Leadership Coaching Digest

MAY 2016

SPONSORED BY: Meyler Campbell Clear Leaders

The ***Leadership Coaching Digest: Science to Practice*** is made possible through a generous contribution by Meyler Campbell and is published by the *Institute of Coaching*, McLean Hospital, Harvard Medical School affiliate.

P1:   Top three research articles in leadership coaching
P2:   Executive Summaries: Are you up to date?
P3-8   Deep Dive: Put the science to work for your practice and business

DO YOU KNOW:

THE MOST POWERFUL INGREDIENT IN COACHING?

Leading to effectiveness: Comparing dyadic coaching and group coaching.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: DATA SHOWS HOW WE ARE THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT

HOW THE DIGITAL WORLD REQUIRES A NEW COACH APPROACH?

A pluralistic approach to coaching.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: A BIG STEP UP IN CO-CREATING A COACHING RELATIONSHIP

THE PATHWAYS FROM TEAM EMPOWERMENT TO PERFORMANCE?

Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: TEAM COACHES WERE MORE EFFECTIVE THAN EXTERNAL MANAGERS

Science to Practice: Carol Kauffman PhD, Founder/Executive Director IOC
Research selection: Irina Todorova PhD, Director of Research IOC

© Institute of Coaching
LEADERSHIP COACHING DIGEST
EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES: ARE YOU UP TO DATE?

Leading to effectiveness: Comparing dyadic coaching and group coaching.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: WE ARE THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT
In the search for the "active ingredient" that leads to effective coaching, these researchers found that the coach's leadership behaviors were the key to greater effectiveness.

Both transactional leadership (clear expectations) and transformational leadership (individualized, respectful) were found to be central to effectiveness. The "who" of the coach is as important as what we do. Therefore, we need to focus on our personal leadership growth as much as our professional development.

The study examined the impact of 3 interventions: 1) Goal setting only; 2) Goal setting in one to one coaching; or 3) group coaching. While dyadic coaching was more effective than group coaching, these differences were insignificant compared to coach leadership behavior.

A pluralistic approach to coaching.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: A BIG STEP UP IN CO-CREATING A COACHING RELATIONSHIP

Our world has become more complex and emergent. A digitized culture of horizontal vs. vertical knowledge sharing has become the norm. As business relational dynamics change, coaching dynamics may need to follow and become even more collaborative and diverse. Co-authorship of knowledge is common, and co-ownership of coaching may become the new paradigm

The traditional coaching model is for the client to lead the "what" e.g. the content covered, and for the coaches lead the "how," or the process, framework and models. In the new model, coaches invite the client deeper into the process to help choose the approach and the processes. To coach more effectively in a complex business environment, coaches need to practice higher levels of collaboration and develop greater cognitive agility to harness multiple approaches.

Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches.
SCIENCE TO PRACTICE: TEAM COACHES WERE MORE EFFECTIVE THAN EXTERNAL MANAGERS

In response to today's environment, empowered teams that shift leadership to the team members rather than a team leader is the new normal. Leadership now requires a step into a facilitation mode to help the team "lead itself" and develop the team's motivation.

Who seems to do this better? When comparing external team leaders and team coaches, the coaching led to greater outcomes. Why? It is harder for the external managers to adopt a coach approach. Two conclusions follow: team coaching is effective AND there is a clear clarion call to train managers in coach approaches.

IOC FELLOWS: write info@InstituteofCoaching.org for complete articles.

Leading to effectiveness: Comparing dyadic coaching and group coaching. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,*

51(2), 198-230 Mühlberger, M.D & Traut-Mattausch, E (2015).
A pluralistic approach to coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist, 11*(1), 46-52. Utry, Z A, Palmer, S, McLeod, J & Cooper, M (2015)
Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(1), 109-123 Rapp, T. L., Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Ruddy, T. (2016).

LEADERSHIP COACHING DIGEST
THE DEEP DIVE: PUT THE SCIENCE TO WORK FOR YOUR PRACTICE AND BUSINESS

Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 2015

Leading to effectiveness: Comparing dyadic coaching and group coaching.
Mühlberger, M. D., & Traut-Mattausch, E. (2015) *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 51*(2), 198-230.

