EXECUTIVE COACHING:

STUDY OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE PROGRAM AT A TOP

EUROPEAN BUSINESS SCHOOL

by

Hyun Jung Kim

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Victoria J. Marsick
Professor Janet L. Miller

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date_____

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2011

ABSTRACT

To understand how tensions caused by the multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching are perceived and overcome, this modified ethnographic study was conducted at an executive coaching program and leadership center at a prestigious European business school. This study is built on prolonged discussions on the role of psychology in executive coaching (mostly in America). According to Ozkan (2008), tribal conflicts between psychologist-coaches and non-psychologist-coaches exist, and debates continue concerning qualification and formal training. In this context, many coach preparation programs have entered the academic community with collaboration from experts of various disciplines (Starr, 2008). This study examines how psychology and organizational study are incorporated in a coaching program for coaches, using an integrated model, within an academic setting.

The integration of psychology and organizational studies is thought to be a great success among study participants, and, after a decade, the structured business school recently approved their executive master's degree in clinical organizational psychology, a new discipline incorporating clinical psychology and organizational studies, for the program. Tensions are found only in the past and outside of the program in: 1) a past failure with psychologists and a continuing success with business people, 2) personal careers of multidisciplinary faculty members, 3) practical and disciplinary conflicts with other parts of school. The tensions are mostly overcome, and the tribal conflict was not found since faculty members and most coaches have both identities. Successful management of tension is attributed to leadership and organizational culture of the program. Thematic analysis is used for data analysis. Conclusions include: 1) fits between training targets and program orientation should be considered in coach

preparation, and 2) business-oriented mind would help integrate multiple disciplines in executive

coaching. Follow-up studies are recommended after the degree program is offered and after the

founder's retirement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I deeply appreciate my dissertation committee members. Dr. Marsick, who made me think of becoming a teacher for the first time, was a caring and effective sponsor; from the first semester, her support of my study, coursework and academic life have been priceless and I am proud to be her student. Dr. Miller opened a new world to me, and her perspective surprisingly but very gently led me to a new research paradigm. Her personal support greatly helped me go through tough dissertation processes. I also thank Dr. Gephart, who appears in my life whenever I need her advice. As a research expert, she taught me how to do academic research and added valuable comments to my dissertation project.

I gratefully acknowledge that this study was conducted with a generous research grant from the Institute of Coaching in McLean Hospital, Harvard Medical School. I specially thank review board who advised my research proposal. This study was never possible without offer of a visiting researcher position and support from the institute, called IBSE in my study. It was an amazing opportunity to conduct my study as well as to learn about coaching and life.

Special thanks to Dr. K, Shallotte and faculty and staff members. It is a great honor to get connected with the people and the institute. They are my personal and professional inspiration. Even though the time was short, I feel the place is another home.

I especially thank my friend Seungho who has gone through the same process and helped me with practical and moral support, Andy Morgan who helped me polish my writing, and other friends including Khaitsa, Bill and Sooim, who gave me cheerful words and effective advices when I was lost.

The whole process of doctoral study is dedicated to my daughter. She is a source of my energy and life. I have worked hard to change the world for her. She made me laugh in any situation and raised me up from hardship. I will never forget my family's support and sacrifice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

PROBLEM AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the issues and challenges in executive coaching and coach preparation caused by the multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching, in an effort to 1) understand how an integrated coaching model is used in a single case, and 2) provide adult educators in the executive coaching field with an example and analysis of how conflicts between bodies of knowledge and scholars could be dealt with in practice.

Executive coaching is growing in popularity: more articles and dissertations on executive coaching appear in academic and practical journals, and more coach preparation programs are being launched around the world. On the other hand, coach preparation is rarely studied, and the field is directed by a handful of authors. As demand for executive coaching increases, more coach preparation efforts will be created in academic and business sectors. The coach preparation programs will likely be an incubator for the industry in the future. Therefore, specific and serious attention should be given to systems and programs prepare coaches.

In this study, I collected, analyzed and interpreted professional coaching stories with a focus on issues and challenges in multi-disciplinarily integrated coaching program

within a business school in Europe in order to develop deeper understandings of coaching preparation and its underlying tensions.

This is a modified ethnographic study incorporating narrative analysis and self-reflexive inquiry on the Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) and the International Leadership Center (ILC) at the International Business School in Europe (IBSE). The fieldwork took place at ILC, where 50 coaches provide 3,500 executives a year with various coaching and consulting programs. ILC will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five, giving special focus to the coach preparation function of one of their leadership coaching programs, LCP. I collected data not only through interviews with faculty members and several coaches and observations, but also document review, and through my own research journal.

This study consists of five main chapters: research problem and purpose of the study, literature review, methodology, findings and interpretation, analysis and conclusion and recommendations. In Chapter One, I introduce the context and background of this study by focusing too on my own personal and professional motifs, including two beliefs and assumptions I bring into this study. In the literature review section, Chapter Two, I present a discussion on executive coaching with a focus on the role of psychology, and begin assessing the tensions in the field. In the third section, I will present my research methodology and data collection, analysis and interpretation methods. Chapter Four organizes my interpretation of findings. Finally, Chapter Five critically analyzes my findings and discusses application.

Context and Background

I have endeavored to become "a counselor for top professionals," a concept that has evolved in my life for nearly 20 years. I remember so vividly the moment that I first heard from my English teacher in my high school class in Korea in 1989 that there was a place called "Wall Street" with a lot of successful bankers as well as mental health professionals helping them. That occupation, the helper, sounded stunning to me because I had assumed that adults never needed help, especially the successful professionals. I was excited that not only "abnormal" people needed such help. Since then, I have developed my fantasy into my career.

I studied education in a Korean undergraduate program and flew to the United States where the bankers, and helpers, were supposed to be. In preparation, I researched many academic programs in the US and decided to study counseling, particularly career counseling in an American Psychological Association (APA) accredited program, which was not taught in Korea,. I could feel the APA's power even before entering the program. My master's program was insulated; the curriculum was almost entirely fixed and almost no outsider could take the courses that my program offered. We students took very few elective classes outside of our program. When taking elective classes for the first time in my second year, I was surprised by the diversity and opportunities in the school. I had several options for minors and could take almost any class, although no one else could take classes in my program. My program was also rigidly structured, perhaps according to APA and American Counseling Association (ACA) guidelines, requiring as much coursework as other master programs (over 40 semester credits), 600 hours practicum under rigorous supervision, a master research project, and a comprehensive exam. The

course fortified my professional identity as a counselor, and the knowledge and skills learned felt unique and special. I saw counseling as a true expertise that required a rigorous training. Since I graduated, more legal regulations, such as licensing, were instituted at state levels throughout the nation. These legal updates sometimes marginalize me, an "old" graduate who does not practice in America, but my knowledge and skills felt more specialized.

Next, I thought I needed to learn about organizations and organizational members. Thus I went to the Leadership Development Center at Samsung, the largest organization in Korea. It was not easy for a counselor to enter major corporations at that time. Among 45,000 regular employees, I was the first one with a counseling degree. I designed and facilitated leadership development programs incorporating psychology with leadership theories as well as with existing learning facilitation processes. I obtained hands-on experience in working with executives and managers and knowledge in leadership, business management in general and knowledge management. I also learned from my own struggle as an organizational member.

Unlike getting into Samsung, the next transition to outplacement consulting business was very easy. In an outplacement consulting firm, I finally career consulted former CEOs and executives one-on-one and in group in a fancy skyscraper as I had dreamt. I took advantage of my uniqueness, being the only one with educational and professional backgrounds for career consulting in Korea. My multidisciplinary knowledge and skills satisfied the needs of my clients. Yet, being alone brought an obligation to train my colleagues: counselors and former HRD professionals. Sadly, I was unable to do this. Instead, I painfully observed how counselors struggled with clients,

former organizational members, due to lack of an understanding of the business context and how HRD professionals seem to have a hard time working in one-on-one situation. I felt my two professional identities as a counselor and as an HRD professional conflict. I wondered, "Why? Do others in similar situation feel the same way?"

Thus I began this study. I quickly discovered that I was not alone: the conflicts between psychologists-coaches and non-psychologist-coaches are prevalent in the coaching field, and the debates are fiery in the literature (Berglas, 2002; Bono, Purvanova, Towler, & Peterson, 2009; Dean & Meyer, 2002; Filipczak, 1998; Ozkan, 2008, p. 3; Sherman & Freas, 2004; Sperry, 2008). My straddling in my unique position helps me understand the conflicts, but even I cannot simply override the conflicts.

As I originally presumed, it would be most beneficial to clients if psychologists and non-psychologist coaches truly cooperated and built theories and training programs, but there seems to be an impermeable boundary between them. Thus they begin "tribal conflicts" (Ozkan, 2008, p. 30), explicitly criticizing each other. At this point, I was curious in what way I was supposed to react to this situation. In this study, therefore, I will examine the conflicts embedded in the executive coaching field and imagine how it could be dealt with through investigating a single case, with reference to two specific contexts and situations of my study as well as to my inner conflicts.

Research Problem

Executive coaching is an international phenomenon in business and now in academia (Economist, 2003; Starr, 2008, p. 78). Today's organizations are challenged by shifting and complex business environments, and the leaders are expected to adapt

themselves to existing volatile realities in order to guide the organization to maximum achievement. As a response, executive coaching has become an "important organizational intervention" (Stern, 2008). This is also interpreted as a substitute of conventional leadership training, "a transfer of training tool" (Olivero, Bane & Kopelman, 1997). Unlike traditional corporate training, this intervention can meet each executive's subtle needs while minimizing the gap in time and space between practice and training because a coach can see an executive any time and any place at executive's convenience or in his/her needs without leaving work (Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999, Michelman, 2004). Executive coaching has been flourishing in diverse organizations, and professional coach pools around the world are rapidly growing. The occupation recognizes its own prestige with its title and with hourly service fees ranging from 200 dollars to 3,500 US dollars (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009).

However, the parameters of executive coaching are unclear. Executive coaching generally refers to "a confidential, individually-tailored engagement designed to meet the needs both of the executive being coached and the organization paying for the service" (Coutu, et al., 2009, p.3). But there are no agreed definitions for "executive" and "coaching," nor of its functions and processes (e.g. Joo, 2005; Ozkan, 2008).

Due to these slippery working definitions, the flexible nature of intervention and the increasing popularity among practitioners and clients, many coaches express anxiety. They are concerned especially about the absence of entry barriers such as academic credentials, licenses or certification. According to Coutu et al. (2009), some executive coaches complain that various personnel service providers abuse the title, and charlatans discredit the profession. Thus, standardized coach trainings and qualifications are

urgently needed (Berglas, 2002; Garman, Whiston, & Zlatoper, 2000; Kilburg, 2000; Sherman & Freas, 2004), but so far this assertion is only echoed in professional literature.

In this dearth of public and academic discussion, The Graduate School Alliance for Executive Coaching (www.gsaec.org) – encompassing several higher educational institutions including schools of arts and science, schools of management and leadership, and education colleges – took a meaningful step by identifying what can be assumed to be "good" 214 coach preparation programs offered by graduate academic institutions in the United States, Canada, Australia, United Kingdom, Ireland, and Scotland (Starr, 2008).

Executive Coaching and Psychology

Despite the variety of contributions to the development of the field, reinforced by the GSAEC list, the literature is mostly limited to psychology. Much space in literature has been taken for discussing the role of psychology in executive coaching (Bono, et al., 2009), many articles comparing executive coaching to psychotherapy (D Coutu et al., 2009; Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Manfred Kets de Vries & Balazs, 2005; Kilburg, 2000). In an anthropological study on executive coaching in New York City, Ozkan (2008) identifies the "tribal conflicts" (p.30) between psychologist-coaches around the American Psychologist Association (APA) and the others around the International Coach Federation (ICF). Why does psychology stand in the center of debate? What does psychology mean in executive coaching? Can the conflicts in the field be reduced? What is the root of this conflict?

Bono et al. (2009) hint at the last question in their survey on what executive coaching involves and who is qualified to conduct it. They reveal that the diversity found

between psychologists of differing disciplines (e.g. counseling, clinical, organizational/industrial psychology) are also found between psychologists and non-psychologist coaches. In other words, executive coaching is rooted in a variety of theories and orientations depending on specific academic roots, even among psychologists, resulting in different coaching approaches. The differences are not only between psychologists and non-psychologist coaches but also among psychologists from different specialties. Then, does the difference cause conflicts between psychologists with different specialties too? It is not known so far. Instead, Kilburg, a clinical psychologist, sees systems theories, which organizational psychologists have developed, as another axis of executive coaching (Kilburg, 2000; Kilburg & Levinson, 2008).

Thus, the many aspects of executive coaching are uncertain and so have become fodder for academic discourse and debate. Therefore, without question, I feel it is worthwhile to explore the issues and ways in which this multidisciplinary intervention called "executive coaching" has been created, practiced and transferred to future coaches in structured academia, including the salient continuation of the conflicts between psychologist-coaches and non-psychologist-coaches as well as between other groups.

Research Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the issues and challenges in executive coaching and coach preparation caused by the multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching. This will help us 1) understand how an integrated coaching model is used in a particular context, and 2) provide scholars and practitioners in executive coaching with

an example and analyses of how conflicts between bodies of knowledge or scholars exist and how this plays out in practice in a particular context and within a particular executive coach preparation program.

My research questions:

1. In what ways has Leadership Coaching Program been conceptualized as "interdisciplinary?"

    a. How has this program been developed over the years?

    b. By whom? How do "participants" describe this program?

    c. What changes over the years, if any, have been incorporated into this program? How has the program emerged, developed and been operated?

2. How do study participants describe the interdisciplinary approach?

    a. What tensions, if any, do they identify in this program in terms of its interdisciplinary nature?

    b. What positive aspects do participants ascribe to this program?

    c. What changes, if any, do participants recommend for this program?

3. What are the director's conceptualizations of the coaching program?

    a. What is his memory of his creation of his coaching model and program?

    b. What is his opinion of coach qualifications?

    c. What are other coaches' understandings and conceptualization of his approach and practice?

<u>Assumptions of the Study</u>

This section addresses major assumptions that I bore when I entered the research site. These assumptions were mostly raised from my own experience as a coach who is a trained counselor and HR professional at the same time. The literature review also generated assumptions but these were mostly reaffirmed rather than newly engraved. I present researcher's assumptions to acknowledge my vantage points so as to help readers interpret this study cautiously. I am aware of my assumptions and tried to watch my biases and assumptions as much I could during the fieldwork.

Assumption # 1. Psychology and organizational expertise will conflict

Even when I arrived at the research site, an academic entity where psychology and business administration are incorporated, I could not clear my skeptical curiosity: "Can psychology and business management marry?" I myself have endeavored to bring my psychological skill-set to the business field in Korea. As reviewed in Chapter 2, executive coaching is the field where knowledge and skills in psychology and business studies are equally required, but this can cause a tribal conflict (Ozkan, 2008) between psychologist-coaches and non-psychologist-coaches.

I experienced this conflict not only in the course of my literature review. I have worked as a career consultant – a coach –with counselors and former human resource (HR) professionals when the coaching/consulting field emerged in Korea. Two groups of people definitely had strengths as well as weaknesses, but the former HR professionals made successful long-term transition to coaching while counselors quickly left their coaching/consulting jobs. This was the opposite of what I had expected: that counselors could be competitive in the coaching/consulting business, perhaps because I, myself, had chosen to study counseling primarily to become a coach. For me, it felt much harder to

gain psychological knowledge and skills than organizational experience, and because there are fewer counselors than people with organizational experience, counseling has scarcity value. Since historically my presumption was contradicted, I wanted to see a clear answer to the counseling versus organizational skills dilemma.

Thus, my research site was particularly attractive in that it is run by psychologists in business school. I entered the site full of curiosity. I kept asking: is it *really* possible to incorporate psychology and business?

Assumption #2. Coaching is a field of tensions

In my past experience, tensions between counselors and former HR professionals were persistent. I heard complaints against each group in and outside of my work because of my straddling position. It hardly seemed possible that these two groups could work together.

The literature supported my assumption, particularly Ozkan's (2008) ethnography of executive coaches in New York City, which described situations similar to what I had experienced in Korea. The different tribes conflict in defining coaching and coaching norms. The occupational culture was also exclusive. Ozkan mentioned that during her fieldwork with coaches, her interview skills were criticized by coaches whom she was interviewing. They seldom open their practice. So she only could sit in actual coaching sessions several times after 3 years of relationship-building. It is not fair to generalize one person's experience, but I sympathized with Ozkan's experience in my current situation, being a doctoral student, and had been concerned about my fieldwork. I was scared and doubtful if I could do this study; if my findings turned out to be as negative as my

assumptions, I wondered how I could publish honestly while keeping my researcher's ethics?

Assumption # 3. Academia is more binary than business world

"An eclectic is always losing argument" (Abbott, 2001).

Graduation fast approaching, landing an academic job became an option to me. People, no matter where they are, push me to declare what field I will join. Essentially, this question is, "To what field does executive coaching belong?" Executive coaching articles are published in many academic fields, like psychology, public administration, organizational studies, human resource development and adult education. Once I decided to place myself in a major company, my unorthodox, multidisciplinary background would not be a problem because they are only concerned with what knowledge and skills I have, rather than to which discipline I strictly belong. Discipline is not in the language of major businesses. While I took some time to explain what I could do with counseling knowledge and skills, never have I been asked about my academic identity. Moreover, I started my corporate career at the time of "digital convergence," when the company put enormous efforts to bring multiple divergent things in one device, such as a camera cellular phone, so my diverse background was intrinsically valuable. Many coaches in the private sector integrate multiple approaches in a similar way.

However, I assume that an academic position will demand specialization. I am curious how academia deals with this, especially when it involves psychology which has very clear boundary following APA guideline and strict ethical codes. As prestigious universities join the coaching business and launch coach training programs, I assume that they encounter qualitatively different problems.

Methodologically, by combining fieldwork using participative observation and filed notes to this study, where I will interrogate my own memory and assumptions, I assume that my interpretations of any personal experience will influence my interpretations of phenomena.

Rationale and Significance

Conflicts persist in every part of academia. Executive coaching is no exception. The conflicts between psychologist and non-psychologist coaches are the most notable in the research literature (Bono, et al., 2009). Discovering why and how the tensions play out in a specific setting could help executive coaches and educators in executive coaching and also in adjacent fields such as career consulting, outplacement consulting, life coaching and the likes, to develop and question, change and or refine their practice and training rubrics. Although the focus of this study begins from the tension between those two specific groups, this also can provide insights into conflicts between different groups in the executive coaching field.

Furthermore, this is the first in-depth study to look into how an actual program which can prepare coaches from an outsider's perspective. There have been studies to identify and introduce briefly coach preparation programs (Maltbia, 2008; Starr, 2008) and to project visions in coach preparation (Manfred Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007; Passmore, 2007). This study moves a step forward. Not many researchers have explored, in-depth, coaching and coach preparation programs besides their own. Ozkan (2008) mentioned that she could sit in several coaching sessions near the end of her three-year-fieldwork, but I had relatively free access to "actual" practices from the beginning. In this study, I had access to actual program which coaches coaches. This micro-cosm

approach from outsider's perspective will provide a view to what is really going on, at least from my perspectives, in coaching and coach preparation in this particular setting. As a result, this study can offer practical insights to other programs, especially those that employ integrated coaching models and curriculums. Moreover, I hope to initiate the discussions on coach preparation that will lead HRD and management trends in 21st century.

Definition of Terms

Psychology is often explicated or implied as clinical, counseling or other therapy oriented psychology in the literature on executive coaching, but no one clarifies what exactly psychology includes. However, in this paper, psychology refers to the body of knowledge used for conversational psychotherapy. In this study, the term psychologist will include counselor, psychotherapist, psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and other helping professionals in the mental health sector.

Chapter II.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews literature on two major concepts for my study: executive coaching; and organizational culture and leadership.

Executive Coaching

In this section, I will critically review how executive coaching is discussed among professionals and scholars, focusing on the embedded conflicts and uncertainties concerning coach preparation.

In contrast to a flourishing practice, there is a paucity of research and theory regarding executive coaching. Lowman (2005) considers executive coaching as more of an area of practice than one of theory or research. Although many books are available in the market, most published books are seen as marketing devices rather than serious academic or educational works (Raskin, 2009). In regard to journal articles, 71% of articles are published in journals for practitioners such as *Harvard Business Review* and *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* with an intention of defining the field and disclosing methods, and only 15% appear in academic journals (Joo, 2005).

Most articles are written by current practitioners, who are stakeholders in the field. This fact possibly endangers the validity of studies; Many empirical studies testing researchers' own coaching techniques and models are poorly designed and yield unsound, biased results (Garman, et al., 2000). In terms of format, they are mostly case studies, best practices, personal perspectives on executive coaching, research on their own practice and survey studies. Bono et al. (2009) identified only two articles published in top-ranked academic journals (Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003).

Recently, however, studies providing a big picture of the current status of executive coaching have been published by scholars (Bono, et al., 2009; D Coutu, et al., 2009; Ozkan, 2008), which, in the past, had been the work of consulting companies using their clients and accounts as samples (Michelman, 2004). Also, an increasing number of academic literatures, including dissertations, have appeared in recent years. For example, using two descriptor "Executive Coaching", ProQuest provides 206 scholarly articles, 94 of which have been published within the past five years (01/18/2011). 64 out of the 94 total dissertations have been published during the same period. The twentieth century only produced 6 dissertations. The early publications were mostly on the grounds of such disciplines as psychology, management and training (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001), and these are still the most popular bases. But somewhat eclectic approaches such as anthropological studies grounded in fieldwork (Ozkan, 2008) are now being introduced.

<u>Selection criteria</u>

I critically selected and reviewed existing literature searched through academic search engines such as ProQuest, Ovis, PsychInfo, Ebsco Business Source Complete and GoogleScholar and through the reference sections of articles found by those search engines. Using "executive coaching," I found PsychInfo results of 288 journal articles including dissertation on 10/23/09. It yielded 233 results in March, 2009. ProQuest results include 1052 articles from all sources and 102 scholarly articles. Business Source Complete shows 268 journal articles. In order to filter irrelevant articles, I roughly defined executive coaching as a helping intervention in organizational contexts involving executives, organization and external executive coaches. I first read titles and abstracts to remove articles or dissertations on life coaching or coaching as an executive's leadership skill. Life coaching informs executive coaching in some ways but it does not include the third party, an organization, a boss and or a human resource manager, so I omitted them. Articles and dissertations that narrow down the focuses on specific contexts, such as K-12 schools and specific situations such as transition, are also mostly excluded. I did not expand my search to similar interventions like mentoring or personal training unless they directly inform executive coaching. Approximately 100 articles, books, dissertations and documents were selected as a result for an initial review. The relevant literature will be reviewed in this section.

This section begins with a brief introduction to executive coaching and then introduces how executive coaching is discussed around issues including contradictions, multidisciplinary nature, and coaching preparations. The critiques and questions will be presented at the conclusion.

<u>Executive coaching defined</u>

    <u>Backgrounds.</u>

       The emergence of executive coaching is hard to pinpoint. Literature began to

appear in 1990's, and it was told to be institutionalized for the first time in 1993 by a

private coaching firm, Coach U (Leonard & Laursen, 1998). The 1990's was a time of

changes, characterized by the mass mobilization of capital markets

through neoliberalism, the invention and proliferation of new media such as the Internet,

and the dissolution of the Soviet Union which increased globalization. Many countries,

institutions, companies, and organizations were prosperous during this period (Stiglitz,

2003). In an effort to catch up, change and change management became a major issue in

many sectors of society. Many scholars and management consultants started pushing

leaders to change in response to the speed of environmental change – chose either deep

change or slow death (Quinn, 1996); (Kotter, 1990). Furthermore, leaders needed to

become change agents. Transformational leadership, first conceptualized in 1970's by

Burns (1978) was revised by Bass and gained explosive popularity in academia and in

practice (Bass, 1998; Bass & U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social

Sciences., 1996). The previous methods for learning about changes like what

globalization is and how technology develops were not sufficient. Leaders are required

to live and work with changes and uncertainty, and proactively change themselves and

their organizations prior to external force.

       In this changing environment, the leader's role is as important than ever. An

organization's success or failure is easily attributed to the leader's behaviors and

tendencies and so forth, although it is still debatable because some argue that situational

factors are more important (e.g. Lieberson & O'Connor, 1972; Thomas, 1988). Partly for this reason, executives receive higher compensation: US executive pay between 1993 and 2003 outgrew the increase that could be explained by changes in firm size, performance, and industry classification (Bebchuk & Grinstein, 2005). Executive leaders are compelled to take practical and ethical responsibility for organizational performance. Thus, it is now argued that leaders and managers at all level in any organization need to formulate and implement strategies which involve self-organizing, self-directing and self-regulating (Stacey, 1992), based on a mastery of reflective self-awareness (Argyris, 1993; Schön, 1987) which results in increased self-efficacy, a belief in one's own ability to do a task (Bandura, 1995). This increased self-efficacy leads better performance (Anderson & Betz, 2001; Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas, 1995).

Many authors maintain that executive coaching has evolved as a tool to help executives become flexible to adjust to this ever changing reality and, as a result, to make a change in organizational performance (Griffin, 2006; Jarvis, 2004; Manfred Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007; Niemes, 2002; Ozkan, 2008). Kilburg (2000) links the environmental changes and the strategies, and executive coaching. He sees that one of the main functions of a coach is to help executives increase self-awareness through reflection and boost self-efficacy to leverage individual and organizational performance.

Origins and definitions.

The origins of coaching can be conceptualized as written from a variety of perspectives, from philosophers like Confucius, Socrates, and Aristotle (Kilburg, 2006), Father François Leclerc du Tremblay in the 17th century (Coutu et al., 2009), to Gallwey (1974; Raskin, 2009), the author of *The Inner Game of Tennis*. Such a range of

perceptions and influences evidences the ways in which executive coaching is

characterized differently. Kilburg views it as transferring wisdom, Coutu et al. view it as

advising a top authority, and Raskin (2009) finds its tradition in sports coaching

involving psychology (Gallwey, 1974). In the midst of this uncertainty, *Harvard*

Business Review Business Report, in a survey entitled, "The realities of executive

coaching", report on 140 current executive coaches to offer a big picture of the field

(2009). According to this report, executive coaching usually refers to "a confidential,

individually-tailored engagement designed to meet the needs both of the executive being

coached and the organization paying for the service" (p. 3). Even though this is a broad

definition, it is still open to debate. For example, confidentiality is handled as a subject

of contracts (Kilburg, 2000) and limited confidentiality is viewed as a point to distinguish

executive coaching from counseling (Jarvis, 2004). Kets de Vries (Kets de Vries, 2005)

sees the coaching in groups as the preferable tool for behavioral change. Ozkan (2008)

maintains that there are as many definitions of executive coaching as the number of

executive coaches. However, it has been generally agreed that executive coaching is an

individualized developmental intervention for executives for organizational benefits

which is differentiated from business consulting and psychotherapy (Berglas, 2002;

Garman et al., 2000; Hall et al., 1999; Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Kilburg, 2000;

Ozkan, 2008). For this article, I will use the definition provided by Kilburg: Executive

coaching refers to

> a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial
> authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a
> wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to assist the client to
> achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her
> professional performance and personal satisfaction and consequently to

improve the effectiveness of the client's organization within a formally
defined coaching agreement. (Kilburg, 2000, p. 142)

Purposes and outcomes.

Historically, executive coaching was a remediation for derailing executives, but today it is more focused on the career development of high potential executives (McCauley & Hezlett, 2002). The purpose of executive coaching varies according to coach, organization, executive, and historical context. In spite of the diversity of viewpoints, sustained behavior change is generally viewed as the ultimate goal (Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn, 1998). Witherspoon and White (1996) suggest that executives use executive coaching 1) to learn specific skills, 2) to improve performance on the job or 3) to prepare for advancement in business or professional life. In addition, coaching can support broader purposes, such as an executive's agenda for major organizational change. The International Coaching Federation (ICF) says professional coaching is an ongoing professional relationship pursuing extra ordinary results, through which clients deepen their learning, improve their performance, and enhance their quality of life (2003). Sherman et al. (2004) understand the purpose of executive coaching as to produce learning, behavior change, and growth in the executives for the economic benefit of the organization that employs the coaches. Indeed, a review of five empirical studies reveals that "coaching results in increased learning, increased self-awareness and development and more effective leadership" (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001, p. 153) Also, concerning the changing environment, executive coaching should help executives become more flexible (Griffin, 2006).

What is more, authors argue that good coaching should involve not only increasing knowledge and skills but also assist executives as they make developmental shifts (Fitzgerald & Berger, 2002). They emphasize *transformational learning*, which refers to making the "form" of one's mind more spacious, more complex, and more able to deal with multiple demands and uncertainty (Kegan, 1994). Kets de Vries and Krotov (2007) and Niemes (2002) suggest that, beyond skill acquisition, executive coaching can be an educational intervention to make transformation possible in executives.

Operations.

