(H2) There exists a positive impact of the perceived relationship between client and coach on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H2.i) and Mindfulness (H.2.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a balanced versus an unbalanced perceived relationship.**

From the literature review the importance and impact of the quality of the relationship between client and coach on coaching outcomes seems evident. To test whether the client-coach relationship quality has an effect on coaching outcomes, a Client-Coach Relationship Index (CCRI) will be used. The expectation is that the more balanced the relationship is between the client and the coach, the more positive the impact will be on the defined coaching outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness. In addition, the level of how satisfied the client has been with their coach, and how
satisfied the coach has been with their client, will be addressed. Therefore, two related sub-hypotheses are:

i.  
(H2.a) There exists a positive impact of Client Satisfaction with the Coach on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H2.a.i) and Mindfulness (H2.a.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a high versus a low Client Satisfaction.

ii.  
(H2.b) There exists a positive impact of Coach Satisfaction with the Client on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H2.b.i) and Mindfulness (H2.b.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a high versus a low Coach Satisfaction.

Finally, as an ultimate test for the strength of the relationship, the evaluation of the level of loyalty between the coach and the client by means of the Net Promoter Score, which measures how strongly they would recommend each other, will be tested. This will be called the Net Promoter Index. The final relates sub-hypothesis is:

iii.  
(H2.c) There exists a positive impact of the Client-Coach Loyalty on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H2.c.i) and Mindfulness (H2.c.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a high versus a low Client-Coach Loyalty.

3.  
(H3) There exists a positive impact of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness (H3.i) and Mindfulness (H3.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a higher versus a lower level of achievement of the client’s coaching objectives.

The importance of objectives for the client in a coaching engagement has been documented in the literature review. As part of the integrated evaluation framework the achievement of these objectives will be evaluated against the as objective as
possible outcomes of the coaching. It is expected that achieving the objectives for the coaching positively influence the outcome of the coaching.

4. (H4) There exists a significant difference between Business Results before and after leadership coaching.

The final hypothesis aims to link the change in Coaching Outcomes as a result of the leadership coaching to improvements in business results. Based on the literature review it has been hypothesized that once a leader is experienced as more effective, this should lead to the leader producing better results for the organisation he or she is responsible for.

In the next chapter the methodology will be defined and explained that will lead to the generation of the data to validate these hypotheses.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research project aims to establish a cause-effect relationship between leadership coaching, coaching outcomes, i.e. leadership effectiveness and mindfulness, and business results. A research design has been defined as “plans and the procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis” (Creswell, 2008, p. 3). This framework then makes explicit what the researcher prioritizes in terms of causal connections, the ability to generalize, understanding behaviour given the context, or being able to establish how social phenomena develop over time and how they are connected. As far as the research method is concerned Creswell (1994) defines it as the data collection technique, i.e. what instruments are used to collect the data. The research strategy is then a question of using either a qualitative, quantitative or mixed approach.

Three framework elements are recommended for consideration in the decision about which approach to follow: “philosophical assumptions about what constitutes knowledge claims; general procedures of research called strategies of inquiry; and detailed procedures of data collection, analysis, and writing, called methods” (Creswell, 2003, p. 3). From the literature review of the topic of this dissertation the knowledge claims are based on a combination of post positivist and pragmatic assumptions. Whereas post positivism is defined as “a deterministic philosophy in which causes probably determine effects or outcomes” (p. 7), pragmatism arrives at knowledge claims “out of actions, situations, and consequences rather than antecedent conditions” (p. 11). A post positivist approach is associated with quantitative research and a pragmatic approach with mixed methods research.

The question then becomes what strategy of inquiry to follow. Creswell (2003) describes the following alternatives:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Mixed Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental designs</td>
<td>Narratives</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-experimental designs, such as surveys</td>
<td>Phenomenologies, Ethnographies, Grounded theory, Case studies</td>
<td>Concurrent, Transformative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Alternative Strategies of Inquiry

Given the nature of this research a randomized or true experiment would be the preferred design for this research project, because it usually is the strongest in linking cause(s) and effect(s) according to Trochim (2006). Random assignment, multiple groups (e.g. treatment and control group) and multiple waves, i.e. a pre-post design, are conditions for such an experiment. One of the challenges in doing research in this field is the lack of readily available data. What is required is identifying coaches and clients who are willing to participate. As pointed out by De Haan et al. (2013) a rigorous study is costly and cumbersome, and coaches prioritize their clients over research. Therefore, given the nature of this research, i.e. applied research within the context of a DBA, and the practical realities to complete this research, a decision was made to use a pre-post design without random assignment and the use of a control group. Hence, a within-subjects quasi-experimental design has been applied. From the literature review De Meuse et al. (2009) also posited that, with an adequate level of methodological rigor, a pre-post within-subjects design is probably the most appropriate study design.

The main concern with quasi-experimental designs is that internal validity, i.e. the independent variable being responsible for the results, may be in doubt (Bryman, 2001; Meltzoff, 1998). This will be addressed further in section 4.4.2. In parallel, qualitative data will also be collected and, upon reviewing Creswell (2003) this seems to fit with the concurrent procedures, i.e. bringing together both quantitative and qualitative data to comprehensively answer the research question. Therefore, the research method applied to this project is characterized by a combination of instrument-based questions, performance data, statistical analysis as well as open-ended questions and interview data.
The following sections will cover the sample, measures, data collection procedure, data analysis procedures and a review of the pilot study.

4.1 Sample

Figure 2 depicts a high-level overview of the overall methodology. It involves obtaining the commitment from qualified coaches to get the participants (clients) to generate the required data through a well-defined coaching program.

Figure 2: Methodology

It starts with the selection of the coaches who will meet defined criteria and will be willing to participate. This will be followed by an interview to get a better understanding of the coaches and how they work. In parallel this will be the moment that the coaches receive their training on the research methodology and also get a copy of the Manual for Coaches (Appendix A). Next, the coaches will identify potential clients and then the Coaching Program will be implemented. The original goal for this research project has been to collect data for 100 coaching engagements based on the involvement of 10 Executive Coaches with 10 Clients each.
4.1.1 Coaches

Based on one of the instruments used in the Coaching Program (see below) and to attempt to control as much as possible for the impact of the background of the coaches themselves, the coaches will have to fulfil the following criteria to qualify for participation in this research project, i.e. s/he:

1. Is certified in The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP), a 360° feedback instrument (must),
2. Is credentialed by ICF (ACC, PCC or MCC), or is in the process of becoming ICF-credentialed, or can show that s/he has the coaching training and client-hours that would qualify him/her for an ICF-credential (must),
3. Agrees to follow the Coaching Program as described below (must), and
4. Has successfully completed the University of Georgetown’s Leadership Coaching Program (want).

The three “must” criteria will establish a solid basis regarding a philosophy of leadership coaching. The ICF accreditation will further contribute to getting closer to standardization. All coaches will have been subject to the same accreditation as it relates to the coaching competencies as defined by ICF requirements to pass and be in compliance with the same code of ethics. The third “must” criterion will facilitate both the data collection as well as a further step towards a common approach in the coaching of the clients involved in this research. The fourth “want” criterion will enhance the probability of common methodologies even further, since all coaches will have followed the same education. It has been classified as a “want” purely for practical reasons since there is no guarantee that a sufficient number of coaches in Europe will fulfil this criterion.

To find the 10 coaches according to the criteria as outlined above, two prime sources, i.e. The Leadership Circle Profile™ community of coach practitioners and the alumni of the Leadership Coaching Certificate program at Georgetown University, have been approached. In addition this project has been presented at the following conferences:

- 3rd DBA Symposium in February 2011 (organized by the Association of MBAs in Grenoble, France) – presentation,
The response to the research has been positive, particularly by practicing coaches. This initial enthusiasm did not yield the target of ten coaches. Of approximately 36 coaches, who reacted to the various approaches to participate in the study, 7 did not qualify because they were not TLCP-certified. Discussions to participate in this research project took place with 29 coaches. 10 of them agreed to participate and only 6, including the author of this dissertation, have actually delivered data for this research project.

All the six participating coaches have received a copy of the “Manual for Coaches” (see Appendix A) that, apart from describing the rationale for this research and outlining exactly the steps as mentioned below in the Coaching Program, includes specific instructions for the coaches to ensure that all material is delivered complete and on time.

In terms of the coaches that have participated, three are female and three are male coaches. The nationalities of the coaches are Swiss, German, French and American. Four of the coaches are based in Switzerland, one in France and one in the USA. Three of the coaches hold Bachelor degrees, two have a Master’s degree and one has a PhD. The industry work experience amongst the coaches ranges from 10 to 25 years.
All participating coaches are professional, external coaches holding either an ACC (Associate Certified Coach) (2), PCC (Professional Certified Coach) (3) or MCC (Master Certified Coach) (1) from the International Coach Federation (ICF). They have a coaching experience of between 2 to 15 years. In addition to the author, only one of the other coaches (male coach with PCC) completed the Georgetown University Leadership Coaching Program. Whereas coach-training programs share many common ingredients, a possible consequence could be that the other coaches will follow a different approach in their methodology. Therefore, in section 5.1 particular attention will be paid to the way the various coaches usually work.

All coaches describe their current role as primarily being a professional external coach who spend at least 60% of their time coaching while providing facilitation and consulting services in the remainder of their work-time. Even though one of the coaches also worked as an internal coach at first, the experience working as an external coach ranges from 2 to 15 years. The typical clients for these coaches range from leaders/managers at middle or senior levels to a specific target-group of women in leadership.

4.2.2 Participants

The participants in this study will be the clients of the coaches who will contribute to this research. They will have to fulfil three criteria. First, clients will have to be managers with responsibility for people, setting the direction and being responsible for the results delivered by their respective department/organisation. Second, the clients will have to agree to participate in the Coaching Program as described below. Third, the clients will have to agree to participate in this research project based on an understanding and commitment that their data will be kept anonymous.

In terms of ethics, the approach towards sponsors, i.e. those who will pay for the coaching, and clients will be to include a section in the coaching proposals about this research project and to give both the sponsors and the clients the choice to participate. If deemed appropriate, a financial incentive, by means of a slight reduction of the coaching fees, will be offered in order to encourage participation. An example of said section is:

8 The term client or clients will be used from here on
“Research in the effectiveness of coaching

In addition to the above it is important to point out that the executive coach is conducting research with respect to the effectiveness of coaching as part of his doctoral studies in business administration (DBA) at Grenoble Ecole de Management. The request is therefore to get permission to include this coaching engagement in the research and therefore also two additional measurements, i.e. one related to Business Results, to be completed by the client and his/her boss, and a so-called Mindfulness Inventory to be filled out solely by the client. An example of the measurement tool for Business Results is attached in Exhibit V and of the Mindfulness tool in Exhibit VI. Both of these would have to be completed pre- and post-coaching. The results of this coaching program, which will be treated anonymously and completely confidentially for the purpose of the research, will be extremely helpful for this research. The benefits to the company by allowing the inclusion of this coaching engagement in the research are a discount of \( x \) on the total price as well as exposure to the results of all the research upon the availability of the completed thesis, the findings of which may be beneficial in the design of future coaching programs.”

In countersigning the proposal the sponsor/client will consent to their participation and the executive coach will agree to treat the data confidentially and anonymously. Since they will be active participants in the research so-called rater-bias, as described in section 2.3.3, will have to be considered in the analysis of the results. Given the intention that, wherever possible, multi-source feedback will be used, it is believed that it will be possible to minimize the impact.

Data for 30 clients (\( N = 30 \)) from the six coaches has been collected between July 2011 and November 2014. 11 clients are female and 19 are male. 20 of the clients work for one company, 5 work for another and the other 5 for 5 different companies. Of the 30, 18 are Managers, 9 Directors and there is one each of a Senior Manager, General Manager and CEO with varying levels of leadership experience. 13 of the clients (2 females, 11 males) worked with the author as their coach, 6 (3 females and 3 males) worked with one of the female coaches, 6 (5 females, 1 male) with the second female coach, 3 (1 female, 2 males) with the third female coach and 1 each (both males) with the two other male coaches. Since the researcher worked with 13 of the 30 clients there could be a possible bias in the results. This will be analysed and reviewed in section 5.4.
Twenty of the clients, who work for the same company, followed the Coaching Program as part of a Leadership Development Program. In addition to the Coaching Program, as per the methodology described earlier, these clients also participated in two 2-day workshops and one 1-day workshop. The other 10 just followed the Coaching Program, however, it is not excluded that they participated in other development activities during the program. The possible biases this may have on the results will be further addressed and commented on in section 5.4.

Five of the clients joined the coaching program as a result of a change management consulting project that one of the coaches was involved with. This is significant because the client assignment did not follow a typical process in which the clients could choose between two or three coaches. There was a strong desire on the part of the management to continue working with the consultant, but now in a coaching capacity. A session to check chemistry between the coach and each of the clients took place and, despite this being the only choice that was presented to the clients, they all accepted. For the ten clients who were also part of the Leadership Development program a preliminary matching was prepared between the Human Resources representative and the lead-coach based on the background, objectives and requests from both the clients and the coaches. Upon completion of the client-coach matching both clients and coaches received the respective biographies of one another. At the kick-off of the program the clients and coaches had an opportunity to meet and do the chemistry check. All preliminary matches were accepted.

Over and above any of the other items covered before, it is worthwhile to note that at one of the sponsoring companies, with five participating clients, a significant change was made both in terms of leadership, i.e. change of boss, and organisation, with four clients experiencing a change in boss during the program. The coaching engagement was completed successfully. In the second company with 20 clients, 4 people experienced a change in boss during the program. Of these clients, 10 were in the middle of the engagement when the company announced a significant reorganisation. The importance of these changes is not to be underestimated. The changes are good examples of what is described in Chen’s Normative Implementation Environment–Impact Evaluation, i.e. the implementation environment and related impact of internal and external factors.
4.2 Measures

To collect the data for this research project a number of different data collection instruments will be used. They are:

- The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP) to collect 360° feedback data both pre- and post-coaching,
- The Business Performance Index (BPI) to collect business results data both pre- and post-coaching,
- The Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory to collect data on mindfulness both pre- and post-coaching,
- An Evaluation of the Coaching Program after the coaching both from the client (about the coach), the coach (about the client) and in terms of the Achievement of the Coaching Objectives,
- A Coaching Record, which will be kept by participating coaches for each of their participating clients.

These are all described in detail in the following sections.

4.2.1 360° feedback - The Leadership Circle Profile™

To collect both pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback an assessment instrument called The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP), a scientifically validated instrument (Anderson Jr., 2006b), will be used. It provides data comparing a self-assessment with the feedback from others. As reported by Anderson (2006a) The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP) is a true breakthrough among 360° feedback instruments and is the first to connect a well-researched battery of competencies with the deep motivations and underlying habits of thought. It reveals the relationship between patterns of action and the internal assumptions that drive behaviour. Ultimately, TLCP goes to the source of behaviour to get greater leverage on change. Furthermore, unlike most profiles, which take hours to interpret, TLCP integrates all this information in a 360° feedback instrument that brings the key issues to the surface instantly. TLCP measures key leadership competencies (Creative - top-half) and assesses belief systems and assumptions (Reactive – bottom-half).
TLCP is grounded in various theories, amongst which “The Creative and Reactive Orientations” - Fritz, Senge and Kiefer, “Emotional Intelligence” - Goleman, “Character Structure” - Horney, “Enneagram”, “Stage Development Frameworks” - Kohlberg, Kegan, Wilber, Hall, Beck and “3 Paradigms” - Covey. It was designed to measure key leadership competencies, assess beliefs and assumptions, point to stage of development, integrate the theoretical framework and organize results to bring key developmental opportunities to the surface immediately.

The Leadership Circle Profile™ provides both average and percentile scores – that is compared to a large group of other managers who have participated using this instrument – for 18 Leadership Competencies, grounded in leadership theories, and 11 Internal Assumptions, grounded in behavioural theory based on the appraisal by self, superiors, peers and subordinates. It contains a total of 124 items with the responses based on nine-point Likert scales with five anchor labels: 5 = Always, 4.5, 4 = Often, 3.5, 3 = Sometimes, 2.5, 2 = Seldom, 1.5, 1 = Never (Vecchio & Anderson, 2009). An example of the evaluator questionnaire can be found in Appendix D (the self-evaluation has exactly the same questions, however starts with “I”). To provide meaningful data the 360° feedback has to be completed by the client, their boss, their boss’s boss, and at least 3 peers, 3 direct reports and 3 other people they are free to choose, thus 11 people excluding the client. The participating clients usually have completed a form both pre- and post-coaching to indicate who they would like to participate in the 360° feedback (see Appendix E for an example of the form). The clients were also encouraged to write to their evaluators to inform them upfront about the upcoming 360° feedback process (an example can be found in Appendix F) to get as high a response rate as possible. Once the coach received all of the evaluator data s/he administered the survey on the Admin portal of the TLCP website. Each client and all evaluators then received a link to the survey on a secure website where confidentiality is ensured through controlled access. The suggested time to take for the survey is 20 minutes. The same process for the 360° feedback has been used for both the pre- as well as post-coaching data collection.

An example of what a TLCP output looks like is included in Appendix G. It is accompanied by a detailed written report that gives visibility to both the absolute and percentile scores in the various dimensions by category, i.e. self, all evaluators, boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others, and it provides written comments in response to three questions:
1. In your opinion, what is this person’s greatest leadership asset, skill or talent, and what suggestions do you have for leveraging this?

2. In your opinion, what is this person’s greatest leadership challenge or area for development, and what suggestions do you have for handling this?

3. What have you observed about this person about which you would like to provide additional feedback to him/her that may not have been previously addressed in this assessment?

The category “all evaluators” consists of the boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others. Whereas the data from the boss’s boss and boss is always reported separately, the data from the direct reports, peers and others is only reported when at least three of these evaluators in the respective categories have completed the survey.

The Leadership Competencies are organized in five dimensions in which leadership competencies have been grouped:

- **Relating** – measuring the capability to relate to others – which is composed of
  - i. Caring Connection
  - ii. Fosters Team Play
  - iii. Collaborator
  - iv. Mentoring & Developing
  - v. Interpersonal Intelligence

- **Self-Awareness** – as defined above (Goleman) – comprised of
  - i. Selfless Leader
  - ii. Balance
  - iii. Composure
  - iv. Personal Learner

- **Authenticity** – ability to relate to others in an authentic, courageous and high integrity way – includes
  - i. Integrity
  - ii. Courageous Authenticity

- **Systems Awareness** – focus on whole system improvement and community welfare – made up of
  - i. Community Concern
ii. Sustainable Productivity
iii. Systems Thinker

- Achieving - capacity to offer visionary, authentic and high achievement leadership – consisting of
  i. Strategic Focus
  ii. Purposeful & Visionary
  iii. Achieves Results
  iv. Decisiveness

The Internal Assumptions are organized in three dimensions in which 11 behavioural habits have been included:

- Controlling – a sense of personal worth is established through task accomplishment and personal achievement – which includes
  i. Perfect
  ii. Driven
  iii. Ambition
  iv. Autocratic

- Protecting – a sense of worth is established through withdrawal, distance, hiding, aloofness, cynicism, superiority and/or rationality – made up of
  i. Arrogance
  ii. Critical
  iii. Distance

- Complying – self-worth is established by complying with the expectations of others as opposed to what one really wants oneself – composed of
  i. Conservative
  ii. Pleasing
  iii. Belonging
  iv. Passive

The instrument also provides four summary measures of which one is of particular interest for this research, i.e. Leadership Effectiveness – measuring the overall effectiveness of a leader. The relation between the questions and the various dimensions in TLCP is also included in the report. Appendix H provides this relationship for the Creative (Leadership Competences) dimensions of TLCP. Since this research project focuses on Leadership Effectiveness a
decision was made not to include the relation between the questions and the Reactive
dimensions of TLCP.

Vecchio & Anderson (2009) used TLCP for 1221 managers in a study correlating leadership
effectiveness evaluations with personality and demographic attributes. Of particular interest
within the context of this research project they found a greater tendency by males and older
managers to overestimate their leadership effectiveness, and that more socially sensitive
managers were, though not by superiors, evaluated more favourably by subordinates and
peers, and, finally, it appeared that the leadership effectiveness in terms of the organisational
unit’s performance were better predicted by the managers themselves than their superiors.

An independent validation of the instrument, which has not been published in an academic
journal, was conducted and published in a technical report. Dalal, Lin, Smith & Zickar (2008)
at the Institute of Psychological Research (IRPA), based on a request by The Leadership
Circle, conducted an independent psychometric evaluation of TLCP with analyses focused on
the reliability, factor structure and validity of the scales. In terms of reliability, first, they
found a mean coefficient alpha of .89 with ranges of .83 to .96 strong alphas for the
competencies and tendencies of TLCP (the inner dimensions), all above the typical alpha of
.70. Second, the alphas for the outer dimensions were also strong except for Conservative and
Balance (0.64); the mean coefficient alpha was .81 with ranges from .64 (for the two
dimensions mentioned before) and the rest all being above .70, from .73 up to .93. Third, a
final series of alphas was assessed for the three most internally consistent parts of the outer
dimension scale and these also returned strong alphas ranging from .79 to .96 with a mean
alpha of .80. Since the data from TLCP is only available in the report-form and not as raw
data, the reported Cronbach's alphas have been used to confirm the reliability of the scales.

Next, they continued by running a series of confirmatory factor analyses to research the
structure of factors of the various subscales of TLCP and concluded that, with the exception
of the Complying scale, the factor structure of TLCP is stable and aligned with the structure
as presented. Finally, they continued with a set of validity tests and concluded that TLCP
correlates with the theoretical constructs it is supposed to correlate with. The top half
subscales all had a positive correlation with Leadership Effectiveness and Performance
variables. On the other hand the bottom half subscales had a negative correlation with these
variables, which were expected based on the negative relationships of these regarding
leadership abilities. Based on all of this Dalal et al. (2008) recommend that The Leadership
Circle generates new items for the Balance and Conservative subscales, examines the outer dimensions in the Complying tendency, and ensures that the item content on the competencies and tendencies, e.g. Complying and Controlling, are tapping the desired leadership construct. All in all it is concluded that

“...the psychometric properties of TLCP are strong, suggesting that TLCP is appropriate and strong for developmental feedback. As this instrument is meant only for developmental feedback purposes and not for selection, promotion, termination, or other high stakes decisions, this instrument is quite strong and acceptable for providing developmental feedback” (p. 3).

