

https://dspace.org/

Coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations

Kumkani, Eric Mxolisi

2016-08-31
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/20980

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



Wits Business School



COACHING FOR THE SYSTEMIC DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP IN ORGANISATIONS

MXOLISI E. KUMKANI

Supervisor: Dr. Kerrin Myres

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 (Business and Executive Coaching)

2015

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate and explore a coaching intervention in an organisation that received and implemented systemic coaching for the systemic development of leadership. Although dyadic coaching is widely used by individual leaders in organisations, its impact in enhancing the wider development of systemic leadership is limited. This limitation is largely compounded by the narrow appreciation of the loci of leadership and how leadership is conceptualised, perceived and discharged in organisations. The reductionist approach to leadership development has led to many organisational resources being reserved, directed and used exclusively for the development of the select few.

The difference between leader and leadership development is discussed in literature. Leader development refers to the development of an individual leader for his/her personal developmental interests. This individualistic development often occurs outside the context of that leader's peers, team and organisation. Leadership development refers to a collective development of leaders with the primary purpose of becoming a unified coherent force for the success and sustainability of the organisation Thus, leader development is preoccupied with the improvement of a leader, whereas, leadership development is preoccupied with building collective capabilities. It is a result of the current inadequate and reductionist view of leadership development in organisations that the study seeks to suggest a systemic approach to coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations.

A qualitative approach was employed as a research methodology, to evaluate systemic coaching implementation in depth. An interview discussion guide was used to engage respondents. Eighteen respondents were invited to participate in the study. The researcher ensured hierarchical representivity, from CEO to general workers, given the interest in the systemic nature of the coaching experienced. This was also to ensure that the study sample was representative of respondents who participated in both dyadic and systemic coaching received at NAC. Interviews were recorded, transcribed and uploaded into Atlas ti.7 software for analysis.

Regarding systemic coaching, the findings showed that systemic coaching is more adequate in the systemic development of leadership rather than dyadic coaching. Systemic coaching was found to promote a collective and inclusive development of leadership and focused with optimising performance for the entire organisation rather than just individuals. Systemic coaching benefits were identified as key in enhancing leadership capabilities, in fostering innovation and in transforming organisational cultures. Eighteen areas were identified where systemic coaching can potentially make a difference in organisations. Some of those areas include, employee retention, organisational alignment and innovation. Seven critical factors to be considered when implementing systemic coaching were identified, chief among those being organisational culture and client readiness.

Finally, though systemic coaching serves as no panacea to organisational challenges, it was found to be an appropriate tool for systemic leadership development. Hence it is proposed as a method to complement the dyadic coaching approach.

DECLARATION

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



.....

Mxolisi Eric Kumkani

Signed at Fourways, South Africa,

On the 29th day of September 2015

DEDICATION

This research study is dedicated to my God of glory, who gave me strength to complete this study.

It is also dedicated to my wife Nokuthula, who remained a pillar of strength throughout the study. My two moms, Mary Phakathi and Nompumelelo Nkovu.

Finally, this study is dedicated to my mother and the memory of my late Grandma, elder brother, elder sister and my two uncles who left too soon.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank the following people:

- To my supervisor, Dr Kerrin Myres, for her encouragement, availability, wisdom and insight.
- To my Master of Management colleagues for their selflessness in availing knowledge without being asked and in making this journey such an enjoyable and rewarding one.
- To the respondents for their time, participation and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT II