The popularity of executive coaching can be partly explained by the heightened need for targeted, individualized, timely development (Jarvis, 2004). The effort to facilitate personal development and transformation in executives is not new (e.g. Bradford, 1964; Golembiewski & Blumberg, 1977). Traditionally, executives have entered executive development programs such as executive MBA programs (Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007). However, executive coaching is differentiated from these programs by its flexibility; while group leadership training occurs outside the workplace on a fixed schedule and agenda, executive coaching can take place anytime, anywhere, at any interval, on any topic agreed upon by a coach and an executive. Coaching facilitates leaders' growth in the context of their current jobs, without removing them from their day to day responsibility (Michelman, 2004), while also covering a variety of experience. While training mostly concerns formal learning, coaching also facilitates informal learning, which happens outside of formally structured, classroom-based activities, and incidental learning, a byproduct of daily routines and activities such as task

accomplishment, interpersonal interactions, sensing the organizational culture, or trial-and-error experimentation (Marsick & Watkins, 2001).

It is also physically flexible. It could take place in either an executive's or a coach's office, or at a coffee shop around the corner. Some coaching relationships use phone or email when necessary. It could take a half hour every six months or one hour per week. The relationship could be rather casual, collaborative and flexible. This flexibility differentiates executive coaching from conventional leadership programs. (Hart, et al., 2001; Kilburg, 2000).

Identity of executive coaches

Then, who are they? The answer is not clear. There are no formalized standards or licensure. However, ICF reports 17,000 members in over 90 countries, and 5,000 credentialed coaches (http://www.coachfederation.org/about-icf/press-room/). This includes life coaches, executive coaches and other coaches. This number is exploding, from 5,500 in 2002 and 11,000 members in 2007. According to a 1997 survey study of 60 coaches (Judge & Cowell, 1997), coaches hold a variety of degrees, from drama to psychology, 90% have master's degrees in business and the social sciences, 45% have doctoral degrees, and most worked for smaller companies or independently. The services are provided by MBAs, attorneys, sports coaches, teachers, nurses, and health and beauty consultants (Brotman, et al., 1998). Virtually anybody can label oneself coach and do whatever one can. Although these articles may no longer represent the field, I agree with Bono et al. (2009): "Everyone is doing it, and everyone is doing differently" (p. 364).

Notwithstanding the fact that "everyone is doing it," executive coaching is generally associated with prestige, as the title suggests. The 2003 *The Economist* article on executive coaching begins by mentioning that the top executives of eBay and Unilever have undergone executive coaching. Many articles and brochures list all the big name multinational companies that hire executive coaches (Michelman, 2004). Although exact numbers are not credible, many top companies use executive coaching. For example, one third of Fortune 500 companies employ executive coaching for performance problems (Fritsch & Power, 2006). Also, executive coaching rarely benefits employees at all levels. According to the American Management Association's survey study (Reilly, Spencer, & Jamrog, 2008), 46% of North American companies use external coaches for executives, 27% use them for managers, 13% for supervisors and only 5% for all employees. Lastly, the service fees tell why it is *executive* coaching. Based upon the survey, the median hourly cost of coaching is 500 dollars with the range from 200 to 3,500 dollars: the median is equivalent to that of a top psychiatrist in Manhattan (Coutu et al. 2009).

However, coaches present their own perspectives on characteristics of a good coach. Perhaps coaches are best judged by their accurate perception, sound judgment and ability to resolve conflict effectively with integrity, knowledge and credibility (Sherman & Freas, 2004). Confidence in the coaching process, (Bacon & Spear, 2003), positive attitudes about coaching and a temperament that can promote the client's development (Laske, 1999) are also important. However, all of these qualities are difficult to assess. What is known is that executive coaches, whatever position they take up, enjoy prestige and have diverse, mostly educated backgrounds. The literature is unclear about anything more specific.

Characteristics of the field of executive coaching

Coaching as a field of contradiction.

The origins, definitions and purposes of executive coaching stem from a wide spectrum of theories and beliefs. Executive coaches show little uniformity in their perspectives on assessment tools, scientific or philosophical approaches, activities, goals, outcome evaluation methods and so forth (Bono, et al., 2009; Joo, 2005). Thus, executive coaching is called a field of contradiction (Coutu et al., 2009). The central contradictory area is the role of psychology in executive coaching. Two pieces published in *Harvard Business Review* clearly reflect these contradicting perspectives – Berglas (2002) and Sherman and Freas (2004). Berglas, a psychiatrist, warns of executive coaches without training in psychology, and Serman et al., business consultants, assert that psychologists are not effective in coaching in the business setting. This is typical of the debate, which is present throughout the literature.

Fortunately, no one imagines a strict divide, either psychotherapy or business consulting, but rather a conjecture of both (Kilburg, 2000). Authors typically envisage a coalition of many disciplines and professional experiences from each executive coach. This contradictory nature continues to demand clarification of the definition of executive coaching (Brotman, et al., 1998).

The debate is even more complex when the coaching process and outcomes move to the center of the debate. For instance, the client's identity is often not clear: whether the client is the person being coached, someone higher up the management ladder, or in the human resource department (Kets de Vries, 2005). Given this variety of positioning,

the use of assessments, coaching methods and techniques, and measures of success are

hotly debated (Bono, et al., 2009).

Executive coaching as a multidisciplinary field.

Though there are numerous debates on executive coaching, it is somewhat agreed

that psychology/ psychotherapy/ psychoanalysis benefit the field (Kilburg, 2000;

Newsom, 2009; Ozkan, 2008; Sherman et al., 2004). A majority of the literature is

published in psychology journals; sixty articles appear in *Consulting Psychology Journal:*

Practice and Research as of October, 2009. Some of the literature is dedicated to an

examination of the effectiveness of certain therapeutic approaches like psychoanalysis

(Huggler, 2007), and cognitive behavioral therapy (Ducharme, 2004) in executive

coaching. Peltier (2001), for example, presents five different approaches that

psychologists take in executive coaching: psychodynamic, behaviorist, person-centered,

cognitive therapy and systems-oriented approach.

On the other hand, many coaching models are based upon various approaches

other than psychology, such as adult learning, system theories, cultural perspectives, or

the adventure based framework including outdoor activities (Maltbia, 2008; Stober &

Grant, 2006). Meanwhile, scholars who have expertise in both psychology and other

areas (mostly in Europe and Australia) integrate different views from various disciplines

when forming their theories on executive coaching. Kets de Vries and Balazs (2005)

include psychodynamics and organizational dynamics in their coaching model. Although

the model is based upon psychoanalysis, they separate executive coaching from

psychotherapy from the outset: to them, executive coaching is an educational/training

rather than remedial or therapeutic intervention. Passmore (2007) views executive

coaching as grounded in psychotherapy rather than business or management, and

develops an integrative model involving humanistic tradition, psychodynamic tradition,

behavioral focus, conscious cognition, and unconscious cognition for each phase of the

coaching process. Gray (2006) argues that adult learning theory, specifically Mezirow's

Transformative Learning Theory (1991, 2000), should be an alternative or parallel to

psychotherapy in executive coaching. All these authors attempt to incorporate diverse

theories and perspectives instead of positioning themselves within a dichotomy for or

against psychology.

Executive coaching preparation and certification

How can executive coaches prepare themselves for this multidisciplinary and

contradictory field? While demands for coaching services continue to grow, the lack of

recognized credentialing worries professional coaches (Thach & Heinselman, 1999).

According to meta-analysis in 2000, training in psychology is suggested as a significant

element of the formal training of executive coaches (Garman et al., 2000). Psychologists

(Dean & Meyer, 2002; Huggler, 2007; Kilburg, 2000) also suggest that psychological

training guarantees that coaches have the basic knowledge and clinical skills needed to

accomplish the objectives and goals of coaching. Berglas (2002), a psychiatrist, asserts

that an executive coach must have a rigorous training in psychology. He warns that, in an

alarming number of situations, coaches without rigorous training in psychology do more

harm than good because they do not notice psychological red flags. Indeed, according to

a study conducted by the University of Sydney, 25% to 50% of coaching clients

demonstrate clinical symptoms of anxiety, stress and depression (Grant in Coutu &

Kauffman, 2009). Other authors also shed light on hidden mental illnesses and psychological struggles among executives (Kets de Vries, 1991; G. Morse, 2004). However, these authors clearly separate coaching and psychotherapy and it is not appropriate to use a remedial approach to coaching clients. Kilburg (2000), a clinical psychologist as well as a coach, in his practice, refers a coaching client who displays symptoms of mental illness to another psychotherapist instead of changing his approach to coach; one of the benefits of studying psychology is the ability to recognize symptoms of mental illness and properly refer an executive to mental health professionals.

Conversely, according to recent survey research, only 13 percents of executive coaches perceive that "buyers" value coaches' experience as psychological therapists, and 46% of them answered it is not important at all (Coutu et al., 2009). Filipczak (1998) revealed that 18% of articles published wrote that training in psychology is potentially harmful, while 45% of them see it as positive. On the other hand, he notes that therapists, who lack business experience, are becoming executive coaches because of the few job opportunities in mental health. As a result, they may be unable to adapt to the role of executive coach because they see business executives as another dysfunctional family that needs to be fixed. Sherman et al. (2004) also reject an entry barrier, arguing that an academic background in certain disciplines is not necessary. They moreover refuse the advantage of psychologists on the basis that they are too *naïve* to be effective in executive coaching, and that their training for low or mal-functioning clients is irrelevant.

Some psychologists agree that psychology is not sufficient to prepare executive coaches (Garman, et al., 2000). Foxhall states that executive coaching is "not the place for psychologists with no particular interest in business" (2002, P. 53). Psychologists

advise fellow psychologists to use different approach with their new clientele and in new environments (Berman & Bradt, 2006). They argue psychologists armed with knowledge in leadership (Kilburg, 2000), business (Foxhall, 2002), and/or adult development and learning theories (Fitzgerald & Berger, 2002), in addition to training in mental health, are most likely to practice executive coaching successfully.

As for the certification, ICF certifies members through accredited coach preparation institutes (www.coachingfedration.org), and more than 200 coach preparation programs exist in the academic community (Starr, 2008). Unlike a license, a certification has no binding power. Nonetheless, this certification process is rapidly proliferating in education and business sectors. Coutu et al. (2009) reports that 29% of coaches indicate that a certificate is important, and an equal 29% say it is not important at all. All of this, however, overlooks the question of who certifies whom. There are at least 50 certification issuing institutions in England alone (Scoular in Coutu et al. 2009) and hundreds or maybe thousands of coaching preparation programs, and uncountable professional associations that issue "certification," all with different standards. So the value of the certificate is left to the buyers.

Questions, study implication and summary

      Questions and critiques.

While research traditionally tends to clarify uncertain phenomena, recent studies (Bono, et al., 2009; Coutu & Kauffman, 2009; Ozkan, 2008) with large samples on executive coaching confirm that it is conflicting, diverse and indefinable. Many other authors have called for clarification as a conclusion of their studies (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). However, I wonder if "indefinable" could become a definition, enshrining the

amorphous diversity of executive coaching. Ironically, coaches themselves do not tolerate the conflicts, uncertainty and multiplicity, considering that executive coaching is to help executives become flexible to adjust to volatile realities (Griffin, 2006; Ozkan, 2008). Should we define, narrow and categorize the field? Would executive coaching benefit from our definitions? In the same vein, could a standardized coach preparation program alone prepare coaches?

Only one agreement that I see through the review is that executive coaching has been gaining popularity and it will continue to do so for awhile. As a response, the number of executive coach programs is expected to increase. Is it possible to develop a universal coach preparation program to respond to the indefinable intervention? I revisit the Bono et al.'s (2009) statement, "everyone is doing it, and everyone is doing it differently" (p. 364). How can this diversity be handled in a coach preparation?

Concerning the conflicts between coach groups, it seems that coaches share their title but differ in expertise, and this suits the diverse needs of executives. Some executives need help from a coach with a psychology background, others need one with an organizational specialty. Since each type of coach tends to only see clients with their specific needs, they might think other coaches work with similar clientele. Both groups might try to work together to complement their approaches. Of course it is not that simple, as I stated in Chapter One and this diversity of perspectives is what I will examine throughout the study.

The imbalance in the volume of literature should be considered. I doubt that the academic literature represents the practice in the field: non-psychologist coaches and non-psychological and integrated approaches being underrepresented. Coaches

increasingly consider the background in organizational development (35%) and previous working experience in similar settings (27 %) are more important than experience as a therapist (13%) for being hired (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009), but very few academic articles written by non-therapists exist. Although executive coaching is "everyone's" field (Bono, et al., 2009), academic discourse is mostly about psychology . However, many academic programs besides psychology are becoming involved in coach preparation (Maltbia, 2008; Starr, 2008), and I hope to review these in the future.

    <u>Summary.</u>

    Executive coaching is gaining explosive popularity with practitioners and academics. However, there is no consensus on its definitions, processes, and measures of effectiveness, and no apparent progress towards consensus. Among many important issues, the central debate is on the role of psychology in executive coaching. Therapeutic models had been dominant in the past, with a history of restoring derailing executives. But now the field is more concerned with the continued development of executives, which should inspire more solutions from diverse disciplines. While the tribal conflicts between psychologist and non-psychologist coaches continue, integrated coaching models that use multiple academic disciplines have begun to appear. As for a coach preparation, some think psychology is a prerequisite, and others think that a psychology background is potentially harmful. However, even proponents of psychology agree that training in psychology is not sufficient for coach preparation. In short, the executive coaching industry is full of contradictions, blurry lines between executive coaching and other interventions, and vague measures of qualifications.

Finally, I question the need to define the field, as its being indefinable may be an essential characteristic. As for the conflicts between psychologist-coaches and non-psychologist coaches, I raised the possibility that they may be practicing different interventions under the name executive coaching.   In reviewing the relevant literature, the current distortion in the literature should be considered because of the severe imbalance in the volume of literature.

<div align="center">Organizational Culture and Leadership</div>

This section reviews how organizational culture and leadership affects the establishment and development of an organization. It covers main concepts and relevant theories and research regarding organizational culture and leadership that inform this study.

Some scholars investigate organizational success through different aspects of an organization. There are multiple ways to make sense of an organization, but many scholars (Fey & Denison, 2003; Hatch, 1993; Martin, 1992; Schein, 1985, 2010) have seen the importance of organizational culture, and the triangular relationships of organizational culture, leadership and effectiveness in organizational studies. This section offer selective literature review on definition and context of organizational culture, the relationship between organizational culture and effectiveness, and organizational culture in relation to leadership.

Definition and context

Organizational culture is an abstraction that has been considered an essential part of understanding an organization. Discussion on organizational culture has been

developed and framed by a number of scholars since the 1970's (Hatch, 1993; Martin, 1992; Ott, 1989; Schein, 1985) and has generated productive disagreements on the fundamentals, including the definition, like many concepts in organizational studies (Hatch, 1993). Simply put, organizational culture is, "a company's way of doing things" (Hill & Jones, 2008, p. 381) that is embedded in the everyday work life of all organizational members (Martin, 2004).

But culture is a complex phenomenon that includes visible structure and practice as well as underlying beliefs and assumptions that cannot be easily observed or articulated. Even the definition of culture is flexible; culture is a relatively commonly word in everyday life and the academic world, and has been studied in many disciplines and generated uncountable definitions from different perspectives (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Schein (2010) compares culture of a group to personality or character of an individual: The behaviors of person are observable but it is hard to see the forces underneath that cause certain kinds of behavior. As personality and character guide and constrain our behavior, so does culture the behavior of organizational members. Thus, Schein argues that an understanding of organizational culture in all its complexity is essential to understanding the organization.

Scholars define organizational culture along various lines. Hill and Jones see organizational culture's importance for strategic management. They define organizational culture as, "the specific collection of values and norms that are shared by people and groups in an organization and that control the way they interact with each other and with stakeholders outside the organization" (2008, p. 381). More precisely, Schein (2004) defines culture as, "a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned

as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way you perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (p. 17). According to Schein, organizational culture is "the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives, thinks about, and reacts to its various environments" (1996, p. 236). In comparison to norms that are the visible manifestations of these assumptions, culture lies behind the norms as a deeper, implicit set of assumptions that most members of a culture never critically examine. Many cultural members are not even aware of their own culture until they encounter a different one.

Observing organizational culture.

Although organizational culture is intangible, it becomes observable through certain forms. Martin (2004) lists tangible aspects of organizational culture including: formal practices such as pay levels, structure of the hierarchy, job descriptions, and other written policies; informal practices such as behavioral norms; the organizational stories employees tell to explain "how things are done around here;" rituals such as Christmas parties and retirement dinners; humor about work and fellow employees; jargon, the special language of organizational initiates; and physical arrangements. She also adds values, sometimes referred to more abstractly as content themes. Sathe (1983) identifies four general manifestations of organizational culture: shared things (objects), shared sayings (talk), shared doings (behavior), and shared feelings (emotions). Such cultural information can be collected by asking, observing, reading and feeling.

Based on Schein's work, Schein (2010) and other authors (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2003) explain culture with three levels: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. Schein's organizational model sheds light on culture from the standpoint of the observer, described by three cognitive levels of organizational culture.

Artifacts is the first and most visible level of Schein's model that can be seen, felt and heard by the stranger observer. Artifacts consists of the physical manifestations of an organization's culture including the facilities, offices, manner of dress, pattern of interaction among organizational members and with organizational outsiders, and even company slogans, mission statements and other operational creeds. Published lists of values, observable rituals and ceremonies are also included. This category is related to Sathe's (1983) and Martin's (2004) manifestations of culture.

The next level of Schein's model is the beliefs and values. Values are "enduring belief in a mode of conduct or end-state" and espoused values mean "the stated values and norms that are preferred by an organization."(Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007, p. 78) Organizational behavior at this level usually can be found by asking questions regarding membership. On the other hand, enacted values, "the values and norms that actually are exhibited or converted into employees' behaviors," can be observed through daily activities.

The organization's basic assumptions are found in the third and deepest level. The tacit, underlying assumptions are unobservable in everyday interactions between organizational members, but represent the core of organizational culture. They constitute organizational values that have become taken for granted over time, embedded

assumptions that guide organizational behavior. These are rooted so deeply among people that someone who does not hold them is viewed as a "foreigner." Basic assumptions, like "theories-in-use" are non-confrontable and non-debatable and hence are extremely difficult to change. In fact, even though this is the core of organizational culture, it is often missed by observers as well as insiders, so understanding it requires in-depth methods that surpass casual interviews or observations. Without understanding of this level, organizational culture cannot be sufficiently examined.

<u>Organizational culture and effectiveness.</u>

We want to observe organizational culture because it affects organizational effectiveness. Organizational culture is complex phenomena, so it is difficult to measure culture and effectiveness in a comparative sense (Fey & Denison, 2003).

However, research linking organizational culture and effectiveness has been conducted in terms of strategy management (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982), adaptability and the fit between organization and its environment (Kotter & Heskett, 1992) and even customer satisfaction as an outcome (Gillespie, Denison, Haaland, Smerek, & Neale, 2008). This stream of research has developed an explicit model of organizational culture and effectiveness and a validated method of measurement. For example, Denison and his colleagues have conducted research from diverse perspectives and contexts, including Asia (Denison, Haaland, & Goelzer, 2004) and Russia (Fey & Denison, 2003), with four traits of organizational cultures: involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission (Denison & Mishra, 1995). He has developed measurement tools to be used with mixed methodology in four traits.

1) *Involvement*: Employees are committed to their work, feel a sense of ownership and have input.

2) *Consistency*: The existence of organizational systems and processes that promote alignment and efficacy.

3) *Adaptability*: Organizational capacity to change in response to external conditions.

4) *Mission*: The organization knows why it exists and where it is headed (Gillespie, et al., 2008, p. 117).

One or two dimensions become more important over the others based on the company's development, regional and cultural nature, business environment and so forth. For example, Involvement and Adaptability are the strong predictor of corporate growth (Denison & Mishra, 1995), high score in any of four traits are associated with high customer satisfaction (Gillespie, et al., 2008), and Adaptability is a more important trait for foreign companies in Russia than in American companies in America (Fey & Denison, 2003).

Deal and Kennedy (1982) also argue that distinct types of cultures evolve within companies, that the impact on strategy and performance can be measured, and that strong corporate culture can be a parameter of corporate success along with profit. Kotter and Heskett (1992) also assert the importance of adaptability, a finding a fit between an organization and its environment.

Three perspectives to view organizational culture

Whether it is measurable or not, many scholars attempt to link organizational culture with other factors as if an organization is a stable, single entity. Some assume that organizational culture shows unity through all levels, while others reject this.

Martin (1992, 2004) introduces three perspectives to see an organizational culture: Integration, Differentiation, and Fragmentation. Integration studies have been most dominant in this area especially in the US. In most Integration studies, including Schein's model, consistency is demonstrated throughout an organization: Top

management of an organization articulate a set of espoused values, sometimes in the form of a mission statement, and these values are reinforced by cultural manifestations that generate organization-wide value consensus. It assumes that members know what they are to do and they agree why it is worthwhile to do it. In the case of cultural change, conflict and ambiguity may be identified, but these are interpreted as evidence of the deterioration of culture before a new unity is established. Schein (1985) gives examples of leaders who attempt to generate organization-wide consensus regarding their personal values and corporate goals through a wide range of consistent corporate policies and practices. Similarly Collinson and Porras (2002) argue that integrated cultures are a key for profitability. This Integration perspective has been the most widely adopted perspective among researchers; however, other scholars (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Martin, 1992; B. A. Turner, 1986) argue that no organization truly demonstrates consistency, organization-wide consensus, and clarity in its culture.

The differentiation perspective is more critical than the Integration perspective. This perspective sees an organization as composed of overlapping, nested subcultures that coexist in relationships of intergroup harmony, conflict or indifference (e.g. Cox, 1993; Frost, 1991). Inconsistent subcultures with different sets of cultural manifestations, maintain their consensus only within their boundaries. From this perspective, organization is a collection of subcultures instead of a cultural monolith. Thus, change is localized within one or more subcultures, triggered by pressures from an organizational environment. This perspective is considered most congruent with research that emphasizes environmental determinants of organizational behavior (Martin, 1992, 2004).

Martin's third perspective is Fragmentation. Studies in this category claim that clarity, consistency, and consensus are too oversimplified and idealized to capture the confusing complexity of contemporary organizations. While the Integration view ignores ambiguity from the cultural stage and Differentiation relegates ambiguity to the intersection between subcultures, Fragmentation studies see ambiguity as the defining feature of culture in organizations. Ambiguity involves multiple meanings, paradox, irony and inescapable contradictions. Whatever consensus exists is issue-specific and transient. This perspective is applied to occupations coping with ambiguous work such as pilot, cockpit crews and air traffic controllers (Weick in Frost, 1991); social workers; policy analysts (Martin, 1992, 2004).

Each of these perspectives offers a lens into organizational culture, and any of them can answer all research questions. A researcher could select the appropriate perspective to his/her research questions. Furthermore, Martin (2004) suggests that these perspectives can be used to examine a single case: use Integration view to see some issues, values, and objectives showing organization-wide consensus, consistency and clarity, and Differentiation perspective for differing opinions in subcultures and finally see some problems and issues which are ambiguous, generating multiple, plausible interpretations. The three perspectives do not conflict with each other.

Organizational culture and leadership

Organizational culture is a complex phenomena. Schein states that culture is the personality of an organization. As scholars keep investigating typologies in human personality, scholars in organizational studies also try to conceptualize organizational culture typologies.

Based on several studies of organizational culture typologies, Berson, Oreg and Dvir (2008) identify three recurring cultural dimensions that characterizes organizational culture. The first dimension emphasizes an Entrepreneurial orientation such as creativity and risk-taking work environment. This dimension is often related to innovation involving an enterprising and opportunity-seeking environment, and members seek challenge and risk are valued (Ireland, Hitt, & Sirmon, 2003; Wallach, 1983). The second dimension is Bureaucratic dimension. Organizations in this dimension emphasize rules, regulations and efficiency for formalization and centralization without flexibility. In these organizations, performance is enhanced through rules, procedures and clearly defined structures that highlight consistency and predictability (Wallach, 1983). The third is a Supportive dimension. These organizations provide a warm place of work where people are friendly, fair and helpful. Such organizations are described with words like trust, safety, encouragement, and collaborative, and leaders in the organizations facilitate equitable and open relationships among members (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991).

Furthermore, Berson et al. (2008) see the link between this typology of organizational culture and the organizational leader's characteristics. They study the relationship between top leaders' value and organizational performance under the premise that leaders' values affect organizational culture. How an organization emphasizes each of these three cultural dimensions – Entrepreneurial, Bureaucratic, and Supportive – is associated with the CEO's personal values.

Berson et al. (2008) generate three categories of leaders' particular personal values in a relation to three dimensions: Self-direction, Security and Benevolence. Self-direction involves an emphasis on making one's own choice, on free thought and on

learning, creating and exploring. People in this category tend to appreciate creativity, freedom and independence. Accordingly, this kind of leader pursues innovation. Security is driven from individual or group requirements for stability, order and predictability. To maintain stability and order, leaders are likely to set routines and clear and strict rules and procedures. This kind of leaders prefers bureaucratic culture. Finally, Benevolence involves preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact: true concern for others' welfare. The leaders in this category pay close attention to employees' needs to encourage corporative and supporting behaviors.

According to their quantitative research, Berson et al. (2008) reveal that the organizations with leaders in the Self-direction category show good performance such as sales growth. The leaders who value Security show a positive association with firm efficiency and a negative association with employee satisfaction. Lastly, the leaders who value Benevolence create supportive culture resulting in greater employee satisfaction. The leaders' personal value can shape organizational culture affecting employee satisfaction as well as financial outcomes.

Many scholars support the idea that organizational culture reflects leaders' personal values (Dess et al., 2003; Guth & Ginsburg, 1990; Ireland, et al., 2003). Leaders manage organizational culture by balancing their own values and responding to the changing demands of the environment. For example, a leader can manage reward system according to his/her own value system and certain behavior or performance can be reinforced by the system, changing organizational culture as a result (Kerr & Slocum, 1987). Leaders at any point of a company's life cycle can influence organizational culture, using diverse management strategies and techniques.

Founder's role and culture transmission.

Schein (1995) considers the founder to have a central and initial role in establishing and shaping organizational culture. Firms are not created accidently or spontaneously. They are created by entrepreneurs with a vision of how to create new product or service in the marketplace. The culture formation begins with the founding of the group of people. Schein describes essential steps:

1. A single person has an idea for a new enterprise
2. A founding group is created on the basis of initial consensus that the idea is workable and worth running some risks for.
3. The founding group begins to act in concert to create the organization by raising funds, obtaining patents, incorporating, and so forth
4. Others are brought into the group according to what the founder or founding group considers necessary, and the group begins to function, developing its own history. (p.17)

The founder has a major impact in the process because the founder has the original idea and biases on how to get the idea fulfilled. The biases are from cultural experience and personality traits, although the degrees and processes vary depending on their personality.

How is organizational culture embedded or transmitted to members? Schein (1995) notes that it involves a teaching process. Organizational members teach each other and new-comers about the organization's preferred values, beliefs, behaviors and expectations. Schein introduces 10 mechanisms:

1. Formal statements of organizational philosophy, charters, creeds, materials used for recruitment and selection, and socialization.
2. Design of physical spaces, facades, buildings.
3. Deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching by leaders.
4. Explicit reward and status system, promotion criteria.
5. Stories, legends, myths, and parables about key people and events.
6. What leaders pay attention to, measure, and control.
7. Leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises
8. How the organization is designed and structured.

9. Organizational systems and procedures.
10. Criteria used for recruitment, selection, promotion, leveling off, retirement, and "excommunication" of people (p.22)

However, not all 10 mechanisms are equally potent. From observation of three cases in the article, Schein concludes that role modeling by leaders (3), what leaders pay attention to (6) and leader reactions to critical events (7) are the most important.

<u>Multi dimensional perspective.</u>

There are a variety of opinions on the relationship between leadership, organizational culture and effectiveness. From the leadership perspective, although an organization's success or failure is easily attributed to the leader's behaviors and tendencies, some argue that situational factors are more important (e.g. Lieberson & O'Connor, 1972; Thomas, 1988). Organizational culture is often viewed as an active, living phenomenon by which key members of the organization create shared meaning (Morgan, 2006). Organizational culture is not stable and influenced only by a top person. Instead, it keeps changing, and is influenced by numerous people and factors. Furthermore, there is no singular way to interpret organizational culture: each individual also interacts with other members and the surrounding culture, and continuously interprets aspects of his/her work environment in his/her way (Hatch, 1993; Martin, 2004). Not all organizational members interpret and internalize a leader's stated value in the same way because each individual also uses their own value system.

This section on organizational culture relies heavily on Schein's concepts and model of organizational culture. Schein's formulation has been the target of many scholars in that he assumes a unity when viewing organizational culture (e.g. Frost, 1985;

Frost, 1991; Gagliardi, 1990). Despite this shortcoming, his model of organizational culture is one of the only conceptual models ever offered. Although arguments against conceptual models of organizational culture have been made on the grounds that they oversimplify complex phenomena, the models serve an important role in guiding empirical research and generating theory (Hatch, 1993).

Summary and study implication

This section reviews selected literature on organizational culture and leadership that informs my study on executive coaching. Just like many concepts in organizational studies, scholars studying organizational culture have generated disagreements on fundamentals, like the relationship between leadership and organizational culture and between organizational culture and effectiveness. Although some scholars still question if organizational culture is measurable, many qualitative and quantitative research has found a positive link between organizational culture and leadership and effectiveness. Schein provided grounding concepts and explanation throughout this study of organizational culture, particularly in relation to the leader's and founder's role.

