

https://dspace.org/

The impact of the coaching preferences and perceptions of South African millennial leaders on the success of leadership coaching

Moodley, Lashan

2022
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/37240

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The impact of the coaching preferences and perceptions of South African millennial leaders on the success of leadership coaching

Lashan Moodley

2328996

Supervisor: Dr Jabulile Msimango-Galawe

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in Business and Executive Coaching

Wits Business School

Johannesburg, 2022

ABSTRACT

According to Stats South Africa, the majority of the leadership roles within the South African labour market falls within the millennial age group. It is therefore critical that businesses adapt and adjust their current development policies and procedures according to the needs of this generational group to ensure successful development and succession interventions. Coaching has only recently been used as a tool in the development of leaders. This study therefore looks at the preferences and perceptions of the millennial leader towards coaching and the impact this has on leadership coaching success.

The generational diversity amongst managers, coaches and the millennial leader may contribute to the misunderstanding and a disconnect when it comes to the use of coaching as a tool to develop the millennial leader. It is therefore pivotal that coaches and managers understand the millennials' perception and preference with regards to leadership coaching to assist in promoting successful coaching interventions. Both the concept of preference and perception is broad and therefore this study concentrates on the preference of how a millennial leader wishes to be coached, and the perception of the millennial leader regarding the characteristics of a coach in terms of the guidance offered, integrity of the coach and the relationship shared with the coachee. The findings of this study will therefore help both managers and coaches to adapt their approach when it comes to interacting and doing business with this generation of leaders. This was a quantitative cross-sectional study that was conducted amongst individuals born between 1981 and 1996 (i.e., the millennial generation). Primary data was collected with a sample size of 382 to identify behaviour and trends of the millennial leader towards coaching.


In this study, all factors, except for the millennials' perception regarding the relationship they share with the coach, had a positive influence on leadership coaching success. This finding is in direct conflict to the belief that the relationship shared with

the coach is pivotal for coaching success. The study sought to provide guidance to both managers and coaches on how to approach the millennial leader when it came to adopting coaching as a leadership development tool. As a result of the findings of this study, a coaching model was developed and recommended to address the needs of the millennial leader. The study therefore aimed to contribute to the limited literature available on the millennial coachee and to assist businesses on adapting their approaches when dealing with this cohort of the workforce.

Keywords: Millennials; Coaching Success; Leadership Coaching; Leadership Development; Preferences; Perceptions.

DECLARATION

I, Lashan Moodley, declare that this research report is my own work except as indicated in the references and acknowledgements. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in Business and Executive Coaching at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in this or any other university.

Name: Lashan Moodley Signature: 

Signed at …….Johannesburg……

On the ……01…….. day of ……March…… 2022..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I need to place on record my sincere appreciation to my husband, Sohann Sher Singh, who stood by me through this difficult period and never lost faith in my ability to complete this degree, even when at times, I lost faith in myself. Thank you for being my pillar of strength through it all.

To my supervisor, Dr Jabulile Msimango-Galawe, thank you for your unwavering support during this process and always being available to answer even the dumbest of questions. Your guidance through it all is the reason I can finally submit this paper.

To Keshan Naidoo and Dr Anthonie Theron, thank you for your patience and guidance in explaining concepts that were foreign to me. Without you both, I would have been at a total loss.

To SABPP, thank you for approving my study, thereby allowing me access to your database to distribute my survey. This allowed me to reach a sample size that I did not believe was possible.

A special thank you to each and every participant in this study. Without you there is no data and hence I would not have been able to complete this study. I am forever grateful for the time you had taken to complete my questionnaire.

To my family, friends and colleagues who cheered me on and encouraged me to continue even when thing got hard.

Lastly, it would not be right if I did not acknowledge God for granting me this opportunity that is a privilege for many in this country.

Contents

ABSTRACT i
DECLARATION iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv
LIST OF TABLES ix
LIST OF FIGURES xi
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Purpose of the study 1
1.2 Context of the study 1
1.3 Problem Statement 3
1.4. Research objectives 5
1.5 Research Questions 5
1.6 Significance of the study 6
1.7. Delimitations of the study 8
1.7 Definition of terms 8
1.9 Assumptions 10
1.10 Structure of the report 10
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW 12
2.1. Introduction 12
2.2. Millennials in South Africa 12
2.3. Cognitive Behaviour Theory 14
2. 4. Conceptualisation of preferences and its importance to coaching 17
2.5. Leadership Coaching Success 19
2.6. The impact of leadership coaching interventions on the development of the millennial Leader 20
2.7. The Influence of Millennial Perceptions on Leadership Coaching Success 24
2.8 Conceptual Framework 26
2.9 Summary 27
CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 28
3.1. Introduction 28
3.2. Research approach 28

3.3. Research design 29
3.4 Population and sample 30
3.4.1. Population 30
3.4.2. Sample and sampling method 31
3.5. The Research Instrument 32
3.6 Procedure for data collection 35
3.7. Data analysis and interpretation 37
3.8. Limitations of the study 39
3.9. Validity and reliability 40
3.9.1. External validity 40
3.9.2. Internal validity 41
3.9.3. Reliability 42
3.10. Ethical considerations 43
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 45
4.1. Introduction 45
4.2. Data Screening and Quality 45
4.3. Sample Characteristics 45
4.3.1 Gender and Ethnicity 46
4.3.2. Occupational level 46
4.2.3. Coaching Exposure 47
4.3. Millennial Coaching Preferences 48
4.3.1. Who conducts the coaching? 49
4.3.2 What is the subject matter on which millennials want to be coached? 49
4.3.3 When should coaching take place? 51
4.3.4. Where should coaching take place? 53
4.5 CONSTRUCT VALIDITY 53
4.5.1 Sampling adequacy 54
4.5.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis 55
4.6 Reliability of Measurement Scales 61
4.7. Correlation Analysis 62

4.8. Assumption Testing 63
4.8.1. Outliers 63
4.8.2. Normality 65
4.8.3. Autocorrelation 67
4.8.4 Linearity 68
4.8.5 Homoscedasticity 68
4.9. Influence of millennials' preference on coaching success 69
4.10. Influence of millennials' perceptions on leadership coaching success 71
4.10.1. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the integrity of the coach 71
4.10.2. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the guidance that a coach should offer 72
4.10.3. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of their relationship with the coach 74
4.11. The dependant Variable – Leadership Coaching Success 75
4.11. ANOVA and Coefficient Analysis 76
4.11.1. Hypothesis H1 78
4.11.2. Hypothesis H2.a 78
4.11.3. Hypothesis H2.b 79
4.11.4. Hypothesis H2.c 79
4.11.5. Hypothesis H2 80
4.12. Summary of results 80
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS 82
5.1. Introduction 82
5.2. Demographic profile of respondents 82
5.3 Preferences of Millennials regarding Leadership Coaching 83
5.3.1 Who conducts the coaching? 84
5.3.2. What is the subject matter on which millennials want to be coached? 85
5.3.3 When should coaching take place? 85
5.3.4 Where coaching takes place? 86

5.4 Influence of preference on how coaching takes place on leadership coaching success 86
5.5 Perceptions of Millennials 88
5.5.1 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching success 89
5.5.2 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of the guidance that a coach should offer 90
5.5.3 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of the relations they should share with a coach 91
5.6 Conclusion 92
CHAPTER 6.CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS 94
6.1 Introduction 94
6.2 Conclusions regarding research question 1 94
6.3 Conclusions regarding research question 2.a 95
6.4 Conclusions regarding research question 2.b 95
6.5 Conclusions regarding research question 2.c 96
6.6 Recommendations and Practical Implications 96
6.7 Suggestions for further research 101
REFERENCE LIST 102
APPENDIX A – RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 112
APPENDIX B – ETHICS APPROVAL 124
APPENDIX C – CONSISTENCY MATRIX 125

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Research Instrument Summary…….34

Table 2: Gender and Ethnicity Cross-tabulation…….46

Table 3: Preference in terms of who should be the coach……49

Table 4: Coaching Subject Matter…….50

Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test……..54

Table 6: Total Variance explained…….55

Table 7: Items removed from the study……57

Table 8: Pattern Matrix……58

Table 9: Impact of the Pattern Matrix on Hypotheses……59

Table 10: Summary of Cronbach Alpha per construct……...61

Table 11: Correlation Analysis between independent and dependant variable….63

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics – Mean, Standard deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis……66

Table 13: The Model Summary…….68

Table 14: Descriptive Statistics – Preference on how to be coached……71

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics – Perception in relation to the integrity of the coach……72

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics – Perception in relation to the guidance received from the coach……..73

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics – Perception in relation to the relationship shared with the coach……..74

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics – Coaching Success……..75

Table 19: ANOVA……..77

Table 20: Coefficients……77

Table 21: Summary of results……..92

Table 22: Analysis of studies that identified coaching success factors…….98

Table 23: Millennials' intrinsic values, manager / coach perception and recommended managerial competencies ……100

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: CBT Model……14

Figure 2: The Cognitive Triad……16

Figure 3: A cognitive framework for understanding leadership development……17

Figure 4: Adaptation of the continuum of coaching behaviours……..21

Figure 5: PREPARE framework for leadership development……..23

Figure 6: Conceptual framework of the study……...26

Figure 7: Examples of linear correlation……39

Figure 8: Occupational levels……..47

Figure 9: Previous coaching experience……48

Figure 10: Ratings of coaching topics……51

Figure 11: Frequency of coaching……..52

Figure 12: When coaching should take place……..52

Figure 13: Preference as to where to be coached……..53

Figure 14: Scree Plot……56

Figure 15: Box Plot with outliers……64

Figure 16: Box Plot without outliers……65

Figure 17: P-P Plot……66

Figure 18: Histogram – Regression Standardised Residual for Coaching Success……67

Figure 19: Scatterplot……...69

Figure 20: Medium used to coach……70

Figure 21: Hierarchy of millennial needs……87

Figure 22: The ACCEPT Coaching Model……..97

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as an outline of the purpose of this research study whilst providing orientation to the reader on the topic. The researcher aims to achieve this by discussing the purpose of the study, the context of the study, the problem statement, the research objectives, the research questions, the significance of the study, the delimitations of the study, followed by the definitions of key terms and assumptions.

1.1 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this quantitative research was to investigate the influences of preferences and perceptions of millennials on the success of leadership coaching interventions, by exploring both the preferences and perceptions of millennial leaders within the South African context. The coaching intervention is deemed successful in the event that the millennial leader shows an improvement in his / her competence as compared to his / her leadership skill set prior to the coaching engagement (Hambach, 2017).

1.2 Context of the study

A number of challenges have been experienced by businesses as they face one of the largest diversity of generations in the boardroom and these challenges are threatening the success and sustainability of these organisations (Glass, 2007). These challenges are aggravated by the entrance of the millennial leader into the boardroom largely due to the different and negative perceptions that the older generational cohorts have of millennials. The millennial leader has been labelled by their older counterparts as a generation that possess a disruptive self-interest, is disengaged, impatient and even has the potential to be narcissistic (Bennet, 2020). Adding to the challenges that organisations face amongst the generation are as a result of their preferred communication style. The millennial, being brought up in the digital age, has a preference toward using digital platforms as a means for communicating but this may

contribute to the misunderstanding, miscommunication and conflict between the different generational cohorts (A. Hershatter & M. Epstein, 2010).

In an attempt to ensure sustainability of organisations with the millennial leader ultimately dominating the C-suite with the exit of the baby boomers, the question that arises is regarding how organisations can develop the millennial leader to bridge the generational gap and ensure that millennials can hold their own within the boardroom. Thorpe (2018b) was of the view that organisations that solicitate the potential and strengths of the different generational groups enable greater knowledge and transfer of skills which will result in improved performance and engagement. Smith and T. Nichols (2015) cited that despite the fact that 76% of millennials are likely to leave an organisation within five years of their employ, millennials are also inclined to strive for the success of their employer. Smith and T. Nichols (2015) further stated that the millennial employee brings with them a strong organisational focus that not only focuses on goal achievement, but also strives to excel and exceed them,

The millennial leader is no different in the South African context; if one is to look at the current workforce within South Africa, it can be established that the majority of the workforce fall within the age group 25 to 40 years old, who are either currently occupying leadership roles or aspiring to become leaders in their respective fields (Stats South Africa, 2020a). It is therefore pivotal that companies are aware of the needs of this staff grouping in terms of their development and succession within the organisation. Organisations often put a lot of effort into diversity in terms of gender and race but one of the biggest diversity challenges that an organisation faces deals with the diversity between the different generations (Roberson, 2017).

A business is only as successful as its leaders and therefore it is important for a business to invest in the development of their future leaders. As it stands, the future generation of leaders will be the group of employees that fall within the generation cohort referred to as millennials (Wisniewski, 2010). Coaching can be used as a development tool to assist this group of employees to develop their skill set to take on leadership roles within an organisation but in order for such an intervention to be successful, one needs to understand the coaching preferences and perceptions of this generational group (Solomon & Van Coller-Peter, 2019). It is for this reason that this

research study explored the impact of the coaching preferences and perceptions of South African millennials on the success of leadership coaching.

In order for an organisation to be successful, it needs to address the conflict that arises due to the generational gap and also to leverage the strengths that each generational group brings, thereby increasing employee motivation and productivity in an environment of changing social and economic factors (Urick, Hollensbe, Masterson, & Lyons, 2016). According to Glass (2007), people born between 1941 and 1960, known as baby boomers, are of the view that they are harder working than the younger generations and have difficulty understanding how remote locations, telecommuting and working from a virtual office can be productive. In addition, the Generation X, born between 1961 and 1980, concentrate more about the outcome rather than the process when compared to their millennial counterpart, who have been classified as digital natives, having grown up with technology (Glass, 2007).

The millennial cohort comprises people born between 1981 and 1996 (Dimock, 2019). Therefore, this implies that people in this age group are currently between 26 and 41 years old. Technology has largely determined how this group communicates and interacts (Au-Young-Oliveira & Goncalves, 2017). Hence, it is pivotal that coaches better understand the needs and wants of this group of people to effectively coach them. This research study aimed to identify if there is a need to adapt coaching approaches to better address the needs and preferences of the millennial leader.

1.3 Problem Statement

Whilst coaching has been around as a tool to develop staff for many years, it is only in recent years that this form of practice has gained momentum as a leadership development tool (Ladegard & Gjerde, 2014). Millennials are only now entering leadership roles within organisations as these roles become available with the exit of baby boomers and some Generation X staff from the workforce (Hobbs, 2017) .

Currently, the millennial leader is misunderstood in organisations and hence organisational policies and procedures are not aligned to how the millennial operates

or their preferences (Bennet, 2020). The problem is that the way managers and coaches dealt with previous generational cohorts will not work for the millennial leader as their approach to their development, communication and general approach to doing business differs significantly from the older generations (A. Hershatter & M. Epstein, 2010). This study therefore sheds light on the problem related to the millennial leader not being coached according to their preference and the misconceptions that millennials have about coaching due to their perceptions, thereby affecting the outcome of coaching interventions.

With an emergence of leaders from the millennial generational group, it is important to explore the preference and perceptions of this generational group to ensure that development strategies employed are successful. The preferences of an individual influence their cognition and behaviours towards a process or intervention and hence have a direct impact on the buy-in of the individual to the process or intervention (Boyce, Jeffery, Jackson, & Neal, 2010) This in turn, affects the trust between the coach and coachee that forms the basis of the coaching relationship. Furthermore, the millennial leader's preferred approach and the way they do things differs from the other generation cohorts (Tripati, Panday, & Kaur, 2019). Baby boomers have a face to face interactions and rate in-person interactions as very important whereas the millennial generation has a preference towards communicating using virtual platforms and does not place much importance on the need to meet people in person to be able to communicate efficiently (Andrea Hershatter & Molly Epstein, 2010). According to Tripati et. al (2019), the millennial leader values constant feedback whereas the baby boomer and generation X are comfortable with little feedback in ensuring that they get the job done. Furthermore, in an impetus to ensure many South African organisations drive a strong transformational agenda, therefore the millennial leader has a propensity towards a greater value of and tolerance for diversity than their older generational cohorts (T. J. Smith & T. Nichols, 2015). The deep desire for purposeful work, along with expectations of their organisations being environments for growth and learning; millennials thrive in collaborative, unstructured environments, which is often in direct contrast to the other generational cohorts (Thorpe, 2018a). It is for this reason that coaches will need to adapt the way they previously coached prior generations to ensure coaching success with the millennial leader.

The coaching preferences of millennials has an impact on how coaching is perceived and accepted by this group of clients, so it is of paramount importance that coaches are cognisant of this fact and adapt their approach to ensure successful leadership coaching interventions. This research paper investigated what these preferences of millennials are, with the aim of helping coaches adapt accordingly. The millennial generation are the future leaders within an organisation therefore further stressing the need to understand the preferences and perceptions of this group to be able to produce leaders to lead the business successfully.

1.4. Research objectives

The research objectives provide insight to what the study wishes to achieve. The following research objectives have been identified by taking into account the research problem that this study addressed.

1. To examine the influence of millennial preferences (i.e., in terms of how coaching should take place) on leadership coaching success within the South African context.
2. To examine the influence of the perception of millennials (in terms of the characteristics of the coach related to integrity, guidance, and the relationship with the coachee) on the success of leadership coaching within the South African context.

1.5 Research Questions

This study intended to answer the following research questions to achieve the study objectives

1. What influence does millennials' preference regarding how they should be coached, have on leadership coaching success?

2. What influence does the perceptions of South African millennials, in terms of the characteristics of a coach, have on leadership coaching success?

a) What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the integrity of a coach have on leadership coaching success?
b) What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the type of guidance received from a coach have on leadership coaching success?
c) What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the relationship shared with a coach have on leadership coaching success?

1.6 Significance of the study

Much research has been done regarding Generation X and Baby boomers, but research lacks in terms of the millennial or Y generation as this is a fairly young generation that has only recently started occupying leadership roles in organisations (Bennet, 2020; Cox, 2016; Hobbs, 2017; Jonck, Van Der Walt, & Sobayeni, 2017; Smith & T. Nichols, 2015). This generation of employees comprises a mix of cultures who grew up with technology and the instant availability of information at the touch of a button. It is therefore only fitting that coaches adapt the way they conduct their trade to the preference of this group to ensure successful outcomes. Furthermore, this study assists the management of organisations to better understand the millennial leader whilst adapting current practices and processes to ensure this leader is appropriately catered for in terms of their leadership development and general day-to-day interactions. The researcher has therefore contributed to the literature gap that exists in this regard whilst providing suggestions for practical implementation.

Previously, literature concentrated on individual leader development with the risk of not fully exploring the meaning of leadership development (Day, 2000; Yarborough, 2018). This focus of concentrating on leader development was at the expense of truly understanding and interpreting leadership development in its totality, which is pivotal as more organisations are buying into the concept of collective and shared models of leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This study addressed the concept of leadership development holistically, taking into account both individual and collective forms of development. The aim of the study was to change the mentality of organisations from moving from a leader development approach to an all-encompassing leadership

development approach by using coaching as a tool whilst taking the preference and perceptions of the leader into account.

Executive or leadership coaching is a new buzz term in business circles with most business utilising coaching as a tool to help their current and future leaders to achieve their own goals, the goals of the organisation and to assist these employees to effectively interact with their team, thereby helping businesses maintain a competitive edge in an ever-changing business environment (Deloitte, 2017). The researcher therefore aimed to assist organisations in developing and streamlining the process when it comes to the development of the millennial leader.