DECLARATION IV

DEDICATION V

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS VI

LIST OF TABLES XIV

LIST OF FIGURES XV

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Purpose of the study 1

1.2 Context of the study 1

1.3 Problem Statement 3

1.3.1 Main Research Question 5

1.4 Significance of the Study 6

1.4.1 Importance of the study for stakeholders 6

1.5 Deliminations of the study 6

1.6 Definition of terms 7

1.7 Assumptions 10

1.8 Structure of the study 10

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 13

2.1 LEADER AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT 13

2.2 TRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATIONS 15

2.2.1 Hierarchical Top down leadership approach 17

2.2.2 Power of Domination 18

2.3 CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATIONS 19

2.3.1 Focus on Leadership development than on leader development 19

2.3.2 Focus of followership and employee engagement 20

2.3.2 Shared leadership 20

2.4 THE ROLE OF COACHING IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT 21

2.4.1 Definition of coaching 21

2.4.2 Coaching and Leadership development 23

2.5 ORIGINS, SOURCING AND INTRODUCTION OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 24

2.5.1 Coaching historical origins 24

2.5.2 Sourcing and introduction of coaching 25

2.6 PURPOSE, USES AND DELIVERY OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 26

2.7 DYADIC, SYSTEM COACHING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISTIONS 26

2.7.1 Dyadic coaching approach 28

2.7.2 The systemic approach 33

2.8 SYSTEMIC LEADERSHIP 38

2.8.1 Systemic coaching and the systemic development of leadership in organisations 39

2.9 FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR SYSTEMIC COACHING IMPLEMENTATION 39

2.9.1 Organisational culture 39

2.9.2 Top leadership participation and support 40

2.9.3 Consent of coaching participants 40

2.9.4 Reporting and accountability 41

2.10 THE POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OR BENEFITA OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 41

2.10.1 Improved organisational culture and value 41

2.10.2 Alignment of employees and organisational strategy 42

2.10.3 Enhanced organisational innovation 42

2.10.4 Enhanced leadership capabilities 43

2.10.5 Improved peer coaching and leadership development 44

2.10.6 Improved employee engagement 44

2.11 EMBEDDING SYSTEMIC COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 45

2.11.1 Integrating and aligning coaching to other organisational programmes 45

2.11.2 Internal coaching training 45

2.12 CONCLUSION 46

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 48

3.1 Sytemic coaching as conducted in NAC 48

3.2 Dyadic coaching as conducted at NAC 49

3.3 Research Paradigm 49

3.4 Research Design 50

3.5 Population and sample 51

3.5.1 Case selection 51

3.5.2 Sample and sampling method 51

3.5.3 Table of Respondents 52

3.5.4 Demographic profile of respondents 53

3.6 Research Instrument 53

3.7 Procedure for data collection 55

3.8 Data Analysis and interpretation 56

3.9 Limitations of the Study 57

3.10 Validity and Reliability 58

3.10.1 External Validity 58

3.10.2 Internal Validity 59

3.10.3 Reliability 59

3.11 Ethical Considerations 60

3.12 Summary 60

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS 62

4.1 CULTURAL CONTEXT 62

4.2 LEADERSHIP CONTEXT 66

4.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: HOW IS DYADIC AND SYSTEMATIC COACHING SOURCED, INTRODUCES AND CO-ORDINATED IN ORGANISATIONS 72

4.3.1 The sourcing, introduction and co-ordination of coaching of dyadic coaching in NAC 73

4.3.2 Dyadic coaching implications for NAC leadership development 74

4.3.3 Summary 77

4.4 THE SOURCING, INTRODUCTION AND CO-ORDINATION OF SYSTEMIC COACHING IN NAC 78

4.4.1 Sourcing of a coaching intervention and coaches 78

4.4.2 Introduction of coaching in NAC employee community 79

4.4.3 Co-ordination of coaching intervention in the organisation 80

4.5 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: HOW IS DYADIC AND SYSTEMIC COACHING DELIVERED AND CONDUCTED IN ORGANISATIONS 81

4.5.1 How systemic coaching was delivered and conducted at NAC 81

4.5.2Summary 84

4.6 RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN IMPLEMENTING COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 84

4.6.1Organisatinal culture 85

4.6.2 Top leadership participation and support 85

4.6.3 Consent of coaching participants 86

4.6.4 Reporting and accountability 86

4.6.5 Dedicated internal coach champion 87

4.6.6 Long drawn out coaching interventions 87

4.6.7 Proper closure of coaching programme 88

4.6.8 Summary 88

4.7 RESEARCH QUESTION 4: WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OR BENEFITS OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 89

4.7.1 Improved organisational culture and values 89

4.7.2 Alignment of employees and organisational strategic goals 91

4.7.3 Enhanced organisational innovation 93

4.7.4 Enhanced leadership capabilities 94

4.7.5 Improved for peer coaching and leadership development 97

4.7.6 Improved employee engagement 98

4.8 RESEARCH QUESTION 5: HOW TO EMBED AND SUSTAIN COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS 103

4.8.1 Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes 104

4.8.2 A need for internal coaching training 105

4.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY 105

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS 107

5.1 Demographic profile of respondents 107

5.2 Discussion of results from an integrated perspective 107

5.2.1 Main research question 108

5.3 Discussion of reasearch question 1: The sourcing, introduction and co-ordination of coaching as identified in the literature review, confirmed, contrasted and extended in the research 108

