Coaching: Theory and Practice

A DIRECTED RESEARCH SUBMITTED

by

Carol Gegner

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of

Human Resources and Organization Development

The University of San Francisco

March 31, 1997
ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the coaching process at the executive level. A survey questionnaire was sent to one hundred and forty six executives who were currently involved or had been involved in the coaching process. The response rate was 32%. Additionally, phone interviews were conducted with twenty five of the twenty eight executives who volunteered to participate in follow up interviews regarding their experiences of the coaching process.

What makes coaching so important today? To more efficiently and successfully face a continuously changing environment, organizations need to develop the untapped potential of people at all levels of the organization. Coaching as a management style offers an opportunity for organizations to attain that potential. For many organizations, this represents a strategic shift in management styles. Since executives reflect the management philosophy of organizations, the focus of the study was at the executive level.

The premise of the study was that coaching executives for professional and personal growth would facilitate shifting to a coaching management style. As executives were coached they would develop more awareness and take more responsibility for their actions, mastering their own growth potential. The effects would filter through the organization as executives started coaching others.
The study explored the outcomes of the coaching process from an interpersonal and intrapersonal nature. The purpose was to measure executives' perceptions of the coaching process to explore what components of the process were most effective and whether coaching sustained behavioral changes. The components were goals, feedback, self-efficacy, rewards, communication style, interpersonal style, awareness and responsibility. The latter two components were the dependent variables. Self-efficacy and communication style were the only two components that affected both dependent variables. The findings indicated moderate correlations. Also, feedback and rewards had moderate correlations with responsibility.

There was a high percentage of agreement among the executives when measuring the effectiveness of awareness and responsibility statements on the questionnaire. As perceived by the executives, coaching helped them sustain behavioral changes.

The quantitative data validated the qualitative data gathered from the interviews. Executives indicated they had become more sensitive to others, developed more awareness about themselves, and they took more responsibility for their own performance. These findings concurred with the self-efficacy correlations with the outcomes obtained from the questionnaire data. As executives developed more self-efficacy, awareness and responsibility also increased.
One of the strongest results found from the interviews was the unanimous consensus among the executives that the coaching process affected their personal life as well as their professional development. During the interviews nine of the executives (36%) indicated they were coaching others. Coaching was starting to filter through the organization from the top down. Executives were implementing the shift to a coaching management style to develop others in the organization.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

One of the greatest challenges organizations have today is in keeping pace with the accelerated rate of change. Since the 1980's the business environment has become more ambiguous and chaotic. Addressing the rapid pace of increased information, technological development, demographic changes, and global competition has forced organizations to look internally to meet those external demands.

As businesses started to understand human behavior in organizations, they began to recognize the importance of their human resources. To survive in today's continuously changing environment, organizations are exploring ways to effectively improve performance levels of employees. Coaching is a management technique currently being used by some organizations to develop people and achieve the desired results in performance.

The concept of coaching as a management style has become very popular although few empirical studies have tested its effectiveness. To better understand the coaching process the following questions need to be addressed. What is coaching? What is its purpose? What are the components that make coaching effective? The following discussion
discussion elaborates briefly on those questions.

Peters and Austin (1985) state “coaching is face-to-face leadership that pulls together people with diverse backgrounds, talents, experiences and interests, encourages them to step up to responsibility and continued achievement and treats them as full-scale partners and contributors” (p. 325). According to Peters and Austin (1985) coaching is a process of enabling others to act, building on their strengths. It involves caring enough about people to take the time to build a personal relationship with them. They describe coaching as a collection of roles that include educating, sponsoring, coaching, counseling, and confronting. The goal of each role is to facilitate continuous learning and elicit creative contributions.

Popper (1992) states “coaching improves performance at the skill level and establishes relations allowing a coach to enhance his trainees psychological development” (p. 15). He believes coaching is an ongoing relationship enhancing self-efficacy and offering greater potential influence for learning and performance. Popper also believes self-efficacy is the key psychological variable in coaching.

According to Popper (1992) coaches have the task of identifying clear parameters of success, structuring situations having potential success, identifying factors leading to success, and identifying inner sources of
success. Coaches provide specific, descriptive feedback aimed at behaviors that can be changed. The message the coach gives is clear, positive, and relates to goals and opportunities for success.

Whitmore (1992) defines coaching as primarily being concerned with the type of relationship between a coach and coachee, and the means and style of communication used. Whitmore quoted from Timothy Gallwey’s *The Inner Game of Tennis*, “the essence of coaching is unlocking a person's potential to maximize their own performance. It is helping them to learn rather than teaching them” (p. 5). The coaching objective is to develop responsibility and awareness in the coachee which affects the attitude of the mind. Whitmore believes the objective is achieved by setting performance goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time phased.

According to Orth (1987), “coaching is a management technique that is based on knowledge about how and under what conditions employees improve and grow, and of specific skills that managers need to practice, develop, and incorporate into their management style” (p. 74). Orth views performance improvement as a positive modification of behavior. Coaches must be able to analyze ways to improve performance, plan mutually acceptable action, create a supportive helping climate, and influence behavior change.
Sperry (1993) describes coaching as teaching skills in the context of a relationship with a learner. His definition incorporates learning through teaching. Sperry's focus is on coaching executives which focuses on feedback to develop more effective interpersonal skills. These skills are emphasized because organizations often expect executives to coach subordinates.

Sperry's ideas are congruent with two current ideas about organizational leadership. First, the roles of executives have changed in today's flatter organizational structures. Building employees' strengths has become a major role for executives. In addition, if organizations want their employees to perform more effectively, executives must become role models for employees. Executives need to be more aware of their behaviors and interpersonal skills and the impact they have on others.

Executives bear the burden for leading organizations through transformational times. The demand for higher levels of skills and competencies is on the rise for executives and executive teams. The coaching process at the executive level may become the model for more effectively improving performance at all levels.

The above discussion indicates there are many ideas relating to the concept of the coaching process. To summarize, coaching is a relationship oriented towards
helping individuals improve performance through continuous learning. The purpose is to develop more awareness about behaviors and interpersonal skills and become more responsible for decisions and actions with a commitment to achieve results. The components of the coaching process include providing feedback, setting goals for success, building levels of self-efficacy or confidence, and communicating clearly in a supportive, caring environment.

Coaching may or may not be a passing fad, but it appears to offer an opportunity to develop people throughout the organization. The strength of an organization lies in recognizing the potential of its human resources and finding a means to unleash that potential. Coaching as a management style may be the means to attain the potential.

Statement of the Problem

Organizations need to develop a new management paradigm to more efficiently and successfully face the rapid pace of change. To make that strategic shift, executives of organizations will need to be committed to the process since executives reflect the management philosophy of organizations. Coaching as a management style is a means to develop the human resource potential in organizations to facilitate the demands of a continuously changing environment. Shifting to a coaching management style requires executives to believe that most individuals are
capable and willing to perform at higher levels.

The premise of this paper is that coaching executives for both professional and personal growth will facilitate making a strategic paradigm shift to a coaching management style. As executives experience the coaching process, they will develop more awareness and take more responsibility for their actions, thus mastering their own growth potential. The effects of increased awareness and responsibility can be filtered through the organization as executives begin to coach others. The shift to a coaching management style will have then been initiated at the top of the organization with a commitment from executives.

This study explores the outcomes of the coaching process from an interpersonal and intrapersonal nature. The outcomes are perceived measures of effectiveness based on the executives' perception of the process. The purpose is to determine if the components are perceived to be effective collectively or if isolated components are more effective in the process.

Normative Definitions of Relevant Variables

"Coaching" is a process that facilitates optimizing performance in the context of a relationship. The purpose is to communicate information that increases awareness and responsibility for achieving higher levels of performance.

"Information" refers to feedback that reinforces or
eliminates behaviors leading to improved skills and competencies that are measurable and can be observed by others and perceived by self.

The "relationship" refers to an interaction designed to accelerate changing behaviors and sustain performance.

The "interaction" consists of a directive communication style to increase awareness and responsibility that encourages optimizing performance.

Other variables to consider in the coaching process are gender, age, and ethnicity of the coach and coachee. Duration, modality, and frequency of the coaching process are also variables to observe. These variables were analyzed from the reported information.

Research Questions

There are several questions relating to the study. As perceived by executives, do the components of the coaching process work collectively to enhance their performance or are there isolated components that are most effective? Does the coaching process contribute to sustaining behavioral changes? Do gender, age, and ethnicity affect the coaching process? Does gender difference affect the coaching process? Lastly, do time, frequency, and modality influence the process?

Importance of the Study

The potential benefits of this study lies in exploring
what positive influences coaching has to offer organizations. Improving performance levels has become a major challenge for organizations. The external environment has created many factors that contribute to the challenge. Reengineering efforts have drastically changed the workplace environment. As a consequence, job descriptions and responsibilities are more confusing and anxiety provoking for employees which can hinder their performance.

Acquisitions and mergers have resulted in more complex work environments by blending together different organizational cultures. Employees often feel resentful when faced with losing their culture to accept a new culture. The culture change can have a negative impact on performance levels.

Downsizing has created voids in all organizational levels and the effect of flatter organizations results in uncertainty among the survivors. Survivors often feel insecure and resentful regarding their future with the organization. They work harder and longer but it does not mean performance is at optimum levels.