Individuals find themselves operating in a fast paced, high-technology world that has left managers to deal with issues that are not described in current leadership theories (Bennet, 2020). To be able to develop and manage future leaders, executives are having to adapt to the preferences of the millennial generation to be able to lead teams that are motivated, productive and have a higher retention rate (A. Hershatter & M. Epstein, 2010; Jenkins, 2019; Salahuddin, 2010). This study therefore looked at possible solutions by adapting current leadership theories according to the perceptions and preferences of the millennial leader.

To date, available literature addresses the needs of the baby boomer and X generational cohorts with very little information on the millennial cohort (Bennet, 2020; Hobbs, 2017; Jonck et al., 2017). This study therefore addresses this literature gap and further addresses the issues experienced by coaches and organisations due to the lack of knowledge about the preferences and perceptions of the millennial leader. By establishing the preferences and perceptions of the millennial leader towards leadership coaching, the researcher has attempted to propose solutions to how both the coach and organisations can adapt their approaches to leadership development when it comes to the millennial cohort.

1.7. Delimitations of the study

Due to the time constraints, the scope of this study was narrowed to focus on South African millennials who are currently employed in leadership roles or are being developed as future leaders within businesses. Secondly, due to the focus being on leadership development, the study did not include millennial generation blue-collar workers but rather concentrated on white-collar workers. White-collar workers are typically described as the “suit-and-tie” workers who are confined to office jobs and often avoid physical labour whereas the blue-collar workers engage in hard manual labour and are often found in industries such as construction, mining and maintenance (Parietti, 2019).

Whilst the concept of perception is broad, this study only concentrated on the perception of the millennial leader towards coaching by focusing on the characteristics of the coach as viewed by the millennial leader to ensure coaching success. This study looked into the preferences of the millennial leader in terms of the characteristics of the coach by investigating the characteristics that a coach needs in terms of integrity, guidance and the relationship shared with the coachee.

This study concentrated on the concept of leadership development and not leader development. Leadership development is further limited to the usage of coaching as a tool to equip the millennial leader with the skill set to succeed in their desired leadership goals. Unlike leader development, leadership development involves the leader reflecting, identifying learnings and in turn, using these learnings to adjust their leadership practices (Ely et al., 2010).

1.8 Definition of terms

Millennial – A person born between 1981 and 1996 (Dimock, 2019). Also referred to as the Y generation, Nexters, Echo Boomers or Generation www. According to Smith (2008), leaders belonging to this generation are extremely optimistic, want acknowledgement, do not value “experience, traditional approaches, rules or structures that they did not create”, prefer to work where they choose to, are able to

mix both work and social life seamlessly, embrace diversity and distrust the authority of the older generations.

Preference – In terms of Warren (2011), preference is equated to the willingness or choice to pay, thereby implying that should a person have a preference of A over B and C, the person will be willing to pay more for A as compared to B and C. This is referred to as expressed preference. Warren (2011) goes further to explain that psychologists would use the term to denote a tendency to consider something or someone desirable or not. This is referred to as underlying preference. In this study, both forms of preference were investigated.

Perception – This term is derived from the Latin word *perceptio* which means "receiving, collecting, action of taking possession, and apprehension with the mind or senses" (Ou, 2017). In terms of the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English perception is defined as the view you have of something, based on your thought and ideology of what it is like.

Leadership Development – Leadership development focuses on the interpersonal dynamics of leadership and the advance of social capital whilst leader development is more an individualistic approach focusing on the development of human capital (DeRue & Myers, 2014).

Leadership Coaching – Leadership coaching is a development tool used by organisations to support leaders and control their interests for the profit of all (Dalakoura, 2010; Gladis, 2007). Leadership coaching is used as a tool to enable positive change that impacts a leader's performance and skills, whilst ensuring personal growth (Stober, 2008).

Coaching Success – To be able to evaluate the success of a coaching intervention, it is suggested that an evaluation of the improved competency of both the coach and coachee during the coaching session be measured by comparing the specific competency prior and post the improvement cycle (Hambach, 2017).

1.9 Assumptions

It is assumed the millennial generation participant would respond honestly during the survey process.

The expectation is that the results of the survey conducted with these participants has yielded the data that would provide insight to the preferences and perceptions of millennial leaders towards leadership coaching.

It is assumed that the information contained in both the cover letter and questionnaire was understood by the participants prior to them answering the questions contained therein and that the participant would have asked for clarity in the event that there was doubt regarding any aspect of the survey.

1.10 Structure of the report

This report seeks to explore ways in which leadership development can be harnessed to enhance millennial performance by exploring coaching as a development tool. It is structured as follows:

Chapter 1 – This chapter serves as an outline of the purpose of this research report whilst providing orientation to the reader on the topic. This section comprises the purpose, context of the research, the problem statement, delimitations, definitions of keywords and assumptions related to the research study conducted.

Chapter 2 - This chapter contains the literature review in which the key terms and concepts pertaining to the study are elaborated. The key terms for this study are millennials, leadership development, coaching success, preferences, and perceptions. At the end of the literature review, hypotheses are stated as possible answers to the research questions posed in Chapter 1.

Chapter 3 – This chapter serves to define the research methodology used. This involves a discussion around the research design, the population and sample, the demographics of the participants, a participant role profile, the research instrument

used, the data collection process, the analysis and interpretation of the data, the limitations of the study and the validity and reliability of the data collected.

Chapter 4 – This chapter details the research findings, based on the research conducted on the field. This is linked to the interviews conducted with the participants identified. The analysis of the responses from the participants resulted in the generation of themes and codes. Direct quotes from the research participants further aided the researcher to support the interpretation of feedback received during the interview process.

Chapter 5 – In this chapter the researcher deliberates the results of study by providing notes explaining the researcher's perspective. The researcher further compares research findings with literature currently available in order to support the conclusions derived by the researcher.

Chapter 6 – The final chapter of this report serves as a record of the conclusions reached as a result of the research conducted. It contains recommendations to interested parties and further informs future research that needs to be conducted.

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter One, the purpose of the present study was to investigate the impact of preferences and perceptions of millennials on the success of leadership coaching interventions, by examining both the preferences and perceptions of millennial leaders within the South African context. The conceptual framework for this research aimed at examining the preferences and perceptions of millennials in order to ensure that leadership coaching interventions are successful. In order to better understand the preferences of Generation Y leaders, the researcher reviewed the literature containing information on generational differences, preferences, perceptions, and coaching success. Despite the quandary that businesses find themselves in regarding generational diversity, there is very little research on this topic, particularly within the South African context (Jonck et al., 2017). This had prompted the researcher to explore this topic further, and in more detail, with particular attention to the millennial leader. In this chapter, the researcher provides a critical analysis of the current literature that exists on the subject matter and attempts to address the gaps that exist within current available literature.

2.2. Millennials in South Africa

The focus of this study was on the impact that the preferences and perceptions of the South African millennial has on the success of leadership coaching interventions. It is vital that coaches involved in leadership coaching are cognisant of the fact that this generation of leaders are the largest generational group within the South African employment arena as a result of the baby boomer generation exiting the workforce (Deloitte, 2017). South Africa is viewed as the rainbow nation and with this comes diverse demographics in terms of the values, work ethic and preferences. It is for the first time that we find four different generations working together so it is vital that organisations and coaches are aware of the preferences of millennials should they

employ coaching as a development tool for this group of leaders (Jenkins, 2019). In order to truly contribute to literature on the topic it was vital that these concepts relating to millennials were unpacked.

Strauss and Howe (1991, p. 26) defined four types of generational groups by taking into account their upbringing, their exposure to public events witnessed during their adolescent years, and the social missions that were awarded to them upon reaching adulthood. Whilst Strauss and Howe (1991) published these finding in relation to the United States, the grouping of the population into the generational cohorts (i.e. the Baby Boomers, the X Generation, the Millennial and the Z Generation) is still relevant in the South African context, given that the characteristics of these cohorts has some resonance in the context of globalisation. Dimock (2019) defined a millennial as a person born between 1981 and 1996 and Codrington (2008) describes this generation group as being born in an era of globalisation, wireless connectivity and technology.

With the exit of the Baby Boomers from executive and leadership positions within organisations, the millennial leader has been accepted into the C-suite with mixed reactions (Riley, 2016). Some have described them as “a generation with a disruptive self-interest,” whilst others have commended this cohort of leaders for their tolerance, open-mindedness and ambition (Bennet, 2020, p. 684). The millennial leader often has to bear the brunt of the negative reputation that goes with being a part of this generational cohort, despite being technically capable. They have been labelled as disengaged, impatient and distrustful and even potentially narcissistic, by previous generational cohorts (Bennet, 2020).

It is therefore pivotal that coaches are aware of the preferences of this group of coachees as the traditional methods previously employed with previous generational cohorts may be outdated and ineffective. Codrington (2008, p. 9) stated that the defining and guiding values that are pertinent to this generational group are “optimism, confidence, street savvy, diversity, networkers, techno-savvy and global citizens.” This study draws from Ellis’ (1957) and Beck’s (1967) work on cognitive behavioural theory in investigating the millennial leader and their preferences and perceptions.

2.3. Cognitive Behaviour Theory

The theoretical foundation that underpins this study is the Cognitive Behaviour Theory (CBT) as developed by Ellis and Beck (McLeod, 2019). According to Neenan and Palmer (2001), the CBT approach places emphasis on the fact that the way a person reacts to an event or situation is based on their views associated with the event or situation and not necessarily the event or situation itself. The cognitive behavioural approach is based on cognition (i.e. how one thinks), emotion (i.e. how one feels) and behaviour (i.e. how one acts) (McLeod, 2019). Figure 1 illustrates the influence that these three components have on each other.




Figure 1: CBT Model adapted from McLeod (2019, p. 1)

It is evident from Figure 1 that one's thoughts have an impact on one's feelings and behaviours (McLeod, 2019). Similarly, this study aimed to analyse the impact of the thoughts of millennials by examining their preferences and perceptions towards coaching as this will influence their feelings and the probability of engaging in coaching which ultimately affects the success of coaching interventions.

In Chapter One, preference was classified as either an expressed or underlying preference. Irrespective of whether a person chooses to pay more for something in comparison to another item, based on their preference or the tendency of a person to consider something desirable or not, it can be established that the preferences of a person is influenced by their feeling and thoughts (Warren, 2011). This is similar to the Cognitive Behavioural Theory model that claims the way a person acts towards something is impacted by how the person feels or thinks towards it.

The two earliest forms of Cognitive Behavioural Theory are Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapy (REBT) that was developed by Albert Ellis in the 1950s, and Cognitive Therapy that was developed by Aaron T. Beck in the 1960s (McLeod, 2019). According to McLeod (2019), Ellis was of the view that the way a person views themselves and the world forms the basis of their reactions to various situations or their viewpoint. Irrational assumptions result in people acting in a specific way that results in them being unsuccessful when they embark on a particular task. This study therefore aimed to identify what these assumptions are around leadership coaching and leadership development. With this knowledge, it is assumed that coaches will be able to adjust their processes to remedy the irrational assumptions, thereby attracting millennials and ensuring coaching success. The ABC (Activating Event, Beliefs and Consequences) Technique of Irrational Beliefs, as introduced by Ellis (1957), suggests that it is not the activating event that results in the negative consequences but rather the irrational belief that results in the consequences (McLeod, 2019).

Whilst Beck's (1967) work around Cognitive Therapy largely dealt with clients suffering from the depression, the basis of his argument in this regard can be used to test the perceptions of millennials towards coaching. The way that the person views the self, the world and the future, as illustrated in Figure 2, has an influence on one's perception (McLeod, 2019). The components of this cognitive triad interfere with the cognitive processing, resulting in the individual's perception being affected. In this study, the researcher looked at the perception of millennials towards leadership coaching and the impact this has on their preference and ultimately, on the success of coaching interventions.




Figure 2: The cognitive triad adapted from McLeod (2019, p. 5)

Leadership development remains a top priority of line managers and human resources teams, resulting in organisations investing large amount of money and time into developing their leaders (Dominick, Squires, & Cervone, 2019). According to Dominick et al. (2019, p. 5), CBT researchers have identified that “early maladaptive schemas” such as “ abandonment, mistrust, abuse, emotional deprivation and vulnerability to harm or illness inhibit performance and development and therefore leadership development practices may find it beneficial to understand the maladaptive schemas which can be identified and changed via leadership coaching. It is therefore vital that a coach is aware to how the millennial coachee wishes to approach these topics to ensure that the process is beneficial to all parties. Figure 3 clearly illustrates how the role that cognitive psychology plays might be integrated into a framework to guide leadership theory and practice.




Figure 3: A cognitive framework for understanding leadership development adapted from Dominick et al. (2019, p. 11)

2. 4. Conceptualisation of preferences and its importance to coaching

According to Grant (2014), the following aspects have a direct influence on the success of coaching millennials:

- autonomy support,
- the satisfaction of the coachee with the coaching relationship,
- the degree to which the relationship between the coach and coachee measures up against the 'ideal' coaching relations,
- and a coaching relationship that is goal focused.

In exploring the direct influences on coaching success, as mentioned earlier, it is important to determine the impact of the preferences of the millennial leader in this regard so that a coach can adapt his / her approach when coaching this generational cohort. By measuring the preferences of millennials in this regard, the researcher aimed to better understand the needs of millennials in these areas, thereby identifying ways in which the coaching process can be adapted to ensure coaching success.

Psychologists view preference as the latent tendency to consider a service or thing desirable or not (Bornstein, 2022; Zajonc, 1980).This view of preference is termed underlying preference. Literature suggests that both expressed and underlying preference only differ in terms of the manner in which the preference is measured or inferred (Tversky, Sattath, & Slovic, 1988). Economists, on the other hand, have defined expressed preference in terms of the choice or willingness of on individual to pay (Rabin, 1998).

The definition of preference was supposed to be based on choice, thereby removing any reference to mental state altogether (Sven-Ove & Grüne-Yanoff, 2018). With the convergence of aspects of economics and psychology, the ordinal psychological interpretation of the concept of preference is dominant (Sven-Ove & Grüne-Yanoff, 2018).

Whilst recent research calls for better understanding if preferences are constructed or not, for this study the researcher had adopted the view of Warren (2011) who is of the opinion that preference is always constructed, due to the fact that context has an influence on all aspects of the choice process.

Warren (2011) further showed that context affects goals, thereby having a direct impact on preferences. This is important to bear in mind in the coaching context as the coaching journey largely revolves around the attainment of identified goals. The preference of millennials, based on where the individual is in terms of their leadership development and exposure to coaching, could have either a positive or negative impact on the success of leadership coaching. With the aid of scholarly articles and the survey conducted in terms of this study, the researcher aimed to explore the impact of preference on coaching success. According to Warren (2011, p. 1), it has been established via literature that preference construction can be defined in two ways i.e.

“(1) Preferences are sensitive to context and (2) preferences are calculated while making a decision.”

The researcher adopted the approach of Tsai (2008) and Knight (2010) in determining the preference of the millennial leader by exploring their preferences in terms of who conducts the coaching, what is the subject matter of the coaching interventions, when should coaching take place, why should coaching be used as part of leadership development, how does the millennial leader want to be coached and where should the coaching take place.

2.5. Leadership Coaching Success

Most companies use return on investment (ROI) as a measure of coaching success. ROI is a metric that is seen as an extension of Kirkpatrick’s four-level taxonomy which was typically used to evaluate training programmes (Grant, 2012). According to Kirkpartrick (1996), to obtain a full picture regarding the impact of a specific training programme, there is a need to evaluate the trainee’s reactions, the learning, the change in behaviour and the results because of the training intervention. In this way, one is able to evaluate the costs and benefits related to the training programme. Phillips (1997) introduces a fifth level to Kirkpatrick’s four-level taxonomy described above, which involved a step dealing with ROI. (Grant, 2012) identified that ROI is unreliable and not sufficient to determine the success of coaching interventions as ROI depends on two things, i.e. the total cost of the coaching intervention which includes the coach’s fee and the financial benefit achieved.

According to Rock and Donde (2008), ROI calculations fail to take into account the effect of other variables, i.e. market context and team contribution. Concentrating on the potential financial gains as a result of coaching restricts one’s view in terms of the potential benefits of coaching (Grant, 2012). Increased staff engagement, the ability to help coachees with goal attainment, decreased stress, depression and anxiety, as well as improved well-being are preferable measures to gauging coaching success, as compared to ROI (Grant, 2012). Well-being encompasses self-acceptance, life purpose, positive relations with both internal and external stakeholders, autonomy and

environmental mastery (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Staff or workplace engagement entails a staff possessing high levels of energy, involvement and commitment to the performance of their duties (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). It is for this reason ROI will not be explored as an indicator of coaching success.

Current research shows that satisfaction with the coaching relationship is not a true indicator in predicting the success of coaching outcomes, the autonomy support and closeness to the ideal coaching relationship only moderately predicted the success of coaching but goal-orientated coaching rates as the most accurate predictor of coaching success (Grant, 2013, 2014; Grover & Furnham, 2016). This study aimed at investigating the impact that the preferences and perceptions of millennials have on coaching success and comparing whether current literatures and findings are pertinent when dealing with coachees from the millennial generational group. Whilst the working relation between the client and therapist is well researched in the psychotherapeutic domain, research into the relationship between the coach and coachee is relatively new and has the potential to improve the current understanding of effective coaching (Grant, 2014; Grover & Furnham, 2016).

This study aimed to explore the ideal coaching relationship in relation to goal-orientated coaching to determine an effective method of measuring coaching success amongst millennials. As part of this study, the researcher examined whether millennials view the successful implementation of who conducts the coaching, what is the subject matter of the coaching intervention, when should coaching take place, why should coaching be used, how to be coached and where coaching should take place in line with their preferences as coaching success.

2.6. The impact of leadership coaching interventions on the development of the millennial leader

It is only recently that leadership coaching interventions formed part of the leadership development (Ely et al., 2010). This type of coaching is defined broadly as a relationship between the coach and coachee that involves the coach assisting the coachee to become a better leader (Douglas & Morley, 2000). The Centre for Creative

Leadership defined leadership coaching as a formal relationship between two people (i.e., the leader and the coach) in which both parties work together to assess and understand the coachee and his or her leadership development goals, challenge the current limitations, explore new possibilities, and to ensure accountability and support for reaching goals whilst sustaining the growth (Ting & Riddle, 2006). This is the definition that was adopted in this study.

The major difference between leadership coaching and leadership development programmes is that leadership coaching concentrates on a one-to-one relationship between coach and coachee. Ely et al. (2010) have identified four differences between leadership coaching and traditional leadership development, i.e. 1. Leadership coaching addresses the individual needs of the coachee and the organisation by embracing the characteristics that each bring, 2. The skills set of a leadership coach is unique, 3. Leadership coaching places emphasis on the coach-coachee relationship, and 4. In leadership coaching, the process needs to be flexible in aiding the coachee to reach the desired goals. It is therefore evident that leadership coaching can be used as a model for developing leaders.