5.3.1 The sourcing of dyadic and systemic coaching 108

5.3.2Introduction of dyadic and systemic coaching 110

5.3.3 Co-ordination of dyadic and systemic coaching 110

5.4 The sourcing of coaching as identified in the research 111

5.5 Duscussion of f research question 2: Dyadic and systemic coaching delivery and conducting as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research 112

5.6 Discussion of research question 3: Factors to be considered when implementing coaching as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research 113

5.6.1 Organisational culture 114

5.6.2 Top leadership participation and support 114

5.6.3 Consent of coaching participants 115

5.6.4 Reporting and accountability 115

5.7 Factors to consider when implementing coaching as identified in the research 115

5.7.1 Dedicated internal coaching champion 116

5.7.2 Long drawn out coaching interventions 116

5.7.3 Proper closure and follow up coaching programme 117

5.8 Discussion of research question 4: The outcomes or benefits of a coaching intervention as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research 117

5.8.1 Improved organisational culture and values 118

5.8.2 Alignment of employees and organisational strategic goals 118

5.8.3 Enhanced organisational innovation 119

5.8.4 Enhanced leadership capabilities 119

5.8.5 Improved for peer coaching and leadership development 121

5.8.6 Improved employee engagement 122

5.9 The outcomes or benefits of coaching intervention as identified in the research 123

5.9.1 Improved non-judgmental leadership 124

5.9.2 Improved open feedback and conversations 124

5.9.3 Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains 125

5.10 Embedding and sustaining systemic coaching as identified in the literature review and in the research 126

5.10.1 Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes 126

5.10.2 A need for internal coach training 127

5.11 Living and leading by coaching principles 128

5.12 Summary of discussion of Results 128

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 131

6.1 Summary of the study 131

6.2 Main research question 132

6.3 Conclusions of the study 132

6.3.1 Conclusions pertaining to question 1: Organisations can better source, introduce and co-ordinate coaching in organisations 132

6.3.2 Conclusion pertaining to question 2: Delivery and conducting of systemic coaching in organisations 133

6.3.3 Conclusions pertaining to Question 3: Factors to consider when implementing systemic coaching in organisations 134

6.3.4 Conclusions pertaining to question 4: The potential outcomes or benefits of systemic coaching in organisations 135

6.3.5 Conclusions pertaining to Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations 136

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS 137

6.4.1Organisations 137

6.4.2 Leadership 137

6.4.3 Coaching practitioners 138

6.4.4 Coach training institutions 139

6.4.5 Learning and organisational development practitioners 139

6.4.6 Recipients of Coaching 139

6.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 140

6.6 CONCLUSION 142

REFERENCES 143

APPENDIX A: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 177

APPENDIX B: DISCUSSION GUIDE 178

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 179

APPENDIX D: RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS INFORMATION DOCUMENT 180

APPENDIX E: LETTER OF CONSENT 181

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Profile of Respondents 52

Table 2: Level of Respondents 52

Table 3: How the research questions relate to the interview questions 54

Table 4: Respondents responses and descriptions relating to NAC cultural context 62

Table 5: Respondents responses and descriptions relating to NAC Leadership Context 67

Table 6: Respondents responses on dyadic and systemic coaching 72

Table 7: Respondents responses relating to delivery and conducting of coaching 80

Table 8: Factors that should be considered that emerged from data 85

Table 9: Coaching outcomes that emerged from the data 89

Table 10: Respondents responses to embedding and sustaining coaching in NAC 104

Table 11: Respondents reported outcomes of coaching per research question 129

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Root Disciplines of coaching 25

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate and explore a coaching intervention in an organisation that received and experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching for leadership development. Therefore, the study described experiences of respondents that received both dyadic and systemic coaching respectively, in order to compare the two coaching approaches.

1.2 Context of the study

Traditional approaches to leadership had the focus on the individual leader, hence, the preoccupation with leader development (Dalakoura, 2009; Serfontein, 2009). However, according to Wheeler et al. (2007), an ever more complex world, with conditions that are ever -changing, demands a different form of leadership that has the ability of looking beyond the traditional approach to work and responsibilities. Hence, according to Hagen et al. (1998), leadership should not be viewed as a linear practice but one that is multifunctional and complex. As a result, it demands an innate ability from leaders to be integral and systemic. The inclination to learn and to effect changes to the organisational system remains the essence of leadership (Boal, 2001).

