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The purpose of this study was to define and understand the perspectives of four executives from differing fields of industry in the Central Pennsylvania area regarding their perceptions of executive coaching in order to gain a deeper understanding of the definition, value, and benefits of executive coaching in the selected geographic region and across the targeted categories of the companies chosen for this study. Data were collected through pre-constructed, semi-structured interviews conducted with each of the four executives. The participants were each asked 11 pre-constructed questions for the purpose of gathering information to answer the research questions about their perceptions of executive coaching. This study was modeled as a replication of a study conducted by Dr. John Stevens Jr., where seven CEOs and presidents were interviewed using the same instrument. Information for this study was gathered using the multiple-case study method for the purpose of answering research questions about the shared perceptions of executive coaching by the four participants.

Some of the expectations the researcher had when conducting by research question (RQ) were: RQ1 executives consider trust, openness, and willingness to work through the process to be attributes of successful executive coaching engagements. RQ2 failure to develop a trust based relationship between the executive and the coach is considered to be an attribute of ineffective executive coaching engagements. RQ3 confidentiality is considered to be a key element and that executives would have expectations of confidentiality. RQ4 Executives consider training in business and
psychology to be important assets of executive coaches. RQ5 Executives would prefer external to internal executive coaches.

Some of the findings from this study by research question: RQ1 some of the important attributes found in successful executive coaching engagements are trust, a feeling of comfort, and commitment to the process. RQ2 Ineffective executive coaching engagements lack trust between the coach and the executive, and are characterized by having an executive who believes that there is no need for change. RQ3 Confidentiality is an essential part of executive coaching. RQ4 Executive coaches should have business training and knowledge as well as some psychology training in order to be effective. RQ5 Internal coaches are viewed as being less likely to break confidentiality and are thought to be less bias than internal coaches.
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Chapter 1
Introduction to the Study

The industry of executive coaching has grown dramatically over the last few decades and continues to do so. It has been estimated that companies in the United States spend one billion dollars on executive coaching services annually. While the rapid growth and continued relevance of executive coaching in today’s world would be difficult to deny, there still remains a lack of information in the literature regarding its effectiveness (Sherman & Freas, 2004).

This study therefore tried to provide a starting point in remedying this lack of information. The goal of this study was to identify the shared perceptions of four executives from different industries in Central Pennsylvania regarding executive coaching in order to gain a deeper understanding of the definition, value, and benefits of executive coaching in the selected geographic region and across the targeted categories of companies chosen for this research. The perceptions of these executives, all of whom have been involved in executive coaching, was used to identify common themes with the goal of attempting to provide more information on the effectiveness of executive coaching, to help develop a clear definition of the term and standards for practice.

Data was collected using semi-structured interviews to reveal the perceptions of four executives from Central Pennsylvania regarding executive coaching. Following the data collection, the revealed experiences were used to identify common themes that were used to determine the following: the attributes of effective executive coaching engagements, the critical training areas required for effective executive coaching
engagements’ the expectations from executive coaches, and the advantages and disadvantages of both internal and external coaches.

Background of the Study

In recent years, the subject of executive coaching has been extensively discussed in the literature (Garman, Whiston, & Zlatoper, 2000). However, despite the attention that executive coaching has received in both the literature and in practice, there seems to be a deficiency of studies regarding its effectiveness. An assessment of the effectiveness of executive coaching would be difficult without an accurate definition of what it is. A clear definition of executive coaching should be formulated to allow researchers the capability to assess the effectiveness of executive coaching. At least one executive who has undergone executive coaching has supported this claim. Romagnoli (2013), in correspondence with the researcher, stated that the lack of a clear definition of executive coaching makes it easier for misunderstandings to occur, especially when concerned with the expectations of both coach and coachee that may not be commensurate with each other.

The existing literature on executive coaching has made a distinction between internal and external coaches (Frisch, 2001; Witherspoon & White, 1996). It is important for researchers to understand the differences between the two since internal and external coaches aim to provide different outcomes and may hold different issues and standards. The basic difference between the two is their relation to the organization that retains their services. Internal executive coaches are professionals who are employed by organizations for the express purpose of coaching managers and executives (Frisch, 2001), while external executive coaches are consultants external to the organization seeking their
services, assigned to an executive on a regular basis for one or more specific function—such as improving managerial skills, correcting performance problems, or facilitating long-term development (Witherspoon & White, 1996).

Wasylyshyn (2003) provided the pros and cons of internal and external coaches, as reported in an outcome study that he conducted. Internal coaches, being employed by the same organization as the executives whom they coach, would most likely have a better understanding of the company’s operations and culture. This could very well make the transition for executive coaching easier for both the coach and the client (Wasylyshyn, 2003). The coach may be able to utilize the knowledge of how the company operates and tailor his or her coaching style appropriately.

This knowledge of the culture of the organization may also provide an internal coach a better understanding of the behavior, attitudes, and expectations of its members, which may help a coach in the areas of leadership, motivation, and delegation (Wasylyshn, 2003). Additionally, by belonging to the same organization of the executives they are to coach, executive coaches are more available for their coachees, and would most likely find it easier to assess their coachees, having more opportunities to observe their coachees in their natural work environment (Segers, Vloerberghs, & Hendrickx, 2011).

However, it is also necessary to note that at least one of the disadvantages of internal coaches is that they are more likely to experience problems concerning their independence, as they may be guided and influenced—consciously or not—by the company’s leadership as well as their own agenda within the organization (Wasylyshn, 2003). In other words, it is more likely for internal executive coaches to be swayed in
their coaching decisions by factors related to a given organization’s culture, which may compromise their objectivity.

External coaches, on the other hand, lack firsthand knowledge of the organization’s culture, which may lead to their suggestions and overall direction to be perceived as misguided and therefore met with resistance by their coachees (Wasylyshn, 2003). Since external coaches are hired for specific assignments and are independent of the organization itself, they have no real ties to the leadership of the organization (Witherspoon & White, 1996). Because of this, they are more likely than internal coaches to be impartial in the coaching they provide. However, external executive coaches, lacking the immersion in a specific organization’s culture that internal coaches possess, may face resistance due to concepts and ideas that their coachees may perceive as opposed to their organization’s culture (Wasylyshn, 2003). Another potential disadvantage for external executive coaches is that, since they are employed by different organizations and thus may be subject to different standards and practices, they possess divergent educational backgrounds and levels (Wasylyshn, 2003). This may lead to difficulties in defining their competencies and a clear definition of their prescribed role.

Problem Statement

Executive coaching as an industry has grown dramatically over the last few decades and is considered by Helen Paige to be one of “the fastest growing executive development processes in adult learning” (Paige, 2002). As the use of executive coaches has increased in organizations, a clear definition of what an executive coach is has not been fully developed (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2010). This lack of a clear definition and setting of standards may allow unqualified individuals laying claim to being
executive coaches. The proliferation of such cases would lead to a loss of legitimacy for
the practice of executive coaching and a higher likelihood of dissatisfaction for clients.

The problem discussed in this study is how to assess the effectiveness of
executive coaching programs using the perceptions of executives from Central
Pennsylvania who have undergone the process. The data collected was used to provide
possible answers to the question of the factors that constitute an effective executive
coaching process. By examining the perceptions of the participants regarding effective
executive coaching, this study was able to provide an adequate starting point for a clear
definition of executive coaching and standards for its practice.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify the perceptions of four
executives from Central Pennsylvania, all of whom have been involved in executive
coaching, in order to gain understanding of the definition, value, and benefits of
executive coaching in the selected geographic region and across the targeted categories of
companies chosen for this analysis. Because the executives have been involved in
executive coaching, their experiences were used to identify common themes that were
generated to address the following research questions posed in this study:

Research Questions

The specific research questions that guided this study are as follow:

R Q1. What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have?

R Q2. What are the critical training areas in order to have effective executive
coaching engagements?

R Q3. What are the expectations from executive coaches?
RQ4. What are the advantages of internal and external coaches?

RQ5. What are the disadvantages of internal and external coaches?

Findings from this study help understand the perception of executive coaching across the four cases examined in this research study. The results of this study could help further develop a definition of executive coaching and standards for the practice in the field of executive coaching in the geographic region under investigation and across companies similar to those targeted in this proposed multiple case study.

Theoretical Framework

Executive coaching has yet to be defined authoritatively, despite numerous attempts by researchers (Judge & Cowell, 1997; Kilburg, 2000; Grant & Stober, 2006; Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011). Kilburg (2000) offered a perspective leaning toward a more organizational understanding of executive coaching. He claimed that executive coaching is a relationship formed between an executive in an organization and a consultant who uses a variety of behavioral techniques to help the client achieve a previously identified set of goals to improve professional performance and satisfaction (Kilburg, 2000).

This possible definition of executive coaching precedes the similar concept elucidated by Wanberg, Welsh, and Hezlett (2003) that then influenced the conceptual framework that will be utilized in this study: namely, the Conceptual Framework for Successful Executive Coaching developed by Joo (2005).

Kilburg (2000) clearly defined executive coaching to be solely between a coach and a coachee. This is in contrast to other researchers who, just to cite two views, contended that an organizational component must be stressed between the coach and
coachee (Bacon & Spear, 2003), and that executive coaching should be conducted in
groups (Kets de Vries, 2005). However, Kilburg (2000) mentioned that the primary goal
of executive coaching is to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization, thus
giving importance to the organizational aspect that Wanberg et al. (2003) later
emphasized.

The conceptual framework developed by Joo (2005) was derived from a similar
understanding of executive coaching as between not just a coach and a coachee, but also
organizational support. However, Joo (2005) extended the focus of the study of Wanberg
et al. (2003) on the dyad relationship, having also contended that there is a difference
between possible outcomes: namely, proximal outcomes, where self-awareness and
learning at an individual level happens, and distal outcomes, where the individual success
from proximal outcomes contribute to organizational success. In this framework,
antecedents such as the coach’s and coachee’s characteristics and organizational support
influence the process chosen for coaching, leading to the two kinds of outcomes detailed
above.

By understanding executive coaching in the framework by Joo (2005), this study
was able to better analyze the factors that contribute to having an effective coaching
project using the data collected for this study. The author contacted Dr. Baek-Kyoo via
email and phone to ask for his permission to use his conceptual framework for successful
executive coaching. Please refer to Appendix K for Baek-Kyoo’s consent for the
researcher to use his conceptual framework. Joo’s framework for successful executive
coaching looks at the antecedents (characteristics of the parties involved), which have an
impact on the process as well as the proximal and distal outcomes. The framework
reinforces the importance of the relationship (or match) between the coach and the executive being coached as well as the expectations of the organization, which affect the process and therefore the outcomes. This framework was chosen because it focuses on the importance of characteristics, approaches and soft outcomes, which are prime for qualitative research and addressed the chosen research questions. The following chart shows Joo’s conceptual framework for successful executive coaching:

![Chart showing the conceptual framework for successful executive coaching](image)


**Nature of the Study**

This study was qualitative in nature and used a multiple case study design to determine how to best assess the effectiveness of executive coaching, as perceived by executives from Central Pennsylvania who have participated in executive coaching engagements. The researcher personally interviewed four executives from different fields of industry using pre-constructed questions to learn their perceptions of what constitutes an effective executive coaching engagement. Semi-structured interviews were conducted over a one-month period (December of 2013) and were audiotaped and transcribed with
the participants’ permission in order to prepare and organize the data obtained. The data was coded and categorized into themes based on the results of the within-case and cross-case analysis, and the preponderance of individual codes (Krippendorff, 2013).

This study is based on a study conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. in 2005. In the research process, the author read the study published by Fr. John H. Stevens Jr. and became interested in finding out what results a similar study conducted in a different geographical area would have. In his study, Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. interviewed seven top-level management executives form different business sectors and gathered data on their perception of executive coaching through the use of a survey. Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. personally interviewed the participants himself through informal telephone interviews. All seven participants had been previously been involved in executive coaching. Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. used 11 pre- constructed questions, which were given to the executives in advanced. The author contacted Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. after reading his article and discussed the possibility of duplicating his study in the Central Pennsylvania area. Dr. Stevens generously agreed and was a guiding mentor throughout this study by allowing the researcher to use his research instrument and participating as a second coder in this study.

In Dr. Stevens’s study, each participant was interviewed and the findings were coded into a summary of themes by question. From the comments collected and analyzed by Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. it seems reasonable to conclude that the participants “consider executive coaching to be a unique process wherein something is not done to them, nor is something done for them to these seven CEOs and presidents, executive coaching is a helping process wherein something is done with them in a way that also
enables them to better meet their role obligations and responsibilities” (p. 283). The study conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens also found “a great deal of agreement among these seven executives that this process occurs within a unique and personalized relationship that is forged on the sacrosanct foundations of confidentiality, mutual interest, and mutual respect” (p. 283).

**Definition of Terms**

**Coachee.** “The one who gets the professional service; namely, it is the executive” (Baek-Kyoo, 2005, p. 165).

**Coaching role.** “Refers to the coach’s primary function in helping an executive learn, grow, and change. The focus may be on imparting specific skills, addressing performance issues on the job, or supporting broader changes in the executive’s behavior” (Witherspoon & White, 1996, p. 126).

**Executive and client (used interchangeably).** “As the primary person receiving coaching” (Witherspoon & White, 1996, p. 126).

**Executive coach.** “A helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization within a formally defined coaching agreement” (Kilburg, 2000, p. 67).

**Executive coaching.** A “helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually
identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization within a formally defined coaching agreement” (Kilburg, 2000, p. 67).

**External executive coach.** “A skilled outside consultant assigned to an executive on a regular basis for one or more specific functions-improve the executive’s managerial skills, correct serious performance problems. Or facilitate ling-term development” (Witherspoon & White, 1996, p. 125).

**Internal executive coach.** “A professional within an organization who, as a formal part of his or her job, coaches managers and executives” (Frisch, 2001, p. 240).

**Organization and firm (used interchangeably).** The organization that contracts for coaching and pays for the service” (Witherspoon & White, 1996, p. 126).

**Assumptions**

This study relied on several assumptions. The first assumption was that since the executive participants voluntarily agreed to be interviewed, they truly wanted to contribute and provided honest answers based on their current and prior experiences. Additionally, the participants were assumed to have had experience in the executive coaching process (more specifically, being the coachee) and therefore possess an appropriate level of understanding of the process of executive coaching. Another assumption was that participants candidly articulated their ideas. Participant responses have the potential of not being perceptive or clear and may be influenced by the interviewer’s presence. A final assumption was that participant conversations needed monitoring. Participants may have possibly need encouragement to speak, thus placing the responsibility of putting them at ease on the researcher during the personal interviews.
Limitations

There are several limitations present in this study. First, the findings may not be generalized because the study utilized qualitative research methods and only involved executives from Central Pennsylvania. Second, the sample size is limited to four executives, which is another reason that the findings may not be generalized. Third, the sample was chosen from organizations where the researcher had access and, therefore, no random sampling procedure was employed.

Delimitations

Creswell (2008) stated that the use of delimitations might affect outcomes and narrow the presented scope. Delimitation factors may include the loss or eventual unwillingness of some executive participants or features related to the collection and analysis of data.

Significance of the Study

The literature is clear in the need for consolidation or unified understanding on basic issues like a definition of executive coaching, description of the job, and qualifications of those who are coaching, as well as standard measurements of success. Sherman and Freas (2004) explained that executive coaching has no barrier to entry and that the knowledge brought forth by executive coaching is very diverse. In fact, Sherman and Freas (2004) have pointed out that “no one has yet demonstrated conclusively what qualifies an executive coach or what makes one approach to executive coaching better than another” (Sherman & Freas, 2004, p. 84).

According to Levenson (2009), the evaluation of the efficacy of executive coaching is presently not represented in the literature. This means that there is an
inadequacy in assessing the effectiveness of effective executive coaching. Given that
executive coaching is a widespread phenomenon, this should not be the case.

This study was conducted with the intent of gaining insight into the perceptions of
executives who have participated in executive coaching interventions regarding the
effectiveness of executive coaching: more specifically, what they perceive to be the
components of effective coaching engagements. The information gathered in this study is
important because it helps to fill a gap in the literature regarding executive coaching. By
providing data from the perceptions of executives about what constitutes effective
executive coaching, this study may help provide leaders with information to assist them
in the creation of tangible assessment tools to assist in the hiring of executive coaches
(Schlosser et al., 2006).

Summary

Chapter 1 introduced the problem to be discussed in this study: namely, how to
assess the effectiveness of executive coaching engagements. To better understand the
context of this problem, the background of the study was presented, where it was stated
that despite the continued growth of the industry of executive coaching, there still
remains a lack of information in the literature regarding its effectiveness (Sherman &
Freas, 2004).

Gauging the effectiveness of executive coaching is difficult, since a universally
accepted definition of what it is has not yet been achieved. In order to shed light on how
best to assess the effectiveness of executive coaching programs, this study collected the
perceptions of four executives from Central Pennsylvania, all of whom have been
involved in executive coaching at some point. By using their perceptions of executive
coaching programs, this study was able to provide a starting point for a clear definition of executive coaching and the standards for its practice, and thus, gain better insight on what constitutes an effective executive coaching engagement.
Chapter 2
Review of Related Literature

This review of related literature provides a comprehensive overview of the literature on executive coaching. The review will begin with a history of executive coaching that focuses on the growth of the industry. The attributes of the job of executive coaching will then be explored, focusing on who are executive coaches, as well as the difference between internal and external executive coaches. The review will also explore the costs and benefits of executive coaching by identifying the parties involved in the coaching process and the potential cost and benefits involved in the transaction. Concerns with the measurements of benefits as expressed in the literature will also be discussed. Finally, the lack of standards in the definitions and expectations of executive coaching will be examined as one of the possible reasons for gaps found in the literature, where there is a deficiency of measurable studies in the subject.

History

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact date when executive coaching became a practice; however, Kampa-Kokesch identifies three phases in the history of executive coaching (2001, p. 6). The first phase is identified as taking place between the years of 1950 and 1979. This was a time when psychological methods along with organizational development were used on executives by a select group of professionals (Kampa-Kokesch 2001). The second phase is considered to have taken place between the years 1980 and 1994, when the practice of using a blend of psychology and business
knowledge began to be standardized by those who were providing these services. The last stage is considered to have started in 1995 and continues to take place currently. This third stage is characterized by an increase in publications on the subject of executive coaching as well as an increase in the demand for the practice (Kampa-Kokesch 2001; Koonce, 1994).

The body of literature on coaching has grown from the first peer-reviewed paper in 1937 (Gorby, 1937; Passmore, Holloway, & Rawle-Cope, 2010) to 428 published papers between the years of 1937 and 1999 (Passmore et al., 2010). It is important to mention that out of the 428 published papers in that 62-year span, only 93 were articles, PhDs, and empirical studies (Passmore et al., 2010). Between the years of 2000 and 2008, there have been 335 more articles published and out of the 77 outcome studies that have taken place since 1980, 26 were case studies, 39 within-subject studies, and 12 between-subject studies (Passmore et al., 2010). Passmore et al. (2010) suggested that the increase in literature in the area of executive coaching is indeed filling the gap that was once very wide within the literature. They also mentioned that despite the evident recent growth in contribution to the literature, the domain is lagging behind other areas of literatures such as appraisals and training and change management.

Market Needs

Executive coaching has been identified as one of the fastest growing processes used to develop executives’ skills (Kampa-Kokesch,; Paige, 2012). The practice of executive coaching has grown in popularity and application over the last few decades (Schlosser et al., 2006). It is estimated that the market for executive coaching is currently a $1 billion industry worldwide (Bono et al., 2009). There are many reasons being
attributed to the growth of executive coaching as a market. Consideration has to be given
to the relative growth on the expectations and jobs of executives. Today’s executives are
expected to have people skills that will allow them to function socially and lead their
subordinates, as well as strategic decision-making skills that allow them to make the right
business decisions (Schlosser et al., 2006). The demand for executive coaches seems to
have grown as the expectations of executives have also grown.

The rapidly changing environment of business must also be considered as one of
the reasons why executive coaches are needed and why the market demand has increased
(Paige, 2002; Schlosser et al., 2006). Globalization has also played a role in increasing
the social skills and knowledge base that successful executives now need and are
expected to have. An increase in the number of business structures and cultures, within
which executives have to function, may have the potential of not allowing executives to
easily adapt and excel at their jobs (Paige, 2002). Paige states that “due to new
organizational cultures and structures placing
a premium on the executives who head public and private corporations, executives must
expand their knowledge base to analyze and comprehend the many changes that are
happening around them. Not all executives are able to adjust easily to these expectations,
or balance the many competing demands and pressures their position may entail” (p. 61).
As a result, executives are faced with high professional and personal expectations, which
in turn have increased the demand for executive coaches.

Attributes of Executive Coaches

The personal relationship between the executive being coached (coachee) and the
person doing the coaching gives room for a need to match the coach and the executive
being coached based on personal and professional attributes (Gregory et al., 2008). This task is certainly difficult and made even harder to accomplish because of the broad definitions of what an executive coach is and who is qualified to do the job of an executive coach.

Baron and Morin (2009) have also contended that the working relationship between coach and coachee helps determine the success of the executive coaching process. Their study “was conducted in a large North American manufacturing company that offered its junior and midlevel managers a leadership development program lasting eight months and addressing various topics such as leadership, interpersonal communication, power and delegations, employee development, and mobilization” (p. 93). The focus of their study was on the “ability of their managers to promote development of their subordinates” (p. 93). Managers participated in three methods of professional development:

*Classroom seminar* (eight one day sessions). “Participants gathered in groups of 11-15 persons outside the workplace each month. Sessions were conducted by a training consultant.” (p.93).

*Action learning groups* (seven half day sessions). “Participants gathered in groups of five to eight each month to reflect on their skills and practice. The role of each participant was to support and challenge colleagues in their self-examination process” (p. 93).

*Executive coaching* (up to 14 sessions of 90 minutes each). “Executive coaching consisted of face-to-face interactions between a “certified” executive and a manager participating in the leadership development program. During the first meeting, managers
were asked to establish three main goals they wanted to work on. These goals had to be related to the skills addressed during the leadership development program. Following a structured process, the coach’s main responsibility was to guide and support coaches in attainment of their established goals. Although the development program suggested one coaching session every two weeks, the specific scheduling was left to the discretion of the coach and the coachee” (p. 93).

The participants in Baron and Morin’s study were divided into two groups: coachees and coaches. The coachees were managers (n = 127) who had voluntarily signed up for the management skills development program. Three questioners were given to the coaches. One questioner was given on the first classroom seminar, a second questioner was given five months later, and a questioner was given an additional three months later. Out of the 127 managers, 118 completed the first questioner, 111 completed the second questioner and 80 responded to the third questioner. Out of the 80 participants in this group, who participated in all three questioners, seven were excluded from the analysis because they did not participate in the full program. The final sample size of the coachee group was 73 participants (n = 73) of which 63 were men and ten were women.

The second group (the coaches) was composed of 64 executives, who had previously earned a coaching certification by participating in a program, which was done by an outside consultant prior to the management skills development program. Out of the 64 coaches, 24 completed the questioner given (n = 24) of which 21 were men and three were women. Overall, 31 coach–coachee dyads were formed, this is because some coaches were paired with more than one coachee.
In their study regarding the links between the coach/coachee relationship and the success of that relationship in an organizational setting, they found, through 31 coach-coachee dyads, that their working relationship not only determined the success of the coaching itself, but also the coaching received from the coach and the development of the coachee’s self-efficacy (Baron & Morin, 2009). The study may be seen to support the notion that the attributes of executive coaches, as well as the executives, play an important role in their relationship.

Additionally, the attributes of executive coaches are important since it has been found by Stevens (2005) that the credibility of the coach in the eyes of the coachees was largely based on how grounded and familiar the coach was with their “reality” and the challenges the executives faced as leaders of business organizations. This in turn influences the willingness of the executives to listen to and be influenced by their coaches, which Stevens (2005) showed was perceived to be necessary for an executive coaching session to achieve its goals. Executive coaching practitioners have a wide range of backgrounds including individuals with knowledge in business, teaching, law, and sports (Kampa-Kokesch, 2001). The absence of a clear definition as well as a lack of standardized training are creating confusion and hesitation within the business world when it comes to understanding the field and benefits of executive coaching. Many authors have contributed a definition of executive coaching to the literature, and a number of them consider executive coaching to be poorly defined and not regulated (Gregory et al., 2008; Kampa-Kokesch, 2001; Paige, 2002). The following definition as provided by Kilburg (2000) is comprehensive:
A helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization within a formally defined coaching agreement. (p. 67)

Liljenstrand and Nebecker (2008) conducted a study by asking approximately 9,000 coaches to answer an online survey designed to study and compare experiences, practices, and approaches of coaches. Participants of this study were selected from a variety of international organizations including the American Psychological Association (APA), the Executive Coaching Network, and the International Association of Coaches. The instrument utilized by Liljenstrand and Nebecker (2008) in their study was The Coaching Practices Survey created by Gale et al. (2002). The survey included a total of 120 items that were divided into seven main categories. The main purpose of the study was to “explore how a coachee’s academic background is related to other coaching characteristics and practices” (Liljenstrand & Nebecker, 2008). The surveys were conducted online and measures were taken to protect the participants’ identities and information. Approximately 25% of the responses received were invalid (the authors did not give details as to what made them invalid). Out of the valid responses received (n=2,231), findings were classified into three sections a) the coaches’ personal attributes, b) client acquisition methods and client attributes, and c) service delivery practices.

Participants’ education background was categorized into five main categories: industrial/organizational psychology (I/O), clinical psychology (CPSY), business (BUS), education
(EDU), and other (OTH). Liljenstrand and Nebecker (2008) reported that out of the total participants (n=2,231), the coaching groups based on education were as follows: I/O n= 154, CPSY n=208, BUS n= 551, EDU n= 235, and OTH n=1083.

From the history and evolution of executive coaching, it would be possible to identify a commonality between the fields of psychology and executive coaching. Kampa-Kokesch (2001) had found that some authors look at the relationship between psychology and executive coaching as an attempt by psychology practitioners to infiltrate the workplace with “therapy” after the damaging effects of managed care. While this view may have some merit, it needs to be considered how knowledge of psychology, as well as knowledge from other fields, may impact the effectiveness of executive coaching. The main difference between executive coaching and counseling therapy is defined by Kampa-Kokesch (2001) as the depth in which the issues that arise are discussed and explored.

Wasylyshyn (2003) conducted an outcome study in 2003 where she sent a survey to 106 executives who she had coached between the years of 1985 and 2001. With 87 participants who responded (N=87), she was able to identify the credentials or experience factors that were considered important when hiring an executive coach. In this study, Wasylyshyn (2003) found that the three attributes are considered to be most important when hiring a coach: (a) graduate training in psychology, (b) experience in/understanding of business, and (c) an established reputation as a coach. This study strengthens the idea that the relationship between executive coaches and psychology are positively related. In her study, Wasylyshyn (2003) concluded that there are strong indicators that successful
coaching is a service provided by an individual with a graduate degree in psychology and experience and/or knowledge in business and management.

There are two main strands of executive coaching: internal and external coaching. Internal coaches are those who have experience working within the company where the person needing the coaching is working, while an external coach is one who is hired as an independent consultant. In the study conducted by Wasylyshyn (2003), 100% of the participants indicated that they prefer external executive coaches.

The study, published in 2003, showed results that were based on a very high response rate of 82%, which was attributed to good relationships between the author and the clients she asked to join in the study. In this study there were 87 participants (n = 87), of which 85% were male and 15% were female. The study explored (Wasylyshyn, 2003):

The choice of a coach, executives’ reactions to working with a coach, the pros and cons of both internal and external coaches, the focus of executive coaching engagements, indicators of successful coaching engagements, coaching tools executives favored, and the sustainability of coached executives’ learning and behavior change. (p. 94)

The findings of Stevens (2005) provide some support for this, as well. A common theme that emerged from his study is that the participants favored external coaches more than internal coaches. The executives claimed that external coaches represent a greater potential value to the executive and the organization he or she represents (Stevens, 2005). While the participating executives in Stevens (2005) did not rule out the effectiveness of internal coaches, they specified that internal coaches might be acceptable if the organization is very large. What this seems to imply is that executives may find it
difficult to be coached by someone who they might encounter in their normal work lives. Whether this is because of suspiciousness on their part that they may feel they cannot be honest, or due to other factors can only be speculated on at this point.

One of the chief advantages of using an external executive coach is that people who work with the executive being coached may be hesitant to express their opinion regarding the behavior or negative attributes (Paige, 2002). Also, people being coached may not be worried about feedback that is coming from a person (external to the company), whom they may only see in the role of an executive coach. Figure 2 shows the pros and cons of utilizing an external executive coach, as found by Wasylyshyn in her 2003 study.

100% POSITIVE
- Objectivity
- Confidentiality
- Breadth of experience (other companies)
- Psychological expertise; better trained
- No “political agenda”
- Trust and integrity

76% NEGATIVE
- Insufficient knowledge of the company, its culture, industry, key executives

9% NEGATIVE
- Quick accessibility, availability
- Continuity, sustaining momentum

8% NEGATIVE
- Cost

(Respondents had more than one choice)

Figure 2. Pros and cons of external executive coaches.

There are benefits to the use of internal executive coaches. An internal executive coach has experience and understanding of the culture of an organization (Paige, 2002).
An internal coach has a needed understanding of the expectations and challenges facing the executive as well as other issues that may be facing the executive (Paige, 2002). Internal executive coaches may also be more likely to make suggestions within covert parameters that may exist within the company. Figure 3 shows the pros and cons of utilizing an internal executive coach, as found by Wasylyshyn in her 2003 study.

