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ABSTRACT

HOW EXECUTIVE COACHES ASSESS AND DEVELOP EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE EXECUTIVE SUITE

Mary McNevin
Dr. Sharon Ravitch

This qualitative research study explores the connections between executive coaching and emotional intelligence (EI) when working with senior level executives. The focus is on coaching the senior executives (chief executive officer, chief financial officer, senior vice-presidents) of companies of over $1 billion dollars in revenue. Since research indicates that EI is a valuable predictor of performance for executives, this study seeks to discover the how executive coaches assess and develop EI with their clients. This study is of importance to multiple audiences. First, it provides the research community with insights into how executive coaches perceive and report on the focus of EI as part of their practice. Second, the findings report on how executive coaches assess or measure EI with their senior level clients. Last, this study explores strategies coaches employ to help their executive clients develop EI competence, as well as what areas of EI coaches perceive their clients struggle with the most. The insights gained through this study are intended to challenge organizations, educators and executives on how to assess and develop EI through education, experiences and other methods identified in the study.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Senior level executives have many demands placed on them today. Research indicates that the executives who distinguish themselves have been shown to excel in emotional intelligence (EI) based competencies (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). The term emotional intelligence gained popularity and extensive media coverage when Time magazine put on the cover of the magazine the question “What’s your EQ?” (1995). Emotional Intelligence (EI) is defined as a “type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others emotions to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). As early as 1997, the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) survey of benchmark practices among major corporations, found that 4 out of 5 companies were trying to promote emotional intelligence with their employees through training and development (ASTD, 1997).

One way executives can develop their EI skills is through executive coaching. Coaching appears to be one of the most powerful, flexible, and efficient leadership tools available despite being an emerging discipline (Peterson, 2010). It is on the rise and in 2005, it was estimated that the coaching industry generated over $1 billion (Underhill & Koriath, 2005) in revenue. The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development conducted a study in 2005, and found that over 70% of United Kingdom employers used coaching in their organizations. Currently, various methodologies are used in the executive coaching profession, and the proliferation of these coaching systems is not
slowing down (Carr, 2004). The profession is still debating issues such as the definition, competencies, and qualifications of effective coaches (Peterson, 2010). David (2005) argued that for coaching to continue to establish itself as a profession, coaches need to learn what they can from existing theory and research, particularly in the areas of psychological growth and development.

With executive coaches coming from a variety of backgrounds, domains of knowledge and theoretical underpinnings will vary from practitioner to practitioner. Currently, with coaches coming from such diverse backgrounds it is difficult to articulate the ideal background of a coach (Underhill, McAnally, & Koriath, 2007). As the profession grows, this issue will become more problematic for human resource and learning officers when trying to hire those with the best qualifications. Another issue related to the lack of standards and credentialing is that there are minimal barriers to entering the coaching profession, and the lack of entry barriers makes it difficult to recognize how to hire a qualified coach. Human resource professionals need to select coaches that are qualified and have the appropriate skill sets for their work with executives. The lack of standardization in the profession leads to some specific questions: How do executive coaches assess and identify EI gaps? Do executive coaches believe EI can be developed? If so, what are the coaches doing to help executives develop competencies?

The practice of executive coaching has shown extraordinary growth and is being utilized by human resource and learning professionals at an increasing rate. Often, companies use coaching as a way to help executives build and develop an executive’s
people-orientation or EI skills. According to the 2008 Corporate University Xchange research report on current concepts in coaching, half (50%) of the companies consider coaching an important performance improvement tool for executives and high-level leaders.

At the same time, interest and focus on EI as an important component of effective leadership has increased since the publication of the concept by Goleman (1995). Subsequent research also indicates the higher up a leader is in the organization, the more important EI-based competencies are to job performance (Goleman et al., 2002). Emotional intelligence competencies are learned abilities (Goleman et al., 2002). This is a key point for both executives and executive coaches. If these competencies have the potential to be learned and they impact a leader’s ability to perform at a higher level, then helping an executive to be a more emotionally intelligent leader is likely to be a focus of development for executive coaches when dealing with c-suite executives.

This study is of importance to multiple audiences. First, this study provides the research community with insights into the emotional intelligence gaps for executive level clients. Second, the insights gained from this study may suggest further research on how the field develops and trains executive coaches, specifically in the area of emotional intelligence. Third, the findings from this study regarding emotional intelligence gaps among executives ought to challenge organizations, educators, and executives on how to plan to minimize those gaps through education, experiences, and other methods identified in the study. This research study was, therefore, framed by the following research questions:
1. How do executive coaches assess and/or measure emotional intelligence of executive clients?

2. What strategies do executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies?
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Because executive coaching is an emerging field, this paper examines the perspectives of the executive coach with regards to how he or she assesses and develops emotional competence when working with senior level executives. First, various definitions of executive coaching are identified. Second, a brief history of coaching is presented, followed by how coaching is utilized today. Third, executive coaching is compared to developmental alternatives provided to executives such as therapy, consulting, mentoring, or other types of leadership development in order to see if there is cross over in the various fields. Fourth is an illustration of the burgeoning profession of executive coaching, including a look at the organizational investment applied to coaching. Fifth is an examination of the drivers for engaging a coach and for whom coaching is targeted in organizations. Sixth, a brief description of EI in the workplace is described along with an outline of three EI constructs and associated measurement instruments. Last is a brief discussion on the impact of improving EI in the workplace. Tying this together is an examination of how executive coaching is designed to help an executive improve job performance through behavior change resulting from self-awareness and learning. There will be a closer look at what executive coaches do to help develop emotionally intelligent leaders at the c-suite level.

Definition of Executive Coaching

The literature contains a myriad of definitions for executive coaching, and this is not uncommon with emerging disciplines. Some definitions focus on development of a
one-to-one relationship between the client and the coach. Underhill et al. (2007) described executive coaching as the “one-to-one development of an organizational leader” (p. 8). Kilburg (1996) described coaching as a helping relationship formed between a client with managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to aid the client in achieving a mutually identified set of goals. This relationship between client and coach is designed to improve the manager’s professional performance and personal satisfaction and consequently to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization within a formally defined coaching agreement.

Some coaching definitions focus on leaders becoming better learners through the use of tools, knowledge, and insights. Peterson and Hicks (1996) asserted that coaching is the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective. Building on the concept of equipping leaders to become more effective is a solutions-focused definition of coaching. Stober and Grant (2006) maintained that coaching is a goal-oriented, solution-focused process. In this process, the coach helps identify and construct possible solutions, delineate a range of goals and options, and then facilitate the development and enactment of action plans to achieve those goal. Some definitions include the focus on the needs and goals of both the executive and the sponsoring organization and expand the concept beyond the one-to-one relationship.

According to the Executive Coaching Handbook (The Executive Coaching Forum [TECF], 2008), executive coaching is an experiential and individualized leader
development process that builds a leader’s capability to achieve short- and long-term organizational goals. The coaching is conducted through one-on-one and/or group interactions and is driven by data from multiple perspectives. The relationship is based on mutual trust and respect. The organization, an executive, and the executive coach work in partnership to achieve maximum impact. Benton (1999) defined the business coach as someone who works with the client privately to provide objective, professional direction to increase performance by helping to enhance what the client has and acquire what she or he needs. In the Executive Coaching Handbook, it was suggested a more targeted definition that is specific to executive coaching, and argued that executive coaching is an experiential, individualized, leadership development process that builds a leader’s capability to achieve short and long-term organizational goals. It is conducted through one-on-one interactions, driven by data from multiple perspectives, and based on mutual trust and respect. The organization, an executive, and the executive coach work in partnership to achieve maximum learning and impact (TECF, 2008).

Peterson (2010) outlined the following criteria to define executive coaching since an agreed-upon definitions has been “elusive” (p. 4). His criteria added additional components to the Executive Coaching Handbook’s (TECF, 2008) definition, and he defined eight key criteria. First, executive coaching is one-on-one coaching and not done in a group or team setting. Second, it is relationship-based where rapport and trust are built. Third, executive coaching is methodology-based and the coach follows a process. Fourth, executive coaching is facilitated by a professional coach as opposed to an internal colleague, such as an HR professional. Fifth, executive coaching has multiple sessions
that facilitate accountability. Sixth, executive coaching focuses on the goals, values, and expectations of both the organization and the executive. Seventh, the process, tools, and techniques are customized to the individual. Last, executive coaching is intended to foster independence and to help the executive develop and grow on his or her own (Peterson, 2010, p. 4).

For the purposes of this study, the Executive Coaching Handbook’s definition was used (TECF, 2008). Executive coaching is typically done one-on-one, mutual trust and respect are needed to protect the confidentiality of the leader, and the information discussed in the coaching session and most often the coach is employed by the organization in order to positively impact the coach and the organization. Additionally, also included was Peterson’s (2010) criteria that indicates the coach is an external professional coach who customizes a methodologically-based process over multiple sessions in order to build in accountability, follow up, and to foster the ability for the executive to develop independently.

The Evolution of Executive Coaching

Coaching has been around for centuries. In the 17th century, Father Francoi Leclerc du Tremblay was a powerful advisor, or coach, to French statesman Cardinal Richelieu (Coutu et al., 2009). In 1937, Gorby wrote the first academic paper describing coaching, because he described how older employees coached newer employees in reducing waste in order to increase profits (Grant, 2003). The term coaching originated in Kocs, Hungary, where some of the finest passenger coaches were first manufactured in the 15th century (Underhill et al., 2007). Because a coach takes a person from one
location to another location, the word coach gradually came to mean a private tutor (Merriam Webster, 1970). Before the word coaching became popular, executives were often sent to charm school to improve on their interpersonal skills (Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999). Today, executive coaching is a confidential, individually-tailored engagement designed to meet the needs of both an executive being coached and the organization paying for the service (Coutu et al., 2009). Professionals—like athletes and musicians—utilize coaches to guide them to a new level by honing their skills, helping them learn new plays, and identifying new strategies to win. In addition, public speakers and performing artists also turn to coaches to help them perform better and move to a higher level (Witherspoon & White, 1996).

Morgan, Harkins, and Goldsmith (2005) argued that as the marketplace has become more competitive and fast-moving, organizations need to know how to take good people and make them the best that they can be and position them to work effectively and cohesively in their work environments. Again, in making a comparison to sports coaches, Morgan et al. (2005) noted that people may not think they need a coach. Having an executive coach is like having a personal trainer who provides self-assessments to help executives move up in their field (Knowledge@Wharton, 2008). Underhill et al. (2007) noted that during the past two decades, organizations have engaged executive coaches to facilitate the transportation of leaders to improved levels of development and effectiveness. As business goes more global and work grows increasingly turbulent, many organizations are making strides by using coaching as their approach to focusing on their people (Goldsmith & Lyons, 2006).
Convenience, time saving, and customization create compelling reasons for a coach to consider coaching as opposed to other methods of development such as training. Coaching can save an executive's time because it is tailored to their individual needs (Lary, 1997). Hall et al. (1999) suggested one possible reason for the rise of executive coaching is that it allows an executive to address issues that typically go unattended in the rush of business life. They also suggested an executive coach can provide straight feedback and allow the executive to be vulnerable. Sherman and Freas (2004) indicated that executive coaching engages leaders in customized ways that acknowledge and honor their individuality. Lary (1997) argued that coaching offers needed expertise, an objective viewpoint, and can easily be integrated into the executive’s routine. The lure of saving an executive’s time, tailoring the coaching session to specific needs, is only realized if the coaching process produces learning, behavior change, and growth in the executives.

Coaching appears to be rapidly becoming a significant portion of many organizations’ approach to developing key executives. Corporate University Xchange (2008) conducted a study on current concepts in coaching. The survey collection period was open for three weeks and garnered about 200 responses from companies of various size and industry. The study found that coaching was noted as one of the three elements of learning in corporate settings, along with formal instruction and on-the-job learning. Only 10% of the respondents indicated that coaching was “not something they needed to do” (Corporate University XChange, p. 5).

Anderson, Frankovelgia, and Hernez-Broome (2008) conducted a benchmark study on coaching trends in organizations. The web-based survey was emailed to
approximately 3,400 leaders from the CCL database and targeted chief officer and senior level positions, with a total of 347 leaders (10.2% response rate) responding to the survey. In comparing the use of coaching from 2007 to 2008, 40% said that their organizations did more coaching in 2008 than in 2007. Only 10% said they did less and 10% did not do any coaching. The remainder (39%) did about the same amount of coaching from 2007 to 2008. Where the respondents forecasted their expectations for 2009, over half (53%) indicated they expected to do more coaching in 2009 than in 2008; 4% expected to do less coaching; and the remainder (42%) expected to do about the same amount from 2008 to 2009 (Anderson et al., 2008). Table 1 shows estimates of the utilization of coaching from the survey results. It is evident that human resource professionals are turning to coaching as a way to provide executives with customized one-to-one coaching. Researchers need to understand and learn about the key areas of focus, assessment tools and the developmental assignments given to executives by their coaches.

Table 1.

Survey Results: Estimated Utilization of Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More coaching</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less coaching</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did no coaching</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Anderson et al., 2008, p. 7)
Experts in the field were also seeing an increase in the need for coaching. Sherman and Freas (2004) stated executives of flatter, leaner, and faster-moving organizations were recognizing a subtler set of competencies such as communication and interpersonal skills for influencing employees. Charan (2009) contended that there was no question that future leaders would need constant coaching as the business environment becomes more complex. Tozum from FARBEYOND Consulting, argued that coaching can be a practical tool to help grow the business, significantly accelerate the process for a leader to see new possibilities, and to deliver with speed (Underhill et al., 2007). Gray (2006) argued the future will have constant change and leaders cannot sustain the discontinuities in their lives without support, and the coach helps guide the leader through a transient corporate culture.

**Coaching Practices and Processes**

The term coaching has a variety of definitions, and the coaching profession is comprised of professionals from a wide array of disciplines and educational backgrounds. Judge and Cowell (1997) conducted a 1996 survey of executive coaches and found roughly 45% have PhDs and about 90% have master’s degrees with concentrations in business and social sciences. Does this mean the profession lacks uniformity in coaching practices, tools and processes? In a study conducted to address the ongoing debate about the role of psychology in executive coaching, Bono, Purvanova, Tolwer, and Peterson (2009) compared the practices of psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, as well as the practices of coaches from a variety of psychological disciplines (e.g. counseling, clinical, and industrial/organizational). Their study suggested that there was little
uniformity in practices. However, they stated it was ill-advised to rely on educational background alone to predict philosophy, process, or behavior, because it provides limited information about actual practices.

**Multi-Rater Feedback**

Judge and Cowell (1997) claimed one differentiating factor was the level of assessment performed. Despite being a relatively new tool, 360-degree feedback assessments are frequently used in organizations and by coaches. Craig and Hannum (2006) stated that just a few decades ago, our 360-degree knowledge was virtually zero. Judge and Cowell (1997) argued the best coaches conducted 360-degree assessments of executives, which included surveying and interviewing all the people with whom the executive leader regularly interacts. They also found some coaches conducted an information session with the executive and this may be sufficient depending upon the type of behavioral change and the ability of the executive to assess his or her place in the firm. However useful a tool 360 feedback may be, in the wrong hands—or in organizations where the culture is not capable of assimilating constructive feedback from peers and co-workers—the tool can have a lasting negative effect. Edwards (1995) discussed the emergence of 360-degree feedback as a tool and argued the impact of feedback is affected by the person’s attitude prior to receiving the feedback. He claimed the feedback can be insightful, yet he cautioned users of this tool to be aware of the ability of the process to harm those that are unable to accept the feedback. Hazucha, Hezlett and Schneider (1993) studied how managers developed after receiving 360-degree feedback. In the study of 198 managers in a large midwestern utility company,
they found receiving the feedback was helpful, but follow up developmental activity was the most critical factor in improving the employee’s skills.

Gray (2006) claimed many coaching interventions were preceded by an assessment of the client’s psychological profile, such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), an instrument based closely upon a Jungian psychodynamic model. Bono et al. (2009) surveyed 428 coaches (256 nonpsychologists, 172 psychologists) and found psychologist practitioners were more likely to use aptitude or ability tests and multisource ratings than non-psychologists. Non-psychologist practitioners were less likely to interview the client, supervisors, or peers than their psychologist peers. Psychologists were also more likely to have access to performance data on the individual being coached than non-psychologists, who were more likely to use interest inventories (Bono et al., 2009).

What are the top topics addressed by coaches? Bono et al. (2009) found the top three topics addressed by psychologist coaches were leadership, interpersonal skills, and management style. For non-psychologist coaches, the top three topics were communication, leadership, and interpersonal skills. Comparing coaching methods, the study found that psychologist coaches were more likely to report having face-to-face interaction, while at the same time having fewer coaching sessions. Additionally, psychologist coaches tended to use multiple methods of assessment and evaluation (Bono et al., 2009). Comparing the scientific and philosophical approaches, they found non-psychologist coaches were more likely to use behavior modification, neurolinguistic programming, and psychoanalytic or psychodynamic techniques, although there were no
differences between the two groups in their use of cognitive-behavioral or goal-setting approaches (Bono et al., 2009).

When analyzing the coaching competencies and models of coaches, Bono et al. (2009) found what appeared to be two distinctly different approaches. Some coaches focused on listening, reflecting, and questioning, with an apparent attention to the personal growth of the client, while others were more interested in business-related outcomes. Unfortunately, the research did not address whether the approaches were related to the type of training or educational background of the coach. Both psychologist and non-psychologist coaches agreed that skills, such as the ability to build rapport, listening, and counseling were key competencies of a coach. Psychologists were substantially more likely than non-psychologists to list knowledge and understanding of human behavior as a key competency. In addition, psychologists rated knowledge of business practices, including strategy, culture, and leadership as a more important competency than nonpsychologists.

TECF (2008) articulated the competencies, skills and attributes of coaches by drawing on their own experiences in the field. They captured the experiences of managers of coaching in organizations and coaching educators and researchers and came up with four key coaching competency areas: psychological knowledge; business acumen; organizational knowledge, and coaching knowledge. They also defined six phases of the coaching process: building and maintaining relationships, contracting, assessment, development planning, facilitating development and change, ending formal coaching, and transitioning to long-term development. In addition, they also outlined a set of nine key
personal attributes for coaches, regardless of context, which were: mature self-confidence, positive energy, assertiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, openness and flexibility, goal orientation, partnering and influence, continuous learning and development, and integrity. For each category, the team defined both basic and foundational competency levels to allow for the varying individual levels of effectiveness (TECF, 2008).

The International Coach Federation, which represents more than 16,000 coaches in over 90 countries, established a set of 11 core competencies and a code of ethical standards that members pledge to uphold. Boyatzis (1982) defined a competency as “the underlying characteristics of a person that lead to or cause effective and outstanding performance” (p. 21). The competencies used in their credentialing process are grouped into four clusters: (a) setting the foundation, (b) co-creating the relationship, (c) communicating effectively, and (d) facilitating learning and results. The ICF code of ethics include professional conduct at large, conflicts of interest, professional conduct with clients, confidentiality and privacy, and a pledge of ethics which members sign. The ICF competencies are included in Appendix A and the ICF Code of Ethics are included in Appendix B.

Some organizations, such as Personnel Decisions Incorporated (PDI) have created their own coaching competency model and ethical guidelines. PDI also has created a coaching certification which supports its core competencies and its three-phased process: (a) planning, (b) developing, and (c) inspiring. The 10 core competencies are: (a) meeting PDI ethical guidelines and professional standards, (b) establishing the coaching
agreement, (c) creating the coaching relationship, (d) coaching presence, (e) active listening, (f) insightful inquiry, (g) productive and crucial communications, (h) creating awareness, (i) behavioral focus, and (j) action planning and best practices. The core coaching competencies, definitions and behaviors are in Appendix C. The PDI code of ethics are included in Appendix D.

Beyond competencies and codes of ethics, what are other key considerations for a coach to consider? Rainey Tolbert and Hanafin (2006) believed that all practitioners want to do their best and typically go to great lengths to use the most extensively tested theories, models and technologies. The authors claimed that ultimate success of an intervention rests with the practitioner’s use of self as instrument, which they refer to as presence, which requires a holistic and deliberate engagement with the client. They propose that the principles of presence are: be honorable, be an effective agent of change, and be curious. One way to look at presence is through the lens of time: past, present, and future (Rainey Tolbert & Hanafin, 2006). For coaches, the past presence would comprise their credentials, work and life experiences. The present presence includes attire, posture, voice tone, content of conversation, gender, race, physical ability, and ethnicity. For a coach, many of these characteristics would seem to be evident, yet the Rainey Tolbert and Hanafin (2006) team argued that many practitioners do not know what they evoke, noting that it is critical to develop self-awareness and interest in how one’s presence impacts others—particularly the client. Future presence involves the client’s interest in the practitioner and the work beyond the present moment. One aspect of future presence is
the ability during the session to shift the client’s thinking to that which will have an impact on the future (Rainey Tolbert & Hanafin, 2006).

McGonagill (2000) suggested that consultants and coaches may have gaps between their espoused theories and their theories-in-use—between theory and actual practice. He cited an example where Argyris analyzed the transcript of a coaching interaction between Stephen Covey and his son from the book *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* (Covey, 1989). Covey was “upset and disillusion[ed]” (p. 177) by his son’s failure to honor his commitments, suppressed his feelings and asked about how the yard work is going, despite evidence the son had not progressed on his yard work. Argyris points out that, as a coach, Covey behaved in ways that were inconsistent. For instance, Covey employed two mutually inconsistent theories of effective action: one that he used in practice and one that he espoused (Argyris, as cited in McGonagill, 2000).

McGonagill also built upon Schön’s research on professionals in action, which lends support to the notion that coaching is more art than science. Schön gave this artistry a name—reflection-in-action (Schön, as cited in McGonagill, 2000). McGonagill’s main thrust was that coaches should be reflective practitioners who are able to see in the moment of client interaction everything one would see if one were to step out of the moment and reflect. He stated this ideal is not completely attainable, but coaches can move towards it by routinely allowing time to adopt a posture of inquiry (McGonagill, 2000). Gray (2006) also referenced Schön’s work—specifically, what Schön called *follow me!* and *hall of mirrors*. Follow me is when the student learns by following the example or performance of the coach. The coach is a role model for the leader and this
can be done either explicitly or implicitly. The hall of mirrors process allows a manager to both experience coaching and to reflect on what it might feel like for their subordinates to be coached by him (Schön, as cited in McGonagill, 2000).

**Executive Coaching Compared to Development Alternatives**

Human resource professionals and chief learning officers often utilize a variety of processes to develop talent within their organizations. Organizations have discovered the benefits of providing executives with individualized coaching to address specific skill deficits, enhance performance, or help them grow into an expanded leadership role (Hodgetts, as cited in Joo, 2005). It is important to note that executive coaching is simply one choice a human resource leader or chief learning officer has, and it is distinct from other types of developmental initiatives such as psychotherapy, business consulting, life coaching, career coaching, performance coaching or mentoring.

Changing behavior through self-awareness and learning can be done by coaching, mentoring, counseling, and therapy. Executive coaches come from a variety of disciplines and tend to employ various techniques based on their background, education, and experiences. However, executive coaches need to know when to refer a person to therapy or counseling, and this should be a part of their certification process. According to Sherman and Freas (2004), people who need therapy tend to make poor candidates for coaching. *Harvard Business Review* published a research report entitled “The Realities of Executive Coaching” in January 2009 (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). The basis of the report was from a survey that was distributed to 245 coaches, and a total of 140 coaches (57% response rate) completed the survey. Nearly all the coaches agreed that executives with
considerable character flaws or deep-seated behavioral problems were poor coaching candidates. The same *Harvard Business Review* report delineated coaching from therapy in several ways.