The focus on leader development appeared to have influenced the sourcing and the use of coaching in organisations. Given the limitations associated with contemporary leadership and dyadic coaching, the study sought to suggest a complementary systemic coaching approach as an intervention that is able to tap into the leadership capacities that are located at levels other than at the top. This leadership capacity is often overlooked and constantly excluded from benefiting in leadership development opportunities as leadership development is treated as an individual trait rather than an organisational capacity (Dalakoura, 2010; Brown & Grant, 2010). According to Cacioppe (1998), Collier (2000), and Harris and Spillane (2008), treating leadership development as an individual trait, has proved limiting, unhelpful, and un-strategic in the context of the complex environmental challenges facing contemporary organisations.

Following is a brief description of the coaching approaches received and experienced by respondents at NAC. NAC was adopted as a pseudonym for the purpose of this study as per the instruction of the CEO of the organisation under study and also in line with the Wits University ethical requirements to protect the identify of respondents.

1.2.1. Dyadic coaching sourcing, design and purpose at NAC

One-to-one coaching, often referred to in the literature as *dyadic,* was a coaching intervention that was sourced, reserved for and enjoyed by only five executives of NAC. Thus it was designed and conducted exclusively for the executive elite. Dyadic coaching is leader focused (Kets de Vries, 2010). The coach and the coachee were the only ones involved in the coaching conversations as reflected by respondents' remarks presented in chapter 4. Peers of the executive were excluded, as were teams of the executive coachee. As a result, emerging themes and learning were not shared across the company as every session was treated with the utmost secrecy. The co-ordination and the evaluation of the programme was problematic as this was left to the discretion of the coach and the coachee (Kemp, 2009). This approach lacked the vision of involving others in contributing towards the executive development of the executive coachee. This approach lacked credibility in NAC for the reason mentioned above and in chapter 4 for its lack of interest in growing leadership collectively regardless of level and position.

1.2.2 Systemic coaching design and purpose at NAC

Enterprise-wide holistic coaching is referred to in the literature as *systemic* (Cavanagh, 2006). The reason advanced is that for coaching to have a meaningful impact on the development of leadership in organisations it should be systemic. In other words, the focus should be the organisational system.

This approach is premised on the following assumptions:

- Most organisational challenges are beyond the individual making as they are rather systemic. This is explained by their recurrent nature and fixing the symptoms thereof is considered reductionist (Wardsworth, 2008). Therefore systemic problems require systemic solutions.

- Individual empowerment of leaders rather than leadership is inadequate in today's complex world where complex solutions to organisational challenges cannot only lie in the ability and wisdom of a few top leaders (Dalakoura, 2010). Thus a systemic development of leadership should take centre stage to empower leadership in overcoming increasingly multifaceted and complex challenges.
- Thinking in systems, meaning thinking in terms of identifying the root cause rather than throwing resources at resolving the part rather than the whole is inadequate and unhelpful in view of limited resources (Collier & Esteban, 2000).
- Maximising coaching to empower leaders across hierarchical levels in organisations can result in higher sustainable returns than dyadic development of leaders (De Meuse et al. 2009).

At NAC, systemic coaching took the following form:

The purpose was to complement the dyadic approach which was found to be limited; coaching was sourced with the intention of empowering more than just leaders at the top; it was designed to be delivered across silos and divisional hierarchical structures; it was delivered in workshops and smaller groups, that were attended by different leaders across the hierarchy. Thus, there was no outward display of titles in those coaching conversations (all were equal participants).

The organisational strategy, values, culture, leadership development rather than just leader development and performance were the focus of coaching conversations. NAC clients pervaded every coaching conversation in terms of how to serve the clientele better. A sharp focus on what works in the organisation preceded conversations on what is not working. Reasons advanced were that investing more energy on what works will eventually assist in changing the culture and mindset about the organisation.