The workplace has become more ambiguous where anxieties, insecurities, and resentments among employees at all levels have increased. To tackle the challenges, organizations need to develop people to overcome the demands from the external environment.
All of the changes that have occurred in organizational life have created a greater necessity to understand the human aspect of doing business. A primary concern for organizations has become developing the potential of employees. The faster employees are developed to improve performance the more opportunity organizations have to survive in a chaotic and competitive environment. The management technique of coaching may help achieve the desired, higher results organizations are currently pursuing.

The study also has potential benefits for the coaching profession, a rather new entity. By quantifying data relating to the various components of the coaching process, coaches will have more knowledge concerning the effectiveness of the components.

This study provides additional information to the existing body of knowledge about the use of feedback, goal setting, and self-efficacy in enhancing individual performance levels. In addition, it offers potential benefits regarding knowledge about leadership development and management skills. As executives are asked to grow professionally and personally through the coaching process, they will become more credible as leaders of organizations.

Lastly, the study integrates theories of social learning, operant conditioning, and humanistic psychology to
Limitations of the Study

The study is limited in several ways. The instrument used in this study was custom designed and has no known reliability or validity. It was pre-tested for face validity and revised where necessary.

The study is a cross-sectional design, completed at one point in time to collect explanatory data. It is not possible to draw cause-and-effect conclusions, with any certainty, about the findings.

The study uses executive coaches to distribute the survey establishing an intermediary layer between the researcher and respondents. The results could be biased based on how the executive coaches selected the respondents.

The study does not account for other factors that may improve performance levels. Since coaching is a constant feedback process, measuring behaviors could produce a "Hawthorne effect"; i.e., perhaps it is the attention that changes behavior, not the coaching.

The survey is based on executives' perceptions of the coaching process, a subjective experience. The subjectivity influences the findings. The study does not account for the fact some executives completing the survey may have also been coaches. This would blur the clarity of the executive's perspective.
Another limitation of the study is anticipating that executives will be willing participants in the coaching process because they are interested in personal and professional growth. Conversely and consequently, the study made a generalization inferring executives being coached would willingly use the concept and become coaches to others.
How can organizations develop people in the work environment to achieve more of their potential resulting in more effective performance for the organization? Recently coaching as a management style has reached new heights in response to that question. Empirically, little is known about the coaching process in organizations. If coaching is to be so influential in organizations it is important to have some knowledge of its developmental history and the components that are used in the coaching process.

The literature reviewed for this chapter will begin with a chronological review of how coaching has evolved in the business environment. The review will then discuss the principles of the coaching process from both a content and process orientation using theories from behavioral science research.

The content aspect revolves around behavioral and cognitive components of improving performance. Research on goal setting relates to the behavioral aspect while self-efficacy research pertains to the cognitive component. Feedback research indicates it has both behavioral and cognitive aspects.

The process orientation of coaching examines the coaching relationship. The basis of this research is found
in humanistic psychology, mentoring research, and qualitative research published by experienced and knowledgeable leaders in the business world. The review will conclude with a summary relating the research material to the study.

HISTORY

The idea of coaching as a management tool was introduced by Mace (1950). Mace believed superiors were responsible for the development of their subordinates because superiors know the strengths and weaknesses of their subordinates. According to Mace, people learn by doing and learning can be enhanced when the tasks given strengthen a weakness. If a superior is not aware of the value of the human assets at his/her disposal, the superior will not take on the role and responsibility of coaching (Mace, 1950).

Mace believed the objective of the superior is to organize and direct the energies of a group of people to accomplish a stated objective and this is done through coaching relationships. Giving subordinates the opportunity to perform is a basic element of the coaching process. Mace (1950) also discussed other aspects of the process, including a climate of confidence, having standards of performance, creating a team, knowing the employees, encouraging participation, and fair treatment of employees.

It seems Mace was ahead of his time, because
information on coaching did not surface again until 1978. Then, Fournies (1978) provided a “how-to” book on coaching for management. Fournies’ focus was on improved performance for employees. He used coaching as a method managers could use to facilitate performance in business as it relates to the business’ survival. His goal was to help managers improve their subordinates’ performances, quantitatively and qualitatively, through face-to-face coaching.

Using Fournies’ techniques, problems with subordinates could be modified and their behavior could be changed. The definition of management had become “getting things done through others” (Fournies, 1978, p.3). He introduced targeting behaviors which are measurable rather than attitudes. After analyzing what factors were influencing unsatisfactory performance, behaviors could be modified using face-to-face coaching (Fournies, 1978). Fournies was interested in helping managers learn to solve performance problems.

Kirkpatrick (1982) combined coaching with appraisals as part of a continuous cycle of performance reviews. Coaches help others move toward new areas of experience, new demands for personal skill development, and problem solving (Kirkpatrick, 1982). Coaching fosters a relationship based on feedback to improve performance. When dealing with emotional conversations, coaches need to listen, be
supportive, understand and be empathic, and reflect back to the person what they heard (Kirkpatrick, 1982).

In 1983, Allenbaugh wrote that the most significant contribution a manager can make to the organization is to develop his/her self and others (subordinates, peers, or superiors) to perform at optimal levels. The focus is on enhancing strengths among employees so they become more productive. According to Allenbaugh (1983), behavioral scientists found employees are more self-motivated and perform better at work when they feel 1) their work is meaningful, 2) they have a responsibility for the outcomes, and 3) they receive knowledge of the results. Ineffective performance is due to lack of direction and feedback (Allenbaugh, 1983).

Allenbaugh (1983) suggested performance appraisals used in organizations generally focus on negative behavior. He emphasized that coaching is an alternative process that focuses on strengths to increase productivity. For Allenbaugh (1983) coaching is a collaborative effort which emphasizes the job and implies respect for the individual. Coaching starts with the current performance as a baseline, identifies real incentives for the individual, and provides greater understanding of the job. It requires an agreement on specific performance goals and measurements. Lastly, the leaders of the organization need to be committed to the
coaching process to ensure success (Allenbaugh, 1983).

Peters and Austin (1985) espoused coaching as a management style that facilitates the development of people in organizations. They described coaching as a real-time endeavor. Peters and Austin (1985) state "coaching is the principal means through which people learn what makes their organization tick, what it stands for, and how they can contribute to it over time" (p, 329). They believe coaches need to be visible, set limits, listen, shape values, and stretch skill levels. According to Peters and Austin (1985) coaches may have a small number of proteges, but the process has the ability to affect many people in an organization.

By 1987, Orth, et.al., described coaching as a way to help employees improve their performance over a period of time to the highest level they are capable of achieving. Although coaching offers potential management benefits for organizations, it is neglected. Orth, et.al, found three factors inhibiting coaching as a management technique (1987). First, organizational climates were not conducive to promoting coaching and managers were not rewarded for developing employees. Secondly, in the business world, coaching had no established role models where benefits could be recognized. Thirdly, it took time, training, practice, and, often times, a change in attitudes to develop coaching skills in management.
Two years later, Evered and Selman (1989) identified coaching as the heart of a new management paradigm. The traditional paradigm of management has been to control others, prescribe what needs to be done, and maintain order.

Evered and Selman (1989) stated, "the coaching paradigm focuses on collaboration, involvement, mutual support, and individual growth to enable employees to generate results and be empowered by the results they generate" (p. 18). Coaching offers a fresh approach to produce peak performances. Evered and Selman (1989) believe coaching creates a new context for management that fosters a genuine partnership between managers and employees where each can accomplish more than they imagined possible from the perspective of a traditional management culture.

In this same time period Kinlaw (1989) wrote about coaching for commitment as a way to sustain superior performance. Kinlaw states, "commitment is evidenced by single-minded, focused behavior and a willingness to sacrifice for the cause" (p. 19). For Kinlaw (1989), commitment is supported by clarity about goals and values, employee competencies that allow success, the degree of influence that employees have, and an expressed appreciation given to employees for their contributions. He emphasized when employees have a sense of meaning of the importance of their job and can connect it to a larger whole, they are
more likely to increase their commitment.

In 1990 Curley implemented a study to develop a management aimed at improving the managers’ coaching capabilities to enhance the performance and self-management of others. Although the T-test analyses did not indicate statistically significant results, the self evaluations described major shifts in self-awareness and sensitivity to others.

In 1995, Jack Welch was quoted as saying that corporate executives must adopt a “people-oriented” model of management (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1995). In the same article he also stated that a corporation’s responsibility lies in providing opportunities for personal and professional growth not long-term job security.

THE CONTENT

To explain behavior, science looked at elements of behavior that could be observed. Skinner said, “behavior is a difficult subject matter not because it is inaccessible but because it is extremely complex. Since it is a process, rather than a thing, it cannot easily be held still for observation” (1953). Skinner’s operant conditioning theory became a basis of research in trying to predict or control behavior (1953). Behavior based on operant conditioning is strengthened or weakened by events that follow the response. Conditioning is determined by what happens after the
behavior is completed. Operant conditioning shapes and maintains behavior by its consequences which include what is presented before and after the response.

"When a bit of behavior is followed by a certain kind of consequence, it is more likely to occur again, and a consequence having this effect is called a reinforcer" (Skinner, 1971, p. 25). A reinforcer is a positive or negative stimulus that increases the probability of a response. A positive reinforcer causes a desired behavior or response to occur again. A negative reinforcer is aversive and reduces or eliminates a behavior or response. According to Skinner, positive and negative reinforcers regulate and control behaviors (1971).