The Leadership Circle (2011) responded to this technical report in the following way:

1. Reliability: measures have been taken to improve $\alpha$ for Balance and Conservative; items have been added to these scales. It is not expected that the improvements to the $\alpha$’s will make a material impact on the already solid properties of TLCP.
2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis: cross loading of one item was found between Conservative and Belonging and, because they are based on a common theoretical framework, variance is expected. There are therefore no plans to modify the assessment.
3. Criterion Validity: relevant correlation coefficients for criterion research are weighted scores, and these are solid. Also, positive correlations are expected between business performance and Creative Dimensions and the reverse for Reactive Dimensions. TLC continues to conduct criterion validity research and accepts the need to further validate against outcome criteria. Until then, IRPA’s conclusion (see above) is accepted.

Whereas the limitation of the technical report not having been published is recognized, this technical report, combined with the work of Vecchio & Anderson (2009) is believed to be a good foundation for conducting the planned research within the context of providing developmental feedback, i.e. how were items ranked before the coaching and how they were ranked after the coaching.
Leadership Effectiveness is a key independent variable in this research. It is reported as a summary measure by TLCP. The items that make up this scale are (The Leadership Circle, 2009; Vecchio & Anderson, 2009):

- I am satisfied with the quality of leadership that s/he provides
- S/he is/ I am the kind of leader that others should aspire to become
- S/he is/ I am an example of an ideal leader
- His/her/my leadership helps this organisation to thrive
- Overall, s/he/I provide(s) very effective leadership

The Cronbach's alpha reported by The Leadership Circle for the self-assessment of 1221 focal managers has been $\alpha = .88$, whereas for the superiors/bosses, peers and subordinates/direct reports they were $\alpha = .95$, $\alpha = .96$ and $\alpha = .96$ (Vecchio & Anderson, 2009). Since the raw data of The Leadership Circle Profile™ will not be available, the reported Cronbach’s alphas in this section have been used as a confirmation of the reliability of the scales.

If TLCP is used only once in a coaching engagement the focus is usually on the percentile scores, i.e. where does the client score as compared to the reference group. Given the design of this study, it will not be appropriate to use the percentile score since this would more than likely cause confusion in what is being measured. On the one hand there would be the true change in a score as seen by raters, while at the same time there would have more than likely be a change in the reference database since the pre-coaching measurement. Therefore, to ensure homogeneity only the average scores will be used in the data analysis.

### 4.2.2 Business Performance Index

To measure the dependent variable Business Results a Business Performance Index (BPI) will be used. This index was developed by The Leadership Circle and provides data regarding how the performance of the organisations that the different clients are responsible for, is rated. There are six categories for evaluating business performance: Sales/Revenue Growth, Market Share, Profitability/ROA, Quality of Products and Services, New Product Development, and Overall Performance (Anderson Jr., 2006a). Both the client and the client’s boss are to complete the BPI form (see Appendix I). In doing so they evaluate the performance of the unit that the client is responsible for by means of comparing the business performance of the
part of the organisation that the person being evaluated manages to the performance of similar organisations. The response scale used is:

- One of the best – Top 10% (7)
- Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% (6)
- Better than most other similar organisations – Between the Top 25 and 50% (5)
- About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% (4)
- Lower than other similar organisations – Between the bottom 25 and 50% (3)
- Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% (2)
- One of the worst – Bottom 10% (1)
- Don’t know, unsure, not applicable

The Leadership Circle has used a combination of TLCP and BPI in a study of 486 leaders in a variety of organisations with the goal of correlating the various dimensions of TLCP as well as the Leadership Effectiveness summary scale with Business Performance as seen by the evaluators. A correlation of .612 was reported between Leadership Effectiveness and Business Performance, which was explained to mean that 37.6% of changes in business performance, as perceived by evaluators, can be explained by Leadership Effectiveness (Anderson Jr., 2006a, 2006b). The BPI has also been used in conjunction with TLCP in another study performed in 2009 on an analysis of self-other ratings in which it was found “…that self-appraisals may possibly reflect self-perceptions of unit performance to a greater extent than superior appraisals” (Vecchio & Anderson, 2009, p. 10) and, as mentioned earlier, this will be considered and further explored for this research project in Chapter 6.

In anticipating that clients will find it difficult to rate all six categories, the instructions to the clients and their bosses for this research will be to complete the BPI with “Overall Performance” as the only mandatory category to be filled in and the other five categories to be optional. Therefore, only this single item will be considered in this study. As a result, no Cronbach’s alpha is available.
4.2.3 Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory

Linked to business results and leadership effectiveness is the question of how to ensure sustained effective leadership. As described earlier (see 2.2.3 Renewal), mindfulness is one of the three elements for renewal that increases the probability of sustained effective leadership. To measure mindfulness a decision was made to select and use the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI). According to Walach, Buchheld, Buttenmüller, Kleinknecht, & Schmidt (2006) this is a semantically robust and psychometrically stable, validated tool. Walach et al. (2006) developed a short 14-item version covering all elements of mindfulness without being dependent on a Buddhist or meditation context. Also, they concluded that the short form is more suitable if knowledge of the Buddhist background of mindfulness cannot be expected. A French translation of this short version of FMI, developed by Trousselard et al. (2010), produced comparable results to the original short version. Therefore, this short form is believed to be appropriate for this research.

According to Walach et al. (2006) the scale of the short 14-item version of the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reported of .86. In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranges from .82 (pre-coaching) to .81 (post-coaching). The detailed questionnaire can be reviewed in Appendix J. Each question is scored from 1 (Rarely) to 4 (Almost Always) except for question 13 in which the scoring is reversed. The maximum score is 56 (most Mindful) and the minimum score is 14 (least Mindful). For the purpose of this research the emphasis will be placed on analysing the pre- and post coaching results.

The inclusion of the FMI serves three purposes. First, the changes in FMI between pre- and post-coaching will give an indication of the sustainability of eventual changes in the Leadership Effectiveness of participating clients as discussed in section 2.2.3. Second, it is an instrument about which numerous validation studies have been published and therefore will strengthen the findings of this research. Third, as also suggested by Walach et al. (2006), it will be intriguing to be able to correlate the results of the pre- and post-coaching FMI’s with both the pre- and post-coaching results for Self-Awareness from TLCP to further comment on the sustainability of leadership effectiveness.
In terms of the process, participating clients have been asked to complete the FMI both before and after the coaching, and return the completed forms to their respective coaches.

4.2.4 Evaluation of Coaching

The coaching program will be evaluated at three different levels, i.e. from the client’s perspective, the coach’s point of view and jointly by the client, coach and the client’s boss in terms of the achievement of the objectives of the coaching program. The clients will be requested to complete a questionnaire to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the coaching from their point of view at the end of the coaching assignment and return it to their coach. The coaches will do the same for their clients and return their questionnaires to the researcher.

The Coaching Evaluation is a Level 1 Measurement in the Kirkpatrick model and focuses on the Reaction to the coaching by the client as measured through the level of satisfaction. A questionnaire has been developed based on the ICF Core Competencies for coaching (see Appendix K). The 11 items client evaluation questionnaire (see Appendix L) uses a five-point Likert Scale, i.e. “Strongly Agree” (5), “Agree” (4), “Undecided” (3), “Disagree” (2) and “Strongly Disagree” (1). The maximum score on the evaluation of the coach is 55. In terms of the scale for client evaluation of the coach in this study, the Cronbach's alpha of .82 shows good internal consistency. To provide further qualitative data, room has been left to include explanations and the possibility to react to two statements (“As a coach you were most effective when…” and “As a coach you could have been more effective by…”) and provide any additional comments. Next, a Net Promoter Score (NPS) question (“I would recommend this coach/client to a colleague/friend”) has been included to gauge the ultimate strength of the relationship between client and coach. NPS is based on loyalty and this is defined as “the willingness of someone – a customer an employee, a friend – to make an investment or personal sacrifice in order to strengthen a relationship” (Reichheld, 2003, p. 3).

To get better insight into the relationship between the coach and the client, the coaches will also evaluate the coaching. The client questionnaire was adapted to be able to represent the coach’s view of his/her level of satisfaction with the client. The 10 item questionnaire to evaluate the client (see Appendix M) has also been developed based on a five-point Likert Scale, i.e. “Strongly Agree” (5), “Agree” (4), “Undecided” (3), “Disagree” (2) and “Strongly
Disagree” (1). The only question that was not transformed for this questionnaire was number 1 on the client evaluation (“My coach followed Ethical Guidelines and Professional Standards), because it was felt that this was not applicable. The maximum score on the coach’s evaluation of the client is 50. For the scale of the coach’s evaluation of the client the Cronbach's alpha of .86 also shows excellent internal consistency. There was also room left for explanations, the two above-mentioned statements and additional comments. The NPS question has also been included.

To provide a level of clarity regarding the perceived relationship between the client and the coach, a Client-Coach Relationship Index (CCRI) has been developed. It is composed of the total score of the Client Evaluation (of the Coach) divided by the total score of the Coach Evaluation (of the Client). The latter has been adjusted to account for the different number of questions (10) on the Client Evaluation of the Coach. Therefore, an index of 1.00 means that both client and coach perceive the relationship the same, i.e. for the purpose of this study it is interpreted as balanced. An index of more than 1.00 indicates that the client has a more positive perception of the relationship of the coach and an index of less than 1 means that the client has a more negative perception of the relationship than the coach. The opposite would be the case for the coach.

The above-mentioned Net Promoter Score is based on the ratio of promoters to detractors. Reichheld (2003) defines promoters as clients who, on a scale of 0 (low) to 10 (high), answer 9 or 10 to the question “I would recommend this coach/client to a colleague/friend”. “Passively satisfied” or “Neutral” are those scoring 7 or 8, and “Detractors” give a score from 0 to 6. The percentage of detractors is deducted from the percentage of promoters to arrive at NPS. World-class loyalty is defined as anything over 75%. To provide an additional gauge to establish the quality of the relationship between the client and the coach a Client-Coach NPS Index (NPSI) has been established by expressing the Client NPS as an index of the Coach NPS.

At the end of the coaching engagement the client, client’s boss and coach will review the original objectives of the coaching for the client and agree on a rating. For the evaluation of the coaching objectives an evaluation form has been developed (Appendix N). The achievement of each objective is scored on a 5-point Likert scale, i.e. from “Strongly Agree” (5) to (1) “Strongly Disagree”. Due to the nature of what is being reviewed, “Strongly Agree”
is interpreted as the client having achieved above what was expected regarding the objective, “Agreed” as having exactly met the objective, “Undecided” as half met/half not-met the objective, “Disagree” as not having met the objective and “Strongly Disagree” as by far not having met the objective. For the purpose of analysis this will translate into a scoring of:

- Strongly Agree: 1.25
- Agree: 1.00
- Undecided: 0.50
- Disagree: 0.00
- Strongly Disagree: -0.25

The achievement of the client’s coaching objectives will then be expressed as an average of the applicable scores. Since only a single item is measured there is no Cronbach’s alpha for this measure.

4.2.5 Record keeping

Each coach will keep a record of their meetings with their clients, the duration, the coaching objectives and any significant events that occur. Appendix O contains the suggested format.

4.3 Data collection procedure

The second level of the methodology will be the actual Coaching Program that will be the mechanism by which data will be collected. Figure 3 provides an overview of the steps involved in this program:
Each coach will engage in a comprehensive leadership coaching program based on a collection of data before the start of the program, 12 coaching sessions and collection of the same data at the end of the program. The expectation is that the whole program will last 6 months. Both the 12 sessions and 6-month time period are grounded in a combination of reported data, experience, belief and practical considerations. A good indication of the difficulty to establish the ideal time for a behavioural change to take effect is illustrated by the following quote: “We’re going to give it to you straight: the transformation of talent takes a while. There is no McDonald’s drive-through window for adult development” (Keegan & Laskow Lahey, 2009, p. 316). Crouter (2006) has reported that eight months cover a reasonable duration to detect changes in behavioural outcome variables. From the work by Theeboom et al. (2013) an average of 9.8 coaching sessions (minimum 1 and maximum 50) can be derived from their meta-analysis of the 17 outcome studies that reported number of sessions. Further, the ICF reported that despite an average length of 12.8 months, coaching engagements tend to be fairly short with over half (53%) lasting less than nine months and almost three quarters (73%) lasting one year or less. The most common engagement durations are 3 to 5.9 months (22%), 6 to 8.9 months (23%) and 9 to 12 months (20%) (International Coach Federation, 2009). As far as experience is concerned, the researcher has found with his
clients over the past seven years that 6 months has been a good starting point for getting a behavioural change solidly implemented. This is also based on a belief that it will take at least this time for coaching to have a sustained effect. Finally, there is the practical consideration in terms of the timing to complete this research project. A planned 6-month elapsed time did not seem unreasonable.

The executive coaches will work with their clients according to the following framework and collect data according to the measures described in section 4.2:

1. The client, his/her boss and a sample of peers, direct reports and others who are deemed to be able to provide valuable input, will complete the TLCP (The Leadership Circle Profile™ 360° feedback instrument). This will be done in combination with a set of questions that indicate an assessment, i.e. by his/her boss and by the client him/herself, of the client’s results (referred to as BPI (Business Performance Index). In addition, the client will be asked to fill out the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) to characterize his/her experience of mindfulness (self-assessment only),

2. Either in parallel with the 360° feedback process (Step 1) the coach will interview the client’s boss to gather his/her input into the specific objectives they have for the coaching, or the boss will provide this input as s/he joins with the permission of the client at the end of the 360°-debrief (Step 3)

3. Upon receipt of the TLCP- and FMI reports the coach will debrief the results with the client and establish together a maximum of 3 objectives for the coaching, which will be formalized in a coaching agreement with the client (an example has been included in Appendix C),

4. The coaching program will commence on the basis of 2 sessions per month, lasting one to two hours per session, for a period of 6 months (for rationale see above),

5. At the 2, 4, and 6-month interval the coach will facilitate a 3-way conversation with the client and the client’s boss for a check-in on progress (based on the review of the literature above that indicates the significance of support by the immediate supervisor),

6. Upon completion of the 6-month coaching program the 360°, i.e. TLCP, BPI and FMI will be repeated with (ideally) the same group of people as mentioned under 1,

7. The coach will complete a final (for the purposes of this research) debrief of the results with the client upon the availability of the TLCP-, BPI- and FMI reports.
8. The client will complete a qualitative evaluation of the coaching program. The coach will complete an evaluation of the client. The client and his/her boss, if needed facilitated by the coach, will conclude an evaluation of the coaching objectives (usually at the time of the post-coaching 360°-debrief (Step 7)).

The expected output from the coaching program will be longitudinal data for the coaching engagements based on the various instruments that will be used to collect the data. The coaches will make all of the data from the coaching engagements available to the researcher either as electronic or printed reports based on the data collection instruments that will be presented next.

4.4 Data analysis procedures

In the introduction to this chapter a conclusion was drawn that a concurrent design, i.e. bringing together both quantitative and qualitative data to comprehensively answer the research question, will be used in this study. Therefore, the expectation is that the following data will have been collected based on the method and instruments described in the previous sections:

1) The clients:
   a. Client-profiles with specific objectives for the respective coaching engagements that will provide insight into the types of clients and the reasons for engaging a coach,
   b. Results regarding the achievement of the coaching objectives for these clients, which will be correlated to the 360° feedback, Business Performance Index - and Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory results as well as the respective coaches,

2) The coaches:
   a. An inventory of coaching methodologies of coaches that will be used to correlate to outcomes of the coaching,

3) Client-coach relationship:
   a. Coaching evaluations will provide data, both from a client and a coach’s perspective regarding the coaching engagement and the relationship between client and coach,

4) Coaching engagements:
a. Detailed pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback data from the point of view of the clients, their boss(es), boss’s boss(es), direct reports, peers and others, which will provide an insight to what changed during the coaching,
b. Detailed pre- and post business performance data from the point of view of the client and his/her boss(es) that will indicate what changed and how this correlates with the 360° feedback data,
c. Detailed pre- and post mindfulness data from the point of view of the client, which will indicate what changed and how this correlates with the 360° feedback and BPI data.

The variables for which data has been collected and will be used for analysis are:

1. Categorical (grouping/descriptive – statistics are frequency and proportion) variables:
   a. Client_id
   b. Client-gender
   c. Coach_id
   d. Coach-gender
   e. Level (of clients in organisation, e.g. CEO, General Manager, Director, Senior Manager, Manager)
   f. Same boss (did the client have the same boss both pre- and post-coaching)
   g. Coaching part of leadership development program (or not)

2. Continuous (numerical values – statistics are mean and standard deviation) variables – for detailed descriptions, please refer to section 4.2):
   a. Coaching Outcomes
      i. The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP) Leadership Effectiveness
         1. Assessment by all evaluators, boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others
         2. Self-assessment
      ii. Mindfulness: Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) - self-assessment
   b. Business Results: Business Performance Index (BPI)
      i. Assessment by boss
      ii. Self-assessment
   c. Client-Coach Relationship
      i. Client-Coach Relationship Index (CCRI)
ii. Client Satisfaction (assessment by client)

iii. Coach Satisfaction (assessment by coach)

iv. Client-Coach Loyalty: Net Promoter Score Index (NPSI)
   1. NPS_client
   2. NPS_coach

d. Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index (COAI) - assessed by client, boss and coach
   i. Relating Dimension
   ii. Self-Awareness Dimension
   iii. Authenticity Dimension
   iv. Achieving Dimension

e. Length of leadership coaching (months)

f. Number of sessions

g. Number of hours

h. Number of 3-ways with boss

i. Number of Evaluators
   i. Boss’s boss
   ii. Boss
   iii. Direct reports
   iv. Peers
   v. Other
   vi. Same evaluators (between pre- and post-coaching)
   vii. New evaluators (between pre- and post-coaching)

The continuous variables 2a and 2b will be measured before the coaching begins (pre-coaching) and after the coaching has been completed (post-coaching). The Leadership Circle Profile™ Leadership Effectiveness will be available as an assessment by self (_self) and boss (_boss), boss’s boss (_boss_boss), direct reports (_dirrpt), peers (_peer) and others (_other) and all these evaluators, except the self-assessment, combined (_eval). Mindfulness will only be available as a self-assessment through the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory. Business Results will be measured by means of the Business Performance Index as a self-assessment and an assessment by the boss. The same convention will be applied to coding these variables, i.e. _self, _boss. The difference between post-coaching and pre-coaching will be calculated and “_diff” will be added to the variables to indicate this.
This data will be analysed from both a qualitative and quantitative point of view following the mixed methods approach in this study. In the next sections the procedures will be described that will be used to analyse the data.

4.4.1 Qualitative data analysis procedure

The qualitative data analysis will be primarily used to better understand the coaches that will contribute to this study as well as the objectives that will be collected for the clients. Depending on the data collected there may be an opportunity to further use qualitative analysis. The data in question will be the comments in the 360° feedback, Business Performance Index and the Client – and Coach Evaluations. Since the goal for this study is to first and foremost deliver empirical results, the use of this qualitative data and the analysis thereof will be decided upon in relation to meeting this objective. In the next sections the focus will be on the coaches and the client’s coaching objectives.

4.4.1.1 Coaches

In order to get an in-depth understanding of the methodologies employed by the coaches, each coach will be interviewed by means of a semi-structured interview approach. The objective will be to get an appreciation of the way the different coaches usually work and create an environment in which the coaches have as much leeway as possible to provide the richest possible information. The decision to use a semi-structured interview is based on already having a clear focus on the topic (Bryman, 2001) while wanting to take advantage of the richest possible conversation with the coaches. As suggested by Kvale (1996) eight different types of questions will be used, i.e. introductory, follow-up, probing, specifying, direct, indirect, structuring, interpreting, as well as silence. The focus will be on the background of the coaches, how they got into coaching, what type of education they have had in coaching, what type of clients they usually coach and how they usually go about their coaching. These interviews will be taped with the coaches’ permission to facilitate transcription. The detailed questionnaire of the 18 questions that will be used can be found in Appendix B. The results of the interviews will be coded based on the identification of common themes and then reported accordingly.
4.4.1.2 Client’s Coaching Objectives

To provide further insight into the types of objectives that will have been defined for the clients they will be analysed according to the following procedure. First, the client’s objectives will be listed as they will be reported on either the coaching agreements and/or objectives review form (see Appendices C and N). Objectives that are similar at first sight will immediately be grouped based on commonality, i.e. those that will relate to specific topics like “improve teamwork”. Second, the objectives will then be grouped according to key words that will match both the inner as well as outer dimensions of the Creative (Leadership Competencies) part of TLCP (see also 4.2.1 and Appendix H for more detailed information about TLCP). The rationale for using TLCP as the grouping mechanism is that this 360° feedback instrument will be key in measuring progress between pre- and post-coaching in this research. Third, apart from having a quality inventory of objectives, the anticipation is that there will be an opportunity to conduct further quantitative analysis (see next section) on the relationship between the achievement of objectives and the changes in the Creative (Leadership) Competencies of TLCP.

4.4.2 Quantitative data analysis procedure

From this within-subjects quasi-experimental design some unique issues will need to be addressed based on the work from Khoo, West, Wu, & Kwok (2006) who raise reliability, homogeneity (unidimensionality) and scaling as even more significant desiderata for good measurement in longitudinal studies. As it relates to reliability Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (α) and Test-retest correlations are widely used indices of measurement dependability. It is important to point out that Cronbach’s α “does not address error resulting from sources that may vary over measurement occasions (e.g. changes in mood)” (p. 302) and “may differ for measures collected during different periods” (p. 303). Green (2003) refers to this as transient influences like moods, feelings and mental states, and argues that these may affect scores when measured at a particular time compared to another point in time, as is the case in longitudinal studies. This could be a reason to use the Test-retest correlations as a better indicator of reliability. While recognizing this, and that both are seen as valid indicators of reliability in longitudinal studies, Cronbach’s α are used to indicate the reliability of the instruments used in this research. A Cronbach’s α of 0.80 “is typically employed as a rule of thumb to denote an acceptable level of internal reliability” (Bryman, 2001, p. 71). The
measures in this study have Cronbach’s α ranging from .81 to .95 indicating good levels of internal reliability (see various sections under 4.2). As has been described in section 4.2 not all raw data is available to obtain Cronbach’s α for all instruments and some are single-item measures.