![Figure 3. Pros and cons of internal executive coaches.](Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive coaching an outcome study. Educational Publishing Foundation and the Society of Consulting Psychology.)

Most executive coaching interventions are targeted at an executive’s influencing skills and change impact (Horner, 2002); however, a study by the Hay group (2002) found that the most commonly referred to areas of change were: (a) interpersonal skills, (b) change management style, and (c) team effectiveness. MakKie (2007) and Feldman (2005) concluded that since executive coaching can have an impact in so many areas of change, it is almost impossible to find a criterion that would fit all types of interventions. This may lead researchers and professionals in the field to think that getting people to agree to a unified or agreed upon definition, attributes, and measures in the area of
executive coaching may be almost impossible to do. Figure 4 shows focus of executive coaching engagements, as found by Wasylyshyn in her 2003 study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Executive Coaching Engagement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Behavior Change</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Stronger Relationships</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Integration</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Respondents had more than one choice)

**Figure 4.** Focus of executive coaching engagements.

**Costs and Benefits of Executive Coaches**

Helen Paige conducted a research study in 2002, where five executives (n=5) employed in the private and public sectors in Australia who had participated in executive coaching engagements (six to twelve months before the study) were interviewed. The data that emerged from the study was evaluated using the “five critical levels of Guskey’s professional development evaluation: participants’ reactions; participants’ learning; organizational support and change; participants’ use of new knowledge and skills; and learning outcomes” (p. 62). The participants in Paige’s study were interviewed twice; once at the beginning of the study and then again one to three weeks later. In the first interviews were conducted by the researcher, she “used questions probes and follow-up
questions to explore the participants’ stories about the content of their coaching experiences, the relationship that developed with their coaches, and to appraise the importance of the coaching on the participants and their work” (p. 63). In the second interviews “specific themes, ideas and concepts arising from the participants’ first interviews were further explored, and the participants’ reactions to events were used as a means of obtaining more in-depth information on matters already discussed” (p. 63). As a result of the analysis of the data used by Paige in her study, three themes emerged:

Theme 1: The context of coaching. “This theme as an umbrella for the following sub-themes: ‘getting started’; familiarity with, and expectations of executive coaching; culture of the organization; the coaches’ familiarity with the organizational culture; and the use of internal or external coaches” (p. 63)

Theme 2: The coaching experience. “The major issues raised in this theme were the focus of the coaching; the coaches’ process, style, skills and technique; timing; and the potential threats or risks of the executive coaching to the respondents” (p.64).

Theme 3: Reflections. “The issues raised in this theme covered the positives and negatives of coaching and some possible effects of the investigation on the participants” (p. 65).

Paige mentions in the introduction of her study that Research has found that the costs and benefits of executive coaching are hard to identify and measure (Paige, 2002) and writes that “Thomas Guskey has been writing for some time about the importance of seeking evidence of effectiveness in professional development programs” (p. 62). However, it is imperative that an attempt is made to identify how to measure the impact of executive coaching in order to analyze whether the cost is worth the investment
Lack of data is a common theme among contributors to the literature (Kampa-Kokesch, 2001; Paige, 2002; Schlosser et al., 2006). There have been some researchers who have published outcomes that executive coaching is an effective practice in the area of learning and development (Fillery-Traves & Lane, 2006; Schlosser et al., 2006; Wasylyshyn, Gronsky & Hass, 2006). These studies reported that there is a benefit to executive coaching that is evident in personal learning and leadership methods. However, there is a need to consider that the attributes that are being looked at as benefits are hard to quantify and difficult to translate to business benefits. Benefits of personal gain, which are hard to interpret as business benefits, make it difficult to figure out whether the costs of executive coaching are worth the investment to organizations (Schlosser et al., 2006).

Clients (i.e. those hiring an executive coach for a member of their organization) tend to consider costs and the impact of an intervention before hiring an executive coach (Schlosser et al., 2006). It is helpful for clients to have a way to measure their investment in terms of dollars. One of the reasons return on investment (ROI) in terms of dollars is hard to achieve is that the rewards of executive coaching tend to be intangible and subjective. The reality is, however, that businesses must benefit from the hiring of an executive coach in order for them to justify hiring one (Levenson, 2009).

When measuring costs and benefits, one must make the time to consider whether the changes (if any) made by the involvement of an executive coach are long-term or short-term changes. Looking at the area of sustainability in executive coaching outcomes, Wasylyshyn (2003) as part of her outcome study asked participants: what makes the difference between a great and mediocre outcome and how effective is coaching really?
Wasylyshyn (2003) found that on a scale from 1-10, more than half of those executives who participated in coaching and in the study rated sustainability levels between 6 and 8 and more than one third reported sustainability levels between 9 and 10. It is important to mention that the coaching done by Wasylyshyn (2003) is described in her study as having established methodology, high credibility, professional integrity, and sufficient emotional competence from sound established working relationships with clients. Other studies of sustainability in learning and behavior changes as a result of executive coaching can be found in Wasylyshyn et al. (2006).

Nieminen, Smerek, Kotrba, and Denison (2013) found, for instance, that executive coaching might increase the self-confidence of executives by providing facilitation strategies that help leaders to interpret and use their received feedback. The authors held a quasi-experiment, following 469 managers from a large government company participating in a 15-month leader development program. The participants were divided into two groups: those who participated in a feedback workshop after the premeasure multisource feedback and those who participated in the same workshop, but also had sessions with an executive coach afterwards. The results indicated that those who participated in sessions with the executive coaches were rated as similar to their colleagues who have not undergone executive coaching by their peers and supervisors; however, it is only those who had gone to executive coaching sessions that self-reported as having improved.

Schlosser et al. (2006) pointed out that there are many studies that relate executive coaching to client satisfaction as well as personal learning. This is important because Schlosser et al. (2006) identifies that even though there is little to no dispute that
executive coaching benefits the individual, it may not always benefit the client.

Wasylyshyn invited 106 executives to participate in her study and with a response rate of 82%, which she attributes to a good relationship with the executives, 87 participants chose to take part (n= 87). The demographics of the study are as follows: male 85%, female 15% (Wasylyshyn, 2003). In this study, executives reported that some of the behaviors executives hope to change through executive coaching are personal behavior change (56%), enhancing leader effectiveness (43%), and fostering stronger relationships (40%) (Wasylyshyn, 2003). Overall, 17% of executives who participated as part of the sample group reported that the focus of their coaching was personal development, while 7% cited that they were looking for better work-family integration as a result of their executive coaching (Wasylyshyn, 2003).

There are three main stakeholder groups in executive coaching: the coach, the manager, and the coachee. In a study conducted by Schlosser, Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Hunt, (2006), participants were divided into three categories: coach, manager, and coachee. In this study, 124 coaches were invited to participate and 60 responded (n=70), 114 managers were invited to participate and 14 responded (n=14), and 130 coachees were invited to participate and 56 responded (n=36). In this study, each group of stakeholders selected different areas they believe to have improved the most as a result of coaching. Coaches selected: Internal customer relationships (51%), employee engagement (49%), promotion/promotability (44%), alignment with business priorities (41%), employee alignment (40%), and productivity (40%). Managers selected: Employee engagement (43%), base of committed followers (36%), promotion/promotability (29%), alignment with business priorities (29%), and employee satisfaction.
Coachees selected: promotion/promotability (50%), employee engagement (41%), productivity (34%), base of committed followers (32%), and employee alignment (32%). From this study it is apparent that each of the three stakeholder groups considered employee engagement and promotion/promotability as important to them. It is important to mention also that business leaders are familiar and comfortable with data analysis and therefore tend to trust data and reports that rely on data. This is imperative to executive coaches who will be perceived as more trustworthy if they find a measurable instrument to present their assessment and goals. It is important to consider that executive coaching is a training tool. In order for change to occur, the coachee has to be willing to make changes and lean from the experience (Kampa-Kokesch, 2001).

Executives may find themselves in a strange position where they may not have anyone in their environment that they feel will be honest with them because of their position within the company (Lukaszewski, 1998). This feeling of isolation and the realization of lack of honest feedback may be one reason why executives may rely on an executive coach. Lukaszewski (1998) identified that one of the greatest challenges facing executives is the inability to find people who will “ask questions, provide advice, and give council.” It was found that most people close to executives were afraid to voice their opinion and provide feedback about the executives’ behavior. This fear of being too honest with an executive for fear of negative retribution or bad perception is one of the reasons executive coaches need to provide feedback to the executive and make them aware of the impact their actions may have on those around them (Witherspoon & White, 1996).
In order to measure the costs and benefits of executive coaching, it should be possible to relate the relationship between coaching outcomes, such as behavior and style changes, to business outcomes (Schlosser et al., 2006). This task is incredibly difficult because of the lack of standards in the field, as explained in the literature. Schlosser et al. (2006) expresses the need for more research on refining the existing methodologies for assessing the value of executive coaching.

There is some evidence in the literature about the effectiveness of executive coaching as it relates to the increased performance of executives (Olivero et al., 1997). However, the practice of executive coaching is viewed as a positive experience by executives, which may lead clients to wonder whether the gains or executive coaching are of greater benefit to the personal attributes of those coached or to the business doing the hiring and incurring the costs.

The Chartered Institute of Personnel Development (CIPD) conducted an independent survey in 2005 on executive coaching and provided a glimpse of how organizations and clients perceive executive coaching and its outcomes. The survey was provided to 29 organizations and there is no evidence in the study as to how many of the 29 participated in the study. The participating organizations “filled a questionnaire designed to gain information about their coaching activities and their views on the effective use of coaching” (p. 7). The study looked at goal attainment, organizational culture, and individual performance. It looked at how these attributes and commonalities could be measurement and evaluated among the firms who participated in the survey (CIPD, 2005). Most of the measurable gains of executive coaching, according to this study, are at the personal level because it is hard to measure organizational gain: “ while
measuring the impact is achievable at the individual level, many organizations are still struggling to gain meaningful data at the organizational level, particularly in determining return on investment” (p. 22). This survey It is also worth considering what impact or possible form of measurement is available for non-business benefits of executive coaching that may be found in skills learned such as time-management and debriefing.

Executive coaching tends to follow a somewhat predictable lifecycle within an organization (Hunt & Weintraub, 2006). Organizations have a tendency to initially become excited about executive coaching and encourage it to spread within the organization. After a while this excitement usually slows down, and eventually it stops (Hunt & Weintraub 2006). These steps are important to understand in order to try to identify the benefits of executive coaching. Hunt and Weintraub (2006) looked at the last two stages by concluding that organizations usually slow down and terminate the use of executive coaching because they fail to see how the coaching is benefiting business goals. The measurement of success of executive coaching as only a function of business goals contradicts the theory of human capital (Davenport, 1999), where employees are considered the number one asset of a company, and as such, investment in those assets translates to gains for the organization.

It is worth mentioning that environment and attitudes will also play a role in the success or failure of executive coaching. Results from the earlier mentioned study conducted by Wasylyshyn (2003), where Wasylyshyn invited 106 executives to participate in her study and with a response rate of 82%, which she attributes to a good relationship with the executives, 87 participants chose to take part (n= 87). The demographics of the study are as follows: male 85%, female 15%. Each participant was
sent a survey and the data gathering phased took place between the years of 1985-2001. Wasylyshyn’s study concluded based on the data gathered from the participants’ surveys that “the most positive coaching outcome begins with executives who are generally motivated to learn and/or change.” This is important to mention because the outcome of coaching is closely related to the attitudes of the organization that is sponsoring the coaching and from the individual being coached. If the executive being coached looks at coaching as a punishment, then the intervention is less likely to succeed (Wasylyshyn, 2003).

Lack of Standards and Commonalities

The body of literature provides some ideas of what executive coaching is, how it is used, and why it is important. There is, however, great concern within the literature regarding the lack of a clear and unbiased definition of an executive coach, lack of standards and practices, and what services are provided by executive coaches (De Haan & Nieb, 2011; Kampa-Kokesch, 2001; Kilburg, 1996; MacKie, 2007). Though executive coaching has grown as an industry, the practice is far from standardized or well-defined (Akrofi et al., 2011). This may cause concern both to companies who want to hire executive coaches and to the coaches themselves. There seems to be no agreement between professionals on what is considered to be good coaching and how good coaching can be measured (MakKie, 2007). Little uniformity in the practice of executive coaching has been observed in the various methods employed by executive coaches. For instance, the assessment tools, scientific or philosophical approaches, activities, goals, and outcome evaluation methods have been noted to differ with executive coaches (Bono,
This opens the doors for the development of an industry that is growing both in number and inconsistencies.

A lack of benchmarking has the potential of creating unrealistic and perhaps even unattainable expectations for those who are going to hire a coach (MakKie, 2007). Lee (2003) suggested that one of the reasons there is such a limited number of outcome studies in the area of executive coaching is that there are so many targets of executive coaching and that researchers are contributing individual case studies and not grouping studies together.

Companies who want to hire executive coaches may have a hard time figuring out what services are provided and how to go through the process of hiring someone who will provide them with a positive return on their investment. Coaches may find that a lack of understanding and standardization of their jobs makes it hard for them to market their services and not get lost in a sea of people offering similar but not well-structured services.

Schlosser et al. (2006) suggested that companies should identify the competencies they want to see developed in their leaders and hire coaches that will work to achieve those competencies. Companies also need to identify competencies that they find important in executive coaches and hire coaches who possess those competencies. Companies hiring executive coaches may not be able to rely on any particular model identified in the literature because they are based on case studies and may not exactly apply to their needs; however, the company doing the hiring can take parts of those models and tailor them to fit their needs (Kampa-Kokesch, 2001).
There are different kinds of coaching activities that fall under the umbrella of executive coaching, and are times named and described interchangeably as executive coaching. Laske (2007) provides definitions for behavioral coaching, cognitive-behavioral coaching, cognitive coaching, social-emotional coaching, and developmental coaching. Understanding the different types of coaching, which also include business coaching, leadership coaching, and executive and performance coaching is important. Here are some of the definitions by Laske (2007) of types of coaching that tend to be included under the umbrella of executive coaching:

- Behavioral coaching: “…confined to applied capability or performance, without access to developmental insight” (p. 204)
- Cognitive-behavioral coaching: “…focusing on behavior using ‘thinking’ tools, without access to developmental insight” (p. 204)
- Cognitive coaching: “Centered on boosting cognitive development and perception and learning, and disregarding social emotional research findings” (p. 204)
- Social-emotional coaching: focused on emotional intelligence excluding developmental insight- much leadership coaching is of this ilk” (p. 204)
- Developmental coaching: “integrating behavioral and developmental research findings and focus on understanding client’s FoR” (p. 204) (FoR is defined as “how the world shows up for’ either coach and/or client, determining what is real.” (p. 203)

The creation of independent executive coaching models and lack of standards within them may cause some frustration to some or all of the stakeholder groups.
identified; however, there are some commonalities found (and agreed upon) in the area of the stages of executive coaching (Kampa-Kokesch, 2001). The identified areas of executive coaching are described by Kampa-Kokesch (2001) as: relationship building, assessment, intervention, follow-up, and evaluation. There is also some common ground in the tools used in the identified and agreed upon stages of executive coaching. One example of this is the use of 360-degree feedback in the assessment stage and leadership style inventories.

Fieldman and Lankau (2005) provided a look at the status and advancement of the literature as it relates to executive coaching. In their study, Fieldman and Lankau (2005) identified feedback as one of the main components of executive coaching. Though coaching often uses 360-degree feedback by direct reports, peers, and supervisors, it is important to look at how feedback affects the outcome of coaching and the importance feedback plays in the coaching process (Levenson, 2009).

The body of literature in the area of executive coaching is growing along with the industry. Though empirical data is lacking in the literature (Paige, 2002), it is possible to find evidence of the fact that executive development is found within a deep and complex structure of variables (Akrofi et al., 2011).

Coaching Competencies and Certifications

The lack of a clear definition of executive coaching has created an environment for many trainers to offer coaching education and certificates, which widely vary in content, duration of training, and cost. Compassion politics published a list (in their blog) of executive coaching programs in the Unites States (compassion politics, 2012). Some of the programs included on the list published by compassion politics are:
• Coach Academy Coach Training Programs
• University of Texas at Dallas Coaching Certification Program
• Coach U
• Columbia University Coaching Certification
• Fielding Graduate University Coaching Certification
• Georgetown University Coaching Certification
• Hudson Institute Coaching Program
• New Ventures West Coaching Program
• Newfield Institute Coach Training
• Coaches Training Institute

Because of the large variety within coaching certifications, compassion politics chose to focus their list of coaching program to those that are most robust, with the hope that their final product would be of programs that provide more for the cost incurred. Executive coaching programs evaluated by compassion politics vary in cost from $4,880 to $16,900 and have an average duration of 10-12 months. Brick and mortar Universities and academies offer executive coaching programs, and some executive coaching programs and certifications are also offered online. It is important to also consider that executive coaching programs are also offered by a variety of Coaching associations and federations (Compassion politics, 2012).

Executive Coaching from the Executive’s Perspective

One of the seminal works on executive coaching is Stevens (2005). In his study, he concentrated on the executives who have undergone executive coaching and their perceptions regarding their experience. Since this study will be based primarily on Stevens’ (2005) previous work, a short exposition on how his study was conducted is warranted.

Stevens (2005) sought to reveal what executive coaching truly is by gathering the perceptions and lived experiences of people who have gone through the process. Stevens (2005) invited seven top management executives from four major business sectors
(industrial manufacturing, financial services, healthcare, and academia) to share their perspectives on executive coaching. Each of them has been engaged in a coaching relationship with an executive coach, three of them with the author of the study (Stevens, 2005). The author interviewed each of them separately in an informal, conversational manner, guided by 11 pre-constructed questions. The executives had all received the questions before their interviews; this was done to allow the executives ample time to reflect on the questions and organize their thoughts (Stevens, 2005). Each interview was audio-recorded with permission from the executives and later transcribed (Stevens, 2005).

Many of the themes that emerged from this study were centered on the common understanding among the executives that executive coaching was not a one-way street. Instead, executive coaching was a relationship between the coach and coachee that sought a mutual goal: namely, a shared interest in the value of the work being done by the executive in his or her organization and the shared desire to help the executive face the many challenges he or she will face more efficiently (Stevens, 2005). This theme can be seen as well in the shared perception of the executives that they should not be forced to engage in coaching, since, they argue, coaching, being not a one-way street, needs the full willingness of the executive to be helped (Stevens, 2005). Without that openness, executive coaching will not be effective (Stevens, 2005).

Stevens (2005) found a common definition shared by the participants of his study for executive coaching: it is a unique helping process where something is done with them instead of to them. In other words, executive coaching is a relationship between a coach and a coachee that is specific to them, based on confidentiality, mutual interest, and
mutual respect (Stevens, 2005). What this means is that the process is not viewed by the executives as another person providing a simple remedy for their perceived shortcomings, but rather, it is a process that coaches and coachees undergo, wherein two persons engage in an (Stevens, 2005):

  Intimate exchange of views and perspectives with a uniquely prepared and professionally-anchored person that aims to strengthen an executive’s ability to think and act in a clear-headed, well-considered way in the service of their organization’s mission and purpose." (p.243)

What is apparent in Stevens (2005) is that executive coaching is not focused on fixing what may be perceived as problems in executives. This highlights the fact that executive coaching is not only employed for underperforming executives. In fact, Stevens (2005) claimed that executive coaching focuses more on helping already successful, healthy individuals more fully meet and carry out their responsibilities as defined by their position and status in an organization.

Stevens (2005) distinguished this definition derived from his participants from coaching sessions that involved executives needing help to resolve personal issues or to modify ingrained behavioral habits and styles that result in sub-optimal performance. In his study, he proposed that “leadership coaching” or “leadership consultation” may better denote what the participants in his study have described as executive coaching, while “developmental coaching” or “performance coaching” may better denote the process where an executive is in need of help to address elements in his or her behavior or personality that limit his or her effectiveness, or an effort to strengthen one’s readiness for an oncoming promotion (Stevens, 2005).
While the findings of Stevens (2005) have been illuminating, more data is needed regarding executive coaching, as the industry has grown much larger since the time of Stevens’s (2005) study. By collecting more perceptions from executives regarding executive coaching, the field can only be helped by understanding more of what executives expect from their coaches. This will be useful as misunderstandings can be more easily avoided or quickly corrected, thus easing the path toward the kind of mutually beneficial relationship Stevens (2005) found to be the cornerstone of executive coaching.

Summary

The current literature in executive coaching has provided a history of the field of executive coaching, which explains the growth of the industry and the importance of executive coaching to stakeholders. Additionally, market trends of executive coaching and how the industry has grown to be significant in terms of the amount of money spent each year by companies purchasing executive coaching services were also examined. It also showed some of the consequences of not having a clear definition and standards for the practice of executive coaching. Lastly, a summary of Stevens (2005) and his study on the perceptions of executives regarding executive coaching has been provided, given that this study has used it as a model.

This review of literature also focused on the lack of empirical research conducted in the area of executive coaching, as well as on the lack of a clear definition of executive coaching, and the differences that have been found in the literature on the expectations regarding the services of executive coaching. By using perceptions of executives from Central Pennsylvania who have undergone coaching, this study will attempt to fill in
some of these gaps. In the next chapter, the methodology used for the study will be
detailed and elaborated.
Chapter 3
Methodology

This chapter focuses on the methodology used to achieve the purpose of the proposed study. This chapter provides a discussion of the problem that was addressed in this study. This chapter also includes a discussion of the study design, the conceptual framework, and the case study protocol. Moreover, this study provides a discussion of the sampling strategy, data collection, and data analysis procedures. The instrument design is also discussed in this chapter. Finally, this chapter provides details on preparing the data for analysis, coding, verifying the quality of the study, triangulation, reliability and dependability, and human subject approval.

The Problem

The literature written on the subject of executive coaching describes an industry that has grown and is continuing to grow dramatically. It is estimated that companies in the United States spend 1 billion US dollars annually on executive coaching services. A common theme in the literature is the lack of information available about coaching effectiveness (Sherman & Freas, 2004). Executive coaching is viewed by different entities within the scope of their perception of the purpose and value of the practice. The purpose of this study was to identify shared perceptions of executive coaching by four executives in Central Pennsylvania in order to gain a deeper understanding of the definition, value, and benefits of executive coaching in the selected geographic region and across the targeted categories of companies chosen for this analysis. Because the executives have previously been involved in executive coaching, their experiences were
used to identify common themes that were generated to address the following research questions posed in this study:

1. What are the attributes of effective executive coaching engagements?
2. What are the critical training areas in order to have effective executive coaching engagements?
3. What are the expectations from executive coaches?
4. What are the advantages of internal and external coaches?
5. What are the disadvantages of internal and external coaches?

Findings from this study assisted in understanding the perceptions of executive coaching across the four cases examined in this research study. The results of this study could help further develop a definition of executive coaching and standards for the practice in the geographic region under investigation and across companies similar to those targeted in this proposed multiple case study. Previous research into executive coaching, most notably by Ely, Boyce, Nelson, Zaccaro, Hernez-Broome, and Whyman (2010), centered on the training of the coach and the interrelationship between the coach and the client. Ely et al. (2010) also examined the impact of coaching on an organizational level and provided a framework to facilitate systematic evaluations during the process; however, the authors focused on advancing coaching evaluation research through a mostly quantitative methodology, whereas this study was interested in generating an in-depth understanding of the experiences and perceptions of the targeted participants. Moreover, this study could provide suggestions for future research into possible standards and guidelines for executive coaching in future studies where the work of Ely et al. (2010) could be expanded and further clarified.
Study Design

The research design of this study replicated a research study conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. The results of Dr. Stevens’ study were published in the 2005 article *Executive Coaching from the Executive's Perspective*. The original study was conducted as individual telephone interviews with seven top management executives. Stevens (2005) utilized a set of 11 questions, which were created ahead of time and provided to the participants previous to the interviews. The questions were as follows:

1. What is your definition of executive coaching?
2. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
3. What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?
4. For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?
5. What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?
6. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?
7. What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?
8. How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?
9. What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?
10. How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?
   In psychology? In human resources? In some other discipline? Why?

11. How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from
   “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization?
   Why?

Stevens (2005) was contacted via email to find out more about his research and
the researcher was able to acquire permission to utilize the same instrument in the present
study. Dr. Stevens was helpful and encouraging in the process of developing the research
design for this study and the development of this paper. His permission to use the same
questions he used for his study has been greatly appreciated and a copy of the email with
his approval is provided in Appendix B.

This study research method was chosen after comparing different methods, as
suggested by Yin (2013) where experiments, surveys, archival analysis, history, and case
study approaches are compared for selection based on form or research questions, control
of behavioral events, and focus on contemporary events (Yin, 2013). This is described in
Table 1.
Table 3.1

Relevant Situations for Different Research Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Form of Research Question</th>
<th>Requires Control of Behavioral Events?</th>
<th>Focuses on Contemporary Events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival</td>
<td>who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Creswell’s (2013) description of a case study was used in the study design. In this study, each participant is considered to be a “case.” Creswell (2013) defined a case study as:

A qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detail, in depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes. The unit of analysis in the case study might be multiple cases (a multisite study) or a single case (a within-site study). (p. 97)

According to Yin (2013), there are five components of research designs that are especially important in case study research:
1. a case study’s questions;
2. its propositions, if any;
3. its unit(s) of analysis;
4. the logic linking the data to the propositions; and
5. the criteria for interpreting the findings. (p. 29).

Though this research study conducted by the author replicated Dr. John H. Stevens’ work, it was very important for the author that all five of Yin’s components of research design that are important for case analysis were met. As suggested by Yin (2013), “to reduce the confusion and ambiguity in defining the unit of analysis or “case”, one recommended practice is to discuss your potential case selection with a colleague” (p. 33) the author consulted with two faculty members who were teaching qualitative courses, in which the author participated during the design phase of this study, regarding the definition and use of individuals as cases.

Yin (2013) emphasizes the importance of defining the “case” to be studied –“a problem that rightfully confronts many researchers at the outset of their case studies” (p. 31) and suggests at least two different steps: defining the case and bounding the case.

Step 1 (defining the case): A clear definition and description of the units of analysis is key to understanding the research and its method of analysis. Yin (2013) mentions that the classic case studies usually focus on an individual person as the case (p. 31), and provides some examples where “an individual person is the case being studies, and the individual is the primary unit of analysis. Information about the relevant individual would be collected, and several such individuals or “cases” might be included in a multiple-case study” (p. 31). Yin (2013) also states “as a general guide, the tentative definition of your case (or the unit of analysis) is related to the way you define your
initial research questions. For this research study, a case is being defined as an individual and four cases (or four individuals) will be studied.

Step 2 (bounding the case): Other clarifications of which individuals are meet the needed requirement of our study become important in order to know who is included in the group and who is excluded (Yin, 2013). Based on the topic and research questions, this study was interested in the perceptions of individuals who have participated in executive coaching and who are or have been employed in the Central Pennsylvania area.

After defining the case and bounding the case, the author concluded a case for this study would be an individual top-level executive, whom is currently working or has worked for a company in the Central Pennsylvania area and whom has participated in executive coaching as the coachee.

It is important for the author to mention Yin’s (2013) point, which relates to the role of the available research literature; that “most researchers will want to compare their findings with previous research. For this reason, the key to definitions used in your study should not be idiosyncratic. Rather, each case study and unit of analysis wither should be similar to those previously studied by others or should innovate in clear, operationally defined ways. In this way, the previous literature also can become a guide for defining the case and unit of analysis. This study replicated a study conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. where the seven units of analysis used were seven individual executives who had participated in executive coaching engagements.

This study follows Creswell’s (2013) definition of a multiple case study, as each individual participant is considered a case. Each independent interview is considered a case, therefore the researcher looked at four individual cases. The study conducted by
Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. used data collected from seven participants. As mentioned in the limitation, this study used data from four participants. This decision was made under advisement due to the time limitations and access to participants. The multiple case study specification for this research study also follows the recommendations of Stake (2013) and Yin (2011) to define and classify the specifications of the individual case and how the cases will be examined on a cross-comparison basis. For the purposes of this study, the dual methodology of within-case analysis and cross-case analysis was an important clarification since the study comprises a sample of four participants from a similar geographic area. Stake (2013) and Yin (2011) stated that the individual cases should initially be assessed separately using a general overview and then coded and analyzed collectively. For the collective analysis, content analysis was utilized following the coding methodology of Krippendorff (2004).

This study was composed of four cases (four participants) and the responses of each participant to the pre-constructed semi-structured interview questions were compared with those of other respondents in order to find commonalities and trends. Creswell’s (2013) definition of collective case study is as follows:

One issue or concern is again selected, but the inquired selects multiple case studies to illustrate the issue. The researcher might select for study several programs from several research sites or multiple programs within a single site. Often the inquirer purposely selects multiple cases to show different perspectives on the issue. (p. 99)

This study also followed Yin’s (2013) case study research definition of a multiple-case study, where “an individual person is the case being studied, and the
individual is the primary unit of analysis. Information about the relevant individual would be collected, and several such individuals or “cases” might be included in a multi-case study” (p. 31). In this study, and as similar to Dr. Stevens’s study, each individual participating in the study was considered to be a case or unit of analysis, and in this particular instance, the four units of cases together are considered to be a multi-case study. Figure 5 shows the multiple-case study procedure described by Yin (2013), which was used in this study.