**Feedback:** Research has shown that feedback is a stimulus that causes a responding behavior. Feedback was constructed on many dimensions in the literature (Greller & Herold, 1975b; Greller & Herold, 1977; Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Jacoby, Mazursky, Troutman, & Kuss, 1984). The feedback dimensions of source, valence, timing, and frequency influence behaviors.

The source of feedback had a significant role as in Greller & Herold (1975b), who originally focused on the source as an aspect of feedback. Sources were defined as company, supervisor, co-workers, task, and self. They found sources closer to the individual, intrinsically or
psychologically, were more important than distant sources in relation to feedback.

In contrast to Greller & Herold's work (1975b), which indicated the closer the source of feedback to the individual the more important the feedback, Becker and Klimoski (1989) conducted a field study and found feedback from supervisory and organizational sources related more to job performance than feedback from self or others. Ashford (1993) also found that individuals place more importance on feedback or cues from the organization and superiors than from peers and self observations.

Ilgen (1979) described three classifications of source. The first comes from individuals who observe and evaluate another's performance. The second source comes from the task and the task environment. Finally, the self is a source of feedback as the individual judges his own performance.

To expand the construct of feedback, Greller and Herold (1977) explored types of feedback, positive and negative, in different settings in relation to sources of feedback. They found two dimensions. There is an apparent distinction between positive and negative feedback. The source of feedback is more important only in conjunction with positive feedback.

Ilgen (1979) reported acceptance of feedback was based on positive and negative signs of feedback. Positive
feedback is accepted more readily than negative feedback. The exception to this was if negative feedback came from a source with more authority or if it fits with the recipient's self-image.

Becker and Klimoski (1989) discovered negative feedback from supervisory and organizational sources lowered performance while positive feedback from these same sources increased performance. It was Greller and Herold's factor analysis (1977) that initiated research studies looking at positive and negative feedback as it relates to who gives the feedback.

In contrast to Becker's findings (1989), research conducted by Ashford and Tsui (1991) examined how managers actively seek feedback to self-regulate their effectiveness. The results indicated that if managers are to gain accurate knowledge of how others view them they need to seek negative feedback more than positive. The accuracy was not affected by how feedback was sought, either through inquiry or monitoring.

Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor (1979) determined the nature of feedback consisted of source, message, and recipient. These three aspects are stimuli which influence behavior. The study's major focus examined how the recipient of feedback processes that information. They developed a model to explain the importance of the recipient's perception and
acceptance of feedback, the desire to respond to the feedback, and the intended response to the feedback.

The message of feedback was examined by Ilgen (1979) and described as follows: At its most basic level feedback is information received by an individual about his or her past behavior (Annett, 1969). It provides some information about the correctness, accuracy or adequacy of the response (Bourne, 1966). According to Ilgen (1979) the individual must be able to interpret the feedback information and convert it into meaningful information, a subjective process.

Ilgen (1979) stated perception of the message is determined by how accurately the recipient perceives it from any given source. The study looked at the timing, sign or valence, the frequency of the feedback, and what the recipient expects to hear. Positive feedback is not affected by interference during intervals, while negative feedback is. Positive feedback is perceived and recalled more accurately than negative feedback. Feedback is perceived more accurately when it is received more frequently unless time is required to apply corrections to behavior. The recipient expects to hear feedback that is consistent with his or her frame of reference. The frame is based on the individual's expectations concerning his performance.
A later study (Larson, Glynn, Fleenor, & Scontrino 1986) was conducted looking at those same dimensions of the message. The study found the dimensions of timeliness, frequency, specificity, sensitivity, and sign of the feedback are not empirically distinct features when examining managers performance feedback behavior to subordinates. Sensitivity was the most difficult to predict.

Ashford and Cummings (1983) found individuals use two distinct strategies, monitoring and inquiry, to obtain information. The choice of which strategy to use depends on perceived costs to self, a subjective process.

The message also contains directional and motivational information for the individual (Ilgen, 1979). Direction clarifies what specific behaviors need to be performed. Motivation provides information about rewards and punishments connected with behaviors. Ilgen (1979) discussed feedback as an incentive using Lawler's (1971) expectancy theory of work motivation and Deci's (1975) theory of intrinsic motivation to explain the complexity of motivational information.

Feedback becomes an incentive or motivation when the message indicates a promise of future rewards based upon behaviors. The stronger the association between rewards and behaviors, the stronger the belief that ties rewards to
behaviors. Individuals develop an anticipation or expectancy towards rewards and behaviors. The expectancy then becomes the reinforcer or incentive to respond to the feedback.

Another dimension of motivational information relates to intrinsic capabilities of the recipient. Feedback enables individuals to judge their competencies. As competencies increase and a sense of personal control develops when performing tasks, intrinsic motivation increases. When feedback is associated with incentives and rewards it can become a reinforcer for behavior.

Estes (1972) studied reinforcement in human behavior and found it was motivational and informational. Reinforcement enhanced the ability to anticipate a consequence. It also impacted the response time when an individual had to make a selection from a variety of choices. This can be related to Ilgen's report (1979) where feedback was considered in a broad framework to direct behavior and act as an incentive or a reinforcer.

Additional research indicated feedback was informational. Feedback was conceptualized as cognitive versus outcome feedback (Jacoby, Mazursky, Troutman, & Kuss, 1984). More evidence was found to validate the benefits of learning oriented versus performance oriented feedback (Johnson, Perlow, & Pieper, 1993). The two studies
indicated learning oriented or cognitive feedback is needed in complex environments to evaluate information while outcome or performance oriented feedback is useful in simpler tasks and response accuracy.

Learning oriented feedback provides individuals with more information for improving task strategies and improving performance (Johnson, 1993). It also fosters mastery orientation and learning goals that lead to adaptive behavior patterns that may increase efforts to improve performance (Johnson, 1993).

**Goal Setting:** For feedback to direct or reinforce behavior research has suggested that it needs to be tied to goal setting (Locke, Latham, Shaw, & Soari, 1981; Latham & Locke, 1991). Goal setting is a motivational mechanism (Locke, 1981, p.131) which explains the use of direction, effort, duration, and strategy development in goal setting. Locke, et al (1981) examined the effect of knowledge of results or feedback on goal setting. They determined from previous research that neither feedback nor goals alone is sufficient to improve performance, both are necessary. They concluded when goals and feedback are used together they can improve performance.

In research later completed by Latham and Locke (1991) they reiterated the importance of combining feedback with goal setting to effect performance. The goal represents the
outcome being sought and the standard for evaluating one's performance. Feedback provides information related to the standard. If the standard is being met, performance continues. If performance is below standard feedback provides an opportunity for corrective action to be taken to meet the goal.

Both studies (Locke, 1981 & Latham, 1991) looked at attributes of goal setting. They found specificity, difficulty, and intensity key contributors in goal attainment. The literature reviewed by Locke, et al (1981) supported research that indicated individuals with high goals who received feedback regarding their performance in relation to those goals performed better than those with low goals. The review also found individuals given specific harder goals lead to higher output than individuals who received vague goals or no goals.

Locke's research (1981) indicated goals affect task performance by motivating individuals to develop relevant strategies to attain the goals. It was found that when individuals participate in goal setting, it not only leads to setting higher goals but helps develop an understanding for how to attain those goals.

Self-efficacy: Bandura (1977) examined outcome expectations versus efficacy expectations. His social learning theory stressed that feedback and goal setting
enhance performance but self-efficacy is what sustains performance. He believed that human behavior was developed through modeling. As individuals emulated certain behaviors and receive information feedback, they established an expectancy of outcome.

Bandura (1977) thought individuals need to have more than a sense of expected outcome to perform new behaviors. They need to have a sense of mastery or efficacy to perform new behaviors. Efficacy expectations are increased and influenced strongly by performance accomplishments. Over time success in performance accomplishments can be generalized to other situations. According to Bandura, repeated successes develop strong efficacy or mastery. He defined self-efficacy as a judgement on one's capability to perform a task.

Bandura (1977) found that perceived self-efficacy determines how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. Bandura (1977) believed self-efficacy increases an individual's ability to adapt and sustain behaviors needed in new situations or environments.

THE PROCESS

Humanistic psychologists stressed the positive dimensions of human experience, the potential that individuals are capable of reaching (Rogers, 1961 and
Carl Rogers (1961) suggested that each person has an inherent drive toward being as competent and capable as he/she is biologically able to be. Maslow (1970) had similar beliefs when he defined self-actualization as the full use of and exploitation of talents, capacities, and potentials. He thought of the self-actualized individual not as an ordinary man with something special added but as the ordinary man with nothing taken away.

Rogers (1961) believed that interactions with another enables an individual to directly discover, uncover, experience, or encounter his or her actual self. According to Rogers, relationships offer the best opportunity to be fully functioning.

Maslow (1970) wrote about synergy in individuals. Identification with others tends to promote high energy individuals. If the success of another is a source of genuine satisfaction to the individual, then help is freely and generously offered. In helping another, the individual seeks his/her own satisfaction. The theories developed by Rogers and Maslow regarding the nature of man and relationships provide a basis for examining the coaching relationship.