Homogeneity (unidimensionality) refers to measures being based on a single dimension. Khoo et al. (2006) point out that in longitudinal research issues of homogeneity are more difficult because dimensions as part of a scale are likely to change at a different pace. Confirmatory factor analysis is usually applied to assess dimensionality. As has been discussed in section 4.2.1 confirmatory factor analysis has been done independently for the 360° feedback instrument. Sample size and the strength of how variables relate to each other are the two criteria to consider in deciding on using factor analysis. From the literature it emerges that, according to Tabachnick & Fidell (2007), it would be good to have 300 cases for factor analysis. Depending on how many high marking loader variables a concept has, they also mention that 150 cases may be sufficient. For the strength of correlations amongst the variables Tabachnik & Fidell (2007) recommend that correlation coefficients > .3 are investigated. They also mention that factor analysis may not be appropriate if few of these are found. This topic will be addressed further when the sample size (refer also to section 4.2.1) and correlations (chapter 5) of the variables in this thesis are clear.

The third item is about scaling. Khoo et al. (2006) and Bryman (2001) describe measurement scales as either ordinal (each participant is assigned to one of several ordered categories, but distances are not equal across the range), interval (a number is assigned such that a one-unit difference at any point of the scale represents the same amount of change) or ratio (equal to an interval scale, but it includes a true 0 point), nominal (equal to categorical that are made up of categories that can not be rank ordered) and dichotomous variables (data with only two categories). “Longitudinal analyses testing trend over time require interval measurement. The origin and units of the scale must be constant over time; otherwise the test of the form of the relationship will be confounded with possible effects of the measuring instrument” (Khoo et al., 2006, p. 304-305). Therefore, they assert that for projects in which quantitative change is measured over time, the researcher has to use a common scale based on an interval level of measurement over time. As has been discussed in section 4.2 in the description of the different data collection tools, it is apparent that this principle will be applied to this research project.
Whereas every effort will be made to ensure an adequate level of methodological rigour in this pre-post design as suggested by De Meuse et al. (2009), it is recognised extraneous variables can further jeopardise internal validity. From reviewing Campbell & Stanley (1963) history, maturation and testing could also be plausible reasons for changes between the pre- and post-coaching results. History refers to other change-producing events that participants may have experienced during the coaching engagement. Maturation has to do with the “biological or psychological processes which systemically vary with the passage of time” (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p.8), in this case independent of the coaching. Testing implies that the participants’ awareness of being part of a research project may have had an effect on the results. Grimshaw, Campbell, Eccles & Steen (2000) rate this design as superior to observational studies, but also warn that “secular trends or sudden changes make it difficult to attribute observed changes to the intervention” (p. S12). They also allude to the Hawthorne effect, “the non-specific beneficial effect on performance of taking part in research (p.S12)”. It needs to be pointed out that the positive effects of supportive supervision, which came out of the Hawthorne studies “have turned out to be more myth than fact as per interviews conducted decades later with three subjects and analysis of the original data with modern statistical techniques that do not support the initial conclusions” (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2010, p. 8).

The quantitative data from the various instruments will be compiled in an Excel-spread sheet. The data for the variables under study will then be been manually transposed from Excel into IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22 for analysis. In terms of the analysis the following steps will be followed to ensure the before-mentioned methodological rigour:

1. Assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of the data will be tested. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance, Skewness and Kurtosis of the data will be used to determine this,
2. Descriptive and Frequency statistics will be obtained from SPSS and reported for the key variables,
3. Based on what has been learnt from the literature regarding the importance of separating multiple effects, it is anticipated that, in reviewing the results a number of independent-samples t-tests will be done to compare mean scores for different groups,
4. Given that rater consistency has been flagged as something that needs to be considered, a paired samples t-test, as suggested by MacKie (2014) will be performed
in case there will be significant inconsistency between the raters before and after the coaching,

5. A correlation analysis will be performed for the key variables of the conceptual model to explore the strength of the relationship between the variables,

6. To control for the influence of different variables on the results, statistical tests will be performed to either rule out or confirm the influence of said variables. These include the number of sessions, hours and 3-way conversations as well as the length of the coaching programs, client gender, different coaches, coach gender and managerial level of the clients,

7. A paired samples t-test will be performed to test H1 and H4 and the related sub-hypotheses,

8. Given the sample size of n = 30 ANOVA (analysis of variance), applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, will be used to test the interactions of hypotheses and sub-hypotheses for H2 and H3. It should be noted that SPSS adjusts actual p-values by applying the Bonferroni correction backwards and hence SPSS Bonferroni adjusted p-values will be still be reported as significant if p < .05,

9. Since there will be an opportunity to analyse the data, in particular the multi-source data, from multiple viewpoints the results will also be analysed from these different sources, i.e. self, boss, boss’s boss, direct reports, peers and others, where appropriate.

The variables within the research model will be expressed in the following way:

- Coaching Outcomes will be measured by the difference between TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, as measured by all evaluators, and FMI Mindfulness, both before and after the leadership coaching. It will also be possible to look at TLCP Leadership Effectiveness from other points of view, i.e. self, boss, boss’s boss, direct reports, peers and others.

- Business Results will be reported by the difference between Overall Performance on the Business Performance Index (BPI), as assessed by the boss, before and after the leadership coaching. It will also be possible to report the self-assessed difference in the Overall Performance on the Business performance Index.

- The Client-Coach Relationship Index refers to how both client and coach have evaluated their relationship and is calculated by dividing the client’s rating by the coach’s rating. A norm of 1 will be defined as the relationship being in balance, i.e.
evaluated in the same way by both client and coach. Any number over 1 will indicate that the client evaluates the relationship as better than the coach and, in reverse, any number below 1 will indicate that the coach evaluates the relationship better than the client.

- **Client Satisfaction** refers to the client’s level of satisfaction with the coach as derived from the client’s evaluation of the coach (see Appendix L).

- **Coach Satisfaction** refers to the coach’s level of satisfaction with the client as per the coach’s evaluation of the client (Appendix M).

- **Client-Coach Loyalty** will be calculated by dividing the Client’s Net Promoter Score by the Coach’s Net Promoter Score. A norm of 1 will be defined as the loyalty relationship being in balance, i.e. evaluated in the same way by both client and coach. Any number over 1 will indicate that the client is more loyal to the coach and any number below 1 will indicate that the coach is more loyal to the client.

- **Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement** will be expressed based on composite scores from the Client’s Coaching Objectives Review (see Appendix N) as described above and will be referred to as COAI (Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index).

Effect sizes will be either reported as eta-squared based on the guideline provided by Cohen (1988) with .01 = small effect, .06 = moderate effect and .14 = large effect and/or as Cohen’s $d$. In reviewing the literature regarding effect size (ES), it has been suggested (http://www.uccs.edu/lbecker/effect-size.html) that in the case of correlated designs Cohen’s $d$, using the original standard deviations to calculate ES, should be used. This is based on the argument from Dunlap, Cortina, Vaslow, & Burke (1996) that ES original standard deviations should be used in correlated designs, e.g. repeated measures designs, because if the correlation is not considered, ES may be overestimated. In this case, effect sizes, referred to as Cohen’s $d$ are classified as Small, $d = .2$, Medium, $d = .5$ or Large, $d = .8$.

### 4.5 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted between March 2010 and January 2011. It needs to be pointed out that the objective of this pilot was to test the concept of the longitudinal study and that not all elements of the methodology were applied, because at this time the final methodology for this thesis had not been finalized. Fully aware of this limitation, there were two considerations
that lead to the continuation with this preliminary study and the inclusion of the results in this thesis. First, the significant experience of having worked as an executive coach during the past 4 years was deemed sufficient in being convinced that, whereas not complete, this study would give an adequate indication of the probable validity of the research methodology approach as well as what could be learned from it. Second, the longitudinal nature, as suggested in the literature, e.g. Evers et al. (2006), as a desired approach for this project is such that conducting a pilot study only upon 100% completion of the methodology within the context of this DBA would mean a further delay of around nine months; this was considered unreasonable and unnecessary.

What follows are the results of the author’s work with a client in a leadership coaching relationship and, with the permission of the client, the use of this mandate as a preliminary study to attempt to validate at least parts of the approach described in this document. The coaching mandate can be characterized in the following way:

1) Intake conversation with the client (March 22nd, 2010)
2) Selection of coach and signing of contract (March 30th, 2010)
3) Pre-coaching 360° feedback using The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP) – (April 1st – April 19th, 2010); neither BPI nor FMI were used in this coaching engagement
4) Discussion with boss and boss’s boss regarding objectives, 360°-debrief, defining objectives and first coaching session (April 20th, 2010)
5) Coaching sessions – 13 session lasting a total of 26 hours and 15 minutes over a 7-month period (May 5th, 2010 – November 19th, 2010)
6) Post-coaching 360° feedback using TLCP, final debrief and evaluation (January 7th, 2011) – neither BPI nor FMI were used and neither was the coach-evaluation of the client. The coaching evaluation was of a different format than the one proposed and described in this preliminary thesis.
4.5.1 Coaching Objectives

Based on input from an HR-representative, the client’s boss and the client the following objectives were defined for this coaching mandate:

1. How to deal with the different personalities and interpersonal issues within his team,
2. How to find a better balance between delegation and control with his team to ensure objectives are met,
3. How to use positional power more effectively,
4. How to manage upwards in addressing issues.

4.5.2 360° Feedback

TLCP was administered as per the schedule mentioned above. For the pre-coaching 360° there were 11 evaluators, whereas for the post-coaching 360° there were 8 evaluators (both including the client). The following table provides a summary of the pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback:
Within the context of this research the first interesting conclusion is that Leadership Effectiveness, as seen by the evaluators, went up from 2.68 (pre-coaching) to 3.00 (post-coaching). Second, going one level deeper it is interesting to note that the evaluator ratings went up in all Creative (Leadership) Competencies (Relating, Self-Awareness, Authenticity, System Awareness and Achieving) and the three Reactive Competencies (Controlling, Protecting and Complying) went down. Third, the self-rating in all Creative (Leadership) Competencies went down after the coaching, whereas they went up in the Reactive Competencies with the self-rating of Leadership Effectiveness going down as well. This phenomenon, rater bias, is also covered in the literature (Nieminen et al., 2013; Waldman et al., 1998) as described in section 2.4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLCP-dimensions</th>
<th>SELF Pre</th>
<th>SELF Post</th>
<th>SELF Post-Pre</th>
<th>EVAL. Pre</th>
<th>EVAL. Post</th>
<th>DIFF. Post-Pre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>+.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>+.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>+.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Awareness</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>+.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>+.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>+.14</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>+.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complying</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>+1.01</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>+.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results from Pilot Study
From this the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The self-perception of the client, as expressed in the self-evaluation indicates that the 360° feedback and, possibly, the subsequent coaching made the client more self-aware (as also confirmed by the evaluators),

- Even though, the client came out significantly lower on Leadership Effectiveness as per his self-evaluation, his evaluators experienced him to be more effective as a Leader.

4.5.3 Coaching Evaluation

The evaluations were based on an existing evaluation and not yet adapted to the Likert scale (as for the evaluations used in the research project). Purely based on the Net Promoter Score for this coaching engagement (100%) one can conclude that the relationship between coach and client was satisfactory. The detailed areas of the evaluation and the comments further support this.

4.5.4 Conclusion of pilot study

Whereas not all elements of the conceptual model have been used in this preliminary study, it is believed that the outcome provided enough indications that the methodology and approach would most likely work. The preliminary study indicates a positive change in the 360° feedback for this particular case. In terms of the hypotheses the following can be roughly concluded for this particular case:

1) Whereas only measured from the client’s point of view, the evaluation indicates a favourable relationship between the coach and the client and therefore this hypothesis could be regarded as partly valid for the pilot study,

2) In this preliminary study there was no direct linking of the coaching objectives to the organisation as such. Nevertheless, a subjective evaluation based on the results of the post-coaching 360° feedback would suggest that the coaching objectives were met by and large (1 and 2 fully, 3 partially, and 4 not), and therefore an argument could be made that this had a positive influence on Leadership Effectiveness,
3) Leadership effectiveness, as reported by the evaluators went up from 2.68 to 3.00, which would indicate a validation of the third hypothesis,

4) The fourth hypothesis could not be validated because the BPI was not set up and used for this case.

One key element learned from this preliminary study has been how to accommodate and address the issue of having the same and constant number of evaluators for the pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback. This study is intended to partially address the need for a well-documented investigation into the impact and/or how to mitigate this.

4.6 Conclusion

In section 2.4.4, based on the literature review for methodological approaches, nine criteria have been defined for research in coaching to adhere to in order to obtain empirical evidence about the impact of leadership coaching. The research methodology described in this chapter fulfills these criteria with the exception of a control group (item 2), multi-levels effects in terms of retention (see 4) and the inclusion of distal outcomes (item 9). The latter two have been deemed outside the scope of this study and a control group has not been included due to time- and resource constraints. The assertion is that the pre-post design with the level of methodological rigor, as suggested as alternative for using a control group, has been adequately fulfilled in this study. Nevertheless, since a control group is also recommended in the Kirkpatrick model (see 2.4.2, item e) the use of a control group to determine the effectiveness of coaching could therefore be considered an area for future research. As pointed out in the literature review, item d (perform a post-training evaluation three months or more after training so that trainees can put into practice what they have learned) from the Kirkpatrick model has also not been included, because coaching in itself is more of a continuous process in which the application of learning is regularly checked.

As far as the theoretical framework from Chen (1989) is concerned the research methodology covers both the Normative Treatment-Impact Evaluation (pinpoints crucial components in the treatment that affects the outcome) and Normative Outcome-Impact Evaluation (integration of normative outcome evaluation and an impact evaluation to be sensitive to both intended and unintended outcomes). Whereas the Normative Implementation Environment-Impact
Evaluation (constructed from an integration of implementation environment evaluation with an impact evaluation) has been considered, the sample size only allows for limited data collection.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this section the results are described, analysed and discussed. First, the qualitative data regarding the coaches will be presented. A section will follow covering the implications of the sample size on the analysis. Thereafter there will be a section on some general findings regarding the data, descriptive statistics, frequencies and correlations, followed by a section with comments regarding the variables that have been controlled for and a specific section on each one of the four hypotheses. The final section will cover an overall discussion of the results.

5.1 Coaches

Since only 21% of coaches, who qualified to participate in this study, actually took part, it is interesting to look at some of the reasons given by the 23 coaches (79%) who decided not to participate. The reasons varied from:

- “The 360° feedback instrument of my employer has changed” (no longer TLCP)
- “Too much work to include this research”
- “Does not fit with my coaching approach”
- “Can only commit to one client”
- “Too busy”
- “Can not commit to 12 coaching sessions”
- “TLCP not available in my country’s language”
- “Not doing enough coaching”
- “Can not commit”
- “Health issues”
- “Pre-and post-measurement too costly”
- “Can not foresee recruiting 10 clients”

The planned semi-structured interviews have been conducted with the 17 coaches who agreed to participate. Only the data of the 6 coaches who have actually delivered data from coaching
engagements according to the defined methodology have been used here. The detailed questionnaire of the 18 questions that has been used can be found in Appendix B. The time for the interviews ranged from 25’ to 1h31.

Table 3 provides a summary of the processes used by the six coaches. As compared to the methodology used in this study to the processes the coaches follow normally, the following is noted:

- Two of the six coaches have significantly more experience with the 360°-instrument (TLCP),
- Whereas a coaching program of 6 months fits within the time frame of what the coaches indicated as their usual time period, this is not necessarily the way they always work,
- Session-lengths vary across the coaches and differ from the 1-hour sessions of this study’s methodology,
- The usual number of sessions is also different for four of the six coaches,
- Half of the coaches systematically use the three-way conversations with the client’s boss,
- All coaches use a client evaluation at the end of the coaching, with one also specifically mentioning “feedback from HR” as part of the process,
- Even though it is not specifically linked to the methodology, there was conformity amongst the coaches in terms of financial structure and media.

For all of the coaches it has been new to work with the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory, Business Performance Index and to do an evaluation of the client at the end of the coaching program. Also, the inclusion of a second 360° feedback (TLCP) has been something most of the coaches have not done before.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach/Topic</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Process    | - “not stuck on process”  
- ideally 1 year, otherwise 6 months  
- intake + 360° + interpretation + goals  
- 2 sessions per month  
- stakeholder check-in (3-way) | - “not one process”  
- 3-9 months  
- qualitative 360° | - 3-6 months  
- sometimes “6-eyes” (3-way)  
- 8-15 sessions, average 75’ per session | - understand context  
- clarification of objectives  
- 3-way after 6 sessions  
- 6-10 sessions, average 90’ once every 3 weeks | - discovery session  
- groundwork  
- 45’ sessions  
- 9-10 sessions | - intake  
- contract  
- 360° with TLCP  
- 6 months, 2 sessions per month, average 1-2 hours  
- regular 3-ways |
| TLCPs completed | >50  
<10  
<10  
<10  
>40 | | | | | |
| Evaluation  | - client evaluation  
- feedback from HR | - client evaluation  
- feedback from HR | - client evaluation  
- feedback from HR | - client evaluation  
- feedback from HR | - client evaluation  
- feedback from HR | |
| Financial structure | - Full-service Package | - Full-service Package | - Full-service Package  
- 6 sessions at special price  
- 9-months Package | - Package preferred | - Full-service Package | |
| Media  | - Face-to-face  
- Skype | - Face-to-face  
- Skype | - 95% Face-to-face plus every other session Skype | - Face-to-face (Corporate)  
- Phone/Skype (Private) | - Face-to-face  
- Skype & Phone | |

Table 3: Inventory of Coaches
5.2 Sample size implications

The sample size of N = 30 presents some challenges in the types of data analysis that can be performed as well as impacts the generalizability of the results. Meltzoff (1998) has described that, as long as distributions are normal and assumption are according to the statistical procedure used, then significant results for samples of 20-30 can be sufficient. In addition, Cohen (1992) produced two tables for the most common statistical tests. Based on the tests that will be used in this study, i.e. t-test, analysis of variance and multiple and multiple partial correlation at an α of .05 and Large ES, the table suggest a sample size (N) of 26 - 30 at Power = .80. Therefore, an argument could be made that, based on these two references, a sample of N = 30 could be sufficient as long as the assumptions are validated. As a result, a preliminary analysis has been performed for the key variables in the conceptual model, and variables closely related to these, to ensure no violation of assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. The outcome has also been helpful to determine what type of statistics to use.

In terms of normality exploration the key variables showed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance of > .05, indicating normality. The exceptions were for the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index (COAI) and the Business Performance Index (both the boss – and self-assessment) with Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance below .05. All mentioned variables except Coach Satisfaction, the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index and Business Performance Index had positive Skewness, indicating a distribution with more scores towards the left at lower values. Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) assert that Skewness will not necessarily make a huge difference with reasonable sample size. Further, all mentioned variables except the Business Performance Index showed various degrees of negative Kurtosis. The negative values indicate a rather flat distribution, while the positive values are indicators of more peaked distribution with longer flat tails. Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) assert that Kurtosis can lead to an underestimation of the variance. Larger samples will reduce this risk. Since the assumptions have been violated for some of the variables, an argument can be made that the sample size of N = 30 may not be sufficient.

As it relates to the type of statistics that can be used, from a statistical point of view there are two types of techniques, i.e. parametric and non-parametric. The biggest difference between the two lies in that the underlying assumptions about the sample-data are more stringent for
parametric than non-parametric tests. Said in another way, non-parametric statistics are defined as “statistical test that do not require specifications about the shape of the distribution of the data in the population from which the sample is taken” (Meltzoff, 1998, p. 285) and they can be used to analyse ordinal and nominal data. Even though there is a mix of variables meeting the assumptions for normality, but given that the majority of variables, except the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index and the Business Performance Index, are in agreement with the assumptions for analysis, the conclusion that has been reached in consultation with the second supervisor is to use parametric statistics for all of the tests that support the data analysis, i.e. correlations, t-tests and analyses of variance. The sample size has been deemed too small for any type of regression analysis.

5.3 Descriptive statistics

To get an idea of the data collected, the following table (4) provides an overview of the characteristics of the Coaching Program for the participating clients (N = 30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length_leadership_coaching (in months)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number_of_coaching_sessions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>2.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number_of_hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>4.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average_duration_coaching_session (in hours)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.4097</td>
<td>.29530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nbr_of_3ways_with_boss</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Coaching Programs

The actual mean length of the coaching engagements is 8.67 months, which is a bit longer than what was planned in the Coaching Program (6 months). 16 (53.3%) of the coaching engagements took 8 months, 10 (33.3%) 9 months, 2 (6.7%) 10 months and the final 2 (6.7%)
11 months. Fifteen of the sixteen engagements that took 8 months were part of a leadership development program with a fixed start and end.

The mean number of sessions ($M = 11.83$) corresponds to what the plan was for the Coaching Program. The range, though, provides interesting insight into how different coaches work and could indicate a preference for how they usually work as compared to the method for this project. The mean for the average number of hours per session is higher than defined in the Coaching Program. This can be partially explained by the fact that some coaches had less sessions of longer duration. Another factor can be that some clients take more time and that the coaches involved in this study were flexible enough to grant them this. From the data regarding the 3-way conversations with the participating clients and their bosses the mean of 2.73 is below what was designed in the Coaching Program. The fact that only half of the coaches used this as part of their regular practice can be an explanation for this difference.