Figure 4: Adaptation of the Continuum of Coaching Behaviours adapted from Ainsworth (2016)

According to Ainsworth (2016), coaching approaches can be codified into the continuum of coaching behaviours, as illustrated in Figure 4. Approaches that are on the bottom of the continuum are characterised by instruction or tell strategies whereas the top half of the continuum deals with thought generating or asking strategies. As one follows the continuum from left to right, it is evident that the process moves from directive management to performance coaching to development coaching. Leadership coaching falls within the area of development coaching and hence is characterised by thought provoking or asking strategies. This study therefore looked at the preference of South African millennials towards leadership coaching as part of their leadership development and ultimately, the influence of this on the success of leadership coaching interventions. The reason that the researcher explored the impact of leadership coaching on leadership development was due to the fact that preferences of leaders who have been exposed to leadership coaching would largely be dependent on the outcomes achieved as a result of such coaching interventions.

According to research conducted by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988), it became evident that challenging experiences contributed to 70% of learning outcomes whereas 20% was from development relationships and 10% from coursework or training. According to Yarborough (2018), subsequent studies that focused on different cultures and sectors resulted in similar findings and therefore, it can be established that this data will also be relevant to South African millennials. As part of this study, the preferences, and perceptions of millennials based in South Africa to learn via challenging experiences was investigated. As part of leadership development, leadership coaching aids in developing the leader's ability to reflect, identify learnings and use these learnings to adjust their leadership practice.

The PREPARE (i.e. Purpose, Results, Experience, Point of intervention, Architecture, Reinforcement and Engagement) framework, as illustrated in Figure 5, helps to better understand the concept of leadership development by exploring the different components that need to be considered when defining the concept of leadership development.

According to DeRue and Myers (2014), the various components of the PREPARE framework can be explained as follows:

- Purpose – The reason behind why the organisation is embarking on leadership development and how this intervention helps the organisation reach its strategic and performance objectives.
- Result – The desired goals or the component that is being developed i.e. the leader's cognitive schema's pertaining to leadership, the relational bonds among team members or the organisation's environment for shared relationship.
- Experience – This refers to the mechanisms that are employed to develop leadership by challenging the individual or collectives.
- Point of intervention – This is representative of the desired target of the leadership development and the qualities linked to the target. The target could be on an individual level, relational level, or collective level.
- Architecture – Refers to the process and climate of the organisation towards leadership development.
- Reinforcement – The chronological sequencing of experience linked to leadership development and the timing of such interventions.
- Engagement – Refers to the journey that the individual or collectives embark on as part of the development process.




Figure 5: PREPARE framework for leadership development adapted from DeRue and Myers (2014, p. 836)

By keeping the above framework in mind, leadership coaches will be able to navigate the coaching journey with the coachee with the aim of achieving the leadership goals identified.

H1 – There is a positive influence of how a millennial leader wants to be coached on leadership coaching success.

2.7. The Influence of Millennial Perceptions on Leadership Coaching Success

In exploring the direct influences on coaching success, it is important to determine the impact of the perceptions of the millennial leader towards the coach so that a coach can acquire the characteristics that this generational cohort is looking for in a coach. By measuring the perceptions of millennials in this regard, the researcher aimed to better understand the way the millennial leader perceives what characteristics a coach should possess and the impact of the same on coaching success.

According to Qiong (2017), perception is a process whereby an individual attains awareness or understanding of the sensory information they receive. In other words perception involves the receipt, collection, taking possession and uneasiness with the mind and senses. Qiong (2017) describes the perception process as consisting of three steps, i.e. selection, organisation and interpretation. The first step, which is termed selection, involves the conversion of environmental stimuli into a meaningful experience, We, however, select unconsciously what we process (Singer, 1987). It is for this reason we only pay attention to the stimuli with which we are familiar or that is of interest to us.

The second phase in the perception process is organisation. According to Qiong (2017), this stage involves taking the information we have chosen from the outside world and organising it in order to find meaningful patterns. Categorisation is a characteristic of this phase and is often influenced by social or physical events that transpire in our lives. Cantor, Mischel, and Schwartz (1982, p. 34) summarised this stage as allowing “us to structure and give coherence to our general knowledge about

people and the social world, providing typical patterns of behaviour and the range of likely variation between types of people and their characteristic actions and attributes."

The last stage in the perception process is interpretation. During this phase, the person attaches meaning to the stimuli that they have selected. It must be noted that different people can assign different meaning to the same stimulus. This is because "culture provides us with a perceptual lens that greatly influences how we interpret and evaluate what we receive from the outside world" (Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 2000, p. 57). As part of this study, it was tested whether the perception of millennials from different ethnic backgrounds shares a similar perception toward the characteristics of a coach or if perception diversity exists between this generational group.

The perception of millennials, based on where the individual is in terms of their leadership development and exposure to coaching, could have either a positive or negative impact on the success of leadership coaching. With the aid of scholarly articles and the survey that was conducted in terms of this study, the researcher aimed to explore the impact of perception on coaching success. From the above discussion on perception, it is clear that perception is a very broad concept to cover. It is an established fact that the success of a coaching intervention is influenced by the satisfaction of the coachee with the relationship he / she shares with the coach (Grant, 2014).

In looking for a scale that could measure the perception of relationship a coachee shares with the coach and the influence that this may have on the success of the coaching intervention, the researcher identified the Ideal Mentor Scale which was originally 111 items that was narrowed down to 34 items using an iterative rational-statical process. According to Rose (2003),the factor analysis of the Ideal Mentor Scale identified three factors, namely Integrity, Guidance and Relationship. The integrity subscale represented the Anderson and Shannon's befriend and encourage functions as well as the Levinson's definitions which included traits such as agreeableness and conscientiousness. The guidance subscale represented the functions of counsel, sponsor and teach. The relationship subscale represents represented the Levinson's traditional theory of mentoring that included items around general relationship and personality of the coach. These three factors have also been identified as being essential for a successful coaching intervention (Levinson,

1996). It is for this reason the researcher investigated the perception of the millennial leader in terms of the characteristics of the coach (i.e., In relation to the integrity of the coach, the guidance offered by the coach and the relationship shared between the coach and coachee).

H2 – There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the characteristics of a coach on leadership coaching success.

H2.a - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching success.

H2.b - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success.

H2.c - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the relationship they share with the coach on leadership coaching success.

2.8 Conceptual Framework

Figure 6 is a conceptual framework that illustrates the expectations that the researcher hopes to discover through this study. This graphical representation defines the variables for the study and how they relate to each other.




Figure 6: Conceptual Framework of the Study (Ainsworth, 2016; Grant, 2014; Knight, 2010; Qiong, 2017; Warren, 2011)

2.9 Summary

Literature remains limited when it comes to the development and management of the millennial leader. This literature gap has left managers and coaches at a loss when it comes to interacting with the millennial leader in terms of their professional development. Leadership and leader development go hand-in-hand with many organisations adopting coaching as a tool to develop leaders. Literature has also shown that perception and preferences can influence an individual's buy-in to a process. This study therefore explored the influence of the millennial leader's preferences and perceptions on the success of leadership coaching. It has also been established, during the literature review, that the way managers and coaches dealt with prior generational cohorts will not necessarily have the same outputs when interacting with the millennial leader. It was, therefore, the aim of this study to unpack the needs and wants of the millennial learner to better adapt processes and policies in terms of their development, according to their preferences and perceptions. Both the concepts of preference and perception are very broad concepts and therefore the study focused on the preference of how the millennial leader wished to be coached and the perception of the millennial leader with regards to the characteristics of a coach, i.e., the integrity of the coach, the relationship shared with the coach and the guidance offered by the coach.

CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter explains the research methodology that was adopted by the researcher to investigate the hypotheses, as identified in chapter 2 of this research paper. This chapter discusses the research approach, design and methodology whilst providing insight into the population, the sample, the research instrument, the procedures used for data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.2. Research approach

For the purposes of this research study, the quantitative research approach was adopted. Quantitative research is defined as a type of research used to explain the impact between variables by means of collecting numerical data that one is able to analyse using mathematically-based methods, such as statistics (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). The reason the researcher has opted for the quantitative approach was to allow for a cross-sectional study to be conducted, thereby ensuring that the study was completed within the limited timeframe available, at minimal costs and error sources as a result of changes over time were minimised (Schindler, 2019).

According to Goertzen (2017), quantitative research involves the collection and statistical analysis of structured data that is numerically represented. In this study, the researcher explored the statistical relationship between the two variables per hypothesis, as discussed in Chapter 2. The researcher tested the hypotheses identified and theories specific to this study by means of a survey with the aim to uncover behaviours and trends of millennials towards coaching in the South African context. It was for this reason that the quantitative methodology best suited the outcomes that the researcher wished to achieve.

3.3. Research design

Malhotra (2007) defines research design as the blueprint that contains the different strategies and procedures that are utilised to answer the identified research questions and to test the identified hypotheses. The research design provides the researcher with a map to navigate through the various processes. Bhattacherjee (2012) defines these processes to include data collection processes, the development of a measuring instrument and method employed with regards to sampling. In quantitative research, data is collected in large numbers by means of questionnaires or structured interviews and thereafter analysed and reported (Blaikie, 2009).

Time plays a pivotal role when it comes to the design and execution of a research study (Babbie, 2015). According to Babbie (2015), a researcher has two options available that are time dependent:

- Cross-sectional studies - This is a research study that is based on observations representing a single point in time.
- Longitudinal studies – This is a research study that that involves the collection of data at different points in time.

Given the limited duration that was available to complete this study and the fact that this study took place in a specific point in time when South Africa is seeing an influx of millennials occupying leadership roles within organisations, the researcher opted to use a cross sectional design for the purposes of this study. The advantage of conducting a cross-sectional study is the access to available data (Sedgwick, 2014). The disadvantage however, is that the findings may not be consistent as the participants may be influenced by personal bias and subjectivity may play a role when they answer the questions (Sedgwick, 2014). The researcher aimed to mitigate this disadvantage by making use of a standard measurement instrument in the form of a questionnaire. This approach was also cost effective in that the study was able to reach more millennials at once over various geographical locations (Galawe, 2017).

3.4 Population and sample

In the early 19th century, researchers had attempted to survey entire populations which proved to be tedious and detrimental to research (Banerjee & Chaudhury, 2010). Current researchers work with a sample of the target population to draw inferences about the target population from which the sample was drawn (Banerjee & Chaudhury, 2010). In this section, the population and sample for this study is defined.

3.4.1. Population

For the purpose of this study, the participants were employed South Africans born between 1981 and 1996. People born within this timeframe are considered to belong to the generational cohort of millennials (Dimock, 2019). According to Babbie (2010), the population in a research study comprises a group of individuals about which we wish to draw conclusions. Due to this study focusing on leadership development, only millennials who were currently in leadership roles or were being developed into leaders were considered as participants for this study. For the purposes of this study, leadership development was not limited to only executives but to all millennials who were currently employed in junior, middle, and senior management roles. Representation from all genders and races were considered for participation in this study as the gender and race of an individual may have an impact on the individual's perceptions and preferences.

According to Stats South Africa (2020b), the estimated number of people employed full time in South Africa stood at approximately 9 193 000 at the end of March 2020. According to Booysen (2018), approximately 51% of the employed population is currently made up of millennials. This equates to 4 688 430 millennials who form part of the South Africa workforce. But only 20% of the employed millennials find themselves in leadership roles (Goodwin, 2018). This means that the population size for this study was approximately 937 686.

3.4.2. Sample and sampling method

In an attempt to increase the probability of more precise results, to efficiently collect the data, accessing the members of the target population and minimising any cost, it was important to frame the sample once the population was determined (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). This ensured accuracy and precision in the collection of data to analyse the research objectives of this study. It was noted that a large enough sample was needed to be able to adequately answer the research questions and to allow for the researcher to perform the necessary statistical tests (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

Whilst the Department of Home Affairs has a database of all persons born between 1981 and 1996, access to this data is not readily available to the public due to confidentiality and regulations as introduced by the Protection of Personal Information Act (de Bruyn, 2014). With the implementation of the Protection of Personal Information Act, companies are no longer willing to share the names and details of staff who qualify to take part in this study due to the risk of liability that they carry, should they do so. In order to ensure greater representation, the researcher used social media platforms such as Facebook and LinkedIn, professional bodies such as the South African Board for People Practices and the researcher's personal networks to obtain the relevant sample. Participants who volunteered to participate in the survey were requested to refer fellow millennial leaders to also participate or to share the link of the survey with millennial leaders in their networks in an attempt to ensure greater diversity and representation.

The sampling methodology employed was therefore judgement and snowball sampling. Both these sampling methods fall within the category of non-probability sampling (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Judgement sampling requires the sample members to conform to specific criteria (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). In the case of this study, the sample member had to be born between 1981 and 1996, as well as occupy a leadership role or was being developed to take up a leadership role. Snowball sampling, as the name suggests, involves the initial participants in the study referring possible participants that meet the criteria to take part in the study (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). The fact that the researcher did not have access to the data base of

millennials in South Africa due to legislation restrictions, probability sampling was not feasible.

Krejcie and Morgan (1970) provide a guideline for determining the recommended sample size for a specific population. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the sample size increases at a very small rate as the population increases and becomes relatively constant at about 384 for a population size greater than, or equal to, one hundred thousand. In applying the recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a representative sample size of at least 384 respondents was aimed for in this study. This point of view was supported by bin Ahmad and binti Halim (2017).

3.5. The Research Instrument

Struwig and Stead (2013) stated that the primary data collection methods in a quantitative study can take the form of questionnaire surveys. These surveys can take the form of in-person surveys, electronic surveys, or telephonic surveys.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher utilised a self-administered questionnaire as the tool used for data collection. A self-administered questionnaire is a tool that is utilised to gather self-reported information from the sample identified in either paper-and-pen or electronic format (Polit & Beck, 2004). The reason for adopting this method of data collection was due to the large number of respondents in different geographical areas that needed to be reached in a short period of time. This method of collecting data allowed for data collection throughout South Africa without the researcher having to be physically present. The fact that during the survey the researcher did not have personal contact with the participant and the participant did not engage the researcher, helps maintain the anonymity in the study (Allen, 2017).

The questionnaire was chosen as the instrument to be utilised in the collection of data due to the fact that it was a quick method of data collection, relatively cheap, participants were more willing to divulge sensitive information in a self-administered questionnaire, as opposed to an interview and due to the fact that this method made the collection of large samples feasible (Babbie, 2010). The researcher acknowledges

the fact that using a questionnaire to collect data comes with some risks such as low response rates, the questionnaire not reaching the intended participants, the respondents not understanding the questions and the respondents having difficulty completing the survey (Struwig & Stead, 2013).

To manage these issues, a detailed cover letter accompanied the questionnaire, detailing the instructions on how the questionnaire was to be completed. The cover letter contained an introduction to the study and the researcher, contact details of the researcher, aims to mitigate any doubt or mistrust on the part of the participant and served as a form of motivation for them to be a participant in the research study (Sarantakos, 2005). The following guidelines, as highlighted by Sarantakos (2005), were incorporated into the cover letter:

- Identify the researcher.
- Outline the objectives and significance of the research study.
- Provide reasoning as to why the participant should complete the questionnaire
- Provide assurance of confidentiality, privacy, and anonymity.
- List the risks associated with the study.
- Discuss issues concerning research ethics.

Babbie (2015) stated that it is necessary to follow specific guidelines in terms of structure and design of a questionnaire as the format can influence the quality of data received and a clear format is likely to yield a higher response rate to all the questions asked. In designing the questionnaire, the researcher ensured that there are clear instructions regarding the completion of the questionnaire, there was a logical flow, the questionnaire was divided into subsections, the questions were short to avoid respondent fatigue and the questionnaire started with questions that are easier to answer (Struwig & Stead, 2013).

The structure of the questionnaire comprises four sections i.e.:

Table 1: Research instrument summarised

Section	Description	Type of question	Adapted from
Section A Demographics	This section required a respondent to complete their demographical and biographical data that included their nationality, gender, race and age. The respondent also needed to specify if they currently hold a leadership position or are currently being developed to become a leader	Multiple Choice Dichotomous Questions	
Section B Preferences	Question in this section served to determine the preference of millennial leaders to leadership coaching	Multiple Choice Dichotomous Questions 7 Point Likert Scale	Knight (2010)
Section C Leadership Coaching Success	In this section the researcher asked what the millennial leader determined as leadership coaching success	7 Point Likert Scale	Coaching Effectiveness Scale
Section D Perceptions	Question in this section aimed to establish the preference of the	7 Point Likert Scale	Ideal Mentor Scale

	millennial leader in terms of the characteristics of a coach that determined leadership coaching success		

The questionnaire comprised various statements linked to a seven-point Likert scale that assisted in measuring the respondents' perceptions and preferences. This is a universal method of collecting data which allows for easy interpretation of data. The Likert rating scale allows the researcher to easily draw conclusions, results and graphs from the responses collected (Struwig & Stead, 2013). According to Bird (2009), using these forms of questioning help reduce the variability of response, are cheap to administer and can be easily coded and analysed.

3.6 Procedure for data collection

As discussed above, the questionnaire survey was the tool that the researcher used to gather data to answer the research questions identified. As this study deals with millennials across South Africa, the researcher made use of Qualtrics, due to the fact that the identified members of the population sample were residing in different geographical areas, and it was not feasible in the period of time that was available to have completed this study for the researcher to collect the data in person. Furthermore, South Africa is currently facing a health epidemic that requires the citizens of the country to practice social distancing and limit direct contact with other people as far as possible.

Given the current predicament in which we find ourselves as South Africans, we needed to ensure that safety measures were in place to prevent the spread of COVID-19. It was for this reason that the researcher did not utilise the paper-and-pen format of conducting the questionnaire survey. The questionnaire was distributed and completed electronically and administered using Qualtrics. In this way, the researcher

was able to reach participants not residing in the same province as well as ensuring that safety measures in terms of COVID-19 were adhered to.

In order to mitigate the errors in measurement the researcher conducted a pilot study amongst 15 colleagues with the aim of picking up any errors that may occur prior to the main study being rolled out. As part of the pilot study, the researcher sent the questionnaire to 15 colleagues via email and allowed for responses to be collected for one week from date of circulation. Once data was received, the analysis of data was conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the data being used.

Once the questionnaire was adjusted to ensure greater validity and reliability, the researcher distributed the questionnaire amongst both his professional and social networks. This was done by means of emails, Facebook, and Linked-In. The researcher targeted pages on social media that had a large millennial following or pages that dealt with coaching. After a month of following the above method of data collection, there was still a shortfall in the number of participants as compared to the targeted sample size.

Being a member of the South African Board of People Practices (SABPP), the researcher approached the SABPP to circulate the questionnaire amongst their member database as the membership of this organisation represents young leaders in the field of people practices. An email containing the details of the study, link to the questionnaire and the qualifying criteria was circulated to all members on the SABPP database.

As identified above, the guideline recommended as a sample size for the given population size for this study is 384. Therefore, a total of 1000 questionnaires were distributed to members of the population group for this study to mitigate for non-responsiveness and incomplete questionnaires. According to Morton, Bandara, Robinson, and Atatoa Carr (2012), the following formulae can be used to determine the response rate of a study:

$$\textbf{Response rate} = \frac{\textbf{Number of completed, usable surveys received}}{\textbf{Number of questionnaires distributed}} \times 100$$

The response rate is a good indicator of the representativeness of the sample of the populations as a higher response rate implies a lower chance of response bias (Babbie, 2015). Recent data show a decline in the numbers listed above and an acceptable response rate for a survey ranges between 13% and 30% (Lindemann, 2019).