Mentoring: Research indicated mentoring is the fore runner of coaching in organizations. Kram (1983) described mentoring as a sponsoring relationship. According to Kram
(1983), mentoring relationships have both psychosocial and career functions. Psychosocial functions build a sense of competence, confidence, and effectiveness in the protégé as the mentor acts as a role model, friend, and counselor in an accepting-confirming manner. The mentor helps the protege learn the ropes of the organization in preparation for career advancement through the career functions of sponsoring, coaching, protecting, providing exposure-and-visibility and challenging work assignments. Kram’s concept has been a basis for the affirmative action movement to help women and minorities succeed in organizations.

To further the research of career development and psychosocial functions of mentoring, Scandura (1992) explored career development as indicated by salary levels and promotions. Scandura (1992) referred to vocation mentoring or career development as coaching. Scandura’s study used managers who had been mentored. The results indicated vocational mentoring was linked to promotions while psychosocial support was related to salary levels of the managers.

Chao, et.al. (1992), examined informal and formal mentoring relationships in organizations. The study used Kram’s two functions of career and psychosocial development to determine if the nature of the relationship had an impact on job satisfaction, salary levels, and organization
socialization. Chao (1992) described informal mentoring in organizations as relationships that formed in a spontaneous and unstructured manner whereas formal mentoring relationships were managed and structured by organizations.

The results indicated proteges of informal relationships rated slightly higher on the three dimensions than those involved in a formal relationship. However, proteges in both relationships rated higher than non-mentored individuals.

To develop a theoretical basis for mentoring Zagummy (1993) explored it from a social learning perspective. He described mentors as role models for behaviors that are rewarded in organizations. Mentors are individuals at higher organizational levels with more knowledge and experience in the organization. According to Zagummy (1993), having a mentor increases the speed of learning regarding appropriate organizational behaviors for proteges.

Coaching: Coaching information in the literature review indicated communication is a component of the process (Kinlaw, 1989; Fournies, 1978; Sperry, 1993). Kinlaw (1989) focused on coaching as a communication process in which problems can be solved and performance improved. Coaching conversations focus on improving performance and ensuring a commitment to sustained, superior performance. Kinlaw believes coaching has four functions: mentoring for career
development, counseling about personal sensitivity to others, tutoring to develop skills, and confronting to improve performance through clarity of expectations.

According to Fournies (1978), coaching is a face-to-face discussion to change problem behaviors. The goal is to provide feedback about behaviors that will improve performance levels. For Fournies the discussion includes getting an agreement that a problem exists, mutually discussing alternative solutions and agreeing on an action plan to solve the problem, following up on the action plan, and recognizing any achievements. Sustaining change is accomplished through recognition. Fournies believed behavior can be managed through direction and feedback and coaches fulfill that function.

Sperry (1993) compared the differences in consulting, counseling and coaching executives. Providing feedback to executives about their interpersonal relations and skills is the focus of coaching (Sperry, 1993). Executives are often unaware that their interpersonal skills negatively impact others and this could be their downfall in organizations.

McCall and Lombardo (1983) studied executives and found the most frequent cause for executive derailment is insensitivity to others. They concluded with four reasons why executives fail. (1) As executives rise in organizations their strengths become weaknesses as their
ambitions erode their base of support. (2) Deficiencies become pronounced in handling more complex problems. (3) Success breeds arrogance and others will avoid working with them. (4) Lastly, executives lose their positions when external events happen beyond their control.

Kaplan (1991) conducted extensive surveys to discover why executives fail to develop. He found three major reasons. First, they become isolated as they reach the executive level. The potential sources for personal feedback are lost in the ascent. Secondly, executives become exempt from performance feedback or appraisals. If a formal evaluation system is in place, who is going to take the risk and criticize the executives? Finally, executives have the ability to misuse their power and position to maintain their status. Inflated egos need to be nourished and subordinates tend to collude and feed the executive's ego. Executives function in a feedback void (Kaplan, 1991).

Coaching can fulfill the feedback void executives experience by providing information concerning behaviors and interpersonal skills that are problematic. This will encourage executives to become more aware of their actions and take more responsibility for their own performance.

SUMMARY

The historical information concerning coaching as a management technique indicates it would be a powerful tool
for organizations to develop. Coaching has taken more than forty years to reach the height of attention it is receiving today. Given the strength coaching portrays as a management style it is surprising that more organizations are not utilizing the style.

The literature on feedback emphasized that information is necessary for individuals to adapt and adjust behaviors to meet the demands of the environment. Feedback also functions as an incentive to continue desired behaviors. The literature on goal setting stressed the complementary relationship between feedback and goal setting to effectively improve performance. Self-efficacy literature indicated that sustaining new behaviors depends on a sense of personal mastery. Feedback, goal setting, and self-efficacy are important elements in performance enhancement.

Mentoring approximates coaching in organizations. However, the basic objective of mentoring is career development and job satisfaction, while the objective of coaching is improving performance levels. In the business world the terms are often used interchangeably, creating some confusion. There are times when mentors coach and coaches mentor.

The literature on coaching suggests that coaching is a relationship enabling others to learn and improve performance. The relationship consists of communicating in
a style that encourages individuals to strive for new levels of performance. The content of the communication refers to goal setting and feedback information. The coach uses his/her interpersonal skills to create an environment that supports learning, changing, and mastering new goals which builds a sense of self-efficacy.

When the behavioral and cognitive components of the coaching process are integrated with the relationship components an opportunity is created to develop the potential of individuals. Coaching is the buzz word for the 1990's. There is a lack of quantitative research material to support coaching. The purpose of this study is to define and explore the components of coaching to establish a theoretical framework and to determine whether the practice of coaching is as influential in organizational life as its proponents claim.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Respondents

The participants in this study represented senior level executives from numerous organizations. These individuals were identified by independent consultants who specialize in executive coaching. The consultants were contacted by phone and asked if they were willing to contact executives they had coached to participate in the study. Some consultants were identified from the membership roster of the Personal and Professional Coaches Association, a national organization. Other consultants were identified through recommendations from the director of Coach University, a training program for coaches.

The executives selected by the consultants had either previously participated or were currently engaged in the coaching process with the consultants. Using the consultants as the point of contact the identities of the executives remained anonymous to the researcher except for those executives who agreed to participate in follow-up confidential phone interviews. Participation in the study was voluntary.

Research Design

The study was a cross-sectional survey questionnaire
using a non-random sample of executives who had been coached. The cross sectional design was chosen to sample the intended population at one time. The intent of the study was to examine the effectiveness of the different components of the coaching process from the executive’s perspective.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used for this study was a questionnaire developed specifically for this study (Appendix A). It included a 5-point Likert scale for responses. The survey consisted of two sections: the first asked respondents to rate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the coaching process; the second gathered demographic information and duration, frequency, and modality information for the coaching process.

The first section consisted of a number of statements relating to the different components that are used in the coaching process. Respondents were given five choices with “Highly Effective” at one end of the scale and “Highly Ineffective” at the other end. A column was designated for statements that were not applicable to the coachee’s experience.

The second part of the survey related to questions about age, gender, ethnicity, modality, frequency, and duration of the coaching process. These questions measured
nominal and interval level data. The main focus of the research measured ordinal level data based on the ratings given by the respondents.

The final question on the survey asked if the respondent would be willing to participate in a confidential phone interview to discuss in more depth his/her experience of the coaching process, leading to a second data collection strategy. A second questionnaire (Appendix B) was used for those respondents willing to be interviewed. The information was reduced and analyzed according to themes that emerged from the interviews.

The validity or reliability coefficients for this survey are unknown. The instrument was pretested using consultants who coach executives. The pretesting established face validity and the survey was revised based on feedback from the consultants.

**Procedures**

Phone calls were made to numerous consultants who specialized in executive coaching. The objective of the research project was explained to the consultants. A cover letter (Appendix C) explaining the project was attached to the survey and sent to the executive coaches who forwarded the letter and survey to the respondents. A stamped envelope was enclosed so the executive coach could easily address the envelope to the respondents. The respondents
were instructed to return the completed surveys to the researcher in an enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Some of the consultants who participated in the research project preferred using e-mail. The letter and survey were e-mailed to them. The consultants then e-mailed the information to the respondents. The respondents were given a choice of e-mailing the completed surveys directly back to the researcher or mailing the survey to the researcher. The e-mail surveys were confidential while the mailed surveys were anonymous. Respondents who indicated a willingness to participate in phone interviews were contacted to arrange appointments. The interviews were completed at prearranged times.

**Operational Definitions**

The variables measured in this study related to the components of the coaching process and self-perceived awareness and responsibility for changing behaviors as a result of the effectiveness of the different components. Do the components of the process effect awareness and responsibility which then leads to enhancing performance?

The independent variables of the survey were goal setting, feedback, rewards, self-efficacy, communication style, and interpersonal skills. They were measured as follows:

(1) Goals relate to specific behaviors or actions to be
achieved and were measured by statements 1 through 5.

(2) Feedback is the type of information given pertaining to the goals and was measured by statements 6 through 10.

(3) Self-efficacy refers to a confidence developed from achieving goals and was measured by statements 11 through 15.

(4) Rewards refer to external and internal incentives directed towards achieving the goals and were measured by statements 16 through 20.

(5) Communication style refers to directed conversations relating to the goals and was measured by statements 21 through 25.

(6) Interpersonal skills relate to the structure created by the coach and were measured by statements 26 through 30.