To get an idea of the population of evaluators involved in the 360° feedback, Table 5 provides an overview. It shows that there were a total of $N = 376$ evaluators for 30 clients at the pre-coaching (T1) stage and $N = 310$ at the post-coaching (T2) phase. 208 of these 310, i.e. 67.1% were the same evaluators, whereas 102 did not complete the pre-coaching assessment. The picture this table provides is one that was also discussed by MacKie (2014) in terms of rater turnover. He reported a rater consistency of 92.5% (Time 1 to Time 2) and 88.8% (Time 2 to Time 3). The rater consistency of 67.1% in this study is well below this. The implications will be further commented on in section 5.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nr_eval_pre</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>4.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr_eval_post</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>2.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr_same_eval</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_evaluators</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of TLCP Evaluators
The breakdown of the evaluators in the different categories, i.e. boss’s boss, boss, direct reports, peers and others (this means anyone not belonging to any of the other categories) is shown in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boss_boss_pre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss_boss_post</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss_pre</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss_post</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirrpt_pre</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirrpt_post</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer_pre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer_post</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other_pre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other_post</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Breakdown of TLCP Evaluators

What can be derived from this table is that only a few (N = 8 at T1 and N = 9 at T2) of the boss’s bosses of the clients have contributed to the evaluation process. Therefore, for the purposes of further analysis a decision was made not to consider this group due to its small size. In terms of the boss’s participation, the bosses of 2 clients did not complete at the pre-coaching (T1) stage and for 6 clients this did not happen after the coaching (T2). Related to the topic of the TLCP Evaluators is the fact that it is important to mention that eight of the participating clients had a change of boss during their coaching engagement. This will be commented on in more detail in section 5.4. The “N” for direct reports, peers and others represents the breakout of the data for these categories according to the rule in TLCP that this data is only reported if there are at least 3 respondents in each of these respective categories. If not, then their data will only be reported in the “all evaluator” category, i.e. it has been captured, but just not in the respective category to ensure confidentiality. Whereas the peers and other evaluators of the clients had an adequate contribution, the direct reports category, with feedback for N = 24 (T1) and N = 20 (T2), could have made a stronger contribution.
Table 7 provides a summary of the descriptive statistics of the Key Variables from the conceptual model. In terms of Coaching Outcomes, i.e. the difference between the T1 (pre-coaching) and T2 (post-coaching) for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, as rated by all evaluators, and the difference in Mindfulness, as self-assessed by each client, the results show a slight increase in the mean difference of $M = .08$ for the difference in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. The mean difference in the mindfulness score of $M = 4.35$ shows a more significant increase. The mean difference in the Business Performance Index as measured by the boss of the participating clients is .02, which indicates only a slight improvement between pre- and post-coaching. The Client-Coach Relationship Index ($M = 1.08$) shows that the clients perceive the relationship more favourable than the coaches. The level of Client Satisfaction with the Coach shows favourable results ($M = 49.93$). The mean score for Coach Satisfaction with the Clients ($M=46.90$) is also high, but not as high as how the clients have evaluated the coach. The mean of the Net Promoter Score index ($M = 1.04$) indicates as well that clients are slightly more likely to recommend their coaches than the coaches would recommend their clients. From the mean of the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index ($M = .96$) it can be concluded that coaching objectives were almost consistently met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le_eval_diff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.33650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fmi_diff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.3500</td>
<td>4.75821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bpi_boss_diff</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.0185</td>
<td>1.04220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client/coach_relationship_index</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.0763</td>
<td>.12762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client_satisfaction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>49.9333</td>
<td>3.30030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach_satisfaction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>46.8967</td>
<td>5.06753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nps_index</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.0423</td>
<td>.11301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaching_objectives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.9647</td>
<td>.22325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables of the Conceptual model

In terms of frequencies, 15 clients have an increase in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (as assessed by all evaluators) ranging from .01 to .86, one client’s leadership effectiveness has
not changed, and 14 show a decrease in their leadership effectiveness ranging from -.03 to -.49. As it relates to Mindfulness 24 clients show an improvement in Mindfulness ranging from 1 to 14, for 2 clients it has not changed, and for 4 clients Mindfulness has deteriorated (range -1 to -4). Regarding the Business Results, as measured by the bosses, 10 clients have had an improvement in business results, ranging from .5 to 2.0, for 9 clients there is no change, and for 8 the business results have deteriorated, ranging from -1.0 to -3.0.

The actual means for the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (as evaluated by all evaluators) and Mindfulness (self-assessment), and Business Performance (as assessed by the boss) at pre-coaching (Time 1) and post-coaching (Time 2) are summarized in Table 8. Please note that in Time 2 (post-coaching) three participating client’s bosses did not complete the BPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1 (pre-coaching)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Time 2 (post-coaching)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le_eval</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fmi</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bpi_boss</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: T1-T2 Means for Key variables

To provide some further clarity, the TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores, as measured by the participating clients’ bosses (le_boss), direct reports (le_dirrpt), peers (le_peer), other evaluators (le_other) and the clients themselves (le_self), as well as the self-assessed Business Performance Index are included in Table 9. These are further augmented by the descriptive statistics of the differences between Time 2 (post-coaching) and Time 1 (pre-coaching) for the same variables in Table 10. Only the bosses’ and self-assessment show an increase in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, the other categories do not. The self-evaluated Business Performance Index also indicates an improvement.
Table 9: T1-T2 Means for Key variables (boss, direct reports, peers, others & self)

What can be noticed in Table 10 is that only 23 of the 30 clients’ bosses actually completed both the pre- and post-coaching assessments, indicating a positive change (M = .27). For 16 of the 30 participating clients their direct reports show a decrease in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (M = -.21). Whereas for the peers (N = 14, M = .04) and other evaluators (N = 13, M = -.03) there is virtually no change, the self-evaluation indicates a positive change (N = 30, M = 0.26).

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (boss, direct reports, peers & self)

It is significant to note that the mean difference of .27 in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, as scored by the bosses, is significantly greater than those of both the mean differences according to all evaluators of .08 (Table 7), the direct reports (M = -.21), others (M = -.03) and peers (M = .04), and relatively close to how the clients see this themselves (M = .26).
Finally, Table 11 shows the contrast between the assessments of the Business Performance Index by the bosses and the clients, with Table 12 including the mean differences, ranges and standard deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1 (pre-coaching)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Time 2 (post-coaching)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bpi_boss</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bpi_self</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: T1-T2 Means for Key variables (BPI boss & self)

At first glance it is striking that the self-assessment of business performance is much higher between pre- and post-coaching as compared to the assessment by the bosses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bpi_boss_diff</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.04220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bpi_self_diff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.08066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (BPI boss & self)

Subsequently, the mean difference of the self-assessment regarding Business Performance of .27 is significantly higher than the boss’s mean difference of .02 as shown in Table 12.

5.3.1 Correlation of key variables

To identify eventual correlations between key variables, as a next step, Pearson Correlation has been applied. The results are summarized in Table 13:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Client-Coach Relationship Index</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coach Satisfaction</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>-.85**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Net Promoter Score Index</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coaching Objectives Achievement Index</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness_diff</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all evaluators)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mindfulness_diff</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Business Performance Index_diff (boss)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 30, except for Business Performance Index (N = 27); * p < .05; ** p < .01. Cronbach's alphas appear along the diagonal in parentheses.

Table 13: Correlation of key variables

It is important to point out, as per section 4.4.2 on the topic of homogeneity, that it was decided not to perform a factor analysis for the measures other than TLCP. This has been grounded in the fact that, as per Tabachnik & Fidell (2007) the number of cases is too small (N = 30) and only few correlation coefficients > .3 have been found. The significant correlations between the Client-Coach Relationship Index and Client Satisfaction, Coach Satisfaction and Mindfulness, as well as the significant correlation between Coach Satisfaction and Mindfulness will be commented on in the following sections regarding the hypotheses. At first glance, it is interesting to note that neither the Net Promoter Score Index, nor the Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index nor TLCP Leadership Effectiveness nor the Business Performance Index have a significant correlation with any of the other variables. This indicates that, with a few exceptions, there are no significant relationships between these variables. This also means that, barring the exceptions; there is no significant shared variance amongst these variables.
5.4 Results of Hypotheses testing

Before analysing the four hypotheses, five subjects need to be commented on, because they could have an impact on the results and need to be controlled for, and a sixth one needs to be addressed since it was covered as a possible approach under the qualitative data analysis procedure (see section 4.4.1). The first subject has to do with the fact that 20 of the 30 clients work for the same company and were part of a leadership development program that included 5 days of workshops in addition to the coaching. To control for and ensure that the data is comparable amongst the 30 coaching engagements, an independent-samples t-test has been conducted to compare the TLCP Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness scores for the clients who followed the Leadership program and the ones who did not. There is no significant difference in the scores for those who attended the leadership program in terms of TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (M = .08, SD = .37) and the ones who did not (M = .08, SD .28); t (28) = .04, p = .97 (two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.01, 95% CI: -.27 to .28) is insignificant (eta squared = .00) based on the guideline provided by Cohen (1988) with .01 = small effect, .06 = moderate effect and .14 = large effect. There also is no significant difference in the Mindfulness results for those who did (M = 3.6, SD = 4.23) and the ones who did not (M = 5.9, SD = 5.6): t (28) = -1.3, p = .21 (two-tailed). The magnitude of difference in the means (mean difference = -2.33, 95% CI: -6.06 to 1.41) is small to moderate (eta squared = .05). The magnitude of difference in the means for Mindfulness could be of concern. However, the clients who did not follow the leadership development program show moderately better results. Since this analysis wants to primarily address a possible concern that the leadership development program could have skewed the results favourably, it has been concluded that the differences between the scores show that this is not the case and all data can therefore be used in the forthcoming analysis.

Second, as described in section 5.3, it is apparent that there is a rater consistency issue, both in terms of the number of evaluators at T1 and the same new evaluators at T2 (see also Table 5) as well as the fact that eight clients had a change of boss during the coaching engagements. In terms of the overall rater consistency, the original thought has been to perform a paired sample t-test of the Leadership Effectiveness scores (le_eval) with original against the new raters at both Time 1 (pre-coaching) and Time 2 (post-coaching) as per MacKie (2014). The limitation in this study is that, whereas this level of detail can be provided from TLCP for self, boss’s boss and boss data, it is not available at this level for all
evaluators, direct reports, peers or others. This limitation will therefore have to be considered in the upcoming analysis.

Third, as mentioned, eight of the participating clients had a change of boss during their coaching engagement. Independent-samples t-tests have been conducted to control for possible impact by comparing key variables, in which the boss was involved in evaluating for clients who changed boss during the program and for those who didn’t. The results, summarized in Table 14, show that the differences are insignificant and the magnitude of differences either show a small or no effect at all based on the guideline provided by Cohen (1988) – see also above. Therefore, the differences between the scores are not significant and can be used in the forthcoming analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Clients with same boss</th>
<th>Clients not with the same boss</th>
<th>$p$ (two-tailed)</th>
<th>Magnitude of difference (Mean Difference=MD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coaching_objectives</td>
<td>M = .99, SD = .23</td>
<td>M = .91, SD = .20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>MD = .08, 95% CI: -.11 to .27 small effect with eta squared = .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bpi_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .18, SD = .77</td>
<td>M = -.38, SD = 1.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>MD = .56, 95% CI: -.33 to 1.45 no effect with eta squared = .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .27, SD = .38</td>
<td>M = .29, SD = .92</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>MD = -.02, 95% CI: -.57 to .53 small effect with eta squared = .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .25, SD = .23</td>
<td>M = .17, SD = .83</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>MD = .08, 95% CI: -.69 to .84 small effect with eta squared = .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-awareness_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .13, SD = .26</td>
<td>M = -.03, SD = .48</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>MD = .16, 95% CI: -.16 to .48 no effect with eta squared = .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authenticity_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .09, SD = .20</td>
<td>M = .34, SD = .78</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>MD = -.25, 95% CI: -.97 to .47 small effect with eta squared = .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving_boss_diff</td>
<td>M = .10, SD = .27</td>
<td>M = -.13, SD = .44</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>MD = .23, 95% CI: -.08 to .53 no effect with eta squared = .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Independent-samples t-tests Bosses
Fourth, a further upfront analysis has been done to control for the possible influence of the number of leadership coaching sessions, number of hours of leadership coaching, length of the leadership coaching engagement and the number of 3-way conversations between client, boss and coach in terms of their relative impact on the coaching outcomes. Table 15 shows the Pearson correlations between Coaching Outcomes and these various elements of the leadership coaching engagements. Except for some significant correlations between the various elements of the leadership coaching engagements, there are no significant correlations with the Coaching Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) le_eval_diff</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) fmi_diff</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) number_of_coaching_sessions</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) number_of_coaching_hours</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) length_leadership_coaching</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) nbr_of_3ways_with_boss</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.753**</td>
<td>.402*</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Table 15: Correlations of Coaching Outcomes with elements of the Coaching Program

To test the interaction between the various elements of the leadership-coaching program with the Coaching Outcomes, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of and control for the number of sessions on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of sessions and time, Wilks Lambda = .86, F (7, 22) = .53, p = .81, partial eta squared = .14. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .99, F (1, 22) = .17, p = .69, partial eta squared = .01. The same analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of the number of sessions on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of sessions and time, Wilks Lambda = .79, F (7, 22) = .82, p = .58, partial eta squared = .21. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .72, F (1, 22) = 8.50, p < .01, partial eta squared = .28.
Next, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been done to assess the impact of and control for the number of hours of leadership coaching on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of hours of leadership coaching and time, Wilks Lambda = .26, F (23, 6) = .74, p = .73, partial eta squared = .74. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .78, F (1, 6) = 1.71, p = .24, partial eta squared = .22. The same analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of the number of hours of leadership coaching on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of hours of leadership coaching and time, Wilks Lambda = .11, F (23, 6) = 2.22, p = .16, partial eta squared = .90. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .11, F (1, 6) = 48.15, p < .001, partial eta squared = .89.

Further, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of and control for the length of the leadership coaching engagement on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the length of the leadership coaching engagement and time, Wilks Lambda = .92, F (3, 26) = .77, p = .52, partial eta squared = .08. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .98, F (1, 26) = .63, p = .43, partial eta squared = .02. The same analysis has been done to assess the impact of the length of the leadership coaching engagement on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the length of the leadership coaching engagement and time, Wilks Lambda = .89, F (3, 26) = 1.09, p = .37, partial eta squared = .11. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .81, F (1, 26) = 6.07, p < .05, partial eta squared = .19.

Finally, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been conducted to assess the impact of and control for the number of 3-way conversations between client, boss and coach on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of 3-way conversations between client, boss and coach, and time, Wilks Lambda = .96, F (3, 26) = .38, p = .78, partial eta squared = .04. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .99, F (1, 26) = .34, p = .57, partial eta squared = .01. The same analysis has been performed to assess the impact of the number of 3-way conversations
between client, boss and coach on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the number of 3-way conversations between client, boss and coach, and time, Wilks Lambda = .79, F (3, 26) = 2.30, p = .10, partial eta squared = .21. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .72, F (1, 26) = 9.89, p < .001, partial eta squared = .28. From all the abovementioned results related to the various elements of the Coaching Program it appears that they have not influenced the Coaching Outcomes.

The fifth analysis has been done to control for the possible influence of client gender, the coaches themselves (particularly since the researcher worked with 13 of the clients), coach gender and the level of the clients in terms of their relative impact on the coaching outcomes. Table 16 shows the Pearson correlations between Coaching Outcomes and these demographics. The significant correlations between client gender, coach and coach gender do not provide insight into the leadership coaching programs as such. The significant negative correlation of the coaches with the change in Mindfulness, with r = -.365, n = 30, p < .05, and coach gender also with the change in Mindfulness, with r = -.388, n = 30, p < .05 imply that the difference in coach explains 13% and coach gender 15% of lower changes in Mindfulness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) le_eval_diff</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) fmi_diff</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) client_gender</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) coach_id</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.365*</td>
<td>.361*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) coach_gender</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.388*</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) level</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Table 16: Correlations of Coaching Outcomes and Demographics

The interaction between the client and coach demographics with the Coaching Outcomes have been tested by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, to assess the impact of and control for the client gender on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between client gender and time, Wilks Lambda = 1.00, F (1, 28) =
There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .95, F (1, 28) = 1.65, p = .21, partial eta squared = .06. The same analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of client gender on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between client gender and time, Wilks Lambda = 1.00, F (1, 28) = .03, p = .86, partial eta squared = .00. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .56, F (1, 28) = 22.05, p < .0001, partial eta squared = .44.

The same mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of and control for the different coaches on TLCP leadership Effectiveness before and after leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the different coaches and time, Wilks Lambda = .92, F (5, 24) = .42, p = .83, partial eta squared = .08. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .92, F (1, 24) = 2.10, p = .16, partial eta squared = .08. The identical analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of the different coaches on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the different coaches and time, Wilks Lambda = .80, F (5, 24) = 1.24, p = .32, partial eta squared = .21. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .63, F (1, 24) = 14.22, p < .0001, partial eta squared = .37.

Further, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of and control for the gender of the coaches on TLCP leadership Effectiveness before and after leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the gender of the coaches and time, Wilks Lambda = .98, F (1, 28) = .53, p = .47, partial eta squared = .02. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .95, F (1, 28) = 1.60, p = .22, partial eta squared = .05. The same analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of the gender of the coaches on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is a significant interaction between coach gender and time, Wilks Lambda = .85, F (1, 28) = 4.97, p = .03, partial eta squared = .15. There also is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .50, F (1, 28) = 28.51, p < .0001, partial eta squared = .50.

The last mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of and control for the level of the clients on TLCP leadership Effectiveness before and after leadership coaching. There is no
significant interaction between the level of the clients and time, Wilks Lambda = .91, F (4, 25) = .66, p = .63, partial eta squared = .10. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .89, F (1, 25) = 3.02, p = .10, partial eta squared = .11. The same analysis has been conducted to assess the impact of the level of the clients on Mindfulness before and after the leadership coaching. There is no significant interaction between the level of the client and time, Wilks Lambda = .82, F (4, 25) = 1.40, p = .26, partial eta squared = .18. There is a substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .62, F (1, 25) = 15.64, p < .0001, partial eta squared = .39. Apart from the possible significant influence of coach gender on an improvement in Mindfulness, all the other abovementioned results related to the various elements of the demographics of the clients and coaches appear not to have influenced the Coaching Outcomes.

The sixth and final subject that needs to be covered has to do with the opportunity to further use qualitative analysis based on the comments in the 360° feedback, Business Performance Index and the Client – and Coach Evaluations (refer 4.4.1). Given the disperse nature of the qualitative comments in the 360° feedback as well as the above-mentioned issue of rater consistency, and since the goal for this study is to first and foremost deliver empirical results, a decision was made not to use this data within this dissertation. As far as the comments on the BPI, Client- and Coach Evaluations are concerned, it turns out that the fields have hardly been used and therefore have been deemed to be insignificant for the purposes of this analysis.

Having clarified these six key points regarding the results, the following sections will cover the analyses of the four hypotheses.

5.4.1 (H1) Leadership coaching and coaching outcomes.

Hypothesis 1 claims that a significant difference exists between the Coaching Outcomes before and after leadership coaching. This is equivalent to a Level 3 (Behaviour) measurement in the Kirkpatrick model, i.e. what changes in behaviour have actually taken place. As indicated this hypothesis is analysed by means of two sub-hypotheses, i.e. there exists a significant difference between TLPC Leadership Effectiveness (H1.i) and Mindfulness (H1.ii) before and after leadership coaching.
A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows no significant correlations between the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness and any of the other key variables of the conceptual model. The difference in Mindfulness, however, shows a strong negative correlation, $r = -0.46$, $n = 30$, $p < .05$, with the Client-Coach Relationship Index, with high levels of the Client-Coach Relationship Index (meaning that clients were more satisfied than the coaches) associated with lower levels of Mindfulness. The Client-Coach Relationship Index explains 21% of the variance in the change of Mindfulness score. This translates into a finding that if a coach is less satisfied with the client than the client is with the coach Mindfulness is impacted negatively. In addition, there is a strong, positive correlation between the change in Mindfulness and Coach Satisfaction, $r = .45$, $n = 30$, $p < .05$, with higher levels of Coach Satisfaction associated with increased levels of Mindfulness of the clients. Coach Satisfaction explains 20% of the variance with the change in Mindfulness score. This translates into a similar finding that the more satisfied a coach is with the client the more Mindfulness is impacted positively.

A paired-samples t-test has been conducted to evaluate the impact of leadership coaching on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, as assessed by all evaluators, and Mindfulness, as evaluated by means of a self-assessment using the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory. The change in Leadership Effectiveness from TLCP (all evaluators) from Time 1 ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .49$) to Time 2 ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .40$), $t (29) = 1.28$, $p = .212$ is not statistically significant. The same paired-samples t-test reveals a statistically significant increase in the Mindfulness score from Time 1 ($M = 36.52$, $SD = 6.20$) to Time 2 ($M = 40.87$, $SD = 5.42$), $t (29) = 5.01$, $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed), a mean increase in FMI scores of 4.35 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 2.57 to 6.13 and the eta squared statistic (0.46) indicates a large effect size based on the guidelines from Cohen (1988), whereas Cohen’s $d = .75$ indicating a large ES.

Given the correlation-results for Coach Satisfaction, these significant results for the changes in Mindfulness, and the possible significant influence of coach gender on an improvement in Mindfulness, an independent-samples t-test has been run to compare Coach Satisfaction for male and female coaches. There is a statistically significant difference in the Coach Satisfaction scores for male coaches ($M = 49.28$, $SD = 4.82$) and female coaches, $M = 44.51$, $SD = 4.22$; $t (28) = 2.882$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference $= 4.77$, 95% CI: 1.38 to 8.15) is large (eta-squared $= .23$), whereas Cohen’s $d = .47$ indicating a medium ES.
While reviewing the results of the paired-samples t-tests for the change in Leadership Effectiveness measure from TLCP as evaluated by the client him/herself as well as his/her boss, direct reports, peers and others, it is interesting to note that only the change in the boss’s and self-evaluations are statistically significant. The boss’s evaluation show there is a statistically significant increase in the Leadership Effectiveness score from Time 1 (M = 3.46, SD = 0.64) to Time 2 (M = 3.73, SD = 0.54), t (22) = 2.30, p < .05 (two-tailed). The mean increase in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (as assessed by the boss) scores is M = 0.27 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.03 to 0.52. The eta squared (0.19) indicates a large effect size and Cohen’s $d = .46$ indicating a medium ES. The self-assessment of the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness also shows a statistically significant increase from Time 1 (M = 3.41, SD = .81) to Time 2 (M = 3.67, SD = .53), t (29) = 2.11, p < .05 (two-tailed). The mean increase in the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores is M = .26 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .01 to .51. The eta-squared (.13) indicates a large effect size and Cohen’s $d = .38$ indicating a small ES.