![Diagram of multiple-case study procedure](image)

**Figure 5.** “Multiple Case Study Procedure.”

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework utilized in this study was the Conceptual Framework for Successful Executive Coaching developed by Baek-Kyoo (Brian) Joo (as shown in Figure 6). This conceptual framework was chosen because it includes the participants, process, proximal outcomes, and distal outcomes. Please refer to Appendix K for Dr. Baek-Kyoo’s consent for the author to use his conceptual framework.
Dr. Baek-Kyoo (2005), developed the conceptual framework for successful executive coaching after identifying that “executive coaching is one of the areas that the practice is way ahead of theory. While executive coaching has become an established practice, however, it is ill-defined” (p. 462). After searching and reviewing 78 articles from academic and practical journals and magazines, Dr. Baek-Kyoo (2005) was able to cluster the literature into different areas: a) type of journal (practice versus academic), b) research methodology (qualitative versus quantitative), c) definition and purpose, d) focus of coaching (coaching versus counseling). His aim was to write and publish an article that “examine the practice of executive coaching, investigating the useful underlying theories by reviewing previous research. It also aims to provide a conceptual framework of executive coaching, integrating the extant literature on executive coaching and related areas such as mentoring, career success, 360-degree feedback, and training and development” (p. 464). Dr. Baek-Kyoo’s (2005) conceptual framework for successful executive coaching was made as the basis for “creating propositions relevant to the following three questions. First, what are the antecedents of positive outcomes in executive coaching? Second, what is the process through which executive coaching leads to positive outcomes? Third, what outcomes might executive caching achieve?” (p. 475).

The introduction of theory to HRD scholars has only been recent (Joo, 2005), and as a result, there are gaps of knowledge: “(a) the lack of explicit philosophical assumptions and frame-work to guide the task of theory building, (b) the absence of well-researched and tested methods of theory building, and (c) the lack of shared and common understanding of the core concepts of theory and theory building in HRD. Executive
coaching is not an exception” (Joo, 2005, p. 475). The conceptual framework for successful executive coaching was designed as an attempt to develop executive coaching theory.

![Diagram of a conceptual framework for successful executive coaching](image)


**Sampling Strategy**

Creswell (2013) suggested that:

Three considerations go into the purposeful sampling approach in qualitative research, and these considerations vary depending on the specific approach. They are decisions as to whom to select as participants (or sites) for the study, the specific type of sampling strategy, and the size of the sample to be studied. (p. 155)

For this study, the participants in the sample, specific type of sampling, and size of the sample are as follows:

**Participants in the sample.** Participants for this study were chosen based on the Typology of Sampling Strategies in Qualitative Inquiry presented by Creswell (2013).
Please see Table 3.2. From the types of sampling provided by Creswell in Table 3.2, criterion and convenience were chosen for this study.

Table 3.2

*Typology of Sampling Strategies in Qualitative Inquiry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum variation</td>
<td>Documents diverse variations of individuals or sites based on specific characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Focuses, reduces, simplifies, and facilitates group interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical case</td>
<td>Permits logical generalization and maximum application of information to other cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory based</td>
<td>Find examples of a theoretical construct and thereby elaborate on and examine it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming and disconfirming cases</td>
<td>Elaborate on initial analysis, seek exceptions, looking for variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowball or chain</td>
<td>Identifies cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme or deviant case</td>
<td>Learn from highly unusual manifestations of the phenomenon of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical case</td>
<td>Highlights what is normal or average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely but not extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically important</td>
<td>Attracts desired attention or avoids attracting undesired attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random purposeful</td>
<td>Adds credibility to sample when potential purposeful sample is too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified purposeful</td>
<td>Illustrates subgroups and facilitates comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>All cases that meet some criterion; useful for quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td>Follow new leads; taking advantage of the unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination or mixed</td>
<td>Triangulation, flexibility; meets multiple interests and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Saves time, money, and effort, but at the expense of information and credibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of selecting criterion as a type of sampling is to find “cases that meet some criterion useful for quality assurance” (Creswell, 2013, p. 158). In this study, the sampling will be chosen from individuals who have had personal experience with executive coaching and hold or have held positions as top level executives such as CEO, president, or controller of an organization.

The purpose of selecting convenience sampling is that it “saves time, money, and effort, but at the expense of information and credibility” (Creswell, 2013, p. 158). In this study, the sampling will be chosen from individuals to whom the researcher has access and who fit the inclusion criteria. Stake (2013) validated the use of the inclusion criteria and convenience sampling methodology as recommended by Creswell (2013) for the application of a multiple case study approach. The use of inclusion criteria can result in the sampling procedure being both a convenience sampling methodology and a purposeful sampling methodology, as the researcher will utilize those individuals that are readily available to gain the benefits of convenience sampling, while at the same time ensuring the inclusion criteria are met.

Types of sampling. There are different levels of samples in qualitative research; the research can find samples at the site level, the event or process level, and at the participant level (Yin, 2011). For this study, a purposeful sampling technique was utilized considering participant level sampling. A purposeful sampling technique was conducted to ensure that participants considered in the study are top-level executives (CEOs,
presidents, or controllers of organizations) who have had experience in the executive coaching arena. The use of purposeful sampling ensures that participants considered in the study are able to share their expertise and experiences in executive coaching.

Moreover, it was ensured that the four participants were from different industries so that a general perception of executive coaching was considered in the study. In the study being replicated, Dr. Stevens chose samples from four major business sectors: industrial manufacturing, financial services, health care, and academia (Stevens, 2005). For this study, the four participants are from academia, manufacturing, the oil industry, and economic development. The types of sampling chosen were criterion and purposeful. These two types of sampling were chosen to ensure that the participants were executives from different industries who have had experience with executive coaching and who are also individuals to whom the researcher has access.

Sample size. Sample size is an important factor when conducting qualitative multiple case studies (Stake, 2013; Yin, 2011). In quantitative studies, the sample size depends on the statistical analysis that will be conducted; however, in qualitative studies, specifically in a multiple case study, Yin (2011) recommended that sample size be sufficient to ensure saturation, but not so large as to generate confusion among the cases. Yin (2013) suggests that a small sample size is preferred in case study, as the researcher is looking for comprehensive descriptive information. For this study, four participants were selected. The depth of the semi-structured, in-person interview allowed for sufficient data to be gathered.

Creswell (2013), suggest that a typical range for qualitative studies is a sample size of 5-25. As mentioned in the limitations of this study, the number of participants for
this study was chosen in consultation and considered the limited time and limited access to participants that the author had.

**Criteria for Acceptability**

For this study, participants needed to meet three criteria for acceptability: have current or past experience as an executive in an organization, have had experience working with an executive coach, was employed and had experience with an executive coach while working in the Central Pennsylvania area.

**Case Study Protocol**

The case study protocol for this study can be found in Appendix A and was generated based on Yin’s (2013) recommendations. Yin (2013) noted “having a case study protocol is desirable under all circumstances, but it is essential if you are doing a multiple-case study” (p. 84). A case study protocol is similar to a questionnaire only in the fact that they are both directed to a single data point (Yin, 2013). According to Yin (2013), there are four main sections in a case study protocol:

1. An overview of the case study (objectives and auspices, case study issues, and relevant readings about the topic being investigated).
2. Data collection procedures (procedures for protecting human subjects, identification of likely sources of data, presentation of credentials of field contacts, and other logistical reminders).
3. Data collection questions (the specific questions that the case study researcher must keep in mind in collecting data and the potential sources of evidence for addressing each question).
4. A guide for the case study report (outline, format for the data, use and presentation, of the documentation, and bibliographical information). (pp. 85-86)

Data Collection

Creswell (2013) presented four data collection approaches for qualitative research: 1) observation, 2) interviews, 3) documents, and 4) audiovisual materials. Since this study is a replication of Stevens (2005), this study also used in-depth interviews as the data collection approach. Creswell (2013) mentions that a “hallmark of a good qualitative case study is that it presents an in-depth understanding of the case” (p. 98). In this case, personal interviews were conducted and participants were provided the transcripts of the interviews to allow them to change or add any other information they felt was important for the researcher to know for the data analyses. Participants were observed during the interviews and the researcher made sure that each participant had access to her for any changes or additions they wanted to make to their contribution to this research.

Participants were purposefully selected through identifying top executives involved in the industries considered in this study. A formal invitation letter or email was sent to top executives from the respective industries to which the researcher had access. The formal invitation letters and emails included a brief background of the study, the purpose of the study, as well as the role of the participants in the study. An informed consent form was also included in the formal invitation letter or taken to the interview for those participants who chose responded to emails. Prospective participants were asked to sign the informed consent form if they agree to participate in the study. Only participants who agreed to participate in the study were scheduled for interviews.
Semi-structured questions were administered in one-on-one interviews with four top executive participants. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to ensure that the interview sessions were guided to address the research questions posed in this study. One-on-one interviews are more time consuming and require travel time; however, the benefit of seeing the interviewee first hand provided the researcher with the opportunity to observe each participant and to pick up on body language and other non-verbal communications that may have been provided by the interview. The in-person interview methodology also allowed the researcher to ensure that the participants provided sufficient depth in their answers. Stake (2013) and Yin (2011) noted that telephone interviews might not provide the same level of contact that can be necessary to obtain qualitative data that will ensure saturation.

An interview protocol was used to aid in the process of the interviews. The interviewer used semi-structured interviews for this research to allow participants to share what they think is important to the research. The interview protocol was used as a guide. Appendix A contains a copy of the interview protocol used.

Semi-structured interviews that were audio-recorded (with permission of the participants) were transcribed and used, as recommended by Yin (2011). The data collection process was divided into five stages: (a) Human subject protection needed to be obtained. The process was begun as soon as possible after receiving approval from the researcher’s committee and was done through the Pennsylvania State University’s website; (b) Participants were identified and contacted through mail and or email to invite them to participate in this study. Communication explained the study and invited the recipient to participate by replying with a date and time that would be good for them to
schedule a meeting for the interview; (c) Reply emails from those participants who responded to the first email were answered in a timely manner to create a list of participants and schedule of interviews. For those who did not reply, a second email was sent two weeks after the first contact was made, which again invited them to participate in the study; (d) A final count of participants was created and a schedule of interviews was printed and confirmed with each participant through an email as a reminder one week prior to the scheduled interview. At this time, participants were provided with the interview questions; (e) Interviews were conducted with each participant using the interview protocol. Each participant was asked if they would give permission for the interviewer to record the session; (f) Recordings were transcribed; (g) Each participant was given the transcript of their interview and asked to review it and make any additions or changes they felt were necessary to fully understand their views and perceptions; (h) Participants returned their transcripts after any changes were made; (i) approved transcripts along with directions for analysis and forms for writing the analysis were provided to each coder; (j) data analysis was done by the researcher based on the transcript and themes analysis done and returned by all three coders.

The following figure depicts the Data Collection Circle (Creswell, 2013), which includes seven data collection activities that are interconnected and designed to assist in gathering good quality information for the purpose of answering a set of research questions. The Data Collection Circle began with locating individuals who were willing and able to participate in the study. Each of the phases was considered in preparation for the data collection of this study.
Figure 7. Data collection activities.

The following table shows the schedule made to achieve the five steps of the data collection process. The schedule was created to aid the researcher with time management and the scheduling of interviews.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule for Completing Each Step of the Research Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human subject protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify possible participants and send initial email inviting individuals to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply to each individual who agreed to participate and make contact again with those who did not respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create final count of participants and contact them to remind them of their scheduled interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher hired a professional transcriptionist to encode the recordings of each interview and the output was provided to the researcher in both electronic and
An analysis of the answers was conducted through comparing the answers of each question to find commonalities and trends. The following table was created to aid the researcher with time management and task identification.

Table 3.4

*Relationships of Interview Questions to Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encoding of interview recordings</td>
<td>November, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing of answers provided by interviewees.</td>
<td>November, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize findings</td>
<td>November and December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write draft</td>
<td>December, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide draft to Committee Chari (Dr. Rothwell)</td>
<td>January, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrite</td>
<td>As many times as needed!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument Design

Stevens (2005) used 11 questions to interview his participants. The 11 questions can be found in Appendix C and are as follows:

1. What is your definition of executive coaching?
2. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
3. What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?
4. For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?
5. What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?
6. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?
7. What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?

8. How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?

9. What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?

10. How important (or relevant) is it that an executive coach be trained in business? In psychology? In human resources? In some other discipline? Why?

11. How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?

It is important to mention how each of the questions used in this study links to the study’s research questions. Table 5 shows each research question and provides the interview questions that link with each research question.

Table 3.5

*The Link Between Research Questions and Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have?</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have?</td>
<td>Q3, Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coach is used?</td>
<td>Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what areas should an executive be trained in order to be effective?</td>
<td>Q2, Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches?</td>
<td>Q1, Q11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

The data analysis of a small sample multiple case study is one of the most important aspects since aggregation of the themes that arise from the cross-comparison are limited by the number of codes generated from the few participants (Stake, 2013). There are numerous approaches that can be applied to case study research designs and Table 3.6 presents data analysis strategies advocated by three authors: Madison, Huberman, & Miles (1994) and Wolcott (1994). For this study, the author chose to follow Wolcott’s (1994) strategy of highlighting certain information in the description, identifying patterned regularities, conceptualizing the framework from literature, and displaying findings in tables, charts, diagrams, and figures; compare cases; compare with a standard case. This approach was augmented by the incorporation of content analysis coding methods suggested by Krippendorff (2013).

Table 3.6

*General Data Analysis Strategies Advanced by Select Authors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sketching ideas</td>
<td>Write margin notes in field notes</td>
<td>Highlight certain information in description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes</td>
<td>Write reflective passages in notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing field notes</td>
<td>Draft summary sheet on field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with words</td>
<td>Make metaphors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying codes</td>
<td>Do abstract coding or concrete coding</td>
<td>Write codes, memos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing codes to themes</td>
<td>Identify salient themes or patterns</td>
<td>Note patterns and themes</td>
<td>Identify patterned regularities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting frequency of codes</td>
<td>Count frequency of codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating categories</td>
<td>Factor, note relations among variables, build a logical chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relating categories to analytic framework in literature
Contextualize with the framework from literature

Creating a point of view
For scenes, audience, readers

Displaying the data
Create a graph or picture of the framework
Make contrasts and comparisons
Display findings in tables, charts, diagrams, and figures; compare cases; compare with standard case

Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Analysis and Representation</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Phenomenology</th>
<th>Grounded Theory Study</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Organization</td>
<td>• Create and organize files for data</td>
<td>• Create and organize files for data</td>
<td>• Create and organize files for data</td>
<td>• Create and organize files for data</td>
<td>• Create and organize files for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, memoing</td>
<td>• Read through text, make margin notes, from initial codes</td>
<td>• Read through text, make margin notes, from initial codes</td>
<td>• Read through text, make margin notes, form initial codes</td>
<td>• Read through text, make margin notes form initial codes</td>
<td>• Read through text, make margin notes form initial codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing the data</td>
<td>• Describe the story or objective set of experiences and place it in a</td>
<td>• Describe personal experiences through epoch</td>
<td>• Describe open coding categories</td>
<td>• Describe the social setting, actors, events; draw picture of</td>
<td>• Describe the case and its context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classifying the data into codes and themes
- Identify stories
- Locate epiphanies
- Develop significant statements
- Group statements into meaning units
- Select one open coding category for central phenomenon in process
- Engage in axial coding—casual condition, context, intervening conditions, strategies, consequences
- Analyze data for themes and patterned regularities
- Use categorical aggregation to establish themes or patterns

### Interpreting the data
- Interpret the larger meaning of the story
- Develop a textual description, “what happened”
- Develop a structural description, “how” the phenomenon was experienced
- Engage in selective coding and interrelate the categories to develop a “story” or propositions
- Interpret and make sense of the findings—how the culture “works”
- Use direct interpretation
- Develop naturalistic generalizations of what was “learned”

### Representing, visualizing the data
- Present narration focusing on processes, theories, and unique and general features of the life
- Present narration of the “essence” of the experience, in the tables, figures, or discussion
- Present a visual model or theory
- Present propositions
- Present narrative presentation augmented by tables, figures, and sketches
- Present in-depth picture of the case (or cases) using narrative, tables, and figures

---


**Preparing for data analysis.** First, recorded interviews were transcribed into field notes. The recording of each interview was sent to a transcriptionist who verified the information and provided each transcript as a word document. Each transcript was cleaned to make sure that no personal information or any information that could be used to derive to the identity of the participant was present. The cleaned transcripts are available in Appendix E.

**Case study coding.** It is imperative in multiple-case studies to become familiar with each individual case separately (Yin, 2011). This provides the researcher with knowledge of each individual case as its own entity so that patterns can be identified. Themes were developed based on the results of the within-case and cross-case analysis and the preponderance of individual codes (Krippendorff, 2013). There were two coding structures used in this study. The first was from Creswell (2013), which involved...
“aggregating the text or visual data into small categories of information, seeking evidence for the code from the different databases being used in a study, and then assigning a label to the code” (p.184). The within-case analysis coding was generated through the counting of frequencies of the number of times a particular code was used by each participant. In the data analysis for this study, if a comment was repeated between two or more of the coders, it was highlighted and only codes that were present by two or all three of the coders were used. Creswell (2013) recommended generating a given code and then counting the number of times it appears in response to the interview questions. The benefit of this coding scheme is that it provides each participant with an opportunity to generate depth in each response; however, a detriment is that it weighs more talkative individuals’ perceptions more heavily when comparing the within-case analysis results. To mitigate this factor, the researcher ensured that each participant gave approximately the same length of answers to each question, which ensured as equal treatment as possible. This approach did not result in perfectly equal treatment, so to bolster the analytic results, the Krippendorff (2013) content analysis method was used to augment the findings during the cross-case analysis approach.

For the cross-case analysis, the coding structure requires that a preponderance of codes result in the generation of a theme. As opposed to the within-case analysis, where themes are generated from a frequency count of each code, the cross-case analysis themes are generated from a preponderance of codes across each participant. Krippendorff (2013) noted that in multiple case studies, content analysis views each case as one participant and thus attributes one code to each participant. For small sample size studies, judgment has to be used to determine what constitutes a theme. In the data analysis for
this study, themes were identified when their presence were found in more than two of the case studies. So, if only one, or two participant mentioned something (even though all three coders identified it in the in case analysis), it would not be included as a theme, but if three or four case studies mentioned a code, it would be identified as a theme.

The extremes are the easiest, since no mentions of a given code or a code mentioned by 50% of the participants equates to no theme or a theme including those codes, respectively. In this study, when three or four participants mentioned a code, it was included in the theme (Krippendorff, 2013). The judgment was required in instances where all participants mentioned different codes (so the highest number of codes within a given theme was one) or where only two participants agreed on a given code. In the former case, where no agreement was generated, it was determined that no theme should result. This method allows no individual code to dominate another code, where each was only mentioned once. The case of two participants agreeing on at least one code resulted in the generation of a theme based on those two codes only in the case where no contrary codes existed in the data (Krippendorff, 2013). If a contrary code was present, no theme was generated. Usually, when a preponderance of codes is present, a theme is generated; however, in this case, since an outlier to the theme would constitute 50% of the frequency count of the code, it is not appropriate to generate a theme. There were three coders in the data analysis of this study. Themes identified by at least two coders were highlighted and used as a theme for the study.

**Second and third coders.** A second coder was used for this study. Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. who wrote the original article *Executive Coaching From the Executive’s Perspective*, which inspired this research, gracefully accepted an invitation to
participate as a second coder. The researcher is very grateful to him for his help and
guidance throughout the data analysis process. Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. is president and
managing partner of Kinckerbocker and Stevens, Inc., a Sudbury, Massachusetts-based
consulting psychology firm. Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. was given a copy of the cleaned
transcripts (transcripts that were cleaned of any personal information of the participants)
along with the guidelines set forth in this chapter. Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. followed the
coding strategy (as described in this chapter) and constructed a Transcript Analysis
Summary (Appendix H) and Themes from Transcripts document (Appendix G). Both
documents were provided to the researcher by Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and utilized in the
data analysis that is explained in Chapter 4.

A third coder was also utilized in the data analysis of this study. Dr. Michele L.
Newhard, Ph.D. graciously agreed to be a third coder. Dr Newhard earned her Ph.D. from
Pennsylvania State University in Workforce Education and Development. Dr. Newhard
successfully defended her dissertation titled “An Exploratory Study of Competencies of
Appreciative Inquiry Practitioners: Discovery” in May 2010, and earned above average
general scholarly attainment at oral defense. She is currently employed by The
Pennsylvania State University, where she works as a Training and
Development Manager.

Each of the three coders, created a transcript analysis summary. The transcript
analysis summaries (available in Appendixes M) were created by each coder by filling in
a transcript analysis form. These forms were utilized to create comparable documents
between the coders. The forms contained each question asked in the interviews as
directed in the interview protocol. Under each question, the transcript analysis form had
a place for the coder to add the codes based on their analysis of each transcript (T-1, T-2, T-3, T-4). Each coder used their transcript analysis forms to create Themes from Transcripts forms (available in appendixes F, G and L). Each coder created used the coding structure based on Krippendorff’s methodology as described above and provided to each coder when the project was explained and their participation requested.

The researcher used the Themes form Transcripts forms provided by all three coders to answer the research questions. Themes provided by all three coders were included in the answers, themes provided by two coders were also included in the answers, and any themes that were provided by only one coder were excluded from the answers.

Verifying the quality of the study. Creswell (2013) suggested utilizing a checklist of 20 criteria for the composition of a good case study, which was composed by Stake (1995). These have been studied and taken into account in this study:

1. Is the report easy to understand?
2. Does it fit together, each sentence contributing to the whole?
3. Does the report have a conceptual structure (i.e., themes or issues)?
4. Are its issues developed in a serious and scholarly way?
5. Is the case adequately defined?
6. Is there a sense of story to the presentation?
7. Is the reader provided with some vicarious experience?
8. Have quotations been used effectively?
9. Are headings, figures, artifacts, appendices, and indexes used effectively?
10. Was it edited well, then again with a last-minute polish?
11. Has the writer made sound assertions, neither over- nor under-interpreting?
12. Has adequate attention been paid to various contexts?
13. Were sufficient raw data presented?
14. Were data sources well-chosen and in sufficient number?
15. So observations and interpretations appear to have been triangulated?
16. Is the role and point of view of the researcher nicely apparent?
17. Is the nature of the intended audience apparent?
18. Is empathy shown for all sides?
19. Are personal interactions examined?
20. Does it appear that individuals were put at risk? (p. 264).

Reliability and dependability. Reliability is an important part of good quality research. Reliability is defined by Yin (2013) as “the consistent and repeatability of the research procedures used in a case study” (Yin, 2013, p. 240). The importance of reliability is being able to acquire the same results if a study is replicated and the same procedure is utilized. For this study, comparing the results of this study with those of Dr. John H. Stevens’ (2005) study can be used to test reliability; however, it is important to mention that because this study and Dr. Stevens’ study are qualitative in nature, the results may not be generalized. Quantitative studies are used to gain understanding of feelings, thoughts, and perceptions and tend to provide a deeper level of details and in depth information.

Creswell (2013) focuses on eight strategies to enhance the validity of qualitative findings: 1) prolonged engagement and persistent observation. Triangulation of data by looking at the data and using it to create themes; 2) peer review or debriefing. Use
member checking to determine the accuracy of the qualitative findings, this can be achieved by asking a qualified individual to read the findings or themes and provide feedback on content and accuracy; 3) rich, thick description. Provide details and create depth. Use rich, detailed descriptions to convey findings in order to give the readers an element of shared experiences; 4) clarifying research bias by providing the reader with knowledge of any bias that the researcher may have; 5) provide both positive and negative information that is found in the research, even if it is contrary to the themes; 6) spend an enough time in the targeted field so that the researcher is able to pick up on the normal environment; 7) use peer debriefing to improve the accuracy of the account; and 8) external auditor. Have an external auditor or consultant review the findings and process. (pp. 250-253).

Using an interview protocol increases the dependability of a study by decreasing interviewer bias and interpretation. In this case, the interview protocol was prepared (Appendix A) and was shared with Dr. Stevens’ prior to conducting the interviews and the same protocol was used for all the individual interviews.

The researcher as well as a second and third coder analyzed the case study transcripts in this study, in order to make sure that the key elements of the case studies were not being affected by a coder’s bias. Themes were created using a strict methodology where only themes that were found by more than one of the coders were identified as themes for the study, again to make sure that bias was reduced.

Human subject approval. The research conducted for this study was subject to review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Penn State University. The pre-constructed questions used in this study were submitted to the IRB for review (after the
author passed her comprehensive examination), and the interviews with the participants were then scheduled. (Please see Appendix J for IRB approval).

Every possible effort was made by the researcher to protect the identities of the participants and only the researcher and transcriptionist had access to the personal and company information provided in the interviews. The research took the step of using a professional transcriptionist to ensure that she would not share the information being transcribed. Clean manuscripts (transcriptions of interviews where all personal and company information have been blacked out) are provided in Appendix D.

**Researcher’s Expectations**

Throughout the process of choosing a topic for this paper, the research did a lot of reading of the current literature on executive coaching. Throughout the research process, she also had the opportunity to gain insight form two main groups: 1) professors whom provided guidance, and 2) executives who provided content. Before the data compiled in the interviews was analyzed, the researcher had the following expectations as they relate to the chosen research questions:

**RQ1.** What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have?

*Researcher’s expectation.* Some of the attributes that will be identified by interviewees are: trust, openness, and willingness to work through the process. While looking for a topic, the researcher found that her relationship with her advisor was based on trust, openness, and the willingness to work through the process as advised. The fact that all these attributes were present in the relationship with her advisor, and that she found these attributes to be key to her advancement in the program, it made her realize that like an executive coach, her advisor had knowledge that she did not possess. Trust is
important because if there is no trust, one will hold back and the learning process or conflict resolution process will be hindered. Openness is in itself based on trust. If a coachee is not open about the issues and feelings at hand, progress may be hindered as well. Along with openness comes the concept and expectation of privacy. If a coachee does not feel that the information shared in the coaching relationship will be kept private, he/she may not be open to sharing the issues and feelings at hand. Willingness to work through the process is very important because the coaching process may take some time and evidence of success may not be present in the short term. Terminating a coaching arrangement early may not yield the expected or desired results.

**RQ2.** What are the critical training areas in order to have effective executive coaching engagements?

*Researcher’s expectation.* Critical training areas that need to be possessed by a successful executive coach will be identified as Business training and Psychology training. The researcher believes that based on the literature, it is critical for coaches to have an understanding of business in order to relate to the work that is done by the coachee. This knowledge will also create trust between the coach and the coachee because the latter will have the idea that the coach knows about the environment of business and therefore can relate to the experiences he/she is going through. Psychology training is important because (like in counseling) this training may allow the coach to guide the coachee to the covert root of an issue and provide assistance in behavior change or avoidance.
RQ3. What are the expectations from executive coaches?

*Researcher’s expectations.* The researcher believes that those being coached expect that those providing coaching will have knowledge of how to guide them through a problem or issue they are experiencing or provide them with skills that will allow them to grow in their careers and personal lives.

RQ4. What are the advantages of internal and external coaches?

*Researcher’s expectations.* Some of the advantages of internal coaches are that they have firsthand knowledge of the organization’s culture and knowledge of the job requirements and expectations that the coachee is evaluated on. Knowledge of the organization’s culture is advantageous because the coach is therefore able to make suggestions that are within the boundaries and norms of the organization. Knowledge of the job conducted by the coachee is important because this knowledge may place the coach in a position to assist (or mentor) the coachee in the tasks required for him/her to succeed in the job for which he/she was hired.

Some of the advantages of external coaches as expected to be found by the researcher in the process of writing this paper are that external coaches are far removed from the organization and therefore may be less bias to follow the path desired by the organization. While and internal coach may have loyalty to the people who pay his/her salary, an external coach is there to do a job and should not experience an agency problem, where he/she is conflicted between doing what is best for the client or what is best for the organization because of their own self-interest. Secondly, an external executive coach may be more likely to be viewed as impartial and trustworthy. This may lead coachees to be more open because they may feel that the coach has their interest in
mind and not an agenda form the organization, which may lead to trust in the coach and the coaching relationship.

**R Q5.** What are the disadvantages of internal and external coaches?

*Researcher’s expectations.* Some of the disadvantages of internal executive coaches are that they may have a bias towards the desires of the organization and not necessarily the best interest of the coachee. Secondly, internal coaches may be more likely to report what was said in the coaching engagement to those in the organization who he/she reports to or whom may have been named within the coaching engagement. The possibility that confidentiality may not exist within an internal coaching relationship may in turn hinder the development of trust and positive outcomes form the coaching experience.

Some of the disadvantages of external coaches are their lack of understanding of the culture and norms present in a specific organization and the lack of knowledge he/she may have of a specific job that is being conducted by a coachee in a specific industry.

**Summary**

This study used a multiple case study research design to examine executive coaching across four companies in PA. The companies were chosen by a purposeful sampling method using a convenience approach to gathering the data. Specific companies were selected to represent different industries and the individual participants were chosen based on whom the researcher had access to. Creswell’s (2013) coding methodologies provided the general outline for the analytic method and were augmented by the inclusion of Krippendorff’s (2013) content analysis for cross-case analysis. Figure 8 provides a flow chart for the logistics of the study.
Figure 8. Flow chart of the study.