1.3 Problem Statement

The development of leaders is an expressed goal in most organisations (Avolio & Hannah, 2009), and leadership development has become "big business" over the past decade (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2010). Given the role that leadership plays in the current malaise around financial crisis, climate control, and ethical debacles, which the media characterises as

a "failure of leadership" (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Claudia, 2010), understanding how to facilitate the development of effective leadership is more crucial than ever. However, systematic investigations of leadership development interventions are rare in the literature (Avolio, Avey, & Quisenberry, 2010), and the practice of leadership development and its scientific foundation are disconnected (Day, 2001). This shortage of systematic investigations and disconnection between theory and practice may result in costly leadership development programs that have unintended or no effects.

Coaching has been presented as a promising leadership development practice (Day, 2001; Ely et al., 2010) and has become a widely used intervention for leader development (Bono, Purvanova, Towler, & Peterson, 2009; Feldman & Lankau, 2005). Coaching has been predominantly used as one-on-one counselling of executives, leaders, and managers about work-related issues with the purpose of improving their leadership effectiveness (Ely et al., 2010; Feldman & Lankau, 2005). The uses and impact of one-on-one coaching in organisations in the light of limited financial resources and leadership challenges has been viewed as limited and un-systemic (Kets de Vries, 2010; Ward 2008). The most cited reason for this individualistic development of leaders is perceived to be the lack of appreciation by leaders of the distinction between leader and leadership development (Dalakoura, 2010).

The difference between leader and leadership development is discussed in the literature. According to Dalakoura (2010) and Katz and Miller (2012), *leader development* refers to the development of an individual leader for his/her personal developmental interests. This individualistic development often neglects the importance of the organisational context of that leader's peers, team and organisation. *Leadership development* refers to a collective development of leaders with the primary purpose of becoming a unified coherent force for the success and sustainability of the organisation (Dalakoura, 2010; Katz & Miller, 2012). Thus, leader development is preoccupied with the improvement of an individual leader, therefore the use of dyadic coaching whereas leadership development is preoccupied with building collective capabilities thus the use of systemic coaching (Grant, 2012; Kets de Vries, 2010). The former seemed to have influenced the preference and sourcing of dyadic coaching and the latter seemed to have influenced the embracing of the systemic coaching in organisations.

It is a result of the current individualistic view of leadership development in organisations that the study seeks to suggest a complementary systemic approach to coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations (Day, 2001). In other words, an empirical study on how systemic coaching is used and implemented in the development of leadership is necessary. Systemic development refers to the strategic and deliberate development of leadership rather than the development of only appointed leaders. This approach is adequate as it assists in cultivating a leadership bench strength in organisations (Stoker, 2008). Systemic development contradicts the practice in hierarchical organisations where leadership is discharged by top leaders only (Katz & Miller, 2012).

Systemic coaching can serve as an inclusive and strategic platform for leadership development rather than only leader development. In other words, coaching can be utilised as a strategic intervention and can be embraced as an organisational capacity as it empowers leadership across organisational hierarchies and structures rather than just top executives (Grant, 2012; Thorton, 2010).

According to various researchers such as Ward, (2008); Kets de Vries, (2010); Grant, (2012); Fine (2013); Kahn (2011); Dalakoura, (2010); Cavanagh, (2006), systemic coaching can yield more meaningful benefits than dyadic coaching for organisational effectiveness.

1.3.1 Main Research Question

How is coaching implemented in the systemic development of leadership in organisations?

Sub-questions

- How is dyadic and systemic coaching sourced, introduced and co-ordinated in organisations?
- How is dyadic and systemic coaching delivered and conducted in organisations?
- What factors should be considered when implementing coaching in organisations?
- What are the potential outcomes or benefits of coaching in organisations?
- How to embed and sustain coaching in organisations?

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study sought to fill an empirical gap by investigating the uses, implementation and the outcomes of systemic coaching in the development of leadership in a South African organisation. Given that coaching is in its infancy, few empirical cases are recorded that are aimed at investigating coaching for the systemic development of leadership (Avolio, Avey, & Quisenberry, 2010), especially in a public sector organisation in South Africa. This study is necessary to expand a limited understanding of such a coaching approach and its contribution to organisational leadership development.

Although significant financial investments are expended in sourcing external coaching interventions, the critical question continues to be asked as to the impact of coaching to the broader organisational leadership. This question is precipitated by the reality that leaders are facing increasing demands of a rapidly growing global economy that is both dynamic and expansive (Grossman & Valiga, 2009. Therefore, one way organisations are addressing this concern is bringing in executive coaches to help leaders deal with the ambiguity created by the complexity of these ever changing business demands (Botha, 2009). Therefore, the need is increasing for organisations to maximise their limited financial resources by empowering leadership rather than just leaders in their organisations (ICF, 2012; DeMeuse et al., 2009).