3.7. Data analysis and interpretation

Upon receipt of the completed questionnaires, the researcher embarked on data summarisation which comprised statistical analysis that resulted in condensation of the data, identifying underlying patterns, applying understandable conceptualisations or making generalised findings regarding the population groups (Burns & Bush, 2010). In identifying patterns and generalised findings, the centre of a distribution of the data received was determined in terms of the mode, median and mean. The mode is the value occurring most frequently whilst the median divides the ordered distribution into equal halves and the mean refers to the mathematical average, i.e. adding all the scores in the distribution and dividing the total by the number of participants (Creswel & Creswell, 2018; Lutabingwa & Auriacombe, 2007).

As part of the data analysis, there was also a need to look at how the data in a distribution are spread apart. In looking at the measurement of dispersion, the researcher looked at the range, semi-interquartile range, variance, and standard deviation. To reduce the data matrix, descriptive statistics was utilised in the statistical analysis (Burns & Bush, 2010). Descriptive analysis involved the basic transformation of data by describing the characteristics of data (i.e. the central tendency, variability and distribution) (Zikmund & Babin, 2013). Descriptive analysis was able to expose the typical respondent and the general response pattern whilst forming the basis for inferential analysis.

According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), descriptive statistics describe a collection of sample observations and therefore, inferential statistics allowed the researcher to make assumptions concerning the hypotheses. Since the researcher used a non-probability sampling technique to collect data, there was a need to calculate the

statistical inference (p-values), as well as effect size (d-values) where appropriate, in order to interpret the data. Inferential techniques were used to test the hypotheses formulated for this study and determine the strength and direction of the relationships between variables.

A correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables for each hypothesis. If it was found that there was a high correlation then it would imply that there was a strong relationship between the two variables whereas a low correlation means that the variables hardly share any relationship (Franzese & Juliano, 2019).This technique was connected to the linear regression analysis whereby the association between the dependent and independent variables was established. Furthermore, a multivariate analysis was conducted as this allowed for increased precision in the relation of the number of independent variables to a dependent variable whilst furnishing the guiding principles in the development of attitude scales and rating scales (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). Some of the multivariate techniques that were employed included multiple correlation, regression analysis and path analysis.

As described above, the correlation analysis was done to determine the relationship between the two variables and was used to test if a null hypothesis exists i.e., there is no relationship between the two variables. Multiple regression was utilised to determine the best predictor between preferences and perceptions of the millennial leader on leadership coaching success. The use of multiple linear regression aimed to establish the linear relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables, as described in the conceptual framework in chapter 2. There was no need to utilise a non-linear regression to describe the relationship between the leadership coaching success (i.e. the dependent / response variable) and one or more explanatory variables (i.e. preference and perception) in a non-linear fashion (Lutabingwa & Auriacombe, 2007).

Taking all the above into account, the steps that were utilised can be summarised as follows: The first step was to construct a model for bivariate analysis by displaying the quantitative variables graphically to show the relationship by means of a scatterplot or dispersion diagram. This enabled one to determine if the two variates covariate in either a linear or non-linear fashion (Bertani, Di Paola, Russo, & Tuzzolino, 2018). The

second step involved measuring the strength of the linear association between the variables by means of a correlation analysis. This is represented by a number between -1 and +1, thus showing either a positive correlation (i.e. both either increase or decrease simultaneously) or a negative correlation (i.e., if one increases the other decreases) (Bertani et al., 2018). The third step involved performing a quantitative assessment of the variation of the dependent variable compared to the independent variable by means of a mathematical equation that describes how the mean value of the dependent variable changes according to the changes of the independent variable (Bertani et al., 2018).




Figure 7: Examples of Linear Correlation adapted from Bertani et al. (2018, p. 1136)

As part of data analysis, the researcher made use of a statistical programme, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The approach that the researcher adopted was a deductive approach in determining the effects on the perceptions and preferences of the millennial leader on coaching success. This approach tested the Generation Theory and the Cognitive Behavioural Theory against the data collected in this study.

3.8. Limitations of the study

- Reliability of data was reliant on the quality of answers that the researcher received from the participants (Almeida, Faria, & Queirós, 2017). In this study if the survey was answered poorly, it would have contributed little or nothing at all to the final results that the researcher wished to achieve.

- The structure was quite rigid as the researcher had determined the orientation of the study, thereby not allowing the participant to elaborate on significant points that they might have viewed as important to the study.
- This study did not allow for emotions and behaviour of the respondents to be captured, therefore limiting the input of participants by only concentrating on the orientation that the researcher had determined for this study.
- The lack of available data regarding possible participants that met the qualifying criteria to participate in this study, limited the sampling methods that could have been adopted and maked probability sampling non-feasible.

3.9. Validity and reliability

According to Patino and Ferreira (2018), the validity of a research study refers to how representative the results of the participants are of individuals belonging to the same population but who did not participate in the study. Reliability on the other hand refers to the extent to which a measurement is free from “random and unstable error” (Schindler, 2019, p. p237). In testing the reliability and validity of the construct and the instrument, the researcher is able to determine if the study is accurately and consistently measuring what it intends measuring (Galawe, 2017).

3.9.1. External validity

External validity refers to the extent to which the results obtained in a research study can be generalised to other contexts (Leedy & Ormrod, 2016; Schindler, 2019). Data was collected across all provinces in South Africa irrespective of their economic development and from millennials of different races, genders and in different occupational categories. This diversity allowed the researcher to gather valid results to be able to generalise across the millennial generational cohort. The researcher also made use of simple random sampling by sharing the link to the questionnaire with colleagues, networks, the members of the SABPP and on the various social media

platforms. This allowed for each member of the population group being studied to have an equal chance of being selected (Creswel & Creswell, 2018).

The researcher improved the external validity by having considered psychological realism in that the researcher provided the participants with the aims of the study in the cover letter to ensure that the participants experienced the events of the study as a real event (Cuncic, 2020). Where needed, statistical methods were used to adjust issues regarding external validity.

3.9.2. Internal validity

Internal validity can be defined as “the extent to which the observed results represent the truth in the population” being studied and that these observations are not as a result of methodological errors (Patino & Ferreira, 2018, p. 183). To ensure that internal validity was achieved, the researcher made use of the same questionnaire regardless of the province in which the participant was residing. The simple random sampling discussed above, the large sample size and the fact that the instrument that was used was adapted from instruments used in previous studies, further improved results in this regard.

As part of ensuring validity, the researcher measured the extent that the test measures the abstract variables that it was intended to measure. This is known as construct validity, and it is responsible for testing the meaning of test scores and validating the content. Construct validity is measured by means of an exploratory factor analysis. The questionnaire was also subjected to the scrutiny of the research supervisor. To maintain internal validity, the instrument used to test the variables identified in this study originated from previous studies which had an acceptable Cronbach alpha score.

A statistical procedure known as factor analysis was explored to allow intercorrelated variables to be condensed into factors in an attempt to determine simple patterns in the pattern of relationships among the variables identified (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). This was done by generating a correlation matrix for all variables, extracting the factors

from the correlation matrix, based on the correlation coefficients of the variables and rotating the factors, if required, in an attempt to maximise the relationship between variables and some other factors.

3.9.3. Reliability

According to Bryman and Bell (2007), reliability deals with the question of whether the results of the study are repeatable. This is in line with Schindler (2019), who stated that reliability refers to the degree that a measure supplies consistent results. There are various sources of threats to reliability, such as subject reliability, observer reliability, situational reliability, data reliability and instrument reliability.

Subject reliability was mitigated by the fact that the questionnaire was completed at the convenience of the participant. As suggest by Galawe (2017), this is further mitigated by the fact that the participants were informed of the time it would take to complete the survey up-front thereby minimising the effects of fatigue or being disturbed. Observer reliability, which deals with the abilities of the person conducting the interview, was not an issue in this study as the researcher made use of an online questionnaire that was self-administered (Drost, 2011).

Situational reliability refers to the conditions under which the measurements were made or under which the questionnaire was completed (Drost, 2011). The researcher is hopeful that the flexibility and convenience of the online questionnaire will mitigate this threat. Data processing reliability deals with the handling of data in terms of capturing and coding (Drost, 2011). In this study, the data captured online in Qualtrics, was exported to SPSS, thereby minimising the data handling error in terms of human error. The instrument reliability can be compromised by vagueness of the questions, double-barrelled questions and poor sentence construction (Creswel & Creswell, 2018). In an attempt to minimise the unreliability with regard to the instrument, the researcher made use of scales that have been tested in other studies.

As suggested by Sarantakos (2005), the researcher used the split-half method by dividing the responses to the items of a measuring instrument into two groups and

then correlating the scores. The degree of reliability was determined by the type and degree of correlation. The researcher also considered the reliability of the various scales in previous research (Babbie, 2010). The researcher also ensured that the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for each instrument and sub-scale, thereby confirming the consistency of the research measuring instrument. This was also achieved by using scales from previous studies with Cronbach alpha of 0.70 or more.

A reliability analysis was utilised to determine if all items in the questionnaire were to be utilised in determining the total scores or to explore the need to remove certain items to improve reliability. The internal reliability coefficient was compared with the coefficients obtained as a result of the factor analysis. This comparison assisted in the determination of which items needed to be removed. According to Shoukri and Edge (1996), a reliability coefficient (r) greater than 0.75 is excellent, between 0.40 and 0.75 is good and anything less than 0.40 is poor. Mat Daud, Khidzir, Ismail, and Abdullah (2018), on the other hand, stated that any Alpha Cronbach score of 0.6 is considered as low but a score above 0.6 is regarded as acceptable.

3.10. Ethical considerations

Babbie and Mouton (2001) were of the view that anyone who conducts social research must be aware of the agreements around what is considered proper and improper in the process of scientific inquiry. As a social researcher, one is bound to transgress the privacy of respondents in order to study social behaviour and therefore one needs to take extra precautions to protect the confidentiality and privacy of the respondents. In considering the ethical issues, the researcher reassured the respondents that all data would be handled confidentially and anonymously.

a) Voluntary Participation

   The researcher was dependent on the participants' voluntary participation and co-operation. The cover letter emphasised that participation was voluntary and provided the outline of the study, requirements of the study and the data collection methodology. By completing the questionnaire, the respondent implicitly consented to taking part in the study on a voluntary basis.

b) Ethical Clearance

Ethical clearance was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand by applying online via the Ethics Management System. Only once granted permission and allocated an ethics number, was the researcher able to embark on the collection of data.

c) Anonymity

In this study, no personal identifying information was requested that could link the respondent to a particular questionnaire or answer. In this way, anonymity was achieved as neither the researcher nor the readers would be able to link a given respondent to a particular response (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

d) Confidentiality

Confidentiality refers to when the researcher may be privy to certain information but holds such information in confidence or keeps such information away from the public domain (Neuman, 2011). In this study, the data was held in confidence and no information was divulged that could link a particular respondent to a particular questionnaire. In an attempt to ensure confidentiality, the research only dealt with data in an aggregate form (i.e. percentage, graphs, tables, etc.) during the data analysis phase.(DeRue & Myers, 2014).

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the results of this study are presented. The results are presented in terms of the sample characteristics, the sampling suitability, the exploratory factor analysis, the reliability and measurement scales, the correlation analysis, assumption testing, the results of all the hypotheses, testing of the various hypotheses and a summary of the results is provided.

4.2. Data Screening and Quality

A total of 725 responses were received. Nine of the responses indicated that they do not consent to the terms of the study as detailed in the introductory letter and 113 indicated that they were not born between 1981 and 1996. These responses were eliminated from the data collected. Of the remaining 603 response, 221 responses contained missing data as a result of the respondents not completing the survey in full. Once the data set was cleaned, a total of 382 responses remained for analysis in relation to the hypotheses identified in Chapter 2.

4.3. Sample Characteristics

In exploring the preferences and perceptions of the millennial leader towards leadership coaching, the study allowed for data to be collected in terms of the gender, ethnicity, occupational level, and previous coaching experience of the respondent. The data collected in this regard is detailed below, showing an equitable spread amongst respondents in terms of their gender, ethnicity, occupational level and previous coaching experience.

4.3.1 Gender and Ethnicity

A total of 138 (36.13%) males compared to 243 (63.61%) females participated in this study. One respondent identified as non-binary or the third gender. The majority of the respondents in the study were black (41.62%) whilst the remainder of the sample comprised 26.18% Indian, 24.35% White and 7.85% Coloured. Table 2, below, shows the gender and ethnicity distribution of the sample population.

Table 2: Gender and Ethnicity Cross-tabulation

		Ethnicity				
		Black	Coloured	Indian	White	Total
Gender	Female	100	20	45	78	243
	Male	59	9	55	15	138
	Non-binary / third gender	0	1	0	0	1
Total		159	30	100	93	382

4.3.2. Occupational level

Due to the fact that this study dealt with millennials that either occupied leadership positions or were being developed as leaders, it was important to determine the occupational level of all respondents. In terms of the occupational level occupied by the respondents sampled, 11.5% were employed as top management, 16% occupied the senior management level, 24,3% held middle management roles, 18.1% where junior managers, 18.3% indicated that they currently do not hold a management role

but were being developed as leaders whilst 11.8% remain unclassified. Figure 8 shows the distribution of the sample on terms of their occupational level.




Figure 8: Occupational Levels

4.2.3. Coaching Exposure

A total of 227 respondents have been exposed to coaching in some form or the other whilst 155 respondents have had no exposure to coaching. This is illustrated in Figure 9. 59.4%, being the majority of the respondents, have had an exposure to coaching and hence it can be implied that this cohort understands the process and is therefore able to contribute to the study by relating to the questions asked, based on personal experience. Whilst 40.6% of the respondents indicated they have not received coaching, the study looked at the differences in the preferences and perceptions expressed by this cohort, compared to those who have received coaching. The millennial leader has been described in Chapter 2, as belonging to a generational cohort that knows what they want and sets out to achieve the same in a way that may not be fully understood by other generational groups. The researcher therefore aimed

to see whether experience could influence the perceptions and preferences of the millennial leader.




Figure 9: Previous Coaching Experience

4.3. Millennial Coaching Preferences

In an attempt to better understand the millennial coachee in terms of their preference, the researcher gathered data on the preference of the millennial when it came to who they want to be coached by, what are the subject matters that they wish to receive coaching on, when do they prefer coaching to take place, and finally, where do they prefer to be coached. Whilst these preferences did not test the impact on leadership coaching success, the descriptive analysis outlined in the sub-sections below can provide the basis of future studies on this topic.

4.3.1. Who conducts the coaching?

A majority of the respondents to the survey (52.4%) indicated they would prefer to be coached by an expert in their field, whilst 23% indicated that they preferred a professional coach whilst 22.8% indicated that a more senior manager in the workplace would be their preference. The remaining 1.8% of respondents indicated that they preferred either a member of top management who did not work in the same company as them or anyone that has relevant experience in the field. Table 3 below indicated the frequency and percentage per variable as selected by the respondents.

Table 3: Preference in terms of who should be the coach

Preference of coach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A more senior manager in my workplace	87	22.8	22.8	22.8
	a professional coach	88	23.0	23.0	45.8
	an expert in my field	200	52.4	52.4	98.2
	Other	7	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	382	100.0	100.0	

4.3.2 What is the subject matter on which millennials want to be coached?

As part of the study, respondents were asked to arrange a list of coaching topics from 1 to 7 with 1 being most preferred and 7 least preferred. In terms of the topics that the millennial leader preferred to be coached, it is clear from the data in Table 4 below that personal development (RFC1), leadership development (RFC2) and career

development (RFC3) were rated as more important when compared to exploring creative solutions to problems experienced (RFC4), reputation management within the organisation (RFC5), relationship with management (RFC6) or self-discovery (RFC7).

Table 4: Coaching subject matter

Count

		trans1							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Index1	RFC5	23	34	31	43	57	106	88	382
	RFC1	154	76	43	27	24	26	32	382
	RFC2	58	97	65	62	46	29	25	382
	RFC3	53	80	106	55	37	27	24	382
	RFC4	21	24	62	117	88	41	29	382
	RFC6	33	27	29	29	74	85	105	382
	RFC7	40	44	46	49	56	68	79	382
Total		382	382	382	382	382	382	382	2674

In terms of rating the reasons for coaching from most important to least important, the respondents' ratings as indicated in Figure 10 below were as follow:

1. Personal development (RFC1)
2. Leadership development (RFC2)
3. Career development (RFC3)
4. Explore creative solutions to problems being experienced (RFC4)
5. Relationship with line-manager (RFC6)
6. Management of one's reputation within the organisation (RFC5)
7. Self-discovery (RFC7)




Figure 10: Ratings of coaching topics

Other areas that millennials preferred coaches to concentrate on, although a very low percentage of respondents indicating the same, included goal setting, work-life balance, relationship management at all levels, challenge commonly held assumptions and beliefs, critical thinking, decision making under difficult circumstances, emotional intelligence, business expansion, better understanding of internal processes, how to navigate the corporate environment, strength identification, change management, provide motivation, peer sharing sessions, strategy and time management.

4.3.3 When should coaching take place?

The majority of the respondents (49%) indicated that they preferred coaching to take place monthly whilst 31.4% indicated that coaching should take place weekly and 19.6% confirmed that their preference is for coaching interventions to take place every other week. Figure 11 is a graphical representation of these splits.




Figure 11: Frequency of Coaching

Of the 382 respondents, 292 (76.4%) indicated that their preference was to be coached during office hours and only 90 (23.6%) indicated that they preferred to be coached outside business hours and did not mind if this happened during weekends. Figure 12 shows the distribution of the responses received in this regarded with the blue part representative of the majority of respondents, indicating that their preference was to be coached during office hours.




Figure 12: When coaching should take place

4.3.4. Where should coaching take place?

In looking at where millennials prefer the coaching to take place, 58.6% of the respondents preferred to be coached at their workplace, 34.6% preferred to be coached outside their workplace and only 6.8% wanted to be coached in the privacy of their home. Figure 13 below is a graphically representation of this split.




Figure 13: Preference as to where to be coached

4.5 CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

Construct validity refers to the degree that a scale measures the construct adequately thereby allowing for a systemic analysis of how relevant the research conducted is in measuring what the study purports to measure (Shuttleworth, 2009). In determining the construct validity of the measurement tool used in this study, the sampling adequacy was determined using the Keiser-Meyer-Olkin test and the Bartlett's test of

sphericity and an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted. Below details the results of these tests and analysis that was performed.

4.5.1 Sampling adequacy

To determine if the sample adequacy and if items had correlation values sufficient to conduct a factor analysis, the Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and the Bartlett's test of sphericity were run. The results from these tests are represented in Table 5. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.825. According to Pallant (2013), as cited by Hadi, Abdullah, and Sentosa (2016), the sampling is both adequate and sufficient if the KMO value is 0.6 or more. Given that the KMO test resulted in a value of 0.825 it can be established that the sample in this study is both adequate and sufficient. The Bartlett's test was used to determine the strength of the relationship between the items by measuring the multivariate normality of set of distribution (Hadi et al., 2016). A significant value of less than 0.05 shows that the data did not result in an identity matrix (Pallant, 2013). In this study, the significant value is 0.000 therefore indicating that the data was multivariate and acceptable to continue further analysis.

Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.825
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2433.748
	df	171
	Sig.	.000

4.5.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

In an attempt to identify the number of factors and their structure, as well as to test the relationship between the different factors and their variables, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted via SPSS. The extraction methodology adopted was that of principal factor factoring, unrotated factor solution, scree plot and Eigenvalue greater than 1. Promax was the rotation method used since it is an oblique method, and the factors are hypothesised to be interrelated. The scree plot and the Eigenvalue of greater that 1 was used to establish the number of factors to be extracted. The statistical significance of 0.40 was used and therefore all items that loaded less than 0.40 were excluded from the study. A score of less than 0.40 indicated that the items did not have an acceptable loading. Items that had cross loadings or were dispersed were also excluded from the study. In this instance, the total variance explained, as illustrated in Table 6 below, explained 62.608% of the variance in the original set of items.

Table 6: Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings[a]
Factor	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	4.572	24.064	24.064	4.060	21.369	21.369	2.621
2	2.960	15.582	39.645	2.556	13.453	34.822	3.043
3	1.820	9.577	49.222	1.370	7.209	42.031	2.735
4	1.518	7.990	57.212	1.004	5.285	47.316	2.868
5	1.025	5.396	62.608	.506	2.665	49.981	2.002
6	.806	4.241	66.849				
7	.716	3.768	70.617				
8	.670	3.524	74.141				

9	.579	3.046	77.187				
10	.561	2.954	80.141				
11	.555	2.919	83.060				
12	.529	2.783	85.843				
13	.496	2.611	88.455				
14	.482	2.537	90.992				
15	.436	2.292	93.284				
16	.371	1.955	95.240				
17	.316	1.661	96.901				
18	.312	1.644	98.544				
19	.277	1.456	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

a. When factors are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

The same was confirmed by the scree plot, Figure 14, that showed that five factors were extracted. It is noted that after the 5th factor the graph flattens.




Figure 14: Scree Plot

Initially the study tested 29 items. The pattern matrix, as opposed to the structure matrix, was used to eliminate items based on the criteria listed below. The following items, as illustrated in Table 7, were excluded from further analysis within the study:

Table 7: Items removed from the study

Item	Reason
Coach Integrity - CIP4	Cross loaded under an alternate factor with less than 3 items
Coach Integrity – CIP6	No Loading
Coach Integrity – CIP7	No Loading
Coach Responsibility – CRP3	No Loading
Coach Responsibility – CRP5	No Loading
Coaching Success – CS1	Cross loaded under an alternate factor with less than 3 items
Coaching Success – CS6	Cross loaded under an alternate factor with less than 3 items
Coaching Guidance – CGP5	No Loading
Preference – PREF1	No Loading
Preference – PREF4	Dispersed over more than one factor and to increase reliability

Coach Guidance Perception CGP1 loaded under Preferences. The cleaned pattern matrix is reflected in Table 8.

Table 8: Pattern Matrix

Pattern Matrix[a]

	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
CRP1	.837				
CRP2	.812				
CRP4	.776				
CRP6	.669				
CS3		.774			
CS4		.698			
CS2		.685			
CS5		.675			
CS7		.454			
CIP2			.956		
CIP1			.613		
CIP3			.598		
CIP5			.499		
CGP3				.717	
CGP2				.551	
CGP4				.538	
PREF2					.806
PREF3					.487
CGP1					.449

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalisation.[a]

a. Rotation converged in six iterations.

As part of the Factor Analysis, a number of statistical procedures were used to determine the number of distinctive constructs that determined the pattern correlations from the items measured in the survey. Table 6 illustrates the nineteen items that loaded on the five factors as a result of convergence and divergence. This was after the pattern matrix was cleaned to exclude all items that cross loaded or failed to load. The five factors that loaded were labelled as follows: Factor 1 – Perception regarding a coach's responsibility, Factor 2 – Coaching Success (i.e., the dependent variable), Factor 3 – Perception regarding the integrity of a coach, Factor 4 – Perception regarding the guidance provided by the coach and Factor 5 – Preference on how to be coached. All five factors had Eigenvalues of greater than zero therefore implying that there is no multicollinearity, and the positive values indicate that the model used in this study was not ill-conditioned. Given the above illustrated facts, it can be established that the measure used in this study was constructively valid. Therefore, all constructs were valid in the context of this study and therefore retained as illustrated in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Impact of the Pattern Matrix on Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Factor of Covergence	Items Related	Overall status of Hypothesis
H1- There is a positive influence of how a millennial leader wants to be coached on leadership coaching success	Factor 5	PREF2 PREF3 CGP1	Further investigations were conducted to test the potential influence of the preference as to how a millennial wants to be coached on leadership coaching success
H2.a – There is a positive influence	Factor 3	CIP2 CIP1	Further investigations were

of millennial's perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching		CIP3 CIP5	conducted to test the potential influence of the millennial perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching success
H2.b – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success	Factor 4	CGP3 CGP2 CGP4	Further investigations were conducted to test the potential influence of the millennial's perception in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success
H2.c – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of the relationship they share with the coach on leadership coaching success	Factor 1	CRP1 CRP2 CRP4 CRP6	Further investigations were conducted to test the potential influence of the millennial's perception in terms of the relationship shared with the coach on leadership coaching success

4.6 Reliability of Measurement Scales

Scale reliability tests were conducted on all constructs and are summarised in Table 10. The table reflects the number of items used to measure the various constructs, the Cronbach Alpha score per construct, the number of items that was deleted to ensure an improved scale reliability and the resulting Cronbach Alpha score once the problematic items were deleted. The reliability coefficient ranged from 0.642 to 0.855 after the data was cleaned up to ensure a clean pattern matrix. These reliability coefficients are within the acceptable range, as per the discussion in Section 3.9.3.

Table 10: Summary of Cronbach Alpha per construct

Description	Factors/Constructs	Codes	No of Items	Cronbach Alpha before adjustment	Items Deleted	Items loaded from another Construct	Cronbach Alpha after adjustment
Leadership Coaching Success	Leadership Coaching Success	CS	7	0,796	2	0	0,794
Preference	Coaching preference	PREF	4	0,587	2	1	0,642
Perceptions	Integrity of the coach	CIP	6	0,828	2	0	0,781
	Guidance from the coach	CGP	6	0,717	3	0	0,664
	Relationship with the coach	CRP	6	0,829	2	0	0,855

The items deleted, as indicated in table 10, was as a result of cross-loading or not loading as illustrated in Table 7. In three instances, this resulted in a decrease of the Cronbach Alpha value but increased the Cronbach Alpha value in the remaining two factors. In an attempt to improve the Cronbach Alpha value, an analysis was run to

see if deleting any further items would improve the reliability of the scale. No improvement was observed and hence no further items were deleted. Item CGP1 loaded under Factor 5 (Preference on how a millennial wished to be coached) and contributed to an increase in the Cronbach Alpha value from 0.587 to 0.642. The Cronbach Alpha values were all above 0.6 which was confirmed as being acceptable by Mat Daud et al. (2018) and Shoukri and Edge (1996). Table 7 lists the related items to the respective factors. In order to ensure reliability of the scale, a single composite score was produced. This composite score for each factor took the place of the items that related to the respective factor thereby increasing reliability, as compared to the original items.

4.7. Correlation Analysis

The Pearson's correlation coefficient and the two-tailed test of significance was utilised to determine the relationships between variables. The results of these tests are contained in Table 11. As part of the correlation analysis, hypothesis H1.d, H2.a, H2.b and H2.c was tested against Leadership Coaching Success, the dependent variable. Table 11 highlights that between the perceptions with regards to a coach's integrity and coaching success there is a positive, medium and significant correlation ($r = 0.315$, $p < 0.01$), between perceptions with regards to coach's guidance and coaching success there is a positive, medium and significant correlation ($r = 0.408$, $p < 0.01$), between perceptions with regards to the relationship with the coach and coaching success, there is a negative, small but insignificant correlation ($r = -0.025$, $p = 0.630$) and between the preference on how a millennial leader wishes to be coached and coaching success there is a positive, small and significant correlation ($r = 0.253$, $p<0.01$).

Table 11: Correlation Analysis between the Independent and Dependent Variable

Pearson Correlation

	Coaching_Success	Coach_Integrity	Coach_Relation	Coach_Guidance	Pref_How
Coaching_Success	1				
Coach_Integrity	.330**	1			
Coach_Relation	-0.008	.165**	1		
Coach_Guidance	.400**	.406**	0.095	1	
Pref_How	.272**	.169**	.187**	.374**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.8. Assumption Testing

Further testing was conducted to ensure that no linear regression assumptions were violated by testing the outliers, normality, linearity, and conducting other regression testing. The results of these test are articulated in the sub-sections below.

4.8.1. Outliers

Outliers refers to data points that differ from the data set as a result of deviating from the range of the majority of the other explanations and therefore lying outside of the set boundaries (Salkind, 2010). In order to determine any outliers, the researcher utilised the box plot methodology. All data points marked with an asterisk in figure 15 below are identified as outliers in the data set.




Figure 15: Box Plot with outliers

As part of the analysis under the variable coaching success, case 305 was identified as an outlier, under the factor preference in terms of guidance from the coach, case 43 was identified as an outlier and under the factor preference on how to be coached, cases 52, 234, 174 and 140 were all identified as outliers. In order to address these outliers, the value in these cases were substituted with the second highest value for the respective factors. For coaching success, the value was replaced with 3.6, for preference in terms of guidance from the coach the outlier was replaced with 3.67 and likewise for the factor preference on how to be coached, the value was substituted with 5.67. As illustrated in Figure 16, once all the outliers were substituted as described above, no further outliers existed. This therefore implies that the assumption that there were no outliers as a result of substitution was met.




Figure 16: Box Plot without outliers

4.8.2. Normality

In an attempt to determine the normality of the constructs, the researcher determined the skewness and kurtosis of the constructs, as illustrated in Table 12. In order for the constructs to approximate a normal distribution, the skewness value needs to be between -3 and 3 whilst the kurtosis value needs to be between -10 and 10 (Aminu & Shariff, 2014; Kline, 2011). From the data below, it can be established that all the variables approximate a normal distribution and a positive skewness with the exception of the perception in terms of relationship with the coach which shows a negative skewness.

Table 12: Descriptive statistics – Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Coaching_Success_CompositeScore	382	5.00	1.00	6.00	614.80	1.6094	.56151	.315	1.745	.125	9.220	.249
Coach_Integrity_CompositeScore	382	2.75	1.00	3.75	617.25	1.6158	.60874	.371	1.005	.125	.758	.249
Coach_Relation_CompositeScore	382	6.00	1.00	7.00	1722.00	4.5079	1.49087	2.223	-.319	.125	-.676	.249
Coach_Guidance_CompositeScore	382	4.33	1.00	5.33	639.00	1.6728	.61261	.375	1.161	.125	3.007	.249
Pref_How_CompositeScore	382	6.00	1.00	7.00	898.00	2.3508	1.02874	1.058	1.411	.125	3.119	.249
Valid N (listwise)	382											

The residuals approximated the normal distribution as is mandatory for regression and is evident from Figure 17 which is representative of a normal P-P Plot of standardised residuals (i.e., the values lie close the diagonal line).




Figure 17: P-P PLOT

Confirmation that the normality of the residual assumption was met can further be illustrated in Figure 18. The histogram of regression standardised residuals is depicted by bars that are only slightly above the normal curve thereby confirming the alignment discussed above in the P-P Plot.




Figure 18: Histogram – Regression Standardised Residual for Coaching Success

4.8.3. Autocorrelation

The Durbin-Watson test was conducted to determine if there was autocorrelation. In this study, the Durbin-Watson, which gives the indication of the independence error, is 2.043 as illustrated in Table 13. According to Field (2013), a Durbin-Watson value between 0 and 4 is acceptable and therefore the value of 2.043 shows that there is an absence of autocorrelation. The model summary (Table 13) further highlighted that 21.9% of the independent variables predict the dependent variable.

Table 13: The Model Summary

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.468[a]	.219	.210	.46600	2.043

a. Predictors: (Constant), Pref_How, Coach_Integrity, Coach_Relation, Coach_Guidance

b. Dependent Variable: Coaching_Success

4.8.4 Linearity

Linearity, which is a requirement for correlation and regression analysis, assists in determining if there is a linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2003). According to Field (2013), linearity is experienced when the correlation between the variables is greater than 0.3. In this study, according to Table 10, the R value is 0.468 and therefore the linearity assumption is met. Whilst a scatterplot may be used to test linearity, the study had a seven-point scale with 382 data points thereby making it difficult to interpret a scatterplot. It is for this reason that the Pearson Moment of Correlation was utilised. Table 11 details the relationship between all variables tested and their significance. Coaching success (CS), which is the dependent variable, had a significant linear relationship with the following independent variables: CIP, CGP, PH at p=0.01 but did not seem to have a significant linear relationship with CGP.

4.8.5 Homoscedasticity

To access the homoscedasticity in the data, a scatterplot was generated, as illustrated in Figure 19. As illustrated in the scatterplot (Figure 19), the error terms were scattered

between -2 and +2 without a specific pattern, thereby signifying that the error terms were independent and therefore confirming the assumption that homoscedasticity was met.




Figure 19: Scatterplot

4.9. Influence of millennials' preference on coaching success

H1 - There is a positive influence of how a millennial leader wants to be coached on leadership coaching success

In looking at how the coaching should take place; the researcher explored the preferred medium that a coach should use when coaching a millennial. As illustrated in figure 20, 262 respondents indicated that they preferred a face-to-face coaching session, 113 opted for online and only seven indicated telephonic as their medium of choice.




Figure 20: Medium used to coach

The researcher further explored the preference to coaching that is structured (PREF1), has homework issued between session (PREF2), coaching that included stimulation and role play (PREF3), or coaching that included open-source programmes, such as YouTube videos or massive open online courses (MOOCs) (PREF4). This was tested by means of a 7-point Likert- scale. In terms of the descriptive statistics, as illustrated in Table 14, PREF2 rated as the highest item with a mean score of 2.69 and PREF1 rated as the lowest item with a mean score of 2.18. All the items in this construct were rated below the midpoint of the scale (i.e., below a 4 rating). This implies that the majority of the respondents leaned towards various degrees of agreements when rating these items. Furthermore, the low standard deviation scores for these four items shows that there was a very small measure of dispersion of data in relation to the mean.

Table 14: Descriptive Statistics – Preference on how to be coached

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PREF1	382	1	7	2.18	1.340
PREF2	382	1	7	2.69	1.517
PREF3	382	1	7	2.38	1.435
PREF4	382	1	7	2.24	1.164
Valid N (listwise)	382				

4.10. Influence of millennials' perceptions on leadership coaching success

In terms of hypothesis two, the study measured the perception of the millennial leader with regards to the integrity of the coach (CIP, the guidance from the coach (CGP), and the relationship shared with the coach (CRP).

4.10.1. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the integrity of the coach

H2.a – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching

In looking at this hypothesis, the study tested the following items in terms of the perceptions regarding the integrity of the coach: recognise your potential (CIP1), believe in you (CIP2), value you as a person (CIP3), generally try to be thoughtful and considerate (CIP4), advocates for your needs and interest (CIP5) and inspire you by his or her example and word (CIP6).

By looking at Table 15, one notices that CIP5 rated as the highest item with a mean score of 1.86 and CIP1 and CIP3 rated as the lowest item with a mean score of 1.53. From the low mean scores, it can be established that the majority of the respondents leaned towards strongly agree or agree when rating the items in this construct. All the standard deviations are below 1, therefore implying that there was a very small measure of dispersion of data in relation to the mean.

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics - Perception in relation to the integrity of the coach

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CIP1	382	1	4	1.53	.693
CIP2	382	1	5	1.54	.785
CIP3	382	1	5	1.53	.744
CIP4	382	1	7	1.76	.875
CIP5	382	1	5	1.86	.898
CIP6	382	1	7	1.62	.888
Valid N (listwise)	382				

4.10.2. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the guidance that a coach should offer

H2.b – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success

To test this hypothesis, the following items were tested in terms of the guidance that a coach should extend to a coachee: give specific assignments related to your problem (CGP1), help maintain a clear focus (CGP2), brainstorm solutions to a problem (CGP3), provide information to help you understand the subject matter you are dealing with (CGP4), be generous with time and other resources (CGP5) and meet with you on a regular basis (CGP6).

From Table 16, it can be established that CGP6 rated as the highest item with a mean score of 2.16 and CGP2 rated as the lowest item with a mean score of 1.64. This implies that the majority of the respondents leaned towards various degrees of agreements when rating these items. Furthermore, the low standard deviation scores for these six items shows that there was a very small measure of dispersion of data in relation to the mean.

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics – Perception in relation to the guidance received from the coach

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CGP1	382	1	7	1.98	1.043
CGP2	382	1	6	1.64	.703
CGP3	382	1	7	1.69	.816
CGP4	382	1	6	1.69	.850
CGP5	382	1	7	2.00	.977
CGP6	382	1	7	2.16	1.019
Valid N (listwise)	382				

4.10.3. Perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of their relationship with the coach

In testing this hypothesis, the study looked at the following items: take you out for dinner and / or drinks after work (CRP1), relate to you as if he / she is a responsible, admirable older sibling (CRP2), help you realise your life vision (CRP3), talk to you about their personal problems (CRP4), be a cheerful, high-spirited person (CRP5), have coffee or lunch with you on occasions (CRP6).

CRP1 was rated the highest with a mean score of 5.01 whilst CRP5 was rated the lowest with a mean score of 2.67. In order of rating from highest to lowest, CRP1 was followed by CRP4 (Mean = 4.76), then CRP2 (Mean = 4.45), followed by CRP6 (Mean = 3.81). CRP3 (Mean = 2.68) and CRP5 (Mean = 2.67). CRP1, CRP4 and CRP2 were all rated above the midpoint of four, therefore indicating that the respondents in these items leaned towards the various degrees of disagreement, whilst respondents' ratings for CRP6 leaned towards them selecting neither agree or disagree and their ratings for CRP3 and CRP5 leaned towards the various degrees of agreement. The standard deviation values, as reflected in Table 17, ranged between 1.857 and 1.372 therefore implying that there was a very small measure of dispersion of data in relation to the mean.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics - Perception in relation to the relationship shared with the coach

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CRP1	382	1	7	5.01	1.700
CRP2	382	1	7	4.45	1.852
CRP3	382	1	7	2.68	1.571
CRP4	382	1	7	4.76	1.857
CRP5	382	1	7	2.67	1.372
CRP6	382	1	7	3.81	1.731

Valid N (listwise)	382				

4.11. The dependant Variable – Leadership Coaching Success

The study looked at the following items when measuring the construct of leadership coaching success: I become aware of my underlying personal issues (CS1), I am able to look openly at my personal strengths as well as my challenges (CS2), I am able to look in new ways at the issues and problems I am facing (CS3), I am able to discuss heated issues constructively (CS4), I am able to note visible improvements in my own and / or my team's performance (CS5), I am able to develop a better sense of balance between my work and home life and leisure (CS6) and I am able to find new ways to enhance my relationships with colleagues (CS7).

According to Table 18, the respondents rated CS1 one the highest with a mean score of 1.93 and CS5 as the lowest with a mean score of 1.53. All the mean scores for the various items under this construct were below two, indicating that the respondents' ratings leaned toward the strongly agree rating. Furthermore, the standard deviation value is very low, indicating that there was a very small measure of dispersion of data in relation to the mean.