The results of the study are discussed in Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 concludes the study with a discussion of the findings with respect to the relevant research on the subject.
Chapter 4

Data Analysis

This chapter consists of five sections. Sections One, Section Two, Section Three, and Section Four are the within-case analysis for each of the executives interviewed. The information for Section One comes from the first case study or first transcript (T1). This section contains the within-case analysis for T1 and it addresses the selection and background of the executive interviewed as well as how the information relates to each of the five research questions of interest in this research. The information for Section Two comes from the second case study or second transcript (T2). This section contains the within-case analysis for T2 and it addresses the selection and background of the executive interviewed as well as how the information relates to each of the five research questions of interest in this research. The information for Section Three comes from the third case study or third transcript (T3). This section contains case content and within-case analysis for T3 and it addresses the selection and background of the executive interviewed as well as how the information relates to each of the five research questions of interest in this research. The information for Section Four comes from the fourth case study or fourth transcript (T4). This section contains case content and within-case analysis for T4 and it addresses the selection and background of the executive interviewed as well as how the information relates to each of the five research questions of interest in this research. Section Five contains the cross-case analysis, which identifies common themes across the four individual cases as analyzed by both the primary coder.
(the researcher) and secondary coder of the data Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard.

The transcript analyses summaries created by the researcher, Dr. Stevens, and Dr. Newhard were used in the first four sections. Please refer to Appendix I for a copy of the transcript analyses summary conducted by the researcher, Appendix H for a copy of the transcript analysis summary conducted by the Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and Appendix M for the transcript analysis summary conducted by Dr. Michele Newhard. Chapter 5 was created based on the themes identified in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher, by Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and Dr. Michele Newhard. Please refer to Appendix F for a copy of the themes identified by the researcher and to Appendix G for the themes from transcripts identified by Dr. John H. Stevens Jr., and Appendix L for the themes from transcripts identified by Dr. Michele Newhard.

There are 11 questions that each person was asked (the interview questions). Each of the 11 interview questions is connected to the 5 research questions, Research Question 1 is answered through interview questions 3, 4, and 5. Research Question 2 is answered through Interview Questions 3 and 4. Research Question 3 is answered through Interview Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9. Research Question 4 is answered through Interview Questions 2, 10. Research Question 5 is answered through Interview Questions 1, 11.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have?</td>
<td>Q3, Q4, Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have?</td>
<td>Q3, Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there confidentiality expectations when</td>
<td>Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an executive coach is used? 
In what areas should an executive be trained in order to be effective? 
Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? 

Q2, Q10  
Q1, Q11

Case Study 1

Within-case analysis. Selection and background of the interview subject.

A face-to-face interview was conducted in early December 2013, with a corporate controller of financial reporting who works for a manufacturing company. This senior manager is next in line as a vice president in the current company of employment. This for-profit company has employed the executive for approximately fourteen years.

The manufacturing company for which the executive works is located in the outskirts of Harrisburg Pennsylvania. This company employs approximately 150 workers in its manufacturing facility and 450 workers in its management, sales, and IT departments in its US facility. The manufacturing process is highly automated. One of the interesting components of this company is that it has very high employee retention. Most of the management team has been employed by this company for a minimum of ten years and the President of the company is very involved in employee retention efforts. The author is familiar with this company because she has connections within the company and has had the opportunity to interview two other employees for other research projects. One of the things that was made very clear by all three employees form this company, who have been interviewed by the author, is the importance the company places on developing employees’ skills and employee retention.

On a visit and tour of the company, the author was able to see firsthand the importance placed on employee satisfaction. The president of the company is very
concerned about his employees’ health and has implemented efforts to help employees in this area. For example, a quit smoking campaign that both paid for employees and spouses’ non-smoking efforts and rewarded the employees who stopped smoking with cash and other prizes was implemented two years ago. The company also assists employees with health eating; the food in the cafeteria is both heavily subsidized and freshly prepared by a professional chef. Employees who wish to further their education are encouraged to do so and the company pays for a majority of the employees’ tuition. The heavy emphasis placed by this company on employee development and retention, is the main reason an employee from this company was asked to participate.

The executive, who was interviewed for this case study, was involved in executive coaching with an external coach. The coaching was part of a mandated effort from the president of the company, who was made aware of issues between the participant and another member of the executive team. Both individuals where asked to participate in executive coaching on a one-on-one format with an outside coach, who was hired to assist with the situation. The participant went through the coaching process individually, but only the interviewee completed the coaching engagement.

Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the first case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to answer Research Question 1 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was used because it looks at the “ingredients” that executives consider important in a successful executive coaching engagement.
this question, executives identify attributes they relate to effective executive coaching engagements. In Question 4, executives were asked to identify the most useful (or valuable) things they experienced from executive coaching engagements. Answers to this question provide attributes of effective executive coaching engagements. Question 5 centers on pitfalls of executive coaching focusing on what executives may have experienced as negative or drawbacks to executive coaching. This also helped gain a better understanding of the positive attributes by working as a check of balance with the previous two questions.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF) and Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 1 (T1) Research Question 1.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>…comfortable with the person (i.e., the coach); …trust…would be the first and foremost the biggest one; …does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are (i.e., does the coach understand me and the situation/context/demands that I have to contend with…?)</td>
<td>…you have to be comfortable with the person…because without trust, you are not going to be as open…does the coach connect with you… do they get what the potential issues at hand are?</td>
<td>…you have to be comfortable with the person that is the -- coaching you because without that trust, you’re not going to be as engaged… does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are that you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>…most valuable was just to be more introspective of myself…looking at possibly my flaws in a different way, things that perhaps I just need to improve upon; …looking at perhaps that maybe I’m not the only issue with whatever dynamic you’re looking at. (… that I alone may not be the ‘problem”; other people/factors contribute to the issues for which ‘a coach for</td>
<td>…be more introspective of myself… looking at possibly my flaws in a different way…</td>
<td>…be more introspective of myself, looking at possibly my flaws in a different way… gave me some insight [to reframe]…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5- What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?

- the amount of time;
- the commitment and the schedule to meet;
- trusting of the executive coach;
- trust and really connecting with what that person is telling you;
- it's up to you to change; until you commit to it and make the change yourself, the results won't change.

Based on the first interview, the executive believes that there has to be a sense of comfort with the executive coach. By feeling comfortable with the executive coach, the interviewee was able to develop a relationship that was based on trust. This allowed the executive to share both the situation and feelings that were felt as a result of the issue at hand and it allowed the executive to connect with the coach. Another important issue that was brought up during the first interview, is that effective executive coaches must also possess an understanding of the issue(s) at hand and have the tools to help.

An effective executive coaching engagement is able to guide the executive through a path of self-development, found in being able to look at one’s faults in a different way and gaining insight to different ways to handle situations. It is also important for people to look at the situation as a system and understand their role within that system; perhaps one is not the problem, but part of the solution.

It is important for the success of the engagement, for executives to understand the time commitment involved in a successful executive coaching engagement. Limited participation as well as the inability to think that one may need to change (in mentality and behavior) may limit the success of an executive coaching relationship. Not trusting an executive coach was also mentioned as having negative effects on the executive coaching relationship and its outcome.
Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the first case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, and 4 were used to answer Research Question 2 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section came from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens Jr., and third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was chosen because it looks at 2-3 “ingredients” that executives might consider important for successful executive coaching engagements. This question opened the way for executives to share attributes that they considered to have been causes of dislike or stress in their executive coaching experience(s). Question 4 asks for what executives consider to be the most useful or valuable things about their executive coaching experience. This question was utilized to answer research Question 2, because many times negative experiences allow people to know what they don’t want and therefore to identify what they do want or consider to be important.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to transcript one (T1) research question two.
Table 4.3

Research Question 2 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>…comfortable with the person (i.e., the coach); …trust…would be the first and foremost the biggest one; …does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are (i.e., does the coach understand me and the situation/context/demands that I have to contend with…?)</td>
<td>…you have to be comfortable with the person…because without trust, you are not going to be as open…does the coach connect with you… do they get what the potential issues at hand are?</td>
<td>…you have to be comfortable with the person that is the -- coaching you because without that trust, you're not going to be as open, you're not going to be as engaged… does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are that you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>…most valuable was just to be more introspective of myself…looking at possibly my flaws in a different way, things that perhaps I just need to improve upon; …looking at perhaps that maybe I'm not the only issue with whatever dynamic you're looking at. (… that I alone may not be the ‘problem’; other people/factors contribute to the issues for which ‘a coach for me’ was prescribed …?)</td>
<td>…be more introspective of myself… looking at possibly my flaws in a different way…</td>
<td>…be more introspective of myself, looking at possibly my flaws in a different way… gave me some insight [to reframe]…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive coaching engagements where the coach is not able to understand the situation at hand or potential issues would be considered to be ineffective. This is largely because when an executive who is being coached does not feel that the executive coach understands why he is there, or what is expected of him/her, then the executive is less likely to trust both the coach and the process.

Another attribute that may be present in ineffective executive coaching engagements is if a coach fails to show the executive what his/her role is within both the organization and the issues at hand. It is possible that the executive coach centers the issue on what others are doing and fails to see what and how the behavior of the executive being coached have in the situation. Building on the above, the executive
comments that in order to have a successful executive coaching engagement; the executive must feel comfortable and connect with the executive coach and develop a relationship based on trust. If these attributes are not present, the executive would not feel comfortable to share his/her thoughts and opinions and would not be benefit from the engagement. The executive described the importance of having a coach that would guide the executive to look at personal flaws in different ways and perspectives and that could not be achieved if trust is not present in the relationship.

**Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used?** Answers provided in the first case study from pre-constructed Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were used to answer Research Question 3 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third coder, Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 6 was utilized because it addresses the issue of parameters that need to be set (if any). This question is important because it allowed the researcher to know if executives considered important to have preset parameters of confidentiality before starting an executive coaching relationship. Question 7 addresses the issue of feedback to the organization, which can be directly addressed in the area of confidentiality of the coaching engagement. It is important to see how much information should be shared with those who hired or are paying for the executive coaching engagement, as perceived by the executives. Question 8 is relevant to this research question because it looks at the how executives feel about more than one member of the executive team being simultaneously involved in executive coaching. The involvement of more than one member of the executive team in executive coaching at the
same time and especially with the same coach, may lead to questions and concerns about confidentiality. Question 9 addresses the perception of the need for parameters (if any) for a successful executive coaching engagement. This question is relevant to the research question at hand because it addresses any stipulation that executives may feel are necessary upfront or guidelines they may feel are necessary for the executive coaching to be successful and comfortable in order to have trust and openness with the coach.

The following Table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to transcript one (T1) research question three.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6- What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>...confidentiality was of the utmost importance to me; …he (the coach) also realized that the confidentiality was important; …the confidentiality was of the utmost importance;</td>
<td>...confidentiality was of the utmost importance…&quot;[difficult to be seen meeting with EC due to perceived colleague curiosity or judgment]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7- What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>I was (asked) to participate (along with) my immediate boss because there was a perception that we had a strained relationship; …there was no real feedback to anyone; I think feedback to the organization would have been good; …feedback to my immediate boss who wasn’t going through it was not going to happen.</td>
<td>…(in my case) feedback to the organization would have been good… feedback to my immediate boss, who was not going through it was not going to happen.</td>
<td>...I think feedback to the organization would have been good, however, feedback to my immediate boss who wasn’t going through it was not going to happen.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q 8- How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching? | ...it was a great concept to have both of us utilize the same executive coach because he could understand some of the issues that perhaps I was | ...a great concept… | ...it was a great concept to have both of us utilize the same executive coach because he could understand some of the issues that perhaps I was having in
having in relationship to my boss and vice versa; I went through it and my boss ended up dropping out; ...the end it cost us a lot of money and I think one party benefitted and perhaps the other party did not.

| Q 9 | What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching? | ...(needed) a higher level executive that forced both of us to participate and then possibly receive feedback from each of us to perhaps fix the strained relationship that was perceived (i.e., need to identify the sponsors/stakeholders, etc. that should hold the coaching participants and the coaching process accountable); ...not quite sure why I initially was requested to participate (i.e., need to build clarity/ownership around the answer to the question, 'why me?'...?); ... I was not speaking to an additional executive within the company regarding my experience and what I was getting out of it. (i.e., need clear stakeholders' role re: accountability/responsibility for driving the coaching process and experience...?) ...because of confidentiality (the coach) may not have always been reporting back to an executive within HR or even the president. (i.e., no stakeholders' role re: accountability/responsibility for driving the coaching process and experience for the 'good of the whole'...?) | ...(in the case of conflict resolution) there should be one executive that requires the parties to participate in executive coaching (sic)...there needs to be someone we can go to... | ...a higher level executive that forced both of us to participate and then possibly receive feedback from each of us to perhaps fix the strained relationship that was perceived...there needs to be that go between and there needs to be someone that we report to at least say how the executive coaching... |

Confidentiality is of utmost importance when an executive coach is used. When an executive knows that what is shared in the coaching engagement is confidential, trust is developed and therefore more information is shared, which can help to get to the root of issues.
It is also important to consider the role of feedback to the organization and how that plays (if any) a role in the expectation of confidentiality. In the case study 1, the executive was asked to participate in executive coaching as part of a conflict resolution effort, which involved two members of the executive team. Even though the coaching engagement was required, no feedback was shared with the organization. The subject felt that it would have been beneficial for some feedback to be given to those who requested the coaching. With that said, there is a strong feeling that while feedback to those who requested the executive coaching would have been appropriate in this situation, that any feedback given to the other executive involved in the executive coaching would have been inappropriate and “was not going to happen”. Having more than one member of the executive team (or the whole team) participate in executive coaching may be a great concept. However, not all members may get the same benefit from the engagement.

It is important to clarity the roles of the executives, as well as the participants, and the stakeholders in the coaching relationship. Having a clear understanding of who is involved and why may also clarify the need for confidentiality and would clarify parameters and expectations from the very beginning. It was important for this executive to have someone they can go to for the purpose of sharing how the executive coaching is going.

**Research Question 4:** In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Answers provided in the first case study from pre-constructed Questions 2, and 10 were used to answer research Question 4 (see Table 5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third
coder Dr. Michele Newhard. These two questions were utilized because Question 2 looks at the reason(s) why executives utilize coaches or choose to hire a coach, while Question 10 looks specifically at the areas of training an executive coach should have.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 1 (T1) Research Question 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2- What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
<td>…executive coach was assigned to me; …not something that I sought; …I could improve by using an executive coach. (To fix/ameliorate personality/behavioral deficiencies thought to be impeding job or role performance…)</td>
<td>…it was assigned to me…not my choice…</td>
<td>in my case it actually was pointed out to me that an executive coach was going to be assigned to me… it was not something that I sought but was something that was looked [sic] that I could improve by using an executive coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10- How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?</td>
<td>…it’s important that the person understands a little bit (about what your business does…) but not certain that it really is necessary to have that person really understand the business; …my executive coach was not a trained accountant or a financial person, but he still got what I was looking for; Psychology is important as well psychology from the standpoint that it allows the person (coach) to really get into your head and open you up and perhaps when it’s dealing with soft skills, trying to dig at what the true issue is…</td>
<td>(business)…I think it is important that a person understands a little bit of what you do… (Psychology)… I think it is important as well…allows a person to really get into your head… (HR)...those skills are also important…facilitates that trust.</td>
<td>…it’s important that the person understands a little bit with what you do but I’m not certain that it really is necessary to have that person really understand the business that you’re in… psychology from the standpoint that it allows the person to really get into your head and open you up and perhaps when it’s dealing with soft skills, trying to dig at what the true issue is…within Human Resources, I think those skills are also important in an executive coach because it’s going to facilitate the trust that is required within the entire program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important for an executive coach to have some business knowledge, but it is not necessary for them to have the all the business knowledge needed to be able to do the job of the executive they are coaching. The coach does not need to know how to do every detail of the job, but they need to understand enough about business to know what and how I need to function in the business environment.

Psychology is an important skill that executive coaches should have because this knowledge allows them to get into the executive’s head and look at the reason(s) for a certain behavior. Why we do what we do. Knowledge in the area of psychology can assist the coach with guidance to the executive in the area of soft skills as well as helping the executive open up to reach deep within them.

Knowledge of Human Resources can also be an important attribute for executive coaches. This knowledge is going to “facilitate the trust which is required within the entire program”.

Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? Answers provided in the first case study from pre-constructed Questions 1, and 11 were used to answer Research Question 5 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 1 was utilized because it provides the executive’s definition of an executive coach, and within that definition, some may have a perception that only external coaches qualify as executive coaches, and Question 11 was utilized because it directly asks how important the executive things it is that an executive coach be someone from outside the organization.
The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 1 (T1) Research Question 5.

Table 4.6

Research Question 5 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 - What is your definition of executive coaching?</td>
<td>...someone that would assist (with) soft skills of managing people.</td>
<td>...someone that would assist (with) soft skills of managing people.</td>
<td>...depending upon the situation... someone that would assist with the -- an executive with potential pitfalls that within their management style... soft skills...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11 - How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from &quot;outside&quot; the organization versus someone from &quot;inside&quot; the organization? Why?</td>
<td>...in some cases it may not matter; ... has to be that trust; organization fairly small, getting an executive from outside probably best; ... perhaps (exec coaching...?) is different skill set from the skill set that actually is internal; ... confidentiality, maybe a person inside the organization that could do that, but can’t be water-cooler talk; ... for that reason I think it’s probably best handled by an external source.</td>
<td>...in some cases it may not matter... there has to be that trust... (if inside coach) it would have to be someone who is very confidential...</td>
<td>...some cases it may not matter. If, however -- but there has to be that trust as well... an executive from outside was probably the best approach because of the time commitment... also perhaps is different skill set from perhaps the skill set that actually is internal and, again, because of the confidentiality... it’s probably best handled by an external source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases it may not matter if an executive coach is internal or external. The decision to hire an internal or external coach may be influenced by the size of the organization. Small organizations, for example, may benefit from hiring external coach because executives being coached may feel more comfortable with someone who they feel will be more likely to keep their information confidential. There could be fear in the part of the executive, that if an internal coach is used, some of the information shared in the sessions may appear in and around the “water cooler” as gossip. It is possible that
some of the skills needed for successful executive coaching are very different than those skills present in small organizations.

**Case Study 2**

*Within-case analysis. Selection and background of the interview subject.* A face-to-face interview was conducted in mid-December with a subject who at the time was an interim President for a for-profit educational institution. Before this position, the subject had been the Vice President of the same institution for a number of years.

During this time, the subject had the opportunity to participate both in one-on-one executive coaching as well as being part of a group of executives, who meets with an executive coach on a monthly basis. The executive coaching experienced by this subject have been with external coaches, who were brought in to help the subject transition to new leadership roles as well as to assist with issues that were taking place within the organization. This subject also was part of the decision team who brought executive coaches to work with the leadership team at the institution of employment.

The educational institution, for which the executive worked, is located within 50 miles of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The for-profit institution was at one time family owned and until a few years ago, the President of the organization was from the original family who started the institution. Many changes have taken place within the institution; the main one being the Board of Directors replaced the President with the existing Vice President while a search was made for a new President.

This institution serves a niche market and has experienced steady growth over the last decade. The institution is composed of approximately 1200 students and 200 staff
and faculty members. There is a very high employee turnover rate and the employee satisfaction rate is not very high. There is a great divide between the employees and the executives of the organization. Many efforts have been made by the executive team to understand some of the issues causing the high turnover rate and employee discontentment, including bringing in external HR consultants and restructuring the institution several times.

The researcher is very familiar with this institution and has followed the structural changes over approximately eight years and has had access to the employees and executives of the organization. One of the issues facing this organization has been that the family who established the institution and whom retained control of the management of the institution, until a few years ago, was guided by very conservative Christian values, which they expected their employees and students to follow. These values were at odds with both and expanding multicultural student and staff population and with the culture and norms of the niche market they serve.

Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the second case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to answer research question 1 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. and the third coder Dr. Michelle Newhard. Question 3 was used because it looks at the “ingredients” that executives consider important in a successful executive coaching engagement. In this question, executives identify attributes they relate to effective executive coaching engagements. In Question 4, executives are asked to identify the most useful (or
valuable) things they experienced from executive coaching engagements. Answers to this question provide attributes of effective executive coaching engagements. Question 5 centers on pitfalls of executive coaching focusing on what executives may have experienced as negative or drawbacks to executive coaching. This also helps gain a better understanding of the positive attributes by working as a check of balance with the previous two questions.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard as they pertain to Transcript 2 (T2) research Question 1.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential &quot;ingredients&quot; that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>Trust is huge; ...the honesty piece is probably the second aspect; ...trust and honesty, I think, are the two biggest ones; ...have to be committed to the time that it's going to take; ...it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn't work.</td>
<td>...trust is huge...honesty is the second one...committed to the time it takes...</td>
<td>Trust is huge...the honesty piece...have to be committed to the time that it's going to take...it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn't work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>...an outlet to share my emotions; ...didn't want to (couldn't) share those emotions at work; they (emotions)can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace; ...in a safe environment with a coach; for me it was really the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.</td>
<td>...(it was) an outlet to share my emotions...</td>
<td>to be an outlet to share my emotions because I didn't want to share those emotions at work...they can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace but you're in a safe environment with a coach and you can get it off your chest and they can help you work through certain things so I think for me it was really actually the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5- What are 2-3 &quot;pitfalls&quot;</td>
<td>...depends on what level individual (works at); ...a</td>
<td>...they (people) think they know everything...they</td>
<td>they think they know everything and they can't</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the attributes that are present in effective executive coaching engagements, which were brought up in the interview with this subject are trust, honesty, and commitment to the time require for the engagement to be successful.

Trust is important because the executive being coached needs to feel that they can trust the executive coach and that the coach has their best interest in mind. With this said, trust is developed over time and while one may not share everything with an executive coach on the first meeting, as the relationship evolves, and trust is experienced, the executive may feel that they can go to a deeper level of communication with the executive coach.

Honesty is tied to trust. The executive can feel that because there is trust, honesty can be both given and expected within the coaching relationship. In itself, honesty is a key attribute in successful coaching engagements, because it leads to confidentiality, self-expression, and openness.

Executive coaching engagements generally require a large amount of time, which is one resource that many executives have in limited quantity. Because of the demands
on the executive’s time, it is important to understand the time commitment of an executive coaching engagement before entering into it. As a result, the time commitment may be a constraint that is present in an executive coaching relationship.

One of the rewards that may be present in an executive coaching relationship is having a coach with whom one is able to share thoughts and feelings about situations and others. There are many times when executives feel lonely because they have built necessary boundaries that keep them from forming close relationships at work. These boundaries may be there because one has to make decisions that would be impaired if influenced by friendships and other relationships. An executive coach tends to be an impartial counsel who can hear one’s opinions and thoughts without judgment, thinking of how what is share affects the coach, or bounded by self-interest in the comments.

Another attribute of efficient executive coaching engagements is when the party being coached is aware of the fact that success in their business does not mean that they are without imperfections. Self-awareness and open-mindedness about possible growth and possible needed behavioral changes, may lead to success within the executive coaching engagement.

Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the second case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, and 4 were used to answer Research Question 2 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and Dr, Michele Newhard. Question 3 was chosen because it looks at 2-3 “ingredients” that executives might consider important for successful executive coaching engagements.
This question opened the way for executives to share attributes that they considered to have been causes of dislike or stress in their executive coaching experience(s). Question 4 asks for what executives consider to be the most useful or valuable things about their executive coaching experience. This question was utilized to answer Research Question 2, because many times negative experiences allow people to know that what they don’t want and therefore to identify what they do want or consider to be important.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 2 (T2) Research Question 2.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>Trust is huge; …the honesty piece is probably the second aspect; …trust and honesty, I think, are the two biggest ones; …have to be committed to the time that it’s going to take; …it’s the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn’t work.</td>
<td>…trust is huge…honesty is the second one…committed to the time it takes…</td>
<td>Trust is huge…the honesty piece… have to be committed to the time that it's going to take… it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn’t work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what was the most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>…an outlet to share my emotions; …didn't want to (couldn’t) share those emotions at work; they (emotions) can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace; …in a safe environment with a coach; for me it was really the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.</td>
<td>...it was an outlet to share my emotions…</td>
<td>to be an outlet to share my emotions because I didn’t want to share those emotions at work… they can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace but you’re in a safe environment with a coach and you can get it off your chest and they can help you work through certain things so I think for me it was really actually the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inefficient executive coaching relationships are those where the executive does not form a relationship with the coach that is based on trust and honesty. If the coach is guarded throughout the executive coaching engagements and is not willing to open up and share feelings and thoughts, the engagement will not reach its full potential of success. Also, if an executive limits what is shared in the sessions because of lack of trust; work in key areas, which would be beneficial, will not take place.

An executive coach can be someone who will listen to the coachee and become an outlet for emotional conversations. If there is no trust or the coachee does not feel that they can talk about their emotions, and fears with the coach, the engagement will be inefficient.

Lack of time commitment on the part of the executive may also be an attribute of an inefficient executive coaching engagement. If the executive is not taking the coaching seriously and is not willing to give it the necessary time it takes to meet with the coach and work on recommendations, then the engagement is flawed.

Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used? Answers provided in the second case study from pre-constructed Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were used to answer research question 3 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens Jr., and Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 6 was utilized because it addresses the issue of parameters that need to be set (if any). This question is important because it allowed the researcher to know if executives considered important to have preset parameters of confidentiality before starting an executive coaching relationship. Question 7 addresses the issue of
feedback to the organization, which can be directly addressed in the area of confidentiality of the coaching engagement. It is important to see how much information should be shared with those who hired or are paying for the executive coaching engagement, as perceived by the executives. Question 8 is relevant to this research question because it looks at the how executives feel about more than one member of the executive team being simultaneously involved in executive coaching. The involvement of more than one member of the executive team in executive coaching at the same time and especially with the same coach, may lead to questions and concerns about confidentiality. Question 9 addresses the perception of the need for parameters (if any) for a successful executive coaching engagement. This question is relevant to the research question at hand because it addresses any stipulation that executives may feel are necessary upfront or guidelines they may feel are necessary for the executive coaching to be successful and comfortable in order to have trust and openness with the coach.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 2 (T2) Research Question 3.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6- What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>(Confidentiality is) probably the key to making it a successful relationship; ...(conference enables me) to talk to somebody in confidence to work through it emotionally; professionally, financially; ...would not have worked if I couldn't have been completely open and honest with that person and know</td>
<td>...they key to making it a successful relationship...</td>
<td>...the key to making it a successful relationship... I needed to be able to talk to somebody in confidence to work through it emotionally, professionally, financially, all of those things and it would not have worked if I couldn't have been completely open and honest...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that person's never going to share any of that information; …it goes both ways, not only do you rely on the coach to keep your information confidential, you don't use that person's (coach's) name in a blame (or attribute things to the coach so as to deflect blame or responsibility for bad decisions/actions/behavior); I think confidentiality is what makes or breaks the whole relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 7- What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That's a great question. …he coached me and he coached her and she reported to me; what information was appropriate for him to share with me or not share with me; the person should give permission; the person should give permission if (the coaching for you was) requested by a supervisor or by a board of directors and if that institution is paying for it, or they're doing it for professional development for you (org needs feedback re: coaching you); I still think it's the individual's right to say no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…one can set parameters for information sharing with the coach ahead of time (sic)…the person should give permission…they have the right to say no…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…we struggled…what information was appropriate for him to share with me or not share with me…so I guess that's the way it should be handled is that the person should give permission…it's the individual's right to say no…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 8- How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we're talking about leaders at the same level in an organization that could be helpful; coaching relationships (at different levels and for different purposes); people down further in the organization (who) are getting coaching or mentoring (should be) getting the same type of coaching or mentoring (as those above them) so they are all getting the same picture, the same information; …risk in people in the same organization getting different coaching from different organizations or different people using different theories; …coaching is a replacement for professional development in many ways (and can replace/substitute for sending people to conferences/seminars); …I would be careful about engaging multiple firms (for coaching different people or org levels) that might have different philosophies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…it was not like that in my experience… I am not sure if it would have been helpful…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure if it would have been helpful… I could see some risk in people in the same organization getting different coaching from different organizations or different people using different theories… I would be careful about engaging multiple firms that might have different philosophies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This executive believes that confidentiality is the key that “makes or breaks the deal”. Confidentiality is a parameter that allows the executive to find trust in a coach. If there is no guarantee of confidentiality, then an executive will not share important pieces of a situation or feelings about a situation or individual, because of fear that the information will be shared and consequences may arise.

At the same time, confidentiality is not only expected in the part of the coach. There needs to be confidentiality for all parties involved. This means that an executive should be bounded from blaming an executive coach for decisions and/or sharing the information that came out in the meetings with the coach as a reason or justification for a decision.

Another aspect of confidentiality is what (if any) information is shared as feedback to the organization. It is important for the person being coached to have control of the information that is shared in the sessions. This means, that the executive should be asked for permission to share specific information about a situation, feelings, or events. Because confidentiality is such an important part of successful executive coaching, the executive being coached should have the right to say no to sensitive information being shared with others in the organization. General information, however, in the form of progress reports, may be shared since the company hired the executive coach and is paying for the services.
One way to handle the question and expectation of confidentiality is to set parameters ahead of time, which are within the comfort level of all parties. This would allow some previously agreed upon information to be shared with other parties.

Coaching can be done for more than one person in the leadership team and may be beneficial for many individuals in the same organization to participate in executive coaching. If this is the case, the coaching should be done by the same firm, though not necessarily by the same coach. The reason for this is that if the same firm is used, the same approaches and philosophies will be utilized across the board. This is important both for consistency and to make sure that all parties are aware of the rules, which includes confidentiality.

**Research Question 4:** In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Answers provided in the second case study from pre-constructed Questions 2, and 10 were used to answer Research Question 4 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. and Dr. Michele Newhard. These two questions were utilized because Question 2 looks at the reason(s) why executives utilize coaches or choose to hire a coach, while Question 10 looks specifically at the areas of training an executive coach should have.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard as they pertain to Transcript 2 (T2) Research Question 4.