**Coaching Versus Therapy**

Therapy (which is done only by psychologists and is not a coaching process) tends to focus on the past and diagnose and treat dysfunctional behavior, is based on medical ethics, and is typically paid for by the individual. Coaching focuses on the future, fosters individual performance in a business context, and helps executives discover his or her own path (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). Stober differentiated coaching and therapy by noting that coaching is a process focused on working with a person’s needs, wants, goals, or visions for where he or she wants to go and then designing steps for getting there. Therapy is focused on resolving deficits and weaknesses in the direction of restoring a person to proper functioning (Stober & Grant, 2006). Peterson (2010) distinguished the differences between coaching and therapy by defining the purpose of both: “The purpose of coaching is to increase work performance, enhance leadership potential, and accelerate development of successful performers.” He defined the purpose of therapy as: “to address a goal that is typically stated as a problem, often related to mood, affect, or personal relationships which are rarely presenting issues in coaching” (p. 12). Summerfield (2006) indicated that counseling has a strict code of ethical practice, and the contract for confidentiality may differ significantly with coaching. Berglas (2002), an executive coach with a psychology background, argued that “in an alarming number of situations,
executive coaches who lack rigorous psychological training do more harm than good.” (p. 87).

Coaching and therapy also have some similarities: Both are complex relationships based on trust (Summerfield, 2006). Some executive coaches have a background in therapy and others do not. However, many coaches surveyed for the Harvard Business Research Report (2009) indicated both coaching and therapy occur through conversations and intimate relationships, and both invite self-reflection, self-awareness, and behavior change. Despite the similarities, certain lines between coaching and therapy should not be blurred. Coaches need to know when a person needs a therapist and should have a referral ready (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). Gray (2006) contended that coaches may wittingly or unwittingly open up a client’s deep-seated psychological anxieties; therefore, coaches not trained in psychotherapy must be sensitive and know when it is time to refer the client to a professional psychotherapist. Both are typically paid for by the organization; involve goal setting, management, planning and evaluating change; advise individuals on business issues; and are based on organizational ethics (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009).

Coaching Versus Consulting

According to Schein (2006), coaching is a subfield of consultation because the coach must be able, like a consultant, to start in a process mode and help identify what the real problems are that need to be addressed in order to be successful. The differences lie according to who initiates the process, whether it is an individual or organizational program, and the status differential between the coach and the client (Goldsmith & Lyons, 2006). Morgan et al. (2005) argued that both the consultant and coach rely on data
gathering to interpret the individual and organizational challenges. According to the Harvard Business Review Coaching Survey (2009), coaching borrows from both consulting and therapy. The table below shows the overlap areas indicated from the survey results.

Table 2.

**Consulting, Coaching and Therapy Overlap Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consulting</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid to come up with answers</td>
<td>Focuses on the future</td>
<td>Focuses on the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advises individual leaders on business matters</td>
<td>Paid to ask the right questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on organizational performance</td>
<td>Fosters individual performance in a business context</td>
<td>Tackles difficult issues at work and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves management in goal setting</td>
<td>Helps executives discover their own path</td>
<td>Diagnoses and treats dysfunctionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strives for objectivity</td>
<td>Based on organizational ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides quantitative analysis of problems</td>
<td>Helps executives discover their own path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on organizational ethics</td>
<td>Focuses on individual behavior change</td>
<td>Based on medical ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid for by the company</td>
<td>Explores subjective experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid for by the individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some executive coaches have a background in business consulting. It is important to note that business consulting is different in a number of ways. Consulting focuses on
success and performance of the organization; in contrast, coaching focuses on success and performance of the individual in a business context. Consultants are often brought in to devise frameworks, provide quantitative analysis of problems, and recommend solutions, while coaches focus on having the executives discover their own solutions (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). Unlike a consultant, a coach works in partnership with the client to discover solutions together through careful listening, provocative questioning and the right level of prompting at the right time. The goal is often to enable clients to find the right answers on their own (Morgan et al., 2005).

**Executive Coaching as a Unique Subfield of Coaching**

Executive coaching also differs from other types of coaching such as career coaching and life coaching. Career coaching is where the focus is on helping the client identify career goals and set career objectives. It was stated in the *Executive Coaching Handbook* that career coaching primarily focuses on the individual's short- and long-range career objectives (TECF, 2008). He further explained that career coaching helps the client plan, seek, or change career direction over the short or long term. Underhill et al. (2007) described career coaching as assisting an individual with an assessment of where their career was now and where it may go next. This is typically paid for by the individual or the company. According to the *Executive Coaching Handbook* (TECF, 2008), career coaching helps individuals determine what they want and need from their career and works with them to make decisions to balance their career objectives with the other parts of their lives.
Life or personal coaching helps individuals gain awareness of and clarify their personal goals and priorities. Personal or life coaching primarily focuses on an individual’s personal goals, thinking, feeling, and actions and how the individual can achieve greater personal effectiveness and satisfaction (TECF, 2008). Typically, the coach focuses on helping the client achieve goals in various aspects of life rather than focusing exclusively on speeding up business objectives (Underhill et al., 2007). In addition, a life coach works with a client to help develop a better understanding of the client’s thoughts, feelings, and options; to take appropriate actions to positively change his or her life; accomplish goals; and feel more fulfilled. Many executive coaches also discuss these goals and priorities; however, unlike life coaching, it involves a third party—the executive’s employer (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). Executive coaching is different from most other forms of coaching because it has a dual focus of working one-on-one to develop the executive as a leader while also helping the leader achieve business results (TECF, 2008). Often in executive coaching, the organizational system is considered and key stakeholders are engaged in the coaching process. It was argued in the Executive Coaching Handbook that the professional coach needs to involve the executive’s key stakeholders in the coaching to truly grasp the relationship between the executive’s behavior and the organization, which is needed to help the executive comprehend how different actions are affected by and impact the entire organizational system (TECF, 2008).


**Executive Coaching Versus Leadership Development**

Executive coaching is leadership development but it differs from traditional forms of leadership development training in that it is customized for the individual. Underhill et al. (2007) found that 96% of the organizations they studied felt that their coaching efforts were somewhat linked or highly linked to their leadership development strategies. Often, executive coaching is tailored to the individual and the organization in which the leader is employed, whereas traditional leadership development training occurs in a classroom setting with many developing leaders with a set of predetermined learning objectives. It is typically more of a one-size-fits-all built around a specific topic or genre. Underhill et al. (2007) argued that as the popularity of executive coaching continues to grow, it will begin to replace one-size-fits-all methods, resulting in a shift from general education to individualized personal development. For example, a coach may work directly in the client’s office on tailored and specific time management techniques; whereas with traditional training an executive may participate in a class or session with others on generic time management skills in a classroom setting. Coaching offers an opportunity for a leader to receive personal attention (Underhill et al., 2007). This personal, customized approach to development can target an individual’s specific needs, address self-awareness blind spots, and help accelerate the development more than attending a classroom leadership development session.

**Coaching Versus Mentoring**

The difference between coaching and mentoring is also relevant to discuss because the distinction can be grey and can cause some confusion. Coaching tends to
focus on performance improvement and skill enhancement, while mentoring tends to focus on long-term career development (Grant, 2001). Underhill et al. (2007) described mentoring as a relationship in which someone with a great deal of experience within the company assists another person, the protégé. The mentor provides the protégé with advice, perspectives on the company culture, office politics, or the protégé’s new role. This relationship is most often voluntary for both parties and usually there are no specific qualifications to be a mentor (Underhill et al., 2007).

Coaching relationships are typically formalized with a contract and set period of time for the coach and the executive to work together, whereas mentoring is typically less formalized, the duration of relationship is undefined, and it can last for years. Coaches have a dual client focus of both the executive and the organization, but mentors typically focus on the protégé and have a single focus. Passmore (2007) argued that the distinction between coaching and mentoring is more blurred than what is suggested in the literature, outlining seven factors when comparing coaching to mentoring: level of formality, length of contract, focus of outcome, level of business knowledge, training, client and supervision or support. The formality of the coaching relationship higher and often involves a contract, whereas mentoring is typically less formal and without a contract (Passmore, 2007). In comparing the length of the arrangement, Passmore (2007) found mentoring relationships to often last 3 to 5 years, while coaching is typically a 2 to 12 month relationship. In addition, he further described the outcome of coaching as performance-facing, while the focus of mentoring is on long-term career objectives.
Mentors typically have detailed knowledge of the organization or business sector, while coaches typically have broad business knowledge.

In regards to training, Passmore (2007) noted that most coaches have a background in psychology, psychotherapy, or human resources while mentors have a background in senior management with limited mentor or coach training. Additionally, in most coaching engagements, there is a dual client relationship. The coach focuses on both the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization. In a mentoring relationship, he argued, there is typically a single client—the individual. Lastly, Passmore indicated that a mentor typically only has informal supervision whereas a coach will have a formal support or supervision as part of the coaching plan.

Mentoring, therapy, consulting, and the various types of coaching all have some crossover with executive coaching. Ives (2008) argued that even as the coaching and mentoring dichotomy becomes widely accepted, coaching has come under the influence of a range of therapeutic or personal-development approaches.

**The Burgeoning Professionalization of Executive Coaching**

The growing popularity of executive coaching is a response to changing workplace demands. Companies are promoting their leaders faster, exposing them to complex relationships involving new cultures and asking them to grow and learn at a rapid pace. In response, the profession of coaching is growing fast, and research surrounding coaching is still in an immature stage. Joo (2005) found most of the extant literature on the subject consisted of case studies published by practitioners rather than researchers. Despite the relative lack of so-called empirical research, the coaching
profession is growing at a rapid pace. Coaches are being educated and certified, while the profession is still emerging—and without the benefit of strong academic rigor. In this section, the dilemma of coaching credentialization to the field is described, along with some actions the profession is taking to build credibility and academic rigor, and concerns of an emerging coaching profession.

Over 16,000 people belong to the International Coaches Federation (ICF). Riddle, Director of Coaching Services for the Center for Creative Leadership, in a February 17, 2009, blog (Riddle, 2009a), asked how many of them could effectively coach the division president of an international bank in the midst of this current economic crisis. If you were to depend on the ICF credentials, about 400 of these 16,000 would have a certificate that asserted their ability to be an effective coach under such conditions. However, there is no generally agreed upon criteria for ensuring the capability of a coach to the most senior leadership (Riddle, 2009a). Hall et al. (1999) described the coaching industry as one that is growing faster than any other type of consulting, with new home pages of both coaches and coaching schools increasing daily. In North America, locating a coach is not difficult, and they come from a variety of backgrounds and with varying levels of experience. The practice of coaching is cross-disciplinary, with people from a wide variety of professional backgrounds working as coaches. Some come from the behavioral and social sciences, while others from organization change and human development fields. Still others have backgrounds in psychoanalytical therapy, behavioral psychology, adult education, or business (Stober & Grant, 2006).
Coaching professions are working to address the lack of standards for training new practitioners. To illustrate, a group of 63 coaches from 16 countries created the Dublin Declaration on Coaching (Global Coaching Community, 2008). This group worked with over 250 coaches internationally to address key areas of professional development for the field. The declaration outlines the array of programs for coaches in various geographies, such as the United States, Australia, United Kingdom, South Africa, and France. At the time of the Dublin Declaration on Coaching, they found that the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom offered the largest number of certificates and degrees by academic institutions. In the United States, over 120 academic programs offered coaching courses from within a variety of disciplines, such as business, psychology, education, executive development, and organizational studies. The United Kingdom had over 31 distinct coach training programs, which varied by specialization, accreditation, theoretical base, and training format. Australia had its own certification standards, while most of France’s programs were self-credentialed with a multiplicity of standards. Ireland had eight coaching programs—most through private colleges without academic oversight. South Africa’s coach training was done by training organizations with academic institutions (Global Coaching Community, 2008). Determining the extent of the diversity of coach training in existence around the globe was a good first step completed by this group, but more needs to be done to ensure quality.

Certification and accreditation is a concern for the executive coaching field. Carr (2004) argued that certification, accreditation, licensure, and registration are often discussed as if they have identical meanings. The goal of credentialing programs is to
raise the professionalism and credibility of the members of the association (Knapp, 1995). Certifications and licenses are for individual practitioners, whereas accreditation targets coaching organizations (Knapp, 1995). Carr (2004) claimed that while coaching associations have shown interest in finding ways to strengthen public confidence in the practice, most have taken action without regard to the policies surrounding certification, accreditation, licensure, and registration of more established associations such as medicine, nursing, psychology, law, social work, and engineering. Even though there are currently no established standards of competence or a universally accepted governing body for coaches, in 2008, the Graduate School Alliance for Executive Coaching set out to establish and maintain standards for education and training provided by academic institutions specifically for the discipline and practice of executive and organizational coaching (Orenstein, 2008).

**Business Needs and Coach Screening**

Morgan et al. (2005) conducted a study for Linkage, a global organizational development company that studies coaching trends. The survey was sent to organizations around the world, targeting industries of all sizes. Over 235 surveys were completed by representatives of 19 countries. The United States, Canada, and Mexico accounted for 74% of the survey respondents; Europe was the second largest respondent group, followed by Asia, representing less than 5% of respondents. When the respondents were asked about their greatest concerns in selecting, hiring, and using a coach, the biggest concern was obtaining and validating coaching expertise (Morgan et al. 2005). This is not
surprising, and with few barriers to entry, nearly anyone is legally capable of hanging out a shingle and declaring himself or herself a coach.

The challenge to business organizations is not in locating a coach; rather, it is in locating and screening the most qualified ones (Underhill et al., 2007). Despite its growing importance, the discipline is unregulated and poorly defined, with no globally-accepted standard for licensure, credentialing, or professional designations (Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn, 1998). Even when a certification process is available, there are ideological controversies to address. To illustrate, Carr (2004) argued that accreditation and certification must be independent of one another in order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. He argued, for instance, that the ICF violates this professional standard because it both certifies individuals and accredits the schools from which the individuals have received their training (Carr, 2004). In a 2004 report, the National Commission for Certifying Agencies concurred with Carr’s assessment and insisted that the two must be separated in order to avoid conflicts of interest between the certification and education functions (National Commission for Certifying Agencies, 2004).

The challenge that top learning executives in business organizations (chief learning and talent officers) face is finding, assessing, and engaging qualified coaches. Harvard Business Review published a research report entitled “The Realities of Executive Coaching” (Coutu et al., 2009), the basis of which was the results of a survey of 140 coaches (57% response rate). In the survey, the coaches were asked what companies should look for when hiring them. The highest rated response was experience coaching in a similar setting (65%), while the second identified qualification was the existence of a
clear methodological approach. In general, coaching methodology is often not clearly defined because the profession as a whole lacks a consistent approach and coaches utilize a variety of methods. Some coaches begin with 360-degree feedback, while others rely on in-depth interviews or psychological feedback (Coutu et al., 2009). According to Scouler, if a prospective coach cannot describe for you what methodology he or she uses and what outcomes can be expected, you should not work with this coach.

In 2006, Executive Development Associates (EDA) published a report on high-impact executive coaching. The report examined the coaching industry from three perspectives: the organizations hiring coaches, leaders being coached, and the executive coaches themselves. To conduct the study, 45 in-depth interviews were held of members from all three constituent groups. In addition, a web-based survey was completed by 48 organizations. Last, a study workshop which brought together practitioners to examine and interpret the findings was conducted. Of importance to the study was how organizations locate coaches. Most organizations indicated they look for coaches through their existing vendors base or by getting recommendations from other organizations. Only 2% of organizations responded that they searched the web to locate a coach. In contrast, coaches answering the same question indicated they were found 15.8% of the time from a web search (Underhill et al., 2007). Locating a well-trained professional executive coach is a dilemma for human resources and learning professionals today.

**Framing Executive Coaching**

Berglas (2002) identified three issues with executive coaching. First, some executive coaches draw their inspiration from sports and sell themselves as purveyors of
simple answers and quick results. In most executive coaching situations, this is not sufficient. Second, coaches tend to rely solely on behavioral solutions. In some instances, another approach may need to be employed to address an executive’s developmental needs. Third, coaches who are unschooled in the dynamics of psychotherapy often exploit the powerful hold they develop over their clients (Berglas, 2002, p. 88). These concerns need to be considered by the human resources or chief learning officer as they work with executive coaches.

While it is argued that coaching does not (and must not) aim to address mental health issues, Grant (2009) showed that, in studies conducted by the University of Sydney, between 25% and 50% of those seeking coaching have clinically significant levels of anxiety, stress, or depression. For that reason, chief learning officers need to recognize some executives may have mental health problems. Therefore, as corporations hire executive coaches, they should require that coaches have some training in mental health issues. It not easy to recognize depression or anxiety without the proper training, and coaches need to be educated so they know when to refer a client to a professional therapist for help (Grant, 2009). Palmer and Cavanaugh (2006) suggested that coaching psychologists bring to the coaching field a host of psychological theories and models as well as an understanding of mental health issues.

In the survey for the 2009 Harvard Business Review research report, coaches were asked what companies should look for when hiring a coach. The highest rated category as “experience coaching in a similar setting, with a 65% important rating” (Coutu et al. 2009, p. 19). In a related argument, Riddle from CCL argued that coaches
need to understand business in four key areas to be useful to the leaders they coach: First, they need to understand how the business makes money, meet customer demands, and differentiate themselves; second, coaches need to understand the marketplace, company competitors and business dynamics; third, they need to understand the value chain and the functions within it that make the business function; and last, the coaches need to understand the secret language of business and the nuances associated with the business in the culture in which she or he is operating (Riddle, 2009b). In a survey conducted by Executive Development Associates in 2005, “business experience” and “match with our culture” were cited as the most critical criteria in coach selection (Underhill et al., 2006, p. 12). Of lesser importance were “industry experience,” “advanced degree” and “cost.” “Specific certification” was least important to organization survey raters. For leaders being coached, “advanced degree” and “certification” were minimally important (Underhill et al., 2006, p. 12).

In the 2009 *Harvard Business Review* research report on executive coaching, respondents had mixed views on what qualifications were important for coaches. When asked if certification was necessary, 29.2% said very much needed and 28.5% said not at all. This is not surprising, because certification may not hold credibility. According to Carr (2004), there are more than 65 distinct coaching credentials and the systems used to grant the credentials vary widely. Some are competency based, some require hours of coursework, others require supervision by someone already certified, some rely on self-assessment, and still others are based on self-proclamation. In the United Kingdom alone, about 50 organizations offer certifications, and buyers are confused about which ones are
credible. There is a trend to move away from self-certification by training businesses and toward an international accreditation, which is subject to tough standards and rigorous audits (Coutu et al., 2009).

Potential coaching students and employers of coaches are becoming more sophisticated and are asking for evidence of coaching effectiveness. In the EDA survey, only 6% of organizations utilize coaches who are certified, and 63% of leaders did not know if their coaches held certification. Coaching certifications that had the most credibility in the marketplace were: ICF, Coaches Training Institute, Hudson Institute, and Newfield Network (Underhill et al., 2007).

With the growing popularity of coaching, academic institutions are responding to this demand. The lack of standardized academic certification has not gone unrecognized by US-based graduate schools. The Graduate School Alliance for Executive Coaching (GSAEC) is leading the effort for graduate schools to set the standards of excellence for the evolving field. The GSAEC was incorporated in 2006, and members of the founding schools became the first official Board of Directors. The schools are the Adler School of Professional Studies, Fielding Graduate University, Franklin University, Kennesaw State University, Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology, University of Pennsylvania, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and The University of Texas at Dallas. It is expected that graduate schools will continue to push for academic rigor and substantive research in the executive coaching field and set the standards for this evolving profession (Graduate School Alliance for Executive Coaching Founders, 2008).
Coaching: An Organizational Investment and Drivers for the Investment

In addition to the lack of standardized education and certification processes for executive coaching, variation in how people define executive coaching—and how it differs from other types of coaching and one-on-one sessions such as therapy, mentoring or consulting—is currently amorphous. Interestingly, even though the field is emerging with no professional standards established, organizations believe coaching is useful and are investing in it in terms of both time and money.

The 2009 *Harvard Business Review* research report found that hourly rates range from $200 to $3,500 an hour. The cost of coaching is similar to what top psychiatrists in Manhattan charge, with a median range of $500 to $725 per hour (Coutu et al., 2009). Corporate University Xchange research found the hourly rates of coaching so broad it was hard to get a handle on the investment. They found the average to be in the range of $6000 to $13,000 for coaching of top levels executives (Corporate University Xchange, p. 13). Similarly, Underhill et al. (2007) found that companies spend an average of $15,000 per leader and they expect to increase that investment by 63%, despite the lack of credentialing.

Goldsmith, an executive coach and author, only gets paid after his coaching client has achieved a positive change in key leadership behaviors (Morgan et al., 2006). According to a 2007 *Knowledge@Wharton* article, Goldsmith typically makes upwards of a quarter-million dollars for approximately a year of work with a client (Knowledge@Wharton, 2007).
Dedicating an executive’s time to coaching is also an investment. The Corporate University Xchange research found that two-thirds to three-quarters of companies say they do not impose a limit on the number of coaching engagements for a particular individual leader (Corporate University Xchange, p. 13). The linkage study on coaching trends found there is a correlation between the length of coaching assignment and the leadership level in the organization. Executive leaders received an average of 14 months of coaching, senior leaders received 12.5 months, middle leadership received 7.3 months, and lower leadership received 6.6 months, on average (Morgan et al., 2005). According to the *Harvard Business Review* research report (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009), coaches reported a range in duration from as little as one month to more than three years. The most popular timeframe was a 7 to 12 month range (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009).

Similarly, the *High-Impact Executive Coaching* research survey found the most common coaching durations were 6 and 12 month assignments (Underhill & Koriath, 2006, p. 29).

What is driving the need and growth of the executive coaching industry? In 2004, Executive Development Associates conducted its bi-annual survey, *Trends in Executive Development*, with more than 100 Fortune 1000 and Global 500 companies responding, and for the first time since the study’s inception in 1984, executive coaching was one of the top five learning methods identified by respondents. This was significant because it appears that even though executive coaching is still considered controversial, the benefits of coaching have gained enough favor to reach such high status (Bolt, 2004). Similar results were found in the United Kingdom by the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, when a 2008 survey found that executive coaching was the third most
effective means of developing leaders (Altman, 2007). According to the Corporate University Xchange (2008), coaching was acknowledged as one of the three main elements of learning in corporate settings, along with formal instruction, and on-the-job learning. Outlined below are the top reasons for engaging coaches and how coaching drivers have evolved in the past two decades.

**Key Drivers for Coaching Investment**

When coaching first became popular, coaches were focused on derailing executives. Today, the industry trend is to use coaches with high-potential executives. According to Peterson (2009), coaching today is not geared mainly toward talented but abrasive executives, as it was 20 years ago. Coutu et al. (2009) agreed with this trend, and they contended that 10 years ago companies hired coaches to fix toxic behavior at the most senior levels of the organization. Now, coaching is focused on developing and retaining an organization’s top talent.