1.4.1 Importance of the study for stakeholders

The study provides guidance to a range of stakeholders, including executive leadership that decide on coaching budgetary investments; human capital executives whose role is the development of human capital across the organisational levels; coaching practitioners who are, in most instances, tasked to assist leadership and leaders grow and excel in their respective professions, organisational development practitioners who are primarily tasked to ensure their organisations remain competitive and effective, and finally potential coaching buyers who might not know which approaches to engage to realise their ultimate goals.

1.5. Delimitations of the study

The study excluded an investigation or research on coaching models other than dyadic and systemic coaching approaches. The interviews were only focused on the officials and

employees of NAC, a public entity who experienced both or either of the coaching interventions. Demographics were not explored as influencers on the coaching outcomes. The study was not meant to investigate and explore why coaching fails. Finally, the study investigated and explored only the coaching interventions as implemented and experienced within the organisation selected and has not taken a longitudinal approach.

1.6. Definition of terms

This section gives definitions and descriptions of terms as they are extensively used in the study. The purpose is to ensure that the reader understands the terms in the context of the study.

1.6.1. Systemic

The term 'systemic' refers to the system and its interrelationships with other systems (Daft, 2007). For example, a system-wide intervention involves having a view of the whole rather than individual parts (Stacey, 2011). Organisational problems that are recurrent are often a signal of a systemic problem, therefore blaming one individual will be inadequate (Collier, 2000). Dealing with symptoms of a problem is easier than uncovering the root cause. Often organisational ills are attributed wholly to leaders as though they were acting alone. Hence a systemic approach to leadership should be an organisational development (OD) activity. In practical terms, this means working across organisational hierarchies and relationships between leaders rather than focusing on individuals (Grant, 2011). The systemic approach is relevant and critical in organisational contexts as, in most instances, people belong to various work teams (Anderson et al., 2008).

1.6.3 Systemic Development

Systemic development of leadership in organisations refers to a strategic development of leadership rather than only appointed leaders in order to cultivate organisational leadership 'bench-strength' (Stoker, 2008). Systemic development contradicts the practice in hierarchical organisations where leadership is discharged by top leaders only, hence leader and not leadership development becomes the logical practice (Katz & Miller, 2012). Systemic

development can only find expression in environments in which employee engagement and knowledge sharing is promoted and a platform of open and frank feedback exists (Rousseau et al. 2013; Hamlin et al. 2008).

1.6.4 Systemic Leadership

Systemic leadership is often referred to in literature as a collective leadership practiced beyond top leadership and distributed across organisational levels (Painter-Morland, 2008). Such collective leadership capacity assists in sustaining organisations far beyond individual efforts (Collier & Estenban, 2000).

1.6.5 Coaching

Coaching can be described as an intervention designed to assist the coachee to identify and accomplish set goals (Ives, 2008). Schein (2005) defined coaching as a helping profession using a set of behaviours on the part of the coach (consultant) assisting the client to develop a new way of seeing, feeling about, and behaving in situations defined by the client as problematic. Some authors have defined coaching as collaborative (Grant & Canavagh, 2007), helping, and facilitative (Hamlin et al., 2008), as well as a type of thought-provoking and creative partnership (ICF, 2011).

1.6.6. The coachee

The Coachee, also termed the client, is the person being coached (Valerio & Deal, 2011). 'Coachee' and 'client' will be used interchangeably in this research report.

1.6.7 Systemic Coaching

Systemic coaching refers to a coaching approach that prioritises the system (Scharma, 2006). Its purpose is to address systemic challenges within organisations. It represents a holistic approach to coaching within organisations for organisational effectiveness (Kets de Vries, 2005).

1.6.8 Dyadic Coaching

Dyadic coaching refers to an exclusive one-on-one coaching between the coach and the coachee as opposed to systemic coaching which refers to an enterprise-wide coaching intervention (Ward, 2008).

Dyadic coaching often neglects the leader's (coachee's) team, peers and the organisational context (Brown & Harvey, 2006). A dyadic coaching approach is seen as lacking the appreciation of factors that are systemic in nature which often manifest within a coaching engagement (Wheelan, 2003).