The evaluation of the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness by the direct reports shows a statistically insignificant decrease from Time 1 (M = 3.75, SD = .47) to Time 2 (M = 3.54, SD = .65), t (15) = -1.34, p = .20. The results from the peers indicate a statistically insignificant increase from T1 (M = 3.32, SD = .75) to Time 2 (M = 3.36, SD = .59), t (13) = .35, p = .73. The changes as perceived by the others also indicate a statistically insignificant decrease from Time 1 (M = 3.57, SD = .62) to Time 2 (M = 3.55, SD = .69), t (12) = -.31, p = .77. Given the insignificance of these results, TLCP Leadership Effectiveness data from the direct reports, peers and others will not be used in further analysis.

Since the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory is only available as a self-assessment it has been decided to attempt to control as much as possible for this given the significant changes in Mindfulness and its contribution to Coaching Outcomes. The Self-Awareness dimension of TLCP was felt to be the best to use for this, because elements of self-awareness are related to mindfulness. First, a Pearson correlation was investigated for Mindfulness with the self-assessed Self-Awareness from TLCP. The results are summarized in Table 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) fmi_pre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) self_aw_self_pre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) fmi_post</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) self_aw_self_post</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (two-tailed), ** p < .01 (two-tailed)

Table 17: Correlation of FMI and Self-Awareness

The significant results are that both the pre- and post-coaching Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory results correlate positively with the pre- and post-coaching results for the (self-assessed) Self-Awareness dimension of TLCP with $r = .49$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$ for the pre-coaching results and $r = .63$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$ for the post-coaching results. As reported earlier a paired samples t-test showed that the change in the FMI scores is significant between Time 1 (pre-coaching) and Time 2 (post-coaching). This is not the case for the (self-assessed) Self-Awareness dimension of TLCP that shows a statistically insignificant increase from Time 1 ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .35$) to Time 2 ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .29$), $t (28) = .10$, $p = .115$. There could be two possible reasons for this. First, the TLCP questions related to Self-Awareness (see Appendix H) are different from the statements on the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (see Appendix J). This is particularly the case for the emphasis in the Self-Awareness dimension of TLCP on the sub-dimensions Selfless Leader and Balance. The questions related to these are not covered in the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory. Second, the impact of the difference between self- and others’ perception at Time 1 (pre-coaching) for the Self-Awareness dimension in TLCP may have influenced some clients, being aware that other evaluators would rate them as well, to be more conservative with their ratings at Time 2 (post-coaching) in response; this was not the case for the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory, which is only a self-assessment. Nieminen et al. (2013) refers to this phenomenon as possibly rater bias.

Based on the above results the first sub-hypothesis (H1.i) has to be rejected, because the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, as measured by all evaluators, whereas positive, is not statistically significant. As pointed out, the low rater consistency may have impacted the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores. The assessment by the bosses could be seen as the next closest objective assessment. Therefore, when considering the difference in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses between pre- and post-coaching, it can be argued that there is a significant improvement. A possible counter argument could be the fact
that eight clients had a change in boss between Time 1 and Time 2. However, as per the analysis in Table 6 the differences between the ratings of the same and new boss have been deemed insignificant. The second sub-hypothesis (H1.ii) can be accepted, because there exists a statistically significant difference in Mindfulness after leadership coaching. In terms of the overall hypothesis it can be said that Mindfulness, enabling sustainable leadership effectiveness, contributes significantly to a positive difference in Coaching Outcomes.

5.4.2 (H2) Client-Coach Relationship

The second hypothesis posits that the perceived relationship between client and coach has a positive impact on Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H2.i) and Mindfulness (H2.ii). The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a balanced versus an unbalanced perceived relationship. Three related sub-hypotheses are that Client Satisfaction with the Coach (H2.a), Coach Satisfaction with the Client (H2.b) and Client-Coach Loyalty (H2.c) also have a positive impact on Coaching Outcomes. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a high versus a low Client Satisfaction (H2.a), Coach Satisfaction (H2.b) or Client-Coach Loyalty (H2.c). Client Satisfaction with the Coach is a typical Level 1 (Reaction) measurement in the Kirkpatrick model.

5.4.2.1 (H2) Perceived Relationship between Client and Coach

The Client-Coach Relationship Index, as per Table 7, shows a mean of $M = 1.08$ with a standard deviation of $SD = .13$ (minimum .84 and maximum 1.35). The mean indicates that the clients assess the level of the relationship at a higher level than the coaches. In sixteen engagements the clients perceived the relationship better than the coaches (CCRI > 1.05). In five cases the clients perceived the relationship worse than the coaches (CCRI < 0.95). In the remaining 9 cases the perception of the relationship was close to similar (CCRI = 0.95 to 1.05).

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows that the Client-Coach Relationship Index has a strong negative correlation, $r = -.85$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$, with Coach Satisfaction, with lower levels of Coach Satisfaction associated with higher levels of the Client-Coach Relationship Index. In this case Coach Satisfaction explains 72% of the variance in the Client-Coach Relationship Index scores. The Client-Coach Relationship Index
indicates a strong, positive correlation, $r = .37$, $n = 30$, $p < .05$, with Client Satisfaction, with higher levels of Client Satisfaction associated with higher levels of the Client-Coach Relationship Index. Client Satisfaction helps to explain 13.7% of the variance in the Client-Coach Relationship Index scores. From these results it can be derived that Coach Satisfaction has a more significant impact on the Client-Coach Relationship Index than Client Satisfaction.

To test H.2.i a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been conducted to review the impact of the Client-Coach Relationship (CCRI) on the clients’ TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (all evaluators) scores between Time 1 and Time 2. There is no significant interaction between the Client-Coach Relationship Index and Time, Wilks Lambda $= .47$, $F (19, 10) = .60$, $p = .84$, partial eta squared .53. There is a no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda $= .95$, $F (1, 10) = .56$, $p = .47$, partial eta squared $= .05$ showing a limited insignificant increase in the TLCP Leadership Effectiveness across the two time periods. To evaluate H2.ii the same mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance has been performed to review the impact of the Client-Coach Relationship (CCRI) on the clients’ Mindfulness scores between Time 1 and Time 2. There is no significant interaction between the Client-Coach Relationship Index and Time, Wilks Lambda $= .26$, $F (19, 10) = 1.47$, $p = .269$, partial eta squared .74. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda $= .32$, $F (1, 10) = 21.71$, $p = .001$, partial eta squared $= .69$ showing a significant increase in Mindfulness across the two time periods.

As per the before-mentioned results from the paired-samples t-test for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (refer section 5.4.1), a further level of analysis by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been done to evaluate the impact of the Relationship between Clients and Coaches on the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses and the clients themselves. First, for the change in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, there is no significant interaction between the Client-Coach Relationship Index and Time, Wilks Lambda $= .16$, $F (15, 7) = 2.38$, $p = .125$, partial eta squared $= .84$. There is also no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda $= .60$, $F (1, 7) = 4.66$, $p = .068$, partial eta squared $= .40$. Second, for the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness between T1 and T2, there also is no significant interaction between the Client-Coach Relationship and Time, Wilks Lambda
There is no main effect for Time either, Wilks Lambda = .85, F (1, 10) = 1.79, p = .211, partial eta squared = .15.

In terms of the interaction between the Client-Coach Relationship Index and Coaching Outcomes, Hypothesis 2 is therefore rejected for both TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H.2.i) and Mindfulness (H.2.ii).

5.4.2.2 (H2.a) Client Satisfaction

Client Satisfaction with the coach has a mean for the 30 participating clients of M = 49.93, out of a maximum total of 55, SD = 3.30, with a minimum score of 44 and a maximum of 55 (Table 7). The mean score per question ranges from M = 4.26 on question 10 (“My coach developed and maintained an effective coaching plan”) to M = 4.83 on question 1 (“My coach followed Ethical Guidelines and Professional Standards”). All questions have received the maximum score of “5”. The lowest score is a “3” (Undecided) on questions 1 – mean of M = 4.83 - , 5 (“My coach continuously listened actively”) – mean of M = 4.60 - , 6 (“My coach asked powerful questions”) – mean of M = 4.37, 10 (“My coach developed and maintained an effective coaching plan”) – mean of M = 4.27 and 11 (“My coach managed progress and held me accountable”) – mean of M = 4.39. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows no significant correlations between Client Satisfaction and any of the other key variables of the conceptual model.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows, as already discussed above in the previous section, that Client Satisfaction has a strong positive correlation with the Client-Coach Relationship Index.

To test this sub-hypothesis a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the impact of Client Satisfaction on the clients’ TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores (H.2.a.i) across two time periods (pre-coaching and post-coaching). There is a significant interaction between Client Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .47, F (9, 20) = 2.53, p < .05, partial eta squared = .53. In this case, there is no main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .82, F (1, 20) = 4.31, p = .051, partial eta squared = .18 showing a limited increase in the TLCP Leadership Effectiveness across the two time periods. The same mixed between-within subjects analysis
of variance has been conducted to review the impact of the Client Satisfaction on the clients’ Mindfulness scores (H.2.a.ii) between Time 1 and Time 2. There also is a significant interaction between Client Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .37, F (9, 20) = 3.79, p < .01, partial eta squared .63. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .38, F (1, 20) = 33.15, p < .0005, partial eta squared = .62 showing a significant increase in Mindfulness across the two time periods.

As per the above-mentioned results from the paired-samples t-test for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (see section 5.4.1), a further level of analysis by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been done to evaluate the impact of Client Satisfaction on the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses and the clients themselves. First, for the change in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, there is a significant interaction between Client Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .33, F (9, 13) = 2.90, p < .05, partial eta squared = .67. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .71, F (1, 13) = 5.29, p < .05, partial eta squared = .29. Second, for the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness between T1 and T2, there is no significant interaction between Client Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .64, F (9, 20) = 1.28, p = .309, partial eta squared = .37. There is also no main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .91, F (1, 20) = 2.06, p = .166, partial eta squared = .09. The difference in significance between the results appears to be influenced by the number of bosses (N = 23), who completed the pre- and post TLCP’s, the mean difference in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (M = .24) and evaluation ratings from the related clients. In comparison, the number of self-assessments is N = 30, with a mean difference of M = .20.

Since there is a positive impact of Client Satisfaction on both TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H.2.a.i) and Mindfulness (H2.a.ii) both sub-hypotheses can therefore be accepted.

5.4.2.3 (H2.b) Coach Satisfaction

The mean Coach Satisfaction with the clients for the 6 participating coaches is M = 46.90 out of a maximum total of 55 (scale-adjusted to the Coach Satisfaction survey), SD = 5.07, with a minimum of 36.3 and a maximum of 55 (Table 7). The mean score per question ranges from M = 3.88 on question 9 (“My client actively participated in designing actions (e.g. practices,
self-observations)”) to 4.52 on question 1 (“My client was committed to the coaching program”). All questions have received the maximum score of “5”. The lowest score is a “2” (“Disagree”) on questions 2 (“My client actively participated in establishing a clear Coaching Agreement”) – mean of M = 4.43, 3 (“My client actively contributed to establishing a trustful relationship between us”) – mean of M = 4.37, 5 (“My client expressed her/himself clearly”) – mean of M = 4.13, 7 (“My client communicated effectively during coaching sessions”) – mean of M = 4.17, 9 (see above) and 10 (“My client allowed and welcomed me to hold him/her accountable”) – mean of M = 4.37.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows, as already discussed above (see section 5.4.2.1), that Coach Satisfaction has a strong negative correlation with the Client-Coach Relationship Index. Further, as mentioned in 5.4.1, Coach Satisfaction shows a strong positive correlation with Mindfulness.

A mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been performed to assess the second sub-hypothesis (H2.b), i.e. the impact of Coach Satisfaction on the clients’ TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores (H.2.b.i) between Time 1 and 2. There is no significant interaction between Coach Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .49, F (14, 15) = 1.14, p = .404, partial eta squared = .52. There is no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .98, F (1, 15) = .256, p = .620, partial eta squared = .02. The same mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance has been done to assess the impact of Coach Satisfaction on Mindfulness scores (H.2.b.ii) of the clients between Time 1 and 2. There is no significant interaction between Coach Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .46, F (14, 15) = 1.25, p = .335, partial eta squared = .54. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .52, F (1, 15) = 14.07, p < .005, partial eta squared = .48 indicating an increase of Mindfulness.

As per the above-mentioned results from the paired-samples t-test for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (see 5.4.1), a further level of analysis by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, was conducted to evaluate the impact of Coach Satisfaction on the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses and the clients themselves. First, for the change in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, there is no significant interaction between Coach Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .35, F (11, 11) = 1.89, p = .153, partial eta
squared = .65. There also is no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .77, F (1, 11) = 3.21, p = .101, partial eta squared = .23. Second, for the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness between T1 and T2, there is no significant interaction either between Coach Satisfaction and Time, Wilks Lambda = .58, F (14, 15) = .79, p = .671, partial eta squared = .42. There further is no main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .89, F (1, 15) = 1.81, p = .199, partial eta squared = .108.

The second sub-hypothesis (H2.b) is therefore rejected, i.e. Coach Satisfaction does not appear to have a positive impact on Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H.2.b.i) and Mindfulness (H.2.b.ii) before and after leadership coaching.

5.4.2.4 (H2.c) Client-Coach Loyalty

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) measures Loyalty. The NPS from the client evaluations is M = 93.17%, with 28 clients recommending their coach and only two clients indicating that they are “neutral” in terms of recommending their coach. The NPS from the coach evaluations is M = 90.17%, with the coaches of 24 clients recommending them and the coaches of 6 clients being neutral. In Table 7 it can be seen that the mean of the Net Promoter Score index M = 1.04, SD = .11, with a minimum of .89 and a maximum of 1.29, indicates as well that clients are slightly more likely to recommend their coaches than the coaches would recommend their clients. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows no significant correlations between Client-Coach Loyalty (Net Promoter Score Index) and any of the other key variables.

To test sub-hypotheses H2.c to measure the impact of the relationship from a Client-Coach Loyalty (Net Promoter Score Index) point of view, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has first been conducted to review the impact of the Client-Coach Loyalty on the clients’ TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores (H.2.c.i) between Time 1 and Time 2. There is no significant interaction between the Net Promoter Score Index and Time, Wilks Lambda = .49, F (10, 19) = 1.98, p = .096, partial eta squared .51. There further is no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .95, F (1, 19) = .98, p = .336, partial eta squared = .05. The same mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance has been performed to assess the impact of Client-Coach Loyalty on the Mindfulness scores (H.2.c.ii) of the clients between Time 1 and 2. There is no significant
interaction between Client-Coach Loyalty and Time, Wilks Lambda = .72, F (10, 19) = .75, p = .673, partial eta squared = .28. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .63, F (1, 19) = 11.19, p < .005, partial eta squared = .37 indicating an increase of Mindfulness.

In addition, as per the above-mentioned results from the paired-samples t-test for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (refer to 5.4.1), a further level of analysis by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been done to evaluate the impact of Client-Coach Loyalty on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses and the clients themselves. First, for the change in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, there is no significant interaction between Client-Coach Loyalty and Time, Wilks Lambda = .52, F (10, 12) = 1.13, p = .414, partial eta squared = .49. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .70, F (1, 12) = 5.12, p < .05, partial eta squared = .30 showing an increase in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. Second, for the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness between T1 and T2, there is no significant interaction either between Client-Coach Loyalty and Time, Wilks Lambda = .59, F (10, 19) = 1.32, p = .289, partial eta squared = .41. There is a main substantial effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .79, F (1, 19) = 4.97, p < .05, partial eta squared = .21 also indicating an increase in self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness.

The third sub-hypothesis (H2.c) is therefore also rejected, i.e. Client-Coach Loyalty does not have a positive impact on Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H.2.c.i) and Mindfulness (H.2.c.ii) before and after leadership coaching.

5.4.2.5 Conclusion

Together with the rejection of H2 it can be concluded that the relationship between the client and coach as such does not appear to have a positive impact on the Coaching Outcomes before and after leadership coaching. Neither does Coach Satisfaction (H2.b) nor Loyalty between the Client and the Coach (H2.c). Only Client Satisfaction (H2.a) has a significant positive impact on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H.2.a.i) and Mindfulness (H.2.a.ii), before and after leadership coaching. For boss- and self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness the analysis only shows a significant interaction between Client Satisfaction and the boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness; this appears to be
predominantly influenced by the number of bosses, who completed the assessments, and the results for the related clients.

All the aforementioned results in this section show that clients see their coaches favourably. The clients rate the relationship, satisfaction with and recommendation of their coaches at high levels. In absolute terms the coaches’ scores also indicate that they believe a good relationship existed, are satisfied with the participating clients and would recommend the majority of their clients. Comparing the results between the clients and the coaches it appears that the coaches score lower across the board, and are thus more critical of the various elements of the relationship with their clients. Whereas the relationship between client and coach as such does not appear to impact the effectiveness of the coaching as measured in this study, based on the significant negative correlation between Coach Satisfaction and the Client-Coach Relationship Index, one can conclude that the level of satisfaction the coach experiences with the client has a much more significant impact on the relationship than the level of satisfaction the client experiences with the coach.

5.4.3 (H3) Coaching objectives

The third hypothesis is that there exists a positive impact of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives on the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (H3.i) and Mindfulness (H3.ii), before and after leadership coaching. The impact is expected to be stronger under the condition of a higher versus a lower level of achievement of the client’s coaching objectives. This is a Level 2 (Learning) measurement in the Kirkpatrick model. It also follows Chen’s (1989) composite theory driven evaluation Normative Treatment-Impact Evaluation, i.e. the outcome of the coaching as affected by the coaching process or methodology as applied through the coaching objectives.

Before analysing the data regarding this hypothesis it is deemed helpful as part of the mixed methods approach to provide a qualitative overview of the coaching objectives for the 30 clients. First, the objectives have been listed as they have been reported on either the coaching agreements and/or objectives review form (see Appendices C and N). Objectives that are similar at first sight have been immediately grouped, e.g. “significantly improve teamwork” has been mentioned 5 times. The inventory of objectives is listed in Appendix P. Second, the objectives have been grouped according to key words that matched both the inner as well as
the outer dimensions of the Creative (Leadership Competencies) part of TLCP (see also 4.2.1 and Appendix H for more detailed information about TLCP). In case it has not been obvious to match a client’s objective with one of the sub-dimensions of TLCP it has been categorised under “Not allocated to sub-dimension”. The rationale for using TLCP as the grouping mechanism is that this 360° feedback instrument is key in measuring progress between pre- and post-coaching in this research. The summarised result of the grouping is depicted in Table 18 below. For the detailed analysis please consult Appendix Q.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLCP Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not allocated to sub-dimensions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caring Connection</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fosters Team Play</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mentoring &amp; Developing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not allocated to sub-dimensions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selfless Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Composure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal learner</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courageous Authenticity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not allocated to sub-dimensions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Focus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purposeful &amp; Visionary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achieves Results</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decisiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 18: Inventory of Objectives
It has been more difficult for the following objectives to be categorized according to the various dimensions, because they had more of a skills-based focus:

- Strengthen negotiation skills
- Expertise to better challenge the controller team
- Step into leadership role and become equipped with management tools
- Develop skills and career
- Unblock career progression

Therefore, out of the total of 95 objectives, 49 (52%) fit with the Relating dimension of TLCP, 22 (23%) with the Achieving dimension, 14 (15%) with the Self-Awareness dimension, 5 (5%) with the Authenticity dimension and the final 5 (5%) cannot be categorized. None of the objectives fit with the Systems Awareness dimension of TLCP. 53% (N = 16) of clients had three objectives, 27% (N = 8) had two, 10% (N = 3) had four, 7% (N = 2) had five and 3% (N = 1) had 1 objective.

The client, client’s boss and coach have reviewed the objectives at the end of the coaching engagement. As described under the methods part they have been scored from “Achieved”: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1) and this has been translated into a Client’s Coaching Objectives Achievement Index (COAI) with 1, meaning that the objectives were achieved. Table 19 shows that the mean for the achievement of objectives is M = .96, i.e. objectives have more or less been achieved, SD = .22. The lowest score is 0.50 and this indicates an average of Undecided, i.e. half of the objectives were achieved and half were not. The maximum score is 1.25, which means that objectives were achieved above what was expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coaching_objectives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.9647</td>
<td>.22325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Descriptive statistics for Objectives Review
A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows no significant correlations between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives (COAI) and any of the other key variables. However, since there is an opportunity to link the achievement of the specific objectives to the dimensions of The Leadership Circle Profile™, Pearson correlations of the post- and pre-coaching differences in the categories of the objectives, as addressed in Table 18, have been performed with the difference in the post- and pre-coaching Coaching Outcomes. Table 20 provides a summary of these correlations from the point of view of all evaluators for the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. TLCP Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness, and the TLCP-dimensions related to the coaching objectives. It is worth confirming that, as reported by Dalal et al. (2008), the top half subscales all have a positive correlation with Leadership Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLCP Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) le_eval_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) fmi_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) relating_eval_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) self_awareness_eval_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) authenticity_eval_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) achieving_eval_diff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (2-tailed), ** p < .01 (2-tailed)

Table 20: Coaching Outcomes’ correlations with TLCP Creative Dimensions associated with Objectives

Given that 49 objectives focused on the Relating dimension of TLCP and $r = .84$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$, an argument can be made that, based on the correlation as described above, leadership coaching influences an improvement in the Relating dimension that explains 70.1% of the improvement in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. The same can be said for the Achieving dimension (22 objectives) $r = .88$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$, which explains 77.4% in higher TLCP Leadership Effectiveness Index scores, the Self-Awareness dimension (14 objectives) $r = .75$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$, explaining 56.3% of improved TLCP Leadership Effectiveness ratings, and the Authenticity dimension (5 objectives) $r = .70$, $n = 30$, $p < .01$ that explains 49.0% of the changes in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. It is interesting to note that Mindfulness only has a significant correlation with the Self-Awareness ($r = .37$, $n = 30$, $p < .05$, explaining 13.7%
of the changes in Mindfulness) and Relating (r = .41, n = 30, p < .41, explaining 16.8% of the changes in Mindfulness) dimensions of TLCP. There are no significant correlations between Mindfulness and the Authenticity- and Achieving dimensions of TLCP.