Coaching is considered a potent solution for ensuring top performance from an organization’s most critical talent (Peterson, 2009). In some instances, it is also considered a badge of honor, as companies use it to signal their commitment to developing their high-potential executives. Today, coaches report that 48% of the time they are engaged in developing high potentials or facilitating transitions, 26% of the time they are hired to act as a sounding board, and only 12% of the time are they addressing derailing behavior (Kauffman & Coutu, 2009). The High-Impact Executive Coaching Study (2007) found the clear purpose of most coaching engagements to be leadership development from the perspective of the organization, leader, and coaches. Companies
are also using coaching as a development strategy to assist a leader transitioning to a new role. On a smaller scale, coaching was found to be used to enhance career development, fix performance problems, and retain high-potential employees (Underhill et al., 2007). Executive coaching is a popular method for developing emotional intelligence in organizations, but there have only been a few rigorous evaluations of these programs (Peterson, n.d).

According to a 2007 study by the Alta Mesa Group, executive coaches were most often hired to increase the performance of high-potential leaders. The two most common reasons identified were to improve performance and to improve retention (Alta Mesa Survey, 2007). In building on this theme of high-potentials receiving coaching, the Center for Creative Leadership Research found high-potential leaders receive coaching, while derailing managers and leaders receive coaching less often. As highlighted by the Center for Creative Leadership, the ways in which coaching is being utilized are expanding. Table 3 summarizes the variety of coaching activities being performed in the surveyed organizations (Anderson et al., 2008).
Table 3.

*Coaching Activities Being Performed in Organizations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-potential leaders receive individual coaching</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly senior leaders receive individual coaching</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derailing leaders and managers receive individual coaching</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching-skills workshops</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-managers receive individual coaching</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-line supervisors receive individual coaching</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team or group coaching</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach-to-coach mentoring</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Anderson et al., 2008, p. 8).

*Executive Derailment and Coaching*

Corporate University Xchange (2008) found that more than half (52%) of companies considered coaching important for high-potential development, and half considered coaching an important performance improvement tool for executives and high-level leaders. If companies are investing in their high-potential employees and high-level executives, it is important for the industry to define the processes of coaching as well as their relation to expected outcomes. In addition, it is important to consider how to decrease the risk of derailment and foster the development of the needed skills. Peterson (2008) found 27% of individuals identified by his or her boss as high potentials were also identified by the same boss as having a high risk of career derailment. The author argued that some of the qualities most indicative of high potentials can also signal potential performance problems. For example, the most common profile for high-potential leaders
likely to derail is someone who is smart, driven, and accustomed to pushing through obstacles to meet ambitious goals. Such hard-driving leaders may become noticed for high performance; however they may derail if they do not learn to show respect for other people’s perspectives and incorporate other opinions to gain commitment (Peterson, 2008).

Van Velsor and Leslie (1995) reviewed the seminal work on executive derailment conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership in the 1970s and 1980s, which provided valuable insight into the developmental needs of managers aspiring to senior leadership positions in the United States. The research identified four enduring themes present both longitudinally and across countries. The four themes were: (a) problems with interpersonal relationships, (b) failure to meet business objectives, (c) failure to build and lead a team, and (d) inability to change or adapt during a transition (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995, p. 63). The authors claimed derailment can be prevented if the leaders are willing to work on tough developmental issues such as self-efficacy, self-esteem, and the need for control. In addition, Goleman et al. (2002) stated that the number one derailer of executives is low impulse control.

Goleman and Boyatzis (2008) contended that leaders who exhibited the emotional intelligence competency of empathy and became attuned to others’ moods literally affect both their own brain chemistry and that of their followers. They argued the minds of the leader and the follower essentially become fused together into one single system. Goleman and Boyatzis’ research on emotions and leadership has confirmed there is a
large performance gap between socially intelligent and socially unintelligent leaders, and that leaders can change if they put in the effort (2008).

**Emotional Intelligence and Executives**

Today, many executives expect their colleagues to possess emotional intelligence and soft skills (Joo, 2005). In the early 1990s, emotional intelligence (EI) began appearing in academic articles, even though the concept had been in use for several decades (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Mayer et al. defined EI as the set of abilities that accounts for how people’s emotional reports vary in their accuracy and how the more accurate understanding of emotion leads to better problem solving in an individual’s emotional life. Therefore, one of the primary reasons companies use coaching is to build people-oriented skills (Charan, 2009). Interest and focus on EI is an important component for effective leadership, and the interest in it intensified after Goleman published his 1995 book, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Goleman’s book contained much of the early literature and provided additional research and claims about EI’s contribution to society (Mayer et al., 2000). Executive coaching is a popular method for developing emotional intelligence in organizations. Coaching typically targets self-awareness, self-management, and social skills—all EI competencies (Peterson, n.d.).

Since executive coaching is designed to enhance an executive’s behavior change through self-awareness and learning, the process for assessing and developing an executive’s emotional competencies needs to be examined. If companies are interested in EI as part of a coaching regimen, one question to ask when identifying practitioners is whether coaches are trained in assessing and developing EI. If so, it is important to
determine what their academic background in EI is and what theoretical underpinnings
are part of their practice. This would include determining whether coaches believe clients
can develop emotional intelligence and how this belief is incorporated into their practice.
Additionally, coaches may utilize a variety of emotional intelligence assessment tools to
understand an executive’s strengths and opportunities for development. Finally, it is
important for clients and their organizations to determine what executive coaches actually
do to help develop emotionally intelligent leaders at the senior executive level level.

The next section will highlight several studies of emotional intelligence related to
job performance, three competing models of emotional intelligence and assessment
protocols commonly used to measure emotional intelligence in individuals.

Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace

In a landmark competencies research study, McClelland (1973) came to the
conclusion that if an organization wanted to hire or promote the best person for a
leadership job it should discard what were at that time the standard criteria: IQ, technical
skills, and personality. In his research, he focused on employees who were already
outstanding performers and compared them to those who were merely average
(McClelland, 1973).

Can emotional intelligence make a difference in workplace performance for an
executive? Goleman et al. (2002) sought to determine which personal capabilities drove
outstanding performance by analyzing data from nearly 500 competence models from
global companies. To do this, they grouped the capabilities into three separate categories:
The first category grouped purely technical skills, the second category grouped cognitive
abilities, and the third category grouped EI competencies. They found that both intellect and cognitive skills were important drivers of success. However, they also found that the higher up a leader is in the organization, the more important the emotional intelligence based competencies were to job performance. The research method compared star performers against average ones in senior leadership roles. Approximately 85% of the difference in the profiles was found to be attributable to EI factors rather than technical expertise or cognitive abilities (Goleman et al., 2002).

Can one learn emotional intelligence? According to Goleman et al. (2002), emotional intelligence can and indeed often must be learned. They cite a longitudinal study from Case Western Reserve University. This study, conducted with students since 1990, found that emotional intelligence not only can be improved upon, but also sustained for years. In this study, students were given assessments at the beginning of their course, again at graduation, and again follow up on years later in their jobs. Up to two years after going through an individualized learning plan that focused on strengthening specific competencies, the students showed 75% improvement in social awareness and relationship management skills, and 47% improvement in self-awareness competencies such as self-confidence and self-management. Clearly, this was a key finding that indicates leaders can become more effective if they are offered the right tools for developing their EI competencies.

For executive coaches, this is also of interest because the research shows that competencies have the potential to be learned and they impact a leader’s ability to perform at a higher level. Therefore, helping an executive be a more emotionally
intelligent leader is likely to be a rich focus of development for coaches when working with senior level executives.

Other researchers have built upon Boyatzis and McKee’s work. For example, Dulewicz and Higgs (2003) investigated the question of whether directors needed emotional intelligence. To study this, Dulewicz and Higgs used data from a large study of UK boards (Dulewicz, Macmillan, & Herbert, 1995). This study was commissioned by the UK Government and conducted with 1,000 directors over a two and a half year period. The authors were able to develop measures of emotional intelligence (EQ), intellect (IQ), and Managerial Competence (MQ), for the sample of directors. The competencies identified for each category are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

*Emotional, Cognitive, and Managerial Competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>MQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>Business Sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Others</td>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence/Persuasiveness</td>
<td>Numerical Interpretation</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Motivation</td>
<td>Critical Faculty</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Organizational Awareness</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Strategic Awareness</td>
<td>Developing Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Developing Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective (Helicopter ability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detail Consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each competency was rated in terms of the director’s performance on a five-point scale. The t-test method was used to identify significant differences between the means and standard deviations of the groups. The authors found a significant difference in the EQ competencies scale, and a highly significant difference in the IQ competencies scale. No difference was found in the MQ scale (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003).

Dulewicz and Higgs (2003) conducted a second study to test the proposition that the higher one progresses in an organization, the more important EI becomes to the role. They were able to compare the director and manager scores, and they hypothesized that directors would have a higher level of EI (as determined by their EQ score) compared to the managers. A t-test was again used to identify statistically-significant differences between the two groups. Directors were found to have significantly higher EQ scores than managers. No differences were found between directors and managers on either cognitive competencies (IQ) or on managerial competencies (MQ). Thus, Dulewicz and Higgs (2003) found support for Goleman’s contention that the higher one rises within an organization, the more important emotional intelligence becomes. According to McKee, Johnston, and Rotondo (2009), emotional and social intelligence makes the most difference, while intellect and technical knowledge are simply baseline competencies. They argued that leaders who have emotional and social intelligence are more effective.

**EI and Performance**

In an earlier study, Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2002) used a meta-analytic technique to examine the relationship between EI and performance outcomes. The studies in the meta-analysis did not use a single measure of EI; therefore, they treated the
measure of emotional intelligence employees in each study as a subgroup. The two most common measures used were the Bar-On EQ-I (Bar-On, 1997) and the 33-item Emotional Intelligence Scale. They found studies that used EI as a predictor typically reported one of three different types of potential correlations: the correlation between a total EI score and performance; the correlation between the EI subsets and performance; and the correlation between the total EI score and performance, as well as the correlations of EI subsets and performance.

Unfortunately, there were numerous problems with the analysis by Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2002). The studies used by Van Rooy and Viswesvaran in their own analysis varied according to the type of response format each used. Some measured EI with a self-report format, while others used another person to rate EI competencies. In addition, performance criteria also varied in the studies, where some criteria relied on objective measures of performance while others used subjective measures. The ratings were obtained sometimes from supervisors, peers, teachers, or self. Despite these flaws, the authors concluded that the results of the meta-analysis demonstrated that emotional intelligence is a construct that could be considered a valuable predictor of performance (Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2002) and encouraged further research.

Lindebaum (2009) argued that organizations attempting to enhance an individual’s EI and performance will encounter intrapersonal, intraorganizational, and interindustrial barriers. These barriers could impair the prospect of developing EI within an organization; therefore, Lindebaum believed the responsibility to foster growth rests with the individuals themselves (Lindebaum, 2009).
There are several competing models to measure EI. The three described in this paper are (a) Mayer and Salovey (1997), (b) Bar-On (1997), and (c) Goleman (1995).

**Mayer and Salovey’s Model**

Mayer and Salovey defined EI as follows:

The set of abilities that account for how people’s emotional perception and understanding vary in their accuracy. More formally, we define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others. (Mayer & Salovey, 1997)

According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), EI pertained to how an individual reasons about and with emotions, included four branches: (a) perception and expression of emotion is the ability to accurately identify emotional content in faces and pictures; (b) assimilating emotion in thought is the utilization of emotion as information to assist thinking and decision making; (c) understanding and analyzing emotion involves the ability to label emotions and understand their progression; and (d) reflective regulation of emotion pertains to the ability to stay open to managing feelings in oneself and others in order to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, as cited in Ivcevic, Brackett & Mayer, 2007).

**The Bar-On Model**

The second construct of emotional intelligence is the Bar-On model. This model illustrates EI as a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills, and facilitators that impact intelligent behavior. The overall definition of EI within this model is: “Emotional intelligence is...an array of noncognitive capabilities,
competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, as cited in Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000). According to the Bar-On EQ-i Technical Manual, the major scales and subscales of emotional intelligence for Bar-On are: intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability and general mood.

**Goleman’s Model**

Goleman’s model is the third emotional intelligence construct reviewed. First, Goleman’s definition of emotional intelligence is as follows: “The abilities called here emotional intelligence, which include self-control, zeal and persistence, and the ability to motivate oneself” (Goleman, 1995). The five domains of emotional intelligence, as described by Goleman are: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills (Goleman, 1998).

These three competing models of EI are the most commonly used constructs. It is important to recognize that these models differ and utilize different frameworks and theories of emotional intelligence. When executive coaches define emotional intelligence, which model is utilized? How was the coach educated on the model he or she uses and how do they stay current with this model?

**Measuring and Assessing EI**

Since research indicates EI is important for the quality of work done by executives, this prompts the question of how to measure and assess it. Are executive coaches measuring EI, and if so, what assessment tools or processes are utilized? Does this tool align with the emotional intelligence constructs which the coach professes to
utilize? Measures vary both in the method of assessment and the content (Conte, 2005). According to the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations, there are many tests that promise to measure emotional intelligence, but many have not been empirically evaluated. In general, the developers of EI measures have used different definitions of the EI construct, which has resulted in various measurement tools for EI (Gowing, as cited in Conte, 2005). Outlined below are the three major instruments that measure emotional intelligence and reflect the EI constructs described earlier: Mayer and Salovey, Bar-On, and Goleman. In the following section, three emotional intelligence measures are reviewed that align with the three different emotional intelligence constructs: (a) Mayer and Salovey, (b) Bar-on, and (c) Goleman.

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) is an ability-based test as opposed to a self-reporting instrument. With 141 items, the test takes approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete. The MSCEIT provides a total EI score and four branch scores: (a) perceiving emotion accurately, (b) using emotion to facilitate thought, (c) understand emotion, and (d) managing emotion (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003).

The Bar-On EQ-I

The second instrument is the Bar-On EQ-I (Bar-On, 1997). Bar-On, an Israeli psychologist, devised the model of emotional intelligence which was the first scientifically validated EI assessment (Bar-On, 1997). This is a 133-item self-report instrument that takes approximately 30 minutes to complete (Conte, 2005). The measure
yields an overall score, called an EQ, as well as scores for five composite scales: (a) intra-personal, (b) interpersonal, (c) adaptability, (d) general mood, and (d) stress management (Conte, 2005). The latest version has a normative database of nearly 4,000 participants, with varying ethnicities and ages represented (Bar-On, 1997).

**The ECI 2.0**

The third instrument is the ECI 2.0, which is a 360-degree tool designed to access the emotional and social competencies of individuals in organizations. This assessment is based on the EI competencies identified by Goleman in *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (1998), and on competencies from Hay/McBer's Generic Competency Dictionary (1996), as well as Boyatzis's Self-Assessment Questionnaire. The ECI 2.0 measures 18 competencies organized into four clusters: (a) self-awareness, (b) self-management, (c) social awareness, and (d) relationship management.

As illustrated above, all three developers of EI measures have used different definitions of the EI construct. This has resulted in using different dimensions and methods of measurement, as well as variation in the types of response formats, including self-report, ability, and informant approaches (Conte, 2005). For the purposes of this study, the Goleman definition and construct of emotional intelligence and how it interrelates to executive coaching when coaching senior level executives has been utilized. This framework has been widely used across a wide array of organizations such as the military, insurance companies, furniture retailers, and multinational consulting firms to assess, train, and develop leaders (Cherniss, 1999).
Baek-Kyoo (2005) presented a conceptual framework for executive coaching based on an integrative review of research and practice in coaching. This model suggested three major questions: First, what are the antecedents of positive outcomes in coaching? Second, what is the process through which coaching leads to positive outcomes? Third, what outcomes, both proximal and distal, can be achieved through executive coaching (Bozer, 2007).

![Baek-Kyoo Executive Coaching Framework (2005)](image)

*Figure 1. Baek-Kyoo Executive Coaching Framework (2005)*

Bozer and Pirola-Merlo (2007) drew upon Baek-Kyoo’s work and elaborated on each component, adding goals and purposes to the coaching framework as an antecedent
to their extended model. In other words, Bozer and Pirola-Merlo (2007) kept Baek-Kyoo’s framework, but added specific dimensions and suggested future research to be conducted among the variables illustrated in their own version of the framework. This model is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2. The Proposed Framework of Successful Executive Coaching (Bozer & Pirola-Merlo, 2007 as adopted from Baek-Kyoo, 2005).
These frameworks were adapted to look at the executive coaches’ academic background, use of EI tools, and their process for closing EI gaps with their clients. If an executive coach is educated in EI constructs, tools, and development, this will provide the executive with a more accurate EI assessment, which will help direct the EI development plan and result in a higher probability of closing gaps. Therefore, drawing on the work of Baek-Kyoo (2005) and Bozer and Pirola-Merlo (2007), a conceptual framework based on existing theory and practice was proposed. The proposed framework should increase the executive’s emotional intelligence and result in behavior change that will increase the executive’s EI performance on the job which will result in enhanced work group and organizational performance.
Since emotional intelligence has been shown to be a valuable predictor of performance for executives, it is important to determine whether executive coaches are using the theoretical underpinnings of EI as a part of their practice when working with senior level executives. Second, research indicated that emotional intelligence becomes increasingly important as an executive moves higher up in the ranks of the organization.
Therefore, it is important for coaches—in particular those working at the senior levels—to understand and assess the impact of EI and integrate an EI framework into their practice. Additionally, it is important to determine what EI gaps the executives are struggling with the most when working with an executive coach. There are a variety of EI constructs, so executive coaches need to understand the differences between the various ways of approaching EI and they also need to be certain that when they espouse to follow a specific model, their practice reflects it. Following on that, the utilization of a specific EI assessment tool to understand an executive’s strengths and opportunities for development is very much dependent on what theory of EI the coach adheres to. Lastly, by framing EI as a learned ability, it is important that executive coaches develop actionable plans to help develop emotionally intelligent leaders at the executive level.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore with 11 executive coaches their perceptions of the use, assessment, and development of emotional intelligence when coaching senior level executives. Executive coaching is still in its infancy, and the human nature aspect of coaching is both what makes it effective and nearly impossible to quantify (Sherman & Freas, 2004). The profession lacks a standardized education or certification process with consistent theoretical underpinnings. MacKie (2007) compared the current level of evidence in the coaching field to the psychotherapy literature, and he contended most published executive coaching studies are in the form of surveys and report perceptions of effectiveness and areas of perceived efficacy. In addition, MacKie stated there were no meta-analytic studies on the effectiveness of coaching and no component analyses of what element is responsible for a positive outcome (MacKie, 2007). David (2005) argued coaches can benefit from integrating an EI framework as a heuristic tool within their coaching practice. Furthermore, she suggested that for coaching to continue to establish itself as a profession, coaches must learn from existing research and theory about psychological development and apply innovative and evidenced-based interventions (p. 1). To learn more about the intersection of executive coaching and emotional intelligence with senior level executives, this qualitative, thematic analysis was designed to learn how emotional intelligence plays out through the lens of an executive coach when working with a senior level executive. To shed light on this topic, the research study was framed by the following research questions:
1. How do executive coaches assess or measure emotional intelligence with executive clients?

2. What strategies do executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies in areas in which they perceive they struggle with the most?

This chapter describes the study’s research methodology and includes discussions around the following areas: (a) participant selection and the population from which this sample was drawn, (b) overall research design and methodology for this study, including a list of steps carried out from data collection through data analysis, (c) an analysis and synthesis of the data, and (d) ethical considerations, issues, and limitations of the research process. The chapter will conclude with a brief summary.

**Rationale for Qualitative Research Design**

Qualitative research methods were selected for this study in order to generate data rich details, stories, and illustrations surrounding how executive coaches perceive, assess, and develop emotional intelligence skills with senior level executives. Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) suggested qualitative research when promoting a deep understanding or activity as viewed from the perspective of the research participants. This methodology provided the researcher with a methodology to explore, discover, and describe the use and perceptions in assessing and developing a senior level executive’s emotional intelligence, from the executive coach’s perspective. This methodology was chosen because it was important to match the research methods to the purpose of the study. This methodological approach allowed the researcher to capture the experiences,
stories, and examples of how an executive coach describes his or her work with a senior level executive when dealing with an emotional intelligence.

The strengths of a qualitative research study are derived from its inductive approach and its emphasis on words (Maxwell, 2005). As Maxwell described, qualitative studies are well suited to help understand the meaning in terms of “cognition, affect, and intentions,” understand the context and the influence this context has on the participants’ actions, identify unanticipated phenomena and generate new theories and discoveries due to the inherent openness and flexibility that allows for design modifications, understanding the process that led to outcomes, and developing causal explanations (Maxwell 2005, p. 22.)

**Rationale for Thematic Analysis**

Within the framework of a qualitative methodologies, a thematic analysis was the approach was the most suited for this study. Boyatzis described thematic analysis as a process to be used with qualitative information, and the purposes of thematic analysis are:

1. a way of seeing; 2. a way of making sense out of seemingly unrelated material and 3. a way of analyzing qualitative information; 4. a way of systematically observing a person, an interaction, a group, a situation, an organization, or a culture; 5. a way of converting qualitative information into quantitative data. (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 4)

Thematic analysis often provides more sensitive raw data than are usually obtained from questionnaires or surveys (Boyatzis, 1998, p. xii). This research study fit well with the purposes Boyatzis described because it sought to better understand how executive coaches understand, assess, and develop emotional intelligence with senior level executives.
Participant Selection

In this study, a criterion-based sampling method was used with 11 executive coaches. Patton (2002) stated that qualitative studies typically focus in depth on relatively small samples, selected purposefully (p. 230). Purposeful and criterion-based selection is a strategy in which particular persons are selected deliberately in order to provide information that can not be obtained from other choices (Maxwell, 2005). Patton (2002) stated, “the logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth” (p. 230). Selecting information-rich cases with coaches who are experienced and recognized as leaders in the field provided in-depth insight and understanding rather than empirical generalizations (Patton, 2002).

Qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples (Patton, 2002). To yield the most information about the phenomenon under study, a purposeful sample was employed to locate individual with specific experience and criteria. Individuals were contacted through professional networks and asked to refer other individuals who met the criteria, thus a snowball sampling strategy was also employed (Patton, 2002). The criteria for selection of participants were:

1. The coach must have worked with a minimum of three senior level executives for at least nine months in an executive coaching relationship.
2. The executive coach must be an external coach and not work inside the executive’s organization.
3. The coach must be working with senior level executive in a company of a minimum of $1 billion in revenues.
4. The executive coach must have at least five years of executive coaching experience and be noted as a leader in the coaching field by teaching others how to coach, publishing a book, speaking at a coaching conference, and have published a peer reviewed article on coaching, leadership, emotional intelligence or executive development.

5. The coach must have experience in developing emotional intelligence or intra/interpersonal skills with executives in his or her practice.

Eleven executive coaches with experience in coaching senior level executives developing emotional intelligence or intra/interpersonal relationship skills were interviewed. This decision helped to ensure the researcher would learn how the coaches viewed, assessed and developed emotional intelligence skills in the interviews. This also eliminated from the pool of participants coaches who did not address intra/interpersonal skills or emotional intelligence. For example, a coach who worked solely on business strategy and not on emotional intelligence would not meet the criteria of the study.

To locate information-rich key executive coaches, the researcher made initial contact with the participants through email communication. Three of the contacts were contacted through email, an international coaching research website, and a social network. Five of the participants were located through referrals from other participants or potential participants that had been contacted but could not participate or did not meet the criteria for the study. Two of the participants were referrals from the researcher’s University of Pennsylvania contacts and one contact was a person the researcher had contact with several years ago, but had never hired or utilized in an executive coaching
capacity. A network diagram is depicted in the table below. The numbers indicate the individuals who were interviewed. In some instances, a person did not meet the criteria and they are depicted as letters. In some instances, those individuals who did not meet the criteria referred coaches who did meet the criteria for the study. The left column indicates the first group contacted and the subsequent columns indicate referrals from them and the third column indicates referrals from this group.