The dependent variables used to measure effectiveness were awareness and responsibility and measured as follows:

(1) Responsibility relates to choices regarding behaviors and actions and was measured by statements 31 through 35.

(2) Awareness pertains to new perceptions gained about self and others and was measured by statements 36 through 40.
Intervening variables were found in the demographics and time related questions as follows:

(1) Age, gender, and ethnicity data of the coachee were measured by questions 41 through 43.

(2) Age, gender, and ethnicity data of the coach were measured by questions 44 through 46.

(3) Duration of the coaching experience was measured by questions 47 through 50.

(4) Frequency of the coaching sessions was measured by question 51.

(5) Modality used for the coaching experience was measured by question 52.

Treatment of the Data

The Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Because the data were derived from a non-random sampling, descriptive statistics were used and the analysis was completed using appropriate measures of association in order to test the research questions.

The qualitative data was analyzed for themes to compare to the results of the quantitative data.
CHAPTER 4  

RESULTS

Response Rate

One hundred forty six questionnaires were mailed to the participating consultants for distribution to the executives they coach or have coached. Forty eight questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 33%. From the 48 questionnaires that were returned, 28 of the respondents voluntarily agreed to participate in a confidential phone interview. The response rate for the interviews was 58%. Interviews were conducted with 25 of those respondents.

Description of Respondents

The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarized in Table 4.1. There were 14 female executives (29%) and 34 male executives (71%). Their ages ranged from 21 to 66 years with a mean age of 44.5 years (SD=8.7 years). Three ethnic categories were indicated in the respondent group: one (2.2%) African-American; one (2.2%) Asian; and 44 (95.6%) Caucasian. Two respondents elected not to answer this question. There were 7 female coaches (15%) and 40 male coaches (85%). The coaches' ages ranged from 35 to 55 years, with a mean age of 48.3 years (SD=4.9 years). One ethnic category was indicated for the coaching group: 47 (100%) were Caucasian. One respondent elected not to answer this question.
**Table 4.1**

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDETS

**EXECUTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total | 48 | 100 
(Mean=44.5)

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COACHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total | 47 | 100 
(Mean=48.3)

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Coaching Process

The characteristics of the coaching process are summarized in Table 4.2. As indicated in the table, 37 (81.3%) of the coaching experiences are ongoing while 9 (18.8%) have ended. Two respondents did not answer this question. The mean for the ongoing coaching was 1.20 years (SD=.83) with a range from three months to 3 years. The mean for the coaching that had ended was 1.30 years (SD=.91) with a range from three months to two and a half years. The mean for the length of the coaching sessions was 1.29 hours (SD=.57) with a range from a half hour to 2 hours. Five respondents did not answer this question. The mode for the frequency of the coaching sessions was weekly (37.5%), with daily sessions at 2.1%, biweekly sessions at 22.9%, and other session frequencies at 37.5%. Other session frequencies were monthly and quarterly. The mode for the coaching modality was face-to-face (73.9%). Phone coaching was performed by 26.1%. Two respondents did not answer this question.
Table 4.2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COACHING PROCESS

(DURATION, HOURS, FREQUENCY, AND MODALITY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ended</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ended Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ongoing Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Indices

The components or indices of the coaching process are summarized in Table 4.3. The five statements used to measure each component scaled with acceptable standardized alpha reliability coefficients. Goals, as measured by statements 1 through 5, obtained an alpha of .73; feedback, measured by statements 6 through 10, obtained an alpha of .81; self-efficacy, measured by statements 11 through 15, obtained an alpha of .81; rewards, measured by statements 16 through 20, obtained an alpha of .64; communication style, measured by statements 21 through 25, obtained an alpha of .84; interpersonal style, measured by statements 26 through 30, obtained an alpha of .88; responsibility, measured by statements 31 through 35, obtained an alpha of .77; and awareness, measured by statements 36 through 40, obtained an alpha of .70.

These components could then be analyzed as cardinal level data as follows: goals had a mean of 7.56 (SD=2.5); feedback had a mean of 8.19 (SD=3.3); self-efficacy had a mean of 9.04 (SD=3.1); rewards had a mean of 8.83 (SD=2.8); communication style had a mean of 7.71 (SD=2.9); interpersonal style had a mean of 7.04 (SD=3.1); responsibility had a mean of 8.31 (SD=2.7); and awareness had a mean of 8.17 (SD=2.6).
### Table 4.3

**SCALE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COACHING COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals (1-5)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (6-10)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy (11-15)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards (16-20)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style (21-25)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal style (26-30)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (31-35)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness (36-40)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on the Research Questions

The main research question was, do the components of the coaching process work collectively to enhance performance or are there isolated components that are most effective, as perceived by executives? Other questions addressed in the study were does the coaching process contribute to sustaining behavioral changes; do age, gender, and ethnicity affect the coaching process; do time, frequency, and modality influence the process; and lastly, does a gender difference between the executive and coach affect the coaching process?

Awareness and responsibility were the dependent variables measuring effectiveness. Table 4.4 summarizes the strength of the association between awareness and responsibility and the other components of the coaching process using Pearson's r correlations.

Awareness had the strongest associations with self-efficacy (r=.55) and communication style (r=.45). These are moderate correlations. Low correlations were found with awareness and interpersonal style (r=.24), rewards (.35), and feedback (.31). Goals showed little or no association with awareness (-.02).

Responsibility had the strongest associations with self-efficacy (r=.74), rewards (r=.64), feedback (.52) and communication style (r=.51). These associations are
moderate to strong in strength. Low correlations were found with responsibility and interpersonal style (.43) and goals (.32).

Self-efficacy obtained the strongest associations with both dependent variables. Responsibility had stronger associations than awareness did with all the components. Communication style had moderate associations with both awareness and responsibility. It was the component with the closest correlations for the two dependent variables.

Table 4.4

ASSOCIATIONS AMONG THE COACHING COMPONENTS FOR EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Style</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values are Pearson’s r’s
The findings for the question, does the coaching process contribute to sustaining behavioral changes, used the dependent variables to analyze the effectiveness of sustaining behavioral changes. The statements for awareness and responsibility were interpersonal and intrapersonal in nature. Interpersonal statements were reflected by understanding others, sensitivity to others, better relationships, and encouraging others to achieve. Intrapersonal statements were reflected by challenged ideas, a better balance in life, applying to future choices, maintaining goals achieved, applying to other areas of life, and stretching abilities.

The statements for awareness and responsibility measured the effectiveness of sustaining change based on the combined percentages of statements rated as "highly effective" or "somewhat effective". Table 4.5 indicates the findings. These are the coaching "outcomes" as perceived by the respondents.
### Table 4.5

**Awareness Statements Ranked in Descending Order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% of Agreement*</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3 Understanding others</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Challenged ideas</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Sensitive to others</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Better relationships</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Better balance in life</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined % responses of “highly effective” and “somewhat effective”*

---

**Responsibility Statements Ranked in Descending Order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% of Agreement*</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#5 Applied to future choices</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Maintained goals achieved</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Applied to other life areas</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Encouraged others to achieve</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Stretched abilities</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined % responses of “highly effective” and “somewhat effective”*
The findings for the questions, do gender, age, and ethnicity of executives affect the coaching process were analyzed using Pearson’s r’s to measure the strength of the associations between the demographic characteristics and the coaching components. Table 4.6 summarizes the findings. Age had a weak correlation to awareness (.225) and a slight correlation to communication style (.193). The associations of age to the following components were too weak to claim: responsibility (.167), interpersonal style (.160), self-efficacy (.110), rewards (.144), feedback (.119), and goals (.023). The age of the executive did not seem to have much effect on the coaching process. Awareness and communication style were the only reportable associations to age.

Ethnicity could not be analyzed for its impact on these variables, since 95.8% of the executives were Caucasian and 100% of the coaches were Caucasian.

Gender had weak associations to interpersonal style (.139), rewards (.157) and communication style (.136) using eta squared to analyze the relationships. The following components had no meaningful association with gender: awareness (.001), self-efficacy (.053), feedback (.011), goals (.016), and responsibility (.012). Table 4.6 summarizes these findings. The weak correlation between gender and interpersonal style, communication style, and rewards
indicate that the gender of the executive does not have much effect on the coaching process.

Table 4.6

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN COACHING COMPONENTS AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age values are Pearson’s r’s
Gender values are eta squares
The findings for question 4 addressed whether duration, time, frequency, and modality influenced the coaching process. Table 4.7 summarizes the findings. Pearson’s r was used to analyze the strength of association between the duration, i.e., ongoing coaching and the components. Duration had a negative relationship (-.362) with awareness and only weak associations with interpersonal style (.204) and rewards (.270). The associations between duration and the following components were too weak to be meaningful: responsibility (.036), communication (.080), feedback (.113), goals (.158), and self-efficacy (.069). The negative association between awareness and duration could indicate there is a time factor in the coaching process where awareness decreases.

The length of the coaching sessions had weak associations with awareness (.205), responsibility (.285), rewards (.276), and communication style (.258), using Pearson’s r’s. The associations between the length of the coaching sessions and the following components were too weak to claim: self-efficacy (.149), feedback (.081), goals (.068), and interpersonal style (.169).

The modality of the coaching session had a very weak association with interpersonal style (.219), using eta to analyze the data. The strength of the associations between modality and the following components were very weak:
awareness (.057), self-efficacy (.007), feedback (.081),
goals (.023), responsibility (.134), rewards (.155), and
communication (.103). It appears that whether coaching was
done face-to-face or via phone calls, the only component
affected was the interpersonal style of the coach.