To assess the impact of the achievement of Coaching Objectives on the clients’ TLCP Leadership Effectiveness scores between Time 1 (pre-coaching) and Time 2 (post-coaching) a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, has been done. There is no significant interaction between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives and Time, Wilks Lambda = .42, F (11, 18) = 2.25, p = .061, partial eta squared = .58. There is no substantial main effect for time, Wilks Lambda = .86, F (1, 18) = 2.85, p = .109, partial eta squared = .14 showing a slight, statistically insignificant, increase in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. The same mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance has been performed to assess the impact of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives on the Mindfulness scores of the clients between Time 1 and 2. There also is no significant interaction between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives and Time, Wilks Lambda = .56, F (11, 18) = 1.29, p = .303, partial eta squared = .44. There is a substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .44, F (1, 18) = 22.72, p < .001, partial eta squared = .56 indicating an increase in Mindfulness.

As per the above-mentioned results from the paired-samples t-test for TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (5.4.1), a further level of analysis by means of a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance, applying Bonferroni confidence interval adjustment, was conducted to evaluate the impact of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives on the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses and the clients themselves. First, for the change in boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness, there is no significant interaction between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives and Time, Wilks Lambda = .66, F (9, 13) = .74, p = .669, partial eta squared = .34. There also is no substantial main effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .80, F (1, 13) = 3.27, p = .094, partial eta squared = .20. Second, for the self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness between T1 and T2, there is no significant interaction either between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives and Time, Wilks Lambda = .67, F (11, 18) = .82, p = .624, partial eta squared = .33. There is no main substantial effect for Time, Wilks Lambda = .99, F (1, 18) = .11, p = .741, partial eta squared = .01.
There are significant correlations between the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives and the dimensions of The Leadership Circle Profile™, which influence changes in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. However, given the lack of significant interaction, this hypothesis has to be rejected as well.

5.4.4 (H4) Leadership coaching and business results

The fourth and final hypothesis is that a significant difference exists between Business Results before and after leadership coaching. This represents a Level 4 (Results) measurement in the Kirkpatrick model. The measure applied is the change in pre- and post business results data as measured by the Business Performance Index.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient investigation (see Table 13) shows no significant correlations between the Business Performance Index and any of the other key variables.

To test the fourth hypothesis, first, a paired-samples t-test has been conducted to evaluate the impact of leadership coaching on clients’ scores on the Business Performance Index (as assessed by the bosses). There is a statistically insignificant increase in these scores from Time 1 (M = 4.74, SD = 0.82) to Time 2 (M = 4.76, SD = 1.03), t (26) = 0.09, p = .927 (two-tailed). The mean increase in these scores is M = 0.02 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -0.39 to 0.43.

Even though the focus of this study is on as objective data as possible, a paired-samples t-test was also applied to the results of the self-assessed Business Performance index. Also for this there is a statistically insignificant increase in these scores from Time 1 (M = 4.93, SD = .87) to Time 2 (M = 5.20, SD = .92), t (29) = 1.35, p = .187 (two-tailed). The mean increase in these scores is M = .27 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.14 to .67.

Based on these results the fourth hypothesis has to be rejected, i.e. whereas there is a slight increase in Business Results, there is no evidence from this study that there exists a statistically significant difference between Business Results before and after leadership coaching.
5.4 Discussion of results

In this dissertation the focus has been on the question of what an integrated evaluation framework will tell us about the effectiveness of leadership coaching. To answer this question a within-subjects quasi-experiment has been conducted measuring leaders before coaching began (Time 1) and after coaching was completed (Time 2). Four hypothesized outcome expectations have been measured. The hypothesized expectations for the improvement of Mindfulness (H1.ii) after leadership coaching and the impact of Client Satisfaction (H2.a) on Coaching Outcomes have been confirmed. The hypothesized impact of the Client-Coach Relationship Index (H2) and Client’s Coaching Objectives (H3) on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness and Mindfulness, and the improvement in Business Results (H4) after leadership coaching have not provided statistically significant evidence.

The results of this study show the challenges to enlist practicing coaches and their clients as participants. As far as the coaches are concerned the outcome confirms what De Haan & Duckworth (2013) have pointed out in terms of this type of study being costly and cumbersome, and coaches prioritizing their focus on their clients over research. On the participants’ side, the challenge in this research project has been to get to a sample size that will enable generalizability of the results. From reviewing the literature there are different views on how big a sample should be for a solid empirical analysis. According to the literature “if significant results are obtained with 20-30 participants per group or 10 or more per cell, and the distributions are reasonably normal and the assumptions of the statistical technique are met, there usually is no good reason for the reader to dismiss the results on the ground that the sample is too small” (Meltzoff, 1998, p. 61). It then also states that “the decision about sample size is not a straightforward one: it depends on a number of considerations and there is no definitive answer” (Bryman, 2001, p. 93). While reviewing the meta-analysis of Theeboom et al. (2013) the average sample size, excluding the significantly larger sample in the study performed by Smither et al. (2003), of the 17 studies was 49 with a minimum of n = 14 and a maximum of n = 103.

To further contribute to the subject of sample size Cohen (1992) introduced the notion of statistical power analysis. He defines it as follows: “the power of a statistical test of a null hypothesis (H0) is the probability the H0 will be rejected when it is false, that is, the
probability of obtaining a statistically significant result. Statistical power depends on the significance criterion ($\alpha$), the sample size (N), and the population effect size (ES)” (Cohen, 1992, p. 98). Two types of errors may happen. A Type I Error means that a null hypothesis (H0) is rejected while in effect it is true, or, said another way, an effect is reported while none is actually present. A Type II Error is the opposite of a Type I Error, i.e. an effect that is present is not detected. Whereas a sample of n = 30 does not appear unreasonable, it appears particularly justified to wonder if the size of the sample could have caused a Type II Error for the impact of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives on one of the Coaching Outcomes, i.e. the change in TLCP Leadership Effectiveness with a $p = .061$ and partial $\eta^2 = .58$. This should be investigated further in future research with a larger sample.

The results of this study also provide a good illustration of the challenges regarding the use of multi-source feedback. It cannot be excluded that rater leniency and bias, as discussed by Nieminen et al. (2013) and Perkins (2009), have influenced the results one way or another. An indication of this could be the fact that the average number of direct reports, who responded to the pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback, was lower than for the categories peers and others. For the direct reports there could have been a concern about giving feedback about their boss despite the process being confidential and anonymous. The rater consistency of 67.1% is another area worth mentioning, since it ostensibly has impacted the apples to apples comparison between results pre- and post-coaching. The argument that results could have been influenced by the fact that eight clients have had a change in boss during the coaching program has been discussed earlier and, given the results of the related analysis, is deemed invalid. Whereas rater leniency and bias appear to be difficult to overcome, future research should consider a way in which to either mitigate the impact of a lack of rater consistency or use a methodology to ensure rater consistency.

From the overall coaching program itself, the actual mean length of the coaching engagements of 8.67 months is consistent with the study of the ICF (2009). Combining the backgrounds of the 6 coaches with the results of the coaching program it becomes evident that coaching is not an exact science. In addition, clients clearly have their preferences as well. Some coaches have had less sessions of longer duration and some coaches have been flexible enough to grant some clients to take more time. From the data regarding the 3-way conversations with the participating clients and their bosses the fact that only half of the
coaches have used this as part of their regular practice can be an explanation for the difference in the mean of 2.73 that is below what has been designed in the Coaching Program. Ultimately, it is interesting to note that in terms of their influence on the final outcome, the results in this dissertation are similar to those of Theeboom et al. (2013), who also did not find a significant correlation between the number of coaching sessions and the overall coaching effectiveness.

Even though the results show that the length of the coaching programs (Minimum: 8 months and Maximum: 11 months) in this study (see 5.4) does not influence Coaching Outcomes, consideration could be given to this. The average number of months for the coaching program of 8.67 months could be too short a period to get statistically significant results. In retrospect the recommendation from Kirkpatrick (1996), to perform something similar as a post-training evaluation three months or more after training so that trainees can put into practice what they have learned, could have been applied. As it relates to coaching and business results a counter-argument could be made that the longer one waits for a business-results measurement, the more difficult it will be to make a direct link with the coaching intervention. This is an area to be considered for future research.

The ideal outcome of this dissertation would have been to objectively show an improvement in business results for the area that the leader, who has been coached, is responsible for, after leadership coaching (H4). Whereas the results (see section 5.4.4) show a slight increase, as assessed by the leaders’ bosses after coaching, they are not statistically significant. Even though Vecchio & Anderson (2009) found that self-assessments could be better predictors of unit performance than assessments by bosses, the self-assessed improvements in business performance, which were indeed better than the assessment of the bosses, are also not statistically significant. These findings are different than the ones found by Anderson (2006a, 2006b) in which a correlation of .612 was reported between Leadership Effectiveness and Business Performance, meaning that 37.6% of changes in business performance, as perceived by evaluators, can be explained by Leadership Effectiveness. It has to be noted that the sample size (N = 486) was significantly larger than the one in this study. Also, their study only had one measurement instead of the longitudinal measurements reported here.

This study shows further that, whereas TLCP Leadership Effectiveness (all evaluators) does not show a statistically significantly increase after leadership coaching, the Coaching
Outcomes *Mindfulness* and *TLCP Leadership Effectiveness* (as evaluated by the bosses and the clients themselves) have increased significantly. The results in this study (see section 5.4.1), range from $\eta^2 = .46$ (change in Mindfulness) to eta squared changes of $\eta^2 = .19$ (TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by the bosses) and $\eta^2 = .13$ (self-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness). In comparing these outcomes to studies that have reported Cohen’s $d$, these results are below those reported by Peterson (1993) ($d > 1.5$ for measures related to objectives of coaching). They are partially below and above the measurement in leadership behaviours in meetings as published by Perkins (2009) ($d > .95$ for 9 out of 11 measured). Further, they are above those documented by Nieminen et al. (2013) with effect sizes ranging from $d = .17$ (mission-focused behaviours) to $d = .27$ (adaptability-focused leadership behaviours), Evers et al. (2006) with $d = .5$ for some self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies in the coached versus the control group, and Smither et al. (2003) who reported $d = .17$ in obtaining higher ratings from direct reports and superiors for managers who worked with a coach, as opposed to those who did not.

It is recognized that the variable *Coaching Outcomes* is made up out of two components, with data of one reported at objective, i.e. other than self-reporting, levels (TLCP Leadership Effectiveness as assessed by all evaluators) and one being a self-assessment only (FMI). This is where the results of the changes before and after leadership coaching in the Freiburg Mindfulness Index, which has been positioned as contributing to a sustainable effectiveness of leadership, can be criticized for being a self-assessment as well as possibly having been impacted by coach gender and coach satisfaction in this study. However, if this approach in measurement is compared to the studies mentioned above, i.e. Peterson (1993): self-reports, supervisor and coach ratings, Perkins (2009): coach ratings, Nieminen et al. (2013): self-reports, Evers et al. (2006): self-reporting, and Smither et al. (2003): direct reports and superiors, it can be argued that this study reaches further by being able to provide a level of analysis at more objective levels where possible. Also, one could raise the question of how feasible it could be to have anything but a self-assessment of something as personal as the level of one’s mindfulness. As it relates to coach gender, it could be argued that, since fifteen clients have been coached by a male coach, and thirteen of these by the researcher, there possibly exists a bias that has influenced the results. However, the results also show that there is no significant interaction between the changes in Mindfulness and the different coaches. This could point to an area for future research in which coach gender and the way the coaches
work impact changes in Mindfulness of clients. The significant difference in coach satisfaction between male and female coaches and the related impact on changes in Mindfulness scores could also be investigated in a future research project.

From the results for Hypothesis 2 and its sub-hypotheses with regard to the impact of the Client-Coach Relationship on the Coaching Outcomes after leadership coaching there are three significant findings. First, while using an independent assessment of the outcome of the coaching, the relationship between the client and the coach does not appear to significantly impact Coaching Outcomes. Even though set in a totally different environment, i.e. the military, these results appear in line with the ones from Boyce et al. (2010), in which they found that leadership performance was predicted by client-coach commitment and not by rapport nor trust between client and coach. Baron & Morin (2009) and De Haan et al. (2013) did find a high correlation between the client-coach relationship and outcome of the coaching. However, the outcome was only measured through a self-report from the clients. This appears to be pointing more at the second finding in this dissertation, i.e. client satisfaction does indeed significantly impact the outcome of coaching. Said in another way, it is not so much about the relationship as to how satisfied the client is with the coach that impacts the outcome of the coaching program. While measured in a different way, this confirms the findings of De Haan et al. (2013), i.e. a strong positive correlation between how the client experiences the relationship and the coaching effectiveness.

Even though it has not shown a significant impact on the outcome of the coaching, the third finding is that the coach’s assessment of the relationship with the client has a much stronger influence on said relationship with the client than how the client evaluates this as illustrated by the negative correlation of \( r = -0.85, \ N = 30, p < .01 \) for coach satisfaction with the Client-Coach Relationship Index. Boyce et al. (2010) and Baron & Morin (2009) also found a greater significance in the coach’s rating of the relationship. Despite the insignificant interactions that have been found for coach satisfaction and coaching outcomes, the positive correlation between coach satisfaction and mindfulness \( (r = 0.45, n = 30, p < .05) \) could possibly confirm a more significant impact of coach satisfaction on coaching outcomes. This is consistent with Boyce et al. (2010), who also found that the coach rating of the relationship correlated significantly with the client rating of the outcome. What this all means is that, contrary to what has been reported by De Haan et al. (2013), the way the coaches feel about
the relationship with the client has a much more significant influence on the relationship between client and coach, and possibly coaching outcomes, than previously believed. This strengthens the argument that De Haan et al. (2013) allude to in recognizing that client and coach perceive their relationship in their own way. “Coaches may not be as “in tune” with their clients as they typically assume” (De Haan et al., 2013, p. 54), which is also illustrated by a similar lack of correlation (r = .13, N = 130, p = .13) between the client’s assessment of the coaching relationship and the coach’s measure of the relationship in their study as compared to r = .17, N = 30, p = .38 between coach – and client satisfaction in this study.

It is within this context that the matching of clients with coaches as reported by De Haan et al. (2013), Boyce et al. (2010), Baron and Morin (2009), Feldman and Lankau (2005) and Hall et al. (1999) needs to be mentioned. While the research by Boyce et al. (2010) focused on a military setting, did not involve external professional coaches and also used the clients’ ratings as a measure for the coaching outcome based on the Kirkpatrick Model, the improved understanding regarding client-coach relationship processes highlights the importance of careful matching. Given the description of the matching for the 30 clients involved in this research an argument could be made that for 25 of the 30 clients the process of matching could have been more stringently applied. Further, it also raises a vital point for coaches in that they need to be even more aware of how they are experiencing the relationship with their clients and, as suggested by De Haan et al. (2013) to not only find a way of measuring the client’s perceptions of the relationship in real time, but to do the same for themselves in order to ensure the maximum possible outcome of the coaching.

Even though a statistically significant result has not been obtained regarding Hypothesis 3, the significance of the achievement of the Client’s Coaching Objectives appears very close to being a predictor for coaching outcome. Bowles et al. (2007), Evers et al. (2006) and Orenstein (2006) also have documented positive findings as it relates to setting goals in coaching. Whereas the setting was again different (military, not using external professional coaches) and also the calculation method of percentage of objectives achieved was arrived at differently, the mean achievement of coaching objectives of 96.5% compares favourably with the one reported by Bowles et al. (2007) for achievement of leadership goals of 85%. In addition, these results appear consistent with those published by Orenstein (2006) in which changes in 15 of 19 behaviours, directly related to coaching objectives, were significant. The important feature to highlight from this dissertation is that an as close to as possible objective
measure for the determination of the coaching outcome has been used and the low rater consistency may have influenced the outcome.

This study can be criticized for not using a control group, specifically because it has been shown by De Haan et al. (2013) that when control groups have been used, smaller effect sizes are reported. However, it is suggested that the value of this research is that it provides data from various sources, i.e. boss’s bosses, bosses, direct reports, peers, others and client’s themselves. As discussed, in the large majority of other published research most of the data has either been self-reported or sourced from the coach, who, particularly in the case of research, may have a certain bias. Future research could possibly look at including a control group.

Another area for possible critique could be that 20 of the 30 clients were part of a leadership development program that included 5 days of workshops in addition to the coaching. Whereas the independent t-test concluded that this has not influenced the results, future research should aim to focus on coaching-only interventions. This could further strengthen the case for the effectiveness of coaching. Based on the results from Oliver et al. (1997), in which they found that whereas training only increased productivity by 22.4%, training-with-coaching increased productivity by 88% in a public agency, the results of this study further reinforces the impact of coaching as a developmental intervention.

It has been difficult to control for environmental, and in particular internal, factors. Even though independent t-tests did not show a significant difference in outcomes for eight of the participating clients, who had a change of boss during their coaching engagement, consideration should be given to this in future research. This also relates to the topic of rater consistency. Further, the results may have been unfavourably impacted by the organisational changes that have been mentioned that impacted half of the clients in this study.
CHAPTER 6: MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Coaching is a multi-billion dollar business that is expected to grow over the years to come according to the International Coach Federation (2012). It is an unregulated profession in most countries. Whereas it is a confidential relationship between a client and a coach, an objective indication of the effectiveness of the coaching, particularly executive or leadership coaching, is often sought. Rather than being sold on mostly subjective calculations of return on investment (ROI), the suggested implication of this research for managers is that it is possible to apply an evaluation framework to identify the effectiveness of leadership coaching.

Organisations that are truly interested in measurable leadership coaching engagements could consider the implementation of an integrated evaluation framework as presented in this project. The suggestion is to systematically implement a pre- and post-coaching measurement by means of a multi-source feedback instrument that includes the perspectives from various stakeholders, e.g. boss, boss’s boss, direct reports, peers and others, for leadership coaching engagements. A related recommendation is to complement this with a third measurement of the multi-source feedback at another point in time, post coaching, e.g. 12 months after the conclusion of a coaching engagement to fully appreciate the extent of the impact. Whereas it may be more difficult to relate any changes at this point of time to the impact of the coaching, from a leadership development perspective this third measurement would also contribute to an on-going cycle of learning.

Beyond other inputs, like performance appraisals, assessments, other feedback and observations, the results from the multi-source feedback instrument have shown to be a good background for the formulation of the objectives for coaching. The outcome of this research suggests that coaching objectives could be a crucial element in making an investment in a coaching engagement worthwhile. The implication for managers is that once they have either engaged in working with a coach, much more precise attention should be paid to the identification, formulation and measurement of objectives for the leadership coaching engagement. Linking them to the results of the multi-source feedback instrument will enable a relatively simple identification of the progress by the client.
Whereas changes in organisations are a reality, the results of this study have shown how crucial it is to have consistency in the people that contribute to the multi-source feedback. A further implication for managers is to set the example and ensure they complete this feedback for their direct reports at the specific moments they get the request for feedback. In addition, managers, who receive coaching, should ensure that they are reasonably sure that the people they request feedback from will complete it and will be able to do so at the designated milestones. A more active upfront involvement of these diverse stakeholders may be one way to achieve this. Considering less, however a sufficient number for meaningful results, rather than more is to be considered as a guiding principle for the selection of evaluators.

As part of the integrated evaluation framework for leadership coaching, organisations should also insist on the inclusion of an evaluation of the coaching at the end of each engagement. Given the significance of the impact of client satisfaction with the coach on the effectiveness of the coaching, organisations should pay particular attention to training Human Resources (HR) professionals to successfully match clients and coaches, and possibly clients for coaching on what skills it takes to interview and select a coach. It is important to mention that this does not necessarily mean that a client chooses a coach they like, but a coach that has a track record and is able to support and challenge the client within the context of the area s/he needs to develop. In addition, clients should be trained and held accountable to consistently check in with themselves and their coach about how satisfied they are with the coaching they are getting. Whereas client-coach agreements usually stipulate that both are responsible for the satisfaction with their relationship, coaching clients should also be trained to systematically check in with their coaches to find out how satisfied the coaches are with how the coaching engagement is going.

Given what the results of this study suggest regarding the impact of the satisfaction of the coach on the relationship between client and coach, the implication for coaches is to pay particular attention to how satisfied they are with their client during the relationship. While reviewing the ICF Core Competences (Appendix K) it occurred to the researcher that it could possibly be helpful to develop a 12th Competence focused exclusively on how coaches experience the relationship with the client. “Coaching Satisfaction” could be considered to be introduced under the heading “Co-Creating the Relationship” emphasizing that the coach should, as suggested by De Haan et al. (2013), not only measure the client’s satisfaction with
the coaching in real time, but to do the same for themselves to ensure the maximum possible coaching effectiveness.

The results of this research indicate how leadership coaching appears to make a contribution to an improvement in mindfulness. Given the importance of mindfulness, as one of the three elements for renewal supporting sustained leadership effectiveness, an implication for organisations and coaches is to ensure that mindfulness is systematically addressed with leaders as part of leadership development efforts. The suggestion is to use the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory, as a part of the integrated evaluation framework for measuring mindfulness before and after leadership coaching. As a result, mindfulness will become a topic of conversation and leaders will become more aware of their own mindfulness and work with their coach to further improve this.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS (CONTRIBUTIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH)

The original objectives of this dissertation were 1) to provide an overview of the assessment of leadership coaching, 2) to propose a framework for how the effectiveness of leadership coaching can be evaluated, 3) to show empirical results about the impact of leadership coaching, and 4) to propose further areas of research in the area of measuring the effectiveness of coaching. The first section of this chapter will focus on reviewing what the contributions are based on the first three objectives. The second section will describe the limitations of the findings, and the third section will suggest areas for future research.