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics – Coaching Success

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CS1	382	1	7	1.93	1.041
CS2	382	1	6	1.55	.641
CS3	382	1	6	1.54	.673
CS4	382	1	7	1.57	.787

CS5	382	1	6	1.53	.712
CS6	382	1	7	1.73	.953
Valid N (listwise)	382				

4.11. ANOVA and Coefficient Analysis

In order to test the hypotheses, set out in Chapter 2, a multiple regression analysis was used. For the purposes of the multiple regression analysis, leadership coaching success was selected as the dependent variable and preference on how to be coached, perceptions in relation to the guidance provided by the coach, perceptions in relation to the integrity of the coach and perceptions in relation to the relationship shared with the coach, were selected as the independent variables. This regression analysis was conducted to determine the manner in which the multiple independent variables simultaneously impacted the dependent variable as well as the size and direction of the impact that each independent variable has on the dependent variable. As discussed in section 4.7.3 above, 21.9% of the independent variables predict the dependent variable.

As part of the regression analysis, an ANOVA value was obtained, as illustrated in Table 19. As indicated in Table 19 the p-value = 0.000, which is less than 0.05 thereby indicating that the independent variables were significant in predicting leadership coaching success.

Table 19: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.927	4	5.732	26.395	.000[b]
	Residual	81.869	377	.217		
	Total	104.796	381			

a. Dependent Variable: Coaching_Success

b. Predictors: (Constant), Pref_How, Coach_Integrity, Coach_Relation, Coach_Guidance

In Table 20, one can establish the coefficients and the variance inflation factors for the individual constructs. The contents of table 20 with respective to the different factors is explained in the sub-sections below.

Table 20: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.878	.105		8.385	.000	.672	1.083		
	Coach_Relation	-.034	.016	-.097	-2.083	.038	-.067	-.002	.946	1.057
	Coach_Guidance	.234	.047	.265	4.996	.000	.142	.327	.739	1.354
	Coach_Integrity	.183	.043	.212	4.217	.000	.098	.268	.819	1.221
	Pref_How	.083	.026	.156	3.127	.002	.031	.135	.837	1.194

a. Dependent Variable: Coaching_Success

4.11.1. Hypothesis H1

H1 – There is a positive influence of how a millennial leader prefers to be coached on leadership coaching success.

In terms of Preference as to how a millennial wants to be coached (B = 0.083, β = 0,156, p-value = 0.002), it can be established that 15.6% of leadership coaching success could be explained as a result of the millennial leaders' preference as to how they wish to be coached. In order for the construct to be significant, the p-value must be < 0.05 (Field, 2013; Pallant, 2013). It can be established that the preference on how a millennial leader wishes to be coached is significant and shows a positive association with leadership coaching success as the p-value of 0.002 is less than 0.05, the standardised coefficient is 0.156 and the unstandardised coefficient is 0.083. This implies that the more the preference as to how the millennial leader is coached is met, the greater the possibility for leadership coaching success. It is therefore deduced that Hypothesis H1 is supported and significant. Similar results were obtained in the study conducted by Knight (2010) entitled '*Coaching preferences of Generation Y'* despite the sample size of 51 being much smaller that the sample size of this study.

4.11.2. Hypothesis H2.a

H2.a - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching success.

With reference to Table 19, it was established that perceptions of millennials in terms of the coach's integrity (B = 0.183, β = 0.212, p-value = 0.000) showed a positive association with leadership coaching success and explained 21.2% of the success in leadership coaching. The positive association can be demonstrated by the unstandardised coefficient which was 0.183 and the standardised coefficient that is

0.212. The significance is established by the p-value which is 0.000. This value is less than 0.05 and hence indicates that the perception of a millennial leader in terms of a coach's integrity is significant in determining the success of leadership coaching. This means that the higher the perceptions are in terms of the coach's integrity, the greater is the success rate of leadership coaching. Therefore, hypothesis H2.a is both supported and significant.

4.11.3. Hypothesis H2.b

H2.b - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success.

Millennial's perceptions in terms of guidance offered by the coach (B = 0.234, β = 0.265, p-value = 0.000) showed a positive relationship with leadership coaching success as the unstandardised coefficient is 0.234 and the standardised coefficient is 0.265. The data therefore shows that 26.5% of leadership coaching success is dependent on the millennial's perceptions of the guidance offered by the coach. Furthermore, the p-value in Table 19 for this construct is 0.000 which indicates that it is significant due to this value being below 0.05. It can therefore be established that hypothesis H2.b is both supported and significant.

4.11.4. Hypothesis H2.c

H2.c - There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the relationship they share with the coach on leadership coaching success.

The multiple regression analysis performed indicated that the perceptions of millennials in terms of the relationship they share with the coach (B = -0.034, β = -0.097, p-value = 0.038) was significant as the p-value for this construct was 0.038, however Table 19 indicates that the unstandardised coefficient was -0.034 and the

standardised coefficient was -0.097. This implies that there is a negative influence of the perceptions in terms of the relationship a millennial shares with the coach on leadership coaching success. As a result of this findings, it was established that whilst hypothesis H2.c is significant, it is not supported.

4.11.5. Hypothesis H2

H2 – There is a positive influence of millennial's perceptions in terms of the characteristics of a coach on leadership coaching success.

Given the above findings in Section 4.11.2, 4.11.3 and 4.11.4, it can be established that not all perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the characteristics of a coach have a positive influence on leadership coaching success. It was deduced that both the perceptions in terms of the integrity of the coach and the guidance offered by the coach positively influence leadership coaching success whilst perceptions of the millennial leader in terms of the relationship they share with the coach does not.

4.12. Summary of results

As part of the data analysis performed, it was established that the Cronbach Alpha scores for all contracts was above 0.6 and therefore the reliability of all the constructs are regarded as statistically acceptable. In determining the sample adequacy, a KMO value of at least 0.5 was required. In this study, the KMO score was 0.825. In cleaning up the pattern matrix to ensure that three or more items remain during the EFA, the following items were removed i.e., CS1, CS2, PREF1, PREF4, CIP 4, CIP6, CIP7, CRP3, CRP5 and CGP5.

It was also established that hypotheses H1, H2.a, and H2.b were all significant as part of the regression analysis conducted. H2.c was significant but was not supported due to the inverse relationship shown.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

5.1. Introduction

The millennial cohort has been perceived by many as a generation that is significantly different from other generational groups previously encountered in the workplace, it is for this reason (Bennet, 2020) stated that the introduction of millennials into the workplace comes with its own challenges but also with new opportunities. This is further supported by Jonck et al. (2017) who stated that businesses now find themselves in a quandary due to the generational diversity and lack of research on this topic related to the millennial leader.

Given the lack of knowledge and research around the millennial leader, their development and coaching, this study aimed at examining the preferences and perceptions of millennials toward coaching to ensure that leadership coaching interventions embarked on with this generational cohort are successful. In this chapter, the demographic profile of the respondents and the results of the hypotheses are discussed and compared to the literature as discussed in Chapter 2.

5.2. Demographic profile of respondents

This study concentrated on millennials who live within the boundaries of South Africa. There are many definitions of what criteria make up the various generational groups. For purposes of this study, the definition of a millennial, as stated by Dimock (2019), was used to define the age group of the respondents. Dimock (2019) defined a millennial as a person born between 1981 and 1996.

The demographics of the respondents were further broken down into gender, ethnicity, and occupational level to determine if any of these inherent characteristics have an effect on the preferences and perceptions, as exhibited by this generational cohort. A total of 382 responses were obtained after the data was cleaned resulting in 138 of the respondents being males, 243 of the respondents being female whilst one respondent identified as being non-binary or of the third gender. Whilst the number

was low regarding the respondents that identified as non-binary or of the third gender, it is important for managers and business to be aware that staff no longer only prescribe to the gender of male and female. Addressing these realities around gender are no longer only about creating policy, procedures, and systems to include these perceptions but it is about having an in-depth understanding about the way gender is approached across the company in its entirety.

Whilst the millennials in this study were born post the apartheid regime, one cannot shy away from the fact that given the history of South Africa and the indifferences that many faced as a result of their ethnicity, all residents within South Africa have been affected in some way, irrespective of when they were born (Das-Munshi et al., 2016). This in turn, affects the feelings and thoughts of an individual and ultimately, their actions (McLeod, 2019). Similarly, the study tested if the occupational level would have influenced the respondent's preference or perception based on their feelings and thoughts. As summarised in Table 2 and Figure 8 in Chapter 4, the study was well represented in all ethnic and occupational categories, thereby enabling one to draw conclusions on the influence of the race and occupational level of the millennial leader on their preference and perception. In general, it was noted that the majority of the millennials had similar responses to the questions posed and hence the study was unable to support the view that race and occupational level could influence one's preferences and perceptions towards coaching. This may have resulted in a different result if the study was testing the impact of their preference or perception on other social topics.

5.3 Preferences of Millennials regarding Leadership Coaching

We currently find that the baby boomer leaders are exiting the c-suite, thereby resulting in the number of executive and leadership positions now being occupied by the millennial leader (Riley, 2016). For the first time, one is able to find four generational cohorts working together and with very little literature and knowledge

shared on the management and development of the millennial leader (Jenkins, 2019). The way managers and coaches dealt with previous generational cohorts will not necessarily work when it comes to the millennial leader as the approach, their development communication, and the way they do business, differs from their older counterparts (A. Hershatter & M. Epstein, 2010). The study explored the possible preference that the millennial leader has in terms of who, what, when, where, and how the millennial leader would engage in leadership coaching. Whilst the study only looked at the impact of the preference with regards to how the millennial wished to be coach on leadership coaching success, the study did explore the millennial cohort's preference with regard to leadership coaching in terms of who, what, when and where. By exploring these areas despite not testing the impact of these preferences on leadership coaching success, it provided insight into how the millennial leader thinks and feels which ultimately, will impact on how they act (McLeod, 2019). The information gathered does allow for a good basis from which future research into this topic can be conducted.

5.3.1 Who conducts the coaching?

As illustrated in a study by Knight (2010), millennial leader tends to have a preference to be coached by an expert in their respective field or a professional coach. Of the respondents surveyed, only 22.8% preferred a senior manager employed within their company thereby indicating that millennials wish to keep their development separate from their day-to-day work. Whilst Solomon and Van Coller-Peter (2020) are of the view that millennials need the guidance and support of their manager, and this may be true in the day-to-day functions of the millennial leader, the statistics obtained in this study shows that when it comes to their development and coaching, a senior manager in the same workforce may not always be the best choice. According to the study, the millennial leader has a preference to be coached by either an expert in their field or a professional coach. This has huge implications for a coach and the need for coaches to stay abreast in their respective fields of coaching. The results indicate that 52.4% of the respondents wish to be coached by an individual with expertise in the field whilst 23% indicated that they preferred a professional coach. This therefore

implies that 75.4% of millennial leaders will only be comfortable with a coach who has the skill set they deem acceptable to be considered an expert or professional in the field. This highlights the importance of coaches to continuously upskill themselves to remain relevant to their clientele. Grant (2013) identified satisfaction with the coaching relationship and the degree of the measure of the relationship between coach and coachee as a key indicator of coaching success and therefore the preference of who conducts the coaching session is pivotal to the success of the same.

5.3.2. What is the subject matter on which millennials want to be coached?

The millennial leader has a deep need for career progression and development, supported by the appropriate training and development (Solomon & Van Coller-Peter, 2020). This need for leadership and career development was confirmed in the survey conducted. Coaching has only recently been adopted as an intervention in leadership training and development (Ely et al., 2010). It is therefore pivotal for a leadership coach to understand the needs and wants of this generational cohort in terms of what the millennial leader prefers when it comes to the subject matter of the coaching session. In terms of the study, the millennial leader placed the least emphasis on self-discovery. This may be influenced by the fact that the millennial is regarded as the technologically savvy global citizen and hence has the information regarding who they are and what they stand for at their fingertips with the aid of technology (Codrington, 2008). Exploring the subject matter that a millennial wished to be coached in as part of their managerial development gives coaches an opportunity to adapt their approach when it comes to the millennial leader and also highlights the areas in which a coach should focus to upskill themselves to be of benefit to this group of leaders.

5.3.3 When should coaching take place?

Whilst 49% of the respondents in this study indicated that they preferred coaching to take place monthly, 51% of the respondents selected either weekly or biweekly. This result failed to produce an outright preference nor support for the belief that there is a

link between a greater frequency of coaching interventions and results. It would however be interesting to investigate if more frequent coaching conversations of a shorter duration promote better results for the coachee.

With the pandemic that has impacted the world and forced leadership to adapt to a new normal that saw workforces adopting an anywhere work pattern that has eroded the boundaries that once defined work-life balance, it is safe to say that COVID-19 has only contributed to further blurring the boundaries in this regard (Sinha, 2021). It is therefore interesting that 76.4% of the respondents indicated that that they preferred to be coached during office hours. This could be indicative of the fact that the millennial leader has developed an awareness of the fatigue that has crept into our lives and is therefore exploring new opportunities to foster inner peace and wellness (Sinha, 2021).

5.3.4 Where coaching takes place?

The majority of the respondents (i.e. 58.6%) indicated that they preferred the coaching interventions to take place at their workplace, as compared to outside the workplace or within the privacy of their home. This may support the notion that the millennial leader is striving to create a balance between their personal and professional life. This is a shift from the behaviour displayed by other generational cohorts who failed to create a work-life balance and could be the reason that the previous generational cohorts have viewed the millennial cohort as disengaged, impatient and potentially narcissistic (Bennet, 2020).

5.4 Influence of preference on how coaching takes place on leadership coaching success

Similar to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Wright (2018) identify five core needs of millennials as illustrated in Figure 21. Forming the base of this pyramid is structure, followed by feedback. This is probably the reasoning behind the results obtained when the study tested the impact of the preference of how a millennial leader wished to be coached on leadership coaching success. Homework, stimulation exercise, coaching

that included open sources and structured coaching sessions were all rated favourably by the millennial cohort, thereby considering their need for structure and feedback. According to Wright (2018), millennials have always been surrounded by structure since birth and therefore thrive for structure and the need for feedback so that they know they on the right track. It is no wonder that the millennial leader is requiring the same from their coach.




FIGURE 21: Hierarchy of millennial needs, as adapted from Wright (2018)

In obtaining the structure and feedback required, through coaching, the millennial leader would be able to find his / her purpose which ultimately, will lead to the attainment of goals and performance. This process, as explored through the coaching conversations, ultimately addresses the cognitive triad of how the millennial views the self, the world and the future, thereby allowing the coachee to be open to feedback and self-awareness (Dominick et al., 2019). Dominick et al. (2019) illustrated that through openness to feedback and self-awareness, the coachee is able to address their self-worth or self-efficacy, schemas, metacognition and goal setting, implementation, and orientation, which ultimately, results in performance or direction.

The coaching relationship in turn, addresses the need on top of the pyramid, i.e., care. The coach plays a role of looking out for the coachee, hence all five millennial needs are addressed.

The millennial leader has been regarded as the technology generation, having been brought up with the internet, wireless connectivity, and technology (Codrington, 2008). It is therefore no wonder that there was a positive response to coaching interventions that included open-source programmes such as YouTube videos and MOOCs. It was however surprising that the preference for homework issued between sessions rated the highest amongst millennials, considering they prefer not to blur the lines between personal and professional life. According to Wright (2018), when compared to other generational cohorts, the millennial hates to take risk and hates to fail so it is no wonder that stimulation and role-plays also rated favourably, as this would afford the millennial leader the opportunity to test a situation in a risk-free environment with no consequence of failing. This is in direct contradiction to their baby boomer and x-generation counterparts who were not brought up with much structure and therefore did not expect structure in workplace but rather figured it out by themselves (Wright, 2018).

5.5 Perceptions of Millennials

With the emergence of the millennial leader, whilst it is important to understand the preference of this cohort, it is equally as important to understand the way they perceive things as both preference and perception has an impact on the success of any intervention. Perception affects one's cognition in that it could create an apprehension with the mind and senses, thereby affecting the outcome (Rossouw & Van Vuuren, 2017). As illustrated by McLeod (2019) in his CBT model, as illustrated in Figure 1,, the way one thinks about something affects the way one feels about it, which in turn, affects one's behaviour toward it. Similarly, perception has an influence on our feelings and behaviour. Perception is quite a large concept to unpack in terms of leadership coaching. This study therefore investigated the perception of the millennial leader when it came to the characteristic of a coach in relation to integrity, guidance offered, and the relationship shared with the coachee. The study went further to explore the impact of the perception in these three sub-categories on leadership coaching success.

5.5.1 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching success

According to Griffin (2020), integrity is defined as the ability to commit to honesty, trust, equality, respect and courage even when faced with adversity which in turn, results in behaviour that enables one to translate ideals into action. From this definition, it can be established that this characteristic dealt with the moral quality with which a coach operates in terms of the norms and values as viewed by the coachee. After cleaning the data, six main components of a coach's integrity were analysed in relation to leadership coaching success, i.e., advocates for the needs and interest of the coachee, generally trying to be thoughtful and considerate, inspire the coachee by his or her example and word, believe in the coachee, recognise potential of the coachee and believes in the coachee. The millennial leader belongs to a generational cohort that has been accustomed to online praise in the forms of likes and comments on Instagram and Facebook, and it is not surprising that they expect the same offline (Daly, 2014). This need for validation is likely the reason for the results displayed by the cohort that responded to the questionnaire.

A different viewpoint as to why the respondents in this study rated the integrity of a coach in the way they did may be due to the need of a millennial for constant feedback. According to Smith and T. Nichols (2015), the millennial's need for constant feedback is due to their thirst to learn and develop. This is a very different way to view this need for validation that has resulted in the prior generational cohorts viewing the millennial leader as a person with disruptive self-interest (Bennet, 2020). Changing this viewpoint amongst the prior generational cohort accordingly, would likely improve the working relationships and pave the way for understanding the millennial leader better. J. Smith (2014) quoted Lawson, Chief Executive of Twilio, as stating that this validation is not praise seeking but rather as providing an indication of how they are doing. The instant gratification and advocacy perceived by the millennial result can be attributed to this generation having grown up with the internet where they receive instant gratification and feedback (Smith & T. Nichols, 2015). Coaches, as seen in the results of this study,

therefore need to be forthcoming in terms of recognition of potential, belief in the coachee, validation of the person and advocate for the coachees' needs and interest is paramount for leadership coaching success as the millennial leader perceives that these are the characteristics that a good coach should have in terms of integrity.

5.5.2 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of the guidance that a coach should offer

This section of the study looked at the guidance a coach needs to offer a millennial leader to ensure that the coaching intervention is a success. Items such as giving the coachee specific assignments related to the problem, assist in maintain a clear focus, brainstorming possible solutions, assist in unpacking the subject matter the coachee is dealing with, the generosity of the coach in terms of their time and resources, as well as meeting on a regular basis where problems are explored in order to establish the guidance that a millennial leader perceives a coach should offer as part of the coaching relationship.

The results obtained confirm the need of a millennial to have clear instruction and clarity on the task at hand. Similarly, the millennial leader wants the same clarity when it comes to the achievement of their goals by means of coaching interventions. The perceived need to meet regularly is validated by the results in this study with regards to the preference of when coaching should take place. The millennials need for constant feedback and guidance as compared to their counterparts (Thorpe, 2018b). This is not only a mindset change for coaches but also managers as they navigate the management of millennial in the workplace. Stein (2016) described the millennial as a generation that has grown up in a culture of immediacy and are therefore impatient, eager to see results on short term goals and long for new experience. It is therefore not surprising that the millennial leaders surveyed as part of this study, displayed a similar perception that was expected from a coach in terms of the guidance that they offer a coachee. The expectation of how a coach should guide a coachee is a reflection of their lax and lenient upbringing which has resulted in them not responding well to

rigid rules and regulations or displays of power. The millennial, as established in this study, rather prefers coaches to be more approachable whilst offering the guidance and encouragement on which they thrive.