This study uses Schein's formulation along with others views introduced in this section; however, this does not imply that I agree with the Integration perspective only. As Martin (2004) suggests, it is necessary to bring more than one appropriate perspective to study a certain culture. Even though I use concepts from Integration perspectives, I will also consider other perspectives to examine organizational culture during fieldwork.

Chapter III.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the issues and challenges in executive coach preparation, caused by the multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching, focusing on a single case. Through the study, I try to answer three questions: 1) In what ways has Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) been conceptualized as "multidisciplinary?" 2) How do study participants describe the multidisciplinary approach in coaching? 3) What are the director's conceptualizations of the coaching program?

To answer these questions, in this chapter, I will discuss research design and methodology: the study design, needed areas of information, study sample, methods for assuring protection of human subjects, overview of research design, data collection methods, data analysis and synthesis, and limitations of the study.

Study Design

This is a modified ethnographic exploratory study, using ethnographic data collection methods with some limitations, including limited fieldwork time, reliance primarily on interviews with limited samples, and limited access to the program.

This methodology provides complementary perspective to current research in executive coaching. Although some empirical studies yield limited results (e.g. Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001) and survey studies sketch the field(e.g. Coutu & Kauffman, 2009), the question of what makes coaching effective remains a "mystery." Kilburg (2004), the most quoted author in executive coaching, is unhappy to see the empirical studies on the efficacy of executive coaching because they tend to document the general effects of intervention rather than specific effects of various approaches to psychotherapy and executive coaching.

Furthermore, research methodologies that generalize require that study samples are uniform in their approach, which is not the case of executive coaching. Additionally, in spite of flourishing practice, it is not fair to say that it is barely possible to yield meaningful results (Lowman, 2001) especially from in-depth qualitative research. Kilburg, in this sense, suggests Jerome Bruner's (1986) two modes of cognition, the paradigmatic and the narrative, and argues "case studies as a narrative way of knowing and creating meaning are an extremely useful way of examining the practice and efficacy of executive coaching" (p.203).

This study is designed to shed light on local, specific, and everyday life in a specific time and context (Fontana, 2003; Smith & Watson, 2001). This contextualized approach will provide my detailed interpretations of stories and deep analysis for a deeper look at one program with a reputation in executive coaching and its surroundings.

Areas of Information Needed

Before I can answer my research questions, I needed information about the International Leadership Center (ILC)'s coaching programs and the Leadership Coaching

Program (LCP) in general to set the context of the study. Even though my main focus is on the coaching preparation function of the program, I gathered information about the center as background and coaching programs and current events to understand how the programs are operated and what issues and challenges the coaches face. Lastly, I learned about the perceptions and conceptualizations of executive coaching from the director and five coaches who hold main roles in ILC.

First, to gather context, I collected data regarding current status, history and the achievements of the ILC, and the coaching programs, to understand where LCP is situated in general. To investigate the coaching model, I reviewed documents and formally and informally interviewed the director, the program coordinator, other staff members and people who know the program outside of the center. To comprehend how the model is taught and exercised, I sat in lecture part of LCP classes. Brief follow-up interviews with interviewees were conducted when necessary for clarification and explanation.

Most importantly, I needed to learn what was going on around the program and how things work in the center; the directors, a leader of the center and conceptualizer of the program, perception of executive coaching, conceptualization of the field and future plans. I also needed to learn how coaches within the center understand the program and the coaching approach. In addition, I wrote fieldnotes and kept a research journal of my own interpretations of my experience at the site. A full case study might include program participants and others outside of ILC who could offer different perspectives, but I could not include them out of respect for the IBSE's policy protecting students' privacy and to keep the original study plan as stated in IRB application.

Discussion of the Site

Research site

The fieldwork for this exploratory study on LCP, International Business School Europe's (IBSE) executive coaching and coach preparation approach, took place at International Leadership Center (ILC), which houses diverse executive coaching programs. IBSE is located within a prestigious English-speaking international business school in France. IBSE is highly ranked for its executive education, and ILC offers executives diverse training and coaching programs and, according to the director, has group-coached more executives than any other center worldwide. For the last ten years, the LCP has been a success due to its unique, multi-disciplinary approach, incorporating psychoanalysis, organization studies and other fields. In spite of its uniqueness and accolades, it remains somewhat unknown to the American coaching community.

Participants

The director, a program coordinator, and approximately ten coaches were interviewed, observed and engaged in small talks to learn about their coaching program and LCP around them. The director and LCP faculty members were mainly interviewed and observed during the fieldwork because their backgrounds, assumptions, approach, and philosophy are significantly intertwined with the program and the center. Among them, the director, Dr. K (pseudonym) is the "most important person": the founder and leader of the center, program conceptualizer and main coach. He is currently a professor endeavoring solely in executive education. He runs several leadership coaching programs for executives and CEO level executives in and outside of the school. Besides

the director, 51 full-time and part-time executive coaches who have expertise both in

psychology and organizational studies work in the center, but most of them work

remotely, so only a few coaches were available for contact during my fieldwork.

The director and the center have produced numerous academic and practical

publications which provided me with a wealth of data.

Methods for Assuring Protection of Subjects

To protect the privacy and confidentiality of the research participants, an

informed consent form was provided; I preserved anonymity in interviews and

observations by using pseudonyms. I informed participants that the institute's name

would be used in future publications based on this study to offer better contexts of the

case, so that they could knowingly choose to participate.

Furthermore, I encoded any electronic documents that include identifiable

information such as contact numbers. Fieldnotes never included any identifiers; when

identifiers were used during interviews or observation, they were replaced with initials or

pseudonyms as soon as the event was concluded. All digital files including taped

interview are saved in my personal computer, requiring security codes, and printouts and

handwritten memos have been kept locked in my file cabinet.

Finally, upon the completion of the study, I permanently deleted all personal

information and electronic traces of participants, including emails. Computer files

deleted and paper products were destroyed using a standard electronic shredder. My

research products remained locked in my personal file cabinet and encoded on my

personal computer. I abide by the strict standards of privacy and confidentiality that

Institutional Review Board suggests. An example of the consent form is provided in the appendix 1.

Overview of Research Design

Research design: Exploratory study

I used exploratory study design for investigation. This research was initially designed to be a study of Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) with a focus on the coach preparation function, but I inevitably included the leadership center (ILC) because the boundary between two entities is blurry. ILC and LCP are both founded by Dr. K and share faculty members, staff and coaches (LCP graduates work for ILC), so ILC is a contextual surrounding for LCP. In addition, I officially belonged to ILC, a physical center, rather than LCP, a program, so I naturally learned about ILC as the historical and organizational grounds of LCP. Practically, since I could not use LCP participants as research subjects according to IBSE's strict policy, I used the two entities to gather enough data. However, I was not concerned with ILC's full catalog of programs.

Research participant recruitment

This site was recruited from my mere acquaintance with the director. I learned about him through his publications on leadership in the year 2000, and since then I have found his research and publications and occasionally asked advice on my coach career through email. He is aware of my background and passion for executive coaching. He permitted my fieldwork within his center through personal email and phone communication in May 2009.

Data collection.

The data collection took place at the research site. To set up my fieldwork plan, I discussed appropriate timing of my visit and rough research plan with the director of the ILC, and requested consultation with my dissertation committee members of this study. I discussed my research schedule with the site in detail, talking to the director and research director about interview and observation of him and also the program coordinator about further formal and informal interviews with others for additional information.

Leadership Coaching Program.

I made two data collection visits in March-April and June for a month each. Because my main interest is the coach preparation function of LCP, which has a fixed schedule, my visits followed its timeline. LCP takes place in selective months for three or four consecutive days per module, seven times in a 14 month period from April to June the subsequent year. During my two visits over the three month period, I observed the last two modules of the 09/10 group and first two modules the 10/11 group, as well as the special LCP 10th anniversary forum.

Document collections and interview.

Upon first arriving, I spent time to familiarize myself with the site and local resources. I visited the contact person, Shallotte (pseudonym), the research director, first. She introduced me the offices and staff members on campus. I was generously given documents such as brochures, publications, and publicized articles on the first day. I collected program materials and pamphlets from classes and events.

Interviews with coaches, staff, and faculty were conducted during my visits when LCP was not in session. In checking the feasibility of my study, I had communicated

Data collection.

The data collection took place at the research site. To set up my fieldwork plan, I discussed appropriate timing of my visit and rough research plan with the director of the ILC, and requested consultation with my dissertation committee members of this study. I discussed my research schedule with the site in detail, talking to the director and research director about interview and observation of him and also the program coordinator about further formal and informal interviews with others for additional information.

Leadership Coaching Program.

I made two data collection visits in March-April and June for a month each. Because my main interest is the coach preparation function of LCP, which has a fixed schedule, my visits followed its timeline. LCP takes place in selective months for three or four consecutive days per module, seven times in a 14 month period from April to June the subsequent year. During my two visits over the three month period, I observed the last two modules of the 09/10 group and first two modules the 10/11 group, as well as the special LCP 10th anniversary forum.

Document collections and interview.

Upon first arriving, I spent time to familiarize myself with the site and local resources. I visited the contact person, Shallotte (pseudonym), the research director, first. She introduced me the offices and staff members on campus. I was generously given documents such as brochures, publications, and publicized articles on the first day. I collected program materials and pamphlets from classes and events.

Interviews with coaches, staff, and faculty were conducted during my visits when LCP was not in session. In checking the feasibility of my study, I had communicated

with the people time to time and I sent copies of the research consent form and the rights of research participant statement. I heard from Shallotte that coaches were willing to be studied before I made the first visit.

Since IBSE has three campuses, coaching programs take place in many places around the world; also, most coaches including LCP faculty members have their own offices off campus, so interviews were scheduled strictly according to their availabilities. Dr. K, the director, and Shallotte helped me recruit interviewees. My purpose was internally announced before my arrival, so most people were aware that I was looking for interviewees. They were very cooperative, so I was able to interview "key" informants such as LCP faculty members and ILC staff members who had been in LCP in spite of their tight schedule, and I was often referred to other interviewees for further information during the interviews.

During the intervals, taped interviews were transcribed by myself and a professional agency. A digital recorder was used for taping. After two visits, I organized data for analysis, wrote a summary and send them to those involved for member check -- confirmation and negotiation, using email, and personal visits in July.

Data analysis.

Thematic analysis was used for data analysis (Riessman, 2008). First, I reviewed the collected data to find significant events, consistent backgrounds of individuals and ILC, common or conflicting assumptions, interpretation of LCP and its foundation and history. This information is described in Chapter Four and analyzed in Chapter Five. During the process of recording information answering my research questions, I tried to recognize and identify themes and patterns that are also influenced by my assumptions,

backgrounds and biases, as well as the literature review. This led me to revisit and re-analyze stories. Selected stories were analyzed together under each theme and are analyzed and reconstructed in the text.

<div align="center">Methods for Data Collection</div>

This study uses ethnographic data collection methods with some limitations, including fieldwork time, sample size, and access to the program. Ethnographic studies typically collect data from three resources: 1) direct, first-hand observation of daily participation; 2) interviews, from conversational small talk (opportunistic short interview) to formal interview; and 3) document and artifacts collection (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). This study uses these three typical ethnographic methods, plus my own fieldnotes and research journal. I took an unpaid visiting researcher position within the center to obtain liberal access to school resources and to buildings and offices. This position gratefully endowed me with freedom to explore the site and interact with people and data without adding work responsibility.

Observation

The main observations took place during theoretical classes of four modules of LCP; 6th and 7th modules of 2009-2010 group (Group 9) and 1st and 2nd modules of 2010-2011 group (Group 10). Since the institute does not allow its students to be research subjects, observations of student activities are not included in this study. However, I could sit in lectures. I got the big picture of the program because one of the modules that I participated in is the program's very first class. I took notes instead of recording the classes and sessions for confidentiality and to minimize interruption. However, I was

careful to not distract the faculty members and participants with persistent writing, so I limited my note taking and reconstructed my observations in my field journal after each session (Riessman, 2008). Additionally, I participated in LCP's special 10th anniversary forum with an evening cocktail party and workshops. Also, everyday life and interactions with people at the center are included in my observations.

Formal interviews

I formal interviewed Dr. K, the director; Shallotte, the research director; two LCP faculty members; the coach/executive director of ILC; and one coach/program director. The interviews all commenced with a couple of basic, open questions that gave participants room to create their stories. Questions asking clarification and further explanation followed. Since my aim was to collect participants' storied narratives of their work, the questions were constructed to elicit specific stories around given topics. All formal interviews were taped by a digital recorder, saved as electronic files and transcribed. Individual interviewees had specific interview processes:

1. Director: The interview with the director was arranged at my second visit in his Paris office. It took about an hour to cover questions that I had prepared in advance. Some questions were asked to other faculty members. I prompted clarification and further explanation when necessary. Besides the formal interview, I had several short opportunistic interviews that I recorded with descriptive notes.
2. Faculty members: As co-founders and faculty members of LCP, two faculty members were interviewed according to interview protocols, with several open questions for an hour each. Their memories, interpretation, and understanding of LCP, its history and visions were asked.
3. Staff members/coaches: Interviews with staff members were intended to learn their understandings of the programs and coaching models. The staff member interview included the interview with the LCP program coordinator, ILC executive director and the research director, which covers the history, current status and her understanding of the center and programs. One pre-scheduled formal interview on their perception towards the coaching model and programs were taped and transcribed. The other interviews with them and other staff members were informal and more frequent, and could result in a

referral. These are recorded in the form of a report or summary. I also interviewed a few coaches about their perceptions and understandings of the coaching model and programs. They were referred or introduced to me by the director or the research director. The formal interviews took about one hour each, and was taped and transcribed.

In addition to formal interview, short conversational interviews were included in my study. Of course, being opportunistic, they were not be taped and transcribed, but were descriptively written in my research journal afterwards.

Document collection

Documents were collected through the office and the classes. Documents include published and unpublished articles, working papers, books, reports, internal documents, brochures and catalogs, and class materials and hand-outs.

Fieldnote/ research journal

Writing is another way to interpret, learn, inquire and know (Bateson, 1994; Richardson, 2000). At the end of both significant events and ordinary days, I wrote fieldnotes and research journals. All learning from my senses, thoughts and feelings on the study were recorded in fieldnotes and research journals.

Methods for Data Analysis and Synthesis

The data were analyzed using the thematic analysis method. According to literature, thematic analysis is a useful and flexible qualitative research analysis method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns and themes within collected data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).   In this approach, researchers first collect data from various sources and then analyze using different steps per their topic or scholarly orientation. In this study, I mainly refer to Riessman's chapters on thematic analysis because she focuses on

narrative analyses to set my own analysis strategy (Riessman, 1993, 2008). She presents several examples, from which I will create my own analytic procedure.

The first step of analyzing the ethnographic study was to carefully review all the data. I found significant events, current status and history of the program, my interpretations of recurring patterns of assumptions and beliefs, descriptions, particular episodes and so forth. This work is situated through by my research questions, prompted by my own curiosities, and creates the themes by which to analyze narratives. I selected narratives under each theme based on familiarity with the case and the richness of the interview. In qualitative research in general and narrative analysis, sampling, including sub- sampling of narratives, is typically not random because the goal of analysis is not to generalize to the population but to interpret meaning and function of stories embedded in interviews (J. M. Morse, 1994; Riessman, 2008).

Once themes and stories that elucidated each theme were created, I constructed a summary and sent it to the research director and the LCP faculty member to review to detect any major misinterpretations of the data. Upon their approval and some negotiations, I confirmed each category and constructed stories with interpretation.

<u>Literature to Support Methodology and Data Collection Methods</u>

In this section I will provide information about my approach and rationale for my research design and methodology with selected literature. This study is not a genuine narrative inquiry, but brings many elements from narrative inquiry, so this section mostly draws from narrative inquiry literature. I provide selective literature supporting my research approach regarding: the narrative approach, ethnography and fieldwork, data collection methods and trustworthiness of the study.

Narrative approach

One form of narrative inquiry consists of the process of gathering and analyzing information through the forms of story (Chase, 2005). Although this particular form of qualitative research depends on the researchers' orientations and inquiry topics, narrative inquiry is generally grounded in the assumption that "human experience is episodically ordered and best understood through a reconstruction of time natural narrative order in which it is lived" (Cole & Knowles, 2001). Using narrative as a way of research basically attempts to understand our experience in the forms of stories as we do in real life. This approach does not generalize across cases, unlike traditional research approaches (Geerts, 1973). Instead, it is interested in local, specific, everyday life (Fontana, 2003).

Some authors apply this non-generalizing research methodology to help people solve problems in their practices. Polkinghorn (1988), a practicing psychotherapist and researcher, began to use narratives for his study because of the *unsettled* feeling between his narrative-based practice and his *scientific* research method. Believing that research should both help him understand "reality" and help him solve problems, he quickly adopted the narrative approach in his research. Moen (2006) asserts, however, that defragmentation is important benefit to narrative inquiry. Whereas traditional qualitative research methodologies try to understand the complex whole by breaking it down to constituent parts, narrative inquiry is against the decomposition of complex whole into elements.

An influential developmental psychologist, Vygotsky(1962), who investigated how child development was guided by the culture and interpersonal communications, warned against decomposition in research. He holds that human development cannot be

separated from culture and environment, so decomposition in research could misrepresent reality. He uses a chemistry metaphor: Hydrogen and Oxygen are two different elements, so the properties of each cannot represent the property of their composition, water (H_2O); Hydrogen and Oxygen each sustain fire while water extinguishes fire. Together, these authors promote the benefits of the narrative approach as an alternative to traditional decomposing and decontextualizing positivist and pos-positivist research approaches.

Ethnography and fieldwork

Ethnography is a research process based on fieldwork using "a variety of mainly (but not exclusive) qualitative research techniques but including engagement in the lives of those being studied over an extended period of time" (Davies, 2008, p. 5). Especially this participation includes not only the culture and people but also the researchers themselves. Accordingly, researchers and research subjects together use all their senses, their bodies, movement, feeling, and their whole being. They thoroughly use the "self" as an "instrument" to learn about others (Cohen, 1992; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Jackson, 1989; Richardson, 2000; V. W. Turner, 1986).

Fieldwork.

This project is a fieldwork in modified ethnography. To undertake ethnography is to enter willingly into a messy set of tasks that will continue over a considerable period of time among strangers (Heath & Street, 2008). Ethnographic fieldwork is to be performed by being physically present more than communicating with people in dialogue (Amit, 2000). It is "a total experience, demanding all of the anthropologist's resources intellectual, physical, emotional, political and intuitive" (Okely & Callaway, 1992, p. 8). It is not a solitary incidence, but a social experience mediated by and constituted through

the fieldworker's relationships with others who are influenced by the events and activities with which the ethnographer is involved. Additionally, fieldwork generally involves travel away from the researcher's ordinary place of residence and work or *home* in any sense (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). In brief, fieldwork involves "where the researcher will immerse him/herself in personal face to face relationships with a variety of natives over an extended period time" (Amit, p. 2).

As an ethnographic study, this study is limited in terms of its "variety of natives" and "over an extended period time." Since the institute protects students' privacy and I had no formal access to LCP participants for interview and participative observation of small group coaching sessions, potentially one of the most important informants of the study. Additionally, the original study plan and IRB application did not include samples outside of ILC that might have provided different and important information. Because faculty members are only present on site as LCP takes place, the time to interact with them in person was limited. Thus, I call this a "modified" ethnography.

<u>Data collection methods</u>

There are three major modes through which qualitative researchers collect data during the fieldwork: participant observation (experiencing), interviewing (enquiring), and studying materials prepared by others (examining) (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Wolcott, 1994). In this section, I cover three methods as well as fieldnotes.

<u>Participation and observation.</u>

Participation and observation is a main data collection method and is a main feature of ethnography. Becker and Geer (1957) consider participant observation to be

the most complete form of collecting data. Data collected through this method provids

more information about the event under study than data gathered by any other

sociological method. However, this is challenged because participative observation is not

a gold standard, instead research methods should be dictated by the research problem

(Trow, 1957). In my study, this participative observation is an important means to collect

data.

To effectively conduct participative observation, the ethnographer needs to be

equipped with visual acuity, keen listening skills, tolerance for details and the ability to

integrate innumerable parts into shifting wholes (Heath & Street, 2008). In participating

and observing with these qualities, Heath et al. advise ethnographers to remain silent and

communicate only as appropriate by local norms. However, even a very silent and well-

intentioned researcher could not be invisible, so ethnographers shifted their emphasis

from participant observation to the "observation of participation" in the 1970's (Tedlock,

1991). Tedlock maintains that ethnographers, in the observation of participation, both

experience and observe their own and others' participation during the study while

researchers doing participant observation, attempt to be emotionally engaged participants.

Especially in this self-reflexive approach, researchers' experiences and interpretations are

an essential part of data.

Interview.

Interview has been the basic tool for information gathering in social sciences for a

century (Denzin, 2001). It is estimated that 90 percent of all social science investigations

use interview data; increasingly the media, human service professionals and social

researchers get their information about society through interviews (Holstein & Gubrium,

1995). We have become an interview society (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997). However, perspectives on the interview has been drastically changed.

Traditionally, interviews were structured with prior categories and questions aiming at capturing precise data that could be categorized, codified and generalized. The functions of an interviewee and an interviewer were absolutely distinguished: Interviewers with authority and sometimes compassion toward interviewees (Clifford & Marcus, 1986) ask questions under the assumption that interviewees, "rational beings" understanding all possible choices presented to them and answer comprehensively and truthfully (Fontana, 2003, p.53).

However, critics claim that this is science fiction rather than science because of the hidden complexity of the interview situation (Cicourel, 1964 in Fontana, 2003). In fact, there are an "unknown number of implicit decision which are not mirrored in the measurement procedures used. The abstraction process required to describe a set of properties, regardless of the measurement system, automatically imposes some amount of reification" (80)   Additionally, the authors may not be aware that the interviewer placed much stress on asking questions and recording answers, and that the interviewer is overlooking the many judgments made in the process. The interviewees also tend to seek compelling or serviceable answers for the interview (Trinh, 1989). Basically, this critique rejects the traditional notion on interview and suggests a new way to view and practice interview. For example, interview is used as an interactional event based on reciprocal stocks of knowledge (Cicourel, 1964). Especially this tries to be more attentive to informants' voice (Clifford & Marcus, 1986) and uses the critical perspective when conducting interviews.

Interview as a social encounter.

In more contemporary sense, interview is to understand the studied in their own

right through the interaction between interviewer and interviewee instead of drawing a

line between two parties (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Fontana, 2003). By this notion,

interviews fully accept the complexity, uniqueness and indeterminateness of each one-to-

one human interaction. Also, due to the nature of interactions and their interpretation,

interview data is unstable in terms of both creation and interpretation and always

revisable. Furthermore, interview is "a social encounters where speakers collaborate in

producing retrospective and prospective accounts of versions of their past or future

actions, experiences, feelings and thoughts" (Rapley, 2004, p. 16). Rapley argues that

interview is an everyday activity, and it should remain casual during the research. It is no

longer reserved for researchers or investigated reporters. Especially in ethnographic

studies like this, interviews do not take place in only formal settings. This less formal

approach to interview is more suitable and plausible in my study.

Fieldnotes/research journal.

While most ethnographers focus on the final product of writing based upon

already written fieldnotes (e.g. Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Van Maanen, 1988), Emerson,

Fretz, & Shaw (1995) shed light on the functions and importance of fieldnotes. They

attend the fact that the "polished" accounts are built upon smaller and less coherent bits

of fieldnotes. The finished work is what ethnographers reorder and rewrite, and select

and mold fieldnotes to some analytic purpose. Fieldnotes thus have very different forms

and carry different implications than the original body of notes that the ethnographer

produced in the field. In these respects, they argue writing fieldnotes lies at the core of constructing ethnographic texts.

In ethnography, fieldnotes is defined as "accounts describing experiences and observations while participating in an intense and involved manner" (Emerson, et al., 1995, pp. 4-5). Writing description is not merely a matter of accurately capturing observed reality, of "putting into words" overheard talk and witnessed activities. There is no "natural" or "correct" way to inscribe the experience because description inevitably involves the observer's perceptions and interpretation.

In addition to the regular fieldnotes that describe daily routines, Emerson et al. (1995) also encourage ethnographers to keep learning journals, which is writing about the ehtnographer's perceptions and feelings more than about what others are doing and saying. They tend to be "crisis focused," attending to the dramatic and remarkable rather than to the everyday routine; therefore they lead to very general accounts or to decontextualized accounts of "critical incidents" that inhibit reflection and in-depth understanding of daily processes. Especially in this self-reflexive study, keeping such journal helps researchers examine the impact of interactions and thoughts, and transform their own subjective experience into an opportunity to enrich the research findings (Davis, Watson, & Cunningham-Burley, 2000; Finlay, 2003).

<u>Trustworthiness</u>

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the basic issue regarding trustworthiness is simple: "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of? What arguments can be mounted, what criteria invoked, what questions asked, what would be

persuasive on this issue?" (p.290). In terms of research methods, Curtin and Fossey

(2007) suggests several means of appraising trustworthiness of qualitative studies: thick

description, triangulation strategies, member-checking, transferability and reflexivity.

1. Thick description: In comparison to thin description, this method offers readers detailed description of the historical, social, and cultural context and circumstances around the phenomena (Geertz, 1973). This involves rationale for research methods, process, completely documented methods of data collection, and details of the raw data and specific analysis processes (Higgs, 2001).

2. Triangulation: This is a method originally used in quantitative research and adapted to qualitative research by Denzin (1970) among others. He addresses that combining multiple observers, theories, methods and data sources can help researchers "overcome the intrinsic bias that comes from single-methods, single-observer and single-theory studies" (p. 313). This includes data, researcher and methodological triangulations, but this study only uses data triangulation due to the limitation of the study. Data triangulation entails using a variety of different sampling strategies and sources to collect data and obtain a diverse view of the same phenomenon (Begley, 1996). This may involve comparing the perspectives of people from different viewpoints or checking for consistency among what is said about a topic over a period of time.

3. Member Checking: The most common strategy to ensure trustworthiness is member-checking (Neuman, 2003). This refers to the involvement of participants in the data analysis process, providing opportunities for them to read, comment on and contribute to the findings.

4. Transferability: Although qualitative approaches like narrative inquiry do not intend to generalize, the findings of study needs to be transferable to similar contexts to demonstrate credibility or authenticity. Detailed descriptions of the participants will help the readers compare the findings with other individual and groups, to their own experiences or to other research findings.

5. Reflexivity: Reflexivity, in general, means "a turning back on oneself, a process of self-reference"(Davies, 2008, p. 4). Listening and writing with reflexivity are often described as tools to help situate oneself and be cognizant of the ways your personal history can influence the research process and thus yield more "accurate," more "valid" research (Altheide & Johnson, 1998; Pillow, 2003) This can be ensured by keeping journals and fieldnotes during fieldwork.

This study employed these methods to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. Due to the unstable and revisable nature of narrative data, such concepts as reliability do not apply to narrative analysis (Riessman, 1993).

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitation

Above all, readers should consider the delimitations of this study caused by the research methodology and design. This study investigated coach prepration function of Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) with a focus on tensions caused by multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching in a specific site for a particular time period. First of all, this is a self-reflexive study, where subjectivity rules the study. Accordingly, this study bears many elements against the positivist paradigm concerning generalizability, objectivity, replicability and a unified theory of science (National Research Council (U.S.). Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research., Shavelson, & Towne, 2002). Instead, this study endeavors to meet the criteria of trustworthiness outlined above.

Second, as the focus of the study is the tensions and conflicts rooted in the multidisciplinary nature of the topic, I eliminated data outside of the main focus. I tried to be flexible only within the parameters of the original research purposes and research questions. However, this limited flexibility kept me from including potentially important informants for several reasons. This is discussed further in Chapter 6.

Third, this study is executed by only one researcher. Although many people would be involved in the process of study development and implementation, the data collection and analysis can only include limited perspectives and interpretations.

Fourth, this study could not include important informants such as program participants, faculty members outside of program and the full range of coaches. There are 50 coaches at ILC, but I interacted only with a handful of coaches because most coaches work off-campus.

Limitations

A major limitation will be the transnational approach. This study deals with the role of psychology and psychotherapy, which are strictly maintained under national regulations, ethical codes and laws in each country. These also form unique assumptions among psychologists. For example, the title "psychologist" is allowed to people with doctoral degrees in the field in the United States, whereas anybody can use the title in the United Kingdom (Jarvis, 2004). In Korea, psychologists cannot name their practice "therapy" because, by law, the word therapy is only permitted to medical professionals. The political, cultural and historical context of each reader varies widely, so readers should interpret this study cautiously. In addition, my own unique position as a Korean educated in US graduate schools doing research at an English-speaking international management school in France, raises unique points for most readers. However, this study does not focus on how a program is regulated under the specific circumstance. Instead, it is rather about how a program is developed and maintained despite conflicting regulations and cultures.

The second limitation is time. The program that I researched runs for 14-month periods, whereas my fieldwork lasts four months at most. Ideally, I would participate in the program from beginning to end to get a sense of the actual preparation of students. But for the researcher's convenience, data were instead collected from two different groups – one in beginning and one in approach to the end.

The third limitation is also a strength. This study is possible thanks to the research site's cooperation. This leverages trustworthiness of the study one hand, but, on the other hand, this may imply that my range of participation is limited because I would be dependent upon and influenced by the director's and staff member's introduction, suggestion and or permission.