The frequency of the coaching sessions had weak
associations with all the components, using eta, as follows:
responsibility (.428), interpersonal style (.412), awareness
(.388), rewards (.367), communication style (.313), self-
efficacy (.303), and goals (.223). The association between
frequency and feedback (.184) was too weak to claim as a
finding. Frequency had more affect on the components than
duration, length and modality of the coaching process.

The last question was whether gender difference affects
the coaching process. The gender of the coach and of the
executive was cross tabulated and it was found that the
gender of the executive can't be predicted from the gender
of the coach or vice versa. The relationship, as measured
by phi coefficient, was only .008. Table 4.8 summarizes
that finding.

A discussion of these results in the context of the
research questions will be explicated in the next chapter as
well as recommendations for further research in this area.
Table 4.7

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN COACHING COMPONENTS
AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COACHING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration and Length values are Pearson’s r’s
Frequency and modality values are eta’s
Table 4.8

GENDER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXECUTIVES AND COACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACHES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALES</td>
<td>FEMALES</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALES</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

phi coefficient = .008

Additional Findings from the Interviews

Six questions were asked of each respondent in the interviews. Question 1 asked, how was the coaching process initiated for you and what were your thoughts about it? Seven respondents (28%) stated they decided to utilize an executive coach for transitions to new careers and a desire to excel in their businesses. Eighteen respondents (72%) stated it was part of a corporate program. Four respondents (16%) were skeptical to neutral about involvement with coaching while 21 respondents (84%) were receptive, positive, and enthusiastic.

Question 2 asked, how was a base line established to measure your progress and by what percent do you think your
performance increased? Ten (40%) indicated no base line was established, seven (28%) said 360 degree appraisals, interviews, or an upwards feedback was used, six (24%) said goals were established for a baseline, and two (8%) indicated their personal values became the baseline. Eight (32%) gave actual percentages for their performance increases ranging from 10% to 100%. The higher percentages represented specific areas, rather than overall performance. The remaining 68% did not quantify performance increases, though all perceived positive results from the experience.

Question 3 asked, what have been the greatest obstacles you experienced in the process? Eleven (44%) indicated that the element of time was the greatest obstacle. Five (20%) referred to the corporate culture or environment, six (24%) said there were no obstacles, and three (12%) indicated other people were the obstacles.

Question 4 asked, what have been the most valuable learning experiences you have gained from the process? Three themes emerged from that question. The first was based on self and all twenty five respondents (100%) indicated they learned more about themselves and /or gained new skills to use. The second theme was based on others and nine respondents (35%) commented on improved interactions with others. The third theme that emerged was based on the
importance of the coach. Four respondents (16%) included comments about the benefits of having an objective person for a reality check.

Question 5 asked, has the experience affected other areas of your life, and if so how? All twenty five respondents (100%) replied positively, that their personal life had changed with regard to interactions with family members, relationships with others, finding a balance in their life, deciding what is important and how they use their time.

Question 6 asked, is there anything I haven’t asked you about your coaching experience that you would like to comment on? Three themes emerged from these responses. First, the coaching process itself emerged as a strong theme. Seventeen respondents (68%) commented on the benefits of the coaching process. Secondly, the coach, i.e., personality or skills was mentioned by ten respondents (40%). Thirdly, the theme of self emerged from statements of 6 respondents (24%). Comments referred to self growth, being receptive to change and having more self-confidence.

A discussion of these results will be expanded upon in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Problem

Why would organizations want to shift to coaching as a management style? How could that shift be accomplished? First, organizations face a rapid pace of change in today’s global market. To remain competitive, organizations will need to recognize and unleash the potential of their human resources. Coaching offers an opportunity to develop people. Secondly, shifting to a coaching management style will require a commitment from executives who reflect the management philosophy of organizations. The premise was coaching executives for professional and personal growth will facilitate making the shift to a coaching management style. As executives master their own growth potential, they will develop more awareness and take more responsibility for their actions. The effects will then filter through the organizations as executives begin to coach others.

The goal of the study was to explore the outcomes of the coaching process from an interpersonal and intrapersonal nature. The outcomes were perceived measures of effectiveness based on the executive’s perception of the process.
Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the findings will be covered in two parts: findings related to the research questions based on the survey and findings related to the interview questions.

Findings Related to the Research Questions

Five research questions were analyzed for this study. The first question asked if the components of the coaching process work collectively to enhance performance or are there isolated components that are most effective. The findings indicated that isolated components are most effective in the coaching process. Awareness and responsibility, the dependent variables, had moderate associations with the components self-efficacy and communication style. Self-efficacy had the strongest correlation with the dependent variables. Communication style had the closest correlation of all the components with awareness and responsibility. Rewards and feedback had low to moderate correlations with responsibility.

As perceived by executives, a sense of mastery and competency affected their awareness of others and self. Also, they took more responsibility for their actions when they had a sense of mastery and competency. The communication style of the coach affected the effectiveness of the coaching process. Directed conversations seem to increase awareness and responsibility. Feedback had the
same association to responsibility as communication style. This could indicate the statements about feedback were repetitious with communication style statements, when measuring associations with responsibility. Rewards had a moderate correlation to responsibility. It seems external and internal motivating factors increase responsibility.

The second question asked if the coaching process contributes to sustaining behavioral changes. The findings indicated high percentages of agreement with “highly effective” and “somewhat effective” statements for awareness and responsibility in sustaining behavioral changes. The statements focused on interpersonal or intrapersonal behavioral changes.

The third question asked if gender, age, and ethnicity affected the coaching process. Ethnicity had no predictive value since Caucasian was basically the only ethnic group represented; 95.8% of the executives and 100% of the coaches were Caucasian. The age (mean=44.5) of executives had a weak to slight association with awareness and communication style. Gender of executives had weak associations with interpersonal style and communication style. Gender also had a weak association with rewards, which looked at internal and external motivational factors.

The fourth question asked if time elements, frequency, and modality affect the coaching process. Duration had a
negative relationship with awareness and a weak association with interpersonal style and rewards. The length of the coaching sessions had weak associations with awareness, rewards, communication style, and interpersonal style. The modality of the coaching sessions had a very weak association with interpersonal style. Frequency of coaching sessions had weak associations with all the coaching components except feedback.

The last question asked if gender differences between the executives and coaches affected the coaching process. From the cross tabulation, the gender differences could not be predicted in this study.

Findings of the Interview Questions

How the coaching process was initiated did not seem to have much affect of how respondents thought about the process. Whether coaching was self-initiated or part of a corporate program, 84% of the respondents had positive thoughts about getting involved in the coaching process. The following comments reflect respondents thoughts.

- "I decided it would be a profitable use of my time and it would be a business expense."
- "My position was eliminated. I decided I wanted a coaching program rather than an outplacement program."
• "I was a little apprehensive about the time involved and what I might get from it but I supported the process and felt positive going into it."

• "It was my decision to join an executive group where coaching was used. I didn't want it, didn't look forward to it, didn't need it, nor did I think I would continue it."

• "Coaching is around this office. My boss takes an active hand in coaching with ideas, thoughts, things to better improve ourselves. I like it, like his interest in each of us. If we succeed, he succeeds and he actively gives us things to succeed. I feel like he's investing in us."

• "Personally, I thought it was essential to do this to develop managers and their skills in working with people to get bottom line results. The challenge was how can we roll it out and be effective with it. I was encouraged because I thought we found something that was going to give us real help."

• "I felt the kind of scared that comes from good anxiety, kind of excited too, because in our pre-conversations he made it clear I would achieve my goals."

Whether a baseline was established or not did not seem to affect the perception of performance increases even when changes could not be quantified. All respondents indicated
they benefited from the coaching process. The following comments reflect some of those perceptions.

- “I don’t think I have a large improvement on performance because of my newness to the position but a validation continues for me to do what I’ve been doing.”
- “My performance has increased 15 to 20% from where I started on the base line.”
- “I think I’ve become more aware of things I knew about but wasn’t reinforced. It’s easy to lose track without reinforcement. It is hard to quantify changes but I think I’ve definitely improved.”
- “My coach isn’t numbers oriented but I think I’ve changed quantumly. My vision, mission, and strategic goals have changed my view of the world tremendously.”
- “More than a 100% in company’s gross sales and my personal sales.”
- “Percent, that’s a nebulous abstract question because there are so many abstracts involved. My effectiveness as a leader? I couldn’t say, only that it’s substantial. Our gross sales are certainly a result of what we are talking about.”
- “If I classify my activities as successful or not in carrying out coaching programs we set up, I’d be a 60%.”
"We didn't establish a base line to look at progress but I've seen tremendous changes in the organization; the way we do things, deal with problems, and support the staff."

The greatest obstacle in the coaching process seemed to be the element of time for 44% of the respondents. Other obstacles were the corporate culture and other people. The following comments indicate thoughts about obstacles.