Table 4.10

*Research Question 4 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 2*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2- What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
<td>...desire to continue to be successful and to grow; ...board recommends or suggests if a company isn't going in the direction that the board likes or if they're trying to develop a certain individual into a leadership position; ...because they want to grow personally.</td>
<td>...the desire to continue to be successful and to grow...can be something that aboard recommends or suggests...or if (the board) is trying to develop and individual for a leadership position...people do it themselves because they want to grow personally.</td>
<td>...desire to continue to be successful and to grow...a board recommends or suggests if a company isn't going in the direction that the board likes or if they're trying to develop a certain individual into a leadership position...if they do it themselves, they take it on because they want to grow personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10- How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?</td>
<td>...the perfect coach is a meld of the two, the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect; ...the coach has to have (these) two different (areas) of expertise; ...important that an executive coach have a wide range of understanding of all business issues; ...if not your field of expertise, coach could have a network of (business experts) specialists; ... (coach needs to) know a lot about a lot of things to gain the trust of the person that you're coaching; (Execs) have to feel as though (the coach) understands, (is) knowledgeable, (and is) really there to help them; (coach needs to know) business and social sciences, including HR; ...have a theoretical understandings of different leadership theories; ...good idea for coaches to know some type of personality assessment, not just for the individual they're coaching but for themselves as the coach to know how to handle that person; ...absolutely can help them understand the personalities of their coworkers, supervisors, or board members, etc.; ...there are little special certifications or certificates that I think would be very helpful.</td>
<td>(business)...CEOs are very successful in business already... (Psychology)...they need to learn soft skills (sic)...It is important... (HR)</td>
<td>...the perfect coach is a meld of the two of the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect... so I would include HR as part of that...And I think it's always a good idea for coaches to know how to assess like the disk profile or some type of personality assessment...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive coaches are hired for many different reasons such as personal development, conflict resolution, or because a board wants to develop an individual for
advancement within an organization. The education or areas of expertise of a coach may vary to meet the needs of the issue at hand.

A perfect coach is a combination of both business knowledge and a social or psychological knowledge. An executive needs to feel that the executive coach is able to understand the position in which the executive lives, and therefore, business knowledge is a must. If the coach does not have knowledge specific to the business in which he/she is hired, then the coach needs to have a wide network of business contacts that can be of aid if more business knowledge is needed. Coaches need to have a theoretical understanding of different leadership theories as well as some understanding of Human Resources.

Knowledge of personality assessment may also be helpful, as coaches help with relationships and skills that affect, and are affected, by those close to the executive. It is not about the certifications that the coach may have, but the specific skills and knowledge that is brought to the engagement.

Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? Answers provided in the second case study from pre-constructed Questions 1, and 11 were used to answer Research Question 5 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 1 was utilized because it provides the executive’s definition of an executive coach, and within that definition, some may have a perception that only external coaches qualify as executive coaches, and Question 11 was utilized because it directly asks how important the executive things it is that an executive coach be someone from outside the organization.
The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 2 (T2) Research Question 5.

Table 4.11

Research Question 5 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 - What is your definition of executive coaching?</td>
<td>...more than mentoring; ...meet one-on-one with an individual and address the problems that they want to bring up whether they're personal or professional; ...in a one-on-one environment rather than a group environment.</td>
<td>...like mentoring...meet one on one with an individual...address the problems that they may want to bring up (personal or professional)...form speaking to business management... in a one on one environment.</td>
<td>...It's a little bit more than mentoring...someone who will meet one-on-one with an individual and address the problems...personal or professional...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11- How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?</td>
<td>I don't think is healthy is if the coach is an employee of the organization because I think you could end up with a trust issue; ...can't stop people's minds from creating (the issue of mistrust when it is an inside person); ...helpful when they (the coach) know a lot about an organization; (As a coach,) you rely on what the person tells you and what they leave out.</td>
<td>...I don’t think it’s healthy if the coach is an employee of the organization because you can end up with a trust issue...</td>
<td>...I would lean toward an external coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may “not necessarily be healthy” for an executive coach to be an employee of an organization. Having an executive coach from within a company may lead to issues of trust and therefore hinder the coaching process. People may be afraid to share their thoughts and opinions with an internal coach because they may see that person as having relationships within the company that may be stronger that their idea of confidentiality.

Case Study 3: Within-case analysis. Selection and background of the interview subject.
The third interview was conducted in mid-December with an executive who works in his family owned and operated oil distribution company. This executive is the President of the company and has transformed the company from its core business to one that has successfully adapted to new technology and customer needs. The company is for-profit and it has a small number of employees when consideration is given to the amount of business they do. It is important to mention that most of the executive team as well as employees have been with the company for many years. There is very little employee turnover and the few times the researcher visited the company, she was very impressed by the culture of the organization.

The company has approximately 20 employees in its corporate office and 400 employees in the distribution side. One of the interesting things about this company is that they are not interested in people knowing what they do or where they are located. They don’t market because they know that they are needed for the oil distribution in the region and they don’t want to let people know what they do or how they do it.

The researcher is familiar with the company after becoming aware of it through a personal connection. After getting a tour of the company, the author became interested in the culture of the organization, which was overtly positive and welcoming. Every employee encountered in the tour seemed happy to be there and willing to go the extra mile for the company. Access to the President by all employees is easily attainable and even encouraged.

While this is a family owned company, the president is highly educated and the next generation of leaders is also expected to earn an education, work, and understand the business before they are given managerial authority. The author was impressed that
throughout conversations with the President, she was told the next member of the family
who may be the future leader has already been put in contact with an executive coach to
guide his education as well as his personal and professional development.

The executive, who was interviewed, has participated in executive coaching both
as an individual and as part of the leadership team. In all occasions, external executive
coaches, who wired to either help with the strategic direction of the organization or
personal development, have conducted the executive coaching.

Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching
engagements have? Answers provided in the third case study from pre-constructed
Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to answer Research Question 1 (see Table 3.5). The
information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by
the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third
coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was used because it looks at the “ingredients”
that executives consider important in a successful executive coaching engagement. In
this question, executives identify attributes they relate to effective executive coaching
engagements. In Question 4, executives are asked to identify the most useful (or
valuable) things they experienced from executive coaching engagements. Answers to
this question provide attributes of effective executive coaching engagements. Question 5
centers on pitfalls of executive coaching focusing on what executives may have
experienced as negative or drawbacks to executive coaching. This also helps gain a
better understanding of the positive attributes by working as a check of balance with the
previous two questions.
The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 3 (T3) Research Question 1.

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> - What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>...definitely understanding what the client is looking for; biggest thing is really understanding kind of the issues and getting agreement on what they are and understanding what you're both working towards (clarifying/agreeing on shared goals/agenda/purpose of the coaching engagement...?); (coach) has to understand the company, what it does how it works, the culture of the company (i.e., the ‘context’ within which the exec needs to performance and succeed...?); (coach) has to understand the business (context) the person works in; ...so that feedback and suggestions that they (coaches) provide can be meaningful and relevant;</td>
<td>...understanding of what the client is looking for...understanding on what they are both working towards...understand the company, what it does, the culture of the company...understand the business of the person they are working for...</td>
<td>Understanding the client’s needs and goals, understanding the client's company and their business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong> - For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>...executive education, I'm calling that coaching; (learned) new strategy using his (coach/trainer’s) five forces model and really transformed our company; ...other answer...I have a long term executive coach I've used for probably 20 years, not consistently; ...kind of like a peer group, you bring business ideas to this forum (Vistage Int’l...?); ...(coach was) just a good sounding board; ...he has a wealth of experience with similar people and similar circumstances with similar problems, and he can take what other people have done, how things have worked out, and (offer) danger signs to look for; ...values would be the same,</td>
<td>...strategy education...strategy work we did...new strategy...good sounding board...</td>
<td>really transformed our company...” Long-term impact; values alignment; communication strategy and feedback delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A key attribute of successful executive coaching relies on the coach’s understanding of what the client needs and is looking for. An executive coaching engagement is more likely to be successful if both parties have a clear understanding of the expectations both parties have as well as the main methodology utilized by the executive coach.

It is important for a coach to have an understanding of the company’s culture as well as the business in which the executive functions. Understanding both the culture of the organization and the business will make the suggestions and actions given by the coach more meaningful and relevant to the executive’s environment and issues at hand.

Another attribute of successful executive coaching experiences is having a good sounding board. Whether the sounding board is the individual executive coach or a peer group formulated of individuals who have or are experiencing similar issues. Hearing how other people have dealt with issues and what they have done in specific situations can ignite ideas and produce tested advice based on others’ experiences.

Getting along with the coach and being able to speak honestly with the coach is also an important attribute of successful executive coaching engagements. The flipped side of being able to communicate with the coach is to be able to listen to the advice...
provided and be open minded to change and the understanding that one does not know everything.

Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the third case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, and 4 were used to answer Research Question 2 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was chosen because it looks at 2-3 “ingredients” that executives might consider important for successful executive coaching engagements. This question opened the way for executives to share attributes that they considered to have been causes of dislike or stress in their executive coaching experience(s). Question 4 asks for what executives consider to be the most useful or valuable things about their executive coaching experience. This question was utilized to answer research Question 2, because many times negative experiences allow people to know that what they don’t what and therefore to identify what they do want or consider to be important.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 3 (T3) Research Question 2.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>…definitely understanding what the client’s looking for; …biggest thing is really understanding kind of the issues and getting agreement on what they are and</td>
<td>…understanding of what the client is looking for…understanding on what they are both working towards…understand the company, what it does, the</td>
<td>Understanding the client’s needs and goals, understanding the client’s company and their business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
understanding what you're both working towards (clarifying/agreeing on shared goals/agenda/purpose of the coaching engagement...?); (coach) has to understand the company, what it does how it works, the culture of the company (i.e., the ‘context’ within which the exec needs to performance and succeed...?); (coach) has to understand the business (context) the person works in; ...so that feedback and suggestions that they (coaches) provide (can be meaningful and relevant;

culture of the company...understand the business of the person they are working for...

---

Q4: For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?

...executive education, I'm calling that coaching; (learned) new strategy using his (coach/trainer's) five forces model and really transformed our company; ...other answer... I have a long term executive coach I've used for probably 20 years, not consistently; ...kind of like a peer group, you bring business ideas to this forum (Vistage Int'n'l...?); ... (coach was) just a good sounding board; ...he has a wealth of experience with similar people and similar circumstances with similar problems, and he can take what other people have done, how things have worked out, and (offer) danger signs to look for; ...values would be the same, congruent (coach/client value congruency...?); ... have to get along with them, have mutual respect; (coach) has to communicate in a good way so to deliver advice, criticism properly;

...strategy education...strategy work we did...new strategy...good sounding board...

...Long-term impact; values alignment; communication strategy and feedback delivery.

---

Ineffective executive coaching engagements tend be those who have coaches who are not able to bring forth information that is relevant to the executive’s business and environment. With that said, it is also important to mention that a coaching relationship where there is no communication between the coach and the executive will not be efficient. A lack of understanding of the expectations from all parties can also constitute
an ineffective coaching engagement, especially if the executive did not hire the coach or was not does not know why a coach is being assigned to him/her self.

Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used? Answers provided in the third case study from pre-constructed Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were used to answer Research Question 3 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 6 was utilized because it addresses the issue of parameters that need to be set (if any). This question is important because it allowed the researcher to know if executives considered important to have preset parameters of confidentiality before starting an executive coaching relationship. Question 7 addresses the issue of feedback to the organization, which can be directly addressed in the area of confidentiality of the coaching engagement. It is important to see how much information should be shared with those who hired or are paying for the executive coaching engagement, as perceived by the executives. Question 8 is relevant to this research question because it looks at the how executives feel about more than one member of the executive team being simultaneously involved in executive coaching. The involvement of more than one member of the executive team in executive coaching at the same time and especially with the same coach, may lead to questions and concerns about confidentiality. Question 9 addresses the perception of the need for parameters (if any) for a successful executive coaching engagement. This question is relevant to the research question at hand because it addresses any stipulation that executives may feel are
necessary upfront or guidelines they may feel are necessary for the executive coaching to be successful and comfortable in order to have trust and openness with the coach.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 3 (T3) Research Question 3.

Table 4.14

*Research Question 3 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6- What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>(confidentiality) is very important; ...someone might want a signed confidentiality agreement (because coach acquires) a lot of power and knowledge (about client/company); (allows coach and client to be) extremely open; ...confidentiality is really, really important; ...similarly, (coach needs to be) impartial and focused on the right outcomes because executive coaching isn't just between the top person and that executive coach, (it requires the trust of the other stakeholders); ...appearing impartial and being able to garner the respect of the people (and other stakeholders) you're working with as a consultant is important; (coach needs to be credible to stakeholders to be effective with targeted client, and very aware of boundaries of relationship, accountability, confidentiality, etc., with the skills to manage/navigate these waters to good/honorable outcomes); ...garner that respect, and show personal integrity (coach must project/convey presence, credibility, and integrity to client and stakeholders to be effective).</td>
<td>...very important...</td>
<td>...very important... for communication to work and for it to be effective, it certainly has to be extremely open and that and so you got to have that trust somehow...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7 - What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>I think there should be some form of feedback in general in the process or how it's going with the person; if the company is bringing the consultant (coach) in for a specific reason there needs to be some form of feedback to the company... Personal information should be kept confidential (sic)... Yes the employee should provide feedback to the organization on &quot;the company's trying to bring the consultant in for specific reason so I think there needs to be some form of feedback to the company and maybe what they're working or how they're address or even just the level of progress they feel but I don't know how detailed it has to be...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8 - How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>(to help keep clear) what you're trying to accomplish, (especially if working on general communication or teambuilding); ... so we all had a common playbook to work from and a common vocabulary and language from that kind of training from an executive coach, good to have everybody up and down the company involved, but depending on what you're trying to do; ...so we all have a common playbook and vocabulary to work with (sic)... good to have everyone involved... ...it's good to have absolutely everybody there...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9 - What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>(coach cannot take sides or focus on whose right and whose wrong... needs to focus on the company agenda); I think both people would have to trust the executive coach is impartial and really trying to get to the right outcome; executive coach would (not) be effective if he didn't garner the trust and the respect of both people he's working with; ... not so much what the coach knows, but how the coach goes about doing what he does (i.e., be skilled at managing boundaries and process...?)... ...all people involved need to trust the executive coach (sic)... confidentiality... Must garner the trust and the respect of the -- both people he's working with so I think that's really important and it think out of that comes -- that's where, you know, it's not so much what the coach knows, I would imagine, but kind of how the coach goes about doing what they do...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidentiality is extremely important in an executive coaching relationship. Not only with the information shared within sessions, but also as far as company information such as positioning and strategy that the coach may be privileged to.

Executive coaching is not just between the top executive and the executive coach it involves different stakeholders. Confidentiality is key as an executive coach reports progress to those stakeholders who hired or want reports to be provided.
When an executive knows that the information being shared in the coaching engagement is confidential, that executive may feel a deeper sense of trust and therefore be more open in the sessions with the executive coach. The sense of trust that is built with the help of expectation of confidentiality can “garner that respect, and show personal integrity.”

If a company is hiring an executive coach for an employee, there needs to be some kind of feedback to the organization. However, confidentiality is very important. Therefore it is key that only relevant information is shared and that personal or thought to be sensitive information is kept private.

It can be considered to be important to have more than one member of the executive team (if not all) participate in executive coaching. This would make sure that all members of the team are learning the same thing (in the case of coaching as strategic development) and it will ensure that the executive team is going in the same direction and is using the same methods and language. With this said, it is important that those who participate in executive coaching feel that there is a sense of trust an confidentiality, otherwise people will not share information because they don’t trust the coach. Confidentiality can be addressed by placing parameters and expectations within the executive coaching relationship.

Research Question 4: In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Answers provided in the third case study from pre-constructed Questions 2, and 10 were used to answer Research Question 4 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by
the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and Dr. Michele Newhard. These two questions were utilized because Question 2 looks at the reason(s) why executives utilize coaches or choose to hire a coach, while Question 10 looks specifically at the areas of training an executive coach should have.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michelle Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 3 (T3) Research Question 4.

Table 4.15

Research Question 4 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2- What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
<td>...simply want to improve their company's performance; ...look internally in themselves skills that they might need to work;</td>
<td>...redo our (the company’s) strategy...somebody may reach out to an executive coach because they may want to improve their company’s performance...if they (an individual) looks internally and find skills that they may need to work on themselves and they may need help...communications or team building...</td>
<td>...would be that they simply want to improve, you know, their company's performance... skills that they might need to work on themselves and they might need someone's help in doing that so...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q 10- How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why? | ...coach needs to definitely have some business background; ...a good foundation in business for an executive coach is worthwhile; (Bkgrd in psychology is) probably the biggest thing; ...higher up you go in any business, the more it is about people; (when ) it's about dealing with people and trying to get the organization to go a certain way or perform or work together or communicate, you're leading, a background in psychology would be really, really important; (Bkgrd in HR is) not as important as business and/or psychology; I think just personal integrity and just being a good person; just being a good person with good integrity. | (business)...definitely has some business background...there needs to be some technical knowledge there...some understanding of certain things...very good foundation in business for an executive coach, I think it’s worthwhile. (Psychology). Probably the biggest thing...understanding people...is critical. (HR)...I don’t think it’s as important as business and or psychology. | ...needs to definitely have some business background. "Psychology is "the biggest thing..." HR "I don't think it's as important and business and or psychology...communication skills and being able to connect are just fundamental to being successful...
In one experience within this case, an executive coach was utilized to help executives come up with a new strategy as the core business of the organization was becoming more competitive and less financially rewarding. In this case, the executive coach needed to have specific business skills that centered on strategy formulation and forecasting.

A good foundation in business is important for executive coaches to have as a skill set. However, a background in psychology is even more important than business knowledge. As executives rise up within an organization, the emphasis on relationships and having the ability to deal with people becomes very important. As a leader, one has to talk with people and guide them in a specific way. The ability to effectively communicate with those who one is leading is very important, and a coach who can help in this area needs to have that soft skill, which comes from psychology.

Training or knowledge of human resources is not as important as training or knowledge in business or psychology. A quality worth mentioning, though perhaps not necessarily a skill or body of knowledge is that it is important for the executive coach to be a good person and have integrity. This helps for the foundation for the executive coach engagement, and trust within that engagement.

Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? Answers provided in the third case study from pre-constructed Questions 1 and 11 were used to answer Research Question 5 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 1 was utilized because it provides the executive’s
definition of an executive coach, and within that definition, some may have a perception that only external coaches qualify as executive coaches, and Question 11 was utilized because it directly asks how important the executive things it is that an executive coach be someone from outside the organization.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 3 (T3) Research Question 5.

**Table 4.16**

**Research Question 5 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1- What is your definition of executive coaching?</td>
<td>... (can be narrow vs. general/broad); ... help you on strategy; help you with everything from leadership to communication to hiring/firing, teambuilding, etc.;</td>
<td>... someone who would help you on a strategy ... someone who will help you with everything (like) leadership or communication, hiring and firing, team building;</td>
<td>Someone to help narrow the focus e.g. strategy or assist with broader focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11- How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?</td>
<td>I think we're doing executive coaching all the time inside our organization; I think executive coaching happens all the time internally but it's kind of like teaching; (But) I think an outside person can be more effective in delivering the same message you deliver; (Outside coach) would also be more effective in coming up with new ideas and bringing (different view/perspective than) internal coach; (Outside coach brings) new way of looking at things we’re doing; ... those things make an outside executive coach very, very valuable.</td>
<td>... I know we have done a lot of it (executive coaching) it hasn’t always been cheap...it pays for itself.</td>
<td>... I think there are a lot of times that I think an outside person can be more effective in delivering the same message you deliver but I think an outside executive coach could also -- would also be more effective also coming up with new ideas and bringing...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are always taking part in executive coaching within our company. This takes place in the way of helping and mentoring people. However, there is value in having an
external executive coach. There are times when an external coach may deliver the same message that one tries to deliver, but because it is an outsider, they are looked as at being more knowledgeable and their message gets across.

An external executive coach is able to look at a situation with a new set of eyes and offer a fresh perspective, one that may not necessarily be seen from the inside. A fresh look at a problem, in itself makes hiring an external executive coach worth it.

**Case Study 4: Within-case Analysis. Selection and Background of the Interview Subject.**

The fourth interview was conducted in mid-December with the president of a for-profit company that does work in economic development by assisting and marketing small startup companies and established businesses, which may need help flourishing.

The company is located in the Harrisburg Pennsylvania and concentrates on serving the local businesses. The company has been in business for approximately 10 years and has experienced constant growth. Currently, there are 60 employees working for this company. The size of the company allows the President to have close contact with the executive team as well as with non-managerial employees.

The author was given a tour of the company and had the opportunity to introduce herself to some of the employees. In this limited experience, the author was able to observe a friendly and very busy work environment.

The president of the company has taken part in executive coaching both in an individual basis with and external coach, as well as in a group setting, where executives gather on a monthly basis to share issues and concern and benefit from both an executive coach as well as other team members and participants.
Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided in the fourth case study from pre-constructed Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to answer Research Question 1 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens, and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was used because it looks at the “ingredients” that executives consider important in a successful executive coaching engagement. In this question, executives identify attributes they relate to effective executive coaching engagements. In Question 4, executives are asked to identify the most useful (or valuable) things they experienced from executive coaching engagements. Answers to this question provide attributes of effective executive coaching engagements. Question 5 centers on pitfalls of executive coaching focusing on what executives may have experienced as negative or drawbacks to executive coaching. This also helps gain a better understanding of the positive attributes by working as a check of balance with the previous two questions.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 4 (T4) Research Question 1.

Table 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>...(coach has) diverse business experience; ...(who has) been where I am (to share wisdoms, lessons learned, etc.); ...(not) somebody who can tell me what is effective and what is not effective...</td>
<td>...diverse business experience...someone who can tell me what is effective and what is not effective...</td>
<td>...diverse business experience...I wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
simply went and got a certificate in executive coaching; …wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches;

Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?

…a sounding board; …(help me) look at it (an issue) a different way; …ask me the thought provoking questions; …make sure I’m looking at a situation holistically; …my peer group which I consider part of my coaching process; …(getting) different perspectives and diverse points of view is very valuable; …be (held) accountable for what you said you were going to do;

…one on one interaction with the facilitator…being able to go to him (the coach) with an issue or decision…having that sounding board…look at it (issue) in a different way…ask me the tough provoking questions…accountability.

…my one-on-one interaction…it's really been being able to go to him with an issue or a decision I'm trying to arrive at and having that interaction, that sounding board, having that individual perhaps look at it at a different way and say you have thought of this, to ask me the thought provoking questions to make sure I'm looking at a situation, you know, holistically, all the angles…to really validate…be accountable for what you said you were going to do because ultimately when you're a CEO, who are you accountable too, yourself, your bank, maybe your bonding company depending on what you're, you know, your business is so I like that.

Q5- What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?

…(need to know that) when you hire an executive coach, it's an investment; …simply showing up is not enough; …(exec doesn't) follow-up (or follow-through is) a misstep in the (coaching) process; …picking the right person is really important; …(need to) find somebody you'll be able to trust and have a good relationship with, not just by simply focusing on credentials;

…showing up for a meeting and not following up (sic)…find someone (a coach) that in time you can trust and form a relationship with.

…when you hire an executive coach, it's an investment so simply showing up for a meeting and having that one hour interaction is not enough and I think there are people that go and have the meeting and when they leave the room, they don't follow up…picking the right person is really important…you'll be able to develop trust…So I think finding the right person and not just focusing on simply credentials but whether you think you can connect with that person.

Business knowledge is an attribute that the coach needs to bring to the executive coaching engagement in order for success to be possible. The executive coach needs to be someone whom not only has certificates, but someone with diverse experience, who has been in the situation where the executive finds him/herself.
In effective executive coaching engagements, executive coaches are able to be a sounding board to the executive. For this to happen, executive coaches need to be available for the executive, especially when unforeseen situations arise or decisions need to be made.

While this particular executive has participated in executive coaching in a group setting, there is consideration that one-on-one interaction with a coach is necessary in order to have a successful executive coaching engagement. Having an executive coach, who is able to provide a different view of an issue and share different options or perspectives to an issue at hand. One-on-one interaction also allows the coach to ask the executive thought provoking questions, which can be very useful in a successful executive coaching engagement.

Trust is a very important aspect of a successful executive coaching engagement. Being able to trust the executive coach means that one feels that they can open up and share thoughts and information with that coach. For this reason, it is important to hire the right person not only for the job, but also for the personality with which the coach will be working.

When one hires and executive coach, it is a large investment, and therefore it is very important to dedicate the needed time to the meetings and any work that needs to be done afterwards. Just hiring a coach is not going to yield a successful outcome, spending time with that coach, listening, trusting, developing a good working relationship where one can go to for help and advice will create a successful executive coaching experience.

**Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have?** Answers provided in the fourth case study from pre-constructed
Questions 3, and 4 were used to answer Research Question 2 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens, and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was chosen because it looks at 2-3 “ingredients” that executives might consider important for successful executive coaching engagements. This question opened the way for executives to share attributes that they considered to have been causes of dislike or stress in their executive coaching experience(s). Question 4 asks for what executives consider to be the most useful or valuable things about their executive coaching experience. This question was utilized to answer Research Question 2 because many time negative experiences allow people to know that what they don’t what and therefore to identify what they do want or consider to be important.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard as they pertain to Transcript 4 (T4) Research Question 2.

Table 4.18

Research Question 2 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>...(coach has) diverse business experience; ...(who has) been where I am (to share wisdoms, lessons learned, etc.); ...(not) somebody who simply went and got a certificate in executive coaching; ...wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches;</td>
<td>...diverse business experience...someone who can tell me what is effective and what is not effective...</td>
<td>...diverse business experience...I wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching? | ...a sounding board; ...(help me) look at it (an issue) a different way; ...ask me the thought | ...one on one interaction with the facilitator...being able to go to him (the coach) with an issue or decision... | ...my one-on-one interaction...it's really been being able to go to him with an issue or a decision I'm
If a coach is hired based only on credentials, a risk is taken in the sense that there needs to be a relationship of trust built between the executive and the coach. This means that while perhaps that coach has all the information necessary to bring forth success, the executive may not feel that there is a good fit between him/herself and the executive coach. If trust is not found in the executive coaching relationship, the executive is less likely to open up and share private and detailed information about issues that may be at hand. Because of this, ineffective executive coaching engagements will lack compatibility between the coach and the executive as well as openness and trust.

Furthermore, relaying on only executive coaching engagements that are group oriented may decrease the possibilities for an executive to share certain crucial information with the executive coach. In this case, inefficient executive coaching experiences lack that one-on-one interaction that an executive usually has with an executive coach. Executive coaching is both a time and money commitment that the executive needs to understand. If the executive is only willing to pay for the engagement,
but does not invest the necessary time to the coaching process, the executive coaching engagement will be inefficient.

Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used? Answers provided in the fourth case study from pre-constructed Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were used to answer Research Question 3 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens, and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 6 was utilized because it addresses the issue of parameters that need to be set (if any). This question is important because it allowed the researcher to know if executives considered important to have preset parameters of confidentiality before starting an executive coaching relationship. Question 7 addresses the issue of feedback to the organization, which can be directly addressed in the area of confidentiality of the coaching engagement. It is important to see how much information should be shared with those who hired or are paying for the executive coaching engagement, as perceived by the executives. Question 8 is relevant to this research question because it looks at how executives feel about more than one member of the executive team being simultaneously involved in executive coaching. The involvement of more than one member of the executive team in executive coaching at the same time and especially with the same coach, may lead to questions and concerns about confidentiality. Question 9 addresses the perception of the need for parameters (if any) for a successful executive coaching engagement. This question is relevant to the research question at hand because it addresses any stipulation that executives may feel are
necessary upfront or guidelines they may feel are necessary for the executive coaching to be successful and comfortable in order to have trust and openness with the coach.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 4 (T4) Research Question 3.

Table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6- What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>it's 100% confidential; ...my expectation is 100% confidential...</td>
<td>...my expectations it's 100% confidential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7- What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>...set very specific goals; ...making an investment for someone to have an executive coach/org/payer is entitled to a return on that investment...and to know if there is a return on that investment; ...(need to) measure the effectiveness of that (coaching) relationship; ...there aren’t a lot of training seminars that I really feel I need to go to but (coaching) is my training for personal (and professional) development; ... (expect) sharing information useful for the greater good (but not individual or) personal things;</td>
<td>...I would expect that if there are things that are useful for the greater good that they would be shared (sic)...not have an expectation that personal things would be shared (sic)...</td>
<td>...if there were things that were useful for the greater good, that that -- that they would come back and impart that knowledge to me or the rest of the team. I think that would be great but I would not have an expectation that if there were, you know, personal things that they were sort of working through together, that that would be, you know, for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8- How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>...certainly see the benefit of that; ...depending on how large your leadership team is, that could get expensive; ...everybody should have some sort of pathway for professional development whether it's an executive coach or ongoing training;</td>
<td>...I would definitely see the benefit of that...depends on how large your leadership team is...if you have the means to do it...</td>
<td>I could certainly see the benefit of that... could get expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9- What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching</td>
<td>...parameter should be that whatever’s discussed with that coach, within the leadership team, should stay within the leadership team...information should stay within the leadership team and not be shared with the greater employee group...the coach is set up to meet with</td>
<td>...one parameter should be that whatever’s discussed with that coach, within the leadership team, should stay within the leadership team...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The expectation of confidentiality with executive coaching is that there needs to be 100% confidentiality between the executive and the coach. With that said, when one hires an executive coach, one is making an investment in the development of that executive and the company is entitled to seeing a return on its investment.