7.1 Contributions

The first contribution of this research project is that the assessment of leadership coaching, as documented in the literature, has been comprehensively summarized. Nine criteria have been identified that should be taken into consideration to obtain empirical evidence about the impact of leadership coaching in research. These are that:

1. Only executive coaching engagements, provided by professionally trained external coaches, should be considered,
2. A pre- and post-coaching within-subject control group research design is the most appropriate, with a pre-post design with an adequate level of rigor the only suitable alternative,
3. Results should be based on the collection of multi-source data from high quality psychometric instruments to reduce potential bias as much as possible,
4. Multi-level effects, including changes in the attitudes, performance, and retention of both the client and the client's subordinates should be part of the analysis,
5. The unique contribution of coaching as compared to other leadership development interventions should be isolated,
6. Reported statistics are an integral part of the research,
7. Formative evaluations of the client, coach, client–coach relationship, and coaching process are included,
8. Coaching objectives that correspond directly to business or organisational requirements are part of the research design,

9. Distal outcomes like leadership retention, adequate pipeline to fill senior positions and others that are deemed valuable by the organisation, are considered in the research as well.

Except for the use of a control group (see 2), multi-level effects in terms of retention (see 4) and distal outcomes (see 9) it is suggested that this dissertation contributes by meeting all other criteria. In terms of the research design (see 2) it is believed that an attempt has been made to meet the conditions for the alternative, i.e. a pre-post design with an adequate level of rigour. By having compared the results between the clients, who received coaching only and those who were known to have been part of a leadership development program, and concluding that there were no significant differences between them, the suggestion is that criterion 5 has also been met. The main reason for the lack of significant differences is most likely that, according to the client evaluations of the leadership development program, the coaching had the most impact on them.

The proposed integrated evaluation framework for evaluating leadership coaching is suggested to be a second contribution of this study. The results appear to indicate that the various elements of the framework provide good insight into the elements of leadership coaching engagements. The advantage of the framework is also that other instruments to collect and report data, which could be more suitable for the organisation, can be used to substitute the various parts. For example, The Leadership Circle Profile™ could be substituted by another 360° feedback instrument that is found to be more suitable for the respective organisation. The same holds for the Business Performance Index, an instrument that did not completely meet up to its expectation in this project. In addition, the approach used in this thesis to collect client-coach relationship data could be substituted by using an adapted version of the Working Alliance Inventory as used by De Haan et al. (2013) and others.

The review of the literature indicated a predominance describing the lack of empirical evidence regarding the measurement of the effectiveness of executive coaching. Related to this is that a gap was identified in the reporting of this type of research in the domain of Business. Therefore, the third contribution of this dissertation is that, even given its
recognised limitations (see next section), it provides empirical evidence that leadership coaching contributes to an increase in Mindfulness and self- and boss-assessed TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. Since Mindfulness is one of three key ingredients in leaders renewing themselves to remain effective, the results of this study suggest that coaches should consider building mindfulness and measurements thereof in their coaching processes.

The fourth contribution is in the area of the client-coach relationship. Whereas client satisfaction seems to have been reconfirmed as a predictor for coaching outcomes, the results of this research raise two key questions. First, is the relationship as such an actual predictor for coaching outcomes? Based on these results, this appears not to be the case. Second, if the satisfaction of the coach with the client has a seemingly more significant impact on the relationship than the satisfaction of the client with the coach, then what should coaches consider doing differently when they work with clients? Careful matching of clients with coaches, therefore, remains an important subject because it could possibly enhance the probability that both will be satisfied with one another. It is also suggested that coaches find a way to build and address constant satisfaction-checks regarding their clients in their process.

A fifth area of contribution relates to the impact the client’s coaching objectives appear to have on the outcome of leadership coaching. It is therefore suggested that the definition of objectives should be carefully considered once a client engages in a leadership-coaching contract. The integrated evaluation framework allows linking the achievement of the objectives for the coaching with the results from the multi-source feedback instrument and, in this way, over and above the possible subjective evaluation of the achievement of said objectives, provides an additional objective verification of whether the objectives have been met.

The issue related to the measurement of Emotional Intelligence, even though not specifically in the scope of this research, was identified as an area in which the results of this study could possibly also show some insight. The suggestion is that this study appears to make a contribution to four of the six issues that are closely related to the issues raised regarding obtaining empirical evidence for coaching effectiveness and the same evidence for Emotional Intelligence. This study shows that it is possible to gather data other than leader self-reported measures of leadership, obtain leadership measures from one source (e.g. subordinates, peers, bosses), use measures that were specifically designed to tap into EI (in this case by means of
TLCP) and use practicing leaders in real-world contexts. Not successfully addressed were having an acceptable sample size, something that has been identified as a limitation of this project and that will be addressed in the following section. Also, obtaining leader individual differences from another source (e.g. leader IQ, EI, personality) was not within the scope of this research and has therefore not been addressed.

7.2 Limitations

For all the contributions of this research project, it should be clear that there are a number of considerable limitations. The first one has to do with the sample size, i.e. data for 30 coaching engagements was collected against a goal of 100. As has been pointed out, the literature is not exact on what an ideal sample size is. However, it is recognized that with a current sample of N = 30 it is difficult to claim generalizability of the results.

A second limitation that has become apparent has to do with rater consistency. This refers to how many evaluators were the same in providing the pre- and post-coaching data. With a consistency of 67.1% between Time 1 and Time 2, it is likely that results have been affected. In considering both the limits of the sample size and rater consistency it is worthwhile to recall that most of the key variables showed negative Kurtosis. Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) assert that Kurtosis can lead to an underestimation of the variance. Larger and, for consideration, more consistent samples could address this. Linked to this is that, as a result of the tool that has been chosen (The Leadership Circle Profile™), the level of detail required to compare scoring patterns between old (pre-coaching) and new (post-coaching) raters has been limited.

Third, given that self-reporting has been identified as a limitation in the coaching effectiveness literature, it could be seen as a limitation that results for the level of mindfulness of the clients has only be obtained as self-assessed data, despite the use of a validated instrument. The change in the level of mindfulness has been shown to make a significant contribution to the Coaching Outcomes. The literature review has shown an important reference to using independent outcome criteria as also reiterated by De Haan et al. (2013). Therefore, the sole usage of the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory as an indicator of mindfulness could be regarded as a limitation. The question remains, based on the questions
of the FMI, how someone else than the individual concerned could correctly assess how mindful he or she really is.

A fourth limitation relates to how events outside of the realm of the coaching have impacted the outcome. Changes of bosses and changes in organisations for the participating clients have all been described. Whereas the impact of the changes of bosses has been analysed more deeply and found not to have impacted the results, the same cannot be said for the analysis of the impact of the organisational changes. The examples of these changes are good examples of what has been described in Chen’s Normative Implementation Environment–Impact Evaluation, i.e. the implementation environment and related impact of external factors.

Finally, it could be argued that a fifth limitation is the fact that two-thirds of the clients received the coaching as part of a leadership development program that also included five days of workshops during the period. As has been mentioned, it cannot be excluded that the other clients also participated in other leadership development activities. The result of the analysis of significant differences in the outcomes has shown that these are not statistically significant. However, it could be seen as a limitation that not only pure, i.e. without other leadership development activities, coaching engagements have been considered. Given the insignificant differences and the difficulties encountered in getting to an acceptable sample size, the belief is that it has been a reasonable choice to include the data for all these coaching engagements in this study.

### 7.3 Future Research

There are several areas that could be considered for future research based on the findings in this dissertation. Whereas the literature on sample size appears to be inconsistent in terms of what is a required sample size, an area for future research could be to take the proposed framework and methodology to continue the collection of data until a sample size has been reached that allows for the results to be generalizable. In addition, using a control group in the design could complement future research. A prerequisite for this, which in itself could also be an area for future research, would be to study what it would take to get professional coaches engaged in large-scale empirical coaching research projects.
The topic of rater consistency is another area in which further research should be considered. Despite possible issues related to rater bias, multi-source feedback has been described as being closest to an objective measurement of progress. What would be interesting to find out is what makes evaluators decide to either complete a request for such feedback or not. Further, it would be interesting to understand the pre-requisite conditions under which evaluators will complete both multi-source feedback requests in a pre- and post-coaching research design.

Given the significance of the changes in mindfulness and its importance for leadership effectiveness another area for future research could be to include a measurement of mindfulness as experienced by others. This would help in getting around the possible criticism that mindfulness has only been measured as a self-assessment in this study. In addition, another area for future research is to evaluate how the gender of the coach, the way coaches work and their satisfaction with the clients impact changes in mindfulness. Since mindfulness is one of three elements supporting renewal, future research should also look at changes in Hope and Compassion as possible outcomes of coaching.

This study was not able to confirm a statistically significant impact of Client’s Coaching Objectives on Coaching Outcomes. The question has been raised if, due to the limited sample size, a Type II Error has occurred for the impact of the achievement of the Client’s Objectives on TLCP Leadership Effectiveness. Given what has been found in the literature review it seems logical that this should be considered an area for future research.

The impact of events external to coaching on the outcome of coaching engagements could be another area to be considered for future research. Today’s organisational world is characterised by constant change. This could be as far as strategy is concerned, changes in organisations and jobs. Research into how these changes impact leadership coaching engagements could possibly assist organisations in determining the planning of these leadership development interventions.

Even though the analysis showed that the difference between those clients who received the coaching as part of a leadership development program and those who only received coaching (although it cannot be excluded that they participated in other leadership development
activities) was statistically insignificant, another area for future research would be to only focus on coaching engagements without any other types of leadership development mixed in. This would further validate the finding of this and other empirical research that coaching, as a standalone leadership development intervention, is effective.

Another area for future research will be to include a different measure of business results. The attractiveness of the Business Performance Index, as used in this dissertation, has been its relative objectivity and the fact that it was closely related to the coaching as part of the integrated evaluation framework. In reality it turned out that the clients and their bosses found it difficult to use and in the majority of cases only used the overall rating. The use of another instrument may yield more significant results.

In addition, based on the experience in this study consideration may also need to be given to the timing of post-coaching measurements in future research. It is here that a follow-up one year after the completion of the coaching, like Kirkpatrick’s three months’ follow-up, could possibly yield better results even though it may likely be more difficult to make the direct link to any changes being the result of the coaching intervention.

Finally, a further area for research in the future could be into multi-level effects from leadership coaching, particularly regarding changes in the retention of the client and the performance and retention of the client's subordinates. Related to this could be future investigations into other distal outcomes of leadership coaching like overall leadership retention, an adequate pipeline to fill senior positions and others that are deemed valuable by the organisation.
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1. Introduction
This manual has been put together to provide clear instructions to and support the participating executive coaches in this research project.

2. Research Question
This research project is focused on coaching of leaders in organisations. It draws on resources from the fields of Management, Psychology and Training & Development. The question this research project aspires to answer is:

“What does the application of an integrated evaluation framework tell us about the effectiveness of leadership coaching?”

3. Research model and hypotheses
This project aims to apply an integrated framework to the evaluation of coaching effectiveness. The fundamental question this research would like to answer is how leadership coaching moderates the link between leadership effectiveness and business results. Based on the literature review this thesis will further investigate how the client/coach relationship and coaching process (purpose (objectives), content and type of coaching) (refer to the recommendations by Ely et al. (2010) moderate (refer to De Meuse et al. (200)) the link between leadership coaching and leadership effectiveness.

The model of research developed for this research project is depicted in the following conceptual framework:
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

The independent variable, ‘leadership effectiveness’, will be expressed by the change in a pre-and post-assessment of 360° feedback (as reported by the evaluators) and mindfulness, and the dependent variable, ‘business results’ will be measured by the change in the pre- and post-evaluation of a business performance indicator for the respective clients (as reported by the evaluators). The leadership coaching is deemed to have been effective if there has been a positive change in the 360° feedback and mindfulness score, and subsequently also the business results have shown improvement. On the contrary, the coaching is deemed to have been ineffective if there has been no change or even deterioration in the 360° feedback, mindfulness score and business results. To complete the integrated evaluation framework the client/coach relationship and the coaching process will be evaluated as moderating variables in the link between leadership coaching and leadership effectiveness.

From this model the following hypotheses have been derived:

1. The relationship between the client and the coach will impact the effectiveness of the coaching (H1),
2. The achievement of coaching objectives (included in the coaching process), which are directly linked to the objectives of the organisation, are a key criterion in establishing coaching effectiveness (H2),
3. Leadership coaching has a direct impact on leadership effectiveness (H3),
4. Leadership coaching moderates business results (H4).

4. The expected methodology

The expected methodology used in this study aligns itself with a combination of a quantitative and qualitative approach and will look like this:
Expected Methodology

The different elements of the expected methodology will be described in detail below. Qualitative research will be used for understanding the coaches and the methodologies they normally use to be able to correlate this to the outcome of the coaching engagements. Within the coaching program quantitative research will be used to validate the four hypotheses.

4.1 Coaches and Clients

The research sample will involve 10 Executive Coaches with 10 Clients each, which will result in data for 100 leadership-coaching engagements and ensure a sufficient number of data-points to make an empirical contribution.

To control as much as possible for the impact of the background of the coaches themselves, the following criteria have been established for coaches to qualify for participation in this research project, i.e. s/he:

5. Is certified in The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP), a 360° feedback instrument (must),
6. Is credentialed accredited by ICF (International Coach Federation) or is on his/her way to becoming credentialed or has a combination of training and coaching hours which would make them eligible for a credential (must), and
7. Has successfully completed the University of Georgetown’s Leadership Coaching program (want).
The two “must” criteria will establish a solid basis regarding a philosophy of leadership coaching. The ICF accreditation will further contribute to getting closer to standardization. All coaches will have been subject to the same accreditation as it relates to the coaching competencies as defined by ICF requirements to pass as well as being in compliance with the same code of ethics. The third “want” criteria will further enhance the probability of common methodologies, since all coaches will have followed the same education. It has been classified as a “want” purely for practical reasons since there is no guarantee that a sufficient number of coaches in Europe will fulfil this criterion.

The leaders (clients/coachees) will need to fulfil the criteria of being managers who have management responsibility for people, set the direction and are responsible for the results delivered by their department.

The ten Executive Coaches will be interviewed regarding the methodologies they apply during their leadership coaching interventions in order to establish a baseline for their way of working. From the results of these interviews an analysis will be done regarding the patterns in coaching methodologies to control for the impact of different methodologies. These will be clustered and used at a later stage to correlate them with the results of the actual coaching.

**4.2 Coaching Program**

The coaches will embark on a coaching program that will look as follows:

![Figure 3: Coaching Program](image-url)
Each coach will engage in a 6-month leadership-coaching program with their ten clients - coaching programs are usually delivered in blocks of time starting with six months. The ICF reported that despite an average length of 12.8 months, coaching engagements tend to be fairly short with over half (53%) lasting less than nine months and almost three quarters (73%) lasting one year or less. The most common engagement durations are 3 to 5.9 months (22%), 6 to 8.9 months (23%) and 9 to 12 months (20%) (International Coach Federation, 2009, p. 50). Further, the six months are both driven by a belief that it will take at least this time to have some effect and by a practical consideration in terms of the timing to complete this project.

The executive coaches will be requested to work with their 10 clients according to the following framework (details on the tools follow in the next section (4.3)):

1. The client, his/her boss and a sample of peers, direct reports and others who are deemed to be able to provide valuable input, will complete the TLCP (360° feedback instrument). This will be done in combination with a set of questions, which will indicate an assessment, i.e. by his/her boss and by the client him/herself, of the client’s results (referred to as BPI (Business Performance Index). In addition, the client will be asked to fill out the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) to characterize his/her experience of mindfulness (self-assessment only),

2. In parallel the coach will interview the client’s boss to gather their input on the specific objectives they have for the coaching,

3. Upon receipt of the TLCP- and FMI reports the coach will debrief the client and together establish a maximum of 3 objectives for the coaching,

4. The coaching program will commence on the basis of 2 sessions per month, lasting one to two hours per session, for a period of 6 months,

5. At the 2, 4, and 6-months interval the coach will facilitate a 3-way conversation with the client and the client’s boss for a check-in on progress,

6. Upon completion of the 6-months coaching program the 360°, i.e. TLCP, BPI and FMI will be repeated with the same group of people as mentioned under 1,

7. The coach will complete a final (for the purposes of this research) debrief with the client upon the availability of the TLCP- and FMI reports.
8. The client will be requested to complete a qualitative evaluation of the coaching program, as will the coach be requested to evaluate the client, and the client and his/her boss will be requested to conclude an evaluation of the coaching objectives.

What clients agree to regarding this research over and above the normal coaching engagements are:

1) The anonymous use of their coaching engagement related data for this research,
2) Completing both pre- and post coaching the TLCP (which will also involve other evaluators), FMI (self-assessment only) and BPI (self- and boss’s assessment only),

4.3 Tools
To collect the data for this research project a number of different tools will be used. In the following sections these will be described in detail.

4.3.1 Coaching Methodology – Semi-structured interviews
In order to get an in-depth understanding of the methodologies employed by the 10 coaches, each coach will be interviewed by means of a semi-structured interview. The results will lead to a better understanding of the coaching processes as employed by the different coaches and is expected to assist in the data analysis of the coaching effectiveness outcomes.

The objective here is to get an appreciation of the way the different coaches usually work and create an environment in which the coaches have as much leeway as possible to provide the richest possible information. The focus will be on the background of the coaches, how they got into coaching, what type of education they have had in coaching, what type of clients they usually coach and how they usually go about their coaching. With their permission all these interviews will be taped in order to facilitate transcription.

4.3.2 360° feedback - The Leadership Circle Profile™
To collect both pre- and post-coaching 360° feedback a 360° assessment instrument called The Leadership Circle Profile™ (TLCP), a scientifically validated instrument ((Anderson Jr.,
2006b) will be used. It provides data comparing a self-assessment with the feedback from others.

**Instructions for the coaches:**

- TLC in Europe and North America have agreed to a specific pricing scheme to support this project. Coaches with clients falling under this project need to create a Project on their account entitled WJH – DBA Research Project. Under this project heading they can add the clients for their profiles and retakes. In this way, Karen (Europe) and Barbara Aranyosi (North America) will see them as part of your project and apply the pricing discount. For North America, please also enter the phrase "DBA Project" in one of the three blank lines in the billing information section when you purchase the Profiles.

The pricing will be as follows:

- All profiles will include Write in Comments Free of Charge
- 10% discount will be applied to wholesale rates as indicated on the attached table
- All taxes and shipping will be added as required.
- Only profile projects being conducted within your research project will be afforded this discount. We reserve the right to cross check at any time that this is condition is being adhered to
- The pricing policy is to remain confidential to you and the coaches who are involved in your research.

More details can be found in the pricing exhibit in Appendix H (Europe).

- Upon completion of the pre-coaching TLCP, please send an electronic copy of the full report within 48 hours to Willem Jan Hofmans via email at willem.jan.hofmans@hfsc.ch. The same is requested for the post-coaching report.

**4.3.3 Business Performance Index**

A Business Performance Index (BPI) tool, as developed by The Leadership Circle and for which permission to use has been granted, will provide data regarding how the performance of the organisations the different clients are responsible for is rated (Anderson Jr., 2006a); again, there will be pre- and post-coaching data available. It will evaluate the performance of the business unit that the manager leads. The client and the client’s boss are asked to compare the business performance of the part of the organisation that the person being evaluated manages to the performance of similar organisations. There are six categories for evaluating business performance: Sales/Revenue Growth, Market Share, Profitability/ROA, Quality of
Products and Services, New Product Development, and Overall Performance (Anderson Jr., 2006a). An example of the Business Performance Indicator tool can be found in Appendix A and B.

**Instructions for coaches:** Please ensure that, in parallel to the 360° TLCP feedback, both the client and his/her boss will complete the BPI pre- and, upon completion of the coaching, the post-coaching questionnaires. Please send the completed questionnaires to Willem Jan (willem.jan.hofmans@hfsc.ch) upon completion.

### 4.3.4 Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory

The Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) is a semantically robust and psychometrically stable, validated tool (Walach et al., 2006) which measures mindfulness. As described earlier (see Leadership Effectiveness), mindfulness is one of the three elements for renewal that increases the probability of sustained effective leadership. Walach et al. (2006) produced a short 14-item version (alpha = .86), covering all elements of mindfulness without being dependent on a Buddhist or meditation context. Also, they concluded that the short form is more suitable if knowledge of the Buddhist background of mindfulness cannot be expected. Therefore, this short form is believed to be appropriate for this research. The detailed questionnaire can be reviewed in Appendix C. Each question is scored from 1 (Rarely) to 4 (Almost Always) except for question 13 in which the scoring is reversed. The maximum score is 56 (most Mindful) and the minimum score is 14 (least Mindful). For the purpose of this research the emphasis will be placed on analysing the pre- and post coaching results.

The inclusion of the FMI serves two purposes. First, it is an instrument about which numerous validation studies have been published and therefore will strengthen the findings of this research. Second, as also suggested by Walach et al., it will be intriguing to be able to correlate the results of the pre- and post-coaching FMI’s with both the pre- and post-coaching results for Self-Awareness and System Awareness from TLCP to comment on the sustainability of leadership effectiveness.

**Instructions for coaches:** Please ensure that, in parallel to the 360° TLCP feedback, the client completes the FMI pre-, and upon completion of the coaching, post-coaching questionnaires. Please send the completed questionnaires to Willem Jan (willem.jan.hofmans@hfsc.ch) upon completion.
4.3.5 Coaching evaluation

The coaching program will be evaluated at three different levels, i.e. from the coachee’s perspective, the coach’s point of view and jointly by the coachee, coach and the coachee’s boss in terms of the achievement of the objectives of the coaching program. Both the coachees and the coaches will be requested to fill out a questionnaire, see Appendices D and E, to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the coaching from their point of view. The answers will enable a better insight into the relationship between the coaches and the clients, and reflect the possible effects this has on the coaching itself. In Appendix G an evaluation form for the coaching objectives has been proposed.