AUTHORS ABSTRACT

Although numerous studies have shown that coaching works, the search for the "active ingredients" of successful coaching is ongoing. The authors argue that the coach's transactional and transformational leadership behavior contributes to coaching effectiveness.

In an experimental study on reducing procrastination, participants (*N* = 108) defined individual goals related to procrastination. They were then randomly assigned to a dyadic coaching session, a group coaching session, or a control group (who identified two "SMART" goals). Procrastination was reduced in all conditions, but participants in the two coaching sessions were better at attaining their individual goals.

Furthermore, compared with participants who received group coaching, participants in the dyadic coaching had a higher increase in goal commitment and showed more goal reflection and higher intrinsic goal motivation.

Mediation analyses further revealed that the differences between dyadic and group coaching were explained by the coach's transformational and transactional leadership behavior.

SCIENCE TO PRACTICE

WE AE THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT

In the search for the "active ingredient" that leads to effective coaching these researchers found that the coach's leadership behaviors were the key to greater effectiveness.

Both transactional leadership (clear expectations) and transformational leadership (individualized, respectful) was found to be central to effectiveness. The "who" of the coach is as important as what we do. Therefore, we need to focus on our personal leadership growth as much as our professional development.

The study examined the impact of 3 interventions: 1) Goal setting only; 2) Goal setting in one to one coaching; or 3) a group coaching. While dyadic coaching (2) was more effective than group coaching (3) these differences were insignificant compared to coach leadership behavior.

Background: This article explores the impact of individual and group coaching in comparison to one SMART session for the control group. The authors also offer excellent thought leadership and the paper is well worth reading. Remarkably the authors found that just one coaching session had a measurable impact.

Points for practice:

- Our personal leadership development is key. Who we are is a highly active ingredient to coaching success. We need to increase our self-awareness of our leadership as well as our coaching style.

- Respectfully challenging client assumptions stimulated creative ideas. Doing this helped with "commitment to goals and goal self-efficacy." A stimulating intellectual environment helped the clients' commitment to their goals and belief they could do so successfully.

- What is described as "transactional" leadership is key. These are the core basics: clear contract, clarity of goals and contingent rewards. We know this, but it's good to have research support.

- Measuring the transformational leadership is more complex, but providing an individualized relationship and the intellectual stimulation were effective.

- Dyadic coaching seemed more effective than group coaching, but when you looked at the active ingredients of both, leadership behaviors were the pivotal factor.

- Group coaching seemed to have more "inspirational" leadership than the one to one coaching. So our challenge is to find the best balance between the benefits of both individual and group coaching to maximize the use of both.

Last, we can often have one question in our minds, and miss the other important information staring at us. In this article the overlooked gem is how the authors conceptualized and broke down what success looks like. The authors used goal theory as a springboard to thinking about coaching effectiveness. They looked at the following aspects of goal: motivation, commitment, self-efficacy, attainment and self-reflection. Unpacking this allows us to think more expansively about how we look at progress in an evidenced-based and richer way.

Advanced Coach Development

The Coaching Psychologist 2015

A pluralistic approach to coaching. (2015) Utry, Z. A., Palmer, S., McLeod, J., & Cooper, M. *The Coaching Psychologist, 11*(1), 46-52.

AUTHORS ABSTRACT
A pluralistic approach to coaching and coaching psychology is proposed, based on Cooper and McLeod's (2011) pluralistic counseling and psychotherapy. Since we live in increasing complexity, it can be assumed that there are many right

ways to coach.

The pluralistic approach suggests that instead of leaving the coach responsible for choosing the right interventions for their clients, it might be better not just to trust the client with the content, but to actively encourage the client to co-determine the process.

Setting up a feedback culture, and regular meta-communication, may make it more likely that high quality decision-making will be realized in practice. Such an approach also helps to develop the client's collaborative capacity, which is in high demand in work and business. A pluralistic coaching approach resonates with the current zeitgeist's values: of desiring both autonomy and belonging.

SCIENCE TO PRACTICE

A BIG STEP UP IN CO-CREATING THE COACHING RELATIONSHIP. Our world has become more complex and emergent. A digitized culture of horizontal vs. vertical knowledge sharing has become the norm. As business relational dynamics change, coaching dynamics may need to follow and become even more collaborative and diverse. Co-authorship of knowledge is common, and co-ownership of coaching may become the new paradigm.