The fourth limitation is to obey the institute's policy protecting its students. I was not allowed to interview students in the program and observe students' group discussions and activities. I was not able to collect data from students, another important part of the program, by any means.

Finally, in terms of study design and methodology, developing my interpretation using narratives alone causes limitation. Using other means such as video clips would help readers understand what I find, but this study can only be displayed in writing.

Chapter IV.

FINDINGS

This chapter organizes my interpretations of the data collected during and after

fieldwork under three themes: 1. Integration of psychology and organizational studies, 2.

ideally psychologists but business people in reality 3. Influence of organizational culture.

I identified themes from the literature review as well as my personal and professional

experiences and biases and refined these throughout the fieldwork. After the first section,

setting and background, each section of this chapter includes qualitative and quantitative

data related to the theme and a reflection.

Pre-Entry

I was a surprised from the moment I contacted Dr. K and Shallotte in May 2009

to discuss the possibility of fieldwork. I was so much afraid that Dr. K, a director, would

say no, and that this request would damage our professional relationship. Shallotte wrote

that they would offer me office space and a visiting researcher position, and let me attend

the lecture parts of LCP and coaching sessions. The reason that I could not sit through

the LCP is due to IBSE's policy to prevent students from being research subjects. At that

time I was not even sure what I would study at the site, but only wanted to know

generally if fieldwork was a possibility. In spite of my inability to articulate my goals,

they were open and willing.

As my proposal became concrete, I regularly contacted Shallotte to confirm the

feasibility of my study. She collected the details about my data collection plan before I

arrived, informed the people at the center, and acknowledged tentatively identified people

whom I would study.

<div align="center">Setting and Context: Setting and People</div>

Entry: being there

While most practitioners agree that knowledge and skills in both psychology and

business are necessary to prepare executive coaches, debates arguing each group's

primacy – psychologist-coach and non-psychologist-coach – continue unabated. My

research site is unique in that it is a business school that offers a diploma in Clinical

Organizational Psychology, as I discovered upon my first visit. It was actually hard for

me to imagine how a business school teaches psychology, so I will attempt to explain

here. First, I will provide an overview of LCP, explaining how (and whether) LCP

prepares coaches.

Physical settings: International Business School Europe

The International Leadership Center (ILC) where I studied the Leadership Coaching Program (LCP), is part of one of the top business schools, International Business School Europe (IBSE), located in a suburb of Paris, France. IBSE began by offering a Master of Business Administration (MBA) program 50 years ago, and has expended its campus and educational programs. This school produces approximately 1,000 MBAs every year from its French and Asian campuses. It has offered Ph.D. programs in business administration, and will soon offer an executive master's degree.

The leadership center at which I was a research visitor is on the first floor of a beautiful two-story glass building, housing several offices, an auditorium and workstations, used by faculty, staff, directors, and researchers. Since the school has two more campuses abroad and the leadership center's programs take place around the world, the office building was quiet unless leadership programs were in session.

International Leadership Center

Founded in early this century by Dr. K, the International Leadership Center (ILC) has developed innovative programs to meet the demand for global leadership development and research. This center offers open enrollment programs, including four leadership programs, three general management programs and two ILC leadership coaching programs: Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) and Leadership Challenges (pseudonym). LCP and LC, which are group coaching programs, differentiating ILC from other leadership centers, cover various leadership issues such as leadership styles, career development, work/life transitions, succession and legacy planning, effective teams, and enfranchising senior executives. Under the direction of Dr. K, the Leadership

Challenge has served top executives for twenty years and LCP has targeted HR and learning managers, line managers and coach/consultants for ten years. ILC provides companies with customized leadership coaching programs and open enrollment.

Their unique leadership coaching programs use group coaching methods developed, executed and refined by Dr. K, nine program directors and a research team within the center. As one of the largest group coaching centers in the world, it served 3,500 clients with three campuses last year. Dr. K is the director, Maria is an executive director, and Shallotte is the research director; other coaches whom I interviewed and observed are all member of ILC.

Events

During my study, I sat in the lectures of Module 6 and 7 of the 2009-2010 group, and Module 1 and 2 for the 2010-2011 group. Each Module lasts for three days. I also participated and observed the special 10th anniversary forum. Besides these formal events, I worked in my office Monday through Friday to collect and review data, formally and informally interview people, and socialize with various types of people at ILC.

People

Faculty members.

The key people of LCP are Dr. K, Steve and Philip, the founders and faculty members. They are all professionally trained and certified psychoanalysts and faculty members at business schools. Dr. K has been a professor at IBSE for several decades, and brought Steve and Philip to IBSE for the leadership center and coaching program a decade ago. Dr. K is currently a professor of leadership development, director, and coach

at ILC. He is a well-known leadership expert who has been recognized by many professional and academic associations, and holds several academic positions in other European business schools. He has a bachelor degree in economics from a European university, MBA and DBA in business administration from a business school in America, and a diploma in psychoanalysis. He has been a faculty member in business administration at business schools in North America and Europe, and is an internationally certified psychoanalyst. He sees himself as a second generation of academics working at the boundary of psychoanalysis and organizational studies. He co-leads the Leadership Challenges and LCP coaching programs, but he is trying to fade out from teaching as he moves toward more writing and consulting. He is a writer of more than 30 books and thousands of articles, the most published professor at IBSE. He is usually found in his Paris office.

Steve and Philip are faculty members of LCP, and both possess Ph.D. in clinical psychology and psychoanalysis. They are directly involved with LCP. Steve is an affiliate professor of Entrepreneurship and Family Business, program director and coach at ILC. He was formerly a director of ILC, and currently works at IBSE's South Asia campus. He studied humanity and psychology at universities in the US and researched leadership with the US army. He moved to Europe to be trained in psychoanalysis and got connected with Philip and Dr. K. Philip is an adjunct professor of Management at IBSE, and a professor of Leadership and Behavior at other European university. They only visit the France campus for the LCP. Because of their unique interest in the interface of psychology and business, Dr. K, Steve and Philip worked together to form LCP.

Researchers and staff members.

I spent the most time and collected the most documents with the research director, Shallotte at ILC. She was my initial contact person and took care of administrative process for me before my arrival. She is an LCP graduate and a coach. She works alone as well as with Dr. K, other professors and researchers at IBSE, writing books and articles. Being at the center of ILC, among coaches, administrative staffs, faculty members and also LCP alumni, she was the first person I consulted for information. I asked questions that I need clarification and her own opinions. She was a great help to me.

Along with Shallotte, Mary has worked for Dr. K as an administrative assistant. The ILC office also includes four staff members and Maria, an executive director. I also spent time with researchers, including a post-doc fellow, research associates, and another visiting researcher.

Program director and coaches.

Program directors are leaders of the group coaching programs that ILC offers. Each group coaching program involves one program director and several coaches, depending on the number of participants. There are nine program directors and about 50 coaches in the three campuses. Many of them are only at ILC part-time, so I could only meet a few of them briefly.

Context: What is executive coaching to coaches?

Executive coaches define executive coaching differently, but it is generally viewed as an individualized intervention, commonly one-on-one intervention. However, Dr. K believes that, "although one-on-one coaching can be highly effective, leadership coaching in a group setting can also have high pay-offs because changes in leadership

behavior are likely to occur." ILC only offers group coaching while some ILC coaches do individual coaching outside of ILC.

Group coaching is delivered in various forms. ILC's introduction DVD shows it as being highly personal and interactive: a coach and a group of several executives from a company were sitting in a circle in which participants take turns to present their stories, supported by a number of exploratory tools, such as a personal self-portrait, a 360-degree leadership feedback package, a review of personal non-anonymous feedback from work and non-work environments, and observations and reflections of other participants. In many cases, group coaching programs operate with a larger number of people. In these cases, a program director gives an introduction or lecture to the whole group, and then breaks the large group into small groups of five or six for small group coaching sessions, each with a coach facilitator. It takes several full days, consecutive or with intervals based on participants' schedules and a consideration of program effectiveness. LCP is an exemplar of a group coaching program, which is described in details later in this chapter. Unfortunately, I could only sit in lectures and large group sessions, not in small group coaching sessions out of concern for students' privacy according to IBSE's policy.

To test the context, I first checked how they define executive coaching in general because they offer a unique form of coaching. Philip said:

> Executive coaching is creating a setting where executives can become more self-aware and more … and because of that also more effective in their leadership roles. And it depends on what kind of executive coaching [it is] because there are more performance related executive coaches.

Steve added "fit" as the best standard for service buyers to select coaches:

executive coaching is to meet individualized needs so the approach should vary. Being a rigorously trained psychotherapist with a master's degree in organizational behavior,

Philip coaches people in organization using the combined methods of psychodynamics and organizational dynamics.

Shallotte define executive coaching and coaches in a relation to psychotherapy: executive coaching as, "a kind of an interface between psychotherapy and consulting but very clearly neither one or the other," and the executive coach as, "a person who is informed by psychodynamic theory and experience but who also has real experience in the business world as well, and they know the boundaries." Others explained executive coaching as an interface of psychology/psychotherapy and business consulting. Axel, a physician, psychotherapist, and coach, says coaching is responsible for process while medicine (therapy) cares about outcomes. Coaches I interviewed at ILC did not appear to have a very different understanding of coaching from perceptions of executive coaching in popular articles and the general coaching context that I am familiar with.

How they became coaches

How coaches became coaches is part of the origin of the coaching program. Staff at ILC started coaching before it became popular. Dr. K started a group coaching program about 20 years ago, Steve and Philip were accidently involved in business consulting using psychological knowledge and intervention and made a transition also about 20 years ago. Considering the prepration period, their step toward executive coaching was taken before anyone used that term. Further, they have lead the coaching movement that only recently became salient.

Dr. K as director, conceptualizer and founder.

Dr. K's motivation to be a coach, he writes, is from his family. He is from a family of very pragmatic entrepreneurs. When he played with conceptual ideas, his

family members asked him how his ideas were going to help them run their business better. So as an adult, he wanted to give executives sensible advice. He studied economics, but his dissatisfaction with *homo economicus* – his word for that remarkable, imaginary, instant calculator of pleasure and pains – led him to the study of management and organizational behavior. But even there the constructs of human beings seemed oversimplified, so he decided to enter the world of psychotherapy. Becoming a member of a helping profession appealed to him as a way to make better sense of people's behavior, and he is very satisfied with his choice.

He commenced his coaching practice within IBSE to help practitioners. Dr. K's coaching career is also a history of LCP and ILC. Dr. K first ran a CEO workshop at IBSE as a professor about 20 years ago, as a "laboratory," and started LCP later. He told me the story like this:

> [In CEO workshop] people really talk about issues because when you normally interview senior executives, they talk about their company, the weather, politics but not about real things, but in that seminar because you know they decided to talk about serious things and…very personal things, they do really talk, because really they have what I call now courageous conversations, and they talk about meaningful things. And then, I decided to start this LCP program because I had been asked by many consulting firms....

> They wanted me to help their young consultants, so [I thought that] maybe it's a good idea to start a program there and that was a very, very good moment because that was the beginning of the coaching movement.

> I had originally thought I would get consultants but it turned out to be a tripartite distribution …one third consultants and coaches, one third HR people and one third line managers....

> At the same time, a little bit later... there was a complaint … it was a study done by the Boston Consulting Group, that IBSE didn't have enough leadership programs… So [the dean] asked me to start a leadership center which has become extremely successful. I think, in group coaching, it is the largest in the world and I think it is one of the largest leadership centers in the world partially because of a whole combination of things. We are very large in executive teaching.

Steve and Philip, LCP faculty members.

After extensive trainings in clinical psychology in the US, Steve moved to Europe for training in psychoanalysis. He talked about his first coaching case in European country during his psychoanalytic training in mid 80s and how he developed his career:

[W]hat I would consider to be my very first coaching case was a senior executive at a large American international organization, who came to me and said, "Doc, I need somebody to talk to, is this something about therapy?" I am not sure what it's about, but [we] bounce[d] ideas… and we laughed about … we don't know what it's called. 'Coaching' was not a word back then. We were talking….

I was in my psychoanalytic training at the time. And we met once a week when he wasn't traveling and we just talked. We talked about his relationship with his team. We talked about his relationship with his boss. He was an American. His boss was German.

We talked … we did coaching, what I considered real coaching. Oh we didn't call it coaching; that wasn't the word for it.... I think he told people and I also began … not really marketing because I was in a very fortunate position of having more work, be it patients or work or whatever that I needed, but my focus slowly moved more and more towards working with and in organizations.

I then spent two or three years in transition, late 80s to mid 90s... mid 90s actually [started working] as an external consultant on a two or three-day basis to again another large American consulting company working with their executive board and their senior partners and in a variety of different roles as basically a coach and... somebody who brought the psychological perspective to help them think about the psychological perspective.

I would have partners come to me and say "We are negotiating with or working up with, on this client project and … things aren't going well and this is happening. What do you think is going on?" So they saw me as a resource and that got me really deeply involved in coaching and also organizational dynamics from a psychodynamic perspective because that was my background, and again relevant to my background … is my clinical training … as a social worker first of all, and then as a clinical psychologist.

Steve was involved in an activity, later called coaching, by accident and became intrigued by such intervention and successfully developed his coaching career. Philip

also considered a coaching career by the request of an organization when he prepared to be a clinician:

> I started my career as a clinician and then with academic aspirations. I wanted to be in science, in an academic environment, to work at a university and I did so but then I was asked to become a clinical psychological advisor of a company. And then I started to think, "Hey that is not a field of application." And I wanted still to be fully trained as a clinician, and as a psychoanalyst and when I was trained in the [a European institute], it took many years and a lot of work but I knew I want to apply it eventually in a different domain, with a different target group, not patients but relatively healthy, normal professionals and executives and see how the knowledge and the technology and the models might be applicable in their domain...

> and then gradually … in fact I started quite soon already with forms of coaching, not psychotherapy or psychoanalysis, clinically … clinical oriented coaching… going deeper into the personal aspects but not as such but ... doing that in the context of the work issues and the professional issues at hand.

> In the mean time, Phillip received a master's degree in organizational studies.

Thus, faculty members are highly trained psychotherapists who became faculty members of business schools and have completely left clinical settings. The needs for executive coaching seemed to be emerging among organizational practitioners, so the coaches were sought first and gradually grew with the needs in their cases. As an early generation who started coaching around 1990's, they tend to become coaches in the course of pursuing a career in clinical psychology or business administration by adding up training or experience in the other area rather planning on professional coaching before they get into professional training.

Some coaches including Maria, an executive director, made a transition from HR manager after taking LCP. Uniquely, Axel, a coach at ILC, had trainings in medicine; psychotherapy in a medical setting; and business administration (MBA at IBSE) and joined ILC. He said, "you do not have to be a good soccer player to be a soccer coach,

but you have to understand how to play the game." The backgrounds and career paths of

people differ, yet most of them had shared strengths in both psychology and business.

This might be the criteria that ILC hires coaches.

<u>Atmosphere</u>

The atmosphere of the center will be dealt with in finding 3. However, the

following is a sketch of my first few days, describing my first impressions:

March 23-24: the first days: Sketch

My fears all melt as soon as I knocked on the doors of Shallotte's and Mary's office. They greeted me very warmly and placed me in an office, set up a network connection, offered brochures, books, articles, and told me how to access their resources, and introduced me to everybody at ILC. Some of staff members were brought to my office or spontaneously came to greet me. They already knew my purpose and expressed their willingness to become interviewees. I was told that I was the first visitor in their 19-year-history, and Dr. K asked people to offer what I wanted. Shallotte told me " You can be an eavesdropper, a spy." Shallotte even personally helped me move into the town. I hung out with staff members, researchers and their family members naturally.

On the first day of LCP, 9th class, module 6, I met with Dr. K, Steve, and Philip at the program. At our first encounter, I thanked Dr. K and his answer was "I don't know." Since then, he asked unexpected, Zen questions like "what is your fantasy?", "where are you?", "what are you doing?" That night, I had dinner with Dr. K, Steve, Philip and Shallotte at a local restaurant. Since the three faculty members also see each other only when LCP takes place, they had lengthy business conversations. I was nervous and suffering from jet lag. But I got acquainted with them and promised to interview them.

<u>Finding 1. Integration of Psychology and Organizational Studies</u>

My major curiosity for this study is whether and/or how psychology and

organizational studies are integrated in executive coaching. From literature and my own

experience I know that executive coaches can benefit from a firm grasp of both

psychology and organization, and a shortcoming in either element is undesirable and

regularly a source of partisan criticism. An understanding of both is greatly beneficial,

even essential, to becoming an effective executive coach, and many practitioners use a blended approach.

American academic institutes commonly offer joint degree programs between business and social science schools or the like, but never does a business school offer a degree in social science or school of social science a degree in business management as far as I know. Students themselves must blend their learning from both parties, as individual faculty members are almost never competent in both fields. Then, what if Harvard Business School offers a degree in "psychology" or school of social science or medical school offer a degree in "business management"? I could have not even imagined this. However, psychology is being taught at IBSE, a structured business school.

Thus, my initial curiosity is: 1) if it is *really* possible to integrate psychology and organizational studies in one program; 2) to what extent will this program experience tensions; and 3) if it is interpreted as a success by the study participants.

Leadership Coaching Program: surface

This section presents the superficial information about LCP, to get an idea if the integration is possible. This information was gathered through brochures, publications, documents, casual conversations, interviews and observations. It focuses on the current status of the program. Some aspects will be studied in-depth in the Finding 2.

Program overview.

The Leadership Coaching Program (LCP) is a group coaching program that targets professionals who are leading change directly or advising key people in an organization. This is a coaching program for coaches, in a broad definition, and the first

program focusing not only on change management but also on consulting and coaching within and to organizations. This program carefully admits HR/learning professionals, line managers and coach/consultants, in equal portions, for professional development by providing a clinical framework for understanding how individual and organizational behavior affects change initiatives.   The program brochure says that it provides participants with "clinical framework, behavioral repertoire and the understanding of individual psychological structures." In fact, seven modules are deliberately designed to provide a clinical framework to people working in organizational settings, and use various innovative activities to enhance self-awareness, which can potentially be used in their own practices. This program consists of seven modules over a 14 month-period.

This program is recognized as the best selling executive program at IBSE; it has always experienced over-enrollment since it was founded. And it has the longest waiting list for faculty members who want to participate in the program. LCP has not done any active marketing for several years, as most participants are gathered by words of mouth.

History.

This program was launched a decade ago by Dr. K, Steve, and Philip, as a joint venture with ADC, another French international business school. Since the joint venture was broken after two years, IBSE offers this program as a diploma program: as participants complete seven modules, they get certificates or a diploma in Clinical Organizational Psychology if they complete a thesis. Study participants have given various versions of the story of the establishment and break-up of the joint venture. Steve recalls that some people in the Association for Psychoanalytic Study in

Organizations (APSO, pseudonym) wanted to teach clinical techniques to business

people:

> We had already set up a taskforce within APSO and there was a way of announcing but all the people, that were doing this, were doing it all with clinicians and then we said "maybe we should do it [with business people] … lets go to IBSE" and initially IBSE said "you are nuts" and then went … we had on our taskforce in our ISPSO group there, we had **a person** from ADC. And she said "I think I can convince ADC to do it" and when basically IBSE found out that ADC was going to do it, they said "actually we think we could do it", and so we set out and this came in a time when the dean wanted ADC and IBSE to do the work together and timing is everything.

Dr. K says they quitted the joint venture because they felt they gained nothing from the

collaboration. As a result, IBSE could no longer offer the degree, which was conferred

from ADC.

Since then, the faculty members have been convincing the IBSE school

administration to offer an advanced degree to graduates who already meet the master's

degree requirements by French government. Thanks to their tenacious proposal and the

success of the program, the proposal has recently been approved (May, 2010). This is the

IBSE's first non-MBA master's degree.

2010 is an important years in IBSE's history because it is its 10th anniversary, and

the proposal to extend LCP as an Executive Master's program in Clinical Organizational

Psychology was approved by the school after seven years of efforts. Fortunately, the

special 10th anniversary forum and the approval occurred during my fieldwork.

Historical backgrounds.

APSO members contributed to LCP to promote the use of a psychoanalytic lens in

organizational studies and practices. Dr. K is an honorary member of APSO, along with

the second generation of academics working at the boundary of psychoanalysis and

organizational studies after Abraham Zaleznik (1977, 1979) and Harry Levinson (2006). Together, these scholars are early academics bringing clinical lenses to organizational studies and created the stream, being often mentioned in executive coaching literature.

APSO, which was established in the early 1980's, is for academics, clinicians, consultants and others interested in working in and with organizations using psychoanalytic concepts and insights. 250 members from 20 countries share their research, theories and perspectives. One of concerns is about creating new forms of education, such as LCP. Several LCP faculty members have been actively involved with APSO, and some coaches including Maria, an executive director of ILC, also joined this movement.

Participants/Admission.

Every group admits 36 participants (38 from 2010) through an application process that includes 14 personal essays (see appendix), two references and an interview with one of the faculty members to assess language, emotional maturity, and overall fitness for the program. Each group is composed of learning/HR professionals, line mangers or coach/consultants, in equal portions. They already carry out coaching/consulting jobs/functions to some extent. Individuals with psychotherapy training are often among the course participants: the two groups that I sat in each had at least one rigorously trained psychotherapist. Each group admits two IBSE faculty members as program participants, and some graduate faculty members are invited to speak later.

Admissions are structured to achieve participant diversity, with the average age being 44 years and an even gender mix. Over the past nine years LCP has attracted a very high caliber of participants: 83% have advanced degrees (MA, MS, MSc, MBA, PhD,

MD); 44% are senior executives; 41% are mid-level executives; 15% own their own business or are partners in boutique & multi-national consultant firms; and 34% have already attended an IBSE program.

For admission, candidates must have 1) at least a bachelor degree, with some exceptions, 2) an organization context where one can work during the program, and 3) at least seven years of work experience. In addition, through interviews, faculty members assess a candidate's readiness to explore him/herself and share his/her thoughts and experience with others, since the program includes many self-reflective activities.

Since the Admission does a good job in screening candidates through pre-application conversations and document reviews, almost all candidates interviewed are admitted or wait-listed for the next year. Only three participants from the past 10 years (9 groups) did not finish the program, all for personal reasons. One has disappeared from everywhere for some reason, two dropouts for their personal reasons.

Participants are mostly recruited through graduates. LCP's only marketing tool is a brochure. The current fee is 36,000 Euros.

Clinical paradigm: multidisciplinary approach.

The purpose of LCP is to provide a framework to understand organizational behaviors which can be applied to actual practice. The framework is called a "clinical paradigm". Dr. K and ILC's unique concept implies eclectic, multidisciplinary, and unorthodox approaches in leadership coaching. The following is an excerpt from Philip's interview article with Dr. K, written before they worked together for LCP.

> Let me start by explaining why I refer to the clinical paradigm and not the psychoanalytic paradigm. It has to do with my horror of orthodoxy and of a dogmatic *Weltanschauung*. By giving orientation to the study of organizations the name clinical paradigm, I am acknowledging the contributions of many other

disciplines apart from psychoanalytic psychology – among them, family system theory, infant observation, neurology, psychiatry, cognition, social psychology, anthropology, and ethnology. In my work, I am trying to integrate ideas from these various disciplines when appropriate. (2000)

In his 2009 publication, Dr. K states that "I do whatever works. I want to help people" (p. xxi). He draws on cognitive, family systems theory, group dynamics, motivational interviewing, neuropsychiatry, and developmental psychology. As a scholar from a business school as well as a psychoanalyst, he sees himself as a bridge builder. As a coach, he says that he has combined the two worlds of management and psychotherapy. He has both obtained insight into more traditional organizational problems, and learned how to use a different lens to decipher those problems, giving him a three-dimensional view of the human being (2009). With this view, he could work with many executives who talk to him not only about the more typical organizational problems but also about other more general, existential issues – fears, desires, concerns about money, search for happiness, disappointments, and even their fear of death.

Although clinical paradigm is Dr. K's concept, two other faculty members also use this approach. Steve and Philip have been involved with various academic disciplines in humanities, business and social science and finally landed in business administration. Steve said, "I was trained as a systemic family therapist. I did some training, never completed the certificate or anything in Gestalt therapy and I did some training in cognitive behavioral therapy before I trained as a psychoanalyst so my approach is extremely eclectic as well." As trained psychoanalysts, however, they claim that psychoanalysis alone is not the most effective framework. Steve claims that he would not work with a company that would push him to define his approach in one

theory or dogma. In fact, Clinical Organizational Psychology is considered as a new

discipline. According to Steve, Clinical Organizational Psychology is a blending of

organizational psychology and clinical psychology.   They use the term "clinical"

because traditional organizational psychology lacks a strong clinical perspective. Steve

states:

> This is why it's a relatively unique degree just like LCP program is not only relatively unique, it is completely unique. And so the focus is using broadly speaking the clinical concept…. How we define "clinical," because it does not mean people wearing white coats and working in hospitals, but about applying the clinical concepts to understanding inter and intrapersonal dynamics, and the impact that those dynamics have on organizations.

They are very proud of themselves and the program for using the eclectic clinical

paradigm by eclectic professors.

Truly LCP covers topics from different disciplines and areas. During four LCP

modules and the 10th anniversary forum, psychiatrists, practitioners, and professors in

public administration, strategy, organizational behavior, family business, etc., taught

classes with three faculty members. The LCP class topics and readings included different

disciplines from counseling psychology to neuroscience as the clinical paradigm does not

specify certain theories or disciplines. Some speakers have been invited since LCP

launched, and others were being introduced to the program. LCP continues to try new

ideas and adapt existing ideas in their approach.

Program details.

Seven Modules over 14-month-period.

The seven modules of LCP are designed to prepare the participants for the

challenge of leading individual, team and organizational change. The focus begins with

self-awareness and then expands to teamwork, organizational dynamics and finally global

perspectives. The seven modules are 1) building foundation 2) interpersonal perspectives

3) organizational family system 4) leadership dynamics 5) groups and teams 6)

organizational change and 7) transformational (see appendix for detailed program

outline). Each module meets for three or four consecutive days approximately every two

months. Participants from around the world stay at a hotel next to the school and attend

classes from eight AM to six PM. Evening social events are also arranged by the

program administrator. The participants receive reading packets, including several thick

text books during the module or between modules.

Between each module, the participants write a reflection essay and a personal case

study, in which they apply the content and insights from the program to their

organizations. Both are read and commented by the faculty. This combines a

performance reminder and feedback. After the final module, the participants write a

thesis of 75 to 100 pages. After graduation, there is a reunion module such as the 10th

anniversary forum to which all graduates of LCP are invited. The content of this module

varies based on the needs of the participants as well as the availability of thought leaders.

The recent reunion module invited a professor from Harvard's Kennedy School of Public

Administration.

Multilevel approach.

"I hear, I forgot. I see, I remember. I do, I understand" -- Confucius.

Dr. K uses Confucius' quotation when he orients participants. To help

participants *understand* the clinical paradigm, LCP offers multilevel experiential learning

opportunities, in three levels.

One level provides the clinical framework, a series of lenses to look at individuals, organizations and themselves so that participants can view organizational behaviors and phenomena in a more explicit way. Such perspectives can be obtained through readings, lectures and discussions.

Secondly, participants can use themselves as a tool by applying the clinical framework to their own cases. Dr. K also stresses the importance of self-awareness of helping professionals;

> …if you want to understand what is going on around you, the old statement 'know thyself', call it a formula in Greek times, in modern Greek times, I think Confucius also talked about things like that, is still the core wisdom, you have to understand yourself, to understand others. And I think that's one of the problems with many coaches, they don't understand themselves, and some people are in the helping profession because they are compulsive helpers for many different reasons which they are not aware of. Compulsive helping can also be very dangerous. (p.8)

The third level is the self-development or career change aspect. After becoming able to use the clinical framework, participants can use it for their professional or personal transformation.

For example, the participants learned about psychotherapy approaches through video, entitled "Three approaches to Psychotherapy: Gloria" and discussed various points including whether or how each approach can be applied in their practice – organizational settings, not clinical settings – in Module 1. The video is a famous educational video for psychotherapists, and I have watched in counseling master's program to learn and compare three psychotherapy approaches. In the LCP class, the participants immediately had a chance to apply new knowledge to real cases in class by evaluating them through their own personal and professional situation. While the students in my counseling programs focused more on the theoretical aspects, LCP

participants tried to use the video and reflection as a reference for present or the nearer future in their personal and professional lives.

Shallotte, the research director and LCP graduate, also sees the program in two different levels – on stage and on balcony. While engaging in various lectures, group activities, and peer coaching, the participants fully experience themselves on stage and also step back and view what is going on from the balcony (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009). For example, they are assessed through a thorough 360 degree feedback program to enhance their self-awareness at the stage level, but at the same time they look into the tools for their own practice. The reflective activities and experiential learning opportunities are given at the beginning and end of each day and each activity.

Unlike conventional lectures, LCP offers knowledge as well as opportunities to experience how the knowledge could be applied to themselves or others in their context. Participants from organizational contexts are required to work with faculty for 14 months to embed the learning.

Outcomes: anecdotes and research.

Then what kind of result does LCP generate? The outcomes of the program could be explained in three aspects: participants' transformation, program's prosperousness and supporting other business.

Anecdotes.