Table 5.

*Referral Network for Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Group Contacted</th>
<th>Referrals from First Group</th>
<th>Referrals from Second Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior contact</td>
<td>Did not meet criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred A</td>
<td>Referred 007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email contact</td>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet criteria</td>
<td>011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred 005 and 011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email contact</td>
<td>Declined interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred C</td>
<td>Referred 009 and 010</td>
<td>010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University contact</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Research Design

The following list summarizes the process steps used to carry out the study.

1. A literature review was conducted to study contributions of other authors and researchers in the broad areas of executive coaching, emotional intelligence and research methodologies.

2. Following the proposal defense, additional literature was obtained and IRB approval acquired to proceed forward with the study. As part of the IRB approval process, the required steps that were to be enacted to maintain participants’ confidentiality and informed consent were detailed.

3. Potential research participants were contacted by email and those who agreed to participate were sent the informed consent document and conference call instructions for the interviews.

4. Semistructured, in-depth interviews were conducted with 11 executive coaches who met the research criteria.

Literature Review

The focus of the ongoing literature review executive coaching and emotional intelligence in the workplace. This review was conducted to inform the study and gain an understanding of the various theoretical foundations for emotional intelligence and the burgeoning professionalization of executive coaching. Included in this ongoing review of the literature was an inquiry into the various definitions of coaching and alternative methods of developing leadership in organizations.
**IRB Approval**

As required for IRB approval, an application was submitted that included: a background of the study, the research questions outlined in chapter 1, the proposed methodological approach, a sample informed consent letter, methods for managing and maintaining the confidentiality of data, and the interview protocol.

**Data Collection Methods.**

“We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe” (Patton 2002, p. 340). As Patton (2002) explained, “we cannot observe everything, such as behaviors that took place at a previous point in time or feelings, thoughts, or intentions” (p. 341). Interviewing the participants was the primary method for collecting data in this research. A semi-structured, qualitative interview process was used for the interviews. The interview protocol had defined questions tied to the research questions; however there was room for conversational, two-way communication. This process provided the researcher with a method to capture how the executive coaches view their world and their clients—using their terminology—to capture their perceptions and experiences when coaching senior level executives. The purpose of the interviews was to enter into the other person’s perspective (Patton, 2002). This approach allowed the researcher the opportunity to explore, probe, and ask questions that elucidated and illuminated stories about executives, emotional intelligence, and coaches (Patton, 2002).

The structured portion of the interview utilized an established interview protocol that was used to guide the interview. The protocol had specific questions to be asked of all respondents. In some instances, order and wording of the interview questions followed
unique conversation paths. Follow up questions and probes were as needed in the interview. The structured portion of the interview protocol helped to ensure the comparability of data across individuals, times, and settings (Maxwell, 2005). The predetermined nature of structured interviewing was aimed at minimizing errors (Fontana, 1994).

During the interviews, careful attention was paid to those experiences that may not necessarily have responded to the study’s research questions, but appeared to provide new insights into the broader topics surrounding the coaches’ background and credentials, emotional intelligence, and potential ways to develop executives. The unstructured component aided the researcher in identifying patterns of key life or work experiences as developmental learning experiences. These unstructured insights helped to make meaning from the structured data by informing particular themes, nuances, and perspectives with contextualizing experiences (Maxwell, 2005).

**Interview Schedule of Questions and Pilot Interview.**

The interview protocol was developed based on the research questions and information obtained from the literature review. In addition, the protocol was refined and streamlined with guidance from the researcher’s dissertation committee members. The interview format was structured in a way that moved the discussion from understanding the participant’s background and education, to experiences with coaching executives, to targeting the executives’ strengths and developmental opportunities, to assessing emotional intelligence gaps and looking for ways to improve competency around specific emotional intelligence competencies. Eventually, questions that applied specifically to
the research questions were woven into the interview. The interview protocol was reviewed by one executive coach and piloted with one executive coach over the telephone. The pilot interview was an opportunity to test the interview guide for appropriate wording, meaning, flow, length, and unexamined assumptions. Minor introductory comments to set up the interview were changed after the pilot.

**Interview Process.**

Emails were sent to prospective participants describing the purpose of the study and the criteria required to participate in the study. The email invited the recipient to participate or to suggest another candidate for the study. Once a mutually convenient date was established, a confirmation email was sent to the participant. This email included a conference call-in number, the purpose of the interview, and had the informed consent document attached. Each participant was requested to review and sign the informed consent document prior to the interview being conducted. The informed consent document is included as Appendix G. The interviews took place between December 2009 and February 2010. The semi-structured interviews were attempts to obtain an accurate view of an executive coach’s perspective on assessing and developing emotional intelligence competencies with senior level executives. Probing questions were asked and specific examples were requested whenever possible. During the interview process, the researcher took notes and recorded key observations (implicit and explicit) based upon a participant’s responses to the questions. The interviews were recorded in order to capture the raw data and actual quotations spoken by the coaches. Upon completion of the interview, the digital recording was transcribed verbatim. Patton (2002) suggested that
“nothing can substitute for these data: the actual things said by real people. That’s the prize sought by the qualitative researcher” (p. 380). Boyatzis (1982) noted the interview method does has limitations. The process required the executive coach to rely on their recollection of the stories and illustrations they chose or happened to remember. An interview guide (Appendix H) was used to ensure the same lines of inquiry were followed with each executive coach interviewed. The guide was used, but in the course of conversation, there were opportunities to explore topics that were not listed explicitly on the guide. The duration of the interviews ranged from 90 minutes to 3 1/2 hours.

Rich Data Sources

Having in-depth interviews with the executive coaches enabled the researcher to obtain a rich, detailed grounding for this study’s conclusions (Maxwell, 2005). The intensive interviews enabled the collection of vibrant stories and vivid illustrations from the executive coaches. The stories and illustrations were captured digitally and transcribed verbatim. Maxwell (2005) contended that in interview studies, one needs verbatim transcription and not just notes on what the interviewer felt was significant (p. 110). Following each interview, notes were reviewed and memos written describing the researcher's impressions of the interview. Maxwell (2005) suggestd that memos are one of the most important techniques and they should include reflections on readings, ideas, and fieldwork. Memos can include personal reactions and it is important to do this throughout the entire study (Maxwell, 2005, p. 13).
Data Analysis and Synthesis Methods

The method of analysis chosen for this study was a thematic analysis, using a hybrid approach which incorporated both an inductive and deductive approach. Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) suggested that the use of a hybrid methodological approach to thematic analysis integrates data-drive codes with theory-driven codes. Furthermore, Fereday and Muir-Cochrane suggested a hybrid process allowed one to incorporate both inductive and deductive thematic analysis of the raw data in the study. Braun and Clark (2006) explained that themes or patterns within data can be identified either in an inductive ways or in a deductive manner. This hybrid approach complements the research questions for this study. By reviewing the research questions, four broad categories were appropriate to establish upon review of the literature, the conceptual framework, and the context of the questions being asked of the participants. The emotional intelligence domains and associated competencies based on research from Boyatzis, McKee, and Goleman's (2002) emotional intelligence framework were coded via a deductive a priori template of codes approach. To learn how executive coaches develop emotional intelligence competence with executives, the inductive approach allowed the themes to emerge directly from the data using inductive coding. Overall, the coding process came up with 11 themes.

Following the data collection from the 11 interviews, the interview transcripts were entered into ATLAS.ti software for theme identification and coding. The process is described as a linear process below; however, the research analysis was “dynamic and
interactive” (Tobin & Begley, 2004, p. 391). The steps involved in data coding are discussed below.

**Create a Code Template**

A “good thematic code” captures the richness phenomenon and is usable in the analysis, elucidation, and presentation of the research (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 31). For this study, the codes followed four of the elements Boyatzis (1998) recommended: (a) a label, (b) a definition, (c) qualifications or exclusions, and (d) examples. The four EI domains for emotional intelligence (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management) were incorporated into this study based on the framework outlined by Boyatzis, McKee, and Goleman (2002). As an example, the code relating to self-management is displayed in Table 6.

Table 6.

*An Example of a Code Developed A Priori*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Label</th>
<th>Self-management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Emotional self-control; transparency; adaptability; achievement; initiative; optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications/Exclusions</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>The leader demonstrated transparency when s/he communicated to his/her team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review the Raw Information and Identify Themes**

This process included reading the transcripts and summarizing the raw data to look for inductive codes. To do this, key points or illustrations made by the participants were looked for. It is important to note that a content analysis was not the aim of the data
analysis, and a single comment was considered as important as those that were repeated or agreed on by others (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p 6).

Refining the Codes

The researcher continued to build a codebook with the four elements developed a priori: code, label, definition, qualifications/exclusions and examples. The coding schemes were scrutinized by various individuals throughout the process, and the researcher’s committee chair was invited to review one transcript and the codes identified. Based on this, the codes were refined and four new codes were added. Subsequently, another committee member was invited to review one transcript along with the codes, and again the codes were refined and further defined. Upon taking a on the ATLAS.ti software, the coding schema was shared with the instructor and the codes were further refined.

Testing the Reliability of the Code

Boyatzis (1998) suggested that consistency in coding is attained when different people see the same themes in the same information (p. 147). To test the reliability of the codes, one transcript and the set of codes were reviewed by a research auditor to test for inter-rater reliability of the coding process. The auditor and the researcher made coding judgments independently and without interacting or seeing the judgments of the other observer. Reliability was computed as a percent-agreement score (Boyatzis, 1998, p 52). The inter-reliability of the coding process was 83% reliable.
Applying the Codes and Creating Additional Codes

The interview transcripts were entered into the ATLAS.ti software as primary documents. The codes developed were entered into the computer program and put into four code family categories. The transcripts were coded by matching the codes with segments of the data selected as representative of the code. During the coding process, inductive codes were added to the code families when they were observed in the transcript but not accounted for in the predetermined coding process. The final coding schema was a refinement and result of this iterative and recursive process of open coding. Once the final codes were completed, the transcripts were reviewed an additional time to verify that the coding process was complete. The final coding schema is included as Appendix G.

Writing Memos During the Coding Process

Memos are an important technique for developing concepts and ideas (Maxwell, 2005, p 12). During the ATLAS.ti coding process, the researcher wrote memos on what was read in the data, reflections on the literature review, and ideas on identifying themes from the transcripts. The memos were entered into ATLAS.ti and put into categories or memo families. Maxwell (2005) suggested that memos are an extremely “versatile tool” that has multiple purposes (p.12). He suggested that various types of memos can help a researcher get ideas noted and this reflective process can assist in obtaining insights throughout the study. Following each interview, a summary of the interview was written that included initial impressions of what was heard, learned, and questioned. During the coding process, memos were created. The memos were written throughout the process
and pertained to questions the researcher had during the process, ideas or concepts on which to do further research, potential linkages between different codes or participants, and simple reflection statements. These memos were put into ATLAS.ti and sorted into memo families.

Data Analysis

To check for variables that would account for similarities or differences among participants, reports were run and data summary tables created from ATLAS.ti across different variables. This step aided in the analysis of the data and allowed the researcher to query and run reports with different variables that helped to identify similarities, themes, or patterns across the codes and participants.

Synthesis of the Data

During the data analysis process, the interview data was broken down into details and analyzed. The next step was synthesis which meant pulling the data fragments back together into patterns and themes. To do this, patterns within categories and across categories were compared, and then compared and contrasted to the issues brought up during literature review research. These actions were not done in a linear format, but they were iterative and ongoing throughout the synthesizing process. Based on the analysis and synthesis, the researcher was able to move forward and consider the implications for this research.

Ethical Considerations

The study participants were informed of the purpose of the study. The participants in the study were enlisted voluntarily and they were informed they were free to leave the
study at anytime and withdrawal would have no negative ramifications. Although study risks were assessed to be minimal, various techniques were employed to ensure the protection and confidentiality of the participants. Confidentiality of the data was taken into consideration when reporting and disseminating the data: codes were used to identify the participants and cautionary measures were taken to secure the storage of the interview notes, digital recordings, transcription files, and research-related records. The researcher was the only person to have access to this material.

Outlined below are the research strategies employed during the research study. Patton (2002) suggested three distinct ways to enhance the credibility of qualitative research analysis: (a) rigorous methods, (b) credibility of the researcher and (c) belief in the value of qualitative inquiry. Prior sections covered why using a qualitative study for this research was appropriate and the methods involved in the study were addressed. In this section, the researcher as the instrument will be addressed, along with the use of memos and how the researcher attempted to avoid blind spots during the study.

**Researcher as Instrument**

The role of the investigator is to adopt a stance of neutrality with regard to the phenomenon under study (Patton 2002, p. 51). This means that the researcher does not set out to prove a particular perspective, but to understand the world as it unfolds and to be true to the complexities and multiple perspectives as they emerge (Patton, 2002). Patton suggested qualitative inquiry means going into the field and getting close enough to capture what is happening. Furthermore, he contended that naturalistic inquiry involves fieldwork that puts the investigator in close contact with people and he or she
should consider the stance of “empathic neutrality” which suggests there is a middle ground between becoming too involved—which can cloud judgement—and remaining too distant, which can reduce understanding (p. 50). A concern with qualitative inquiry arises because the researcher is the “instrument” used for both data collection and data interpretation (p. 50).

The researcher is the director of learning for a mid-sized, privately-held multinational company. When the participants were emailed, I introduced myself as a student at the University of Pennsylvania the work title was not emphasized. During the interviews, three people inquired about my role outside of school and because of social networking, it is these participants knew more about my role than I shared with them during the introductory comments in the interview or though email communication. It should be noted that my role and job title in my organization could imply that I may be a future client and bias the interview to some degree. It should also be noted that the executive coaches who met the criteria and were selected for this study were well established coaches, with strong client lists, and accepted as experts in the executive coaching field.

Patton (2002) suggested that training to be a skilled observer is no less a rigorous process than the training necessary to become a skilled researcher (p. 261). Maxwell (2005) suggested that it is important for researchers to understand how they are influencing what the participants say and how this affects the validity of the inferences made from the interview (p. 109). I have been training in behavioral interviewing for over 20 years and have taught dozens of behavioral interviewing courses during this time. This
experience has provided me with training in listening and allowing silence during the interview process, paying attention to specific behaviors, and asking for examples, illustrations, and stories, when obtaining information and practice in writing up summaries based on the interview. This experience was helpful in determining when a coach was sharing a theory or a philosophy, and in determining if the theory was espoused or enacted in their coaching practice. In addition, obtaining specific behavioral illustrations aided me in not misinterpreting the meaning of what the coaches were conveying to me in the interviews.

**Avoiding Blind Spots and Bias**

To avoid blindspots during this research study, I had ongoing discussions with my committee members, outside advisors, peers, and cohort group. These discussions served to broaden my perspective by raising issues I had not considered, asking me to read or reasearch a new topic, or by asking me to refine or further define a method I was using. These outside advisors helped me to consider, process, and continually question the quality of my the interview, research, and analysis processes.

Maxwell (2002) argued that in qualitative research, it it is important to understand how a researcher’s values and expectations may influence the conduct and conclusions of the study (p. 108). In order to keep this in mind, I referred to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) suggestions that researchers should resist the urge to avoid uncertainty by trying to get closure on one’s research. The authors suggested the characteristics of a grounded theorist are:

(1) the ability to step back and critically analyze situations, (2) the ability to recognize the tendency toward bias; (3) the ability to think abstractly, (4) the
ability to be flexible and open to helpful criticism, (5) sensitivity to the words and actions of respondents, and (6) a sense of absorption and devotion to the work process. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 7)

In addition, during the coding and analyzing process, I focused on identifying and analyzing the discrepant data and negative cases as a part of testing for validity (Maxwell, 2005). To do this, I rigorously examined both the supporting and the discrepant data to assess or modify my conclusions. I utilized an outside auditor to check my own biases, assumptions and flaws in my logic, and data interpretation and methods (Maxwell, 2005).

**Conclusion**

In summary, this chapter provided a detailed description of the study’s research methodology. A qualitative thematic analysis was employed to illustrate how executive coaches assess, develop, and perceive the use of emotional intelligence when coaching senior level executives. The participant sample was 11 purposefully selected executive coaches with experience working with emotional intelligence or intra/inter personal relationship skills. The data was collected through a semi-structured interview process, and was analyzed using ATLAS.ti. This analysis process helped to identify key themes from the findings.

By using qualitative research methods, this study was designed to better understand how executive coaches perceive and use emotional intelligence in their practice. Second, this research illustrates the tools and processes coaches use to assess emotional intelligence. Last, this study reveals the techniques and processes that coaches utilize to develop emotional competence with senior level executives. This overall study
was intended to contribute to the understanding of how executive coaches connect executive coaching and emotional intelligence when working with senior level executives.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to explore the connections between executive coaching and emotional intelligence (EI) when working with senior level executives. Research has clearly indicated that EI is a valuable predictor of performance for executives, and human resource professionals and chief learning officers look to coaching as a method to help senior level executives to perform better in their roles, often in areas of emotional intelligence. This study was designed to gain a better understanding of this phenomenon and proceed from a more informed perspective in terms of how executive coaches assess, develop, and use emotional intelligence in their practices with senior level executives. This study is relevant to executive coaches, human resource professionals, and chief learning officers as they look to coaching as a developmental method for executives in their organizations. This chapter documents the study results obtained from 11 in-depth interviews with executive coaches and sets the stage for the study recommendations and future research implications outlined in the final chapter. Outlined below are the findings associated with the research questions from the study.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do executive coaches assess and/or measure emotional intelligence of executive clients?

2. What strategies do executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies?
This chapter presents the five findings in order of the research questions. There was one additional finding derived from the study that was not specifically linked to the two research questions, and this finding will be presented after the research question findings.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 was “how do executive coaches assess and/or measure emotional intelligence of executive clients?” The conclusions, inferences, and implications to be drawn from this are explored in chapter 5.

Finding 1

When working at the senior executive level, the executive coaches often limited their use of traditional assessment instruments, yet were in 100% agreement that the multi-rater interview and observation were valuable when assessing an executive’s EI.

This group of executive coaches were cautious with using assessment instruments at the senior executive level, while others used them according to the specific needs of the leader being coached. All of the participants indicated they use multi-rater interviews to help assess an executive’s emotional intelligence.

The coaches in this study indicated that there were two major reasons why they limited the use of assessment tools at the executive level: First, the executives have little time to complete self-assessments; and second, the coaches indicated they built on insights already identified either from the executive or his or her organization. Outlined below are the insights around the reasons for refraining from the tools, along with a brief discussion on the most common assessment tool utilized by the executive coaches in this study to gain insights into the executives behavior—the multi-rater interview.
Reasons for Not Using Assessment Tools

Time Constraints in the C-Suite. Two of the 11 coaches indicated they consistently used assessment tools in their coaching process with their senior level clients. For example, Participant #5 used assessments to gain a full and complete picture of the leader:

Everyone does it differently; I'm a little bit compulsive in that I am a scientist. And because I am a scientist and brought up in a scientific discipline as a psychologist, I believe in valid data collection. And from multiple perspectives, using multiple models and methodologies to cross-validate that data and to ensure that the data is not confounded by individual perspective or how it's collected or other confounding variables. (Participant #5, p. 11)

On the other hand, one coach indicated he never used any assessment tools. The remaining coaches indicated they were cautious and very selective when asking the executive to complete an assessment tool. Two of the coaches indicated the use of assessment tools as a key differentiator when dealing with the senior level executive compared to mid-level managers. Participants described this distinction in the following ways:

You want me to take two hours of instruments? I don’t think so. That’s gonna cost my company $20,000. You must be joking. (Participant #6, p. 9)

Typical managers would probably be way more okay with assessment tools because they’re used to doing what people ask them. The C-Suite is “I’ve got 45 minutes here to change this problem.” Okay, now. (Participant #6, p. 10)

One of the differences in management coaching versus executive coaching is that they don’t have much time and they want results and they want them now so I always found myself sitting there thinking okay, what’s the most helpful thing I could do right now? (Participant #9, p. 20)

Executive coaching differs from mid-level manager coaching. Participant #6 described it as: “It’s sort of high stakes. It’s the quicker, faster or the faster, smarter
leaner model” (p. 10). The coaches in this study clearly indicated that they needed to
operate at a different pace, obtain information differently, and often work with fewer
assessment tools at the senior executive level.

*Insight Already Identified.* In many situations, the coaches indicated the executive
comes to the coaching engagement with a strong self-awareness level and conducting
assessments is simply not necessary. This is because, often, at the senior level of the
organization, the executive client has already participated in numerous assessments
throughout his or her career because many organizations utilize a battery of
psychometric, behavior, EI, and personality tools and assessments which are facilitated at
various stages of an executive’s career.

As one executive coach indicated, he only used assessment tools when gaining
insight was necessary: “You know, let’s not throw a 360 at everybody immediately. At
first, see *if* insight is a constraint” [emphasis in original] (Participant #10, p. 21).
Additionally, one coach indicated that he stays away from assessment tools because
“people have gotten these things ad nauseam” and argued the assessments can be “sugar-
coated” and are “almost meaningless on lots of levels” (Participant #4, p. 8). This coach
refrained from using assessment tools because he believed he could gain more
information from his own observation skills and through a multi-rater interview process
with key stakeholders.

To coach a senior level executive, the coaches must use themselves as the
assessment instrument in order to see past the executive’s façade and successfully
couch the individual. To do this, the executive coaches indicated they need to use their
own active listening and observation skills to help them to assess their clients. Instead of asking the executive to complete a battery of assessments, the coaches often try to observe the executive to help assess the executive. For example, Participant #9 stated, “I don’t know that I’ve ever found a paper pencil test that I felt got me farther and faster than good old-fashioned questions and listening” (p. 21).

The observation process goes beyond the coaching session. The coaches indicated they learn a lot about the executive by watching every interaction including emails, luncheons, dinners, and how the executives interface with their administrative staff. Participant #4 indicated he watched for themes or patterns when he is with his clients: “For instance, if I’m interviewing somebody over lunch, I start to listen for patterns” (Participant #4, p. 7). These insights are helpful to the coach in determining how the executive behaves on the job. The coaches believe they learn a great deal about how the executive interacts in the workplace and outside of the work environment. When working with the senior level executive, the coach must not be biased, impressed, intimidated, or in awe of the executive in order to be fully present during the coaching process. In this study, the coaches indicated they needed to also be very self aware and cautious to not be either positively or negatively influenced by the status of the executive at this level.

Participant #8 summed it up:

You know, like they get seduced by it, like, wow, check it out, you know, and the next thing we know they’re renting big cars and mirroring their clients in a way. Or the opposite, which is they get so annoyed at their clients because it triggers something in them about race—or about class or gender or race or whatever. (p. 16)
Multi-Rater Interview

In this study, the multi-rater interview was mentioned by all 11 executive coaches in the study. A multi-rater qualitative interview is an interview where the coach interviews key stakeholders to help the coach gain assessment data on the executive. This tool is one way in which the coach can uncover perceptions and gain an understanding of the dynamics of what is actually occurring in the organization. The executive coach is able to synthesize the data and create a thematic analysis of the feedback and to carefully share the unfiltered feedback with the executive. The coaches felt this data was a richer assessment tool than any self-reporting tool the executive may complete. For example, Participant #3 declared:

I’m not a big believer, for example, in self-assessment of EQ. I think that if you really want to get a handle on somebody’s emotional intelligence, you need to be collecting data pretty closely with the people who are the receivers of that person’s behaviors and intent and emotions. And for me, I really feel like it works best to get beyond even paper and pencil 360s of EQs. (p. 9)

The coaches interviewed identified three primary reasons for using the multi-rater interview. First, this was a way to gain specific behavioral data from key stakeholders who see the executive in action regularly. This allows the coach to gain data the colleagues would not naturally tell the executive. Second, the multi-rater interview engages a wide array of stakeholders, including family members. This allows the coach to gain insights inside and outside of the office and to gain an historical perspective on the executive’s behavior. Third, by engaging the stakeholders in the coaching process, this creates an open and transparent process, opening the door for the executive to make
amends, share the action plan, obtain feedback, and evaluate changes during and after the coaching engagement. Each reason is outlined below in more detail.