5.5.3 Impact of the millennial's perception in terms of the relations they should share with a coach

The coaching relationship has been described as a partnership wherein both parties work together towards a desired goal as mutual reliance is created and this is based on confidence, trust, and friendship (Williams, 2021). This study therefore explored the preference of the millennial leader in terms of how they view this coach-coachee relationship to enable coaches to adapt their approach when it comes to coaching this generational cohort.

According to the study, the millennial leader wants clarity in realising their life vision whilst interacting with a coach who is cheerful and high spirited. This can be attributed to the fact that the millennial leader thrives in an environment where they have clarity with regards to what needs to be done and how to get it done (Thorpe, 2018b). Williams (2021) described the relationship between the coach and coachee as a friendship. This was contrary to the results in the study wherein the respondents were in disagreement about going out for dinner or a drink after work with the coach or having coffee or lunch with the coach on occasion. This change in relationship dynamics can be attributed to the fact that the millennial leader is striving to ensure a work-life balance and hence has created distinct barriers in an attempt to separate their professional life from their personal life (Sinha, 2021). This is further emphasised by the fact that the majority of the respondents were not interested in the coach sharing their personal problem with them. Coaches are therefore required to adapt their approach with the millennial leader as the friendship as describe by may have worked for other generational cohorts but the millennial leader prefers the coaching relationship to be more professional.

5.6 Conclusion

The millennial generation is one of the most misunderstood generations that currently occupy the workspace due to the limited literature that exists on this generational cohort in leadership roles. The millennial leader is only now entering the c-suite as a result of the baby boomer generational cohort exiting the business arena as they approach retirement (Bennet, 2020). Whilst it can be established from the results in this study that not all millennials have the same viewpoint when it comes to preferences and perceptions regarding leadership coaching, it is safe to say that this generational cohort is different to prior generations. It is for this reason that both management and coaches need to ensure that the traditional ways of previously doing things need to be adapted to accommodate the millennial leader in order to ensure successful outcomes.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the various hypotheses in this study and the results can be summarised as per Table 21.

Table 21: Summary of results

Hypothesis	Supported / Unsupported
H1- There is a positive influence of how a millennial leader wants to be coached on leadership coaching success	**Supported**
H2.a – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of a coach's integrity on leadership coaching	**Supported**
H2.b – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of the guidance offered by the coach on leadership coaching success	**Supported**
H2.c – There is a positive influence of millennial's perception in terms of the	**Unsupported**

relationship they share with the coach on leadership coaching success	

CHAPTER 6.CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

As discussed in both the literature review (Chapter 2) and the discussion of the results, the literature available when it comes to the millennial leader as a coachee is very limited as the majority of the literature available deals with baby boomers and Generation X. This is rightfully so as the millennial leader has only recently started entering the professional space and taking their seat around the boardroom. This study aimed at bridging the gap in the literature available whilst affording managers and coaches practical steps that they can implement to ensure successful interactions with the millennial leader. In this chapter, the conclusions to the various research questions outline in Chapter 1, the recommendations and implications, as well as suggestions for future research, are unpacked.

6.2 Conclusions regarding research question 1

What influence does millennials' preference regarding how they should be coached have on leadership coaching success?

The study data showed that millennials' preference regarding how they should be coached has a positive influence on the success of leadership coaching. It was clear from the study that receiving homework and doing role plays during the coaching session rated high amongst millennials on how they preferred to be coached which further highlighted the need for a millennial to have clarity on how to perform a task or addressing an issue. The use of YouTube and MOOCs is also not surprising as method millennials prefer as part of their coaching journey as the millennial leaders have grown up in the era of the internet and technology.

6.3 Conclusions regarding research question 2.a

What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the integrity of a coach have on leadership coaching success?

The millennial leader's perception in terms of the integrity of a coach has a positive influence on leadership coaching success. Taking the mean score of the items that tested this construct, it can be determined that the respondents of this study either agreed or strongly agreed that their perception in terms of the integrity of a coach is viewed as positively influencing leadership coaching success.

6.4 Conclusions regarding research question 2.b

What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the type of guidance received from a coach have on leadership coaching success?

Guidance forms the basis of a coaching relationship. It is therefore not surprising that the perception of the millennial leader in terms of the type of guidance received from the coach has a positive influence on leadership coaching success. In this study, the millennial leader rated the following items favourably in terms of the perception they have when it comes to the guidance that a coach should offer: give specific assignments related to their problem, help maintain a clear focus, brainstorm solutions to a problem, provide information to help them understand the subject matter with which they are dealing, be generous with time and other resources and meet with them on a regular basis. This is important for coaches to consider as they embark on coaching journeys with the millennial leader. These are also important points that managers and organisations need to consider as they put development programmes in place for the millennial leader. The way in which coaches, managers and organisations engage the millennial leader is very different, as outlined in this study, as compared to the baby boomer and Generation X.

6.5 Conclusions regarding research question 2.c

What influence does millennials' perception in terms of the relationship shared with a coach have on leadership coaching success?

Contrary to the studies that interviewed or surveyed other generational cohorts, such as Kilburg (2001) and McGovern et al. (2001), this study showed that the perception of the relationship the millennial leader shared with the coach has an inverse relationship to coaching success. This brings about a new stance as to how coachees view the influence of their satisfaction with the relationship they share with the coach and the perceptions they have in this regard. As discussed in Chapter 3, it was always believed that the relationship a coachee shares with the coach is paramount for the success of the coaching intervention. In unpacking the preferences, it was established that the qualification of the coach and their expertise was more important to the millennial leader in influencing the success of their coaching journey, rather that the perception of the relationship that they share with the coach.

6.6 Recommendations and Practical Implications

From both the results of this study and the need that millennials have for wanting to be developed, it can be confirmed that coaching is viewed as an appropriate development tool by the millennial leader when it comes to his / her growth. Whilst it may be expected that this generation that has been brought up with technology will opt for more virtual or telephonic media of engaging a coach, this study has showed that this is not the case. The millennial leader still prefers the coaching interventions to take place face-to-face. Taking this need for in-person coaching and the buy-in to engage in coaching, a coaching model taking the preference and perceptions of the millennial leader as illustrated in Figure 22 was developed as part of this study and is recommended for use when coaching the millennial leader. This coaching model was called the ACCEPT model, based on the fact that the millennial leader is fighting for acceptance in the boardroom which was previously dominated by the baby boomer and Generation X.




Figure 22: The ACCEPT Model (Dominick et al., 2019; McLeod, 2019; Rossouw & Van Vuuren, 2017; Tripati et al., 2019)

The above model uses the person-centred approach that does not make any assumptions about the needs of the coachee or how the coachee should be feeling (Grant, 2013). In doing so, the coachee is not forced into "self-acceptance, self-direction, development, self-actualization or congruence between real or perceived selves or a particular vision of reality" (Grant, 2004, p.158). Similarly, the above model allows the coach to explore the needs of the millennial leader to better address their preferences and perceptions, as illustrated above. The above model calls for the coach to practice reflective listening as this would help the coach to contain the coaching conversation within the coachee's agenda whilst not forcing the coachee to think in a particular way nor to introduce new themes or topics that are not brought to the table by the millennial leader. In doing so, the coach is able to exhibit the perception of millennials when it comes to the characteristic of a coach. According to Cherry (2020), an important quality of this approach is the absolute encouraging regard that the coach has for the coachee and the issue being discussed which is what

the millennial leader is looking for in a coach, according to the results obtained in this study.

Interestingly, when an analysis was done with some of the studies previously conducted in terms of coaching success, as summarised in Table 22, it can be established that most of the items identified in this study in terms of the perception and preference of the millennial leader are very similar to the success factors with which cohorts in the studies listed below identified. The only factor that this study showed to have an inverse relationship on coaching success was the relationship shared with the coach which was in direct conflict with some of the studies listed below that identified the relationship shared with the coach as a success factor. These has been highlighted in the table below for ease of reference. It can therefore be concluded that whilst the success factors are universal across generational cohorts there are slight nuances that are specific to the millennial leader that need to be taken into consideration when it comes to coaching this generational cohort. Structure, support, and feedback rates highly with the millennial leader, as seen in the data collected in this study. Whilst this may have been part of the coaching engagement with prior generational cohorts, it is pivotal that the coach places greater emphasis on these factors when engaging with the millennial leader.

Table 22: Analysis of studies that identified coaching success factors

Study Details	Coaching Success Factor
The characteristics of dyadic trust in executive coaching. Alvey and Barclay (2007)	Confidentiality Support and Challenge from the coach Articulation of the goals Credibility of the coach Organisational support
Behind closed Doors (Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999)	Feedback Competence of the Coach Clarity of objectives

	Ease of accessibility and availability of a coach
Facilitating intervention adherence in executive coaching (Kilburg, 2001)	Structure of the coaching intervention Relationship with the coach Commitment of the coach Commitment of the coachee Quality of the coaching
Maximising the Impact of Executive Coaching (McGovern et al., 2001)	Relationship with the coach Feedback Support Quality of assessments Commitment of the coachee
The state of executive coaching research (Passmore & Gibbes, 2007)	Support Reflection - past and present Support and Openness

Based on the data collected in this study, it is clear that the millennial leader enjoys being intellectually challenged and is open to ways to improve their development, both on a professional and personal basis. There is however, some conflict in the way the millennial leader is perceived by managers who do not understand this generation's intrinsic value system. It is therefore recommended that both managers and coaches acquaint themselves with the intrinsic values of the millennial leader versus the managers' or coaches' perception. Table 23 summarises these values and perceptions, as determined by Espinoza, Ukleja, and Rusch (2010) and Lily (2012) whilst recommending the competence to be used to address the respective intrinsic value of the millennial leader. These recommended competencies are pivotal when recruiting managers and coaches who will be responsible for the leadership development of the millennial leader.

Table 23: Millennials' intrinsic values, manager / coach perception and recommended managerial competencies (Espinoza et al., 2010; Lily, 2012)

Millennials' Intrinsic Value	Perceived Orientation	Recommended Competency
Work-life balance	Autonomous	Flexibility – the ability to adapt to doing things differently
Reward	Sense of entitlement	Incentivise – reward the millennial leader according to the values
Self-expression	Imaginative but can be distractive	Cultivation – Provide an environment that encourages creativity
Attention	Self-Absorbed	Engage – Get to know their interests and connect
Affirmation on accomplishments	Defensive	Disarm – Listen, fairness and equality, be open to resistance
Informal work culture	Abrasive	Self-differentiation – do not take things personally. Self-regulate
Simplicity	Short-sightedness	See the big picture – find the connection between the daily tasks and the big picture
Multitasking	Distracted	Direction – Also provide clear instruction and expectations to avoid ambiguity
Meaning	Apathetic	Motivation – Identify the meaning in the work

		produced and the millennial's contribution

6.7 Suggestions for further research

From the descriptive statistics, explored in Section 4.3.1 to 4.3.4, as well as the studies that measured coaching success which are listed in Table 22 above, it is clear that millennials' have strong preferences in terms of who, why, when and where coaching takes place. This study only explored the influence of preference of how coaching takes place on leadership coaching success. It is therefore necessary to further investigate the influence of millennials' preference in terms of who, why, when and where coaching takes place on coaching success. Future researchers may use the descriptive data collected in this study as the basis to test the influence of these preferences on coaching success.

It was always thought the relationship shared between the coach and coachee is pivotal for the success of the coaching relationship (McGovern et al., 2001). In this study, it was found that the relationship that the millennial coachee shares with the coach has an inverse relationship on coaching success. It may therefore be interesting to further unpack the reasons for millennials having this perception as compared to their counterparts from the previous generational cohorts. Researchers may also want to explore if this is a common perception of generational cohorts that come after the millennial generation as this could signify a change in how coaches view their interactions with their coachees going forward.

REFERENCE LIST

Ainsworth, C. (2016). *Coaching for greater effectiveness (course workbook)*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Allen, M. (2017). The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods In (Vol. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Almeida, F., Faria, D., & Queirós, A. (2017). Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods. *European Journal of Education Studies, 3*, 369-387. doi:10.5281/zenodo.887089

Alvey, S., & Barclay, K. (2007). The characteristics of dyadic trust in executive coaching. . *Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*, 18-27.

Aminu, I. M., & Shariff, M. N. M. (2014). Strategic orientation, access to finance, business environment and SMEs performance in Nigeria: Data screening and preliminary analysis. *European Journal of Business and Management, 6*, 124 - 131.

Au-Young-Oliveira, M., & Goncalves, R. (2017). The social impact of technology on millennials and consequences for higher education and leadership. *Telematics and Informatics*, 908 - 919.

Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Belmont: CA: Wadsworth.

Babbie, E. (2015). *The practice of social research* (14th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.

Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Banerjee, A., & Chaudhury, S. (2010). Statistic without tears: Populations and samples. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal, 19*(1), 60-65.

Bennet, N. (2020). Readying millennials for the C-suite: A key to future organizational performance. *Business Horzions, 63*(6), 683 - 691.

Bertani, A., Di Paola, G., Russo, E., & Tuzzolino, F. (2018). How to describe bivariate data. *Journal of Thoracic Disease, 10*(2), 1133-1137.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: principles, methods, amd practices* (2nd ed.). Florida: Creative Commons Attribution.

bin Ahmad, H., & binti Halim, H. (2017). Determining sample size for research activies: The case of organizational research. *Selangor Business Review, 2*, 20 -34.

Bird, D. K. (2009). The use of questionaires for acquiring information on public perception of natural hazards and risk mitigation - A review of current knowledge and practice. *Natural Hazards and Earth Sytems Sciences, 9*, 1307 - 1325.

Blaikie, N. (2009). *Design social research* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Booysen, J. (2018). Millennials are moving up. Retrieved from https://www.iol.co.za/personal-finance/millennials-are-moving-up-17778321

Bornstein, R. (2022). The psychodynamic perspective. In R. Biswas-Diener & E. Diener (Eds.), *Noba textbook series: Psychology.* . Champaign, IL: DEF publishers.

Boyce, J., Jeffery, R., Jackson, L., & Neal, J. (2010). Building successful leadership coaching relationships: Examining impact of matching criteria in a leadership coaching program. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(10). doi:10.1108/02621711011084231

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (2010). *Marketing research* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. (1982). Social Knowledge. In A. Isen & A. Hastorf (Eds.), *Cognitive social psychology* (pp. 33 - 72). New York: Elsevier.

Cherry, K. (2020). What is client centered therapy? A closer look at Carl Rogers' person-centered therapy. Retrieved from https://www.verywell.com/client-centered-therapy-2795999

Codrington, G. (2008). Detailed introduction to generational theory. *Tomorrow today, 2*.

Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business Research Methods* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Cox, L. (2016). Understanding Millennial, Generation X, and Baby Boomer preferred leadership characteristics: Informing today's leaders and followers. *Dissertations, 42*.

Creswel, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5 ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Cuncic, A. (2020). Understanding internal and external validity: How these concepts are applied in research. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/internal-and-external-validity-4584479

Dalakoura, A. (2010). Diferentiating leader and leadership development: A collective framework for leadership development *Journal of Management Development, 29*(5), 432 - 441.

Daly, A. (2014). Generation Validation: Why everyone just wants to be liked. *Elle*.

Das-Munshi, J., Lund, C., Mathews, C., Clark, C., Rothon, C., & Stansfeld, S. (2016). Mental Health Inequalities in Adolescents Growing Up in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Cross-Sectional Survey, SHaW Study

PLOS ONE.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 581-613.

de Bruyn, M. (2014). The Protection Of Personal Information (POPI) Act - Impact On South Africa. *International Business & Economics Research Journal, 13*(November / December), 1315 - 1340.

Deloitte. (2017). The 2017 Deloitte Millennial Survey Apprehensive millennials: seeking stability and opportunities in an uncertain world. *Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited.*

DeRue, D. S., & Myers, C. G. (2014). Leadership development: A review and agenda for furture research. In D. Day (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of leadership and organisations* (pp. 832 -855): Oxford University Press.

Dimock, M. (2019). Defining Generations: Where Mellennials end and Generation Z begins.

Dominick, P. G., Squires, P., & Cervone, D. (2019). A cognitive approach to leadership development: A review and integration of existing research - A literature review proposal. *ResearchGate*.

Douglas, C. A., & Morley, W. H. (2000). *Executive coaching: an annotated bibliography*. North Carolina: Centre of Creative Leadership.

Drost, E. A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives 38*(1), 105.

Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leaderhip coaching: a review and intergrated framework. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 585 - 599.

Espinoza, C., Ukleja, M., & Rusch, C. (2010). *Managing Millennials: Discover the core competencies for managing today's workforce*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics uising IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Franzese, M., & Juliano, A. (2019). Correlation Analysis. *Computational Biology, 1*, 706-721.

Galawe, N. J. (2017). *Endogenous and exogenous risk factors in the success of South African small medium enterprises.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Witwaterstrand,

Gladis, S. (2007). Executive coaching building steam in organizations. *T+D, 61*(12), 59-61.

Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*.

Goertzen, M. J. (2017). Introduction to Quantitative Research and Data. *Library Technology Reports, 53*(4), 12 -16.

Goodwin, D. (2018). #YouthMonth: Millennials in the workplace. *BIZCommunity*. Retrieved from https://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/535/178894.html

Grant, A. M. (2012). ROI is a poor measure of coaching success: towards a more holistic approach using well-being and engagement framework. *Coaching: A International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 5*(2), 74-85. doi:10.1080/17521882.2012.672438

Grant, A. M. (2013). The efficacy of coaching In J. Passmore, D. B. Peterson, & T. Freire (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring* (1 ed.): John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Grant, A. M. (2014). Autonomy, support, relationship satisfaction and goal focus in the coach-coachee relationship: which best predicts coaching success. *Coaching: A International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 7*(1), 18 - 38.

Griffin, S. (2020). The perception of integrity. *Linkedin Pulse*.

Grover, S., & Furnham, A. (2016). Coaching as a developmental intervention in organisations: A systematic review of Its effectiveness and the mechanisms underlying It. *PLoS ONE 11*(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0159137

Hadi, N. U., Abdullah, N., & Sentosa, I. (2016). An easy approach to Exploratory Factor Analysis: Marketing Perspective. *Journal of Education and Social Research, 6*(1), 215 - 223. doi:10.5901/jesr.2016.v6n1p215

Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors. *Organizational Dynamics, 27*(3), 39-53.

Hambach, J., Müller, L., and Metternich, J. (2017). Evaluation of Coaching Success for the Continuous Improvement Process – How to Distinguish a Good Leader in CI? *Procedia Manufacturing, 9*, 331-338. doi:10.1016/j.promfg.2017.04.044

Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organisation and management persepective. *Journal of Business and Psycology, 25*(2), 211 -223

Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of business and psychology, 25*(2), 211-223.

Hobbs, H. L. (2017). *A qualitative study of millennials in the workplace: gaining their long-term employment in news media firms in North Alabama.* (Doctor of Business Administration), Bisk College of Business at Florida Institute of Technology,

Jenkins, J. (2019). Leading the Four Generations at Work. Retrieved from https://www.amanet.org/articles/leading-the-four-generations-at-work/

Jonck, P., Van Der Walt, F., & Sobayeni, N. C. (2017). A generational perspective on work values in a South African sample. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 43*(1), 1 - 9.