1.6.9 Holistic Coaching

Holistic coaching is defined by the respondents as a coaching approach that is inclusive of various levels, departments and individuals. Inclusive refers to coaching that is not reserved for the selected few (as in dyadic coaching), but is also enjoyed by other levels below the executives (Kets de Vries, 2005). It is understood also as referring to the system as a whole within which such employees operate. In other words, holistic can be understood in the context of this study as being part of systemic coaching.

1.6.10 Exco

Exco stands for the executive committee of NAC, and is the highest body responsible for leading the organisation and is accountable for the organisational resources and in the execution of its mandate.

1.6.11 NAC

Due to political sensitivities and specific instruction from the head of the institution, NAC was used as a pseudonym. For the purpose of this study, NAC refers or stands for the National Aid Council. This organisation has a national footprint, meaning that NAC has

provincial offices in all nine provinces of South Africa. Its main mandate is derived from the national government and that mandate is to capacitate and empower aid agencies in their development agendas.

1.7 Assumptions

The following are assumptions made by the researcher in view of the study.

- The researcher assumed that respondents who received coaching (dyadic and systemic) were as honest as possible in discussing both their knowledge and their insights of coaching.
- Respondents' willingness to narrate personal experiences, whether positive or negative, about themselves as participants in their coaching journey.
- Given the fact that they experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching, respondents have the ability to make some distinctions between the two coaching offerings.
- However, given the other programmes that were going on during the coaching programme in the organisation, the coaching experiences might have been confused with other interventions, such as team building sessions.
- The research design and methodology were assumed to be appropriate in the conducting of the study and in soliciting responses from a group of professionals in an organisational setting.
- Finally, the researcher assumed that respondents were free to share their personal experiences

1.8 Structure of the study

1.8.1 Chapter 1: Introduction and Context

Chapter 1 introduces to the reader the study and its context. It also explains the study purpose, problem statement, significance, delimitations, definition of terms and assumptions.

1.8.2 Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 2 is purposed to review relevant literature in the field of coaching, specifically dyadic coaching and systemic coaching. This discussion is preceded by a discussion of leader

and leadership development and how such leadership perspectives are playing themselves out in cultivating leadership capabilities through the internal use of organisational resources.

1.8.3 Chapter 3: Research Methodology

The following section entails a description and rationale of the research methodology, research design, population and sample, the research instrument, procedure for data collection, data analysis and interpretation, limitations of the study, validity and reliability, ethical considerations and finally the demographic profile of respondents.

1.8.4 Chapter 4: Research Findings

This chapter provides a description of findings of the study that was conducted at NAC. These respondents were the five executives who received dyadic coaching and were later included in the systemic coaching. The 13 respondents received systemic coaching. The respondents were asked, *inter alia*, to provide the description of coaching intervention they received; the intention of the coaching intervention; how coaching was sourced, introduced, delivered and conducted; how coaching was received by internal stakeholders; what the impact of such coaching was to the organisational leadership collaborations and performance and; what factors could be considered for the systemic coaching implementation, what benefits, if any, accrued; how NAC culture was affected during and post the coaching intervention; what areas of coaching could be changed and improved upon and how; and finally, how to sustain and embed systemic coaching in organisations.

1.8.5 Chapter 5: Discussions of Results

Chapter 5 introduces and defines the study themes as they emerged from the data analysis as assembled in the family codes. The themes and findings and their meanings are subsequently compared and contrasted to the literature. In other words, are these study findings expanding, complementing or discarding what previous literature has found.

1.8.5 Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter 6 tabulates a conclusion of a research that was conducted on coaching in the National Aid Council. Findings are highlighted in accordance of the study research objectives. Future research recommendations are suggested premised on chapter 4 and 5 outcomes and findings. This chapter concludes with the recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review introduces a diversity of views on the topic and an opportunity to understand how dyadic and systemic coaching can be sourced, introduced, coordinated and conducted for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. Such literature serves as a knowledge platform to critically compare with field research. It covers: leader and leadership development; traditional approaches to leadership development; contemporary approaches to leadership development; coaching definitions; origins, sourcing and introduction of coaching in organisations; purposes, uses and delivery of coaching in organisations; dyadic, systemic coaching approaches and leadership development in organisations; factors to consider for systemic coaching implementation; potential outcomes or benefits of systemic coaching in organisations; and how to embed and sustain coaching in organisations.