Some feedback to the organization is needed in order for the organization to measure the effectiveness of the coaching engagement. In this case, sharing information that is necessary for the greater good is important, though that sharing of information should not include personal information.

Confidentiality may also be an issue if more than one member of the executive team is involved in simultaneous executive coaching. Confidentiality issues, in these cases may be two-fold: there needs to be confidentiality between the executive coach and each specific leader who is being coached, as well as confidentiality between the executive team in a sense that matters discussed within the team should be kept private between the leadership of the organization and not necessarily shared with other employees.

Research Question 4: In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Answers provided in the fourth case study from pre-constructed Questions 2, and 10 were used to answer Research Question 4 (see Table 3.5). The
information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens, and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. These two questions were utilized because Question 2 looks at the reason(s) why executives utilize coaches or choose to hire a coach, while Question 10 looks specifically at the areas of training an executive coach should have.

The following table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 4 (T4) Research Question 4.

Table 4.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4 and Corresponding Transcript Analysis for Transcript 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2- What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10- How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important for an executive coach to have a solid business background because the executive is functioning in the business world. Most of the issues that an
executive has to deal with are based in the area of Human Resources; therefore knowledge of Human Resources would be very beneficial in an executive coach. This executive states that the thought of an executive coach being trained in Psychology was not something that was considered before and that if the tree options (business, human resources, and psychology) were given, the need for psychology training in an executive couch would not be as important as the other two options.

Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? Answers provided in the fourth case study from pre-constructed Questions 1 and 11 were used to answer Research Question 5 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the transcript analysis summary created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens Jr., and the third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 1 was utilized because it provides the executive’s definition of an executive coach, and within that definition, some may have a perception that only external coaches qualify as executive coaches, and Question 11 was utilized because it directly asks how important the executive things it is that an executive coach be someone from outside the organization.

The following Table shows the information found in the Transcript Analysis created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) as they pertain to Transcript 4 (T4) Research Question 5.

Table 4.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 - What is your definition of executive coaching?</td>
<td>…I think about an individual that I can meet with regularly to discuss</td>
<td>…an individual with whom I can meet with regularly to discuss business issues…to</td>
<td>…an individual that I can meet with regularly to discuss business issues that I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a preference towards external executive coaches, because they bring a new perspective to the table. An external coach is able to look at issues with a “fresh look” and would be able to contribute new ideas.

There are issues with using and internal coach, and the main thing is that they may know too much about an individual or a situation, and therefore have a bias. If the choice is there to hire an internal or an external executive coach, an external would be hired.

**Cross-case Analysis**

As stated in Chapter 4, each interview was transcribed and analyzed as a single case. This section takes the information from the transcript analysis summaries conducted by the researcher, the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and the third
researcher Dr. Michele Newhard (please see Appendixes H, I, and M) which was utilized by the researcher, the second coder, and third coder to develop themes (please see Appendixes F, G, and L). The themes that were developed are being used in this section to answer each of the five research questions that pertain to this study.

Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided by all four case studies from pre-constructed Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to answer Research Question 1 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the themes from transcripts created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens and third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was used because it looks at the “ingredients” that executives consider important in a successful executive coaching engagement. In this question, executives identify attributes they relate to effective executive coaching engagements. In Question 4, executives are asked to identify the most useful (or valuable) things they experienced from executive coaching engagements. Answers to this question provide attributes of effective executive coaching engagements. Question 5 centers on pitfalls of executive coaching focusing on what executives may have experienced as negative or drawbacks to executive coaching. This also helps gain a better understanding of the positive attributes by working as a check of balance with the previous two questions.

The following table shows the information found in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele
Newhard (MN) based on the information collected in the transcript analyses of all four cases as it relates to Research Question 1.

Table 4.22

**Research Question 1 and Corresponding Themes from Transcripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Themes from Transcripts (JHS)</th>
<th>Themes from Transcripts (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>Coach-centered: • Trust between coach and client; Authentic/honest; • Understands client’s needs/issues; Been there - done that; • Capable of understanding the org/bus/culture, etc. Executive-centered: • Able/willing to invest the time; Context-centered: • A goal-orientation; clarity around why, what, and how;</td>
<td>Coach-centered: • Trust • Comfortable • Understand needs of client Executive-centered: • Commitment to time it takes • Open mind to process Context-centered: • Business knowledge • Understand what the client is looking for</td>
<td>Coach-centered: • Trust and Confidentiality • Honesty • Understand of client’s needs Executive-centered: • Diverse and seasoned business experience • Open mind to process Context-centered: • Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td>• Deeper self-awareness; • See the issues as larger than one’s self; • Better modulation/expression of emotions; • Education/additional training; • Expended/deeper sense of issues; • Being accountable; • Introspective of oneself, looking at issue in a deeper way • Looking at my flaws from someone else’s view • Share my emotions • Good sounding board • Accountability • Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introspection opportunity • Reframing my flaws • Insight into me • Transformed our company • long-term impact • External outlet for discussing difficult emotional topics. • 1-on-1 interaction • Helps me to view through a holistic lens • Validation • Personal accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5- What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
<td>• Big time commitment; • Need real commitment to listen/change to get benefit; • Can’t be a ‘know-it-all’; have to be ready to learn something; • Seeing coaching as just a ‘cost’ rather than an ‘investment’; • Need to take risk to be open/sharing/vulnerable; • The time involved in executive coaching • Executives thinking that they know everything • Going through the motions of executive coaching, but not doing the recommended work • Need to trust the executive coach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not following through on time commitment; committing to the process or schedule • Picking the right coach with whom you have a connection and trust • Thinking you know everything and no one else can help you • Being closed off to learning, growth, or other ways of doing something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Successful executive coaching engagements have a few attributes in common. One of the issues, identified by two of the coders is the need for trust between the executive and the executive coach. Executives also mentioned that one of the benefits gained from executive coaching is being able to look at an issue in a deeper way as well as having someone who will hold them accountable. Executives also looked at training as a positive gain from executive coaching.

Executives, who are in successful executive coaching engagements, set aside time that is dedicated to both meetings with the coach as well as personal work for growth and development that may be assigned by the coach. It is important for executives to be open minded to the process of executive coaching and be willing to work through the process in order to achieve success and not have an attitude of “knowing it all”. The perception that an executive does not need help because of the business success experienced by the executive is another fallacy that may be considered an attribute of ineffective executive coaching engagements. This view that one “knows best” may create an executive coaching experience where both the coach and the executive are waiting their time because no effort is being put forth by the executive and the recommendations of the executive coach may not be considered at all. It is also important for the executive to be aware of the time commitment that a successful executive coach engagement requires, and that the executive is willing to set aside time to participate in the meetings with the executive coach as well as any extra work assigned by the executive coach.

Coaches who have business knowledge and who are able to understand what clients are looking for, guide successful executive coaching engagements. Coaches, who have had experience in the business field, tend to be highly regarded and their opinions
are taken seriously because “they have been in the trenches”. Another characteristic of successful coaches is that they tend to be viewed as authentic and honest by their clients.

Successful coaches may provide a forum for deeper self-awareness as well as the opportunity to see the issues as larger than oneself. In a successful coaching engagement, it is possible for executives to have an outlet for their emotions and have a sounding board, who will not judge but instead provide positive and unbiased advice. Another important aspect of successful executive coaching is that it provides the executive accountability in the sense that since executive coaching engagements tend to spread over sometime, there is accountability to the coach in terms of reporting how a situation went or even discussing what was done based on the last session that occurred.

Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have? Answers provided by in all four case studies from pre-constructed Questions 3, and 4 were used to answer Research Question 2 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the themes from transcripts created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 3 was chosen because it looks at 2-3 “ingredients” that executives might consider important for successful executive coaching engagements. This question opened the way for executives to share attributes that they considered to have been causes of dislike or stress in their executive coaching experience(s). Question 4 asks for what executives consider to be the most useful or valuable things about their executive coaching experience. This question was utilized to answer research Question 2 because many time negative experiences allow people to know that what they don’t what and therefore to identify what they do want or consider to be important.
The following table shows the information found in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) based on the information collected in the transcript analyses of all four cases as it relates to Research Question 2.
### Table 4.23

**Research Question 2 and Corresponding Themes from Transcripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3- What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td><strong>Coach-centered:</strong> • Trust between coach and client; Authentic/honest; • Understands client’s needs/issues; Been there-done that; • Capable of understanding the org/bus/culture, etc.</td>
<td><strong>Coach-centered:</strong> • Trust • Comfortable • Understand needs of client <strong>Executive-centered:</strong> • Commitment to time it takes • Open mind to process <strong>Context-centered:</strong> • Business knowledge</td>
<td><strong>Coach-centered:</strong> • Trust &amp; confidentiality • Honesty and time-commitment • Understand needs of client <strong>Executive-centered:</strong> • Diverse and seasoned business experience • Time-commitment • Understand needs of client <strong>Context-centered:</strong> • Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?</td>
<td><strong>Deeper self-awareness;</strong> • See the issues as larger than one’s self; <strong>Better modulation/expression of emotions;</strong> • Education/additional training; • Expended/deeper sense of issues; • Being accountable;</td>
<td><strong>Introspective of oneself, looking at issue in a deeper way</strong> • Looking at my flaws from someone else’s view • Share my emotions • Good sounding board • Accountability • Training</td>
<td><strong>Introspection opportunity</strong> • Reframing my flaws • Insight into me • Transformed our company • long-term impact • External outlet for discussing difficult emotional topics. • 1-on-1 interaction • Helps me to view through a holistic lens • Validation • Personal accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ineffective executive coaching engagements are those where there is a failure to develop a trust-based relationship between the executive and the coach. This lack of trust manifests itself in the hindrance of communication between the two parties and may be detrimental for the development of a solid working relationship, where necessary information is shared. Executive coaching engagements, where the coach fails to understand and meet the needs of the client were also considered to be ineffective. It is important to consider the time commitment of the process of executive coaching and know that when time is not committed, the likelihood of failure is great. In cases where
the executive coaches failed to be goal centered, it caused the executives to view the engagement as ineffective.

Some of the most valuable lessons or experiences that the case studies gained from executive coaching were: a) the ability to gain a deeper view of oneself; b) being able to see issues as larger than oneself; c) having an outlet for the expression of emotions; d) gaining training; and e) having a person to be accountable to.

Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used? Answers provided in all 4 case studies from pre-constructed Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were used to answer research Question 3 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the themes from transcripts created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John Stevens, and third coder Dr. Michele Nehard. Question 6 was utilized because it addresses the issue of parameters that need to be set (if any). This question is important because it allowed the researcher to know if executives considered important to have preset parameters of confidentiality before starting an executive coaching relationship. Question 7 addresses the issue of feedback to the organization, which can be directly addressed in the area of confidentiality of the coaching engagement. It is important to see how much information should be shared with those who hired or are paying for the executive coaching engagement, as perceived by the executives. Question 8 is relevant to this research question because it looks at the how executives feel about more than one member of the executive team being simultaneously involved in executive coaching. The involvement of more than one member of the executive team in executive coaching at the same time and especially with the same coach, may lead to questions and concerns about confidentiality.
Question 9 addresses the perception of the need for parameters (if any) for a successful executive coaching engagement. This question is relevant to the research question at hand because it addresses any stipulation that executives may feel are necessary upfront or guidelines they may feel are necessary for the executive coaching to be successful and comfortable in order to have trust and openness with the coach.

The following table shows the information found in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) based on the information collected in the transcript analyses of all four cases as it relates to Research Question 3.

Table 4.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6- What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?</td>
<td>• Is paramount to the relationship and to the success of the endeavor;</td>
<td>• It is very important and related to the success of the coaching;</td>
<td>• Critical to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach and client need to respect confidential communication;</td>
<td>• Expectations of confidentiality need to be addressed and kept from day one.</td>
<td>• Breeds openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7- What should the nature and extent of feedback be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>• Appropriate and respectful feedback is necessary and legitimate;</td>
<td>• Parameters need to be set;</td>
<td>• Progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parameters should be clarified and agreed to up-front;</td>
<td>• Can be helpful to the organization if done in a respectful way</td>
<td>• Goal attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coachee needs to give permission</td>
<td>• Parameters must be developed on front-end to determine what will be shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coached individual should always have veto power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal info should remain personal but process can be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8- How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?</td>
<td>• Need to promote coherency of ideas/philosophies/theories, etc. across org; Relevant for all in key roles as ‘professional development’</td>
<td>• Good concept</td>
<td>• Great idea if all complete program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good idea if all are equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical that all receive same type of coaching using the same theories and philosophies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confidentiality is an essential part of a successful executive coaching engagement. It is paramount that both the executive and the executive coach have an understanding of the expectations of confidentiality that are present by all parties involved in the executive coaching process. In order to reach an overt understanding of the expectations of confidentiality, this issue should be addressed between the executive and the executive coach from day one.

Executive coaching does not only involve the executive and the executive coach, it also involves other stakeholders in the organization who may have an interest in the success of the coaching as well as those who are financially responsible for the coach’s services. Therefore confidentiality has to be addressed with all the involved parties from day one. It is expected that some information will be shared between the coach and the organization; however, the extent of that information should be limited to progress and should not include personal information. The ownership of any personal information shared between the executive and the executive coach is that of the executive and the coach should ask permission before sharing any of it with anyone, including those who are paying for the coach’s services.

If more than one member of the executive team is simultaneously being coached, it is important that there is a clear understanding of the expectations of confidentiality.
While some executives may not feel that they can share personal or incriminating information with a coach who is coaching others, preset parameters of confidentiality may be helpful. It is also important to consider that it may be optimum to have coaches for the same firm, serving more than one executive in a particular business, this way theories and concepts are the same, but trust and confidentiality may be easier to achieve.

Research Question 4: In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Answers provided in all 4 case studies from pre-constructed Questions 2, and 10 were used to answer Research Question 4 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the themes from transcripts created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. These two questions were utilized because Question 2 looks at the reason(s) why executives utilize coaches or choose to hire a coach, while Question 10 looks specifically at the areas of training an executive coach should have.

The following Table shows the information found in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) based on the information collected in the transcript analyses of all four cases as it relates to Research Question 4.

Table 4.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2- What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?</td>
<td>• For self-improvement • To ameliorate or address potential shortcomings • Deepen self-awareness/self-insight; • Get fresh/unbiased input;</td>
<td>• To succeed and grow • Get a new look at issues, (un-bias, no agency problem) • Grow personally</td>
<td>• Desire for professional development and growth • Improve performance for individual and organization • External mentor needed • Provides a sounding board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Successful executive coaches should be trained in the areas of business, psychology, and human resources. With that said, there is a large emphasis on the need for an executive coach to have business knowledge. This knowledge allows the executive coach to help the executive navigate and grow in the business world. Another aspect of the importance of business knowledge for an executive coach is that executives value the opinion of coaches who have themselves had business experience and success. It is easier to relate to and trust someone who has done the job at hand and who has succeeded in the business environment, in which they are coaching.

Knowledge in the field of psychology is also considered to be of importance, as that may help executive coaches with an understanding of how people think and behave as well as soft skills, which are so necessary in the business world. The importance of understanding and having the knowledge to aid with soft skills in considered to be very important.

Knowledge in human resources is important for a successful executive coach, but not necessary. It may help with some decision-making, but it is not imperative to the
executives’ development or decision-making process. Most companies have some kind of internal human resource person or department, who can be consulted on such issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 5</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (JHS)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (DAF)</th>
<th>Transcript Analysis (MN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1- What is your definition of executive coaching?</td>
<td>To help the manager/executive…</td>
<td>Helper…</td>
<td>• Discuss and improve weaknesses in management style and soft skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify/remediate potential shortcomings in mgt style/approach;</td>
<td>• Assist with soft skills, strategy, counsel</td>
<td>• Provides a reference for reframing situation or alternative solutions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen skills not taught in business school (i.e., soft skills of leading/managing people);</td>
<td>• Meet one-on-one with an individual</td>
<td>• Provides thought-provoking questions I haven’t asked myself;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One-on-one help/counsel/consultation; more than mentoring; provide sounding board;</td>
<td>• Someone who will help you with leadership and soft skills</td>
<td>• A little bit more than mentoring;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assist in forming business strategy/plans to helping with mechanics of managing people;</td>
<td>• An individual with whom I can meet regularly to discuss business</td>
<td>• External outlet for discussing problems or difficult emotional topics, 1-on-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify/strengthen thinking re: issues;</td>
<td>• Sounding board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be accountable for actions and decisions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 11- How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?

| | | | |
| | • An outside coach has numerous potential advantages and represents a greater potential value to the executive and/or organization; | • Outside coaches can be easier to trust | • Critical for internal coach to provide confidentiality |
| | • Outsider perspective trumps insider knowledge; | • Outside coach brings in new perspective or way to look at thing | • External coach is preferred |
| | • A coach from the inside may be OK in large | • Inside coaches may be harder to trust and may share information | • Eternal coach can be more effective even if delivering same message as internal |
| | | | |
Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? Answers provided in all four case studies from pre-constructed Questions 1 and 11 were used to answer research Question 5 (see Table 3.5). The information used in this section comes from the themes from transcripts created by the researcher as well as that of the second coder Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and third coder Dr. Michele Newhard. Question 1 was utilized because it provides the executive’s definition of an executive coach, and within that definition, some may have a perception that only external coaches qualify as executive coaches, and Question 11 was utilized because it directly asks how important the executive things it is that an executive coach be someone from outside the organization.

The following table shows the information found in the Themes from transcripts created by the researcher (DAF), Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. (JHS), and Dr. Michele Newhard (MN) based on the information collected in the transcript analyses of all four cases as it relates to Research Question 5.

Table 4.26

Research Question 5 and Corresponding Themes from Transcripts

Executives described executive coaching as an interaction on a one on one basis between the executive and the executive coach. There is a wide preference for external coaches. Having an internal coach may produce issues of bias and therefore lack of trusts and concerns about confidentiality. External coaches on the other hand, are viewed as easier to trust and tend to bring many benefits with them.
External executive coaches have numerous potential advantages and represent a greater potential value to the executive and/or organization. External coaches bring with them a “fresh look”, which may help both in conflict resolution and in encouraging the executive to look at a specific situation in a different way.
Chapter 5

Study Summaries, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Study Summaries

The purpose of this study was to define and understand the perspectives of four executives from differing fields of industry in the Central Pennsylvania area regarding their perceptions of executive coaching in order to gain a deeper understanding of the definition, value, and benefits of executive coaching in the selected geographic region and across the targeted categories of the companies chosen for this study. Data was collected through pre-constructed, semi-structured interviews conducted with each of the four executives. The participants were each asked 11 pre-constructed questions for the purpose of gathering information to answer the research questions about their perceptions of executive coaching. This study was modeled as a replication of a study conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., where seven CEOs and presidents were interviewed utilizing the same instrument. Information for this study was gathered using the multiple-case study method for the purpose of answering research questions about the shared perceptions of executive coaching by the four participants. The research questions were as follows:

1. What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have?
2. What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have?
3. Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used?
4. In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective?
5. Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches?
The conceptual framework utilized in this study was the Conceptual Framework for Successful Executive Coaching developed by Baek-Kyoo (Brian) Joo (as shown in Figure 8). This conceptual framework was chosen because it includes the participants, process, proximal outcomes, and distal outcomes.

The introduction of theory to HRD scholars has only been recent (Joo, 2005), and as a result, there are gaps of knowledge: “(a) the lack of explicit philosophical assumptions and framework to guide the task of theory building, (b) the absence of well-researched and tested methods of theory building, and (c) the lack of shared and common understanding of the core concepts of theory and theory building in HRD. Executive coaching is not an exception” (Joo, 2005, p. 475). The conceptual framework for successful executive coaching was designed as an attempt to develop executive coaching theory.


The research design of this study is a replication of the research conducted by Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. The results of Dr. Stevens’s study were published in the 2005 article
Executive Coaching from the Executive's Perspective. The original study was conducted as individual telephone interviews with seven top management executives. Stevens (2005) utilized a set of 11 questions, which were created ahead of time and provided to the participants previous to the interviews. The questions were as follows:

1. What is your definition of executive coaching?
2. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
3. What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?
4. For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?
5. What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?
6. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?
7. What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?
8. How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?
9. What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?
10. How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business? In psychology? In human resources? In some other discipline? Why?
11. How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization?

Why?

Participants for this study were chosen based on the Typology of Sampling Strategies in Qualitative Inquiry presented by Creswell (2013). The purpose of selecting convenience sampling is that it “saves time, money, and effort, but at the expense of information and credibility” (Creswell, 2013, p. 158). In this study, the sampling will be chosen from individuals to whom the researcher has access and who fit the inclusion criteria. Stake (2013) validated the use of the inclusion criteria and convenience sampling methodology as recommended by Creswell (2013) for the application of a multiple case study approach. The use of inclusion criteria can result in the sampling procedure being both a convenience sampling methodology and a purposeful sampling methodology, as the researcher will utilize those individuals that are readily available to gain the benefits of convenience sampling, while at the same time ensuring the inclusion criteria are met.

For this study, participants needed to meet three criteria for acceptability: have current or past experience as an executive in an organization, have had experience working with an executive coach, was employed and had experience with an executive coach while working in the Central Pennsylvania area. Personal one-on-one interviews were conducted in December 2013 with four executives who met the three criteria identified above and the author toured each facility and had access to some employees in order to gain a firsthand understanding of each case study’s internal business environment.
For the data analysis phase, both the researcher, a second coder, Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr., and a third coder, Dr. Michele Newhard analyzed the data. Each coder read transcripts from all 4 case studies and each composed a Transcript Analysis Summary (to be used in with-in case analysis) and a Themes of Transcripts (to be used in cross-case analysis).

The coding was conducted with the understanding that it is imperative in multiple-case studies to become familiar with each individual case separately (Yin, 2011). This provides the researcher with knowledge of each individual case as its own entity so that patterns can be identified. Themes were developed based on the results of the within-case and cross-case analysis and the preponderance of individual codes (Krippendorff, 2013). There were two coding structures used in this study. The first was from Creswell (2013), which involved “aggregating the text or visual data into small categories of information, seeking evidence for the code from the different databases being used in a study, and then assigning a label to the code” (p.184). The within-case analysis coding was generated through the counting of frequencies of the number of times a particular code was used by each participant. In the data analysis for this study, if a comment was repeated between two or more of the coders, it was highlighted and only codes that were present by two or all three of the coders were used. Creswell (2013) recommended generating a given code and then counting the number of times it appears in response to the interview questions. The benefit of this coding scheme is that it provides each participant with an opportunity to generate depth in each response; however, a detriment is that it weighs more talkative individuals’ perceptions more heavily when comparing the within-case analysis results. To mitigate this factor, the
researcher ensured that each participant gave approximately the same length of answers to each question, which ensured as equal treatment as possible. This approach did not result in perfectly equal treatment, so to bolster the analytic results, the Krippendorff (2013) content analysis method was used to augment the findings during the cross-case analysis approach.

For the cross-case analysis, the coding structure requires that a preponderance of codes result in the generation of a theme. As opposed to the within-case analysis, where themes are generated from a frequency count of each code, the cross-case analysis themes are generated from a preponderance of codes across each participant. Krippendorff (2013) noted that in multiple case studies, content analysis views each case as one participant and thus attributes one code to each participant. For small sample size studies, judgment has to be used to determine what constitutes a theme. In the data analysis for this study, themes were identified when their presence were found in more than two of the case studies. So, if only one, or two participant mentioned something (even though all three coders identified it in the in case analysis), it would not be included as a theme, but if three or four case studies mentioned a code, it would be identified as a theme.

The extremes are the easiest, since no mentions of a given code or a code mentioned by 50% of the participants equates to no theme or a theme including those codes, respectively. In this study, when three or four participants mentioned a code, it was included in the theme (Krippendorff, 2013). The judgment was required in instances where all participants mentioned different codes (so the highest number of codes within a given theme was one) or where only two participants agreed on a given code. In the former case, where no agreement was generated, it was determined that no theme should
result. This method allows no individual code to dominate another code, where each was only mentioned once. The case of two participants agreeing on at least one code resulted in the generation of a theme based on those two codes only in the case where no contrary codes existed in the data (Krippendorff, 2013). If a contrary code was present, no theme was generated. Usually, when a preponderance of codes is present, a theme is generated; however, in this case, since an outlier to the theme would constitute 50% of the frequency count of the code, it is not appropriate to generate a theme. There were three coders in the data analysis of this study. Themes identified by at least two coders were highlighted and used as a theme for the study.

Conclusions

In this section, finds of the study developed by using the information developed in the Themes of Transcripts, which were made by the researcher along with the second coder and third coder based on the interview transcripts and in-case analysis, were utilized to answer each of the research questions.

Research Question 1: What attributes do effective executive coaching engagements have? Successful executive coaching engagements have a few attributes in common. The main issue that was shared by all four of the participants is the need for trust between the executive and the executive coach. Another shared perception between the subjects is the need to be comfortable with the executive coach. This need for comfort is important for success in an executive coaching relationship because when an executive feels comfortable with the coach, he/she is more likely to be open about feelings and share details that may be pertinent to the issue(s) or situation(s) at hand.
Executives, who are in successful executive coaching engagements, set aside time that is dedicated to both meetings with the coach as well as personal work for growth and development that may be assigned by the coach. It is important for executives to be open minded to the process of executive coaching and be willing to work through the process in order to achieve success.

Coaches who have business knowledge and who are able to understand what clients are looking for, guide successful executive coaching engagements. Coaches, who have had experience in the business field, tend to be highly regarded and their opinions are taken seriously because “they have been in the trenches”. Another characteristic of successful coaches is that they tend to be viewed as authentic and honest by their clients.

Successful coaches may provide a forum for deeper self-awareness as well as the opportunity to see the issues as larger than oneself. In a successful coaching engagement, it is possible for executives to have an outlet for their emotions and have a sounding board, who will not judge but instead provide positive and unbiased advice. Another important aspect of successful executive coaching is that it provides the executive accountability in the sense that since executive coaching engagements tend to spread over sometime, there is accountability to the coach in terms of reporting how a situation went or even discussing what was done based on the last session that occurred.

Another attribute of successful executive coaching engagements is the extent to which the engagement is goal oriented as well as all parties involved having clarity and understanding of why the executive coaching is being conducted, how it will be conducted and what the process is.
Research Question 2: What attributes do ineffective executive coaching engagements have? Ineffective executive coaching engagements are those where there is a failure to develop a trust-based relationship between the executive and the coach. This lack of trust manifests itself in the hindrance of communication between the two parties and may be detrimental for the development of a solid working relationship, where necessary information is shared.

The perception that an executive does not need help because of the business success experienced by the executive is another fallacy that may be considered an attribute of ineffective executive coaching engagements. This view that one “knows best” may create an executive coaching experience where both the coach and the executive are waiting their time because no effort is being put forth by the executive and the recommendations of the executive coach may not be considered at all. It is also important for the executive to be aware of the time commitment that a successful executive coach engagement requires, and that the executive is willing to set aside time to participate in the meetings with the executive coach as well as any extra work assigned by the executive coach.

Research Question 3: Are there confidentiality expectations when an executive coached is used? Confidentiality is an essential part of a successful executive coaching engagement. It is paramount that both the executive and the executive coach have an understanding of the expectations of confidentiality that are present by all parties involved in the executive coaching process. In order to reach an overt understanding of the expectations of confidentiality, this issue should be addressed between the executive and the executive coach from day one.
Executive coaching does not only involve the executive and the executive coach, it also involves other stakeholders in the organization who may have an interest in the success of the coaching as well as those who are financially responsible for the coach’s services. Therefore confidentiality has to be addressed with all the involved parties from day one. It is expected that some information will be shared between the coach and the organization; however, the extent of that information should be limited to progress and should not include personal information. The ownership of any personal information shared between the executive and the executive coach is that of the executive and the coach should ask permission before sharing any of it with anyone, including those who are paying for the coach’s services.

If more than one member of the executive team is simultaneously being coached, it is important that there is a clear understanding of the expectations of confidentiality. While some executives may not feel that they can share personal or incriminating information with a coach who is coaching others, preset parameters of confidentiality may be helpful. It is also important to consider that it may be optimum to have coaches for the same firm, serving more than one executive in a particular business, this way theories and concepts are the same, but trust and confidentiality may be easier to achieve.

Research Question 4: In what areas should an executive coach be trained in order to be effective? Successful executive coaches should be trained in the areas of business, psychology, and human resources. With that said, there is a large emphasis on the need for an executive coach to have business knowledge. This knowledge allows the executive coach to help the executive navigate and grow in the business world. Another aspect of the importance of business knowledge for an executive coach is that executives
value the opinion of coaches who have themselves had business experience and success. It is easier to relate to and trust someone who has done the job at hand and who has succeeded in the business environment, in which they are coaching.

Knowledge in the field of psychology is also considered to be of importance, as that may help executive coaches with an understanding of how people think and behave as well as soft skills, which are so necessary in the business world. The importance of understanding and having the knowledge to aid with soft skills in considered to be very important.

Knowledge in human resources is important for a successful executive coach, but not necessary. It may help with some decision-making, but it is not imperative to the executives’ development or decision-making process. Most companies have some kind of internal human resource person or department, who can be consulted on such issues.

Research Question 5: Is there a preference between outside coaches and inside coaches? There is a wide preference for external coaches. Having an internal coach may produce issues of bias and therefore lack of trust and concerns about confidentiality. External coaches on the other hand, are viewed as easier to trust and tend to bring many benefits with them.