*Gain Behavioral Data.* The coaches in this study utilized qualitative multi-rater feedback to obtain specific examples of behavior data from key stakeholders. They indicated that they valued this process so they can get key information from the perspective of the key stakeholders with whom the executive interfaces with both on and sometimes off the job. Some coaches also include business partners, close friends, and family members in the interview process. The coaches do this to be able to validate if the executive’s behavior is consistent between work and home. This specific behavioral data helps the coach to provide the executive with an accurate self-assessment. There was no consistent method or format of providing this data back to the executives; the majority of coaches provide the stakeholder feedback to the executive in a thematic format in order to protect the key stakeholders providing the information. Two of the coaches provided the stakeholder feedback verbatim to the executive. All of the coaches indicated that this qualitative data is particularly useful for identifying specific strengths and developmental opportunities. Participants summarized the advantage of interviewing key stakeholders as follows:

> What I want to know, as a coach, is what really happens? How does this person interact? What does this person see as their strengths? When do they overuse their strengths? What does the person see as the leader’s developmental opportunities? (Participant #1, p. 7)

The way I collect the data primarily is through qualitative interviews, where I interview a very good strong sample of people who work for the person and work with the person and the person works up too. So members of the board, if it's a senior vice president, then to the CEO. If it's a CEO, the chairman of the board
and members of the board of directors, if it's an executive director, then it could be to the board of advisors or—it all depends on the role. (Participant #5, p. 11)

We would interview between 6 to 12 people depending upon their world, critical, significant people in their world for about an hour each, asking them sort of standard set of open-ended questions. (Participant #8, p. 18)

The process of reviewing stakeholder data is a tool used by the coaches to help the executive examine, reflect upon, and understand the positive and negative consequences of their behaviors. In addition, themes provided help the coach and the executive to examine the disparities between thoughts, feelings, and actions. Participant #3 indicated this data was very helpful if the senior level executive was willing to act on this feedback:

It's very rewarding to coach people like that because if they get it, if you can give them enough data to give them insight because of the type of people they are, they will do more with it than the average person. (p. 12).

Participant #11 agreed the that the senior level executive was often open to this information and is exceptional at following through on their feedback: “are very, very strategic and very skilled from a logic perspective, often very, very highly intelligence and, and also just highly conscientious” (p. 7).

Getting behavioral data and examples is helpful when the coach is assessing the executive’s level of EI or learning how they interact with individuals. The executive coaches used this data to help identify key themes and to inspire the executive to look at how his or her behavior was perceived through the eyes of their key stakeholders. The coaches believed this process was helpful at engaging the executive in action planning and due to the executive’s focus and drive, he or she often demonstrates exceptional skills at putting the behavior changes into practice.
Key Stakeholder Engagement. The multi-rater interview process also engages the key stakeholders in the development process. Most often the key stakeholders included in the interviews were the boss, direct reports, peers, and board members. In one instance, the coach also interviewed friends, parents, partners, and older children. The coach did this to gain a life-long history and to gain insights on the executive both inside and outside of work. The practitioner who employed this technique felt this was valuable and helped to gain a historical perspective on the executive:

I think what makes this process work really well for the coaching of senior-level people. And that is to go out and spend two hours each with 25 people that know this person well in some part of their life ... and often lately, teenage children, 15-year old, 16-year old, older. So there’s a non work, total life element to this, and I think that’s really important in trying to tease out kind of the lifelong learning and experiential elements of this.

They think that they’re not doing some of the same negative behaviors at home that they’re doing at work and they find out that everybody at home is feeling it or their parents have seen it forever. (Participant #3, p. 31)

This coach involved key family members in order to gain an historical perspective and a non-worklife perspective on the individual. This is helpful when determining if a behavior is a pattern that has been done for decades or an isolated example. Additionally, the coach also used this to determine if the behavior was consistent between work and home and used this is in addressing the whole person in the coaching sessions.

In some instances, the key stakeholders are also engaged throughout the coaching process. For example, in some situations, after the executive realizes the impact of his or her actions, they want to apologize for their past behavior. One coach required the executive to apologize to the key stakeholders:
Now, he’s got to engage stakeholders. There’s an email that I help him craft, and he’s got to apologize for past behavior. He quits. He says, “I’m not doing it. I’m not going to apologize.” I said, “Fine.” He said, “What do we do?” I said, “I don’t know. You’re on your own.” I said, “I don’t work with you. The engagement’s over.” (Participant #4, p. 10)

This coach also worked with the stakeholders to ask them to let go of the past and to evaluate the executive’s behavior from this point forward. This helps to rebuild the relationship between the executive and the stakeholder and to start their relationship over.

In the example above, the executive did return to the coach and asked to meet him for breakfast:

He comes back and he calls me up, “Let’s have breakfast.” He says, “I’ve rethought that,” and I said, “Fine.” You just say, and here’s the way to phrase it in an email you could say, “Look, I’ve done the 360. You said I’m good at these, this, this and this and here’s some areas I could improve and I agree. You’ve been the recipient of some of my inappropriate behavior in the past. Please accept my apology.” (Participant #4, p. 10)

The coaches also worked with their clients to help engage stakeholders in the development process and to provide them with identifying specific behavioral suggestions into the executive’s action plans. One example of this is:

Now that you’ve engaged the stakeholders, you ask them to email you a couple of suggestions. From those suggestions you and the person you’re coaching build the action plan. A big believer in sharing the action plan that you develop with the stakeholders so that they see that their fingerprints are on the action plan.

(Participant #4, p. 46)

This step is helpful for several reasons: First, this step enables the stakeholders’ voices to be heard and to see that their input is part of the executive’s action plan; second, this step increases dialogue between the executive and the stakeholder around the developmental issues; and last, this step opens the door for the client to obtain ongoing feedback from the key stakeholders. This allowed the executive to get ongoing feedback on the job from
people who could see the executive in action on the job as illustrated in the next two examples:

For instance, she had a big FDA presentation that she did with her leader and she went back and she got feedback from him, specific feedback. (Participant #1, p. 9)

We practiced it over and over and over again, and then we asked her to get several mentors who could observe her in the situation she’s most commonly in, where she had the most difficulty. And she would check with them before and after those meetings. (Participant #5, p. 18)

This step was helpful in getting the executive to learn from his or her peer group and sustain the behavior change after the coaching engagement subsided. Second, the coaches indicated getting the stakeholders’ help in providing the executive with leniency in the learning process.

So we had to get to the point of—they had to ask permission of people to give them a chance. So part of the coaching was to go to people and admit to them they were having a very hard time and they need some help from them to give them some space to learn and to grow and to get through a hard time without sharing any of the details. (Participant #5, p. 16)

Two of the coaches in specifically mentioned having a process in place to have the key stakeholder evaluate the changes the client has made. Both executive coaches work with their clients to customize it to the specific behavioral changes the executive is working to develop. The data suggests the coaches do this as needed, based on a few key areas of development. One coach indicated, “We do a mini survey at the four or five month mark, and then we readjust from there” (Participant #4, p. 46). The coaches do this to help the executive assess the changes made after the coaching process has begun:

And it's like a mini 360 that assesses not where somebody is, but what changes they've made. So it actually asks rather than saying how good is somebody at this is? It says what changes have you seen from this person in this thing over the last few months? (Participant #10, p. 29)
Am I delegating more effectively? Am I holding people more accountable? Am I treating people with respect? Am I following the action plan that you have a copy of? (Participant #4, p. 28)

The coaches indicate they pulled in stakeholders to help the executive to make amends, create a specific action plan, learn how to obtain ongoing feedback, and to evaluate changes made during the coaching process. Research indicated support, accountability, and follow up were helpful in the change process. The coach can be very helpful in proving this support and accountability. Obviously, broadening this to other stakeholders, such as coworkers and family members, is helpful. The stakeholders are able to reinforce and encourage the executive in using their new skills. This step is very helpful in holding the executive accountable beyond the coaching engagement.

**Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 was “what strategies do executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies?”

**Finding 2**

The executive coaches in this study addressed various aspects of the senior executive’s life, including work-life balance, career goals, and health and family issues. Today’s executive faces an overabundance of pressures of the job. To meet these unrelenting demands, they often find they end up serving others and put less value on renewing their own personal body, mind, and spirit needs. As Participant 8 indicated, “they have really drunk the Kool-Aid for their organizations over the years and sacrificed a lot over the years” (p. 12). This constant stress can be debilitating and can lead an executive into a state called the sacrifice syndrome (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005). The
sacrifice syndrome occurs when leaders sacrifice and give to others rather than taking care of their own needs for an extended period of time. When a leader gets trapped in this zone, they often feel exhausted, discouraged and disheartened. When they feel this way, their emotions are spread to others in the organization or at home.

In this study, nine of the 11 executive coaches indicated they look at how the client manages their career, health, spirit and energy renewal. They addressed topics that extended outside of the office, such as work life balance, energy renewal, stress relief, health concerns, personal goals, and life satisfaction. As one participant indicated, “I think having that grounding in total life…is really a critical part, a powerful development at this level” (Participant #3, p. 33). The coaches indicated it was important to do this to understand and address the executive’s physical and emotional health, family relationships and work life balance issues and energy renewal. This study revealed how executive coaches consider areas outside of work such as physical health, family relationships, and energy renewal a key area of focus for them when working with the executive. By addressing the whole person, the coaches believed they could help make the executive more balanced and healthier emotionally and physically, and this would also help positively impact the executive’s behavior on the job and positively cascade through the organization.

**Physical Health**

The executive coaches clearly indicated how the physical health of their client was interconnected with their work performance. The coaches attended to the wholeness of the individual and acknowledged how the interactions of the mind, body, and behavior
can impact how the executive sees the world, processes information, and socially interact with others. The coaches indicated the executive may start out his or her career with excitement, but in order to fulfill the requirements of the role may end up exhausted.

Illustrated below are two comments on how the coaches indicated that physical and emotional health was considered a key area of focus and positively impacts the individual and the organization. The individual benefits by having improved physical and emotional health. The organization benefits by retaining an individual who was suffering emotionally and physically:

We stress a lot in the [name removed] work, physical fitness, and I think part of the reason is that the successful people are often healthier, and in better shape than a lot of other people. (Participant#3, p. 7)

They were very successful in their role, they were highly-respected, they were emotionally, physically—they got to a very good point. They changed their own personal life, they changed the hours that they were working, they did lots of good things, both for themselves and it worked out for the company as well. (Participant #5, p. 17)

Maintaining good physical health can be very difficult to do when an executive is working long days, eating out in lavish restaurants, and taking limousines or the corporate jet to their meetings. When a person is emotionally and physically healthy, this impacts the executive’s personal life, physical health, and work-life and it also helps the company as well. In some situations, the executive may face a health crisis and the coach is one of the first people to find out there is a link between an executive’s health and his or her performance on the job as illustrated by Participant #5:

Is there anything else you think I should know? and one person once said to me, “Oh yes, I'm a cancer survivor and my wife currently has cancer and my two kids have chronic diseases and are in and out of the hospital all the time.” That says a
great deal, that the person never mentioned that and no one in the organization knows about it—they're keeping it very private.” (p. 15)

In this situation, the executive coach helped the executive consider all aspects of her life by having access to information that the board or key stakeholders did not have. The executive considered the external executive coach “safe” because he had no personal organizational agenda and was able to be viewed as a trusted confidant. The coach worked with this individual to help the executive regain focus and see how the chronic health issues and workplace stress was interrelated to her lack of impulse control or EI:

Their hours were—they were stressed out, they were not managing their stress, they were not managing their relationships. They were blowing up at people, they didn't have impulse control, they weren't able to handle anger, they came across as a chip on their shoulder all the time. (Participant #5, 15)

Addressing the whole person also helps improve family relationships and this aspect impacts the executive’s perception of the coaching experience. One coach relayed how an executive described the total life being addressed in the coaching process:

It was about my total life. I’ve learned more about myself, and my relationships with my kids, and I’m not sure that I could really justify coming. There’s always been kind of that discussion that the big change, the big impact of [name removed] programs was very powerful and personal enough, and total life-related. (Participant #3, p. 35)

**Energy Renewal**

The coaches were attentive to how the executives refreshed and renewed energy levels. Boyatzis and McKee (2005) argued that executives need more than just rest and relaxation; they need renewal in order to avoid sliding into dissonance. Boyatzis and McKee found when an executive engaged in personal renewal, he or she was better equipped to deal with the challenges and sacrifices inherent in leadership (2005, p. 61).
The data indicated that executive coaches in this study agreed. One coach indicated that the senior level executives have high demands put on them. This coach found it important to address how an executive renews his or her energy levels to deal with the high degree of demands:

I am always interested in what we call the personal agenda and that really is work life balance and that is, I'm very interested to know what their strategies are for energy renewal, you know, because they just have the whole world you know, pulling energy from them. (Participant #9, p. 33)

The majority of the executive coaches in this study found it important to address the whole person in the coaching process. By addressing health, family, and energy renewal issues, the coaches believe they made an impact on the executive, their family, coworkers and the organization as a whole.

**Finding 3**

Executive coaches help their clients develop EI by making their clients feel comfortable doing what would normally be considered socially uncomfortable. When asked how the coaches develop EI with their clients, the coaches indicated that they practice techniques with their clients and make the executives feel comfortable doing what may be considered socially awkward.

In the data there were various illustrations of role-playing, rehearsing presentations, practicing expressions, and the Gestalt empty chair technique used with these senior level executives. The data indicated there were two ways the coaches did this with their clients: First, this indicated the coaches had established trust and credibility with the executive in order to get them to venture down socially awkward paths, and second, the coaches made the executive feel safe and comfortable in order to try new
techniques and they gave them permission to feel socially awkward during the coaching sessions. They were cognizant of when and how to do these types of activities with the executive in order to make him or her feel comfortable and to venture into uncomfortable activities.

**Trust and Credibility**

Building a trusted, confidential relationship is key competency in establishing a successful coaching relationship. This is addressed in the both ICF competencies as “Establishing Trust and Intimacy with the Client” and in the PDI Coaching Competencies as “Creating the Coaching Relationship.” An executive coach who is working with senior most level executives must be able establish rapport and confidence early on in the relationship. As Participant #3 indicated, senior level executives are very quick to make judgments and determine if a person is credible:

> I think that people at this level have—and maybe we all do, but particularly, I think people at this level have a very quick sizing up of people. And so I think they make a lot of snap judgments pretty quickly about whether somebody has credibility to them or not. (Participant #3, p. 14)

Furthermore, building trust is essential for the coaching relationship to be successful. The coaches in this study indicated they built trusted relationships by clearly defining the ground rules for confidentiality and seeking to understand the executive as illustrated:

> I establish a partnership between me and the boss and the person being coached, or the board and the HR department and we put in writing an agreement on how we're going to work together and what's confidential and how it will be managed and we meet over the course of the coaching at least three or four times. (Participant #5, p. 14)
I think the coach's desire to really understand the person is one of the best ways to build a strong relationship. So when the executive comes to see me, I am focused primarily in that initial meeting with him on understanding what they're looking for. What brings them to coaching? What they're trying to achieve? Where their pain is? Where their struggling. (Participant #10, p. 7)

Once the relationship was established the coach and the executive were able to gather data and present it back to the executive as illustrated by Participant #3:

Relationship building at the beginning of this I think is critical to your ability to gather the data that you need that will be truthful and honest. And to be able to present it back to them in a truthful and honest way is all contingent on your ability to build that relationship with a person. (Participant #3, p. 14)

**Safe in Awkward Situations**

Second, the coaches created such a trusting environment that they were able to push the executives to try new techniques to help them practice growing and developing EI skills in a safe environment. For example, visioning, role-playing, mindfulness training, and rehearsing speeches can be very uncomfortable. The coaches were able to get senior level executives, who are accustomed to always being shown at their best, do these techniques in their coaching sessions.

**Visioning**

The coaches used visioning techniques to help the executive picture a positive outcome or demonstrate confidence. Boyatzis and McKee (2005) suggested that having positive emotions, such as confidence, are beneficial and that sparking positive emotion positively impacts a person's physical and psychological health and relationships. The coaches in this study agreed with this and believed positive emotions help people to change. This is illustrated in these examples: “We teach people to visualize the positive. Visualize this” (Participant #4, p. 32); “That's a technique I've used a lot for folks who
are lacking confidence is to really picture themselves being confident” (Participant #1, p. 9); and “So like imagine you’re going in confident” (Participant #7, p. 27).

**Role Plays or Practice**

The coaches worked with their senior level clients to get them to role play or practice expressions, presentations or phrases in the coaching sessions. The reasons for this appeared to be twofold. First, practicing allows the person to think through alternative methods for behaving differently, and this helps them to consider alternative behaviors that may differ from their habitual defense reactions or routines. Second, the coaching session provides a safe place to practice behaviors and get feedback in a comfortable and protected environment. Examples of how the coaches enabled the executives to do this in the session are illustrated by the following: “So literally I would play roles and okay, how are you going to start that conversation?” (Participant #9, p. 19); “And I say “Okay now let's do something other than scowling. Look at me—I'm going to respond without a scowl. Now could you practice that?” (Participant #5, p. 21); and “and we do video feedback of him rehearsing how he's going to make those presentations. And I give him immediate feedback right then” (Participant #5, p. 20).

The coaches also indicated there was a benefit to facilitating role plays or practice sessions with their clients. Participant 9 described enlisting clients in practice sessions or role plays: “So there is an enormous benefit to actually getting people to practice their words with you” (p. 19).

I think most actors, when they’re first reading the script, feel a little, and it’s a great metaphor for it, you know, the best actors are still reading somebody else’s words, but there is something authentic about them that makes us you know, drawn into the character. But getting people to understand and this is a huge
misconception, that if it doesn’t come naturally to me, it’s not mine and it can
never be mine (Participant #9, p. 36)

Metaphors

In several instances, the coaches described using metaphors in the coaching
sessions, and this appeared to be used for two reasons. First, the coaches used metaphors
to help create a memorable way for the executive to remember intangible information
during the moment of need. Second, the metaphor helped the coach and the executive to
make sense of and help the executive make decisions back in the workplace, based on the
metaphor. Two illustrations follow:

We came up with a really good metaphor that these meetings were like sitting on
the edge of a rapidly moving river, stream or whatever. And what it was is rafts
were shooting by really fast that could take him across that river, but if he didn’t
jump on the raft at the right moment he was never gonna get across. (Participant
#6, p. 13)

We began to talk about places where he could color with a full palette, you know
use his reds and pinks and you know, and places where he needed to walk into a
room and operate as we later called it, you know, varying shades of navy blue.
(Participant #9, p. 17)

Gestalt Techniques

One coach, with a background in therapy, specifically mentioned using the
Gestalt empty chair technique. This technique is one that can help the client express to
another person what they have not expressed before. In addition, the client is sometimes
asked to switch chairs and respond. This process can evoke buried emotions and only
skilled therapists should consider using an advanced technique such as this technique.
This experienced coach illustrated the example as follows:

One of the most important things that we can help people with in therapy and
obviously in my work in coaching and so the empty chair technique, if I’ve got a
CEO who’s having a very difficult situation with a board member, I’ll actually get the CEO to take on the position of the board member. (Participant #11, p. 18)

As this data indicated, the coaches made people feel comfortable and gave them permission to feel awkward while practicing new behaviors, techniques, or expressions. The executives must trust and feel comfortable with the coaches in order to simulate, test, and experiment with techniques that feel challenging or uncomfortable. Examples of how they did this with the executives are illustrated: “So I go at, you know, occasionally like acting school. And I give them permission to feel awkward” (Participant #9, p. 36); “I do my best to kind of remain enough in—enough similar that I’m not too strangely different” (Participant #8, p. 16); and “I try to show the person that I’m taking their needs, their goal, what they’re trying to achieve into consideration” (Participant #10, p. 8). The coaches in this study indicated they were confident in building rapport, establishing trust and pushing their clients to try new techniques in order to help them achieve their goals.

**Finding 4**

The coaches indicated an executive coach must be models emotional intelligence in their practice to develop EI in the client. The coaches in the study indicated they needed to be models of emotional intelligence in coaching the executives. The data suggested three reasons for this: First, in order for the coaches to address tough issues, they must do so with empathy; second, the coaches need to attend to the needs of their client as opposed to projecting their own needs onto their client; and third, the coaches need to teach EI by demonstrating EI.
Coaches Demonstrate Empathy

The coaches described creating a safe and empathetic environment when coaching on emotional intelligence issues with their clients. Outlined below are comments that illustrate their sensitivity to their clients and how they created a safe environment to address tough issues: “I think empathy is foundational to developing healthy relationships. So I believe that the executives really feel that I care for them” (Participant #8, p. 31); “this is such a difficult process for a lot of people, and they feel this loss of control. And, I really want to make sure that they have as many choices in the matter as possible” (Participant #10, p. 12); and “People cry a lot in our offices. You know, what’s that about? And I think it’s, you know, people who’ve done it a lot can create an environment of safety” (Participant #9, p. 14).

Attend to the Client Needs without Bias or Projection

The coaches also indicated they must be careful not to project their own feelings, biases, or values onto their clients during the coaching sessions. Below are examples where the coach demonstrated this was a factor considered during the coaching relationship.

Really knowing yourself, really enables you to be in somebody else's story without getting seduced into it, or you know, so - you know, kind of triggered by it, whether positively or negatively. (Participant #8, p. 16)

I may suggest something to an executive because I think it's in their best interest, but I need to be careful that it doesn't come out of my need, but something that is useful for them. As a coach, one of the things that I try to be mindful of is not to insert my biases or my views, but to help them figure out from their point of view what's useful or what's meaningful. (Participant #1, p. 10)
Teach EI by Modeling EI

One way the coaches teach the use of EI is by modeling EI during the coaching sessions. The coaches indicated this was a lesson they have learned and it is helpful to their clients to have this modeled for them. This was illustrated by the following comments:

I've come to believe a lot over the last 20 years at least that a whole lot of this work involves modeling. So one of the most powerful ways that people learn things like emotional intelligence is one that's modeled with them or for them in the relationships that they have. (Participant #3, p. 37)

And you're not always going to have positive emotions about the person that you're learning from, so I think there's an authenticity and a realness and a genuineness component to coaching or teaching emotional intelligence that a lot of the learning comes from experiencing emotional intelligence and insight from you. (Participant #3, p. 38)

Coaching an executive in EI skills implies that the coach possesses these skills. In addition to having the skills, the data suggested the coaches use modeling of the EI skills as a way to help address tough issues, attend to the client's needs, and to model EI as a way to teach EI. One coach suggested that only certain coaches may be qualified to deal with EI because it is a difficult and complex topic. This participant suggested, "only certain coaches can deal with emotional intelligence because it's one of the most complex and most difficult things to deal with as a coach." (Participant #5, p. 25)

Finding 5

The previous four findings related to research questions 2 and 3. The following finding emerged throughout the interview process, but was not directly related to the research questions, and is included below.
Coaches enact boundaries as to not enter into therapy, legal, or health issues. Executive coaches come from a variety of backgrounds and domains of knowledge with a wide array of theoretical underpinnings. In this study, eight of the coaches interviewed had a background in therapy. During the qualitative interviews, it was clear that the coaches were explicit at drawing boundaries and not entering into the work of a therapist, doctor, or attorney. Despite the differences in their backgrounds, the coaches provided specific examples of how and why they deliberately drew boundaries with their clients.