Accounting for achievement of the program, Steve and Philip never hesitate to point changes within each participant. Steve says:

> A number of people that came up to me privately and said "LCP has changed my life, it has changed my company, it has changed the way I do business; blanket transformation." 95 to 98 percent of our graduates say this program has changed their life .… there was one participant who a number of years ago said "this

program was a waste of time" and I got an email from that person three weeks ago that said that "the program has changed my life, it just took a lot longer.

Philip offers the transformational effect of the program and a piece of relevant story with pride:

> I think the major accomplishment is that we have touched people at a level of learning and change for themselves, that they maybe changed and indeed started looking through these lenses and have internalized these lenses and become more happy and effective in the way they operate as a person. That goes far beyond the professional level.
>
> Many have opened up to family members, for instance I remember that in the context of the LCP, there was a participant from Latin America, and he had a conflicted relationship with his father. As a faculty member, I had a talk with him, "Why don't you try to meet your father? you never know what happens in life but that might be an opportunity to give it a try, to reconnect". He did so and after six months his father died.
>
> So for me that was a very important message there, and also touching for me that here is somebody who could reconnect with his father before his father died, otherwise he would have for the rest of his life, until the next generation even, with this gap between him and his father, this disconnect. And this is just one example of many of those kind where people have brought it in a different way.

The graduates at the 10th anniversary forum told me similar stories. One said, "LCP has changed my life. More than that. I had no idea about what my life consisted of before LCP. I couldn't even reach that question. It made me start thinking what my life is." One line manager at a large factory evaluates that she could lead her team better after the program, so she flew to the forum paying from her pocket, expecting another learning opportunity. As I was introduced as a researcher, many people tried to offer positive words about LCP. During the cocktail party, some graduates went on stage to give updates on how LCP has affected their lives.

Research.

Shallotte and researchers at ILC have conducted a survey study with LCP

graduates for the 10th anniversary of the program. The study was originally designed to

learn to what extent participants from various groups feel they have developed in key

leadership areas as a result of attending LCP.   The online survey was emailed to 236

participants from groups 1 to 7. The response rate was 46% and the analysis was done

with 38% of valid responses. Six domains were generated by researchers who graduated

from the program (table 5.1). Participating graduates considered LCP has contributed to

1) Individual development, 2) Broadening theoretical knowledge and 3) Improving

personal development and leadership skills.

Table 5.1. Changes in priorities after program participation

Average	Entry Priorities	Exit Priorities	
(a)Individual/Personal development	25.93	26.89	3.70%
(b)Individual career planning and development within the organization	7.75	8.72	12.52%
(c)Transition to a new career	18.13	25.61	41.26%
(d)Improving people development and leadership skills	17.8	13.93	-21.74%
(e)Broadening theoretical knowledge	21.81	15.94	-26.91%
(f) Multi-cultural experience and perspectives	8.57	9.06	5.72%

ANOVA shows that all respondents but one who see the (d) "improving people

development and leadership skills" as a priority at entry changed their priority after the

program. It is interpreted along based on explanations given by the respondents, as those

who put priority on (d) found that their goal had been achieved through the program and

realized through the program that (a) "individual/personal development" should come first to achieve (d). This is valid through Group 1 to 7.

As a consequence of LCP, participating graduates have started external activities such as professional transition, including job changing, continuing professional training, starting their own company (27), health-related activities, creative works, or therapy (45); or life changes like divorce, marriage, and children (4). Nine people responded that no new activity was started as a consequence. Overall, 85% of participating graduates responded LCP changed them and 87% responded that they will continue to change as a result of LCP.

Program prosperity.

As a result of students' high satisfaction in the program, LCP has been over-booked without active marketing. LCP is very profitable, which enables the program to have support from the school. IBSE has insisted on offering only the MBA. If LCP had not been this successful, it would hardly be possible that this structured academic institute could decide to offer another kind of master's degree. This had been on hold for long time for fear of cannibalization of their master's and doctor's degrees, according to Dr. K. Although Dr. K complains about not having control over ILC's profit and not getting the support that they deserve, others say that LCP is a big triumph in a typically French, bureaucratic administration. Because of the success of LCP in France, the program will be offered at another campus.

Having two faculty member participants each year, and having the longest faculty wait list, this program has influenced the school at large. Dr. K mentions:

> More and more faculty members want to take LCP so we have now people who would be otherwise considered as super nerds, left–brained … just like Charles

(pseudonym). He is a very good example. He is a professor of technology management, serious academic and he took LCP and so he can translate some of the ideas in a particular way … I have been teaching the McKinsey directors for four years similar things. …it really has to do with implementation, they maybe very good conceptualizers but they have no idea how to deal with the people …… now with the training, they will be hopefully more effective… (p.7-8)

LCP consequently benefits in reverse by expanding the connections within the school, enjoying speakers who already understand the context. Charles ran an interesting workshop linking clinical paradigm and his area for Module 6. Dr.K envisions that IBSE becomes the best business school in what is known as "soft" skills which is related to "the cluster of personality traits, social graces, communication, language, personal habits, friendliness, and optimism that characterize relationships with other people. Soft skills complement hard skills (part of a person's IQ), which are the occupational requirements of a job and many other activities." (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soft_skills). By focusing on the people-side of organization, Dr. K says that he tries to help the left-brained IBSE professors like Charles have a better idea of how to include human factors in their research and practice.

Contribution to other business: synergy creating system.

The LCP's success affects other parts of ILC. It is difficult to separate LCP and ILC, although Steve, a LCP faculty member as well as the first director of ILC, argues that these are two separate and distinct entities within IBSE. However, ILC and LCP share faculty members, and Dr. K's philosophies and approaches are present in both. And most ILC coaches are recruited from LCP, selected and trained by "shadow-coaching." Shadow-coaching is a way to train new coaches who already have adequate knowledge from LCP or elsewhere, in which potential coaches observe coaching sessions as a form of apprenticeship. The current executive director, Maria, was also recruited this

way; she had attended LCP when she was a HR director of a multinational company. After being approached, she went through shadow-coaching and became an ILC coach and executive director. Now she is in charge of recruiting new coaches from LCP upon faculty members' recommendations.

Thus, in spite of Steve's strong statement, LCP and ILC are very closely related and create synergy. Most coaches at ILC also have similar backgrounds and approaches, which are controlled and reproduced through LCP. What is taught through LCP is tested and improved through ILC coaching practice. ICL could hire credible like-minded coaches through LCP and the ILC's prosperity updates and strengthens the contents of LCP. It is like a medical school and a hospital under one management. They have internal resources for certification, a diploma or an executive master's degree from IBSE. The plan to include supervision as a master's degree requirement in LCP was possible because they have experienced nine program directors in ILC. As those program directors understand Dr. K's clinical paradigm, the system would work as a "cloning" system to maintain the founder's approach.

Further, this system has also provided work opportunities for LCP graduates recommended by faculty members. This was possible because of another unique system. ILC coaches are mostly part-time. Dr.K explains this as how ILC becomes one of the largest leadership centers in the world with low cost and only about 10 full-time faculty/staff members.

> I could pick them out and select them and then use them as coaches, and so the kind of structure is a virtual structure in which I have a very small skeleton staff who supports it and everybody else is virtual. So 'no work, no pay.' They like to associate with IBSE intellectually but also financially, as it has some advantages because you know, you say if you are an Adjunct Professor or a program director

at IBSE, you can ask for better fee structure and more clients. It has a beneficial effect, it's mutual, and it's synergetic.

<u>Next agenda</u>

The program itself appears to be stable, and faculty members are only considering minor changes in the curriculum. The program does anticipate a huge shift with the return of the executive master's degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology, which will soon be offered to LCP graduates meeting certain requirements. The program will be slightly expanded to include additional academic and practical requirements which are currently being discussed among stakeholders.

As for the current curriculum, as Philip regrets, guest lecturers for the organizational strategy/behavior section showed slight discrepancy from the whole.   As coaches need to view each executive's issues in a big picture, understanding of organizational strategy is essential. However, this is outside of those three faculty members' specialties, so they relied on guest lecturers. Philip said that they are aware of the problem, and are improving the situation. It did not seem to be very problematic to me, though I could understand that the guest session had less impact on students than other sessions. The faculty members also appeared to step back from the session partly because they were less familiar with the subject. The session was introduced by a guest instructor for the first time. However, there is no specific plan stated for the improvement.

Finding 2. Ideally Psychologists But Business People in Reality

Even after observing the successful integration of psychology and organizational studies, I still question which group is the preferred for executive coaching. This may be

a binary-reifying question. However, as long as the tribal conflict continues in literature, it will remain an issue for many coaches. In academic literature, the psychologist-coaches have more voices, while in my experience, coaches who used to work as HR specialists survived. The faculty members saw in psychologists the potential to be executive coaches first a decade ago, but the situation has changed. This section presents stories about tensions between psychology and business found in the history of faculty members and LCP.

Leadership Coaching Program: behind the scene

The program initially appeared to me to have achieved success due to talented faculty members' unanimity and innovation. However, the program's founding and its various developmental shifts were not easily achieved. This section includes what I found towards the end of my fieldwork, including what I now consider as some tensions within the program.

LCP and coach preparation.

Just as executive coaching does not have clear definition and standards, LCP is also not crystal-clear in all aspects. The thing that confused me the most is the coach preparation function of the program. I initially understood LCP as a coach preparation program, until Steve and Dr. K explicitly disagreed that this is to prepare coaches. Reading the introduction on the web I learned that LCP was designed to train people within or for organizations to have a clinical paradigm. Although their answer is definite "no", they firmly believe that LCP is offering the best basis for executive coaching. Philip said "yes" in that providing a clinical framework is the most important preparation for a professional.

One of the main reasons for their "no" is that LCP does not offer practicum and supervisions, although participants do peer-coaching and get some help from experienced coaches according to Dr. K and Steve. In that sense, they hope that the master's degree program which will be launched soon and according changes in the program such as supervision or practicum fulfill this function. They plan to bring experienced ILC program directors as supervisors. Furthermore, Shallotte stated that this could not be a "preparation" program because the participants already are coaches. In other words, LCP can be considered a coach education program not a "preparation" program. Program participants are seen as conducting coach/consultant functions in their jobs to a certain degree, even if they are not professionally entitled coaches. Their clinical paradigm is believed to help their practice. When they are professional coaches and consultants, the clinical paradigm provides a foundation or link between clinical theory and business practice. Steve states, "We have a lot of people from coaching and consulting practices, and they are honest saying "I know what I am doing works and works really well; what I don't have is the theory and the foundation and that's why I want to come". Most of the psychotherapists that come here say "cut the clinical stuff down. I know Freud or I know cognitive behavioral theory or I know Pearls' Gestalt, what I don't know is how [to put] things into a business perspective." Since this program is a coaching program for coaches, participants learn how to coach better by getting what is missing in their current practices.

Regardless, as a coach, I found the program useful for my current coaching practice. It is designed to enhance self-awareness by providing an array of interesting theories, lenses, and tools which help participants possibly attain knowledge and self-

awareness (self-as-a-tool). Heightening self-awareness is one of the purposes of executive coaching (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Kilburg, 2000). For example, the Core Conflictual Relationship Theme (CCRT), introduced by a psychoanalyst instructor in the second module, was first used to give participants a better understanding of their own relational problems, but at the same time, it seems to be useful in coaching contexts. These interventions will be more effective and safer if they are taught and refined through practicum and supervision.

Though they feel the program is not complete, they are very confident about their graduate's coaching skills. To my question as to whether or not it is good for LCP graduates to use such activities as CCRT in their own practice, all the faculty members responded yes, raising some concerns about "knowing your limit." Nevertheless, Steve even regards as the graduates higher than "licensed" coaches. He believes that "certification" or "license" gives people legal permits, but not necessarily makes them "qualified." In this context, he believes that the graduates are fully qualified to use the tools in their own practice.

In spite of negative opinions on preparation functions, in fact, some LCP graduates are recruited as ILC coaches. Even though they are entitled "best," LCP graduates become coaches after LCP and a shadow-coaching process. Maria thinks that LCP prepares coaches as much as the MBA program prepares business consultants. MBA is not a business consultant preparation program, but many graduates become business consultants. Maria and other ILC coaches also see the needs of practicum and supervision, which will come with a master's degree program.

Despite differences in people's opinion on this issue, everyone agrees on the necessity of an additional arrangement. I was a bit surprised by the fact that all interviewees raised the same concerns regarding the question about how LCP could be different. This may be because some agreements had already been reached in the course of proposing the master's degree program.

In summary, LCP is not a coach preparation program where anyone can turn into an executive coach, but it prepares coaches to some extent; at least one faculty member believes so, and, in fact, some LCP graduates have become ILC coaches. Especially in terms of framework, approach and theoretical founding, everyone confidently agrees that LCP provides future and current coaches with the best framework.

<u>Origins: tensions at emerging.</u>

LCP leaders have different opinions on the coach preparation function of the program, so I examined how this program commenced. I asked questions regarding the founding of the program, assuming that I could uncover aspects that were not included in the literature. The origins of the program are viewed differently by the different people involved, and sometimes multiple stories were identified by a single person. Many factors, many people and many stories surround the birth of this program.

The Coach Training Program with psychologists.

One founding story was introduced during the cocktail party at the special 10th anniversary forum. Steve tells the story, in interview, of how those faculty members met and what was done as follows:

> I knew of Dr. K but never met him, but Philip knew Dr. K well. I knew a German industrialist who said unusually, "I think that senior executives have got to understand psychodynamics, and the future of business and management is in

having a core understanding in psychodynamics." We brought those two people together.

I brought in the industrialist, Philip brought in Dr. K and we met in Paris. At the end of the meeting the industrialist said, "I am willing to help you with your vision, Dr. K; I need a way to train people who can look with a clinical perspective in organizations." We thought a completely wrong thing… because we came out of a clinical tradition and because, I suppose, IBSE's feedback was that this is crazy stuff, we thought that we needed to train psychologists to be able to understand business and to work in business. So what they need to do is to train people who already have a bit of a clinical background in how to work in organizations (p.4).

As a result, the Coach Training Program was launched outside of IBSE to train

psychologists into executive coaches. It is interpreted as a great success as well as a great

failure, as it failed to actually generate coaches. Steve says that "It was a complete

failure except for Philip and me; most of the people just could not make the leap and we

actually sat with the program after we delivered it with all seven modules." The trained

psychologists could not find coaching employment, and kept asking Steve and Philip to

find them jobs and bring them to business people. So Steve and Phillip did an

experiment to help:

We did some experiments by inviting one of the participants to join us in a project. And I remember Steve once invited somebody, a psychotherapist, psychiatrist, and psychoanalyst to join him at the meeting of a family business. And then the first thing the psychotherapist said "Could you please remove the table because there should be no space in between us" and in a business context that is a very strange intervention, and it was not discussed by Steve upfront, and it upset the whole business setup because we were not in a psychoanalytic clinic … so we thought, this is too difficult. It is a bridge too far for us. (p.10)

Steve and Phillip turned this failure into a new start. They decided to change their

targets by training people who are already in an organizational context. To launch this

unconventional executive program they worked with another business school, ADC, and

used Dr. K's good reputation in IBSE, making LCP a joint venture between IBSE and ADC. Although it was not simple, it did not meet with big trouble or resistance.

Training program for business consultants.

Dr. K's interpretation of the founding varies from Steve and Phillip's because he worked on LCP through another context. As introduced in the context section, for the previous ten years he had been successfully leading a CEO workshop, the Leadership Challenge program, which is a group coaching program exploring top executives' professional and personal lives in a secure environment to maximize their performance. LCP's basis materials, like the clinical paradigm, came from the Leadership Challenge program, Dr. K claims. Inspired by the success of the program, Dr. K thought about LCP as a manager-level of his Leadership Challenge program. It was originally designed to train young consultants at business consulting companies like Bayne or McKinsey, although it turned out to be for coach/consultant, learning/HR specialist and line mangers because of the beginning of the coaching movement. In this way LCP did not face major tensions or conflict, and it has been implemented as he originally planned, Dr. K says. Unfortunately, this is the thing only Dr. K knows about because no one has ever observed Leadership Challenge program. Steve and Philip do not share this context because they were never involved in this program.

To Dr. K, LCP is manager-level (rather than top executive level) version of the Leadership Challenge program, and to Steve and Philip, it is a business-people (rather than psychologist) version of the Coach Training Program.

LCP and therapy.

As LCP is seen differently in terms of its origin and coach preparation function from different point of views, people have various interpretations of LCP. Beyond the purposes that faculty members suggest, many participants appreciate it for changing their personal life. In fact, the faculty members are rigorously trained psychotherapists, although they are in business field now. What creates this perception among participants? Wouldn't this "fact", faculty members' clinical background, create this perception?

All program directors strongly argue that coaching is different from therapy. A coach and psychotherapist, Axel, tells a story wherein coaching was about to become a therapy session. In his group coaching session, one of participants made a case presentation that very briefly mentioned that his wife would die, and kept talking about what is happening in his business. That was the moment Axel asked himself, "Do I refer to that? Do I just listen to it and say nothing? What sort of risk do I take, by doing that?" In therapy, he should obviously touch the point, but in coaching session, it was on the borderline. After deep consideration, he decided to deal with it because group members were also surprised by the participant's behavior. The group developed it very successfully after all. Axel points to that moment as an example of coaching and therapy overlaps and tensions.

Steve and Philip also very clearly discern coaching from therapy. During the first module, they state that coaching is different from therapy; some of their tools have therapeutic effects but they are not therapy. They make it clear that participants should not mimic the practices of experienced psychoanalysts, and know their limits. Shallotte also define executive coaching in a relation to psychotherapy:

[it is] neither consulting nor therapy but an overlap so you have … it's a person who is informed by psychodynamic theory and experience but who also has real experience in the business world as well, and they know the boundaries.

They are very clear … they should be very clear on the boundaries between coaching and psychotherapy and they should be very careful to not cross those boundaries even though it's tempting. It is very tempting …in particular … particularly when you had some psychodynamic training or experience and you think you know it all and you know why should you not go there but I think it's been made very, very clear that that's not acceptable. And at the same time, it's important for them to realize that they are not consultants and even though they do have organizational training, the idea is not to find solutions, organizational solutions, and from there, I think that's the clearest answer I can give on that.

I mean there are lots of more details on that but that … it's kind of an interface between psychotherapy and consulting but very clearly neither one or the other and it's difficult to stay varied and that's why I think you need a lot of experience and training… that may sound, to be able to stay in that space between the two…

However, Shallotte, who knows the program and faculty members well and stated as above, interestingly interprets LCP as group psychotherapy without any hesitation. She is aware that LCP is not supposed to be a therapy and faculty members keep stressing and warning that it is not a group therapy, but she told the story of her perspective. Being a researcher at ILC, she had satisfactorily carried out her duties including reading, writing and helping students with research projects from her office. However, Dr. K pushed her to go out and meet more people against her will. With great resistance, she ended up in LCP. But at the end, she appreciates the program, and her self-esteem and confidence levels improved. For example, she had experienced great fear of public presentations in the past, and she learned that she could do presentation with full support of the group. She thus appreciates LCP's therapeutic effects. During my stay, she was in the center of people, made presentations in different settings, and was preparing for a large conference without any problem – it was difficult to imagine her in the past. And Shallotte was not alone confessing the therapeutic effects of LCP; I have heard stories and comments on

how LCP has changed people's lives in therapy-typical ways. Thus, LCP is not a therapy, but has therapeutic effects for some participants.

Tensions caused by being unorthodox.

As with executive coaching in general, LCP is on the border of many divergent elements. Does it have tensions due to its multidisciplinary nature? Although Dr. K's reputation in the school made LCP develop relatively smoothly, he appeared to have experienced difficulty until he built up his status in academia. Indeed, Dr. K's academic life was a miniature of the tensions that might have been found in the program. In his autobiography and interview, it was found that he could not obtain professorship at the school where he earned his doctoral degree because his interest in the interface of psychology and organizational study was not orthodox. Instead of turning to mainstream, however, he deepened his expertise in psychoanalysis, crossing Europe and North America to find an institution training a non-physician to become a psychoanalyst. Once he commenced his writing career incorporating psychoanalysis and leadership, he published numerous articles in top journals. He became a renowned leadership expert in academia and practice, and his name is usually found on leadership must-read lists. He developed a solid academic basis adhering to his own interest.

However, he stepped out of the department of Organizational Behavior about two decades ago, when he chose to run a coaching program for executives. Thus he could not "clone" himself through academic advisor-advisee relationships, so he developed innovative executive education programs such as LCP and trained some post-doctoral scholars at ILC. He appeared not to have any problem as a multidisciplinary scholar now; this is his competitive edge. An editor of Harvard Business Review who I met on

campus evaluates Dr. K as a genius writer and academic. He recently received a prize in Holland, due to his contributions to bringing psychoanalysis to a larger audience. And now, after several decades of endeavor, his unorthodox ideal is realized in conferring the master's degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology in a structured business school.

Master's degree approval.

Background.

The LCP offered a master's degree for its first two years through a joint venture period through ADC. The program was approved by French Ministry of Education as a master's program, but IBSE instead offer a diploma for many years. The degree returned after eight years. Approval was won after the LCP faculty members strongly raised concerns surrounding this issue.

First of all, LCP no longer is the only program offering knowledge and skills but also coaching and consulting to participants. Many top business schools offer similar programs to executives along with a master's degree. The faculty members are afraid to lose competitive candidates due to the absence of a degree program, and thus lose primacy as a unique executive program. Their frustration is shown in the master's degree proposal:

> IBSE was the very first business school to offer a very different kind of program focusing not only on change management but also on consulting and coaching within and to organizations. The original LCP Specialized Master's degree program set the standard for the design and delivery in this unique market and defined the "playing field". Unfortunately, after the demise of the joint venture with ADC, IBSE decided to award graduates with a Diploma and not to continue offering a masters degree. As a consequence we have gradually compromised on our first mover advantage. This became abundantly clear when we are not even mentioned in the 2009 comprehensive study of global organizational change and coaching degree and non-degree programs that was conducted by the University of Pennsylvania - the Penn Center for Organizational Dynamics, the Ackoff

Center for Advancement of Systems Approaches. The "first mover" and primary innovator in the arena was not even on the radar screen!!! (P. 9)

Despite LCP's primacy in this area and its continued success, it is not even recognized by outsiders, while ADC's program with another university is prominent. This frustration brought the degree issue on the table and finally drew official approval. IBSE was resistant and careful in breaking their master's degree policy.

Reactions.

The approval shocked some professors in the school. I heard from a staff member who went to the meeting including some organizational psychologists outside of ILC that they were against offering the degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology, claiming that they are the ones who should offer degree in Organizational Psychology, and not ILC. They furiously complained that this was an "outrageous scandal" and should be re-considered. But it had been approved by the official process.

Although the Department of Organizational Behavior (OB) also has run events concerning leadership development in the past few years, it is not as active in comparison to ILC. Dr. K. thought the department dysfunctional when he left the department. Effectively, ILC is the only working leadership center at IBSE.

Finding 3. Influence of Organizational Culture: Culture and Leadership

Although having tried hard to find the tensions within the program, I was at ILC when tensions were mostly overcome and people were enjoying a recent victory – the return of the master's degree. So my focus shifted to how tensions have been managed or why no tensions were detected. I decided to investigate the organizational culture and leadership at ILC.

Culture

Towards the end of my data collection, I received an invitation to ILC's Organizational Culture Indicator (OCI, pseudonym). It is an online questionnaire developed by ILC to examine organizational culture. I was surprised that I, a visiting researcher, was included in the participant list, and that ILC examines their own culture with a tool they developed.

From the first day, I felt fully embraced by the institute. I had the same badge as other staff and faculty members, access to all the buildings and facilities on campus, an email account and access to online resources. I felt treated as a part of the center before I felt myself as a part of it. I have always minded my being a researcher and temporary sojourner, but my "subjects" did not seem to have this objection. Since faculty members and coaches are only on campus when they have business, I was no different from them. They even counted me when they decided the ILC meeting date.

Secondly, I was surprised at ILC's willingness to be tested by the questionnaire, OCI. I assume that many are afraid of being examined. Moreover, in my experience, organizations are not positive towards voluntary testing. However, this is part of the culture at ILC that makes the multidisciplinary or unorthodox program run well.

I entered this site to learn about the tensions that dominate the literature and my experience. Yet, until I processed collected data, I could not identify any tensions like a tribal conflict (Ozkan, 2008). So I asked them why they did not suffer from tensions, but it was hard to find it through formal and informal interviews because the members did not understand why I assumed that tensions should exist. I first present relevant parts of the OCI result, and then discuss and analyze what I experienced in my fieldwork.

General overview: culture at ILC.

To look into the culture at ILC in general, I slightly touch upon the Organizational Culture Indicator result for ILC. 51 ILC staff, faculty and coaches in Europe and South Asia campuses all answered the questionnaire in June 2010. The following analysis is based on the information that I was provided at that moment and reviewed and confirmed by Shallotte and Steve. The full analysis was in the process.

The Organizational Culture Indicator.

The Organizational Culture Indicator (OCI) is designed to offer a comprehensive diagnosis of corporate culture alongside a detailed understanding of organization's ideal culture, by examining employees' perceptions of the organization's current values and the values they consider desirable. It covers 12 dimensions of organizational culture that research and interviews with large numbers of senior executives have shown to be most salient in high-performing global organizations: Competitiveness, Social responsibility, Client/Stakeholder orientation, Change, Teamwork, Fun, Responsibility and accountability, Trust, Learning environment, Result orientation, Respect for the individual, and Entrepreneurship.

On a five-point scale, ILC as a whole put highest values on Responsibility and accountability, Client orientation, Trust, and Respect for individual, respectively (all above 4.25), and evaluate that their practice is slightly below what they desire. The practice that exceeds their value is Fun at work, which is interpreted to mean that they enjoy their work more than they feel they believe to be. This is also shown in their qualitative comments. Many people appreciate and agree that they should maintain their open communications, high teamwork, trust and fun at work. On the other side, they

marked Competitiveness the lowest both on their value (3.47) and practice (2.87), yet it has the largest gap between value and practice (0.60): they do not see competitiveness as their high priority, and in practice it is not important compared to other elements. The gap is the largest in their lowest priority. Shallotte explains that they have more or less given up this part due to ILC's semi-autonomous status within IBSE, and they lack a clear competitor. Overall, it sounds like ILC is a relaxed and comfortable place to work, and people feel they are effective in pursuing what they should.

Leaders' assessment.

Interestingly, leaders, Dr. K (director) and Maria (executive director), appear to have quite different value systems from each other and from the group. These leaders put the maximum value (5.0) on Competitiveness. Maria sees their practice (2.86) is far lower from the value, while Dr. K evaluates them as competitive (4.57). The categories that both leaders and other members altogether put the highest value on are Responsibility and accountability, Trust and Respect for individuals, and the gaps for each of theses categories are relatively small. Shallotte tries to explain the discrepancy between the leaders and ILC members with the fact that Dr. K is somewhat detached from the center now. The ILC's hybrid structure within IBSE creates different perspectives and interpretations about their value and practice.

In spite of the different patterns of value system and perceptions among members at ILC, they put priority and practice high in Responsibility and accountability, Trust and Respect for the individual, Teamwork and Fun, and they view themselves as carrying out their values fairly well at work in general.

Observation.

The OCI results are consistent with my observations. The relationships among people felt very comfortable. Staff members at ILC worked well as a team with low observable stress overall. They appeared to enjoy their work, and are easy-going but reliable and cooperative. They celebrate members' birthdays with cheerful songs, cards, and home-made cake – including me. They were very accountable – they seldom missed my request or complaints even if trivial (like printing problems). The administrative process was very clear and prompt (my office space was fully prepared when I arrived). The director kept checking on me and other staff members. When I had a problem with the housing office, everybody told me that they would fight on my behalf. I truly enjoyed the people.

I agree with the qualitative comment section of the OCI results that openness is one of their strengths. People became approachable to me, physically and psychologically. Everybody including Dr. K always expressed that they were a phone call away and I could knock on the door anytime. During the interviews, faculty members raised their own opinions no matter how Dr. K and others might think. They said anybody in the center could raise different opinions or complaints to anybody. Indeed, during interviews people often said, "I know that xxx wouldn't agree with me but…." Aware that what they said would be shared with other members, they were not afraid to have different opinions.

Although I heard and perceived an uncomfortable relationship between ILC and other parts of IBSE, including rivalry relationship with Department of Organizational Behavior and with school management concerning money matters, the inside was calm.

Aligned culture: theories in practice.

This friendly and family-like culture at ILC can be compared to Dr. K's

concepts/theories in organizational culture, and family business.   I will use ILC,

established and developed by Dr. K, to describe the culture by linking between theories

and data to examine how his theories are aligned with his practice.

Authentic and vital organization

Dr. K states that he pursues a participative and inclusive culture where voices are

afforded to everybody and people feel good. This is what he conceptualized as

"*authentic and vital*" organization (compromised title). This seems to be actualized for

the people that I spent time with at ILC. Looking into the Organizational Culture

Indicator (OCI) result, ILC has characteristics of an *authentic and vital* organization,

"where leaders 'walk the talk', people feel alive and all are called to give their very best."

Dr. K maintains that this is the organization that the 21st century requires.