External executive coaches have numerous potential advantages and represent a greater potential value to the executive and/or organization. External coaches bring with them a “fresh look”, which may help both in conflict resolution and in encouraging the executive to look at a specific situation in a different way.
Recommendations

Study findings are important additions to the body of literature, and the results within have important implications for future research and the practice of executive coaching. This section provides recommendations for both future researchers and practitioners.

For future researchers. This study focused on the shared perceptions of executive coaching, based on four executives in the Central Pennsylvania area. Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. conducted a similar study focused in executives form a different geographical area, which was utilized as a guide for this study. It would be beneficial for future researchers to a) compare the two studies to see if there are similarities in the data, b) conduct similar studies in other geographical areas to later compare the data, c) use the data collected to aid in the formulation of a definition of executive coaching, d) identify positive and negative attributes of executive coaching, e) create and evaluation system for executive coaching programs, f) create an instrument to aid companies with identifying the right executive coach for their needs, and g) replicate this study in different geographical areas outside of the United States.

a) Compare the two studies to see if there are similarities in the data. Comparing the studies conducted by both the author and Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. may provide researchers the opportunity to see if the executives in both studies have the same perceptions of executive coaching. This may be interesting to know, as both studies were conducted in different geographical areas. Also, it may help other researchers who are conducting similar studies by providing a methodology for comparing such studies. Findings of a study of this nature may also be helpful to
practitioners who are interested in understanding what their clients’ perceptions of executive coaching are in order to align their offerings to their needs.

b) Conduct similar studies in other geographical areas to later compare the data. This study was conducted in the Central Pennsylvania area and was a replication of a study conducted in Massachusetts. Conducting this study in other geographical areas may increase the knowledge of the practice of executive coaching and perhaps provide geographical differences that may be factors of perceptions based on culture or norms. Having more studies like this, conducted in different geographical areas would also provide researchers with a better understanding of how the practice of executive coaching may differ based on geography.

c) Use the data collected to aid in the formulation of a definition of executive coaching. The literature is very clear on the lack of a comprehensive definition of executive coaching. It would be of great value for future researchers to define executive coaching in a way that includes identifying the needs of the organization, the executive, and services provided by coaches. Providing a clear and comprehensive definition of executive coaching will help eliminate confusion and target executive coaching education to meet clear market demands.

d) Identify positive and negative attributes of executive coaching. Future researchers may want to consider conducting studies to identify both the positive and negative attributes of executive coaching. What kind of characteristics of executive coaching and coaches are perceived to be there? What is it that people like about executive coaching? What is it that people don’t like about executive coaching? Finding answers to these questions would help educators of executive coaching
programs develop curriculum that addresses those issues and teach students how to avoid pitfalls of negative attributes, as well as how to acquire and further develop positive attributes. This study would also help current executive coaches with their marketing efforts by allowing them to use those strengths they may possess, which align with the positive attributes of executive coaches.

e) Create and evaluation system for executive coaching programs. Future research may be conducted to aid in the formulation of an evaluation system for executive coaching programs based on customer demands and expectations. While having some form of certificate or accreditation may be helpful for a practitioner to market his or her skills, making sure that those skills align with the demands and expectations customers may have, would actually make those skills marketable. It would be a great opportunity for future research to be conducted in the area of what customers’ expectations are when it comes to hiring an executive coach, and using those expectations to look at current programs offering executive coaching education to see if the two align with one another.

f) Create an instrument to aid companies with identifying the right executive coach for their needs. Researchers may want to consider looking at the needs companies have for executive coaches and exploring the possibility of creating an instrument to assist companies with hiring the right executive coach for their specific needs. This research would be extremely helpful to both companies who need to hire executive coaches by allowing them to identify the correct candidate with the correct set of skills they need, as well as for executive coaches, who may be able to market their skills to those companies who are a good match for their offerings.
g) Replicate this study in different geographical areas outside of the United States.

The suggestion was made earlier to replicate this study in different geographical areas, and it is important for the author that consideration is made to replicate this study outside of the United States. The field of executive coaching is not limited to within the borders of the United States. Being that today’s business environment tends to be very global in nature, it is appropriate that future research be conducted outside of the United States to discover the differences (if any) of the practice of executive coaching as well as the perceptions executives have about executive coaching in other countries.

h) Research different types of coaches. The number of different types of coaches that exists further complicates a definition of executive coaching. The literature would benefit form an effort to list different types of coaches, such as performance coaches, strategic coaches, career coaches, and life coaches.

For practitioners. This study was based on Dr. John Stevens Jr.’s paper titled Executive Coaching From the Executive’s Perspective. Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. is the president and managing partner of Knickerbocker & Stevens, Inc., a Sudbury, Massachusetts-based consulting psychology firm. It is recommended that other practitioners follow Dr. Stevens’s initiative of publishing articles based on primary data obtained by themselves within their practices in order for researchers to have access to current and relevant data.

It would also be beneficial to the practice of executive coaching for a clear definition of executive coaching to be developed. The literature points to a lack of both definition and standards in executive coaching, giving light to a confusion of the practice.
Any efforts that are undertaken to let potential employees understand the offerings of executive coaches will aid in the marketing of such services.

A study that compares executives’ reasons for hiring executive coaches with executives’ expectations of executive coaches would be a welcomed addition as well. Because there are so many definitions of executive coaches, companies may hire an executive coach for an employee based on their own expectations or limited knowledge of the practice. If the executive, for whom the coach is hired has a different definition of executive coaching, form that of the company, a conflict may result, which may not be related to the quality or effectiveness of the executive coach.

Dr. Baek-Kyoo (2005), mentions that “there are four coaching areas in executive coaching: learning, development, performance, and leadership agenda” (p.484). The four areas of executive coaching mentioned above, are areas of interest in the field of HRD. HRD practitioners may want to consider research in the area of executive coaching, especially when looking at the market need and opportunities in executive coaching consulting. HRD practitioners may want to focus on the training that executive coaches need and utilize this and other related studies to market their practices.
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APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol

Time of Interview:______________________________________________________________

Date:______________________________________________________________

Place:______________________________________________________________

Interviewer: Daniela Feenstra

Interviewee:______________________________________________________________

Position of Interviewee:_____________________________________________________

Description of Project:

These interviews are being conducted to collect primary data for a dissertation as part of the fulfillment requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Workforce Education and Development with a concentration on Human Resource Development/Organization Development from the Pennsylvania State University. This interview will assist in figuring out the shared perceptions of executive coaching as shared by three executives in Central Pennsylvania.

The interview is being conducted in a voluntary basis and the participant is always welcome to end the interview if he/she feels like doing so. No information given by the respondent during the interview process will be shared with others participating in the interview process or any other individuals that may be part of the interview and research process. Names of individuals and companies will not be included in the final report or shared with others in the research process.
Questions:

Initial Questions

1. What position do you hold in the company for which you work?
2. Have you ever taken part in executive coaching?
3. Did you work with an internal or external executive coach?

Intermediate Open-ended Questions

1. What is your definition of executive coaching?
2. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
3. What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?
4. For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?
5. What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?
6. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?
7. What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?
8. How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?
9. What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?
10. How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?
11. How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?

Ending Questions

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with me that you think may be helpful to understand your thoughts on executive coaching?
2. Who do you think would be a good person for me to speak with to get a better understanding of the role executive coaching?

Closing:

- Thank participant for taking the time from their schedule to participate in this research
- Invite participant to be included in the results of the study.
APPENDIX B

This is a copy of an email asking Dr. John H. Stevens, Jr. for permission to utilize his instrument for this research, as well as the reply by Dr. John H. Stevens Jr. granting the researcher permission to utilize the interviews he designed for his study published in 2005 by the Educational Publishing Foundation and the Society of Consulting Psychology in the article titled Executive Coaching From the Executive’s Perspective.

Dr. Stevens,

My name is Daniela Feenstra. I am a PhD candidate at Penn State University in Workforce Education and Development. My goal is to earn a Clinical Psychology degree and work as an executive coach. I am currently working on my dissertation and through my research I came across your article Executive Coaching From the Executive's Perspective. My dissertation is on the Shared Perceptions of the benefits of Executive Coaching as Shared by four Companies in Central Pennsylvania.

I noticed after reading your article that my study is set up in a similar manner to yours, and I am wondering if you would allow me to use your 11 questions as an instrument in my research. I would be very happy to share my findings with you. I would also love to have the opportunity to communicate with you via email or phone to find out more about your practice and career.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you. I can be reached via email at dafeenstra@yahoo.com and by telephone at 717 439 6475.

Sincerely,
Daniela Feenstra

Daniela…

Yes…you may use the 11 questions from my article. Would love to hear more about your project, and of course I’d like to see the end-product.

FYI: I will be away on vacation for the next 10 days.

Thanks…

John
APPENDIX C

The following are the interview questions utilized in this study, by permission from their author Dr. John H. Stevens Jr.

1. What is your definition of executive coaching?
2. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
3. What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?
4. For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?
5. What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?
6. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?
7. What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?
8. How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?
9. What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?
10. How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?
11. How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?
Dear Michele,

My Name is Daniela Feenstra. I am a PhD candidate in Workforce Ed and I am currently writing my dissertation. I got your name and email form my advisor, who suggested I contact you to see if you would consider being my third coder. I would really appreciate your help and participation in this matter.

My dissertation is a qualitative study on executive coaching. The data has been transcribed and the transcripts have been cleaned of all personal and marking information. As a third coder, you would have to read the transcripts and find commonalities that will lead to themes. Each coder used worksheets, which make the process easy to understand and painless!

Please let me know if you are able to help me. I can be reached via email if you have any questions. Again, I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniela Feenstra
APPENDIX E

The following are cleaned transcripts of one interview conducted for this study. Every effort has been made to make sure that the identity of each participant is protected as well as the company for which they work.

Q  Hello.
A  Hello.

Q  All right. What position do you hold with the company for which you work and I guess that would be XXXXXX XXXX a month and a half or two ago.
A  Okay. Well for XXXXXXX XXXX I was the Strategic Advisor to the President...

Q  Okay.
A  ...for the last couple of months.

Q  Okay and before that?
A  Before that I was the Interim President of XXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXX.

Q  Awesome. What have you -- have you ever taken part in executive coaching?
A  Yes, I have.

Q  Awesome. Did you work with an internal or external executive coach?
A  External.

Q  That’s great. What is your definition of executive coaching?
A  It's a little bit more than mentoring. An executive coach, I see as someone who will meet one-on-one with an individual and address the problems that they want to bring up whether they're personal or professional. It could be anything from speaking to business management types of issues taking place in a one-on-one environment rather than a group environment.
Q Okay. What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
A I think the desire to continue to be successful and to grow are the things that make people pursue something like that. I think in other situations, it could be something that a board recommends or suggests if a company isn't going in the direction that the board likes or if they're trying to develop a certain individual into a leadership position but individually, personally, I think that people -- if they do it themselves, they take it on because they want to grow personally.

Q Okay, cool. What are two to three essential ingredients that underline an effective executive coaching engagement?
A Trust is huge because you -- if you don't trust the person that you are getting your coaching from, you're not going to be completely honest and the honesty piece is probably the second aspect because the coach can't help you if you're not honest with the coach so, you know, trust and honesty, I think, are the two biggest ones and you have to be committed to the time that it's going to take. Coaching takes a lot of time but it's an important valuable amount of time that you spend on it and I know just from experience with other individuals that it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn't work.

Q Okay great. For you, what has been most useful or valuable from executive coaching?
A I found the most valuable piece for me to be an outlet to share my emotions because I didn't want to share those emotions at work whether it was anger, fear, frustration, or sadness. No matter what it would be, those things, they can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace but you're in a safe environment with a coach and you can get it off your chest and they can help you work through certain things so I think for me it was really actually the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.

Q Okay, that's interesting. What are two to three pitfalls that executives should keep in mind when
considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?

A Well it depends on what level of individual but since we're probably addressing more at the president or CEO level or the vice president level, I think a trap that people fall into is that they think they know everything and they can't learn from someone else and I think that's a huge trap, especially if you're thinking of it in a silo, you know everything about your own industry. What I have discovered is that every industry has the same types of problems and different people go about solving those problems in different ways so I think that's a really big trap that people fall into is that they already know everything and they don't need anybody to help them, you know, I think if you go along with what the three most important things are, I think those are the traps too. If you think you cannot be completely honest with your coach, it's going to be ineffective.

Q Okay, makes sense.

A If you don't trust that person, you're not going to share the vital aspects of an issue.

Q Yes, that makes sense. What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?

A It's probably the key to making it a successful relationship. It has to be. You know a little about my situation with the college and I certainly couldn't talk about a lot of the issues surrounding the transition of ownership and of leadership with anyone around me at the college and if I shared that information, it could not go beyond the person that I shared it with and that's why the confidentiality piece was so key. I couldn't figure that stuff out on my own but I needed to be able to talk to somebody in confidence to work through it emotionally, professionally, financially, all of those things and it would not have worked if I couldn't have been completely open and honest with that person and know that person's never going to share any of that information and I think it goes both ways, you know, not only do you rely on the coach to keep your information confidential, you know, if they're going to give a judgment about, you
know, about a decision that was made or something, you don't use that person's name in a blame, you know, well so and so said it should have never been done that way. You shouldn't use your coach's name in that way if they are validating you that something wasn't done right so I think confidentiality is what makes or breaks the whole relationship.

Q That's cool. What would the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching so we're talking about the feedback that the coach gives back to the organization. Should there be any -- what kind of boundaries should there be?

A Right. That's a great question because we struggled a little bit with this when we talked about XXXX XXXXXXXX because XXXX XXXXXXXX was in a peer group for mentoring and coaching with the same person that I was in the CEO group, okay, so he coached me and he coached her and she reported to me so one of the reasons I wanted her to do it was because I wanted to see how capable she was of growing so it goes along the same lines of the exact question that you're asking, you know, what information was appropriate for him to share with me or not share with me and, you know, he had to -- we had a big conversation about this topic and, you know, he had to go to XXXXX and explain to her what I was looking for and ask her permission, you know, and to what level, what degree he could share things with me so I don't know what parameters were set up but he did share information with me and I -- so I guess that's the way it should be handled is that the person should give permission and I think that the person should give permission if it's been something, for example, requested by a supervisor or requested by a board of directors and if that institution is paying for it and they're doing it for professional development for you, they have, you know, they really have a purpose in it as well but I still think it's the individual's right to say no. Yes, it all -- it's a sticky situation because at times I felt uncomfortable with some of the things that he would tell me about XXXX and they -- it was mostly validation of things that I thought but I sort of
felt like it was, you know, going by -- going through the back door type of thing.

Q How important or useful is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching so how important is it for everybody in an executive team to be using an executive coach at the same time?

A I don't know, I mean, it certainly wasn't that way in my experience so would it have been helpful? I'm not sure if it would have been helpful. If we're talking about leaders at the same level in an organization, that could be helpful but if we're talking about leaders that are in a tiered, you know, hierarchy I think that -- so at XXXXXXXX they have coaching relationships that are different at the CEO level, at the key report level so like vice presidents or general managers, that's a different level and then there's a -- one more step below that which are the person who report to the top two levels of individuals and I think the further down in the organization that you go, the more important it is that one dynamic of culture is portrayed so if people down further in the organization are getting coaching or mentoring, that they're getting the same type of coaching or mentoring so they are all getting the same picture, the same information. I could see some risk in people in the same organization getting different coaching from different organizations or different people using different theories and they could clash with the culture of the organization but I think that what I found to be true is that in coaching, it is a replacement for professional development in many ways. Instead of somebody sending somebody out to a conference or a training or a seminar, a lot of times what people have to do is work on themselves and finding out that they really know a lot of the answers. The answers are in them. They just have to find out how to work through them to make a decision about a project so I know that doesn't directly address your question but I think it's very -- I think coaching is valuable on a variety of levels but my ultimate answer would be I would be careful about engaging multiple firms that might have different philosophies.
Q: That's really interesting. I never thought of that. What parameters or considerations need to be considered when an executive from the same team -- when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching so if you have more than one person in a team engaged in executive coaching, what kind of parameters should there be?

A: In any situation, whether it's the same coaching company or not?

Q: Um-hum.

A: See I think what -- as an executive, one of the parameters that I would set up is that coaching has to take place from the same company for each individual in the organization, maybe not the same person but the same company, again, because of philosophies. There are a lot of different types of management in leadership philosophies out there and say the CEO is learning a particular style of leadership and wants to apply it to the organization, wants to live that leadership culture and let it flow down through, say the second level people are getting a totally different type of leadership theory, it's not going to work...

Q: Okay.

A: ...and so it goes kind of back to the other question that you were asking so I think that that's a parameter that I would set up is that everybody gets the same type of theory training.

Q: All right, great. How important or relevant is it -- is that an executive coach be trained in business? So should an executive coach have business training?

A: Yes. I've wrestled with this thought a lot because I think that there are two fine lines here. CEO's and presidents are often very, very successful in one aspect of their life and that's usually the business aspect, obviously, and where they lack are in the soft skills part of their lives so I think the perfect coach is a meld of the two of the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect because you have to be able to help the person you're coaching sort of massage the part of their personality or their persona that they're missing so usually CEO's are strong in business but they're not strong in personal relationships and
listening, in creating a culture, in exciting people so I think that the real answer is the coach has to have two different expertise.

Q Okay, that's great because actually my second question was how important or relevant is it for an executive coach to be trained in psychology so you've kind of answered that so the next one is how relevant or important is it for an executive coach to be trained in Human Resources?

A I think that it's important that an executive coach have a wide range of understanding of all business issues so, for example, if you are an executive coach and they're coming to you with a budgeting question or issue that they need to talk through, you're going to need to know how to do that. I think that if it's not your field of expertise, the other piece that a coach could do is have a network of specialists and experts that they can refer a person to or that they could go to find some information out for the person that they're coaching but I think, again, you need to know a lot about a lot of things. First of all, they gain the trust of the person that you're coaching. They have to feel as though you understand, as though you're knowledgeable, as though you're really there to help them and the first time you look like you don't know what you're talking about can ruin those sort of things so I do think you have to have -- you do have to have the business piece along with it.

Q Is there any other discipline that you think an executive coach should be trained in and why?

A Right, so business and social sciences but in business I think it has to run the gambit so I would include HR as part of that. Academically, not necessarily but theoretically, I think that it would be good for coaches to have understandings of different leadership theories which may or may not come in the form of business education.

Q Okay.

A And I think it's always a good idea for coaches to know how to assess like the disk profile or some type of personality assessment, not just for the individual they're coaching but for themselves as
the coach to know how to handle that person, again, you know...

Q  Okay, that makes sense.
A  it's not necessarily an academic criteria but it's certainly something I think is absolutely helpful in the process because they can help them understand the personalities of the their coworkers or of their supervisors or of their board members and like I said, you know, the personality piece is usually the harder piece for the executive to crack.

Q  Yes and usually something that needs assessments, you know...
A  Right.

Q  ...it's...
A  Right.

Q  ...you know, it's taught that, you know, it's a critical part.
A  Right, right at -- right exactly root, you know, there's all kinds of ways to look at it. It could be root cause analysis type of stuff where you're teaching an executive to not make a snap decision based on the motions but to try and evaluate so there's a bunch of different things that you touch on in a business degree that could be valuable but there are little special certifications or certificates that I think would be very helpful.

Q  Okay, great how would -- how critical or essential is it that an executive coach be someone from outside of the organization versus someone from inside of the organization and why?
A  I don't believe -- well XXXXXXX does -- XXXXXXX has something called an inside professional. It is a XXXXXXX member that does key groups and CEO groups in the same organization and they go into the organization and they're trying to put that culture that they've instilled in the top two levels down through the rest of the organization so they call that an inside person in XXXXXXX. I think that's okay but what I don't think is healthy is if the coach is an employee of the organization because I think you could end up with a trust issue there...
Okay.

...whether it be the CEO not trusting that the person isn't telling the board something they said in confidence or, you know, an employee lower down in the organization, you know, confiding in the mentor and then that person sharing it with their boss.

So almost like running into an agency problem?

Yes, yes and, you know, a good coach or a good coach or a good mentor isn't going to be the root of the problem but you can't stop people's minds from creating those things and that -- so I would lean toward an external coach. Now I think it's very helpful when they know a lot about an organization which, you know, the learning curve there could be difficult and you rely on what the person tells you and what they leave out and I think that's a challenge but still I think that's better than being within the organization.

Okay and I totally agree with you by the way. Is there anything else that you think or that you would like to share with me that you think may be helpful to understand your thoughts on executive coaching?

The only comment that I have, I guess, is that I think that most organizations should consider requiring employees to do it as a part of professional development if they are at a certain level in the organization and wish to go higher.

Okay.

Because, again, you know, an outside person's perspective can help you change the way you think without being offensive or abrasive or feeling like your job is in jeopardy, that outside person doesn't, you know, doesn't fire you.

That's good to know. Who do you think would be a good person for me to speak with to get a better understanding of the role of executive coaching?

Well there are locally a couple of -- they call themselves executive coaches or life coaches or, you know, there's a bunch of those in the area but I would -- I'd probably want to sit down with you and tell you what I know about each of those people before I would suggest who you talk to, you know, my
network, of course, is full of XXXXXXX people. Locally, there are a couple of current XXXXXXX chairs that you could talk to, XXXX XXXX is one of them, and the way that XXXXXXX does their coaching is they do a group aspect as well as the one-on-one aspect so that was the other thing I wanted to mention to you is that my experience is a little bit different than are just only a one-on-one coaching...

Q Okay.
A ...and anybody that's involved with XXXXXXX is going to have that same type of experience. I find it valuable because you're with 10 or 15 other people and at a similar level in their organization but different industries so you're not competing with each other but you can help them solve their problems as well by saying oh well I dealt with last year and here's how I handled it.

Q Okay.
A So that group piece is really a significant part of the XXXXXXX approach but outside of my experience and relationships through XXXXXXX, you know, I have a limited scope there, you know, we've had certain people come into the college over the years, XX XXXXXXXXXX is one of them, and they do life coaching, you know, so there are people like that...

Q Okay, cool, I'll look into it. Thank you so much for your time. I really appreciate it.
A You're welcome.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing is an accurate transcript.

Jennifer E. Snyder, Transcriber
November 12, 2013
APPENDIX F

Themes From Transcripts (per DAF)

THEMES from Transcripts 1 - 4 *(per DAF)*

Q1: Definition / purpose of EC

*Helper...*
- Assist with soft skills, strategy, counsel
- Meet one-on-one with an individual
- Someone who will help you with leadership and soft skills
- An individual with whom I can meet regularly to discuss business
- Sounding board

Q2: Why engage in EC

- To succeed and grow
- Get a new look at issues, (un-bias, no agency problem)
- Grow personally

Q3: ‘Ingredients’ of an effective EC engagement

*Coach-centered:*
- Trust
- Comfortable
- Understand needs of client

*Executive-centered:*
- Commitment to time it takes
- Open mind to process
**Context-centered:**

- Business knowledge
- Understand what the client is looking for

**Q4: Benefit from EC**

- Introspective of oneself, looking at issue in a deeper way
- Looking at my flaws from someone else’s view
- Share my emotions
- Good sounding board
- Accountability
- Training
THEMES from Transcripts 1 - 4 (per JHS)

Q1: Definition / purpose of EC

To help the manager/executive...
- Identify/remediate potential shortcomings in mgt style/approach;
- Strengthen skills not taught in business school (i.e., soft skills of leading/managing people);
- One-on-one help/counsel/consultation; more than mentoring; provide sounding board;
- Assist in forming business strategy/plans to helping with mechanics of managing people;
- Clarify/strengthen thinking re: issues;
- Be accountable for actions and decisions;

Q2: Why engage in EC

- For self-improvement
- To ameliorate or address potential shortcomings
- Deepen self-awareness/self-insight;
- Get fresh/unbiased input;

Q3: ‘Ingredients’ of an effective EC engagement

Coach-centered:
- Trust between coach and client; Authentic/honest;
- Understands client’s needs/issues; Been there - done that;
- Capable of understanding the org/bus/culture, etc.

Executive-centered:
- Able/willing to invest the time;
Context-centered:

- A goal-orientation; clarity around why, what, and how;

Q4: Benefit from EC

- Deeper self-awareness;
- See the issues as larger than one’s self;
- Better modulation/expression of emotions;
- Education/additional training;
- Expended/deeper sense of issues;
- Being accountable;

Q5: ‘Pitfalls’ to keep in mind

- Big time commitment;
- Need real commitment to listen/change to get benefit;
- Can’t be a ‘know-it-all; have to be ready to learn something;
- Seeing coaching as just a ‘cost’ rather than an ‘investment’;
- Need to take risk to be open/sharing/vulnerable;

Q6: Confidentiality

- Is paramount to the relationship and to the success of the endeavor;
- Coach and client need to respect confidential communication;

Q7: Feedback to the organization

- Appropriate and respectful feedback is necessary and legitimate;
- Parameters should be clarified and agreed to up-front;

Q8: All team members in EC
• Need to promote coherency of ideas/philosophies/theories, etc. across org;
• Relevant for all in key roles as 'professional dvlpmt';

Q9: Considerations re: team members in EC

• Need to identify/involve sponsors/stakeholders in goal setting and feedback;
• Need to promote coherency of ideas/philosophies/theories, etc. across org;
• Rules re: confidentiality need to be set/adhered to;

Q10: Training / preparation of the coach

• Business background very important;
• Blend of business & psychology a 'slam-dunk';
• Coach needs to understand ‘personalities’ in the context of bus orgs;
• Integrity, honesty, etc. more important than prof discipline;
• Bkgrd in HR can be very helpful for personnel-related issues;

Q11: Outside or inside coach

• An outside coach has numerous potential advantages and represents a greater potential value to the executive and/or organization;
• Outsider perspective trumps insider knowledge;
• A coach from the inside may be OK in large organizations;
APPENDIX H

Transcript Analysis Summary (per JHS)

Transcript Analysis Summary (JHS)

(red text = inserted by JHS to improve clarity/readability of response, or to pose suggestion/question)

Initial Questions:

Q 1: What position do you hold in the company for which you work? (org

level... Executive mgt vs. senior mgt vs. middle mgt...?) (business sector/industry...) (type of business: size, for-profit, family-owned, etc...?)

T-1: Corporate Controller of Financial Reporting. (level...?)

T-2: Interim President (company size...?)

T-3: Owner/Chairman & CEO (company size...?...type = family-owned?)

T-4: Owner/President (company size...?...type = for-profit, family-owned?)

Q 2: Have you ever taken part in executive coaching?

T-1: yes

T-2: yes

T-3: yes

T-4: yes

Q 3: Did you work with an internal or external executive coach?

T-1: External
Pre-Constructed Questions (1-11):

Q 1: What is your definition of executive coaching?

T- 1: …someone that would assist with the potential pitfalls within their management style; looks at and (helps you with) the soft skills of managing people (and those) pieces of your job that you're not typically taught; not (helping to build) the knowledge of what you're truly doing (i.e. the job) but the skills to manage the people.

T- 2: …more than mentoring; …meet one-on-one with an individual and address the problems that they want to bring up whether they're personal or professional; …in a one-on-one environment rather than a group environment.

T- 3: …(can be narrow vs. general/broad); …help you on strategy; help you with everything from leadership to communication to hiring/firing, teambuilding, etc.;

T- 4: …I think about an individual that I can meet with regularly to discuss business issues, get feedback, leverage some of their experience to help me arrive at a decision, or to ask me questions that I have not asked myself; …to (help me) develop plans or be a soundboard for those plans; … (to hold me) accountable for doing what I said I was going to do;

Q 2: What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?
T- 1: …executive coach was assigned to me; …not something that I sought; …I could improve by using an executive coach. *(To fix/ameliorate personality/behavioral deficiencies thought to be impeding job or role performance...?)*

T- 2: …desire to continue to be successful and to grow; …board recommends or suggests if a company isn't going in the direction that the board likes or if they're trying to develop a certain individual into a leadership position; …because they want to grow personally.

T- 3: …simply want to improve their company's performance; …look internally in themselves skills that they might need to work;

T- 4: …executive coach to help mentor me; …someone to bounce ideas off of that I wouldn't want to do internally; …(someone who could) provide me an unbiased point of view;

Q 3: What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?

T- 1: …comfortable with the person *(i.e., the coach)*; …trust…would be the first and foremost the biggest one; …does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are *(i.e., does the coach understand me and the situation/context/demands that I have to contend with...?)*

T- 2: Trust is huge; …the honesty piece is probably the second aspect; …trust and honesty, I think, are the two biggest ones; …have to be committed to the time that it's going to take; …it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn't work.
T-3: …definitely understanding what the client's looking for; …biggest thing is really understanding kind of the issues and getting agreement on what they are and understanding what you're both working towards (clarifying/agreeing on shared goals/agenda/purpose of the coaching engagement...?); (coach) has to understand the company, what it does how it works, the culture of the company (i.e., the ‘context’ within which the exec needs to performance and succeed...?); (coach) has to understand the business (context) the person works in; …so that feedback and suggestions that they (coaches) provide (can be) meaningful and relevant;

T-4: …(coach has) diverse business experience; …(who has) been where I am (to share wisdoms, lessons learned, etc.); …(not) somebody who simply went and got a certificate in executive coaching; …wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches;

Q 4: For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?

T-1: …most valuable was just to be more introspective of myself; …looking at possibly my flaws in a different way, things that perhaps I just need to improve upon; …looking at perhaps that maybe I'm not the only issue with whatever dynamic you're looking at. (... that I alone may not be the ‘problem’; other people/factors contribute to the issues for which ‘a coach for me’ was prescribed ...?)