First, some saw this as a role boundary issue and did not see their role as a therapist, even if they had the background to do this for the executive. Second, the coaches did not want to risk harming their clients at all during the coaching practice. Third, the coaches have chosen this as their career and they do not want to be on-call. Outlined below are illustrations of each.

**Role Boundary**

The coaches in this study clearly indicated their role was one of a coach and not a therapist. They recognized that there were similarities between coaching and therapy, yet they were clear to not blur the line between coaching and therapy in their practice. The coaches focused on enhancing the leader’s potential and increasing the executive’s future effectiveness at work. One participant delineated the difference between coaching and therapy as “the profession of therapy is about looking backwards . . . the role of the coach is absolutely, black and white, is absolutely present and future focused” (Participant #7, p. 6).
Those coaches with training in therapy were quick to note their role was specifically one of a coach and not a therapist: "I never get hired as a clinician; I get hired as a coach" (Participant #5, p. 15); and "my role is not as a therapist. I've been in that role, I understand that role... that's not my job and I need to be clear on that" (Participant #1, p. 10).

The coaches were clear that the line between coaching and therapy should not be blurred. The coaches in this study indicated they were not hired to diagnose or treat dysfunctional behavior, but they were there to increase the executive's effectiveness on the job and enhance organizational performance. The coaches were careful to not cross over into the role of a therapist and were comfortable enforcing this boundary with both their client and the organization.

**Protect the Client**

The data suggested that the coaches recognized when the client needed additional support in the way of therapy, medical, or legal issues. They enacted boundaries and helped the client to seek professional help and in some situations, the coach partnered with other professionals to help the client: "As a former therapist I'm careful when someone is in an emotional crisis or difficult situation... I may recommend that they seek some professional counseling, but that's not mine to do" (Participant #1, p. 11).

The coaches also were very comfortable with enacting boundaries and referring their client to a professional rather than acting in the role of the therapist. Executives with deep seated behavioral problems or significant character flaws are not good candidates for coaching. In some situations, the executive coach worked with a therapist to
determine if the executive was strong enough emotionally to be considered a candidate for coaching as illustrated by Participant #5:

So because I'm a psychologist and because in those kinds of situations you really need a mental health professional who's a coach to be able to assess the situation and get permission from the individual to talk to their mental health professional and determine whether or not the person is a viable person to stay in the job and that they're strong enough to get coaching, because a lot of people shouldn't be getting coaching—it's not a coaching time. (Participant #5, p. 15)

During the coaching process, the coach may also uncover a client's medical, legal, or psychological issues that were not presented at the beginning of the coaching relationship. Coaches need to know when a person needs additional help and be ready to refer the executive to another resource. This was illustrated by the coaches in the study: “and then as an executive coach, if it looks like that that's a wound that needs to heal, I make a referral for a psychotherapist” (Participant #9, p. 12); “So I actually helped her find her a therapist” (Participant #7, p. 7). Participant #1 said:

I suggested to her that one of the things she might want to do is have a conversation with her therapist about whether it would be useful for her to seek the opinion of an attorney around what just are her legal rights. (p. 10)

The coaches in this study indicated they saw their role as a coach and they recognized the importance of referring clients to outside professionals. The coaches felt this helped them in defining their role as a coach and also was key in protecting their client, ensuring they addressed issues with the most appropriate professional based on a client's specific needs.

**Coach Lifestyle**

One last area of focus was on the lifestyle of the coach. Since many coaches come from a therapy, business, or human resource background, they find the freedom and
flexibility of being a coach as one that suits their own work life balance. As these professionals have transitioned into coaching, they indicated to me that they relished the ability to work with driven and motivated individuals. This served them well as they were not needed to be on call as they were in their prior roles.

One coach indicated she had worked as a therapist before and changing to a coach changed the demands on her life. She indicated that she could go on vacation without being called out to address a person’s mental health issue. This coach saw this as a benefit to her lifestyle and she enjoyed that part of her role as a coach, and summed this up by saying “companies are paying me to be an executive coach, not a therapist and I don’t carry malpractice insurance anymore and I don’t carry a 24/7 beeper” (Participant #9, p. 13).

The coaches with both therapy and non-therapy backgrounds were comfortable with their role as coach, and with partnering with other professionals in order to help clients. The data suggested this was due to three major reasons. First, the coaches have clearly thought through their role and where the boundary is between the coach and other professionals who may be working with their client. Second, the coaches want to make sure their client is seeking the correct type of outside professional help in order to protect the client. Third, the coaches have chosen a coaching career and they appreciate not needing to be on call or having to carry malpractice insurance in this capacity.
Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the study results obtained from 11 in-depth interviews with executive coaches and sets the stage for the study recommendations and future research implications outlined in the final chapter.

Executive coaches assess the senior level executive’s EI differently than they do for other leaders. For the senior executive, they often use their own observation skills and the multi-rater interview process to assess an executive’s EI. They limit their use of traditional assessment instruments since the executives have already completed assessments of due to time constraints or the executive.

When looking at the strategies the executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies I found they addressed the executive from a holistic perspective and considered topics such as energy renewal, work life balance and health issues. They also help their clients develop EI by making their clients feel comfortable doing what would normally be considered socially uncomfortable such as role-playing, rehearsing presentations, and practicing expressions. Additionally, they indicated they must be models emotional intelligence in their practice to develop EI in order to address tough issues and to attend to the needs of their client. Modelling EI was one key way in which they were able to demonstrate what EI looks like to their client.

One last, yet separate finding the coaches were explicit at drawing boundaries and not entering into the work of a therapist, doctor, or attorney. They recognized that there
were similarities between coaching and therapy, yet they were clear to not blur the line between coaching and therapy in their practice.

This chapter presented the five findings uncovered by this study. As is typical with qualitative research, extensive samples of quotations from the participants were included in this chapter. By using their own words, I have attempted to represent the reality of the practitioners while coaching the executives.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to explore how executive coaches assess and develop emotional intelligence (EI) when working with senior level executives. This study researched the following questions:

1. How do executive coaches assess or measure emotional intelligence when coaching senior level executives?
2. What strategies do executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies?

Following is a discussion of the findings and conclusions drawn from this research. This discussion is followed by recommendations for future research and a final reflection on the study.

Assessing and Measuring EI

Finding No. 1

When working at the senior executive level, the executive coaches in this study often limited their use of traditional assessment instruments, yet were in 100% agreement that the multi-rater interview and observation were valuable when assessing an executive’s EI. The coaches used two primary methods when assessing the EI of their executive level clients: observation and the multi-rater interview. When used together, the coaches were able to form a more complete picture of the executive and target developmental strategies to help the executive develop their EI. The coaches limited their
use of traditional psychometric tools when working at the senior executive level primarily
due two reasons: First, the executives had little time to complete self-assessments; and
second, the coaches indicated they built on insights already identified either from the
executive or his or her organization. Outlined below is a discussion of the reasons and
implications of limiting the use of the psychometric tools and a discussion of why the
combination of multi-rater interview was found effective by the executive coaches in
assessing EI.

Limiting the Use of Assessment Tools

Only two of the 11 coaches indicated they consistently used assessment tools in
their coaching process with their senior level clients. This is an interesting finding
because most executive coaches are certified and accustomed to using a variety of
assessment instruments in their practice for lower level leaders. Training in the use of
assessment tools is often part of the executive coaches’ background if they come from a
therapy, human resources or employee development discipline, which is common. When
a coach works with middle level managers, using assessment instruments such as aptitude
tests, personality instruments, multi-rater instruments, or self-assessments is common and
acceptable; however, as indicated by the coaches in this study, when working at the
senior executive level, they often limit the use of these instruments.

The coaches indicated they limit the use of the instruments due to the executive’s
time constraints. Executives operate at a fast pace, work long days, travel extensively
across time zones, serve on boards, and often have busy, active families. As a result, they
judiciously guard their schedules and prioritize their activities with a “return on
investment” mentality. What this means for executive coaches who serve senior level executives is that they need to operate at an entirely different level than what they would for an emerging or middle level manager client. Coaches who work at the senior executive level need to be exceptionally skillful at rapidly establishing the coaching relationship, assessing client’s needs, and determining the action plan. Often they need to do this with limited face time with the client and access to data. Only two of the coaches consistently used assessment tools such as personality indicators, EI self-assessments, or multi-rater feedback instruments. As Kaplan and Paulus (1994) argued, traditional 360-degree feedback is an effective development tool for all management levels, but senior managers sometimes require a richer feedback experience.

The coaches indicated that in some instances they were able to obtain data from prior assessments conducted by the executive’s organization. In many organizations, there is a systematic process of assessing leaders at the time of hire and subsequent development, appraisal, and succession planning. The coaches indicated that if they can obtain this data from the client’s organization, they do so. If they were unable to obtain this data, they often acquired a high-level overview of the prior assessments from the client or the human resources department. This background information proved to be a starting point for the coaches and helped them to work with their clients on quickly targeting specific areas of focus.

Additionally, the coaches indicated that often a client’s organization had already conducted multi-rater assessments and other psychometric assessment tools and provided the feedback to their senior level client, but had been unsuccessful in helping the
executive make the desired changes, and this is why the executive coach was called in for
the coaching engagement. All of this insight is helpful for the organization to provide in
order to give the coach a head start on what has been done to date and what the barriers
have been to developing the executive’s EI.

In order to adapt to the quick pace and time constraints, the coaches in this study
indicated they needed to quickly determine the highest and most pressing needs for the
senior level executive without demanding a lot of time on the executive’s part. Peterson
(2006) argued that coaching is about changing behavior and the core of his coaching is
captured in one question: “What are you going to do differently?” This question implies a
focus on both action and the future (Peterson, 2006, p. 51). In this study, the coaches
agreed, indicating they needed to make their observations quickly and collect qualitative
data from key stakeholders. The combination of the two techniques was the primary way
the coaches assessed an executive’s EI, and together with the executive determined what
the executive was going to do differently without a huge time investment.

**Observation Skills**

The executive coaches in this study confidently used their own observation skills
as part of the assessment process. They observed the executive during their coaching
sessions, noted how he or she wrote emails, and took notice of who the executive did or
or did not include in the email exchanges. They watched how the executive interfaced
with his or her staff members, restaurant employees, and receptionists. The coaches
indicated these insights were helpful to them in assessing how an executive client
interfaced with others and demonstrated EI competence in relationship management. This
study did not test or assess how accurate the coaches were in their observations; this was self-report data and this is an area in which further research is needed to determine if the coaches were accurate during their observation processes.

Executive coaches need to have finely honed observation skills in order to do these assessments and observations accurately. Executives are often excellent performers and if the coach does not possess exceptional observation skills, he or she may be taken in and fooled by the executive during the coaching process. Senior level executives are often on-stage when interfacing with their constituencies, and they perform for the board of directors, the media, their employees, and the public. It is entirely possible for the executive to put on a charade for his or her executive coach that conforms to his or her own sense of superiority. The executive may do this for a number of reasons: first, some executives may feel that not unveiling the truth about their behaviors may help them to maintain their reputation or dignity. For example, if an executive has a brand name coach, the executive may only tell the coach portions of the truth and selectively turn on the charm in order to preserve his or her own standing with the coach.

Second, the executive simply may not find the coach credible and put on an act in order to get on with the coaching process. The executive may also have entered into the coaching process at the request of someone in the organization and does not value the coach or may simply be cynical of the coaching process. Third, the executive may mistrust the coach if he or she suspects their conversations are not held in confidence. This perception may occur if the coach is working with multiple leaders in the organization or if the coach has a perceived relationship with the human resources
professional or another executive in the firm. Additionally, an executive may use this as an opportunity to glorify themselves at the expense of others if they feel they can use this coaching relationship to maneuver organizational dynamics.

**Multi-Rater Interviews**

In many coaching engagements, the coaches use the multi-rater interview to supplement and test observation skills when working with their clients. This step provides the coaches with information they would not obtain by observation or assessment alone; the multi-rater interview can provide the coach with insights that even trained observers may miss. Through the multi-rater interview process, the coaches are able to gather additional insights and perspectives that help to avoid misperceiving the organizational dynamics by only hearing the perspective of the executive (who may find it in his or her own best interest to withhold key information). The qualitative data helps the coach to gather unvarnished information even that the executive does not know, and also helps to pull the key stakeholders into not only the assessment, but also the development of the senior leader. This step can help an organizational leader listen and take others’ views into account rather than remain isolated by organizational sycophants.

At the senior executive level, even the executives’ closest colleagues find it thorny and perilous to provide the leader with genuine and authentic feedback. This lack of information is sometimes called the CEO disease. Even though the executive may be familiar with this disease, he or she may not even realize they are experiencing this dynamic when they are in this situation. Many executives believe they are immune to this disease because they see themselves as asking probing questions and think they are
excellent listeners, trusting that colleagues and direct reports are responding genuinely and truthfully when this is not happening in reality. Frequently, their “trusted” colleagues withhold the truth. There are several reasons for this phenomenon. First, some people simply want to please and tell the boss what he or she wants to hear in order to advance their own career, and upon discovering that there are rewards for this pleasing behavior they use it as a tactic for managing or getting ahead by playing to their leader—sycophancy becomes the way to get ahead organizationally.

Second, some executives react negatively or close their minds when direct reports or colleagues provide dissenting, discouraging, or nonconformist points of view. Some leaders are hypersensitive to criticism or feedback and can react to dissenting opinions as personal attacks on their character. After this is learned, the executive’s colleagues learn to selectively share data, and respond only positively or optimistically in order to be perceived as a team player instead of a dissenting employee. Healthy dissent is not rewarded and false optimism becomes the standard operating process.

Third, some executives are noted for shooting the messenger and colleagues have learned it is risky to be the bearer of bad news. This behavior insulates the executive from the truth or reality because only a few brave colleagues will share bad news if it is obvious that this executive prefers rosy group conformity over brutal facts. Fourth, some executives have a commanding or intimidating presence. The executives may not even know they are perceived as intimidating because they do not see themselves in this manner.
Whatever the reason for the executive’s lack of information and awareness, the executive coach has an excellent opportunity to help bridge this gap between the executive’s self-perception and the reality of others in the organization through the multi-rater interview process. The data gathered through the multi-rater interview process helps the coach to obtain specific behavioral data from multiple stakeholders and helps them to gain a more complete picture of the executive’s EI, especially when the client is not self-aware or is not willing to provide a complete picture to the coach.

**Stakeholders Assess and Help Develop**

As the data suggested, the coaches pulled in key stakeholders for the multi-rater interview process and to help guide the executive’s development journey. The coaches indicated that key stakeholders are part of the organizational system and it is sometimes helpful to engage them in sustaining the change process. Morgan, Harkins and Goldsmith (2005) describe how Goldsmith used to only work primarily with the key executives and now he actively pulls in the executive’s key stakeholders, specifically asking for help in four ways. Goldsmith asks the stakeholders to (a) let go of the past and to focus on the future, (b) be supportive and helpful, (c) to tell the truth, and (d) to improve or develop themselves along the journey. These four steps help to engage the key stakeholders in the development process and create a two-way development process. One coach in this study followed this process with each coaching engagement.

Stakeholders can hold the executive accountable during the development process. Peterson (2010) argued that accountability mechanisms are important when motivation is low, a task is difficult to learn, or when an environment lacks support. One technique he
suggested as useful is one that involves periodic meeting with key organizational stakeholders (Peterson, 2010, p. 41). In this study, the coaches indicated the key stakeholders were helpful in encouraging or sustaining behavioral changes, and it helped the coaches in several ways: First, engaging the stakeholders provided an avenue for gathering ongoing developmental feedback; second, by making the process transparent, the coaches indicated this opened up and increased the dialogue between the executive and his or her stakeholder population; and third, by actively engaging the stakeholders in the development process, the coaches were able to address the organizational system dynamics that occurred around the executive. All of these steps were helpful in increasing the quality of authentic dialog within the organization and would be helpful for sustaining change after the executive coach has completed the coaching assignment.

Although 100% of the executive coaches used the multi-rater interview process sometimes, there was variability in the ways data were collected, from whom it was sourced, how the data were sorted and what method was used to deliver the feedback to the executive. To illustrate, in this study, some coaches collected data only from organizational colleagues; other coaches extended the stakeholder group to include friends and family members. Some coaches collected the data through telephone interviews and others collected the data from extended face-to-face interviews. Some coaches used a guided interview process, some used a strict interview protocol, and others used more of a dynamic inquiry interview process. The coaches also sorted and tabulated the data using various methods. Some coaches took careful notes while others jotted down themes during the conversations.
Last, the coaches differed in the ways they delivered the data back to their executive clients. Some coaches typed up the notes into a very detailed binder for the executive to read and then would review the data together over several days; other coaches simply provided a high-level thematic analysis to their clients in order to ensure confidentiality of the data. Regardless of the specific processes employed by the executive coaches, all indicated the multi-rater interview process was very helpful in providing the executive with rich feedback and insights that helped them to have a new perspective and subsequently improve their EI.

**Recommendations for Executive Coaches**

The executive coaches used both observation and the multi-rater interview as two primary techniques for assessing an executive’s EI. At the senior most levels, the coaches often avoided other assessment instruments that they may use with lower level executives. This indicates a strong need for coaches to be trained in both techniques as part of their own development process. For the coaching industry, I would recommend conducting further research for employing best practice techniques for both observation training and multi-rater interviews.

There are a variety of training methodologies to help coaches become exceptional observers and to help them accurately read through an executive’s façade. One such potential training was described by Goleman (2007) when he took Ekman’s training on reading facial microexpressions. This training is used and considered valuable for law enforcement professionals, judges, and diplomats in reading affective signals. Training such as this may be a consideration for helping executive coaches become skilled at
detecting microexpressions with their executive clients. Strong observational skills are one way an executive coach can read situations clearly and be of higher value to their clients.

Second, executive coaches need training in all steps of the multi-rater interview process. This tool was utilized, at times, by all of the coaches interviewed, but if this technique is to be of highest value, the coaches need to be experts at identifying the relevant stakeholders, conducting qualitative interviews, assessing the results, and providing feedback to their clients. Training in qualitative research methods would help the coaches be able to gain, assess, and detail the richness of the qualitative information gathered. Additionally, if an executive coach pulls in family members as key stakeholders, this can raise delicate and sensitive issues. With this in mind, I would recommend that coaches have extensive training in therapy, psychology, or mental health counseling prior to venturing into this aspect of an executive’s life.

**Strategies Employed to Develop EI in an Executive**

**Finding No. 2**

In exploring what strategies executive coaches employ to help their executive clients develop emotional intelligence competencies, one finding was the executive coaches addressed various aspects of the senior executive’s life, including work-life balance, career goals, health, and family issues. The data indicated that nine of the 11 executive coaches deliberately focused on how their clients managed their mind, body, heart, and spirit as part of their coaching process. The coaches felt it was important to address the whole person and to help their clients recognize that how topics such as
work-life balance, stress management, and energy renewal are addressed can impact EI and ultimately on-the-job performance. Goleman et al. (2002) argued that leaders needed opportunities to recover from chronic stress and renew themselves in mind, body, heart, and spirit. (p. 184).

Maintaining strong physical health is essential to keeping up with the fast paced lifestyle of the corporate executive. Harburg (2010) compared the impact of executive stress to soldiers at war because the executives have exhausted staffs, sustained corporate causalities, and endured persistent stress for an extended period of time. When an executive has to face intense work pressures such as laying off staff, closing down business units, and continual media pressures, they can face an energy level shutdown. This level of fatigue can be interpreted as lack of interest or engagement, when in reality it is the hostile response of the parasympathetic nervous system as it forces a person into recovery by shutting down their physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual energy systems (Harburg, 2010). Often leaders will ignore the symptoms of the sacrifice syndrome and rationalize their problems in the midst of creating a toxic environment for themselves and others. Without the benefit of reflection, the executive may continue to be hard-driving and absorb themselves in work despite the constant pressures. Human resource professionals, learning officers, or another senior executive will often call in an executive coach to help the executive deal with power, stress, and possible addiction to the fast paced work life.

The executive coach is in a unique position to help an executive to reflect, refresh, and renew his or her energy levels in order to regain focus beyond career alone. During
the coaching sessions, the coach can help the executive with both reflection and renewal. Under stress, many corporate executives work harder and forget to pace themselves in order to manage and sustain a high energy level. Even though there may be clear symptoms of burnout, fatigue, or the sacrifice syndrome, some executives resist the concept of taking time for themselves because they feel selfish or too busy to consciously take time to focus on their body, heart, or spirit, continuing to push to achieve their vision of success. This is where the executive coaches can help executives step back and recognize the impact of the sacrifice syndrome on the executive, and his or her family and colleagues.

The coaches in this study viewed their role as one that helps the executive to step out of an automatic pilot mode and reflect on how he or she renews and sustains their energy level during times of extreme stress. Once this was identified, the coaches indicated that they were able to proceed forward and help the executive to cultivate appropriate actions to handle emotions such as anxiety and frustration more effectively. Boyatzis and McKee (2005) suggested that renewal experiences stimulate neural circuits that increase electrical activity in the brain’s left prefrontal cortex and arouses the parasympathetic nervous system, provoking a release of hormones into the blood stream that subsequently leads to changing a person’s sense of well-being (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 62). Coaches can help the executive become aware of what is happening to their brain when under stress, and describe the science behind amygdala arousal and how this releases cortisol which is part of the sympathetic nervous system’s flight-or-fight response. When an executive is in this state, it can prevent him or her from thinking
rationally. When the coach educates the executive about this process, it is a step to helping the executive regulate emotions better so he or she is able to demonstrate EI through self-regulation.

The implications of the finding regarding coaches addressing various aspects of the senior executives’ lives, including work-life balance, health, and family issues are outlined below. You will see specific implications for both human resource (HR) and learning professionals and executive coaches.

**Recommendations for Human Resource/Learning Professionals**

High performing leaders may derail or suffer from the sacrifice syndrome if EI competence is not developed. This is harmful to the executive and their key stakeholders as well as direct reports, peers, managers, customers, family members, and the shareholders of the organization. Because research suggests that EI is a differentiating factor for performance, this should be a key component in the talent decisions in an organization. As a result, I would suggest human resources and learning leaders incorporate an EI factor into their talent management decisions in the areas of hiring, developing, appraising, succession planning, and promotional decisions. HR and learning professionals should also consider including energy renewal programs, mindfulness training or wellness opportunities into their executive development opportunities as appropriate. Additionally, if an HR/learning professional takes note of an executive derailing, they should consider bringing in an outside executive coach with experience in emotional intelligence, mindfulness coaching, or therapy.
Recommendations for Executive Coaches

EI is a key area of focus when coaching senior level executives. Research indicated that the variance between star performers against average performers is attributable to EI factors rather than technical expertise or cognitive abilities (Goleman et al., 2002). Considerations around stress, energy renewal, work and life balance, and health are intertwined with EI development. As illustrated in the data, it is likely a coach may be engaged to help an executive with EI development and may focus on addressing stress or energy renewal as a part of the executive’s development. This suggests that coaches may want to be educated in various techniques (such as mindful meditation) for managing stress.