> The first *[authentic]* conveys the idea that the organization is authentic. In its
> broadest sense, the word authentic describes something that conforms to fact and
> is therefore worthy of trust and reliance. As a workplace label, authenticity
> implies that the organization has a compelling connective quality for its
> employees in its vision, mission, culture, and structure. The organization's
> leadership has communicated clearly and convincingly not only the how but also
> the why, revealing meaning in each person's task. These are the kinds of
> organizations where people find a sense of flow; where they feel complete and
> alive.
>
> The *[vital]* means "vital to life." In the organizational context, it describes the
> way in which people are invigorated by their work. People in organizations to
> which the *[vital]* label can be applied feel a sense of balance and completeness. In
> such organizations, the human need for exploration, closely associated with
> cognition and learning, is met. The *[vital]* element of this type of organization
> allows for self-assertion in the work place and produces a sense of effectiveness
> and competency, of autonomy, initiative, creativity, entrepreneurship, and
> industry. (p. 110)

According to that definition, ILC seems to be an *authentic and vital* organization. OCI results indicate that their positive perception on the gap between their value and practice shows they feel they are on track. It is also found that people "enjoy" their work and they appreciate their open communication and teamwork. Some staff members have worked with Dr. K for nearly 20 years. Those I met at the center expressed their satisfaction at work in terms of their jobs, work-life balance, flexibility, work atmosphere, relationships with colleagues and leaders, etc.

Dr. K's *authentic and vital* organization focuses on people rather than on how a company becomes more profitable. The core of his theory is to return the person to organizational studies. He criticizes current organizational studies as too concerned with systems and structure instead of seeing organizations of people. This idea is well demonstrated in his practice alongside the OCI results. As he does not stress competitiveness in the theory, the members value competitiveness lowest amongst 12 categories. However, from my observation and interview, he is prone to believe that *authentic and vital* organizations are competitive, and that ILC is competitive in that sense. He is proud to be people-oriented and develop employees in his practice.

Family business.

One of Dr. K's specialties is family business. The ILC involves his family or family-like members. His wife, daughters, son-in-law and close friends are coaches at ICL or attend LCP. My impression was that ILC is family-friendly. I frequently met staff and faculty members' family members on and off campus. Staff members bring their children or partners to hang out at the office or have meals at a school restaurant. I have seen almost all the family members of staff and faculty members who live in France

in such a short period. The relationships among faculty, staff, and members to me resemble a kinship. They keep work-life balance by perforating the borderline between the two, not by perfectly isolating one from the other.

Aligned culture: coaching culture

In addition to the theoretical perspectives, ILC is a prosperous coaching center. As a counselor and coach, I often wonder if I practice what I teach in my private and professional life. As an insider, I frequently observe, directly and indirectly, how helping professionals are not helpful in everyday-life.

I was surprised, then, as ILC faculty members and coaches were good coaches to me, even though I am not and was not their client. They were good listeners and supporters, and used coaching skills such as clarification questions or paraphrasing. They use coaching patterns to me, a nervous observer; they kept checking my physical and psychological well-being.

Shallotte and other professors also expressed their willingness to help me in my study. A professor in the Department of Family Business who worked closely with ILC bought me dinner and promised help for my dissertation project in any way. Another post-doc fellow said that she got a lot of personal coaching from Shallotte. It appeared that everyone at ILC was attentive and willing to help.

Aligned culture: crossing boundaries

This generally stable, open and congenial atmosphere grounds unorthodox and innovative techniques. ILC is a multi-, cross-, trans- cultural place. The coaches have specialties in multiple areas, and program directors have advanced degrees in multiple disciplines such as M.D. and MBA, or extensive professional experience in diverse field

such as finance or human resource management. The nationality and spoken language also vary. This diversity practically matches the clients' diverse regional, industrial, and language needs.

Everyone including staff members in the center speaks at least two languages fluently and has transnational experience. Axel, for example, is a European coach who speaks German, English, French and Spanish or more; has been trained in his country and England and practiced in France as a physician, pediatrician and psychotherapist; and received MBA from IBSE to become an executive coach; he is not unusual, but typical, in this place. Even considering the special conditions of the European Union and IBSE, which support international exchange and integration, faculty and staff members are already cross-cultural. The only exception is the distinct French-ness of contracted staff, such as security, and the geographic context (although the center stresses that it is not French).

In terms of nationality and language, where you are from is no more than a subject of curiosity. People tried to learn about my country. My being in France, studying in the US and living in Korea was not very special because people as well as students there frequently cross national borders. Although the official language at IBSE is English, it is a second language to everyone but Steve, Shallotte and Mary in the center. Those three also had to learn French to run everyday life. Dr. K says he has accents in every language he speaks including his mother tongue. They all truly understood what speaking a second language was like, which made me less nervous.

In terms of discipline, like Dr. K, many coaches are professionally trained or have work experience in psychology as well as management. The LCP program itself strives to

bring concepts and theories from any field. However, some of ILC coaches think it to be

limited by a heavy tradition in psychoanalysis although faculty members argued they

were eclectic. It is not sure if it is the presumption due to the title, internationally certified

psychoanalyst, of the faculty or actual practice. In addition to faculty members' training

backgrounds, serious psychoanalysts are invited to LCP. Dr. K is definitely a

psychoanalyst, but Steve and Philip demonstrated general understanding of other

psychotherapies in my opinion. The faculty members have a shared anchor but it could

create presumption that they excessively lean to it. This criticism might be inevitable,

because no person or organization does everything equally well.

Risk-taking and challenging culture

Just like literature, people at the ILC think that the boundary between

psychotherapy and coaching is blurry and needs to be separated.   Dr. K imposes very

high standards for coaches, including broad and deep understandings of several

approaches in psychotherapy and the ability to monitor one's own transference and

counter transference. He emphasizes a psychological background for coaches but

believes that alone is not enough.

However, Dr. K has the most liberal opinion among faculty members on using

psychological intervention in coaching sessions. For example, Dr. K mentioned using the

"empty chair" experiment[1], which is originally used in Gestalt therapy, in LCP, implying

---

[1] The empty chair technique is described as follows by therapists: "The empty chair is probably the best
know and most widely used Gestalt technique, is one with tremendous power. In the hands of an expert it
looks very simple: the patient is instructed to move back and forth between two seats or positions which
represent tow different aspects of himself or the relationship between himself and another person and
engage in a dialogue. The therapist sometimes simply watches this without comment or indicates that the
time has come to change seats. Sometimes he repeats the patient's words or gives him encouragement to
continue. Sometimes he asks the patient to repeat his own words or exaggerate what he is saying or doing,
calls attention to posture or tome of voice, or suggests sentences to say. These seem to be non-demanding

that students should use it in their practice. From my experience, it is a powerful

technique, so is a bit dangerous for non-clinicians to use. Steve and Phillip tried to be

clear that it is to enhance students' own self-awareness within LCP only, if they use for

LCP. However, Dr. K did not see it as a problem; he maintains that many people do

harm by doing nothing. This is the logic of experiment-experience-expert: to become an

expert, you make a mistake at the beginning, you will learn from it and do better. Beyond

discipline matters, faculty members say that they are willing to take risks for change.

They accept that not all techniques were successful, and sometimes guest professors

"dropped a bomb."

I learned that open culture is rough on the bottom – openness is bred on

assertiveness. The students, staff and faculty members stress that you can freely bring

complaints, different opinions and perspectives. However, the atmosphere sometimes felt

aggressive to me, especially in workshop and the 10th anniversary forum. The LCP

graduates naturally raised challenging questions during class and negative feedback to

professors on stage. I was shocked because it was different from ILC's work culture and

my experiences at my schools, and I even felt sympathy with the speaker. After I

inquired, Shallotte answered that this is part of LCP's unique culture. I also heard that

LCP students speak frankly and straightforward about each other and faculty members

during reflection sessions, even with criticism. From the scene at the forum, I could

imagine what happens in LCP.   This might have been experienced as tensions. However,

or simple therapeutic tasks, yet extensive skill is required, including sensitivity to non-verbal cues, knowledge of available techniques, ability to deal with resistance and understanding of process. The techniques themselves evoke strong emotion which, when accurately focused, resolves impasses, finishes old business, and heals polarities and splits so that the patient has not just a powerful experience, but a powerfully healing experience. Much of the skill of the expert is in making this very complicated and delicate process appear easy and inevitable." (Fagan et al., 1974)

among LCP participants, those tensions are brought to the instructors as a natural part of the learning process. LCP itself normally includes such tensions, along with resolutions.

The last session of the forum was the discussion for LCP's future. The discussion leader came to gently ask me to leave because the last session should be only for faculty members and LCP graduates. Although I was fully welcomed in many contexts, they said directly "no" when they needed, so I was more comfortable.

Leadership

A founder's influence on organizational culture is very critical (Schein, 1985). This section focuses on an essential aspect of ILC and LCP: Dr. K. He is ILC. Although ILC has a unique culture and other faculty members contribute to LCP, a significant portion of the phenomenon is explained by Dr. K's philosophy, knowledge, and background. I gathered information from interviews with him and the ILC staff, as well as his autobiographies. My personal experience with him also gave me several characteristics, which also informs the background of how he has conceptualized and developed the coaching field and programs.

Rebellious Explorer

Dr. K is a hunter. His autobiography is filled with his hunting stories throughout his life. His offices and home are literally full of taxidermy trophies. His being a hunter was easy for me to overlook as I had wanted to look to him as a coach and educator, but then he went on a trip to the Amazon to fish during my fieldwork period, and I have lately realized that this was a good metaphor for him.

Dr. K's early childhood memory with a big bull represents how he has created his field in spite of oppression. He was born and raised in a small Dutch village. One day, he

was missing with his cousin and dramatically found in the middle of nowhere. He wrote

the story like this;

> From the dubious safety of one side of a small ditch, I was busily throwing stones at a big bull that was getting madder and madder. I still wonder whether I was trying to drive the bull away or was I the instigator of its fury – probably the latter. I don't remember why I was doing what I was doing…. This story was repeated to me many times over the years by my mother, who saw it as a metaphor for my attitude toward authority and 'bullies' – less sympathetically, my rebelliousness.. (2009, x.)

His rebelliousness, also described as "horror of orthodoxy"(2000), seems to have

driven him this far. He has pioneered a new field and aggressively pursues what he

wants. When he took up an unorthodox field after earning a doctorate, one of the power

holders in his department said that "[he] would never write anything." However, Dr. K

wrote in his 29th book, "One of the small pleasures in life is doing something people say

you will never do." (2009, xvii)

Dr. K is also a hunter exploring the wild:

> I've managed it by going on strange expeditions.... After glasnost, I was one of the first to travel to previously forbidden regions of the Russian Federation. I liked to explore the country's wild places, from Kamchatka, to Siberia, to the High Altai.... I get great pleasure from going to totally out of the way places where nobody else has been. (xi-xii)

Just as he goes on exploring the wild, he explores in intellectual dimensions. He

started a coaching practice, which was called "leadership coaching," 20 years ago. It was

before or around 1993, the time when a coaching firm, Coach U, claims to have

institutionalized coaching for the first time (Leonard & Laursen, 1998). To develop and

implement coaching programs, he came out of the "orthodox" department, Department of

Organizational Behavior, where he originally belonged and started exploring a new field.

His career path is also unusual. In pursuing his career, he moved from his home country to America, when the foreign student body was not big. He recalls, "My English was not good at that time. So I was scared to death. I did my best to avoid professors' eye contact during the class." He tried several programs and finally got a doctorate in business management. However, he could not get a professorship because he was a "deviant" working for "deviants." His advisor did not have enough political power to place him in the school. He moved back to Europe and then to North America to be trained in psychoanalysis. He crossed academic fields as often as he crossed national borders. Even after he landed at IBSE, his exploration into the unknown has continued.

Dr. K has even shown interest in my country, Korea. No one in New York asked about Korea that much, while he keeps asking me questions that even I myself have not thought about, and watched Korean movies and emailed me a short memo on them. He seems to be sincerely eager to explore new territory.

Practical academic.

IBSE is a highly structured academic institute whose faculty members are mostly from Ivy League schools and has a competitive position with top US business schools. European researchers regard IBSE as competing with US schools rather than European. When I sought admission to IBSE, one of the professors once advised me to become a strict student, reading and publishing academic articles, and then begin doing practical stuff in 20 years. My practice-oriented mind would hinder me from becoming a good member of IBSE. It seemed that academic and practical were conflicting opposites.

Dr. K also sees the importance of education in structured institutes. He approximates ten years at school to become a fully functional coach, five years in

psychology and five years in business management. His standards for coaches are very high, requiring knowledge and skills in various psychotherapies through guided rigorous training.

However, Dr. K's perspective is totally different from other professors. When I first asked his permission to do my dissertation project at ILC, I mentioned some theoretical frames. In reaction, he stressed not to abide by "theories," even though he has created numerous theories. I was a little puzzled because he is a professor at IBSE and I am a doctoral student assuming that academia is based upon theories.

Furthermore, he criticizes that academic research is often done only to satisfy other researchers' standards, alienating them from practice (2009). This forgets the noble purpose of applied schools that should do research at the edge of knowledge and help to create better organization. He points the reality of the clinical field, where clinicians and researchers are separated.

> Now, how much exposure do they [clinicians] have to the real people, as opposed to rats and stats, you know that's relative stats versus real people. And none of them… it's not 'either-or', its 'and-and' you see, yes, that's important. It was nice to have people who are interested in clinical psychology and also know how to do serious research but it's very often its either-or. (p.25)

He does not argue which has the primacy, practice or academic research. He argues, "business school research and the practical knowledge, that helps practitioners to create more effective organizations, should be cross-fertilizing." He describes himself as a bridge builder between disciplines. He also links practice and academic research, and his academic purpose is to help practitioners. In fact, he is a practitioner, a leadership coach, doing research in the leadership field. Academic and practical are not

contradictions for him. Thus, he holds high standards for both the practical and academic aspects for their respective and reciprocal virtue.

Although he emphasizes academic's touch on practice much more than many academics, he has contributed to academia more than the professors who disregard practice and practitioners. Thus, ILC is a materialistically successful leadership center working for practitioners, and also produces abundant, high-quality academic research.

Negotiator between ideal and reality.

Dr. K is somewhat stubborn in that he has very strong and clear opinions and the power to realize them. He has realized many ideals by breaking traditions, such as getting the master's degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology approved. However, he is not always fighting like a single-minded warrior; he is flexible enough to compromise to reality.

First he does not like assessments. He is a psychoanalyst who seldom works with assessment and statistics. However, he decided to develop some assessments to maintain ILC's competitiveness in the market, as other major leadership coaching centers developed them. ILC is a part of a business school, but it competes with for-profit leadership centers. Second, he is not good at quantitative research, so he hired the best person in that area and totally delegated those responsibilities. Third, funds for ILC were not forthcoming. Since ILC does not have control over the money that they make, he almost "begged on the knees" to get money from the school.

In explaining the founding of LCP, Dr. K points out that that was the time when the executive coaching business emerged. He had run coaching programs for 10 years and saw the right timing to launch LCP. Their effort to get the masters degree back is

also partly driven by external factors, as it is crucial to keep competitive in the market and take first-mover advantage. It took four years to convince school management to create a new policy, breaking tradition. To get approval, they are expanding the program by adding one more module and special arrangements such as supervision, even though the program as is has already been approved by the government for a master's degree. Dr. K gives extra effort to get what he wants.

Led by Dr. K, ILC has generated many new ideas and realized them in market-driven ways. They sometimes fight, push or negotiate with reality to realize their vision. They are realistic, action-oriented and flexible to create and maintain the unorthodox program in an academic structure.

Retirement.

Dr. K's retirement is approaching. After a near-fatal accident during a hunting trip in Kamchatka a few years ago, he started thinking about his future. He tried to change his direction from teaching toward writing and consulting. He often mentions retirement in public, saying "I am old. So you guys do this." Since 2008, he has published a reflection series covering what he has published thus far and including his own autobiography for the first time. He explicated that Steve and Philip are in charge of LCP: "it is their program." At my question about his succession plan, he regarded nine program directors, Shallotte and others as his successors. To my response "do you mean you need more than ten people to do what you have done?" he listed the strengths of each person. However, it seems that there is no one person who can replace him.

In his autobiography, he mentioned that he would not retire from life, only from IBSE. He will keep working with great energy. As he has created his own path so far, he will explore new territory and make a new path;

> Not only does my work involve teaching, writing, and playing with ideas, at IBSE, I have also developed one of the largest leadership coaching centers in the world. And, to hedge my bets, I also have my own consulting firm. I am well aware that there are some people who start their retirement long before they stop working but that way of behaving has never been attractive to me. I don't want to retire from something before I have something to retire to. I am always interested in doing new things. Furthermore, I also believe that age is only a number-a means of keeping track. As I play many roles in life, as long as my mind is functioning, I certainly will not retire. How can I retire from life? I know that sooner or later, I will die, but 'retirement' is not part of package. There are still too many things and places left to explore. As comedian George Burns said, 'You can't help getting older, but you don't have to get old.' (2009, xv-xvi)

Dr. K's leadership

As the famous business concept, "the knowing-doing gap" (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000), implies, an expert in leadership does not necessarily mean a good leader. From Dr. K's achievements, I had once imagined him as a dictator as the worst case to manage my fantasy about the leadership guru. How does he actually lead his people at ILC?

Inclusive leader

Dr. K believes that he has helped make a participative environment where people communicate freely. He wants them to call him when they are upset and say "this is not right." He is aware of his position as an authority figure in the school, but he wants people who work closely with him to say "you are full of garbage" because it is good for him. He even told me not to be too polite. He seems to want an inclusive organization. I was surprised when he expressed disagreement on the founding of LCP for the interview. Steve, Philip and others believe that the Coach Training Program for psychotherapists is the former form of LCP, but Dr. K expressed his disagreement after the 10th anniversary

forum. He did not seem to intervene with the declaration by the others before or after the public announcement.

Shallotte perceived his leadership as he said. She introduced me to his concept of the *organizational fool*, "a fool as a means of creating a counter-vailing power against the regressive forces inherent in leadership; in other words, to reinforce the leader's capacity for reality testing." She believes that Dr. K plays the role of mediator between leader and followers, brings to the surface certain conflicting themes and thereby allows both parties to deal with the issues at hand.

I have not had an opportunity to observe Dr. K practicing his role as leader or mediator, but I could imagine it from people's perceptions. Mary, his administrative assistant for 19 years, also appreciates that Dr. K is humorous and humanistic. When I had trouble approaching him because I was afraid of being stupid in front of him, people made fun of him: he speaks so fast with a strange accent, his mind is here and there, etc. In fact, he spoke same thing about himself in LCP's first class. In spite of their words, I could not lessen the worries. People took that naturally, and encouraged me to speak with him, ask him to speak slowly and ask for repetition. Shallotte told me that he has always answered repeated questions as if it is the first time. He never blamed her for last 18 years because of stupid questions. However, he gets angry and yells when her writing was not up to his expectation, for example. Then it is always followed by "let me help you." For the most part, he is perceived as a humanistic joker, maybe possessing the conditions of the organizational fool. He is humorous and warm, and a charismatic professor and leader. What impressed me the most is his transparency: what he says and

his people say about him, and what he writes are not much different, although there are some divergent opinions.

However it should be noted that the data that I collected are mostly from his immediate employees and many of them have worked for him for long time. What I could hear about Dr. K outside of the center were all about his academic performance like writing qualities etc.. My position, a visiting researcher and observer also might have affected my interaction with the center. This probably hindered me from accessing to another level of story.

Teacher/helper

Before he was a leader at ILC, he was a teacher. He was recognized as the best teacher at school several times and created and runs the most popular executive education programs. Outside of classroom, he stresses "learning" as a leader too as revealed through Organizational Culture Indicator above. This may be interpreted as part of the special nature of the coach group, and Shallotte attributes it to Dr. K.

Dr. K develops his people. Shallotte is a good example: "I think nobody at the school has developed anybody as far as I have done with Shallotte" says Dr. K. Shallotte started as a part-time typist at IBSE, but she is now working toward her doctorate in another university and she has better records than most professors of IBSE. She participated in LCP at his insistence, and that experienced transformed her. Dr. K is very proud of her. Even though she did not have an advanced degree, he developed her and put her in charge of research. In fact, IBSE hired researchers only on project basis by French law, but Dr. K pushed the school and put her in full-time permanent employment.

It was my first time meeting a research director without a master's or doctorate degree. Dr. K insists on her taking an important position in the center after him.

My case also does not seem to be usual. I am the first pre-doctoral student invited as a "visiting researcher;" a scholar with a doctoral degree is invited as a "visiting scholar," although there is no practical difference between the two titles. The center is open to people who really want to learn.

As mentioned above, just when I had the fear toward Dr. K, LCP class taught participants to be true to themselves and express emotion. So I discussed my own struggle with the staff that supported me. So I approached Dr. K, who responded, "I am proud of myself to be approachable by people, especially people like you." He invited me to his Paris office, showed me around the neighborhood, and chitchatted over lunch before our formal interview. After our formal interview, he even coached my career and introduced his wife, a coach at ILC, for further discussion.

He told me that he is available, his door is always open, call him whenever I have a question, do not try to be too polite, and so forth. I felt a lot more comfortable with him after all, and came to know that he was sincere with his invitations. He referred to the famous tale of the sea stars showing his philosophy as a teacher:

> thousands of sea stars on the beach and the person is taking his dog for a walk and he sees the old man taking one sea star at a time and throw it back in the water and he goes to this old man and asks, "What are you doing? So many of them thousands, you can't make a difference." it certainly makes a difference with this one, [the old man responded.]

> So that's what a teacher is, you know you open the doors, you help people. You can't go in … the people have to go through the doors themselves, but you can open the door for them. And that's my next teaching, if you are fortunate in that respect; also it's a very good profession.

Academic entrepreneur

I have tried to describe Dr. K's characteristics above. In a book Dr. K co-authored, I found an exact summary of his characteristics:

> They are creative and imaginative, with high levels of energy and great perseverance, and they are willing to take calculated risks. These personal strengths enable them to transform a simple, even ill-defined, idea into something viable and real…. They do not like to be subjected to control and they dislike structures. They like to be independent and be in control… [the he] starts his own business generally does so because he is a difficult employee. He does not take kindly to suggestions or orders from other people and aspires most of all to run his own (p.112-113).

Here, "they" refers to entrepreneurs. In addition to this, above all aspects of his leadership, Dr. K is a good entrepreneur in relation to his definition. Indeed, he calls himself an academic entrepreneur who had developed a large leadership center. I have not investigated academic entrepreneurs before, but it seems to be very unusual to develop such a large institute within a school. More than 60 people including about ten full-time staff and faculty members belong to ILC under his direction, although their official employer is IBSE, and the center competes with for-profit leadership centers and serves 3,500 executives per year. Academically, entrepreneurship has been Dr. K's specialty for more than 30 years. He wanted to help entrepreneurs' practice, and he himself has walked the path of entrepreneur in academia.

Chapter V.

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter analyzes the data presented in Chapter 5 and presents applications and the data's limitations, and concludes with some suggestions for future research.

Interpretative Summary of Findings

My research focuses on three factors: 1) Integration of psychology and organizational studies in Leadership Coaching Program (LCP); 2) tensions found in the history of LCP and International Leadership Center (ILC); and 3) ILC's organizational culture and leadership as a major influence.

Integration of psychology and organizational studies

The multidisciplinary coaching approach works!

I started this study curious about the possibility and effectiveness of integrating psychology and organizational studies, which conflict in my experience and in literature. ILC and LCP have their own concept for this integration, the clinical paradigm. First, their clinical paradigm integrates multiple approaches with what appears to be good design and delivery. They stress that LCP is the only program taught by three psychoanalyst as well as faculty members at business schools. This integrative approach

made LCP unique and competitive in the market. Steve and Philip have strong

backgrounds in psychotherapy, so they teach psychological knowledge and skills well,

but very clearly explicate the boundary issues between therapy and coaching in class. Dr.

K has a better understanding of organizational context and cases of psychological issues

in organizational context. Each of them holds diverse perspectives, but those are well

situated in the program.

In introducing interventions, they used materials from various fields such as

organizational behavior, leadership, neuroscience, medical interview, interventions from

various psychotherapy approaches, and deep psychology. From my perspective, those

appeared to be presented almost seamlessly thanks to knowledgeable faculty members

who explained practical rationales and intellectual resources. Linking new knowledge

with participants' practice, the participants immediately have a chance in class to apply

new knowledge to real cases, no matter the field of each intervention. A clear orientation

toward practical purposes, instead of academic purposes, helps integrate psychology and

organizational studies without a major glitch. While faculty members presented solid

academic founding and background in the class, they are connected by practical studies.

This is partly because each faculty member has expertise and experience in

several areas. Dr. K especially has initially conceptualized the executive coaching,

leadership coaching at that time, program several decades ago and developed two

programs, so knowledge and skills from many disciplines are digested and reborn in his

clinical paradigm. Many coaches in ILC also have such unique combinations in their

career. Thus whatever tribal conflict may exist between psychology and business

disciplines has been internalized in each individual rather than externalized between groups of people.

However, it should be considered that this is the case under the right condition. This program, besides what stated above, has some usual circumstances surrounding founding and implementation of the program due to the charisma of the founder; and the participants selected already had strong business background.

1. It has minimal tensions and runs well.

However, it was not perfectly seamless. As Philip regrets, guest lecturers for the organizational strategy/behavior section should be revised. Besides discussion on curriculum, faculty members, coaches, and graduates agreed that the program is well designed and includes crucial elements to help practice. In terms of operation, this program runs smoothly with only two drop-outs for last 10 years, and high staff and faculty retention. This program is well-organized and stable. However, looking into the history, many tensions in the founding of the program were identified and it does not seem to be impossible that further tensions will arise when the founder retires.

2. The program is evaluated as a success

Besides curricular aspects, this program is perceived as entirely successful by study participants. LCP's success is measured in that it has been overbooked, with a high reputation among potential participants and in the school, IBSE, from a business perspective; participants regard the program very highly, introducing the program to their colleagues and participating in reunion events at participant level; it provides the ILC coach pool with high quality graduates.

In summary, the integrated approach, their clinical paradigm, functions well and attracts students. LCP and coaching programs at the leadership center at large are developed by faculty members and coaches who have expertise in both psychology and organizational studies, so I could not specifically identify tensions between psychologists and non-psychologists.

Ideally psychologists but business people in reality

If the integration is possible, is either professional group better prepared to become executive coaches than the other? The faculty members first failed training psychologists into executive coaches, but the program with business people turned out to be a "great success." Although the faculty members cannot articulate why, business people took the places where psychotherapists failed. Dr. K phrases this as, "psychologists ideally, but business people practically."

Why psychologists first?

Dr. K, Steve and Philip first chose psychologists to train executive coaches in the Coach Training Program. I myself also chose to first study counseling. The first and second modules of the LCP also teach counseling, and most coach training manuals include basic counseling skills such as active listening and interviewing. The LCP faculty members regard an understanding of psychology to be an essential component of coaching: Steve and Philip both earned a Ph.D. in clinical psychology, not business management. ILC's diploma and degree are offered in clinical organizational "psychology." When expanding LCP, they seek faculty members who have advanced training in psychology, with a nuanced "understanding" of business.

However, the clientele are close to business consulting, and executive coaching is a "business" involving monetary transactions. As Steve and Philip explained, the psychologists trained to work in organization settings in CTP did well in the program but had difficulty creating a business. They would have stopped even before seeing a client. Philip pointed at that they did not understand the "language" and culture in organizations. For example, they did not know even that CEO stands for Chief Executive Officer. Consequently, they could not communicate well with clientele and members of the organization by maintaining the communication strategy they used with patients in clinics. The psychologists could not understand organizational culture – they could not make a leap to another world.

<u>Why business people?</u>

After the failure with psychologists, faculty members began targeting business people such as HR/learning professionals, line managers and coach/consultants. This change met with "great success." Steve said that it is easier to teach business people about executive coaching than psychologists. He could not pinpoint a reason, but he mentioned that the attitudes of business people were more open, eager and ready to learn. As psychologists kept their ways, business people also have a tendency to apply what works to everywhere, so they are less cautious in using interventions, for example, which worries therapists. Some of the participants expressed their worries that those therapeutic interventions are available for non-clinicians, and I share these worries. The faculty members combat this by often clarifying what therapeutic interventions could be used in which contexts and for which populations. According to Dr. K's logic, participants

become experts – in coaching– through experience, although I still think this is a bit
dangerous for potential clients of the participants.

Steve and Philip state that the coach training program for psychotherapists was
successful as a program, but psychotherapist-coaches were unable to launch coaching
businesses. Coaches need to get new clients, while clinicians are sought by patients.
Psychotherapy has developed the system over last 100 years, and people are rather
familiar with the service. However, coaching is a new field requiring introduction and
marketing. It is unusually lucky for coaches to meet clients who have an understanding
of and need for coaching, and approach the coach, as Steve and Philip were first offered
jobs. Otherwise, coaches must find their first business.

Regarding the therapist behavior that is unwelcome in business settings,
psychologists trained through CTP demonstrate a need to be noticed at the business
meetings. Being a therapist could be a strength as well as a stigma that psychologists
should overcome in business settings. I again realized that some people have a fantasy
about therapists, that therapists would analyze what you say and evaluate the person.
Most coaching clients do not expect or want therapy, at least publically, and pay much
more money for the coaching service. So it is not necessary or even desirable to show an
expertise in therapy from the first meeting.