- "I realized I had no time to work through and implement ideas."
- "Finding the time to devote to the process."
- "Becoming fluent in coaching techniques when you've grown up in a certain culture isn't easy. The history with the company isn't easy to change. The consequences of past management practices makes it difficult."
- "The environment. A person will be consistent with the environment they are placed in. If you drop someone in a competitive, autocratic, directive environment they will become like that to survive. So the biggest obstacle we have to change is helping each other act in new ways."
- "Follow through with implementing my plans, what we reviewed and what I said I would do."
- "Obstacle is sometimes yourself and facing the pressure of something different. I say I'm going to work on that..."
and I don’t get a chance to work on it. The pressures of now interfere with pressures of tomorrow.”

- “I don’t believe in obstacles, so they don’t exist. I’ve had the feeling and experienced a glimpse of whatever we want to do, we can do it, just will it, it’s pretty much that simple.”

- “Personnel problem of one key person. When dealing with personalities you aren’t always able to set a path and follow it. Trying to implement what you think you should do and make concessions to the way the other person does things you compromise goals to reach an agreeable solution.”

- “The actual administration above our manager. They didn’t think along the same lines. We shouldn’t have ideas, they should make all the decisions. And people inside our group trying to get by with as little as possible, would hold us up.”

Three themes emerged from the most valuable learning experiences gained from the process. The themes were “self”, “others”, and “coach”. The following comments reflect thoughts around the themes of learning experiences.

- “I went from a CEO position to something else. I learned to develop skills I hadn’t used in 15 years. I learned to use a computer, word processing, faxing. I learned communication skills and how to listen. CEO’s don’t
listen. They operate like robbers robbing a bank without a gun. People adapt to you when you are a CEO."

• "Patience in my communication skills. I learned to slow down my process. Having a third person outside the company to share experiences relating to real live business issues and to develop practical applications was very valuable."

• "Being more conscious of the needs and benefits of letting people work more on their own and coming to conclusions from consensus a manner where everyone feels they are part of the process rather than being given a unilateral decision."

• "When you get a chance to ask questions, to self-introspect, it forces you to ask what am I doing here. We don't take to time to do that. It forces you to step back. That is an indirect benefit. Every time I step back it forces me to improve. I wouldn't get it if I didn't step back."

• "It has taught me how much we want to know what is expected. We want it to be clear, want to be able to go off and do it. I guess today it's called empowerment. The coaching model helps me be clear with my direct reports regarding their expectations in a way that isn't autocratic. It is more comfortable for me to be a lead manager than a boss manager."
• “Putting down clear goals with times; weekly, monthly, and quarterly, these have been very powerful tools. I report my progress. Being accountable for my own progress. Knowing the CEO is available to me to bounce ideas off him.”

All respondents agreed the coaching experience has affected other areas of their life. Their personal lives had changed with regard to interactions with family members and other relationships, finding a balance in their lives, deciding what is important and how they use their time. The following comments reflect some of the respondents thoughts:

- “Absolutely. It helped me make a transition in my life. I am happier but poorer. My wife says I behave differently, I’m more relaxed, have more time, more tolerance. I even go to movies now.”

- “Principles work in private life as well. I realized recognition of people’s accomplishments and positive feedback is important, same for my wife and kids.”

- “Oh sure. Unless you are a chameleon, if you change your behaviors, it will affect the rest of your life. It has affected my marriage, a positive affect. It opened up more dialogue in marital relationship and caused me to be more thoughtful.”

- “The one thing it has affected is my time management. Time is life’s currency, how we use it. With time
management comes a balance in life. I spend more time with my wife and two sons. Time management has been a major factor for me."

- "Oh absolutely, it really has. I've gotten a lot more balance in all aspects of my life. I own my own company, I have a lot of employees and I'm sure a lot of people think I'm quite successful, but I only work 40 hours a week. I know how to leave problems at work and I spend a lot of time with my family. One of the biggest pluses of the experience was finding a better balance.

- "I have better communication with friends, family, colleagues, and associates. It has helped me in all areas, particularly with my children. It helps me step back and reflect where my children are coming from before reacting. I help them solve their problems instead of solving problems for them. Wonderful as a parent to use coaching with children."

- "My personal life a lot. I've been a workaholic but I've improved. My family sacrificed a great deal because of that. My family life has improved."

Three themes emerged when the respondents were asked if there was anything about the coaching process they would like to comment on. The themes revolved around the
"coaching process", the "coach", and "self". The statements below represent comments made by the respondents.

- "The process is what makes it effective. It is hard to use metrics for that. There was good rapport, empathy, and candidness. I like the open ended process of coaching. I'm comfortable with it and I've used it with my folks."
- "Coaching is a simple thing to do if the person is receptive to it. Coaching helped me to do things I would eventually have done myself. It facilitated the process and I got there sooner and with more ease. The coach needed to have excellent skills and adopt her approach to meet my needs. I needed to have respect for the coach."
- "The coaching was not isolated for me. It paralleled and was done with training and education. The combination provides a powerful experience. It has been more than I expected. I have seen definite changes in the management team this year. Changes from autocratic styles and the group works more as a team."
- "There is no format of coaching that works for everybody. The coach needs to adopt to the person to be effective. One template won't be effective, especially with people."
- "Coaching has a psychological aspect. We all beat ourselves up unnecessarily. Coaching helps me feel good
about myself even with mini failures or negative things. I don't beat myself up over them."

• "It is invaluable having a coach when you are a boss. It's not so much about learning new concepts or about coming home with an inspiration to bring into your life. It's the process of having somebody else on the sideline going, "Oh, you're straying off the path, let's get back in, too much to the left, get back in center. I have employees but I don't have anyone who manages me to keep me on track, bring me new ideas. She's invaluable to someone like me, someone who's the boss."

• "If I had to quantify and qualify all my experiences to date, this has been the best single-handedly the best. It gave me the technical expertise to implement what I felt were the values, principles, and philosophies of what the organization stood for and to support people. I'm in a position to directly coach. If you want to change the world you need to start by changing yourself. It gave us the tools and common language to talk about things."

Conclusion

The study explored the outcomes of the coaching process from the perception of executives. The quantitative
measures from the survey did not appear to be as strong as the qualitative measures from the interviews.

The quantitative analysis indicated two isolated components, self-efficacy and communication style, had the strongest association to both the dependent variables, awareness and responsibility. Self-efficacy statements referred to a sense of mastery and competency. According to Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, people need to have a sense of mastery to perform new behaviors. He believed that self-efficacy increases an individual's ability to adapt and sustain new behaviors in new situations (1977). It seems self-efficacy as a coaching component has the ability to change the awareness and responsibility of executives.

Communication style statements referred to how the conversations were directed in the coaching process. According to Kinlaw (1989), Fournes (1979), and Sperry (1993) coaching is a communication process where problems can be solved and performance increased when feedback is provided. It appears the communication style of the coach has the ability to affect executives' awareness and responsibility.

Rewards and feedback seem to affect responsibility. According to Ilgen (1979) and Estes (1972) feedback contains directional and motivational information for the individual. When feedback is directional it gives information to the
individual to adapt and learn new behavior patterns. According to Jacoby, et al (1984) and Johnson, et al (1993) learning oriented feedback is needed in complex environments. Learning oriented feedback becomes motivational as it provides more information and fosters a sense of mastery, increasing intrinsic motivation. This could explain how rewards and feedback affected responsibility. It could also explain how self-efficacy affected both awareness and responsibility.

The interpersonal style of the coach did not appear to have significance. It seems possible interpersonal style is part of the communication style of the coach. Goals could also have been part of the communication style since goals had little significance in the findings.

The demographic characteristics of age, gender, and ethnicity did not appear to have significant affects on the coaching process. The strength of associations between the demographics and coaching components ranged from weak to not reportable. The same is true for the coaching process characteristics of duration, frequency, and modality.

There was high percentage of agreement regarding the effectiveness of awareness and responsibility in sustaining behavioral changes as measured by statements reflecting awareness and responsibility. It appears executives developed increased levels of awareness and responsibility
The qualitative statements collected from the interviews seem to validate the above findings. Executives indicated they learned more about themselves and how they interact with others from the coaching process. This validates Rogers (1961) belief that interactions with another enables an individual to directly discover, uncover, experience, or encounter his or her actual self. These findings confirm Maslow’s (1970) definition of self-actualization where the individual fully uses his talents, capacities, and potential. He also believed identification with others tends to promote high energy individuals (1970).

Nine of the respondents (37%) interviewed had started coaching others, shifting their management style with their direct reports. This provides some evidence for the premise of the study which stated that as executives reach their own potential they will begin to coach others and coaching as a management style can filter through the organization. One respondent said, “In order for me to become successful, I myself have to become the consummate coach to all my employees and partners to help them become the best they can be.” Another respondent said, “Coaching is a rather narrow word. It is rewarding to try and mentor or guide other younger, less experienced people in our organization to be
more productive and capable, to come along. The pleasure of the coaching experience adds up to good results, if properly used.”

It appears coaching offers some benefits to organizations as they face challenges from the external environment. One respondent said, “The greatest challenge was getting direct reports to open themselves up to a culture of continuous improvement. In our organization at upper management level we are lucky to have people who get it. I've only had to replace one of them in this process and that person would still be here if I had not gone through this process and raised the bar, as it were. The whole process made me see the light, that we needed to improve and continuous improvement was needed to stay ahead in our business.”