T-2: …an outlet to share my emotions; …didn't want to (couldn't) share those emotions at work; they (emotions) can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace; …in a safe environment with a coach; for me it was really the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.
T-3: ...executive education, I'm calling that coaching; (learned) new strategy using his (coach/trainer's) five forces model and really transformed our company; ...other answer...I have a long term executive coach I've used for probably 20 years, not consistently; ...kind of like a peer group, you bring business ideas to this forum (Vistage Int'l...?); ... (coach was) just a good sounding board; ...he has a wealth of experience with similar people and similar circumstances with similar problems, and he can take what other people have done, how things have worked out, and (offer) danger signs to look for; ...values would be the same, congruent (coach/client value congruency...?); ... have to get along with them, have mutual respect; (coach) has to communicate in a good way so to deliver advice, criticism properly;

T-4: ...a sounding board; ... (help me) look at it (an issue) a different way; ...ask me the thought provoking questions; ...make sure I’m looking at a situation holistically; ...my peer group which I consider part of my coaching process; ... (getting) different perspectives and diverse points of view is very valuable; ...be (held) accountable for what you said you were going to do;

Q 5: What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?

T-1: ...the amount of time; ...the commitment and the schedule to meet; trusting of the executive coach; ...trust and really connecting with what that person is telling you; ...it's up to you to change;

...until you commit to it and make the change yourself, the results won't change.
...depends on what level individual (works at); ...a trap that people fall into is that they think they know everything and they can't learn from someone else; ...if you're thinking of it (i.e., your work or role) in a silo; ... (if you think) you know everything about your own industry; ...big trap that people fall into is (thinking) that they already know everything and they don't need anybody to help them; If you think you cannot (trust or) be completely honest with your coach, it's going to be ineffective; If you don't trust that person (i.e., the coach), you're not going to share the vital aspects of an issue.

T- 3: (???)

T- 4: ... (need to know that) when you hire an executive coach, it's an investment; ...simply showing up is not enough; ... (exec doesn't) follow-up (or follow-through is) a misstep in the (coaching) process; ...picking the right person is really important; ... (need to) find somebody you'll be able to trust and have a good relationship with, not just by simply focusing on credentials;

Q 6: What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?

T- 1: ... confidentiality was of the utmost importance to me; ... he (the coach) also realized that the confidentiality was important; ... the confidentiality was of the utmost importance;

T-2: (Confidentiality is) probably the key to making it a successful relationship;

...(Confidentiality enables me ) to talk to somebody in confidence to work through it
emotionally, professionally, financially; …would not have worked if I couldn't have been completely open and honest with that person and know that person's never going to share any of that information; …it goes both ways, not only do you rely on the coach to keep your information confidential, you don't use that person's (coach's) name in a blame (or attribute things to the coach so as to deflect blame or responsibility for bad decisions/actions/behavior); I think confidentiality is what makes or breaks the whole relationship.

T-3: (confidentiality) is very important; …someone might want a signed confidentiality agreement (because coach acquires) a lot of power and knowledge (about client/company); (allows coach and client to be) extremely open; …confidentiality is really, really important; …similarly, (coach needs to be) impartial and focused on the right outcomes because executive coaching isn't just between the top person and that executive coach, (it requires the trust of the other stakeholders); …appearing impartial and being able to garner the respect of the people (and other stakeholders) you're working with as a consultant is important;
(coach needs to be credible to stakeholders to be effective with targeted client, and very aware of boundaries of relationship, accountability, confidentiality, etc., with the skills to manage/navigate these waters to good/honorable outcomes); …garner that respect, and show personal integrity (coach must project/convey presence, credibility, and integrity to client and stakeholders to be effective).

T-4: it's 100% confidential;

Q 7: What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?
T-1: I was (asked) to participate (along with) my immediate boss because there was a perception that we had a strained relationship; ...there was no real feedback to anyone; I think feedback to the organization would have been good; ...feedback to my immediate boss who wasn’t going through it was not going to happen.

T-2: That’s a great question. ...he coached me and he coached her and she reported to me; what information was appropriate for him to share with me or not share with me; ..the person should give permission; the person should give permission if (the coaching for you was) requested by a supervisor or by a board of directors and if that institution is paying for it, or they’re doing it for professional development for you (org needs feedback re: coaching you); I still think it's the individual's right to say no.

T-3: I think there should be some form of feedback in general in the process or how it's going with the person;

T-4: ...set very specific goals; ...making an investment for someone to have an executive coach (org/payer is entitled to a return on that investment...and to know if there is a return on that investment); ...(need to) measure the effectiveness of that (coaching) relationship; ...there aren’t a lot of training seminars that I really feel I need to go to but (coaching) is my training for personal (and professional) development; ...(expect) sharing information useful for the greater good (but not individual or) personal things;

Q 8: How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?

T-1: ...it was a great concept to have both of us utilize the same executive coach because he could understand some of the issues that perhaps I was having in
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relationship to my boss and vice versa; I went through it and my boss ended up dropping out; ... the end it cost us a lot of money and I think one party benefitted and perhaps the other party did not.

T-2: If we're talking about leaders at the same level in an organization that could be helpful; coaching relationships *(at different levels and for different purposes)*; people down further in the organization *(who)* are getting coaching or mentoring *(should be)* getting the same type of coaching or mentoring *(as those above them)* so they are all getting the same picture, the same information; ... risk in people in the same organization getting different coaching from different organizations or different people using different theories; ... coaching is a replacement for professional development in many ways *(and can replace/substitute for sending people to conferences/seminars)*; ... I would be careful about engaging multiple firms *(for coaching different people or org levels)* that might have different philosophies.

T-3: *(to help keep clear)* what you're trying to accomplish, *(especially if working on general communication or teambuilding)*; ... so we all had a common playbook to work from and a common vocabulary and language from that kind of training from an executive coach, good to have everybody up and down the company involved, but depending on what you're trying to do;

T-4: ... certainly see the benefit of that; ... depending on how large your leadership team is, that could get expensive; ... everybody should have some sort of pathway for professional development whether it's an executive coach or ongoing training;
Q 9: What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?

T- 1: …(needed) a higher level executive that forced both of us to participate and then possibly receive feedback from each of us to perhaps fix the strained relationship that was perceived (i.e., need to identify the sponsors/stakeholders, etc. that should hold the coaching participants and the coaching process accountable); …not quite sure why I initially was requested to participate (i.e., need to build clarity/ownership around the answer to the question, ‘why me’…?) …I was not speaking to an additional executive within the company regarding my experience and what I was getting out of it. (i.e., need clear stakeholders’ role re: accountability/responsibility for driving the coaching process and experience…?) …because of confidentiality (the coach) may not have always been reporting back to an executive within HR or even the president. (i.e., no stakeholders’ role re: accountability/responsibility for driving the coaching process and experience for the ‘good of the whole’…?)

T- 2: …coaching has to take place from the same company for each individual in the organization because of philosophies; …everybody (should) gets the same type of (leadership/mgt) theory training.

T- 3: (coach cannot take sides or focus on whose right and whose wrong…needs to focus on the company agenda); I think both people would have to trust the executive coach is impartial and really trying to get to the right outcome; executive coach would (not) be effective if he didn't garner the trust and the respect of both people he's working with; …not so much what the coach knows, but how the coach goes about doing what he does (i.e., be skilled at managing boundaries and process…?)
T-4: …parameter should be that whatever’s discussed with that coach, within the leadership team, should stay within the leadership team and not be shared with the greater employee group; …(need to) set up guidelines of the kinds of things that stay within the group and within the coach and things that will be transparent and shared with others; …another parameter is that once the coach is scheduled, everybody show up and be engaged and prepared;

Q10: How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?…in psychology?…in human resources?…in some other discipline? Why?

T-1: …it’s important that the person understands a little bit (about what your business does…) but not certain that it really is necessary to have that person really understand the business; …my executive coach was not a trained accountant or a financial person, but he still got what I was looking for; Psychology is important as well psychology from the standpoint that it allows the person (coach) to really get into your head and open you up and perhaps when it's dealing with soft skills, trying to dig at what the true issue is….; Human Resources…those skills are also important in an executive coach because it's going to facilitate the trust that is required within the entire program.

T-2: … the perfect coach is a meld of the two, the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect; …the coach has to have (these) two different (areas) of expertise; …important that an executive coach have a wide range of understanding of all business issues; …if not your field of expertise, coach could have a network of (business experts) specialists; …(coach needs to) know a lot about a lot of things to gain the trust of the person that you're coaching; (Execs) have to feel as though (the coach)
understands, *(is) knowledgeable, *(and is) really there to help them; *(coach needs to know)*
business and social sciences, including HR; *(have a theoretical understandings of)*
different leadership theories; *(good idea for coaches to know some type of)*
personality assessment, not just for the individual they're coaching but for themselves
as the coach to know how to handle that person; *(absolutely can help them)*
understand the personalities of their coworkers, supervisors, or board members, etc.;
*(there are little special certifications or certificates that I think would be very helpful.)*

*T- 3: *(coach needs to definitely have some business background; *(a good)*
foundations in business for an executive coach is worthwhile; *(Bkgrd in psychology is)*
probably the biggest thing; *(higher up you go in any business, the more it is about)*
people; *(when)* it's about dealing with people and trying to get the organization to go a
certain way or perform or work together or communicate, you're leading; *(a)*
background in psychology would be really, really important; *(Bkgrd in HR is)* not as
important as business and/or psychology; *(other?)* I think just personal integrity and just
being a good person; just being a good person with good integrity.

*T- 4: *(A lot of the value that I find in my coach is all his business experience; *(coach)*
being connected to the business world; *(trained in psychology? Not something I have*
considered before; *(would definitely be a second tier thing; *(coach has business*
experience and a degree in psychology would probably be a slam-dunk; *(human*
resources? 90% of issues leaders/managers deal with are people issues; *(having a*
coach that has an HR background could be really beneficial;*
Q 11: How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?

T- 1: …in some cases it may not matter; …has to be that trust; organization fairly small, getting an executive from outside probably best; …perhaps (exec coaching…?) is different skill set from the skill set that actually is internal; …confidentiality, maybe a person inside the organization that could do that, but can’t be water-cooler talk; …for that reason I think it's probably best handled by an external source.

T- 2: I don't think is healthy is if the coach is an employee of the organization because I think you could end up with a trust issue; …can't stop people's minds from creating (the issue of mistrust when it is an inside person); …helpful when they (the coach) know a lot about an organization; (As a coach,) you rely on what the person tells you and what they leave out.

T- 3: I think we're doing executive coaching all the time inside our organization; I think executive coaching happens all the time internally but it's kind of like teaching; (But) I think an outside person can be more effective in delivering the same message you deliver; (Outside coach) would also be more effective in coming up with new ideas and bringing (different view/perspective than) internal coach; (Outside coach brings) new way of looking at things we’re doing; …those things make an outside executive coach very, very valuable.

T- 4: …companies that have someone internally call them chief culture officer or director of training, or something like that; …might not call them executive coach; As a CEO, I would want someone from the outside; …inside (coaches) can know too much and can’t give you a completely fresh perspective, though they also have more
knowledge in about certain situations; (If) I had to favor one over the other I think that
(an external coach) would be better just for the unbiased, fresh perspective feedback.

Ending Questions:

Q 1: Anything else to share?

T-1: ...it was a big time commitment, it was fairly expensive, but allowed me to look
at me and my skills and areas in which perhaps I needed to change and address those
head on.

T-2: I think that most organizations should consider requiring employees to do it as a
part of professional development if they are at a certain level in the organization and
wish to go higher; an outside person's perspective can help you change the way you
think without being offensive or abrasive or feeling like your job is in jeopardy, they
can’t fire you.

T-3: (Exec Coaching) hasn't always been cheap but it pays for itself; ...you definitely
have to take a look at not what it's costing you but what is it bringing you; ... the
value proposition of (exec coaching) to the company is almost always there but you have
to help the process; the nice thing about executive coaching is that it forces you to get
out of that day-to-day circus (perspective), making you stop, pause and step back, to
take a look at that forest and see the forest instead of running through the trees; ...that
alone is valuable.

T-4: I really enjoy the group interaction (i.e., the external coaching group); I don't think it's
traditionally a part of executive coaching but I think it's an interesting dynamic to
explore because you do get a lot of benefit from interacting with your peers;
Q5: ‘Pitfalls’ to keep in mind

- The time involved in executive coaching
- Executives thinking that they know everything
- Going through the motions of executive coaching, but not doing the recommended work
- Need to trust the executive coach

Q6: Confidentiality

- It is very important and related to the success of the coaching
- Expectations of confidentiality need to be addressed and kept from day one.

Q7: Feedback to the organization

- Parameters need to be set
- Can be helpful to the organization if done in a respectful way
- Coachee needs to give permission

Q8: All team members in EC

- Good concept
- Need to consider time and cost, if means are available it is a good thing

Q9: Considerations re: team members in EC

- Coaches form the same company so that the same methods and philosophies are used across the team
- All people involved need to trust the executive coach
- People need to know what information is going to be shared and with whom ahead of time

Q10: Training / preparation of the coach

- Business knowledge is very important
- Business and philosophy knowledge is a great combination
• HR background helpful, but not a must
• People (soft) skills are a must

Q11: Outside or inside coach

• Outside coaches can be easier to trust
• Outside coach brings in new perspective or way to look at thing
• Inside coaches may be harder to trust and may share information
• In large organizations it may be okay to have an inside coach, not in small ones
APPENDIX I

Transcript Analysis Summary (per DAF)

THEMES from Transcripts 1 - 4 *(per DAF)*

Q1: Definition / purpose of EC

*Helper...*
- Assist with soft skills, strategy, counsel
- Meet one-on-one with an individual
- Someone who will help you with leadership and soft skills
- An individual with whom I can meet regularly to discuss business
- Sounding board

Q2: Why engage in EC

- To succeed and grow
- Get a new look at issues, (un-bias, no agency problem)
- Grow personally

Q3: ‘Ingredients’ of an effective EC engagement

*Coach-centered:*
- Trust
- Comfortable
- Understand needs of client

*Executive-centered:*
- Commitment to time it takes
- Open mind to process
**Context-centered:**

- Business knowledge
- Understand what the client is looking for

**Q4: Benefit from EC**

- Introspective of oneself, looking at issue in a deeper way
- Looking at my flaws from someone else’s view
- Share my emotions
- Good sounding board
- Accountability
- Training

**Q5: ‘Pitfalls’ to keep in mind**

- The time involved in executive coaching
- Executives thinking that they know everything
- Going through the motions of executive coaching, but not doing the recommended work
- Need to trust the executive coach

**Q6: Confidentiality**

- It is very important and related to the success of the coaching
- Expectations of confidentiality need to be addressed and kept from day one.

**Q7: Feedback to the organization**

- Parameters need to be set
- Can be helpful to the organization if done in a respectful way
- Coachee needs to give permission

**Q8: All team members in EC**
• Good concept
• Need to consider time and cost, if means are available it is a good thing

Q9: Considerations re: team members in EC

• Coaches form the same company so that the same methods and philosophies are used across the team
• All people involved need to trust the executive coach
• People need to know what information is going to be shared and with whom ahead of time

Q10: Training / preparation of the coach

• Business knowledge is very important
• Business and philosophy knowledge is a great combination
• HR background helpful, but not a must
• People (soft) skills are a must

Q11: Outside or inside coach

• Outside coaches can be easier to trust
• Outside coach brings in new perspective or way to look at thing
• Inside coaches may be harder to trust and may share information
• In large organizations is may be okay to have an inside coach, not in small ones
APPENDIX J

IRB Protocol Authorization

Date: October 30, 2013

From: The Office for Research Protections - FWA#: FWA00001534
      David Goldstein, Compliance Coordinator

To: Daniela A. Feenstra

Re: Determination of Non-Human/Non-Research Status

IRB Protocol ID: 44339

Title of Protocol: Shared Perception of Executive Coaching by Four Executives in
              the Central Pennsylvania Area

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) has received and reviewed the above
referenced eSubmission application. It has been determined that this project does not
meet the definition of Human Participant Research, as defined by the DHHS Federal
Regulations.

In meeting the criteria for the DHHS Federal Regulations definition of “human
participant research”, the project must fulfill requirements for BOTH “human
participant” and “research”:

• \(45 \text{ CFR } 46.102[f]\) A human participant is defined as “a living individual
about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research
obtains: 1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual or 2) identifible private information”.

• \(45 \text{ CFR } 46.102(d)\) Research is defined by DHHS as “a systematic
investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to
develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge”

Therefore, this project, as described in the application, does not require further review by
The Pennsylvania State University’s Institutional Review Board or the Office for Research Protections. Your application will be closed out. You will receive no further communication regarding this matter. You may begin your project.

Should your project change in any way that would then involve human participant research, prior to initiating those new procedures, you must submit for review and approval the appropriate application for the use of human participants in research: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/humans](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/humans)

Please do not hesitate to contact the ORP if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you for your continued efforts in protecting human participants in research.

This correspondence should be maintained with your research records.
APPENDIX K

Joo, Baekkyoo
To Me

Today at 12:46 PM
Thank you for your interest in my article, Daniela. It is my pleasure for you to use my conceptual framework for your dissertation, as long as you cite mine. I'd like to know more about your research. Is it an empirical study? What are the construct and measures? and so on. Please feel free to email me if you need anything form me. Thanks and good luck!

Brian
THEMES from Transcripts 1 - 4 (per MN)

Q1: Definition / purpose of EC

- Discuss and improve weaknesses in management style and soft skills;
- Provides a reference for reframing situation or alternative solutions;
- Provides thought-provoking questions I haven’t asked myself;
- “A little bit more than mentoring;”
- External outlet for discussing problems or difficult emotional topics, 1-on-1.

Q2: Why engage in EC

- Desire for professional development and growth
- Improve performance for individual and organization
- External mentor needed
- Provides a sounding board
- Offers “unbiased point-of-view”

Q3: ‘Ingredients’ of an effective EC engagement

Coach-centered: trust & confidentiality; honesty; time-commitment; understanding of client’s needs, goals, company, & business
Executive-centered: diverse and seasoned business experience; time-commitment; understanding of client’s needs, goals, company & business; comfort-level & connection to build trust

Context-centered: goals

Q4: Benefit from EC

- Introspection opportunity
- Reframing my flaws
- Insight into me
- “Transformed our company”
- long-term impact
- External outlet for discussing difficult emotional topics.
- 1-on-1 interaction
- Helps me to view through a holistic lens
- Validation
- Personal accountability

Q5: ‘Pitfalls’ to keep in mind

- Not following through on time commitment; committing to the process or schedule
- Picking the “right” coach with whom you have a connection and trust
- Thinking you know everything and no one else can help you
- Being closed off to learning, growth, or other ways of doing something

Q6: Confidentiality

- Critical to success
- Breeds openness
- “100% confidential”

Q7: Feedback to the organization

- Progress reports
- Goal attainment
- Parameters must be developed on front-end to determine what will be shared
- Coached individual should always have veto power
- Personal info should remain personal but process can be reported
Q8: All team members in EC

- Great idea if all complete program
- Good idea if all are equals
- Critical that all receive same type of caching using the same theories and philosophies

Q9: Considerations re: team members in EC

- Determine transparency and communication strategy beforehand to create trust
- “Everybody show up and be engaged and prepared”
- Use only on firm for multiple staff in the coaching program to keep coaching philosophy aligned

Q10: Training / preparation of the coach

- Psychology and HR background can provide basis for trust building and connection
- Business knowledge and experience is important
- “The perfect coach is a meld of the two of the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect”
- Communication skills are important
- Theoretical HR and leadership theories help

Q11: Outside or inside coach

- Critical for internal coach to provide confidentiality
- External coach is preferred
- Eternal coach can be more effective even if delivering same message as internal
APPENDIX M

Transcript Analysis Summary (MN)

(red text = inserted by JHS to improve clarity/readability of response, or to pose suggestion/question)

Initial Questions:

Q 1: What position do you hold in the company for which you work? (org level... Executive mgt vs. senior mgt vs. middle mgt...?) (business sector/industry...?) (type of business: size, for-profit, family-owned, etc...?)

T- 1: The Corporate Controller of Financial Reporting

T- 2: Strategic Advisor to President & Interim President

T- 3: Owner, Chairman and CEO two companies

T- 4: Owner & President

Q 2: Have you ever taken part in executive coaching?

T- 1: yes

T- 2: yes

T- 3: yes

T- 4: yes

Q 3: Did you work with an internal or external executive coach?

T- 1: External
Pre-Constructed Questions (1-11):

Q 1: What is your definition of executive coaching?

T-1: “…depending upon the situation… someone that would assist with the -- an executive with potential pitfalls that within their management style...soft skills…”

T-2: “….It's a little bit more than mentoring…someone who will meet one-on-one with an individual and address the problems…personal or professional…”

T-3: Someone to help narrow the focus e.g. strategy or assist with broader focus.

T-4: “…an individual that I can meet with regularly to discuss business issues that I may be facing, issues that I’m trying to reach a decision on to get feedback, perhaps leverage some of their experience in the business world to help me arrive at a decision or perhaps ask me questions that I have not asked myself about a particular situation or issue that I'm working through…”

Q 2: What might prompt an executive to engage in an executive coaching relationship?

T-1: “in my case it actually was pointed out to me that an executive coach was going to be assigned to me… it was not something that I sought but was something that was looked [sic] that I could improve by using an executive coach.”
T-2: “…desire to continue to be successful and to grow…a board recommends or suggests if a company isn't going in the direction that the board likes or if they're trying to develop a certain individual into a leadership position…if they do it themselves, they take it on because they want to grow personally.”

T-3: “…would be that they simply want to improve, you know, their company's performance… skills that they might need to work on themselves and they might need someone's help in doing that so…”

T-4: “…so I could have somebody to help mentor me… someone I could bounce ideas off to that I wouldn't want to do internally…that could provide me, you know, an unbiased point of view on a particular situation.

Q 3: What are 2-3 essential “ingredients” that underlie an effective executive coaching engagement?

T-1: “…you have to be comfortable with the person that is the -- coaching you because without that trust, you're not going to be as open, you're not going to be as engaged… does the person connect with you and do they get what the potential issues are that you have.”

T-2: “Trust is huge…the honesty piece… have to be committed to the time that it's going to take… it's the time that causes them the most anxiety and they just won't give it up and the relationship then doesn't work.”

T-3: Understanding the client’s needs and goals, understanding the client’s company and their business.
T-4: “…diverse business experience…I wanted somebody that had really been in the trenches.”

Q 4: For you, what has been most useful (or valuable) from executive coaching?

T-1: “…be more introspective of myself, looking at possibly my flaws in a different way…gave me some insight [to reframe]…”

T-2: to be an outlet to share my emotions because I didn't want to share those emotions at work…they can be misinterpreted when they are shared in the workplace but you're in a safe environment with a coach and you can get it off your chest and they can help you work through certain things so I think for me it was really actually the emotional piece rather than any technical aspect of coaching.

T-3: “really transformed our company…” Long-term impact; values alignment; communication strategy and feedback delivery.

T-4: “…my one-on-one interaction…it's really been being able to go to him with an issue or a decision I'm trying to arrive at and having that interaction, that sounding board, having that individual perhaps look at it at a different way and say have you thought of this, to ask me the thought provoking questions to make sure I’m looking at a situation, you know, holistically, all the angles… to really validate… be accountable for what you said you were going to do because ultimately when you're a CEO, who are you accountable too, yourself, your bank, maybe your bonding company depending on what you're, you know, your business is so I like that.”
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**Q 5:** What are 2-3 “pitfalls” that executives should keep in mind when considering whether or not to participate in an executive coaching relationship?

*T-1:* “…the amount of time… and just the commitment and the schedule to meet… trusting of the executive coach if you're really not sure that what they're suggesting or what they're recommending… really what it comes down to is it depends on you as well, meaning it's up to you to change.”

*T-2:* they think they know everything and they can't learn from someone else…. people go about solving those problems in different ways so I think that's a really big trap that people fall into is that they already know everything and they don't need anybody to help them too…If you think you cannot be completely honest with your coach, it's going to be ineffective.”

*T-3:* (**???) Stepping on toes?? Credibility of consultant??

*T-4:* “…when you hire an executive coach, it's an investment so simply showing up for a meeting and having that one hour interaction is not enough and I think there are people that go and have the meeting and when they leave the room, they don't follow-up… picking the right person is really important…you'll be able to develop trust…So I think finding the right person and not just focusing on simply credentials but whether you think you can connect with that person.”

**Q 6:** What is the nature and scope of confidentiality in an executive coaching engagement?

*T-1:* “…utmost importance…” [difficult to be seen meeting with EC due to perceived colleague curiosity or judgment]
**Q 7:** What should the nature and extent of feedback to the organization be when executives are engaged in executive coaching?

*T-1:* “I think feedback to the organization would have been good, however, feedback to my immediate boss who wasn’t going through it was not going to happen.”

*T-2:* “…we struggled…what information was appropriate for him to share with me or not share with me… so I guess that's the way it should be handled is that the person should give permission… it's the individual's right to say no…”

*T-3:* Yes the employee should provide feedback to the organization on “the company's trying to bring the consultant in for specific reason so I think there needs to be some form of feedback to the company and maybe what they're working or how they're address or even just the level of progress they feel but I don't know how detailed it has to be…”

*T-4:* “…if there were things that were useful for the greater good, that that -- that they would come back and impart that knowledge to me or the rest of the team. I think that would be
great but I would not have an expectation that if there were, you know, personal things that they were sort of working through together, that that would be, you know, for them.

**Q 8:** How important (or useful) is it for all members of an executive team to be simultaneously engaged in executive coaching?

**T-1:** “...it was a great concept to have both of us utilize the same executive coach because he could understand some of the issues that perhaps I was having in relationship to my boss and vice versa… a lot of it comes down to that you're strained relationship is with the party that is no longer involved in the coaching so I sort of walked away with it from the standpoint that in the end it cost us a lot of money and I think one party benefitted and perhaps the other party did not.”

**T-2:** “I'm not sure if it would have been helpful… I could see some risk in people in the same organization getting different coaching from different organizations or different people using different theories… I would be careful about engaging multiple firms that might have different philosophies.”

**T-3:** “...it's good to have absolutely everybody there…”

**T-4:** “I could certainly see the benefit of that… could get expensive.”

**Q 9:** What parameters or conditions need to be considered when executives from the same team are engaged in executive coaching?

**T-1:** “...a higher level executive that forced both of us to participate and then possibly receive feedback from each of us to perhaps fix the strained relationship that was
perceived…there needs to be that go between and there needs to be someone that we report to
at least say how the executive coaching…”

T-2: “…coaching has to take place from the same company for each individual in the
organization… everybody gets the same type of theory training.”

T-3: Must “garner the trust and the respect of the -- both people he's working with so I think
that's really important and it think out of that comes -- that's where, you know, it's not so
much what the coach knows, I would imagine, but kind of how the coach goes about doing
what they do…”

T-4: “…one parameter should be that whatever's discussed with that coach, within the
leadership team, should stay within the leadership team and not be shared…” And figure out
“here are the things that, you know, will be transparent and shared with others… everybody
show up and be engaged and prepared with whatever they need to be prepared with that day.”

Q 10: How important (or relevant) is that an executive coach be trained in business?...in
psychology?...in human resources?...in some other discipline? Why?

T-1: “…it's important that the person understands a little bit with what you do but I'm not
certain that it really is necessary to have that person really understand the business that you're
in… psychology from the standpoint that it allows the person to really get into your head and
open you up and perhaps when it's dealing with soft skills, trying to dig at what the true issue
is…within Human Resources, I think those skills are also important in an executive coach
because it's going to, I think, facilitate that trust that is required within the entire program.”
T-2: “...the perfect coach is a meld of the two of the business aspect as well as a social or psychological aspect... so I would include HR as part of that...And I think it's always a good idea for coaches to know how to assess like the disk profile or some type of personality assessment...”

T-3: “…needs to definitely have some business background…” Psychology is “the biggest thing…” HR “I don't think it's as important and business and or psychology… communication skills and being able to connect are just fundamental to being successful…”

T-4: “A lot of the value that I find in my coach is all his business experience.” Psychology “For me personally, it would not matter...so if I was ranking, it would be business, human resources and psychology.”

Q 11: How critical (or essential) is it that an executive coach be someone from “outside” the organization versus someone from “inside” the organization? Why?

T-1: “…in some cases it may not matter. If, however -- but there has to be that trust as well... an executive from outside was probably the best approach because of the time commitment...also perhaps is different skill set from perhaps the skill set that actually is internal and, again, because of the confidentiality...it's probably best handled by an external source.”

T-2: “…I would lean toward an external coach

T-3: “…I think there's a lot of times that I think an outside person can be more effective in delivering the same message you deliver but I think an outside executive coach could also -- would also be more effective also coming up with new ideas and bringing…”
T-4: “…I think external if I had to favor one over the other I think that would be better just from the unbiased, fresh perspective feedback.

Ending Questions:

Q 1: Anything else to share?

T-1: N/A

T-2: “…most organizations should consider requiring employees to do it as a part of professional development if they are at a certain level in the organization and wish to go higher.”

T-3: “…We had to then take what we learned as principles and apply them to ourselves so, you know, you'd also have to make sure that you don't come in expecting I'm going to hire this person to bring me this. They're a facilitator. They're not going to bring the answer and you have to be able to put in your own work and effort to get to the answer you want to get to because it's not going to be given to you but I think as long as you go into it with that attitude…” it’s of value.

T-4: N/A
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