On the contrary, business consultation is for business, and it entails working with
companies for very high rates, so they must have a good idea how to deal with business
meetings, both for their clients' needs and their own needs as businesspeople. Coaches in
business context are more competitive in this aspect. Top consulting companies spend
tremendous amount of money for marketing, and all consultants must make professional

presentations. When I did outplacement consulting, I did many presentations and was often involved in marketing and negotiation. Coaches need to negotiate with clients for many things including money. This is a whole new set of job skills for clinicians as clinicians traditionally have control over the relationship with clients. Even if psychologist-coaches could do better in actual coaching sessions, business consultants are better prepared in getting accounts. Since coaching is not controlled by one absolute association like the APA, each coach's capability in this area will be essential for their success. In addition, business consultants and people in business already have accounts and a reputation. Already top management consulting companies provide or prepare coaching services. Executive coaching is a marketing wild west, where you need to aggressively plant flags.

Influences of occupational culture

Occupational cultures also make a difference in coaching. The business culture is quite different from that of clinicians. While risk-taking and challenging sprits are typically highly appreciated in business, "do no harm" is therapists' first norm. Clinicians are cautious and conservative in treating people. While business people are often told to adapt new approaches and try new things, psychologists tend to embrace tested methods. As executive coaching is a new field adjacent to psychotherapy and business consulting, business people seem to have an advantage in this aspect. I can imagine that while psychologists try to empirically prove and explain executive coaching, business people have already gained accounts.

ILC is an academic institute with a business mind. Dr. K is a good entrepreneur and tries to set up this environment. He pioneered new fields and keeps encouraging others to do so. Those at ILC take risks and try new things.

Influence of Organizational Culture: Culture and leadership

In-school center like an enterprise.

I first attempted to identify tensions, but at some point, I confirmed that my premise of tension was based on my own biases, and I started to look for a different side of the case. How can ILC and LCP run without the major tensions that are the norm in literature and my experience? I noticed their organizational culture and leadership.

My father once said, "Four eyes become normal among people with four eyes." I wonder if I am too acclimated to conflict in the field. During the fieldwork, I tried to figure out why nothing negative was happening, and finally I wondered why I had been in organizations full of problems and conflicts in the past.

The culture at ILC felt very ideal to me: people enjoy their work and have trustful relationship with colleagues, and take their culture for granted. They explicate that they like different opinions and even criticism from colleagues. The leader, Dr. K, was charismatic, but also shows his effort to be open for any opinion including criticism. However, externally, indeed, Dr. K had to fight against academics adhering to orthodoxy and organizational psychologists outside of the ILC, calling the situation where LCP confers a master's degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology an "outrageous scandal" by professors outside. However, those statements never affected the center and program negatively, and overcoming these voices provided more confidence to all who in the center. Management of tensions does depend greatly on the nature of leadership and

other political factors in the host environment. Therefore, it is my question whether other dynamics will arise when the founder retires, depending on how becomes the program's champion.

The first thing I noticed at ILC was its open communication and mature culture, which is due in part to Dr. K and also is a result of the entrepreneurship and leadership of its members. Openness is one of the important factors for effective organization. Although this is an in-school institute, it has many aspects of enterprise. Alongside an enjoyable work environment, ILC is a strong enterprise; the theorist director practices his theories, which came out of organization that he worked with as an external consultant. Lessons from organizations were theorized and the theories practiced in his organization.

Further, I think that ILC is an "*authentic and vital*" organization, and the leader has characteristics of "organizational fool." Dr. K argues that 21st century organizations should have these characteristics, and his center meets the standards. Also the Organizational Culture Indicator (OCI) results tell that ILC has values that reflect effective characteristics of executives in practice, and they are well implemented. Although the hybrid structure of ILC within IBSE and the situation of part-time coaches, staff members, researchers and faculty in different campuses are not unique compared to regular for-profit companies, the OCI result does not show a major difference with that of regular organizations besides putting relatively low priority on competitiveness. ILC and other programs that Dr. K is involved with are shaped by the qualities that he argues for in his books for business practitioners. From the outside LCP and ILC is typical educational program and institute.   However, the inside is more like an enterprise that

starts a new business, especially in a differentiated way, and develops the organization to achieve clear goals without losing the original purpose of the educational institute.

Second, this organization is well-aligned. Alignment is an important factor in business management. They value and appreciate diversity and difference explicitly, and respect each member's voice, while working harmoniously. The vision, leadership, organizational culture and products are all aligned. As he has strived to bring human factors in organizational studies, Dr. K's center is where people enjoy working in trustful and respectful relationships. Group coaching programs such as LCP, based on a deep understanding of human nature, care about each individual's well-being for high performance. The center steps toward one direction while embracing diverse ideas and people.

Leader as an entrepreneur.

Dr. K is a productive scholar and practitioner in leadership, psychoanalyst, leader-creating a people-centered organization, teacher and helper, and entrepreneur. These elements enable him to pioneer the coaching field and realize a coaching program at an educational institute. As debates and conflicts continue, executive coaching is situated in a gray space: coaches needs skills and understanding of psychotherapy as well as organizational dynamics; coaches are seen as practical and only recently academic; coaches require the skill sets of helping professionals as well as those of business persons. It might be hard to find a person or group of people possessing those skills, but Dr. K has all.

In some sense, I agree with the proposal that Dr. K invented executive coaching, although he did not claim this himself and I could not find any explicit mention of this in

literature. In fact, I had believed so several years after reading his book written in the 1990's, which describes how he group coached or counseled top executives and their families. He has gathered, developed and educated like-minded people and cultivated an entire field.

In addition to his solid academic basis, Dr. K is able to realize this new field through his entrepreneurship, which might be rare among academics and clinicians. His unique combination of skills, knowledge, credentials, and approaches are converged in this new field through the ILC and LCP.

In terms of personality, although Dr. K is humorous, humble, sincere and even funny, he is also courageous, as far as I experienced. His hunting represents his adventurous spirit and his psychological power. He is unafraid, and even enjoys things that make me afraid. A brave mind seemed to be a good metaphor of his exploring habit in the wild as well as intellectual arena.

 Double positions.

Shallotte, who has worked very closely with him for long time, said Dr. K likes to be "messy:" He brings many things into one pot and melts them together. For example, he seriously warns against compulsive helping or other negative temptations in unqualified coaching, but at the same time encourages beginners to experiment; he encourages me to find a post-doctoral researcher position after graduation while he criticizes current academia; he remains in an orthodox educational institute while abhorring orthodoxy. However, instead of keeping consistent, in black and white, he appears to have very situational, straddling or multi-dimensional opinions. Although he criticizes current academia, it does not necessarily mean that academia is bad. It was

hard for me to figure out what he really meant at first, but I came to understand that it is the power that he could combine contradictions and realize his ideals in a reality: he knows the ideals and also reality. For example, if he adhered to only theories, he would have not created programs like LCP. His world is messy like the executive coaching field.

The like-minded people.

Dr. K is unusual, LCP is unusual, and the people at ILC are also unusual. The unique interests and background covering psychology and organizational studies brought the faculty members and coaches together from different countries: Dr. K selected them, so he may have looked for people who shared his views. They all work under the same direction, but it is not one-sidedly given by a leader. Shared interest and visions provide the power to lead the center and the program. Their success could not be attributed to one person or one factor. From my viewpoint, everyone in the center plays a unique role and a leadership role. Everybody appeared to me to have characteristics of organizational fool and entrepreneur, and this seems to be the way the center of over 60 people has become a success.

Theoretical analysis: Organizational Culture

This organizational culture can be explained with theories and models from organizational culture presented in Chapter 2. Although ILC is within the academic community rather than a "regular" for-profit organization, and it is a sub-institute within a large school, IBSE, there seems to be no problem in ILC as an organization, nor with the director, Dr.K, as a leader, CEO and founder position in applying organizational theories. In reverse, this affirms my idea that ILC is like a regular enterprise. Thus, I

attempt to apply the framework introduced by scholars in organizational studies to my case.

Although it is still debatable whether organizational culture, leadership and performance are in positive relation, those are all related in this case. Among Berson et al.'s (2008) three typologies of organizational culture, ILC falls into Entrepreneurial dimension, which emphasizes creativity and a risk-taking environment, as well as the Supportive dimension, in which people are friendly, fair and helpful and enjoy a warm work place. ILC is never a Bureaucratic culture where rules, regulations and efficiency are emphasized.

This is related to the CEO's values, which stress Self-direction in Entrepreneurial culture and Benevolence in Supportive culture. The organizational culture at ILC reflects Dr.K's values. He developed his theory on organizational culture, *authentic and vital culture*, stressing Entrepreneurial (self-direction) and Supportive (Benevolence) culture. As Berson et al. (2008) reveal in their study, ILC has achieved external growth such as program popularity, growth in service products, revenue, and employee size, and organizational members are highly satisfied with their work according to the Organizational Culture Indicator and according to my own observation. Since ILC is not a Bureaucratic culture whose leader emphasizes Security, it is not associated with low employee satisfaction. According to Berson et al's parameter, ILC has all the characteristics of a positive organizational culture which leads to positive outcomes.

Schein's (1995) formulation of relationship between founder and organizational culture can be applied to this case (see p. 17). The ILC's unique organizational culture has been established according to the founder's biased ideas and values; a founding group

was created with people, faculty members for his coaching program, in consensus of the founders' idea; then they create and implement what founders think and the group agree; and lastly they bring others, staff members and coaches, according to what founding group considers necessary, and the group begins their own history upon the founder's ground. ILC and LCP has followed the formulation and is preparing to start a new chapter in their history without the founder.

Discussion and Interpretation

In this section, I offer a deeper level of interpretation incorporating findings, literature review, personal assumptions and experiences and relevant studies and theories. This helps us see data from somewhat different angles and with different lenses by critically stepping out of the research site. I will provide discussion on my assumptions and their justification, including tensions, culture-leadership, and entrepreneurship.

I began this study with negative assumptions, so I hoped to see my assumptions were not justified or predominant. I was skeptical because my assumptions were firmly rooted in my personal experience and literature. But this became an assumption-breaking journey for me. While I was there, I was mostly convinced by what I observed, but when I returned to desk, my assumptions and research questions became parameters that revealed a different side of my fieldwork. Some of my assumptions were partly or fully broken, but some are still open for question.

Tensions in hindsight.

Psychology and organizational expertise will conflict in coaching.

First of all, I assumed that the executive coaching program would include tensions stemming from the strict discipline, psychology. From my psychology training, I assumed that psychological knowledge and skills should only be shared and used by clinicians with rigorous training and professional approval, resulting in a strictly controlled discipline. From my counselor's viewpoint, I did not understand the teaching of advanced counseling skills to non-clinicians in a reputable school, and I thought that the strong and exclusive expertise of clinical psychology would conflict when it exceeded its boundaries.

I also assumed that people with expertise in psychology and people with business background would be divided, creating the tribal conflict presented in my literature review (Ozkan, 2009). This tendency was partially true in the case of the psychologists who participated in the Coach Training Program, designed for psychologists and led by Dr. K outside of IBSE. To train them into executive coaches, the faculty had chosen a typical professional group against other professional groups. They behaved exactly as they are criticized in literature: they were too naïve to work in business contexts, and tried to "treat" organizational members at work (Filipczak, 1998; Sherman & Freas, 2004).

However, this critique is invalid in other parts of ILC. Although the rate is low, Steve, Philip and Axel seem to have made a successful career transition from clinicians to coaches without specialized education. It would be easy for clinicians to run coaching sessions as I do, but teaching and training in a structured graduate school is a different story: the knowledge should be explicitly blended, and some knowledge, such as therapeutic approaches like the "empty chair," could be inappropriate to teach to non-

clinicians. In the classroom, instructors cannot make clear distinctions between "tribes."

At ILC, the clinicians reproduce non-clinician coaches using an approach that blends

clinical psychology, organizational studies and so on. I observed that the instructors' and

students' expertise in multiple academic disciplines did not foster tension at LCP. I even

imagined so far for the faculty members as to have expertise in the areas such as

management strategy to solve the problem with Module 6, Organizational Change part.

Knowledge and skills from multiple disciplines do not conflict in intervention as long as

all the faculty members have understanding of those areas. The both-handed would not

complain which hand is better. It was easier for LCP because all individual developers

and faculty are multidisciplinary.

I now think that integration would not create serious tensions unless stakeholders

split the coach groups and argued over primacy. Individuals matter, not their discipline

of their coaches. I suspect that the prohibitive cost of coaching, the lack of uniformity

worldwide, and the fact that LCP is also trendy and expensive, create tensions.   I suggest

further investigation on this.

Different program for different targets.

It still remains unanswered why the psychologists from the Coach Training

Program failed. Their lack of understanding of organizational culture and language is not

a complete explanation because Steve and Philip started their coaching careers without a

full understanding of organizational culture either. It might be due to the unique

characteristics of this particular group, or it might reflect the broader failure of

psychologists in my past experience with counselors in outplacement consulting settings.

I noticed that the coaching program curriculum was fixed and the target was changed. I

have no idea what the Coach Training Program was like, but I presume that it was not very different from LCP, as the faculty members claim that they changed targets instead of curriculum.

Business people have been successful in LCP unlike psychologists in the Coach Preparation Program. The survivors immediately generate desirable results after the program, which has resulted in stopping thinking about psychologists for executive coaches. The program is designed and taught by faculty members who have specialties in both psychology and organizational studies, which led to meaningful changes in business people.

LCP delivers useful content to business people who are unfamiliar with psychology topics like basic counseling theories, skills and psychological interventions. As those students are already familiar with business context and the psychology content is new to them, mastery must boost their motivation. In contrast, that content might feel redundant, repetitive or too easy to psychologists so that they were overconfident about their readiness for executive coaching and showed less motivation to learn. I was interested in the program and wished to participate in it, but I am not sure if I would recommend this program to someone with psychological training, investing such time and money to learn things with which they are mostly familiar.

The ground program, Leadership Challenge, was designed for and had been proven by top executives for a decade before LCP. Dr. K's original intention in becoming a coach was to help executives like his entrepreneur family members. Thus, intrinsically, LCP might be more suitable for business people than psychologists.

As a reason for the psychotherapists' failure, Steve and Philip point to the lack of understanding of business context and an inability to create businesses. The faculty members assumed that the therapists would already understand the business context, but business might be a whole new world to therapists. There is no actual data on whether the Coach Training Program was good enough to turn psychotherapists into executive coaches and about how fit the failed psychologists were later, so it would be a leap to say who would become a better coach. In terms of attitude, value set, business skills and understanding of the context, business people seemingly have a better position, while psychotherapists have an appropriate skill-set to lead coaching sessions.

To make the transition, the psychotherapists might have needed something else. If they were trained in a different way, perhaps in an MBA-like program, the result may have been different. Axel, a psychotherapist, physician and coach, earned an MBA to become a coach for ILC; Steve had worked in military researching leadership for long time; and Philip had first worked as a psychological advisor for companies. Their psychological backgrounds were gained through traditional therapist trainings rather than a special program for coaching, but it was married to extensive contact with business culture. I imagine that if the failed psychologist tried an MBA program instead of Coach Training Program, they would have different results.

Business skills vs. psychological skills: tacit and explicit knowledge.

What could have been provided for psychologists? I consider the structure of knowledge and skill in both areas. The psychological skills that business people need are better systemized. In its long history, psychologists developed training programs to cover various skills. Korean and US psychologists are trained in a scientist-practitioner model,

making them researchers and professors, with authority to generate and deliver knowledge and as active clinicians. The training rubric is well established. What I learned from counseling programs, what executive coaching class included at my school, and what LCP taught did not widely vary over time and space. Additionally, my counseling program taught me how to write a contract, to deal with difficult clients, choose words based on context and population, write a counseling log and meeting minutes, and talk to clients or referees over the phone. Those skills are explicated andhanded down to students in school and through extensive practicum. Teaching psychological skills is nothing special in academia.

However, basic business skills – such as how to make a business proposal and presentation, make a deal, negotiate for a better contract, and generally behave like an entrepreneur – are not obtained only in academia. Unlike clinic settings, business settings are open to everyone, so the knowledge is not generated and handed down through selective channels. Professors and researchers in business management are mostly not business practitioners. Many companies teach skills to new employees through training programs, apprenticeship or on-the-job training, or new members learn naturally in organizational context. Such business skills mostly remain tacit among practitioners (V Marsick & Watkins, 2001). It does not seem to be an area that academic training has covered. This might be the reason LCP requires preceding work experience for candidates.

Thus, the psychological skills that are well-articulated and systemized by psychologists trained in scientist-practitioner model benefit business men whose

knowledge still remain tacit. Where and what can psychologists learn to become

executive coaches?

As executive coaching attends to individual needs, coach education programs also

require a "fit." LCP suits business people better, so the program has continued, whereas

the experiment for psychologists was discontinued for an unclear reason. If faculty

members have had strengths in business, so the program might have included more

content regarding organizational dynamics and business skills, and the result might have

been different.

People are different: occupational norms and culture.

I also had a binary definition of people in certain occupational groups as business

people versus clinicians or academics. I assumed that psychologists, clinicians, and

academics prefer boundaries more than business practitioners for various reasons. This

assumption is supported in Dr. K's academic history and the complaints of professors in

the organizational behavior department claiming that "organizational psychology" is their

territory. However, LCP overcame the social norm or assumptions and went a new

direction by creating a new, blended discipline: Clinical Organizational Psychology. In

fact, there seems to be a wide gap between those two groups, psychologist coaches, a

tribal conflict (Ozkan, 2008). Killburg (2000) also mentioned that those two groups have

different sets of value. I witnessed the difference in their attitude.

The knowledge and skill that each group has makes the differences. Indeed, the

occupational cultures make a difference as long as they keep stick to their own standards

and norm. The unique culture and the founder's influence of ILC overcame clinical

culture where "do no harm" is the first norm. I saw the entrepreneurship and the unique

organizational culture at the cutting edge. Their challenging spirit, strong dedication,

flexibility and market-orientation created synergy with their expertise in psychology.

The in-school institute, ILC, differentiated it from other groups of people inside the

school, too. Because they are different, LCP cultivates this unique program. LCP creates

success with students who do not take boundaries seriously, by adhering to the real

problems that students face. Indeed, the culture at LCP made a difference before the

skills and knowledge.

 Institutional basics.

  Psychologists' ethical codes and first norm, "do no harm," protects clients. But

Dr. K maintains that many people do harm by doing nothing. Both philosophies try to

help people. The purpose of norms and interventions are altogether to help people.

Strictly trained to keep ethical codes, I hesitate to bring psychological knowledge and

skills out of a clinical counseling setting. However, if it does not harm people or even

help them, can I use the interventions in non-clinical settings? "Why not?" implied LCP

faculty members. In non-clinical settings, a well-trained and confident practitioner with

limits could use clinical interventions on mentally healthy people to help personal and

professional growth. Although not formally trained in psychology, professionals who

have experienced various relationships at work could have a degree of skill with

counseling techniques. What would be the problem with teaching such professionals

some therapeutic interventions to help their clients or trainees? In fact, Dr. K said, "You

could make a mistake at first but you will learn and do better and become an expert." It

might be true many practitioners in all fields make mistakes in the way to become experts.

Yet, the counselors that I worked with in outplacement settings failed, leaving scars on their clients' minds. They were hurt by immaturely practicing interventions. The counselor-consultants tried to console and treat outplaced executives and the clients were upset by their attempts to diagnose and treat. Challenges are beneficial in any field, but it needs some internal or external restraint, which do not yet exist. Not all the experiences are educative, as John Dewey (1910) suggests.

Indeed, even Dr. K warns against compulsive helpers without adequate qualification; he does not ignore ethical issues in coaching. To him, the key is confidence to take a "calculated" risk whenever possible. LCP and faculty members are writing a new, fuzzy guideline on coaching and its boundary, and are teaching it to the students.

Tensions outside of ILC: Sampling limitation

Contrary to my expectations, I could not find major tensions in ILC. However, my limitations might have been partly responsible. I learned about complaints outside of ILC and LCP regarding the executive master's degree that was offered at the end of my fieldwork, but I could not probe it further for several reasons: 1) I surely assumed to find tensions within LCP or ILC easily, so I did not plan to get samples outside of ILC. My IRB application did not include people outside of the institute, ILC, so I was not sure if it was appropriate to include them in my study. 2) I did not actively seek a connection with the complainants once I learned that they had negative opinions against the situation involving the people who were helping me. This might have had something to do with my personal or cultural barriers. I also wondered if the complainants would offer information and frank opinion without embarrassment. 3) I talked to some of LCP

students regarding this but could not include it in my study because of IBSE's research regulation preventing students from being research subjects. If I had not limited myself, I could gather more data on tensions. In fact, I stopped my effort to find tensions transgressing the boundaries. I, a researcher, must have been conscious about the boundary issues in many aspects. Once I learned that there is uncomfortable emotion from either side, I could not go further. However, due to lack of information on tensions, I was able to focus on the organizational culture and leaders in ILC.

Organizational culture and leadership.

The success of LCP has been explained through the unique combination of skills and knowledge in psychology and organizational studies, but this does not fully explain their success. The combination of attitudes rather than specific knowledge and skills seems to be more important along with Dr. K's personal reputation and word of mouth. Dr. K has a stronger specialty in organizational studies than Steve and Philip, but they did not have divergent perspectives on the multidisciplinary approach and have been remarkably successful as faculty within IBSE. Although the degree differs, they all have similar attitudes toward the eclectic approach. Together they built open, challenging and risk-taking minds – entrepreneurship – alongside their expertise, making the boundaries between disciplines meaningless. They use the mindsets of serious clinicians and scholars as well as business men.

Outstanding founder.

Dr. K heavily influences the organizational culture of ILC. Although several aspects of LCP lead to its success, as stated so far, I wonder if LCP would even be possible without Dr. K. He has cultivated executive coaching in academic boundaries,

collected like-minded people and established a system. He has an ideal combination of academic backgrounds and characteristics as an executive coach and coach educator.

The school took time and effort. Growing executive coaching within an academic boundary is difficult without avoiding the limitation of traditional disciplines. Dr. K has defended himself while pioneering this new field, which is parallel to the experience of most coaches. It took more than 20 years for him to see his product – much of his life.

In addition to his ability and personal characteristics, I also attribute LCP's success to Dr. K's high credentials. Although he works in a gray area and has not gotten much support from his *alma mater*, his credentials are from top level institutes. In combating authorities, his orthodox credentials might have helped support him. I wonder if he could reach that far if he got a degree in a mediocre university in his country. Dr. K showed how executive coaching is rooted in academia. Indeed, there seems to be no tenured professor to replace Dr. K in their radar at that moment, and I wonder how LCP and ILC will continue beyond Dr. K.

Outstanding institute.

Just as Dr. K is outstanding, the IBSE also deserves its high reputation. This status and its medical school hospital-like system also enable LCP and ILC to be independent from larger professional associations. Coaches can choose from hundreds of certifying agencies. Without affiliating with associations like the International Coach Federation, LCP and ILC together provide what professionals want for their practice and what service buyers want in their coaches, and it will be in more demand with the executive master's degree with additional training like supervision. The executive master's degree from IBSE would attract service buyers.

The ground of success: business mind or entrepreneurship.

By overcoming orthodoxy and with the privilege of reputations and system, LCP and Dr. K reached an ideal. The most basic factor of their success is their spirit, attitude, or culture. Thus, psychologist-coaches might need more than certain knowledge and skills, such as a sense of entrepreneurship that cannot be obtained through text books. This attitude could be teachable, but using models more like corporate training than LCP. Perhaps a business school can teach the personal attitude better than LCP. LCP transforms many students' lives, but can it change people to be more business-oriented?

This seems possible, but LCP is oriented the opposite way – person oriented rather than work oriented. However, many companies desire more business-minded team members, like IT companies that set many programs to help engineers sell products to clients. Yet, it is important how psychologists see the necessity of such mind.

Perhaps the answer lies with the unique feature of the LCP and Dr. K's entrepreneurship – the contradictions. They are adventurous but aware of danger; they set very high standards for coaching qualification but are generous in using therapeutic interventions; they pursue academic zeal but are also concerned with practice; they appear to be well organized and aligned but welcome confusion and mess; the leader is an influential authority but not an authoritarian.

Great leader and aftermath: Dependency on one person

Although Dr. K is a great founder and leader and ILC is like an enterprise and involves many family members in its business, he and ILC are absolutely a part of IBSE, the higher education institute, not a private business entity. Succession in even family business is a rough task, according to him. It is often reported that even successful in-

school institutes/center/facilities can hardly survive after a founder's retirement (V

Marsick, 2010)). Impressed by the culture and Dr. K's leadership, I became curious and

even worried about Dr. K's retirement. His interests are moving him to his own

consulting firm, and I wondered how ILC would prepare leaders after Dr. K, not only as a

director but also as a star professor. Nobody gave me a clear answer and did not know,

either; this issue seems to be totally pending.

On an optimistic note, LCP is popular among faculty members in IBSE, and two

faculty members each year go through the program. They could become advocates for

the program within the school. Dr. K and his programs and the center have written a

unique and unusual history, so the aftermath will be another experiment for them. I look

forward to a follow-up study.

Flexible alignments

Executive coaching is roughly defined as an individualized developmental

intervention for executives to realize organizational benefits, which is differentiated from

business consulting and psychotherapy. However, coaches disagree over the basic

founding, including the definition: why they are hired, what they do, and how to measure

their success. Many think that the field should clarify definitions, qualifications and

measurement standards on coaching effectiveness, in a context in which executive

coaching helps executives become more flexible in an uncertain and changing business

environment. The executive coaching field is full of contradictions. Nevertheless,

executive coaching has gained popularity and some coaches seem to enjoy financial

success and prestige. I questioned whether executive coaching should be uniformly

defined and controlled, but the amorphous character seems to be a core premise of executive coaching.

While I was in the research site, I found the ground of LCP and ILC are also in flux with many diverse perspectives, just as the entire executive coaching field. The faculty and staff keep moving and changing, but their strong belief in the clinical paradigm and their eclectic approach to coaching allow for flexibility. They are proud of their curriculum, but open to change. I noticed many discrepancies in respondents' interpretation of historical events; however, they did not try to clarify or draw agreement, they left the story "messy". While I noticed different interpretations and understandings of their own program and its ground, the respondents gave me an impression that they are very transparent and consistent. What they publically argue through research publications is exactly realized in the field, although they know that they could improve many aspects. The program and organization are well-structured and stable, but felt somewhat loose because they are flexible. They say they keep changing themselves and are always open to evolution, just like executive coaching

Dr. K could be a standard for people being coached by him. He practices his theories as a person and as a leader. He keeps core competencies as an entrepreneur as he wrote. He prepares proactively for a major change, retirement. He moves promptly and bravely out of IBSE, his achievements, when it is still in peak. I think he is a good coach for himself.

Furthermore, the organizational members are well aligned. They definitely have divergent opinions and the freedom to raise their own voices, and at the same time their attitude is cooperative and trustful. There are authorities but no authoritarian.

One difference from the current coaching field that I noticed is that they have minimal internal tensions. Although the faculty members do agree that coaching needs a normative qualification process, distinctions between adjacent interventions, and empirical research proving the effectiveness of coaching, these opinions did not turn into tensions. They do not look down on any group in the coaching field. Instead, they attempt to set their own standards, even create field standards, and share their experience through their own publications and external studies. The tensions in faculty members' career history and outside of ILC promote their development, and the positive result endows confidence for further evolution.

ILC and LCP share many characteristics of the current executive coaching field and differentiate it from the field in some points. Tensions in human society might be inevitable, and not entirely negative. ILC and LCP are examples of how inevitable tensions could be also turned into developmental models, and become a ground of growth.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Applications

I have concluded that LCP is worthwhile for coaches and coach trainers who intended to include psychology in their approach. First of all, the well-woven curriculum, facilitation and operation serve as an example of how to teach psychology in business context. Without other research available, it is good to investigate the real case, which has run for 10 years. Beyond the surface level, this study suggests coach educators consider how to select their target group, how to cultivate organizational, faculty or classroom culture, and how to envision executive coaching.

<u>Training target and program development.</u>

When educators choose between targeting people with a psychology background or people in a business context, they should remember that each group needs different training, and putting them together will motivate one group less than the other. LCP appears to be better for business people, and psychologists need a different curriculum. However, faculty members should have understanding of both areas to both relate to their students and access the curriculum. Thus, cross-field teaching seems to be ideal.

<u>Organizational culture.</u>

As *authentic and vital* organizational culture grounds the multidisciplinary intervention, and how the classroom culture and/or faculty leadership are established is important. As coaching is a new field with no absolute professional association, how leaders or instructors put direction appears to be important. LCP faculty members' understanding of aspects of executive coaching matched market needs. If the faculty group is not specialized in both areas, it might be necessary to assess gaps and find ways to complement their capabilities in other ways. What is sure is that executive coaching is a business, not a part of clinical practice, and new intervention needs new leadership and culture.

<u>Limitations</u>

<u>Regional and contextual limitations.</u>

This case study suggests directions and details to which executive coaches or coach educators can refer, but readers should consider the limitations. First, regional characteristics should be considered. I only experienced three countries, Korea, the US, and France (Europe), but the power and influence of psychologists' association varies. It

is unlikely that a US business school could offer a master's degree in psychology. Educational systems are also different.   Even within France, French schools might have different regulations. IBSE is an independent business school, so universities have relationships with other department such as psychology and regulations or ideas dealing with cross-discipline programs.