A primary concern for organizations has become developing the potential of employees to improve performance in organizations (Allenbaugh, 1983; Peters, 1985; Orth, 1987; Evered, 1989). The following are excerpts from a respondent's comments about the coaching process. “It has helped me understand that managing is a tremendous opportunity to help other people and coaching can help me help others better and work through others better, which is a real art, a matter of life long learning to be sure, but it is something most of us, certainly myself, didn't get any
training for. As you work your way up the ranks you are not really prepared for what happens when you have to turn around and work through other people as opposed to survive or fail by virtue of your own efforts.” He continued, “I have five managers who report to me and fifty people report to them. It doesn’t take much of an incremental improvement in my effectiveness to see it ripple through the organization and have a major pay off. I think the odds of getting a pay back on the cost of the investment (referring to coaching) are astronomical and chances are much higher there are many, many thousands of dollars return on investment. Just as a result of getting that little bit more out of everybody.”

To counter that view, another respondent stated, “I have to evaluate a coaching program from an employment perspective. The expense needs to be justified in a not-for-profit organization. The public pays for it. I worry about those things. I have to think in terms of outcomes. How long do you need a coach to change how you do things?”

And finally, a respondent stated, “There is a feeling something is missing and I’m frustrated by it. I’ve backed away and I’m not advancing as rapidly and I’m distracted by a host of other things leaving me with that something isn’t finished feeling. If I pursue coaching further I need to pursue that.”
In summary, the study explored the outcomes of the coaching process from an interpersonal and intrapersonal nature. The goal was to determine what components of the coaching process were most effective and whether coaching sustained behavioral changes.

From the collected quantitative and qualitative data, self-efficacy and communication style were the two components that correlated to both awareness and responsibility, the dependent variables. The communication style of the coach and a greater sense of mastery and competence for the executive indicates increased awareness and responsibility. This finding supported themes that emerged from the interviews. Executives indicated they had become more aware of others and self and took more responsibility for their actions through the coaching process.

Rewards, the component measuring internal and external motivating factors, correlated moderately to responsibility. It appears self-efficacy can also be an internal motivating factor influencing the executive’s sense of responsibility.

Sustaining behavioral changes as measured by the high percentage of agreement regarding the effectiveness of awareness and responsibility supported findings from the interviews. All the executives perceived positive performance changes, 37% stated they were coaching others,
all indicated their personal life had been influenced and enhanced by the coaching process, and all agreed they had learned more about themselves. These findings support Bandura’s (1977) belief that perceived self-efficacy is what sustains behavioral changes.

Lastly, the influence of socio-demographic characteristics and the characteristics of the coaching process, i.e., duration, frequency, and modality were too weak to be meaningful in this study.

Is coaching effective from the perceptions of the executives interviewed? There was unanimous agreement coaching has had a positive affect on their professional and personal development. The agreement was reflected by the metrics in the survey measuring how effective coaching is in sustaining behavioral changes. The survey alone, would not have given a true picture of the coaching process. The interviews gave the study a depth that would have been lost using only metrics. As Einstein said, "not all things that count, can be counted."

Recommendations for Action and Future Research

The findings of the study were from a relatively small sample size and no cause and effect conclusions can be stated with any certainty. However, several recommendations can be made based on the findings of this study. To determine if behavioral changes are sustained, follow up
interviews could be conducted in six to twelve months. Since the findings were subjective experiences of executives, the time factor would allow for perceptions to change and regressions for old behaviors to occur. Follow up interviews would also determine if more of the executive are using a coaching management style.

Future surveys could reduce the number of independent coaching components. It seems there was a repetitious nature to the statements used in this study.

According to the demographics of the study, coaching occurs with mostly with Caucasian, forty to fifty year old males. Currently, that is who represents executives in organizations. Future action can be applied to other ethnic, gender and age groups. Given the demographics of this study, the findings could be skewed.

Organizations will need to establish outcome results to determine what the return is on their coaching dollar investments. Shareholders require results measured with numbers. Organizations may need to educate shareholders that some changes are a developmental process and require time to implement and show bottom line results. Time will tell whether the positive subjective experiences of coaching will filter through organizations improving bottom line results.
Coaching is relatively new in the business world and has few empirical studies to support its effectiveness. If coaching is to become a management style to strengthen the position of organizations in a continuously changing environment, future research is needed.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

COACHING EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Based on your experience, please rate the effectiveness of the coaching process for each statement. If the statement is not relevant to your experience, please rate it as N/A. Circle the appropriate number that applies to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOMewhat EFFECTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NEUTRAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOMewhat INeffective</strong></td>
<td><strong>HIGHLY INeffective</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOALS:** To what extent were goals established between you and your coach?

1. Goals were mutually agreed upon........... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Goals were challenging yet attainable...... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Goals were specific and clear............... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Smaller goals were set to direct progress towards larger goals.................... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. Goals were realistic........................ 1 2 3 4 5 NA

**FEEDBACK:** How was information regarding your performance shared with you?

6. Feedback focused on specific behaviors...... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. Feedback created an awareness of my behaviors ......................................... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. Feedback was given in a constructive way.... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. Feedback encouraged me to strive harder.................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. Feedback gave me the chance to try new behaviors................................. 1 2 3 4 5 NA

**SELF-EFFICACY:** How was your sense of mastery or competency affected?

11. Achievements due to coaching increased my confidence levels in other areas....... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. My sense of personal control increased..... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
13. I started to take more risks to accomplish my goals............................... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
14. I felt more confident in challenging situations........................................... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
15. My desire to learn new skills increased..... 1 2 3 4 5 NA
REWARDS: To what extent did external and internal factors influence your motivation?

16. Recognition by the coach encouraged my progress........................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
17. The organizational environment supported my efforts........................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
18. My motivation increased with each goal I reached........................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
19. Taking risks was encouraged and supported ..................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
20. My anticipation of success increased ...............................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA

COMMUNICATION STYLE: How were conversations directed in the coaching relationship?

21. My ideas were listened to attentively.............................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
22. Questions were asked that focused my awareness...........................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
23. My choices and possibilities were explored....................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
24. An action plan specific to my needs was mutually agreed upon...........................1 2 3 4 5 NA
25. My progress was reviewed in a timely manner.................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA

INTERPERSONAL STYLE: How was rapport developed in the coaching relationship?

26. The coach established a climate of trust.........................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
27. The coach was empathic and understanding......................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
28. The coach was committed to helping me achieve my goals................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
29. The coach created a partnership with me.........................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
30. The coach remained calm when my emotions were aroused....................................1 2 3 4 5 NA

RESPONSIBILITY: To what extent did coaching influence your actions or performance?

31. I have chosen to stretch my abilities to new heights.......................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
32. I have applied feedback from my coach to other areas of my life........................1 2 3 4 5 NA
33. I have encouraged others to achieve higher performance levels........................1 2 3 4 5 NA
34. I have maintained the goals I achieved..........................................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
35. I have applied what I learned to making future choices....................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
AWARENESS: How did coaching affect your attention towards yourself and others?

36. I have become more sensitive to others...1 2 3 4 5 NA
37. I have personally challenged and confronted my ideas and actions......1 2 3 4 5 NA
38. I have more understanding of how my actions impact others..................1 2 3 4 5 NA
39. I have developed a better balance in my life.................................1 2 3 4 5 NA
40. I have developed better relationships with others.........................1 2 3 4 5 NA

DEMOGRAPHIC, TIME, DURATION, AND MODALITY QUESTIONS

41. AGE: _______Years
42. GENDER: _______Female _______Male
43. ETHNICITY: _______African-American _______Asian _______Caucasian _______Hispanic _______Other

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR COACH

44. AGE: _______Years (approximate if you do not know)
45. GENDER: _______Female _______Male
46. ETHNICITY: _______African-American _______Asian _______Caucasian _______Hispanic _______Other

47. Has the coaching experience ended? ____Yes  ____No
48. If so, how long did it last? _______Months _______Years
49. If not, how long since it started? _______Months _______Years
50. How long did the sessions last? _______Minutes _______Hours

51. How often did the coaching sessions take place?
   ____Daily ____Weekly ____Bi-weekly ____Other (specify)

52. What mode of coaching was used?
   ____Face-to-Face ____Phone ____e-mail ____Other (specify)

Are you willing to participate in a 15 minute confidential phone interview to discuss 5 more questions? If so, include your name and phone number so we can arrange an interview time convenient to your schedule.

Name: __________________________________________

Phone No: _____________________________________
APPENDIX B

PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How was the coaching process initiated for you and what were your thoughts about it?

2. How was a base line established to measure your progress and by what percent do you think your performance increased?

3. What have been the greatest obstacles you experienced in the process?

4. What have been the most valuable learning experiences you have gained from the process?

5. Has the experience affected other areas of your life and if so, how?

6. Is there anything I haven't asked you about your coaching experience that you would like to comment on?
November 24, 1996

Dear Respondent:

I am a graduate student at the University of San Francisco completing a Masters in Human Resources and Organization Development. My thesis research is on Coaching: Theory and Practice. The study examines the different components of the coaching process to determine which components are most effective in facilitating performance improvement at the executive level in organizations.

The attached survey is an integral part of this research. I am requesting that you complete the survey and return it to me by December 20, 1996. Please note the survey is anonymous unless you e-mail your response in which case it is confidential.

I thank you in advance for your participation in this survey. I realize your schedule is extremely busy and I appreciate your taking the time to complete it. Because of the relatively small sample size it is important that I receive as many of the surveys back as possible. I have enclosed a self addressed stamped envelope for this purpose.

Again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Carol Gegner
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