The coachee and coach evaluations have been developed based on a Likert Scale related to the coaching core competencies as defined by the ICF. To provide further qualitative data, room has been left to include explanations as well as three statements have been included to further provide qualitative data. A Net Promoter Score (NPS) question has been included to gauge the ultimate strength of the relationship between coachee and coach. NPS is based on loyalty and this is defined as “the willingness of someone – a customer an employee, a friend – to make an investment or personal sacrifice in order to strengthen a relationship” (Reichheld, 2003, p. 3).

Instructions for coaches: Please ensure that, upon completion of the coaching engagement and within 48 hours:

- The client completes the coach-evaluation form,
- You complete the client-evaluation form,
- You coordinate the review of the objectives with the client and his/her boss, and complete the coaching objectives evaluation.

Please send the completed forms to Willem Jan (willem.jan.hofmans@hfsc.ch) upon completion.

4.3.6 Record keeping

Each coach will be required to keep a record of when they met their clients, for how long, the coaching objectives and any significant events that may occur. This will be used later to further validate and correlate data required in the analysis phase. See Appendix G for the suggested format.
Instructions for coaches: please complete the coaching record per client and send it to willem.jan.hofmans@hfsc.ch within 48 hours of the completion of the coaching engagement.
Appendix B: Questions for Executive Coaches participating in DBA-project

1) Tell me about yourself?
2) What is your educational background?
3) What about your work experience?
4) How would you describe your current job?
5) How did you get into coaching?
6) What training have you followed?
7) What made you, or not, obtain a credential?
8) What type of clients do you typically coach?
9) How would you describe your coaching process?
   a. Intake
   b. Contracting
   c. 360°
      i. How many TLCP’s have you completed?
   d. Length
   e. Number of sessions
   f. 3-ways
   g.
10) How do you evaluate your coaching engagements?
11) How do you structure your coaching engagements financially?
12) What success stories and disasters have you had in coaching?
13) What have you learnt from these?
14) What other things are important for me to know about your coaching?
15) What questions did I not yet ask you about coaching that you expected me to?
16) How much do you like coaching?
17) How do you measure coaching outcomes?
18) What media do you use for coaching (Face-to-face, Skype, email, Phone, Other)?
Appendix C: Sample Coaching Agreement

Coaching Agreement

Client Name: xxxxxxx

This agreement, between executive coach (coach), xxxxxxx, and xxxxxxx, the client, will begin on Month, Day, Year and will continue for 12 sessions for a maximum of 4 hours per month for the next 6 months.

The services to be provided by the coach to the client are coaching services, based on 360° feedback and objectives as defined jointly with the client. Coaching, which is not advice, therapy, or counselling, may address specific personal projects, business successes, or general conditions in the coachee’s life or profession.

The coach promises the client that all information provided to the coach will be kept strictly confidential.

Throughout the working relationship, the coach will engage in direct and personal conversations. The client can count on the coach to be honest and straightforward in asking questions and making requests. The client understands that only the client can grant the power of the coaching relationship, and the client agrees to do just that: have the coaching relationship be powerful. If the client believes the coaching is not working as desired, the client will communicate that belief and take action to return the power to the coaching relationship.

The objectives and expected outcomes for this coaching program are:

1) To improve xxxxxxx’s self-awareness of being critical and right by focusing on suspending judgement (be less critical) and being an advocate for his position (listen actively versus telling),
2) To improve how xxxxxxx relates to others, in particular his direct reports, by focusing on a more inquiry-based and a participative style as opposed to an autocratic approach.

The outcomes are expected to be that xxxxxxx becomes a go-to person, a boss who makes his direct reports feel good, people want to be on his team and his reputation is stronger than today. This will be measured through a post-coaching 360° feedback survey.

Our signatures on this agreement indicate full understanding of and agreement with the information outlined above.

________________________   ______
_____________________________________
Client                  Date            Coach                  Date
Appendix D: TLCP Evaluator Questionnaire Example - © TLC Confidential 8/14/09

This instrument is designed to profile ____________________________ development as a leader. You must complete the entire survey in order for your responses to be included in the feedback. Please respond to all statements, answering how frequently each applies. Use your first impression and work quickly. It takes about twenty-five minutes to complete. Your answers are anonymous unless you are Boss or Boss’s Boss. Please be as accurate as possible. Choose the best response to each question. If you don't know for certain, go with your instinctive or gut response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/he is quick to seize opportunities upon noticing them.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is an efficient decision maker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he investigates the deeper reality that lies behind events/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is sarcastic and/or cynical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he stresses the role of the organisation as corporate citizen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he acts with humility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he forms warm and caring relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is a workaholic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he integrates multiple streams of information into a coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he lacks drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he provides strategic vision for the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he creates common ground for agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is conservative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he shares leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is excessively ambitious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he handles stress and pressure very well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he helps people learn, improve, and change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he tries to do everything perfectly well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he strives for continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he needs to be admired by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he displays a high degree of skill in resolving conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he pursues results at the expense of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he directly addresses issues that get in the way of team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the quality of leadership that s/he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he exhibits personal behaviour consistent with his/her values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he gets the job done with no need to attract attention to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himself/herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he is passive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he helps direct reports create development plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he worries about others' judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The scale is exactly the same for every question
Appendix E: 360° Feedback Evaluator’s Form

360° Feedback Evaluators

Participant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Preferred Language**</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boss’s boss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reports*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Choose at least 5 people in this category
** E(nglish) or F(rench)
Appendix F: Example of email message to 360° Feedback Evaluators

Dear colleagues,

As part of my professional and personal development I will work with an Executive Coach. I would like to invite you to be part of an externally administered 360°-feedback process. This will be done both before the actual coaching starts and after it will be completed. You will receive an email from profiledirector@theleadershipcircle.com - please complete the survey before the deadline. Also, please ensure that this email-address is accepted in your email-settings, i.e. that it doesn't end up in spam.

Thanks in advance for your time. I look forward to receiving your feedback and using it to identify development points.

Best regards,
Appendix G: The Leadership Circle Profile™ - Example
Appendix H: Questions Relation to TLCP Creative Dimensions

Relating

*Caring Connection*
- I connect deeply with others
- I am compassionate.
- I form warm and caring relationships.

*Fosters Team Play*
- I create a positive climate that supports people doing their best.
- I promote high levels of teamwork through my leadership style.
- I share leadership.

*Collaborator*
- I negotiate for the best interest of both parties.
- I work to find common ground.
- I create common ground for agreement.

*Mentoring & Developing*
- I help direct reports create development plans.
- I am a people builder/developer.
- I provide feedback focused on professional growth.
- I help people learn, improve, and change.

*Interpersonal Intelligence*
- I take responsibility for my part of relationship problems.
- In a conflict, I accurately restate the opinions of others.
- I listen openly to criticism and ask questions to further understand.
- I directly address issues that get in the way of team performance.
- I display a high degree of skill in resolving conflict.

Self-Awareness

*Selfless Leader*
- I am relatively uninterested in personal credit.
- I lead in ways that others say, 'we did it ourselves.'
- I act with humility.
- I get the job done with no need to attract attention to myself.
- I take forthright action without needing recognition.

*Balance*
- I balance work and personal life.
- I find enough time for personal reflection.

*Composure*
- I am composed under pressure.
- I am a calming influence in difficult situations.
- I handle stress and pressure very well.

*Personal Learner*
- I learn from mistakes.
- I personally search for meaning.
- I investigate the deeper reality that lies behind events/circumstances.
- I examine the assumptions that lay behind my actions.

**Authenticity**

*Integrity*
- I exhibit personal behaviour consistent with my values.
- I hold to my values during good and bad times.
- I lead in a manner that is completely aligned with my values.

*Courageous Authenticity*
- I surface the issues others are reluctant to talk about.
- I speak directly even on controversial issues.
- I am courageous in meetings.

*Systems Awareness*

*Community Concern*
- I create vision that goes beyond the organisation to include making a positive impact on the world.
- I attend to the long-term impact of strategic decisions on the community.
- I balance community welfare with short-term profitability.
- I live an ethic of service to others and the world.
- I stress the role of the organisation as corporate citizen.

*Sustainable Productivity*
- I balance 'bottom line' results with other organisational goals.
- I allocate resources appropriately so as not to use people up.
- I balance short-term results with long-term organisational health.

*Systems Thinker*
- I reduce activities that waste resources.
- I redesign the system to solve multiple problems simultaneously.
- I evolve organisational systems until they produce envisioned results.

*Achieving*

*Strategic Focus*
- I see the integration between all parts of the system.
- I accurately anticipate future consequences to current action.
- I focus in quickly on the key issues.
- I have a firm grasp of the market place dynamics.
- I provide strategic direction that is thoroughly thought through.
- I am a gifted strategist.
- I integrate multiple streams of information into a coherent strategy.
- I establish a strategic direction that helps the organisation to thrive.
- I stay abreast of trends in the external environment that could impact the business currently and in the future.

*Purposeful & Visionary*
- I am a good role model for the vision I espouse.
- I live and work with a deep sense of purpose.
- I communicate a compelling vision.
- I inspire others with vision.
- I provide strategic vision for the organisation.
- I articulate a vision that creates alignment within the organisation.
Achieves Results

- I am quick to seize opportunities upon noticing them.
- I pursue results with drive and energy.
- I am proficient at achieving high quality results on key initiatives.
- I strive for continuous improvement.

Decisiveness

- I am an efficient decision maker.
- I make the tough decisions when required.
- I make decisions in a timely manner.
Appendix I: Business Performance Index - example

Pre-Coaching/Post-Coaching

Business Performance Index

Boss’s assessment

Client:                      Boss:
Coach:                      Date:

The following questions relate ONLY to that specific part of the overall organisation/company (e.g. department, work unit, division, region, etc.) that the client, i.e. the person receiving the coaching, has formal responsibility for leading/managing. Please use the scale to select your responses.

Please rate the performance of the organisation the client is responsible for in the categories below: How does the performance of the organisation the client is responsible for (division, department, work unit, etc.) compare to that of similar organisations in your industry or profession?

1) Sales/Revenue Growth

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

Explanation
2) Market Share

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

Explanation

3) Profitability/ROA

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

Explanation

4) Quality of Products or Services

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

*Explanation*

5) New Product Development

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

*Explanation*

6) Overall Performance

One of the best – Top 10% [ ]
Much better than other similar organisations – Top 25% [ ]
Much better than most other similar organisations – Between the top 25 and 50% [ ]
About the same as other similar organisations – About 50% [ ]
Lower than other similar organisations – Between 25 and 50% [ ]
Much lower than other similar organisations – Bottom 25% [ ]
One of the worst – Bottom 10% [ ]
Don’t know, unsure, not applicable [ ]

*Explanation*
Appendix J: Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to characterize your experience of mindfulness. Please use the last ...... days as the time frame to consider each item. Provide an answer for every statement as best you can. Please answer as honestly and spontaneously as possible. There are neither ‘right’ nor ‘wrong’ answers, nor ‘good’ or ‘bad’ responses. What is important to us is your own personal experience. Thanks very much for all your effort!

1. I am open to the experience of the present moment. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2. I sense my body, whether eating, cooking, cleaning or talking. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3. When I notice an absence of mind, I gently return to the experience of the here and now. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4. I am able to appreciate myself. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5. I pay attention to what’s behind my actions. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
6. I see my mistakes and difficulties without judging them. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
7. I feel connected to my experience in the here-and-now. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
8. I accept unpleasant experiences. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
9. I am friendly to myself when things go wrong. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
10. I watch my feelings without getting lost in them. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
11. In difficult situations, I can pause without immediately reacting. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
12. I experience moments of inner peace and ease, even when things get hectic and stressful. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
13. I am impatient with myself and with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

14. I am able to smile when I notice how I sometimes make life difficult. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
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Appendix K: ICF Core Competences (source: www.coachfederation.org)

Setting the Foundation

1) Meeting Ethical Guidelines & Professional Standards
   Understanding coaching ethics and standards and applying them appropriately in all coaching situations.

2) Establishing the Coaching Agreement
   Understanding what is required in the specific coaching interaction and coming to agreement with the prospective and new client about the coaching process and relationship.

Co-Creating the Relationship

3) Establishing Trust & Intimacy with the Client
   Creating a safe, supportive environment that produces ongoing mutual respect and trust.

4) Coaching Presence
   Being fully conscious and creating spontaneous relationships with clients, employing a style that is open, flexible and confident.

Communicating Effectively

5) Active Listening
   Focusing completely on what the client is saying and is not saying, understanding the meaning of what is said in the context of the client’s desires, and supporting client self-expression.

6) Powerful Questioning
   Asking questions that reveal the information needed for maximum benefit to the coaching relationship and the client.
7) Direct Communication

Communicating effectively during coaching sessions, and using language that has the greatest positive impact on the client.

Facilitating Learning and Results

8) Creating Awareness

Integrating and accurately evaluating multiple sources of information, and making interpretations that help the client to gain awareness and thereby achieve agreed-upon results.

9) Designing Actions

Creating with the client opportunities for ongoing learning, during coaching and in work/life situations, and for taking new actions that will most effectively lead to agreed-upon coaching results.

10) Planning & Goal Setting

Developing and maintaining an effective coaching plan with the client.

11) Managing Progress & Accountability

Holding attention on what is important for the client, and leaving responsibility with the client to take action.
Appendix L: Coaching Evaluation

Coach: Client:

Please rate the following Coaching Competencies of your coach by indicating your level of agreement by circling the appropriate response; please explain rating if you see fit.

1) My coach followed Ethical Guidelines and Professional Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

2) My coach established a clear Coaching Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

3) My coach established a trustful relationship with me
   (created a safe, supportive environment producing respect and trust, and established clear agreements and kept promises)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

4) My coach displayed a full coaching presence
(created spontaneous relationship and employed an open, flexible and confident style)

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

Explanation

5) My coach continuously listened actively

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

Explanation

6) My coach asked powerful questions
   (asked open-ended questions that evoked self-discovery, clarity, possibility or new learning)

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

Explanation

7) My coach communicated effectively during coaching sessions

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

Explanation

8) My coach created awareness
   (helped discover new distinctions in thoughts, beliefs, assessments, emotions, moods)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**

9) My coach supported me in designing actions (e.g. practices, self-observations)

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

**Explanation**

10) My coach developed and maintained an effective coaching plan

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

**Explanation**

11) My coach managed progress and held me accountable

(held attention on what was important for the client and leave responsibility for action with the client)

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

**Explanation**
Please provide feedback on the effectiveness of your coach by answering the following 3 questions.

- As a coach you were most effective when:

- As a coach you could have been more effective by:

- Any other comments:

12) Please indicate your reaction to the following statement on a scale of 0-10:

   “I would recommend this coach to a colleague/friend”

   Absolutely (9, 10) : ____
   Neutral (7, 8) : ____
   Unlikely (0-6) : ____
# Appendix M: Client Evaluation

**Client:**

Please rate your client by indicating your level of agreement by circling the appropriate response; please explain if you see fit.

1) My client was committed to the coaching program
   (was engaged, active, involved, didn’t cancel meetings without good reason, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**

2) My client actively participated in establishing a clear Coaching Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**

3) My client actively contributed to establishing a trustful relationship between us
   (created a safe, supportive environment producing respect and trust, and established clear agreements and kept promises)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**
4) My client displayed a full presence
   (created spontaneous relationship and employed an open, flexible and confident style)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explanation*

5) My client expressed her/himself clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explanation*

6) My client actively looked for self-discovery, clarity, possibility and/or new learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explanation*

7) My client communicated effectively during coaching sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explanation*

8) My client discovered new distinctions in thoughts, beliefs, assessments, emotions, moods
Please provide feedback on the effectiveness of your coach by answering the following 3 questions.

- As a client you were most effective when:

- As a client you could have gotten more out of the coaching by:
- Any other comments:

12) Please indicate your reaction to the following statement on a scale of 0-10:

“I would recommend this client to a colleague”

Absolutely (9, 10) : ____
Neutral (7, 8) : ____
Unlikely (0-6) : ____
Appendix N: Coaching Objectives

Client: 

Boss: 

Please rate the achievement of the coaching objectives by circling the appropriate response; please explain if you see fit.

1) Coaching objective 1 - please insert - achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explanation

2) Coaching objective 2 - please insert - achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explanation

3) Coaching objective 3 - please insert - achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explanation

4) Coaching objective 4 - please insert - achieved
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### 5) Coaching objective 5 - *please insert* - achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explanation*
Appendix O: Coaching Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach:</th>
<th>Client:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix P: Inventory of Coaching Objectives

- Significantly improved teamwork (6)
- Be even more focused on involving other people and departments in development of plans/action
- Delegate more responsibilities to direct reports (5)
- Dedicate more time to communicate with colleagues (2)
- Find a better balance between work and life (3)
- Stop always justifying decisions
- Implement the practice of always assuming positive intent
- Discover common ground in conflict situations and find mutually beneficial agreements
- Be sensitive and conscious in dealing with feelings of others while managing own feelings
- Improve communication skills (7)
  i. More listening, less advocacy
  ii. Provide feedback
  iii. Clearly express disagreements and positions
  iv. Adapt content and complexity of message to audience
- Increase value-added of department
- Be more proactive and influential (3)
- Define and set a clear direction/Express a clearer strategy (3)
- To improve self-awareness of being critical and right by focusing on suspending judgement (be less critical) and being an advocate for position (listen actively versus telling)
- Build better relationships with peers and colleagues/To improve how to relate to others (3), in particular direct reports (1), by focusing on a more inquiry-based and a participative style as opposed to an autocratic approach/Learn how to continually improve relationships
- Be better at setting priorities (3)
- Be more self-confident/Develop self-confidence (2)
- Be more assertive and courageous in communication and actions/More powerful stance with boss and challenging employees
- Clearer decisions—without prevarication or backpedalling
- More efficient meetings
- Get internal customers’ buy-in
- Improve how to deal with difficult questions during meetings
- Be more aware of feelings and needs, and adapt behaviour
- Comfort in any relationship
- Find ideal way to deal with colleagues
- Canalize potential and stretch influence
- Strengthen negotiation skills
- Make an impact and be more visible vis-a-vis the next manager level
- Work on perfectionism being less detailed oriented
- Improve low self score on "achieving" dimension
- Improve the dimension of "strategic focus" and improve subject matter expertise to better challenge the controller team
- Step into leadership role and get equipped with management tools
- Channel energy of reaction
- Improve presentation skills
- Lead more effectively
- Develop skills and career
- Mentor and build team
- More strategic thinking
- Learn and apply the various leadership styles (2)
- Improve communication of own convictions and beliefs through self-confidence and clearly expressing opinions as measured through Achieving dimension
- To increase Mentoring and Development of team with more sharing and delegation
- Increase communication effectiveness and assertiveness both with Corporate and internal clients
- Increase visibility and credibility to position for next level
- Develop and communicate action plans to help guide internal partners
- Develop a deeper understanding of own values to better define own purpose and direction
- Improve efficiency in getting things done and speed up decision-making
- Set standards and clear expectations for team
- Broaden self-awareness
- Unblock career progression
- Improve networking (2)
- Improve my leadership
- Learn how to create strategy
- Accept criticism
- Develop good relationships with management above through proactive communication as measured through an increase in Caring Connection
- Pay particular attention to emotions, particularly under stress, and manage them accordingly leading to an increase in Composure
## Appendix Q: Detailed Analysis of Objectives and the TLCP Creative Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLCP Dimension</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Find ideal way to deal with colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve networking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caring Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dedicate more time to communicate with colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Build better relationships with peers and colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve how to relate to others and, in particular direct reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and a participative style as opposed to an autocratic approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learn how to continually improve relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comfort in any relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop good relationships with management above through proactive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication as measured through an increase in Caring Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fosters Team Play</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Significantly improved teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Be even more focused on involving other people and departments in development of plans/action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborator</td>
<td>- Develop and communicate action plans to help guide internal partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Set standards and clear expectations for team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discover common ground in conflict situations and find mutually beneficial agreements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Get internal customers’ buy-in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Delegate more responsibilities to direct reports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mentor and build team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work on perfectionism being less detailed oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Developing</td>
<td>- Improve communication skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More listening, less advocacy, less critical and less being an advocate for position by focusing on a more inquiry-based approach (listen actively versus telling)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearly express disagreements and positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stop always justifying decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Be more assertive and courageous in communication and actions/More powerful stance with boss and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>- Clearly express disagreements and positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stop always justifying decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Be more assertive and courageous in communication and actions/More powerful stance with boss and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>challenging employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase communication effectiveness and assertiveness both with Corporate and internal clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selfless Leader</td>
<td>- Be more self-confident, develop self-confidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Be more aware of feelings and needs, and adapt behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broaden self-awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve self-awareness of being critical and right by focusing on suspending judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balance</td>
<td>- Find a better balance between work and life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Composure</td>
<td>- Be sensitive and conscious in dealing with feelings of others while managing own feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Channel energy of reaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pay particular attention to emotions, particularly under stress, and manage them accordingly leading to an increase in Composure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal learner</td>
<td>- Implement the practice of always assuming positive intent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learn and apply the various leadership styles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accept criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authenticity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrity</td>
<td>- Develop a deeper understanding of own values to better define own purpose and direction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courageous Authenticity</td>
<td>- More efficient meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve how to deal with difficult questions during meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make an impact and be more visible vis-a-vis the next manager level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canalize potential and stretch influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Systems Awareness** |  |  
| --- | --- | --- |
| - Community Concern |  | 0 |
| - Sustainable Productivity |  |  |
| - Systems Thinker |  |  |

<p>| <strong>Achieving</strong> |  |<br />
| --- | --- | --- |
| - Improve low self score on &quot;achieving&quot; dimension | 2 | 22 |
| - Improve communication of own convictions and beliefs through self-confidence and clearly expressing opinions as measured through Achieving dimension | 1 |  |
| - Define and set a clear direction/Express a clearer strategy | 3 | 10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Purposeful &amp; Visionary</th>
<th>- Be better at setting priorities</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase value-added of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve the dimension of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;strategic focus&quot; and improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More strategic thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learn how to create strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achieves Results</td>
<td>- Improve presentation skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lead more effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve my leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase visibility and</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>credibility to position for next</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decisiveness</td>
<td>- Be more proactive and</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influential</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearer decisions- without</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prevarication or backpedalling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve efficiency in getting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>things done and speed up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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