The findings are collected, organized, and represented absolutely by a biased researcher from a different national, cultural, and personal context. Thus, cultural, legal, systemic and emotional contexts should be considered before application.

Implemental limitations.

The establishment of the program relies on one person, Dr. K, along with remarkable faculty members. Even if similar programs are possible in a certain school system, it would not be easy to find experts with such high specialties and credentials. Executive coaches with an advanced degree in at least one field and deep understanding of other fields might be able to run the program. As executive coaching is in the process of entering into the academic community, we could see more people with multiple specialties, making a group of people from multiple disciplines to answer the needs of coaching more realistic.

Conclusion

Clinical paradigm: a success of integration.

I started this study with curiosity and doubts. However, my research has shown that integration of psychology and organizational study under the "clinical paradigm" for coach preparation is possible with minimal internal tensions and with "great success."

LCP integrates psychotherapy and business consulting by teaching business people the clinical paradigm, integrating ideas from various disciplines when appropriate. However, the program and the founder have experienced tensions due to its unorthodoxy and its educational target. In addition, organizational psychologists in the school complain that Clinical Organizational Psychology is their field, not LCP. However, they overcame those challenges and the program yields positive results in its popularity and reputation, in the participants' lives, and in getting three psychoanalysts in the faculty body of IBSE. Now, to be able to confer an executive master's degree in Clinical Organizational Psychology is another high accolade.

It was initially possible because of Dr. K's specialty, academic achievement, years of experimental experience, and continual challenge. Dr. K sets the tone and all the faculty members with various academic backgrounds and interests share the core ideas, although they hold different perspectives on some issues.

In making ILC a world-class leadership center, the staff, faculty and coaches altogether create an *authentic and vital* organizational culture, which alleviates the boundaries and makes the integration possible. They share certain characteristics, such as "organizational fool," enjoy their work and contribute to the organizational success. It is both an in-school leadership center and an entrepreneur competing with for-profit leadership centers around the world.

Crossing borderlines.

Some dividing lines in executive coaching were obvious, like disciplines and nationality to me, and some were realized later during or after the fieldwork. My fieldwork helped me visualize perforating border lines. The border lines between

psychotherapy and business consulting, academic and practice, academic pursuit and market-orientation, challenge and caution, leaders and followers, work and life, orthodoxy and unorthodoxy, external reputation and internal accreditation, and language and nationality, are all able to be crossed to flow well and blend. But it is not a melting pot image where everything is mixed up without recognizable origins: the faculty members are aware of where each element came from and teach them to LPC participants.

Faculty enjoy playing with boundaries, dealing with contradictions and complements. Dr. K's characteristics and achievements are converged as an academic entrepreneur. Most faculty and staff members share his mindset, and it is well actualized in their practice. They pioneered a new field and kept challenging the existing boundaries.

However, I still question about the degree of extent to which border lines can be blurred: How far can we, as coaching practitioners, be free from the lines? The integration has been successful, but ethical issues, such as using therapeutic interventions in non-therapeutic settings, still come in my mind. According to Dr. K's logic, participants become experts in coaching through experience, although I still think this is a bit dangerous for potential clients of the participants. This might be an issue that the whole executive coaching community currently embraces.

No universal solution.

As executive coaching rejects universal solutions, so this case is singular. In spite of their success, the ILC and LCP might be deficient in some situations. Indeed, their unorthodox and eclectic program is enviable in the field. However, as the executive coaching market grows and service buyers have a better understanding and buying

standards, coaches will follow LCP's success by actively adapting their interventions to meet the needs in the market, as many other preparation programs have already. LCP presents the possibilities for coaching and coach education programs.

Even though there must be issues left such as ethical issues in coaching, roles of therapists and coaches, and qualification and certification, I do not judge these to undermine the fundamental approach of the LCP.

In terms of application, this case can serve many executive coaches and coach educators as a success case or exemplar, especially considering that research done about practice in the interface between psychology and business management is uncommon. However, contextual uniqueness should be remembered. IBSE is unique in that it is independent international business school in France, with no need to consider the relationship with other departments or schools. Also, the academic and professional combinations and high credentials of the founder, which is the cornerstone of LPC, are necessary and rare. Therefore, this case could be examined and interpreted in the context of each coach and coach educator.

Suggestions for future research

Executive coaching has been more an area of practice than research. I suggest more studies be fielded to picture what is really happen in coaching. The LCP and ILC are absolutely worthwhile for further study. This program has many points to give lessons for executive coaches and coach educators no matter what kind of coaching they pursue. Thus, in the future I would like to see the in-depth studies of many aspects of coaching, including specific outcomes of executive coaching. In fact, some relevant studies are on-going within ILC now.

From the program's perspective, since critical changes are happening and planned, follow-up study will be interesting, especially studies that focus on the impact of the return of master's degree; the scheduled retirement of the leader; the program's expansion to other campuses.

In addition to LCP and ILC, it would be beneficial to see how other coaching programs are developed and operated. Although executive coaching is never the same in two cases, more case studies can offer better insights to executive coaches and coach educators. The studied program is developed and run by psychologists and business professors in business schools, and is suitable for business people, so I would like to see other approaches with different targets and settings.

Executive coaching is an emerging intervention with a growing popularity. For its healthy development, it needs scholarly attention and research alongside practice so that coaching can be supported by sound research and generate practical theories. Grounded in sound research and theories, executive coaching will benefit practitioners as well as service buyers. Coach preparation should also reflect these needs to continue the coaching phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. D. (2001). *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Altheide, D., & Johnson, J. (1998). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 283-312). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *The Journal of Management Studies, 39*(5), 619.

Amit, V. (2000). *Constructing the field : ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Anderson, S. L., & Betz, N. E. (2001). Sources of Social Self-Efficacy Expectations: Their Measurement and Relation to Career Development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(1), 98-117.

Argyris, C. (1993). *On organizational learning*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.

Atkinson, P., & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's Immortality: The Interview Society and the Invention of the Self. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(3), 304-325.

Bacon, T. R., & Spear, K. I. (2003). *Adaptive coaching : the art and practice of a client-centered approach to performance improvement* (1st ed.). Palo Alto, Calif.: Davies-Black.

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership : industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., & U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership : an inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria, Va.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Bateson, M. C. (1994). *Peripheral visions : learning along the way* (1st ed.). New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Bebchuk, L., & Grinstein, Y. (2005). The Growth of Executive Pay. *Oxf Rev Econ Policy, 21*(2), 283-303.

Becker, H., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization, 16*, 28-32.

Berglas, S. (2002). The very real dangers of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review, 80*(6), 86-92.

Berman, W. H., & Bradt, G. (2006). Executive coaching and consulting: "Different strokes for different folks". *Professional Psychology-Research and Practice, 37*(3), 244-253.

Berson, Y., Oreg, S., & Dvir, T. (2008). CEO values, organizational culture and firm outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*(5), 615-633.

Bono, J., Purvanova, R., Towler, A., & Peterson, D. B. (2009). A survey of executive coaching practices. *Personnel Psychology, 62*, 361-404.

Bradford, L. P. (1964). *T-Group theory and laboratory method; innovation in re-education*. New York,: Wiley.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brotman, L. E., Liberi, W. P., & Wasylyshyn, K. M. (1998). Executive coaching: The need for standards of competence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 50*(1), 40-46.

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Chase, S. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. xix, 1210 p.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cicourel, A. V. (1964). *Method and measurement in sociology*. [New York]: Free Press of Glencoe.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (1986). *Writing culture : the poetics and politics of ethnography : a School of American Research advanced seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, A. (1992). Self-conscious anthropology. In J. Okely & H. Callaway (Eds.), *Anthropology and autobiography* (pp. 221-241). London: Routledge.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (2001). *Lives in context : the art of life history research*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Coutu, D., & Kauffman, C. (2009). The realities of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review Business Report*, 32.

Coutu, D., Kauffman, C., Charan, R., Peterson, D. B., Maccoby, M., Scoular, P. A., et al. (2009). What can coaches do for you? *Harvard Business Review, 87*, 91-97.

Coutu, D., Kauffman, C., Charan, R., Peterson, D. B., Maccoby, M., Scoular, P. A., et al. (Writer). (2009). What Can Coaches Do for You? [Article], *Harvard Business Review*: Harvard Business School Publication Corp.

Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations : theory, research, and practice* (1st ed.). San Francisco, Calif.: Berrett-Koehler.

Curtin, M., & Fossey, E. (2007). Appraising the trustworthiness of qualitative studies: Guidelines for occupational therapists. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 54*(2), 88-94.

Davies, C. A. (2008). *Reflexive ethnography : a guide to researching selves and others* (2nd ed.). London ; New York: Routledge.

Davis, J., Watson, N., & Cunningham-Burley, S. (2000). Learning the lives of disabled children: Developing a reflexive approach. In P. M. Christensen & A. James (Eds.), *Research with children : perspectives and practices* (pp. 201-224). London ; New York: Falmer Press.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures : the rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Dean, M., & Meyer, A. (2002). Executive coaching: In search of a model. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(2), 1-15.

Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., & Goelzer, P. (2004). Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness: Is Asia Different From the Rest of the World? *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(1), 98.

Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a Theory of Organizational Culture and Effectiveness. *Organization Science, 6*(2), 204-223.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act in sociology: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. London,: Butterworths.

Denzin, N. K. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research, 1*(1), 23-46.

Dess, G. G., Ireland, R. D., Zahra, S. A., Floyd, S. W., Janney, J. J., & Lane, P. J. (2003). Emerging Issues in Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management, 29*(3), 351-378.

Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston,: D.C. Heath & Co.

Ducharme, M. J. (2004). The Cognitive-Behavioral Approach to Executive Coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56*(4), 214-224.

Economist, T. (2003, November 13 2003). Corporate therapy. *The Economist*.

Ellis, C., & Bochner. (2000). Autoethongraphy, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fagan, J., Lauver, D., Smith, S., Deloach, S., Katz, M., & Wood, E. (1974). Critical Incidents in the Empty Chair. *The Counseling Psychologist, 4*(4), 33-42.

Feldman, D. C., & Lankau, M. J. (2005). Executive coaching: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 829-848.

Fey, C. F., & Denison, D. R. (2003). Organizational Culture and Effectiveness: Can American Theory Be Applied in Russia? *Organization Science, 14*(6), 686-706.

Filipczak, B. (1998). The executive coach: Helper or healer? *Training Megazine, 35*, 30-36.

Finlay, L. (2003). The reflexive journey: Mapping multiple routes. In L. Finlay & B. Gough (Eds.), *Reflexivity : a practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences* (pp. 3-20). Malden, MA: Blackwell Science.

Fitzgerald, C., & Berger, J. (2002). *Executive coaching: Practice and perspectives*. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Fitzgerald, C., & Berger, J. G. (2002). *Executive coaching : practices & perspectives* (1st ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Pub.

Fontana, A. (2003). Postmodern trends in interviwing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 51-65). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Foxhall, K. (2002). More psychologists attracted to the executive coaching field. *Monitor on Psychology, 33*(4).

Fritsch, J., & Power, C. (2006). *Similarities and differences in organizational coaching program between the U.S. government and Fortune 500 companies.* Paper presented at the the fourth International Coach Federation Coaching Research Symposium, Lexington, KY.

Frost, P. J. (1985). *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Frost, P. J. (1991). *Reframing organizational culture*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Gagliardi, P. (1990). *Symbols and artifacts : views of the corporate landscape*. Berlin ; New York: W. de Gruyter.

Gallwey, W. T. (1974). *The inner game of tennis* ([1st ed.). New York,: Random House.

Garman, A. N., Whiston, D. L., & Zlatoper, K. W. (2000). Media perceptions of executive coaching and the formal preparation of coaches. [Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal]. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 52*(3), 201-205.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures : selected essays*. New York,: Basic Books.

Gillespie, M. A., Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., Smerek, R., & Neale, W. S. (2008). Linking organizational culture and customer satisfaction: Results from two companies in different industries. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology, 17*(1), 112-132.

Golembiewski, R. T., & Blumberg, A. (1977). *Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach : readings about concepts and applications* (3d ed.). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Gray, D. E. (2006). Executive coaching: Towards a dynamic alliance of psychotherapy and transformative learning processes. *Management Learning, 37*(4), 475-497.

Griffin, M. (2006). The executive coaching trend: towards more flexible executives. *Leadershio and Organizational development Journal, 27*(7), 584-596.

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997). *Culture, power, place : explorations in critical anthropology*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Guth, W., & Ginsburg, A. (1990). Corporate enterpreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 5-15.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography : principles in practice* (3rd ed.). London ; New York: Routledge.

Hart, V., Blattner, J., & Leipsic, S. (2001). Coaching Versus Therapy: A Perspective. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(4), 229-237.

Hatch, M. J. (1993). The Dynamics of Organizational Culture. *The Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 657-693.

Heath, S., & Street, B. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research* New York: Teachers College Press.

Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership : tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Press.

Higgs, J. (2001). Charting standpoints in qualitative research. In J. Higgs, H. Byrne-Armstrong & D. Horsfall (Eds.), *Critical moments in qualitative research* (pp. 44-67). Oxford ; Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hill, C., & Jones, G. (2008). *Strategic management theory: An integrated approach*. Marson, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Huggler, A. (2007). *CEOs on the couch: Building the therapeutic coaching alliance in psychoanalytically informed executive coaching.* Fielding Graduate University, California.

Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship: The Construct and its Dimensions. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 963-989.

Jackson, M. (1989). *Paths toward a clearing : radical empiricism and ethnographic inquiry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jarvis, J. (2004). *Coaching and buying coaching services: A guide* (No. 2995). London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

Joo, B.-K. (2005). Executive Coaching: A Conceptual Framework From an Integrative Review of Practice and Research. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(4), 462-488.

Judge, W. Q., & Cowell, J. (1997). The brave new world of executive coaching. (cover story). *Business Horizons, 40*(4), 71.

Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(4), 205-228.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads : the mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, J., & Slocum, J. W., Jr. (1987). Managing Corporate Culture Through Reward Systems. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 1*(2), 99.

Kets de Vries, M. (2005). Leadership group coaching in action: The Zen of creating high performance teams. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*(1), 61-75.

Kets de Vries, M., & Balazs, K. (2005). Organizations as Optical Illusions:: A Clinical Perspective on Organizational Consultation. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*(1), 1-17.

Kets de Vries, M., & Korotov, K. (2007). Creating Transformational Executive Education Programs. [Article]. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6*, 375-387.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1991). *Organizations on the couch : clinical perspectives on organizational behavior and change* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kilburg, R. R. (2000). *Executive coaching : developing managerial wisdom in a world of chaos*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Kilburg, R. R., & Levinson, H. (2008). Executive dilemmas: Coaching and the professional perspectives of Harry Levinson. [Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal]. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(1), 7-32.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change : how leadership differs from management*. New York; London: Free Press ;Collier Macmillan.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York; Toronto: Free Press ;Maxwell Macmillan Canada ;Maxwell Macmillan International.

Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2007). *Organizational behavior* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture; a critical review of concepts and definitions*. Cambridge, Mass.,: The Museum.

Laske, O. E. (1999). An integrated model of developmental coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 51*(3), 139-159.

Leonard, T. J., & Laursen, B. (1998). *The portable coach : 28 surefire strategies for business and personal success*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Lieberson, S., & O'Connor, J. F. (1972). Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Study of Large Corporations. *American Sociological Review, 37*(2), 117-130.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Lindsley, D. H., Brass, D. J., & Thomas, J. B. (1995). Efficacy-Performance Spirals: A Multilevel Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 645-678.

Lowman, R. L. (2001). Constructing a literature from case studies: Promise and limitations of the method. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(2), 119-123.

Lowman, R. L. (2005). Executive Coaching: The Road to Dodoville Needs Paving With More Than Good Assumptions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 57*(1), 90-96.

Maltbia, T. (2008). *Creating a coaching program: Our journey to date and where we are headed!* Paper presented at the Is Executive Coaching an Academic Discipline? Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/od_conf_2008/8

Marsick, V. (2010). Personal conversation. New York.

Marsick, V., & Watkins, K. (2001). Informal and incidental learning no. 89 (Spring 2001) p. 25-34. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no.89*, 25-34.

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations : three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. (2004). Organizational culture. Stanford University.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation : critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Michelman, P. (2004). *Methodology: Do you need an executive coach?*

Moen. (2006). Reflections on the narrative research approach. *International Journal of Qualitative Methodology, 5*(4), 1-11. Retrieved from www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_4/pdf/moen.pdf

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization* (Updated ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Morse, G. (2004). Executive Psychopaths. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(10), 20-22.

Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 220-235): Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

National Research Council (U.S.). Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research., Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods : qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Niemes, J. (2002). Discovering the Value of Executive Coaching as a Business Transformation Tool. *Journal of Organizational Excellence, 21*(4), 61-69.

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit. *The Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 487-516.

Okely, J., & Callaway, H. (1992). *Anthropology and autobiography*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A., & Tamkins, M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology* (Vol. 12): John Wiley & Sons, inc.

Ott, J. S. (1989). *The organizational culture perspective*. Chicago, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Ozkan, E. (2008). Executive coaching: Crafting a versatile self in corporate America. [Dissertation Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 69*(2-A), pp.

Passmore, J. (2007). An integrative model for executive coaching. [Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal]. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59*(1), 68-78.

Peltier, B. (2001). *The psychology of executive coaching : theory and application*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence : lessons from America's best-run companies* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. (2000). *The Knowing-Doing Gap: How Smart Companies Turn Knowledge into Action*: {Harvard Business School Press}.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE), 16*(2), 175.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep change : discovering the leader within*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rapley, T. (2004). Interviews. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 15-33). Thounsands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Raskin, P. (2009). Executive Coaching (Class at Teachers College, Columbia University ed.). New York.

Reilly, E., Spencer, D., & Jamrog, J. (2008). Coaching: A global survey of successful practices. Retrieved November 9, 2009, from American Management Association: http://www.amanet.org/training/webcasts/coaching-052908.aspx

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 923-948). Thousand Oak: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Sathe, V. (1983). Implications of corporate culture: A manager's guide to action. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(2), 5-23.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner : toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schein, E. H. (1995). The Role of the Founder in Creating Organizational Culture. *Family Business Review, 8*(3), 221-238.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 229-240.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sherman, S., & Freas, A. (2004). The wild west of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(11), 82-90.

Smith, S., & Watson, J. (2001). Life narrative: Definitions and distinctions; and autobiographical subjects. In S. Smith & J. Watson (Eds.), *Reading autobiography : a guide for interpreting life narratives* (pp. 1-48). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(1), 23-44.

Sperry, L. (2008). Executive coaching: An intervention, role function, or profession? [Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal]. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(1), 33-37.

Stacey, R. D. (1992). *Managing the unknowable : strategic boundaries between order and chaos in organizations* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & S. L. Yvonna (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Starr, L. (2008). Building Executive Coaching As An Academic Discipline: Establishing The Academic Community Database And Peer Review Of Proposed Academic Guidelines And Standards For Graduate Education In Executive Coaching 2008, from http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1005&context=od_working_papers

Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *The roaring nineties : a new history of the world's most prosperous decade* (1st ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.

Stober, D. R., & Grant, A. (2006). *Evidence based coaching handbook : putting best practices to work for your clients*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.

Tedlock, B. (1991). From Participant Observation to the Observation of Participation: The Emergence of Narrative Ethnography. *Journal of Anthropological Research, 47*(1), 69-94.

Thach, L., & Heinselman, T. (1999). Executive coaching defined. *Training & Development, 53*(3), 34-+.

Thomas, A. B. (1988). Does Leadership Make a Difference to Organizational Performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(3), 388-400.

Trinh, T. M.-H. (1989). *Woman, native, other : writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Trow, M. (1957). Comment on 'Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison'. *Human Organization, 16*, 33-35.

Turner, B. A. (1986). Sociological Aspects of Organizational Symbolism. *Organization Studies, 7*(2), 101-115.

Turner, V. W. (1986). *The anthropology of performance* (1st ed.). New York: PAJ Publications.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field : on writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vygotski*i, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge,: M.I.T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wallach, E. J. (1983). Individuals and organizations: The cultural match. *Training and Development Journal, 37*, 28-36.

Witherspoon, R., & White, R. P. (1996). Executive coaching: A continuum of roles. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 124-133.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data : description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: You are invited to participate in a research study on executive coach preparation program focused on the tensions caused by the multidisciplinary nature of the intervention. This research will be conducted by Hyun Jung KIM at International Leadership Center (pseudonym). You will be asked to share your experience, opinions and perspectives on executive coaching and its preparation programs during interviews and to permit me to sit in during classes and/or coaching sessions.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: This study may possibly benefit your practice by providing an opportunity to reflect and to learn from an outsider's perception of your practice. As a coach educator, you can help people learn from you. In case your institute's name may be used in publications based on the study, this study becomes another means to publicize your program. This study may cause some negative effects because of the fact that competitors know better about your program.

PAYMENTS: You will not receive payment for your participation.

DATA STORAGE TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY: Although future publications based on this study may use your institute's name, individual's name will absolutely not be used for this dissertation and publications. I will use pseudonyms in all products. All audio files, transcripts and research reports including your identifiers will be kept secure in my personal computer using security codes. All printouts and documents will be locked in my personal cabinet. Upon completion of study, audio and document files will be transferred to DVD and remain locked in my personal cabinet along with printouts.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 1 hour for interview. My class observation will not take your extra time.

HOW WILL RESULTS BE USED: The results of the study will be used for educational purposes: initially for a dissertation and eventually published in journal articles.

I have read and signed the attached **"Participant's Rights" form from Teachers College, Columbia University.**

Name (print):

Signature:

Date:

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

Principal Investigator: Hyun Jung KIM

Research Title: Executive coaching and its preparation program

• I have read and discussed the Research Description with the researcher. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the purposes and procedures regarding this study.

• My participation in research is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy to future medical care, employment, student status or other entitlements.

• The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his/her professional discretion.

• If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue to participate, the investigator will provide this information to me.

• Any information derived from the research project that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
• If at any time I have any questions regarding the research or my participation, I can contact the investigator, who will answer my questions. The investigator's phone number is int'l+82-10-5217-8980.

• If at any time I have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about my rights as a research subject, I should contact the Teachers College, Columbia University Institutional Review Board /IRB. The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4105. Or, I can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.

• I should receive a copy of the Research Description and this Participant's Rights document.

• If video and/or audio taping is part of this research, I ( ) consent to be audio/video taped. I ( ) do NOT consent to being video/audio taped. The written, video and/or audio taped materials will be viewed only by the principal investigator and members of the research team.

• Written, video and/or audio taped materials ( ) may be viewed in an educational setting outside the research ( ) may NOT be viewed in an educational setting outside the research.

• My signature means that I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature:_____ Date:__ /__ /__

Name:_____

Appendix 2. Sample Interview Protocols

Interview protocols are prepared for coaches, and the director.
All interview sessions will begin with 1) an introduction to the study, 2) an overview of the informed consent form, 3) an opportunity for questions regarding the study and the informed consent form, and 4) the interviewee's signature on the form.
Overview of interview

1) Interview with Coaches

Introduction :

In this study, I would like to learn about your executive coaching program and coach preparation program, focusing on the tensions created by the multidisciplinary nature of executive coaching. As you know, executive coaching often employs cross-disciplinary approaches. This is the case for the IBSE International Leadership center (ILC, peudonym) So during our sessions together, I would like to listen to your thoughts as a coach and then ask about your understanding of your coaching program and experiences as a coach at ILC.
Questions

Q 1. Tell me about yourself as a coach.

   a. What is/was your motivation to become a coach?
   b. What is your background?

Q 2. How would you describe your coaching approach?

   a. Please describe your coaching approach.
   b. Do you see your approach as multidisciplinary?
   c. Please share a story that shows how you coach an executive?

Q 3. Tell me about the institute's (ILC) approach.

   a. Please share your perceptions and understandings of ILC's approach.
   b. Do you see any divergence between your own approach and ILC's approach?

Q 4. Questions regarding tensions

   a. Have you ever experienced any tension in your coach experience because your or your institute's coaching approach crosses disciplines?

   b. Do you have any idea about how this program could be different?

Interview with the Director (conceptualizer/developer of the program and coaching model)

Introduction

I have learned from your publications that you incorporate organizational dynamics and psychoanalysis in your executive coaching at International Leadership Center and in your coach preparation program, Leadership Coaching Program. While I have gathered general information about your approach, I would like to hear about your experience incorporating multiple approaches in executive coaching.

Questions

Q1. Could you tell me about yourself as an executive coach and educator?

   a. I learned about how you conceptualize executive coaching from your publications. However, do you have anything to add, correct or emphasize?

Q 2. Please briefly introduce your coaching center and coach preparation program.

   a. What are the academic foundations of your approach?
   b. Please recount the founding of and major changes to the coaching program / coach prepration program.
   c. What do you consider your major accomplishment in the program?
   d. What has been your biggest struggle?

Q 3. Please describe your multidisciplinary practice?

   a. Have you experienced any tensions because of conflicting perspectives or conflicting people involved in the program? If any, please describe?

Q 4. What is your vision of and for executive coaching?

   a. What is your opinion on executive coaches' qualification and training?
   b. Do you have a recommendation for other coaches and coach educators with multidisciplinary approaches?
   c. What is your latest vision or opinion on executive coaching and coach prepration?

Appendix 3. Application form: Personal Essays

Please answer each essay topic listed below as completely and candidly as possible. Type your

answers on separate sheets of paper; each essay should bear your name on each page. From

question 3 to question 15, the length of the essays must be at least half a page.

QUESTION 1

Describe briefly all types of extra-professional activities in which you have been involved (associations, sports, arts, politics, etc). How are you enriched by these activities?

QUESTION 2
Describe briefly any significant international exposure you have had (long/short-term residence including childhood, professional assignments, etc).

QUESTION 3
Describe your current responsibilities. What do you like / dislike about your current position?

QUESTION 4
Why are you applying to this programme?
How will this programme contribute to the achievement of your professional objectives?

QUESTION 5
What achievement are you most proud of?

QUESTION 6
Describe a failure that you have experienced and comment on it.

QUESTION 7
Describe the sort of person you are (please be frank in elaborating on your strengths/weaknesses, likes/dislikes, skills/limitations, interests/values).

QUESTION 8
What do you like best/least about your life?

QUESTION 9
What are some of the more risky things you have done in your life?

QUESTION 10
If you could imagine an entirely different life from the one you have, what would you want to be or do?

QUESTION 11
Is there anyone who has especially influenced your choices in life? Is there anyone who you believe *you* have influenced?

QUESTION 12
Have you had some experience in the area of personal growth? Have you had a role in helping others to grow?

QUESTION 13
How do you see your future (your fantasies, dreams, goals, hopes, fears, as well as specific commitments and responsibilities you have undertaken)?

QUESTION 14
Why would you say that you are a good candidate for this programme?

QUESTION 15
Complete the following sentences:
- My parents always told me I should …
- The best measure of personal success is …
- The main driving force in my life is…
- I know that I will be successful if I …
- I am happiest and most satisfied when I …
- If could magically chose any career, I would become a … because …
- When I'm under pressure, I …
- What gets me into trouble is …

Appendix 4. Leadership Coaching Program: Program outline

(excerpt from the program brochure)

Module 1: Building foundations

Gain a theoretical and methodological foundation in the behavioural, clinical, cognitive, and psychoanalytical schools of thought that will be your base for subsequent modules.

— Conduct an initial assessment of your own organisation

— Learn to use psychodynamic concepts to explore the hidden dimensions of yourself and organisations

— Open the door to exploring the unknown

Module 2: Interpersonal perspectives

Expand your horizons on organisations as networks of inter and intrapersonal interactions.

— Make sense of your inner theatre

— Learn to understand both your own and others' emotions

— Increase your ability to recognise and diagnose key behaviours

— Discover techniques to regulate your emotions

Module 3: Organisational family systems

Change your understanding of how families shape our thinking and provide our first model of how organisations work in regard to decision making, control and rewards.

— Develop your ability to apply family systemic thinking in coaching and consulting

— Build your appreciation on the influence that your family has on your work

— Gain an understanding of the unique business and interpersonal challenges of advising family owned businesses

Module 4: Leadership dynamics

Explore the dynamics of leadership in diverse organisational contexts.

— Engage in comprehensive 360° feedback exercises examining your professional and personal leadership styles as well as a personality audit

— Use these insights to develop a personal leadership development plan

— Understand the differences between effective and ineffective leadership styles

— Better understand how to create high performance teams

Module 5: Groups and teams

Expand your perspective to gain a theoretical framework for understanding the psycho-socio dynamics of groups and teams by participating in an experiential learning exercise.

— Increase your understanding of group decision making, influence processes and multi-party team dynamics through an experiential learning simulation

— Learn to increase cohesiveness and effectiveness regarding tasks

— Understand the roles you play in a team

— Practice team coaching

Module 6: Organisational change

Learn how to think systematically and strategically by examining organisational resistance to change.

— Address the challenges of diagnosing and changing behaviour in organisations

— Gain insights on change from both classical and clinical perspectives

— Engage in an in-depth case consultation by presenting your change management study

Module 7: Transformational

Develop your own approach to change and transformation as well as understand the intricacies of interactions between the individual, group, organisation and the environment in the process of change.

— Navigate career transition

— Implement the new perspectives you have learned to develop a unified and integrated change process