Kilburg, R. R. (2001). Facilitating intervention adherence in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology, 53*(4), 251 -267.

Kirkpartrick, D. (1996). Great ideas revisited. *Training and Development, 50*(1), 54-59.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practices of structural equation modelling* (5th ed.). New York: The Guilforf Press.

Knight, K. C. (2010). *Coaching preference of Generation Y.* (Master of Science in Organisation Development), Pepperdine University, Pepperdine Digital Commons. (80)

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(1), 607-610.

Ladegard, G., & Gjerde, S. (2014). Leadership coaching, leader role-efficacy, and trust in subordinates. A mixed methods study assessing leadership coaching as a leadership development tool. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(4), 631 -646.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2016). *Practical research: planning and design* (11th ed.). USA: Pearson.

Levinson, H. (1996). Executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 115-123. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.48.2.115

Lily, N. G. (2012). *The millennials: an overview and implications for coaching Generation Y*. Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Lindemann, N. (2019). What's the average survey response rate? Retrieved from https://surveyanyplace.com/average-survey-response-rate/

Lutabingwa, J., & Auriacombe, C. J. (2007). Data analysis in quantitative research. *Journal of Public Administration, 42*(6), 528 - 548.

Malhotra, N. K. (2007). *Marketing research: an applied orientation* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Maslach, C., & Goldberg, J. (1998). Prevention of burnout: new perspectives. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 7*(1), 63 - 74.

Mat Daud, K. A., Khidzir, N. Z., Ismail, A. R., & Abdullah, F. A. (2018). Validity and reliability of instrument to measure social media skills amongs small and medium entrepreneurs at Pengkalan Datu River. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability 7*(3), 1026 - 1037.

McCall, M., Lombardo, M., & Morrison, A. (1988). *Lessons of experience: how successful executives develop on the job*. New Yorlk: The Free Press.

McGovern, J., Lindemann, M., Vergara, M., Murphy, S., Barker, L., Warrenfeltz, . . . Bachmann, T. (2001). Maximizing the impact of executive coaching. *The Manchester Review, 10*(6), 1-10.

McLeod. (2019). Cognitive behavioral theory.

Morton, S. M. B., Bandara, D. K., Robinson, E. M., & Atatoa Carr, P. E. (2012). In the 21st Century, what is an acceptable response rate? . *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 36*(2), 106 - 108.

Neenan, M., & Palmer, S. (2001). Cognitive Behavioural Coaching. *Stress News, 13*(3), 15 -18.

Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Ou, Q. (2017). A Brief Introduction to Perception. *Studies in Literature and Language, 15* (4), 18-28.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual. A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.): Allen & Unwin.

Parietti, M. (2019). Blue-collar vs White-colar: What is the difference.

Passmore, J., & Gibbes, C. (2007). The state of executive coaching research. . *International Coaching Psychology Review, 2*(2), 116-128.

Patino, C. M., & Ferreira, J. C. (2018). Internal and external validity: can you apply research study results to your patients? *Jornal brasileiro de pneumologia : publicacao oficial da Sociedade Brasileira de Pneumologia e Tisilogia, 44*(3), 183-183. doi:10.1590/S1806-37562018000000164

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whysof leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phillips, J. J. (1997). *Return on investment in training and performance improvement programs*. Worburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2004). *Nursing research: prinicples and methods*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.

Qiong, O. U. (2017). A brief introduction to perception. *CSCandian Studies in Literature and Language, 15*(4), 18-28.

Rabin, M. (1998). Psychology and Economics. *Journal of Economic Literature, 36*(1), 11 - 46.

Riley, K. G. (2016). *Strategies for Transitioning Workforces From BabyBoomer to Millennial Majorities.* (Doctor of Business Administration), Walden University, Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/147834444.pdf

Roberson, Q., Ryan, A. M. & Agins, B. R. (2017). The evolution and future of diversity at work. *Jornal of Applied Psychology, 102* 183-499.

Rock, D., & Donde, R. (2008). Driving organisational change with internal coaching programmes: part two. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 40*(2), 75 - 80.

Rose, G. L. (2003). Enhancement of mentor selection using the ideal mentor scale. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 473 - 494.

Rossouw, D., & Van Vuuren, L. (2017). *Business Ethics* (6th ed.). South Africa: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Limited.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisted. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 69*(4), 719 -727.

Salahuddin, M. M. (2010). Generational Differences Impact on Leadership Style and Organizational Success. *Journal of Diversity Management, 5*(2), 1-6.

Salkind, N. J. (2010). Encyclopedia of research design In (Vol. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & Stefani, L. A. (2000). *Communication between cultures* (3rd ed.). Beijing: Foreign language Teaching and Research Press.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research* (3rd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Macmillan Education.

Schindler, P. S. (2019). *Business research methods* (13th ed.). New York: NY: McGraw-Hill / Irwin.

Sedgwick, P. (2014). Cross sectional studies: advantages and disadvantages. *BMJ (online), 348*, g2276.

Shoukri, M. M., & Edge, V. L. (1996). *Statistical methodas for health sciences*. New York: CRC Press.

Shuttleworth, M. (2009). Construct Validity.

Singer, M. (1987). *Intercultural communication: a perceptual approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sinha, S. (2021). How Millennials, Gen Z are shifting focus to balance in work life, not just work-life balance. Retrieved from https://www.businesstoday.in/opinion/columns/story/how-millennials-gen-z-are-shifting-focus-to-balance-in-work-life-not-just-work-life-balance-293434-2021-04-14

Smith. (2008). Gen Y leaders, Boomer Coach. *International Journal of Coaching in Organisations*(1), 34-46.

Smith, & Nichols, T. (2015). Understanding the millennial generation. *The Journal of Business Diversity 15*(1).

Smith, J. (2014). Why millennials constantly need feedback at work. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/why-millennials-need-constant-feedback-2014-3?IR=T

Smith, T. J., & Nichols, T. (2015). Understanding the millennial generation. *The Journal of Business Diversity, 15*(1), 39.

Solomon, C., & Van Coller-Peter, S. (2019). How coaching alignes to the psychological contract between the young millennial professional and the organisation. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management 17*(0), a1146.

Solomon, C., & Van Coller-Peter, S. (2020). How coaching can strengthen the relationship between millennials and employers. *USB Management Review*.

Stats South Africa. (2020a). Statistical release P0277: Quarterly Employment Statistics.

Stats South Africa. (2020b). *Statistical release P0277: Quarterly Employment Statistics*. Retrieved from Pretoria, South Africa:

Stein, G. (2016). *Nine Tips For Managing Millennials*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2016/09/08/managing-millennials-nine-tips/?sh=4c09284cd8af

Stober, D. (2008). Making it stick: coaching as a tool for organizational change. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice, 1*(1), 71-80.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). The Cycle of Generations. *American Demographics, 13*(April 1991), 24-33.

Struwig, F. W., & Stead, G. B. (2013). *Research: planning, design and reporting* (2nd ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Pearson.

Sven-Ove, H., & Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2018). Preferences. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition ed.).

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2003). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Thorpe, T. (2018a). Millenial Leadership: How to lead and mentor a multi-generational workforce. Retrieved from www.tamarathorpe.com

Thorpe, T. (2018b). Millennial Leadership: How to lead and mentor a multi-generational workforce.

Ting, S., & Riddle, D. (2006). A framework for leadership development coaching. In S. Ting & P. Scisco (Eds.), *The center for creative leadership handbook of*

leadership development (pp. 116 - 150). San Fancisco: John Whiley and Sons.

Tripati, S., Panday, P., & Kaur, G. (2019). An Exploratory Study of Leadership Preferences of Millennials. *Universal Review, 7*(IV), 247 - 258.

Tsai, J. (2008). Generation Y: Who, what, where, when and Y. *Customer Relationship Magazine, 4*(11), 24 - 28.

Tversky, A., Sattath, S., & Slovic, P. (1988). Contingent weighting in judgment and choice. Psychological Review. *Pyschological Review, 95*(3), 371 - 384. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.95.3.371

Urick, M. J., Hollensbe, E. C., Masterson, S. S., & Lyons, S. T. (2016). Understanding and Managing Intergenerational Conflict: An Examination of Influences and Strategies. *Work, Aging and Retirement, 3*(2), 166-185. doi:10.1093/workar/waw009

Warren, C., McGraw, A. P., and Van Boven, L. (2011). Values and preferences: defining preference construction. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews, Cognitive science, 2*(2), 193-205.

Williams, J. S. (2021). An empirical investigation of coaching ingredients: the role of the coach-coachee relationship in influencing coaching outcomes. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*. doi:DOI: 10.1080/17521882.2021.1979612

Wisniewski, M. A. (2010). Leadership and the millennials: transforming today's technological teens into tomorrow's leaders. *Journal of Leadership Education 9*(1), 53 - 67.

Wright, W. (2018). *Second-Wave Millennials: Tapping the Potential of America's Youth*: Second Wave Press.

Yarborough, J. P. (2018). The role of coaching in leaderhip development. *New Directions for Student Leadership, 158*(Summer 2018), 49 - 61.

Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist, 35*(2), 151 - 175.

Zikmund, W. G., & Babin, B. J. (2013). *Exploring market research* (5th ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

APPENDIX A – RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

MMBEC Research Survey

Start of Block: Introductory Letter

Topic: The impact of coaching preferences and perceptions of South African millennial leaders on the success of leadership coaching

Dear Sir / Madam

My name is Lashan Moodley, and I am currently a post-graduate student at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. This research study is in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in Business and Executive Coaching.

The purpose of this questionnaire to assist the researcher in gathering data to better understand the preferences and perceptions of millennials in terms of coaching and to assist coaches to work more effectively with this generational cohort.

There is no monetary or physical benefit to the participant. In order to participate in this study, you will need to have been born between 1981 and 1996 and either currently occupy a leadership role or are being developed for a leadership role. You are required to complete the attached questionnaire which should take you between 15 and 20 minutes to complete.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any given time.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact me on Lashanmoodley8@gmail.com or call 0837969869.

If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the ethical procedures of this study, you may contact the University Human Research Ethics committee (Non-medical) via email hrec-medical.researchoffice@wits.ac.za or telephonically on 011 717 1408.

Yours sincerely,
Lashan Moodley

Q1 I hereby consent to participate in this research study. It was explained to me and I understand what my participation will involve.

- ○ Agree (1)
- ○ Disagree (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I hereby consent to participate in this research study. It was explained to me and I understand w... = Disagree

Section A - Demographics

Q2 Are you born between 1981 and 1996?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Are you born between 1981 and 1996? = No

Q3 What is your gender?

- ○ Male (1)
- ○ Female (2)
- ○ Non-binary / third gender (3)

Q4 What is your ethnicity?

- ○ Black (1)
- ○ Coloured (2)
- ○ Indian (3)
- ○ White (4)

Q5 How will you classify your role in your current organisation?

- ○ Top Management (1)
- ○ Senior Management (2)
- ○ Middle Management (3)
- ○ Junior Management (4)
- ○ Not yet a manager but being developed as a leader (5)
- ○ None of the above (6)

Q6 Have you been coached before?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Page Break

Section B - Preferences
The below declarations deal with your **preference** in relation to coaching. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by selecting from the options provided.

Q7
Who would you prefer to be coached by?

I prefer to be coached by.....

- ○ a professional coach (1)
- ○ an expert in my field (2)
- ○ A more senior manager in my workplace (3)
- ○ Other (4)

Skip To: Q9 If Who would you prefer to be coached by? I prefer to be coached by..... = a professional coach

Skip To: Q9 If Who would you prefer to be coached by? I prefer to be coached by..... = an expert in my field

Skip To: Q9 If Who would you prefer to be coached by? I prefer to be coached by..... = A more senior manager in my workplace

Skip To: Q8 If Who would you prefer to be coached by? I prefer to be coached by..... = Other

Q8 If you answered other in question 7 above, please indicate who you would prefer to be coached by

_____

Q9
Rate the following reasons of coaching using the scale 1 to 7, with 1 indicating most important and 7 indicating least important. A rating cannot be used more than once.
_____ My personal development (1)
_____ Leadership development (2)
_____ Career development (3)
_____ Explore creative solutions to the problems I am having (4)
_____ How to manage my reputation within my organisation (5)
_____ My relationship with my manager (6)
_____ Self discovery (5)

Q10 Are there any other reasons that you feel passionate about but has not been identified in the above question that you feel could form the basis of coaching?

_____

Q11
When should coaching take place?

I prefer the frequency of coaching session to be...

- weekly (1)
- every other week (2)
- monthly (3)

Q12 I prefer coaching to take place...

- during business hours (1)
- outside normal business hours (including weekends) (2)

Q13 What medium would you prefer to be used when coached?

- ○ Face-to-face (1)
- ○ Online (2)
- ○ Telephonically (3)

Q14 How well do the statements below describe how you would like to be coached?
I prefer coaching...

	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
...,that is very structured (Q14_1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...that has homework in between coaching sessions (Q14_2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
…that included stimulation and role plays (Q14_3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
,,,that included open source programmes (i.e. MOOCs, You-Tube etc) (Q14_4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q15
Where should coaching take place?
I would prefer coaching to be done...

- ○ at my workplace (1)
- ○ outside my workplace (2)
- ○ in the privacy of my home (3)

Section C - Leadership Coaching Success
Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on leadership coaching success by selecting from the options provided

Q16
I will consider coaching interventions to be successful if ….

	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
...I become aware of my underlying personal issues (Q16_1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...I am able to look openly at my personal strengths as well as my challenges (Q16_2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...I am able to look in new ways at the issues and problems I am facing (Q16_3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...I am able to discuss heated issues constructiv	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

ely (Q16_4)							
...I am able to note visible improvements in my own and / or my team's performance (Q16_5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...I am able to develop a better sense of balance between my work and home life and leisure (Q16_6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...I am able to find new ways to enhance my relationship with colleagues (Q16_7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

- **Section D - Perceptions**

The below statements deal with your **perceptions** to coaching related to integrity, guidance and the relationship between coach and coachee

Q17 As you reflect on the characteristics of a coach in terms of integrity, your ideal coach would...

	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
...recognise your potential (Q17_1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...believe in you (Q17_2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...value you as a person (Q17_3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...generally try to be thoughtful and considerate (Q17_4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...advocates for your needs and interests (Q17_5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...inspire you by his or her example and word (Q17_6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Q18 As you reflect on the characteristics of a coach in terms of guidance, you perceive your ideal coach to...

	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
...give you specific assignments related to your problem (Q18_1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...help maintain a clear focus (Q18_2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...brainstorm solutions to a problem (Q18_3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...provide information to help you understand the subject matter you are dealing with (Q18_4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...be generous with time and other resources (Q18_5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
....meet with you on a regular basis (Q18_6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q19 As you reflect on the characteristics of a coach in terms of the relationship, you perceive your ideal coach to...

	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
...take you out for dinner and / or drinks after work (Q19_1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...relate to you as if he / she is a responsible, admirable older sibling (Q19_2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...help you realise your life vision (Q19_3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...talk to you about there personal problems (Q19_4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...be a a cheerful, high-spirited person (Q19_5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
...have coffee or lunch with you on occasion (Q19_6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q20 In order to be truly affective please forward this survey to fellow South African millennial leaders within your network. Alternatively, please supply the details below of fellow South African millennials that either occupy leadership roles or are being developed into leadership roles. Thank you for participating in this research survey.

End of Block: Introductory Letter

APPENDIX B – ETHICS APPROVAL

Graduate School of Business Administration
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Wits Business School Ethics Committee
Constituted under the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical)

Ethics Clearance Certificate

Ethics protocol number: WBS/BE2328996/709

This certificate is only valid with a legitimate ethics protocol number and signed by the Researcher (below).

Project title	The impact of the coaching preferences and perceptions of South African millennial leaders on the success of leadership coaching
Investigator / Researcher	Mr Lashan Moodley
Nature of Project	MM (Business & Executive Coaching)
Decision of the Committee	Approved, provided stakeholders and participants are guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality.
Issue Date of Certificate	2021-05-04
Expiry date	Date of submission of the project report
Chairperson	Prof Anthony Stacey ☎ +27 11 717 3587 +27 82 880 4531 anthony.stacey@wits.ac.za

Declaration by Researcher

One copy must be signed by the Researcher and returned to the Chairperson of the Wits Business School Ethics Committee.

I fully understand the conditions under which I am authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure to be contemplated from the research procedure as approved I undertake to resubmit the protocol to the Committee.

Signature

04/05/2021
Date:

The impact of the coaching preferences of South African millennials on the success of leadership coaching interventions							
Main Objective Here : To investigate the coaching preferences of the millennial generation to ensure successful leadership coaching interventions within the South African context							
Sub-Aims/Objectives	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses /Propositions**	**Research questions**	**Variables(Independent & Dependent)**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
To examine the impact of millennial preferences (i.e. in terms of who, what, when, why, how and where) on leadership coaching success within the South African context	Dimock, 2019; Warren, 2011; Deloitte, 2017; Day, 2000; Yarbough 2018; Jenkins, 2019; Jonck, 2017; Bennet 2020, Strauss and Howe, 1991; Zanjonc, 1980; Sven-Ove and Grune-Yanoff, 2018; Tsai, 2008; Knight, 2010; Grant, 2012; Rock and Donde, 2008; Grant. 2013; Grant, 2014; Grover and Furnham 2016; Ryff and Keyes, 1995; Maslach and Goldberg, 1998; Ainsworth, 2016; DeRue and Myers; 2014	Millennial preferences with regard to coaching processes has a positive impact on the outcome of leadership coaching success	What impact does millennial preferences have on leadership coaching success? A) What impact doees meillenial preferences regarding who conducts the coaching have on leadership coaching success? B) What impact millennial's preferences regarding what the subject matter of the coaching invertvention have on leadership coaching success? C) What impact millennial's preferences regarding when coaching takes place have on leadership coaching success? D) What impact millennial's preferences regarding why coaching should be used as a development tool have on leadership coaching success? E) What impact millennial's preferences regarding how they should be coached have on leadership coaching success? F) What impact millennial's preferences regarding where they are coached have on leadership coaching success?	IV1= Millennial Preference i.t.o Who, what, where, how, why and when DV1= Leadership Coaching Success	Survey Section B - Q7 To Q15, Section C Q16	Ordinal Scale	Quantative
To examine the impact of the perception of millennials (in terms of the characteristics of a coach) on the success of leadership coaching within the South African context.	Qiong, 2017; Singer, 1987; Cantor, Mischel and Schwartz, 1982; Samovar, Porter and stefani, 2000; Grant 2014; Warren, 2011; Ainsworth, 2016; Dimock, 2019; Warren, 2011; Deloitte, 2017; Day, 2000; Yarbough 2018; Jenkins, 2019;	Millennial preceptions regarding the characteristics of a coach has a positive impact on the outcome of leadership coaching success	What impact does the perceptions of South African millennials, in terms of the characteristics of a coach, have on leadership coaching success?	IV2= Perception of millennials i.t.o the characteristics of a coach DV2=Leadership Coaching Success	Survey Section C Q16, Section D Q17 to 19	Ordinal Scale	
KEYWORDS - Millennials, Leadership Coaching, Coaching Success, Preference, Perception, Leadership Development							