The traditional coaching model is for the client to lead the "what," e.g. the content covered, and for the coaches to lead the "how," or the process, framework and models. In the new model, coaches invite the client deeper into the process to help choose the approach and the processes. To do this, and to coach more effectively in a complex business environment, coaches need agility to harness multiple approaches.

DEEPER DIVE

Background:
Collaboration between coach and client is brought to a new level with a pluralistic approach. The cultural impact of digitalization (*digimodernism*) has shifted expectations of equality and coaching needs to integrate more of this culture. One benefit of this approach is it builds some of the very skills most leaders need to develop and to collaboratively engage in identifying goals, solutions and pathways forward.

What does the step up from collaborative to co-ownership of coaching look like?

Points for practice:
In putting a pluralistic perspective into practice:

- Can we find ways to collaborate more deeply? As clients become more sophisticated we can engage in a level of questioning that invites them to make choices about frameworks, models or intervention styles.

- We can step beyond typical collaboration into deeper collaborative dialogue about the processes of coaching, and regular "meta conversations" about their perceptions of the coaching process.

- Can we share the ownership of coaching even more than we have so far? Comfort with these ideas may help us work with those growing up in a digital culture.

- Are there ways we can adapt our style and coaching process more fully to suit the preferences of our clients? Where is our growth edge?

Team and Group Coaching

The Leadership Quarterly 2016

Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches. Rapp, T. L., Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Ruddy, T. (2016). *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(1), 109-123. (Full text is available to members)

AUTHORS ABSTRACT

We examine the influence of two sources of team leadership – formally assigned external team leaders and team coaches, along with organizational and team-based human resource (HR) supports – on team empowerment, processes, and performance.

Using survey measures and temporally lagged objective performance indices from 70 service teams and applying structural equation modeling, the results indicate that coaches significantly influence team empowerment, and thereby team processes and performance whereas external team leaders do not.

Findings also indicate that HR and organizational supports relate positively to team empowerment and that the effect of coaches on empowerment is beyond the effects of HR and organizational supports, team interdependence, and external team leaders. Directions for future research and application are discussed in terms of using team coaches in addition to traditional leaders for teams adopting new work arrangements. 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

SCIENCE TO PRACTICE

Background: This paper has an extensive literature review that can be the basis for presentations on team coaching. It offers many perspectives on team functioning, and unpacks the nature of teams, how they work and what can help. Forms of leadership in "empowered teams" are discussed, where leadership is distributed and the members take the responsibility for leading the team.

There were two groups of team leaders: external managers who continued to be involved with the team and; team coaches brought in to support the empowerment and processes of the teams. HR supports and organizational support was available. The team coaches with team based leadership were most effective in helping to create team empowerment which improved team processes and led to greater team performance

Points for practice: The finding that the external team coaches had a positive impact on team empowerment has important implications for coaches:

- Evidenced-based marketing: Coaches can share that research supports that team coaches are effective in supporting empowered teams, and teams in general.

- In coaching teams, a useful focus is team empowerment. This in turn leads to better team processes and greater performance.

- One reason the external team leaders were not as effective as coaches is their difficulty in shifting from a command & control to a collaborate & cultivate talent. This highlights the clear need for leaders to learn coaching skills to expand their repertoire of leadership behaviors.

- The Dean of Harvard Business School and others describe that 70% of all change initiatives fail and that a true shift to an empowerment model is complex and takes time. Involving team coaches can increase the likelihood of sustaining change.

References

Research Digest

Mühlberger, M. D., & Traut-Mattausch, E. (2015). Leading to effectiveness: Comparing dyadic coaching and group coaching. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 51*(2), 198-230.

Rapp, T. L., Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Ruddy, T. (2016). Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(1), 109-123.

Utry, Z. A., Palmer, S., McLeod, J., & Cooper, M. (2015). A pluralistic approach to coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist, 11*(1), 46-52.

Carol Kauffman, PhD is the Founder/Executive Director of the IOC, an Assistant Professor at Harvard Medical School, the Chief Supervisor of Meyler Campbell and a leadership coach with over 40,000 client hours.

Irina Todorova, PhD is the Director of Research at the IOC, a Lecturer at Harvard Medical School, an Adjunct Associate Professor at Northeastern University and a health psychologist and coach with special interest in narrative coaching and diversity.