As David (2005) argued, coaches need to apply theoretically driven and empirically validated interventions in their practice. As the coaching profession continues to evolve, this is an opportune time for coaches, coaching schools, and certifying bodies to consider adding or incorporating training on the mind-body connection as part of the curriculum. This is important because if a coach is going to work with an executive in the area of the mind and body connection, the coach needs to be educated—at a minimum—on the various research studies and theories.

Because many coaches come from a non-therapy background, this educational process could be overlooked. I would recommend additional training or a higher level of certification be considered for coaches to be considered qualified for entering into this realm of coaching. The coach may or may not choose to teach these techniques
themselves, but they need the background to help their clients recognize how to renew energy and manage stress.

*Finding No. 3*

Finding 3 concluded that the executive coaches made their clients feel comfortable doing what would normally be considered socially uncomfortable. Asking a senior level executive to role play, practice expressions, or rehearse a presentation requires the executive to feel safe for the process to be valuable. This finding implies that the executive coaches interviewed in the study had established trust and credibility with their clients. Stober and Grant (2006) argued that if a coaching client does not feel accepted and understood, the chances for the coach and client to work together are slim (p. 24).

The data indicated the coaches were skillful at making the executives feel accepted and comfortable trying out new techniques and overcoming resistance. When I asked the coaches to describe how they did this, they indicated that they gave the executive permission to feel awkward or to act out a performance in their presence. This required risk taking on the part of both the coach and the executive. The coaches needed to select the right technique, understand how to process and implement the technique, be comfortable to take on the challenge, and be willing to address the awkwardness with their client. Additionally, the coach must be credible when suggesting the technique to the executive and have established trust in order for the technique to deliver the desired results.
Goleman et al. (2002) argued that improving EI takes months because the emotional centers of the brain are involved. The authors explained that people literally rewire their brains through repeated practice (p. 156). The data suggests that the coaches in this study agreed with that stance. As Participant #9 explained, “So there is an enormous benefit to actually getting people to practice their own words with you” (Participant #9, 2010, p. 19). Selecting the right tool or technique is an art; as Peterson (2010) described capability building as a complex and artful aspect of coaching. A part of this art appears to selecting the appropriate tool or technique that will most likely facilitate the EI development needed with the senior level executives.

The data showed the coaches utilized a variety of tools, techniques, and processes to help the executive practice and develop emotional intelligence capabilities. There was a wide variety of techniques described by the coaches, ranging from role playing, practice presentations, visioning exercises, and metaphor building, to the empty chair technique. Getting the executives to practice in a safe environment appears key to helping the executive anticipate reactions, practice responses, and implement new behaviors on the job. This study found that executive coaches helped their clients develop EI by making the clients feel comfortable doing what is normally found socially uncomfortable. Implications of this finding for executive coaches are below.

**Recommendations for Executive Coaches**

The data in this study indicated the coaches used a variety of experiential techniques with their clients. The implication for coaches is to have a wide array of tools, techniques, and processes available for use during coaching sessions. These tools can be
effective in helping an executive practice EI skills in a safe environment; deliberate practice with a coach can help an executive literally rewire how he or she thinks and reacts, and this practice is very helpful in developing EI competence. One consideration for the coaches is the skill level that is needed to select the appropriate tool and properly apply the techniques mentioned in this study. For example, using a Gestalt technique like the empty chair needs a higher level skill and without the proper training, this technique may not be beneficial. One consideration is to have various levels of coach training and education that would allow coaches to gain knowledge and advanced skills before utilizing them in practice.

**Finding No. 4**

Next, the researcher found that the coaches indicated they must be models of emotional intelligence in their practice in order to develop EI with their clients. TECF (2008) suggested that emotional intelligence competencies are a key factor in the effectiveness of the coach. The data from this study suggest that coaches must not only understand EI, but they must model EI during the coaching process. The data indicated the coaches modeled empathy in many ways in their coaching practice. Goleman et al. (2002) suggested that to be empathic, we must begin with curiosity about other people and their experiences. Participant #8 explained that empathy is foundational to developing healthy relationship and during the coaching sessions, the executive must feel that “I really care for them” (Participant #8, 2010, p. 31). Furthermore, Goleman et al. (2002) argued that to be effective, a coach needs to build resonant relationships with others (p. 195). Possessing and modeling EI competencies can help a coach convince the
executive try new techniques, build inspirational leadership skills, and journey into new and uncomfortable territory.

In addition, emotional self-awareness helps a coach to not project his or her own feelings, biases, or values onto the client. Goleman et al. (2002) noted that one of the most common mistakes seen in the coaching relationship is collusion. Collusion is when the coach relates closely to the executive and takes on the executive’s feelings and reacts as if the emotions were his or her (the coach’s) own (p. 196). The self-aware coach maintains empathy and compassion but remains objective (Goleman et al., 2002). The findings suggested the coaches displayed a number of the EI competencies while working with executive clients, and addressed tough and challenging situations with empathy and compassion. One coach suggested EI development involves a high degree of complexity and difficulty and that not all coaches are equipped to address EI.

If a coach is working on developing the EI competencies of an executive, it obviously implies the coach needs to be a model of EI in practice. As indicated from the study, it is critical that the coaches demonstrate and model the EI competencies with their clients. As noted earlier, EI competencies are a key factor in the effectiveness of the coach (TECF, 2008).

By displaying EI skills as a model, the coaches create a safe and empathic environment for the executive who is working on relatively sensitive issues. To do this, the coaches must ground themselves in EI research, determine what EI framework to use, and understand the underlying theory that frames the model utilized in their practice. The coaches indicated they used EI as examples in their practice, provided feedback with
empathy and compassion, and this helped them to not only provide the feedback, but to also model strong EI skills to their clients.

One important consideration is that the participants in this study were not representative of the entire field of coaching. In fact, the coaches interviewed were all selected for this study due to their experience or expertise in EI or working with their clients in the areas of inter- or intra-personal relationship skills. Many coaches come from a wide array of disciplines and one can not assume they have the same backgrounds, education, or theoretical base as the participants in this study.

The implications of this finding are highlighted below, and specific implications for HR/learning professionals and executive coaches and the field of coaching are outlined below.

**Recommendations for HR/Learning Professionals**

First, the coaches in this study revealed there are a variety of coaching processes and EI models in use today. Some coaches have a strong background in EI; however, not all executive coaches in the profession have this background. This implies that HR and learning professionals must inquire and learn about the specific experiences and background in working with EI or intra or interpersonal behavioral skills before securing the services of a professional coach.

**Recommendations for Executive Coaches**

Developing the EI of a senior level executive is often a part of the role of an executive coach because emotional intelligence is a key success factor for senior executives. Executive coaches need to build resonant relationships with their clients in
order to build the trust and empathy, helping the client to feel comfortable with and trust the coach. Additionally, by modeling EI for their clients, this helps manage the relationship with appropriate boundaries (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005). EI modeling is a key way to help the client see how EI can be displayed and emulated back in the executive’s work and home life. Training on EI and having the ability to demonstrate EI is a key competency for executive coaches to possess in their practices, and should be part of coach certification programs and considered part of the ongoing training for coaches as they progress in their careers.

**Additional Finding from the Data.**

**Finding No. 5**

In addition to the findings surrounding the research questions, there was one additional findings important to note. This finding showed that the coaches enacted boundaries as to not enter into therapy, legal, or health issues. This has been discussed in the literature extensively. For example, Gray (2006) argued that a coach could open up deep-seated issues and coaches not trained in psychotherapy must know when it is time to refer their client to a professional. The data in this study indicated that most coaches both espoused and enacted boundaries in their role as a coach. Additionally, the data suggested that both coaches with and without a therapy background enacted this boundary. In some instances, the coaches maintained their role as a coach, yet partnered with a mental health professional or a therapist in order to serve their client.

There could be several reasons for this finding. First and most likely, the data suggests that coaches are sensitive to this issue and well educated, therefore they know
when to refer their client to a professional. However, it is good to consider other potential reasons. One reason may be the coaches are naïve and not recognize the need to send their client to a professional. Second, the coaches may be relieved to not be in a therapy role and may appreciate that they do not need to carry malpractice insurance or carry a beeper in their coaching role.

Recommendations for HR/Learning Professionals

When hiring executive coaches for issues related to EI, one must look for coaches to have some training in mental help issues. Coaches need to be educated so they know when to refer a client to a professional therapist for help (Coutu et al., 2009). It not easy to recognize depression or anxiety without the proper training, and executive coaches working at this level should have some experience or education in this area.

Recommendations for Executive Coaches

The line between therapy and coaching can become blurred at times. As has been discussed in the literature, coaches need to know when and how to enact boundaries when needed in the coaching relationship. Coaches with a therapy background need to avoid responding to their clients as if they were working as a therapist. Palmer and Cavanaugh (2006) suggested that coaching psychologists bring to the coaching field a host of psychological theories and models, as well as an understanding of mental health issues. Coaches need to ensure that the coaching relationship does not include therapy, and this is a clear ethical line. It is also important for coaches to not attempt to diagnose, even if psychological needs are identified. The data in this study indicated the coaches were comfortable referring clients to specialists such as therapists, attorneys, and medical
professionals. In several instances, the data suggested the coach worked in tandem with the outside professional for the benefit of the client. This helped to keep the coaching sessions focused on the coaching agenda. This finding implies that coaches must be prepared by having networks of key professional contacts to use for referral purposes.

**Research Limitations**

There are potential limitations to the research findings. The first is the participants were selected if they indicated they work with EI or intra/interpersonal relationship issues with senior level executives in companies $1 billion in size or larger. The prescreening of this group most likely had an impact on the findings in the sense the participants were experienced with EI or intra/interpersonal developmental issues. Additionally, the prescreening criteria eliminated coaches who did similar work, but with clients from smaller organizations. The second limitation was the research sample size: 11 coaches were interviewed for this study. One critique of this research may be the research sample was too small. This may be considered a limiting factor in generalizing this study to other groups of coaches or leaders, although generalizing this study to other groups of leaders or coaches was not the intended goal of this study.

**Implications for Future Research.**

This exploratory study identified how coaches assess, develop, and use EI in their coaching practice with senior level executives. The following research questions could further define the connections and interplay between EI and executive coaching:

1. Coach certification. Coaches come from a variety of disciplines; some coaches are certified and others have built their practice based on their
profession, research, or expertise. Today coaches can attend a week long
session and walk away with a “master level” coaching certification. As the
profession evolves, should there be consideration for a tiered structure of
coaches? For example, in the nursing profession, there are certified
nursing assistants, licensed practical nurses, registered nurses, and
advanced practice registered nurses. Further research should be done to
see if a similar model should be considered for the coaching profession.

2. Multi-rater qualitative interviews. Multi-rater interviews were used, at
times, by 100% of the coaches in this study. Further research is needed to
dissect and explore how the qualitative data is collected by the executive
coaches because there are various methods for coding and putting the data
into themes. Also, there was no consistency in methods for providing the
data back to the executive. Further research and study should be done to
benchmark best practices for conducting multi-rater interviews.

3. Observation. All of the coaches used observation as a technique for
assessing EI with the key executives. Although the coaches felt confident
in their observation techniques, this study did not assess how accurate the
coaches were because this was a self-report study. Further research could
be done to assess how accurate executive coaches are at being observers in
their coaching practice.

4. Coaching versus therapy. EI touches upon sensitive issues and it is likely
coaches will encounter times where the line between coaching and therapy
may be unclear. Further research should be done to determine how, why, and when coaches are currently transitioning a client from coaching to therapy.

**Conclusion**

This study highlighted new insights into understanding how coaches assess and develop EI into their practice with senior level executives. The coaches primarily use assessment and multi-rater interviews to assess EI with their executive level clients. Coach certification training should include how to observe clients closely and how to conduct qualitative multi-rater interviews. Both techniques require a level of sophistication that is not present in all executive coaches today. Coaches also need to understand how the mind-body connection works as they look to help their executive level clients manage stress and their reactions with a high level of EI. Coaches need to be well versed in this area prior to venturing into this area with their clients. Additionally, they need to be skillful at helping their clients to rehearse or practice techniques in their presence. This means they need to be artful on how to incorporate the appropriate technique at the most opportune time with their client. They need to be role models of EI during their sessions to help model appropriate reactions and to demonstrate EI in all situations with their client. By being excellent models of EI, they can help demonstrate empathy and build trust with their client. Last, the coaches need to be careful to not enter into a therapy session during the coaching process. Even coaches with experience and training in therapy should be very comfortable in drawing the line between coaching and therapy with their clients.
By telling stories of the executive coaches who are noted in the field, the research community gains a perspective on how they perceive and report on the focus of EI as part of their coaching practice. Second, the findings report on how executive coaches assess or measure EI competencies with their senior level clients. Last, this study will provide coaches and researchers with a view of the strategies the coaches employ to develop EI competence, as well as what areas of EI their clients struggle with the most.

While this study is open to interpretation and debate, it is the desire of this researcher that the insights and implications highlighted in this study may be applied to the professionalization and development of the executive coaching profession.
Appendix A

ICF COMPETENCIES

A. SETTING THE FOUNDATION

1. Meeting Ethical Guidelines and Professional Standards - Understanding of coaching ethics and standards and ability to apply them appropriately in all coaching situations.

Understands and exhibits in own behaviors the ICF Standards of Conduct (see list, Part III of ICF Code of Ethics),
Understands and follows all ICF Ethical Guidelines (see list),
Clearly communicates the distinctions between coaching, consulting, psychotherapy and other support professions,
Refers client to another support professional as needed, knowing when this is needed and the available resources.

2. Establishing the Coaching Agreement - Ability to understand what is required in the specific coaching interaction and to come to agreement with the prospective and new client about the coaching process and relationship.

Understands and effectively discusses with the client the guidelines and specific parameters of the coaching relationship (e.g., logistics, fees, scheduling, inclusion of others if appropriate),
Reaches agreement about what is appropriate in the relationship and what is not, what is and is not being offered, and about the client's and coach's responsibilities,
Determines whether there is an effective match between his/her coaching method and the needs of the prospective client.

B. CO-CREATING THE RELATIONSHIP

3. Establishing Trust and Intimacy with the Client - Ability to create a safe, supportive environment that produces ongoing mutual respect and trust.

Shows genuine concern for the client's welfare and future,
Continuously demonstrates personal integrity, honesty and sincerity,
Establishes clear agreements and keeps promises,
Demonstrates respect for client's perceptions, learning style, personal being,
Provides ongoing support for and champions new behaviors and actions, including those involving risk taking and fear of failure,

Asks permission to coach client in sensitive, new areas.

4. Coaching Presence - Ability to be fully conscious and create spontaneous relationship with the client, employing a style that is open, flexible and confident.

Is present and flexible during the coaching process, dancing in the moment,

Accesses own intuition and trusts one's inner knowing - "goes with the gut",

Is open to not knowing and takes risks,

Sees many ways to work with the client, and chooses in the moment what is most effective,

Uses humor effectively to create lightness and energy,

Confidently shifts perspectives and experiments with new possibilities for own action,

Demonstrates confidence in working with strong emotions, and can self-manage and not be overpowered or enmeshed by client's emotions.

C. COMMUNICATING EFFECTIVELY

5. Active Listening - Ability to focus completely on what the client is saying and is not saying, to understand the meaning of what is said in the context of the client's desires, and to support client self-expression.

Attends to the client and the client's agenda, and not to the coach's agenda for the client,

Hears the client's concerns, goals, values and beliefs about what is and is not possible,

Distinguishes between the words, the tone of voice, and the body language,

Summarizes, paraphrases, reiterates, mirrors back what client has said to ensure clarity and understanding,

Encourages, accepts, explores and reinforces the client's expression of feelings, perceptions, concerns, beliefs, suggestions, etc.,

Integrates and builds on client's ideas and suggestions,

"Bottom-lines" or understands the essence of the client's communication and helps the client get there rather than engaging in long descriptive stories,

Allows the client to vent or "clear" the situation without judgment or attachment in order to move on to next steps.
6. Powerful Questioning - Ability to ask questions that reveal the information needed for maximum benefit to the coaching relationship and the client. 
Asks questions that reflect active listening and an understanding of the client's perspective, 
Asks questions that evoke discovery, insight, commitment or action (e.g., those that challenge the client's assumptions), 
Asks open-ended questions that create greater clarity, possibility or new learning 
Asks questions that move the client towards what they desire, not questions that ask for the client to justify or look backwards.

7. Direct Communication - Ability to communicate effectively during coaching sessions, and to use language that has the greatest positive impact on the client. 
Is clear, articulate and direct in sharing and providing feedback, 
Reframes and articulates to help the client understand from another perspective what he/she wants or is uncertain about, 
Clearly states coaching objectives, meeting agenda, purpose of techniques or exercises, 
Uses language appropriate and respectful to the client (e.g., non-sexist, non-racist, non-technical, non-jargon), 
Uses metaphor and analogy to help to illustrate a point or paint a verbal picture.

D. FACILITATING LEARNING AND RESULTS

8. Creating Awareness - Ability to integrate and accurately evaluate multiple sources of information, and to make interpretations that help the client to gain awareness and thereby achieve agreed-upon results. 
Goes beyond what is said in assessing client's concerns, not getting hooked by the client's description, 
Invokes inquiry for greater understanding, awareness and clarity, 
Identifies for the client his/her underlying concerns, typical and fixed ways of perceiving himself/herself and the world, differences between the facts and the interpretation, disparities between thoughts, feelings and action, 
Helps clients to discover for themselves the new thoughts, beliefs, perceptions, emotions, moods, etc. that strengthen their ability to take action and achieve what is important to them,
Communicates broader perspectives to clients and inspires commitment to shift their viewpoints and find new possibilities for action,

Helps clients to see the different, interrelated factors that affect them and their behaviors (e.g., thoughts, emotions, body, background),

Expresses insights to clients in ways that are useful and meaningful for the client,

Identifies major strengths vs. major areas for learning and growth, and what is most important to address during coaching,

Asks the client to distinguish between trivial and significant issues, situational vs. recurring behaviors, when detecting a separation between what is being stated and what is being done.

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

Brainstorms and assists the client to define actions that will enable the client to demonstrate, practice and deepen new learning,

Helps the client to focus on and systematically explore specific concerns and opportunities that are central to agreed-upon coaching goals,

Engages the client to explore alternative ideas and solutions, to evaluate options, and to make related decisions,

Promotes active experimentation and self-discovery, where the client applies what has been discussed and learned during sessions immediately afterwards in his/her work or life setting,

Celebrates client successes and capabilities for future growth,

Challenges client's assumptions and perspectives to provoke new ideas and find new possibilities for action,

Advocates or brings forward points of view that are aligned with client goals and, without attachment, engages the client to consider them,

Helps the client "Do It Now" during the coaching session, providing immediate support,

Encourages stretches and challenges but also a comfortable pace of learning.

10. Planning and Goal Setting - Ability to develop and maintain an effective coaching plan with the client.

Consolidates collected information and establishes a coaching plan and development goals with the client that address concerns and major areas for learning and development,

Creates a plan with results that are attainable, measurable, specific and have target dates,
Makes plan adjustments as warranted by the coaching process and by changes in the situation,

Helps the client identify and access different resources for learning (e.g., books, other professionals),

Identifies and targets early successes that are important to the client.

11. Managing Progress and Accountability - Ability to hold attention on what is important for the client, and to leave responsibility with the client to take action.

Clearly requests of the client actions that will move the client toward their stated goals,

Demonstrates follow through by asking the client about those actions that the client committed to during the previous session(s),

Acknowledges the client for what they have done, not done, learned or become aware of since the previous coaching session(s),

Effectively prepares, organizes and reviews with client information obtained during sessions,

Keeps the client on track between sessions by holding attention on the coaching plan and outcomes, agreed-upon courses of action, and topics for future session(s),

Focuses on the coaching plan but is also open to adjusting behaviors and actions based on the coaching process and shifts in direction during sessions,

Is able to move back and forth between the big picture of where the client is heading, setting a context for what is being discussed and where the client wishes to go,

Promotes client's self-discipline and holds the client accountable for what they say they are going to do, for the results of an intended action, or for a specific plan with related time frames,

Develops the client's ability to make decisions, address key concerns, and develop himself/herself (to get feedback, to determine priorities and set the pace of learning, to reflect on and learn from experiences),

Positively confronts the client with the fact that he/she did not take agreed-upon actions.
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ICF CODE OF ETHICS

Part One: Definition of Coaching
Section 1: Definitions

**Coaching:** Coaching is partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential.

**A professional coaching relationship:** A professional coaching relationship exists when coaching includes a business agreement or contract that defines the responsibilities of each party.

**An ICF Professional Coach:** An ICF Professional Coach also agrees to practice the ICF Professional Core Competencies and pledges accountability to the ICF Code of Ethics.

In order to clarify roles in the coaching relationship, it is often necessary to distinguish between the client and the sponsor. In most cases, the client and sponsor are the same person and therefore jointly referred to as the client. For purposes of identification, however, the International Coach Federation defines these roles as follows:

**Client:** The "client" is the person(s) being coached.

**Sponsor:** The "sponsor" is the entity (including its representatives) paying for and/or arranging for coaching services to be provided.

In all cases, coaching engagement contracts or agreements should clearly establish the rights, roles, and responsibilities for both the client and sponsor if they are not the same persons.

Part Two: The ICF Standards of Ethical Conduct

*Preamble:* ICF Professional Coaches aspire to conduct themselves in a manner that reflects positively upon the coaching profession; are respectful of different approaches to coaching; and recognize that they are also bound by applicable laws and regulations.

**Section 1: Professional Conduct At Large**

**As a coach:**

1) I will not knowingly make any public statement that is untrue or misleading about what I offer as a coach, or make false claims in any written documents relating to the coaching profession or my credentials or the ICF.
2) I will accurately identify my coaching qualifications, expertise, experience, certifications and ICF Credentials.

3) I will recognize and honor the efforts and contributions of others and not misrepresent them as my own. I understand that violating this standard may leave me subject to legal remedy by a third party.

4) I will, at all times, strive to recognize personal issues that may impair, conflict, or interfere with my coaching performance or my professional coaching relationships. Whenever the facts and circumstances necessitate, I will promptly seek professional assistance and determine the action to be taken, including whether it is appropriate to suspend or terminate my coaching relationship(s).

5) I will conduct myself in accordance with the ICF Code of Ethics in all coach training, coach mentoring, and coach supervisory activities.

6) I will conduct and report research with competence, honesty, and within recognized scientific standards and applicable subject guidelines. My research will be carried out with the necessary consent and approval of those involved, and with an approach that will protect participants from any potential harm. All research efforts will be performed in a manner that complies with all the applicable laws of the country in which the research is conducted.

7) I will maintain, store, and dispose of any records created during my coaching business in a manner that promotes confidentiality, security, and privacy, and complies with any applicable laws and agreements.

8) I will use ICF member contact information (e-mail addresses, telephone numbers, etc.) only in the manner and to the extent authorized by the ICF.

Section 2: Conflicts of Interest

As a coach:

9) I will seek to avoid conflicts of interest and potential conflicts of interest and openly disclose any such conflicts. I will offer to remove myself when such a conflict arises.

10) I will disclose to my client and his or her sponsor all anticipated compensation from third parties that I may pay or receive for referrals of that client.

11) I will only barter for services, goods or other non-monetary remuneration when it will not impair the coaching relationship.
12) I will not knowingly take any personal, professional, or monetary advantage or benefit of the coach-client relationship, except by a form of compensation as agreed in the agreement or contract.

Section 3: Professional Conduct with Clients

As a coach:

13) I will not knowingly mislead or make false claims about what my client or sponsor will receive from the coaching process or from me as the coach.

14) I will not give my prospective clients or sponsors information or advice I know or believe to be misleading or false.

15) I will have clear agreements or contracts with my clients and sponsor(s). I will honor all agreements or contracts made in the context of professional coaching relationships.

16) I will carefully explain and strive to ensure that, prior to or at the initial meeting, my coaching client and sponsor(s) understand the nature of coaching, the nature and limits of confidentiality, financial arrangements, and any other terms of the coaching agreement or contract.

17) I will be responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries that govern any physical contact I may have with my clients or sponsors.

18) I will not become sexually intimate with any of my current clients or sponsors.

19) I will respect the client's right to terminate the coaching relationship at any point during the process, subject to the provisions of the agreement or contract. I will be alert to indications that the client is no longer benefiting from our coaching relationship.

20) I will encourage the client or sponsor to make a change if I believe the client or sponsor would be better served by another coach or by another resource.

21) I will suggest my client seek the services of other professionals when deemed necessary or appropriate.

Section 4: Confidentiality/Privacy

As a coach:

22) I will maintain the strictest levels of confidentiality with all client and sponsor information. I will have a clear agreement or contract before releasing information to another person, unless required by law.
23) I will have a clear agreement upon how coaching information will be exchanged among coach, client, and sponsor.

24) When acting as a trainer of student coaches, I will clarify confidentiality policies with the students.

25) I will have associated coaches and other persons whom I manage in service of my clients and their sponsors in a paid or volunteer capacity make clear agreements or contracts to adhere to the ICF Code of Ethics Part 2, Section 4: Confidentiality/Privacy standards and the entire ICF Code of Ethics to the extent applicable.

**Part Three: The ICF Pledge of Ethics**

As an ICF Professional Coach, I acknowledge and agree to honor my ethical and legal obligations to my coaching clients and sponsors, colleagues, and to the public at large. I pledge to comply with the ICF Code of Ethics, and to practice these standards with those whom I coach.

If I breach this Pledge of Ethics or any part of the ICF Code of Ethics, I agree that the ICF in its sole discretion may hold me accountable for so doing. I further agree that my accountability to the ICF for any breach may include sanctions, such as loss of my ICF membership and/or my ICF Credentials.

*Approved by the Ethics and Standards Committee on October 30, 2008.*

*Approved by the ICF Board of Directors on December 18, 2008.*
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PDI COACHING COMPETENCIES

1. Meeting PDi Ethical Guidelines & Professional Standards
   • Understands and applies PDi coaching ethics and standards in all business coaching situations.
   • Understands and follows all PDi coaching ethical guidelines.
   • Clearly communicates the distinctions between coaching and other support professions and refers client to the appropriate resources.
   • Exemplifies and models the behaviors and professional standards being advocated,
   • Adheres to confidentiality agreements.

2. Establishing the Coaching Agreement
   • Understands what is required in the specific coaching interaction and develops specific agreements with the client about the coaching process, relationship and role clarification for all participants.
   • Understands and effectively discusses with the client the guidelines and specific parameters of the coaching relationship (e.g., logistics, fees, scheduling, inclusion of others if appropriate).
   • Reaches agreement about what is appropriate in the relationship and what is not, what is and is not being offered, and clarifies the client’s, coach’s and immediate supervisor’s responsibilities.
   • Determines whether there is an effective match between his/her coaching method and the needs of the client.

3. Creating the Coaching Relationship
   • Establishes trust and rapport with the client by creating a supportive relationship that facilitates positive performance improvements.
   • Shows genuine concern for the client’s welfare and future.
   • Continuously demonstrates personal integrity, honesty and sincerity.
   • Establishes clear agreements and keeps promises.
   • Demonstrates respect for client's perceptions, learning style and personal characteristics.
   • Provides ongoing support for and champions productive new behaviors.
• Consistently asks insightful and thought provoking questions to enhance the client’s self discovery.
• Creates a safe and positive professional relationship that encourages full disclosure.

4. Coaching Presence
• Stays attentive and focused with the client, employing a coaching style that is open, flexible and effective.
• Is focused and flexible during the coaching process.
• Utilizes a diversity of coaching methods to facilitate effective behavioral changes.
• Confidently shifts perspectives and experiments with new possibilities.
• Demonstrates confidence in working with the client’s strong emotions.

5. Active Listening
• Focuses on what the client is and is not saying to understand the meaning of what is said in the context of the client’s needs, business requirements and to support client self-expression.
• Attends to and balances the client's, immediate supervisor’s and organization’s goals and objectives
• Explores the client's concerns, goals, values and beliefs about what is and is not possible
• Distinguishes between the words, the tone of voice, and the body language.
• Summarizes and reiterates what the client has said to ensure clarity and understanding.
• Encourages, explores and reinforces the client's expression of feelings, perceptions, concerns, beliefs, suggestions, etc.
• Integrates and builds on client's ideas and suggestions.
• Allows the client to express, vent or "clear" the underlying emotions associated with a business situation without judgment or attachment in order to effectively move on to productive next steps.

6. Insightful Inquiry
• Ask supportive and insightful questions that reveal the information needed for maximum benefit to the coaching relationship and the client’s performance improvement efforts.
Questions that reflect active listening and an understanding of the client's perspective.

Questions that evoke discovery, insight, commitment or action (e.g., those that challenge the client's assumptions).

Questions that foster greater understanding, clarity, and new options.

Questions that emphasize the What, How, When, Where, and Why.

Questions that encourage an understanding of positive and negative consequences.

Questions that move the client towards what they aspire to be.

7. Productive and Crucial Communications

- Communicates effectively during coaching sessions by using language that has the greatest positive impact on the client.
- Is clear, articulate and direct in sharing and providing constructive feedback.
- Reframes and articulates to help the client understand from another perspective the impact of their behaviors, wants or uncertainties.
- Clearly explains all coaching techniques or exercises.
- Uses language appropriate and respectful to the client (e.g., non-sexist, non-racist, non-technical, non-jargon).
- Uses metaphor, analogy and personal experiences to help to illustrate business coaching points.

8. Creating Awareness

- Integrates and accurately evaluates multiple sources of information, and provides insightful interpretations that help the client to gain awareness and thereby achieve agreed-upon results.
- Identifies with the client his/her underlying concerns, typical and fixed ways of perceiving himself/herself and the world, differences between the facts and the interpretation, disparities between thoughts, feelings and action.
- Helps clients to discover for themselves the new thoughts, beliefs, perceptions, emotions, moods, etc. that strengthen their ability to take action and achieve what is important to them.
- Communicates broader perspectives to clients and inspires commitment to shift their viewpoints and find new possibilities for action.
· Expresses insights to clients in ways that are useful and meaningful for the client.
· Identifies strengths and areas for improvement.

9. Behavioral Focus

· Creates client opportunities for ongoing learning during coaching and in work/life situations that inspire new actions/behaviors that will most effectively lead to agreed-upon client goals.
· Brainstorms and assists the client to define actions/behaviors that will enable the client to demonstrate and practice new skills.
· Helps the client to focus on and systematically explore specific concerns and opportunities that are central to agreed-upon goals.
· Engages the client to explore alternative ideas and solutions, to evaluate options, and to make better decisions.
· Promotes active experimentation and self-discovery, where the client applies what has been discussed and learned during coaching sessions in his/her work or life setting.
· Celebrates client successes and capabilities for future growth.
· Challenges client's assumptions and perspectives to provoke new ideas and find new possibilities for action.
· Helps the client "Do It Now" during the coaching session, providing immediate support.

10. Action Planning and Best Practices

· Develops and maintains an effective coaching plan with the client by consolidating information and development goals with the client that address concerns and major areas for learning and development. (i.e. PDi Online Action Planning)
· Creates an individual action plan with “SMART” goals that are specific, measurable, action oriented, realistic and time focused.
· Makes action plan adjustments as warranted by the business coaching process and by changes in the situation.
· Helps the client identify and access different resources for learning (e.g., books, trainings and other resources).
· Identifies and targets early successes which are important to the client.
· Supports the client in taking responsibility for action and inaction.
• Clearly requests of the client actions that will move the client toward their stated goals.

• Demonstrates effective follow up by asking the client about those actions that the client committed to during the previous session(s).

• Acknowledges the client for what they have done, not done, learned or become aware of since the previous coaching session(s).

• Effectively prepares, organizes, summarizes and reviews with client information obtained during sessions.

• Focuses on the coaching plan but is also open to adjusting behaviors and actions based on the coaching process and shifts in direction during sessions.

• Develops the client's ability to make decisions, address key concerns, and develop himself/herself (to get feedback, to determine priorities and set the pace of learning, to reflect on and learn from experiences).

• Positively confronts the client with the fact that he/she did not take agreed-upon actions.
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PDI CODE OF ETHICS

Professional Conduct

i360°CertifiedCoach©:

1). I will conduct myself in a manner that reflects positively upon the business coaching profession and I will refrain from engaging in conduct or making statements that may negatively impact the public's understanding or acceptance of business coaching as a profession.

2). I will not knowingly make any public statements that are untrue or misleading, or make false claims in any written documents relating to the business coaching profession.

3). I will respect different approaches to business coaching. I will honor the efforts and contributions of others and not misrepresent them as my own.

4). I will be aware of any issues that may potentially lead to the misuse of my influence by recognizing the nature of business coaching and the way in which it may affect the lives of others.

5). I will strive to recognize personal issues that may interfere with my coaching performance or my professional relationships. Whenever the facts and circumstances necessitate, I will promptly seek professional assistance and determine the action to be taken, including whether it is appropriate to suspend or terminate my coaching relationship(s).

6). I will conduct myself in accordance with the PDi360°Coaching Code of Ethics and standards in all training and supervisory situations.

7). I will conduct and report research with competence, honesty and within recognized scientific standards. My research will be carried out with the necessary approval or consent from those involved, and with an approach that will reasonably protect participants from any potential harm. All research efforts will be performed in a manner that complies with the laws of the country in which the research is conducted.

8). I will accurately create, maintain, store and dispose of any records of work done in relation to the practice of PDi360° business coaching in a way that promotes confidentiality and complies with any applicable laws.
9). I will be responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries that govern any physical contact that I may have with my clients.

10). I will not become sexually involved with any of my clients.

11). I will construct clear agreements/contracts with my clients, and will honor all agreements/contracts made in the context of professional business coaching relationships.

12). I will ensure that, prior to or at the initial coaching session, my client understands the nature of coaching, the bounds of confidentiality, financial arrangements, any company policies and other terms of the coaching agreement.

13). I will accurately identify my qualifications, expertise and experience as a PDi360°Certified Coach.

14). I will not intentionally mislead or make false claims about what my client will receive from the coaching process or from me as their PDi360°Certified Coach.

15). I will not give my clients or prospective clients information or advice I know or believe to be misleading.

16). I will not knowingly exploit any aspect of the coach-client relationship for my personal, professional or monetary advantage or benefit.

17). I will respect the client's right to terminate business coaching at any point during the process. I will be alert to indications that the client is no longer benefiting from our business coaching relationship.

18). If I believe the client would be better served by another coach, or by another resource, I will encourage the client to make a change.

19). I will suggest that my clients seek the services of other professionals when deemed appropriate or necessary.

20). I will take all reasonable steps to notify the appropriate authorities in the event a client discloses an intention to endanger self or others.

21). I will respect the confidentiality of my client's information, except as otherwise authorized by my client, company policies or as required by law.

22). I will obtain agreement from my clients before releasing their names as clients or references, or any other client identifying information.
23). I will obtain agreement from the person being coached before releasing information to another person or organization compensating me.

24). I will seek to avoid conflicts between my self interests and the interests of my clients. Whenever any actual conflict of interest or the potential for a conflict of interest arises, I will openly disclose it and fully discuss with my client how to deal with it in whatever way best serves my client.

25). I will only barter for services, goods or other non-monetary remuneration when it will not impair the business coaching relationship.
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BAR-ON MODEL

Intrapersonal (self-awareness and self-expression)

- Self-Regard: To accurately perceive, understand and accept oneself
- Emotional Self-Awareness: To be aware of and understand one’s emotions
- Assertiveness: To effectively and constructively express one’s emotions and oneself
- Independence: To be self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others
- Self-Actualization: To strive to achieve personal goals and actualize one’s potential

Interpersonal (social awareness and interpersonal relationship)

- Empathy: To be aware of and understand how others feel
- Social Responsibility: To identify with one’s social group and cooperate with others
- Interpersonal Relationship: To establish mutually satisfying relationships and relate well with others

Stress Management (emotional management and regulation)

- Stress Tolerance: To effectively and constructively manage emotions
- Impulse Control: To effectively and constructively control emotions

Adaptability (change management)

- Reality-Testing: To objectively validate one’s feelings and thinking with external reality
- Flexibility: To adapt and adjust one’s feelings and thinking to new situations
- Problem-Solving: To effectively solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature

General Mood (self-motivation)

- Optimism: To be positive and look at the brighter side of life
- Happiness: To feel content with oneself, others and life in general
Appendix F

GOLEMAN’S MODEL

*Self-awareness:* Knowing what we are feeling in the moment, and using those preferences to guide our decision making; having a realistic assessment of our own abilities and a well-grounded sense of self-confidence

*Self-regulation:* Handling our emotions so that they facilitate rather than interfere with the task at hand; being conscientious and delaying gratification to pursue goals; recovering well from emotional distress

*Motivation:* Using our deepest preferences to move and guide us toward our goals, to help us take initiative and strive to improve, and to persevere in the face of setbacks and frustration

*Empathy:* Sensing what people are feeling, being able to take their perspective, and cultivating rapport and attunement with a broad diversity of people.

*Social skills:* Handling emotions in relationships well and accurately reading social situations and networks; interacting smoothly; using these skills to persuade and lead, negotiate and settle disputes, for cooperation and teamwork
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INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
RESEARCH SUBJECT
CONSENT FORM

Protocol Title: Use and Perceptions of Emotional Intelligence by Executive Coaches
Principal Investigator: Dr. Sharon Ravitch 267-Sharon Ravitch
Investigator: ravitch@gse.upenn.edu
Investigator: Mary McNevin, 920-997-2772, mary.mcnevin@mccain.com

You are being invited to participate in a research study. Before you agree, the investigator must explain a number of things to you. These things include:

• **The purpose of the study** is to explore the use and perceptions of emotional intelligence and executive coaching. This study will research how coaches utilize emotional intelligence in their practice, what tools they utilize and how they work with their clients in the area of emotional intelligence.

• **Ten to twelve executive coaches** who have experience with senior level executives and emotional intelligence will be included in the study.

• **Your participation will require one 60-90 minute interview** that will be conducted either in person or by phone, depending on location and participant preference. All interviews will be tape recorded.

• **Information collected will be kept strictly confidential**, except as may be required by law. All responses are held in the strictest confidence and are only being used for the purposes of this dissertation study. At no time will any reference be made to identify you specifically or your company. Any reference to your information through this research study will be through a number in order to protect your confidentiality.

• **Potential study risks** are minimal. That is, the risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those associated with daily life.

• **Potential study benefits** are expected to enhance the knowledge of the use and perceptions of emotional intelligence in the field of executive coaching.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. If you decide not to participate, you are free to leave the study at anytime. Withdrawal will not have any negative ramifications. If you have questions about your participation in this research study or about your rights as a research subject make sure to discuss them with the study investigator or members of the study team. You may also call the Office of Regulatory Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania at (215) 898-2614 to talk about your rights as a research subject.

You will be asked to sign this form to show that

• the research study and the information above have been discussed with you
• you agree to participate in the study
  You will receive a copy of this signed form and the summary of the study that will be discussed with you.

_________________________  ____________________________  ____________

Subject’s Name [print] Subject’s Signature Date

_________________________  ____________________________  ____________

Witness [print] Witness’ Signature Date
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INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The purpose of the study is to explore the use and perceptions of emotional intelligence and executive coaching. This study will research how coaches utilize emotional intelligence in their practice, what tools they utilize and how they work with their clients in the area of emotional intelligence.

Information collected will be kept strictly confidential, except as may be required by law. All responses are held in the strictest confidence and are only being used for the purposes of this dissertation study. At no time will any reference be made to identify you specifically or your company. Any reference to your information through this research study will be through a number in order to protect your confidentiality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Related Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been an executive coach?</td>
<td>5 years or less 6 - 10 years 11 - 15 years 16 or over</td>
<td>To see if there are any trends that emerge with years of executive coaching experience</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you choose profession?</td>
<td>Academic Professional Experience Certifications</td>
<td>To see if there are any trends that emerge from the coaches background.</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am going to ask you a series of questions around strengths and developmental opportunities you have found when working with executives:</td>
<td>MQ IQ EQ</td>
<td>To see if the strengths cited can be categories as managerial competence, intelligence or emotional intelligence.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you coach senior level executives, what would you list as the most common strengths you see in them overall?</td>
<td>MQ</td>
<td>To see if the gaps cited can be categories as</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see as the largest leadership gap or the area in which executives struggle with</td>
<td>MQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the most?
If EI...which specific EI competency?

How does this gap usually present itself?

How do you assess the intra/interpersonal or EI skills of an executive?
What tools do you use? How were you trained on them? Is there a specific EI or Intra/Interpersonal framework you utilize?

How do you work with executives to develop their interpersonal or emotional intelligence competence?

Tell me a story of a time when you were very successful in coaching an executive who struggled with one of the emotional intelligence competencies. What was the presenting problem and how did you work with the executive?

Reflect back what have you learned about the role of emotional intelligence in your role as a coach?

Can emotional intelligence really be developed in a leader? Yes/No
If yes, how so?

Thinking back on our interview...is there anything else...upon reflection...that you would like to share?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>managerial competence, intelligence or emotional intelligence. If EI, how does the coach make this determination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Get story...if comm....dig deeper for specifics around commn. To see if there are trends with the tools used in assessing EI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Mayer &amp; Salovey (MSCEIT) To see if there are trends on how coaches work to close EI gaps. R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Bar-On EQ-I R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Goleman ECI 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) 360 – indicate which one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case example – dig deeper into the stories. To see if there are trends in what coaches have learned about EI in their practices R1, R2, R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful change stories..... Get details here....probe for details m/f, country, demo, etc. Used to capture, present and preserve the stories into success stories via results mapping R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect back what have you learned about the role of emotional intelligence in your role as a coach? See if there are trends in what coaches believe EI can be developed R1, R2, R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can emotional intelligence really be developed in a leader? Yes/No To see if coaches believe EI can be developed. R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, how so? Example. Get an illustration of a coach working to develop EI in an executive. R3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G

**TITLE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Qualifications/Exclusions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Help the Executive Assess their Situation on their own</td>
<td>Through dialog and questioning, the coach, helps the executive self-assess their situation – the coach asks questions that evoke discover, insight</td>
<td>The coach does not prescribe what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I ask the executive to describe their current situation and the impact on their team?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Role Boundary</td>
<td>Coach is not a therapist and refers the executive to an outside expert for deeper issues (Espoused or Enacted)</td>
<td>Coach define the boundary of his/her role compared to other roles (attorney, therapist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Coaching is not therapy, I do coaching, not therapy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>EI can be developed</td>
<td>An executive can improve their intra/interpersonal/EI abilities</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Unlike IQ, EQ can be developed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Holistic approach to coaching</td>
<td>The coach address the ‘whole person’ in coaching sessions including work life balance, but not therapy</td>
<td>Work life balance, wellness and health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I address the whole person, not just their career life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Assessment tools are used for assessing the executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definition

The coaches uses a pre-established assessment tools to help assess the executive’s intra/inter/EI abilities

Qualifications/Exclusions

Online, pen/pencil (not interview) (NOTE: Intention & Outcome)

Examples

Eqi, Myers Briggs, Firo B, Hogan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Qualifications/Exclusions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Multi-Rater Assessment</td>
<td>Online, pen/pencil (not interview)</td>
<td>Benchmarks, 360 BY DESIGN, company specific 360 (NOTE: Intention &amp; Outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Multi-rater Interview</td>
<td>Family members, coworkers, partners, direct reports, key stakeholders (NOTE: Intention &amp; Outcome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Observation and Active Listening</td>
<td>Coach hears the client’s concerns, goals, values &amp; believes and allows the client to vent without judgment or attachment in order to move onto the next steps (NOTE: Intention &amp; Outcome)</td>
<td>Coach attends meeting, watches the executive deliver a presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Structured Interview</td>
<td>Coach conducts a structured interview of the executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Each coaching session is individual – tailored made</td>
<td>No strict process followed – coaches uses different assessment tools, techniques and steps based on the executive’s individual needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Target just a few specific developmental areas</td>
<td>Coach &amp; Executive jointly develop under 5 areas on which to focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Visioning/Role Playing/Acting</td>
<td>Coach works with the executive to prepare in advance for specific situations and role plays how the executive can best handle a intra/interpersonal/EI situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>The coach helps the person vision or assigns them a role to play to prepare for a situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We role play out the situation in advance, I have the executive deliver the presentation and I video tape them in order to hone their skills in advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The coach requires the executive to engage key stakeholders in the coaching process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The coach requires key stakeholder involvement in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Examples**

I ask the executive to meet with the stakeholders to share the development plan or get feedback after a presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Qualifications/Exclusions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Raw Data Given to Executive</td>
<td>Data is given in raw format – not summarized</td>
<td>I take notes when I conduct multi-rater interviews and give it to the executive (Outcomes and Intention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Thematic analysis done by the executive</td>
<td>The coach doesn’t summarize for the executive, but may do separately and compare to what the executive does</td>
<td>I give the executive the assessments and data...and ask them to come up with the themes, patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Qualifications/Exclusions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>Coachee/Leader</td>
<td>The leader knew exactly where he stood in relation to his peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>Coachee/Leader</td>
<td>The leader demonstrated transparency when s/he communicated to their team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Qualifications/Exclusions</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>Empathy; Organizational Awareness; Service</td>
<td>Coachee/Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Relationship-Management</td>
<td>Inspirational Leadership; Influence; Developing Others; Catalyst for Change; Conflict Management; Teamwork/Collaboration</td>
<td>Coachee/Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>IQ – Strength or Developmental Area</td>
<td>Problem Analysis; Judgment; Numerical Interpretation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>MQ – Strength or Developmental Area</td>
<td>Business Sense, Delegating; Appraisal;</td>
<td>Not EQ or IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>No Assessments are used by the coach</td>
<td>The coach does not use any assessments</td>
<td>I don’t use any assessments at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>R2 or R3</td>
<td>Perceived Effectiveness of process</td>
<td>Coach believes their process or assessment is effective</td>
<td>Efficacy of tool or process (Benchmarks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Qualifications/Exclusions</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Perceptions of Success</td>
<td>Coach – I believe in myself</td>
<td>I know he is better because I worked with him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Coach uses EI during coaching session</td>
<td>Coach meets the client at the appropriate stage – cognitively and emotionally</td>
<td>Coaches sees many ways to work with the client &amp; dances in the moment with the client by accessing own intuition</td>
<td>Coach doesn’t do 360 FB until they are ready; draws leader back to save face during session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Coach understands and clearly communicates the distinction between coaching, therapy &amp; other professions</td>
<td>I do not email to the company email address....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manages Progress and Accountability</td>
<td>Keeps the client on track and promotes self-discipline</td>
<td>Can be verbal, email or another method of tracking</td>
<td>I ask them to send me an email stating how they did on XYZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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