2.1 LEADER AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Since the study deals with the systemic development of leadership in organisations, the review of literature commences with a brief literature on leader and leadership development. In the competitive and uncertain world of business, organisational leadership remains under severe pressure from both internal and external stakeholders (Cavanagh & Lane, 2012). The call for a better and more effective, ethical leadership has become the norm across the world of business. Leadership and leader development has since assumed the centre stage of organisational discussions as the success of organisations largely depends on the ability and capabilities of leadership rather than leaders (Elenkov, 2008). According to Dalakoura (2010) and Day (2001), the confusion around leader and leadership development seemed to be traceable to early research on leadership which advanced the individual aspect placing huge emphasis on leader traits, experience and brand. As a consequence, individual training took centre stage rather than collective leadership capacity building. This point was earlier advanced by Senge (1995), who argued that the traditional leader notions were a product of un-systemic and individualistic practices.

Likewise, Day (2001) further makes a distinction between leader and leadership development by simplifying it through two questions: a) leader-"What qualities do we need to develop in

our leaders?" Leadership-"what qualities do we need to develop in our organisation?". In other words, leader refers to an individual capacitating exercise whereas leadership refers to a collective empowerment of leaders for organisational effectiveness. Furthermore, this may also mean that leadership development should be embraced as an organisation-wide phenomenon rather than an individual trait (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004; Wenger & Snyder, 2000; Tichy & Cardwell, 2002).

According to Dalakoura (2010) and Katz and Miller (2010), leader development refers to the development of an individual leader for his/her personal developmental interests. This individualistic development often occurs outside the context of that leader's peers, team and organisation (Kets de Vries, 2005). Leadership development refers to a collective development of leaders with the primary purpose of becoming a unified cohered force for the success and sustainability of the organisation (Dalakoura, 2010; Katz & Miller, 2012). Thus, leader development is preoccupied with the improvement of a leader, whereas leadership development is preoccupied with building collective leadership capabilities.

It is a result of the current inadequate and individualistic view of leadership development in organisations that the current study seeks to suggest a systemic approach to coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. An empirical study investigating and exploring how systemic coaching is used in the development of leadership is important. Systemic development refers to a strategic and deliberate development of leadership rather than of a few leaders. This approach is adequate as it assists in cultivating leadership bench strength in organisations (Stoker, 2008). Systemic leadership development contradicts the practice in hierarchical organisations where leadership is the sole privilege of a leader rather than a collective, and is discharged by top leaders only (Katz & Miller, 2012).

Systemic coaching can serve as an inclusive and strategic platform for leadership development rather than leader development. Coaching can be utilised as a strategic intervention and can be embraced as an organisational capacity as it empowers leadership across organisational hierarchies and structures rather than only top executives (Grant, 2012; Thorton, 2010). Dyadic coaching focuses on leader development rather than leadership development (Grant, 2012; Kets de Vries, 2010).

According to various studies such as Ward (2008); Kets de Vries (2010); Grant (2012); Fine (2013); Kahn (2011); Dalakoura (2010); and Cavanagh (2006), systemic coaching can yield more meaningful benefits than dyadic coaching to further organisational success.

2.2 TRADITONAL APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATIONS

This section expounds on the traditional leadership characteristics which include individualistic forms of leadership; the hierarchical top-down leadership approach and power and domination as discharged by leaders.

Traditional theories of leadership that informed the work of leaders and organisations in the 20th century reflect both linear and vertical thinking (Hernez-Broome, 2004). Individual leaders were deemed more important than collective leadership (Hawkins, 2011; Harris & Spillane, 2008). These individualistic practices and highly structured approaches to leadership development elevated the use of compartmental and definitive work structures and processes to organise work, which often led to silos (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Given the new world order with a new and different generation of employees, the individualistic approach to leadership development remains an obstacle to broad employee empowerment Ket de Vries, 2011).

As a result of this individualistic view of leadership development, dyadic coaching remains the preferred model for leader development (Grant, 2012). However, in the latter part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, the very foundation of work and thus leadership changed as new models evolved with the advent of information technology, knowledge workers and their impact on society (Kets de Vries, 2011). In this new world of intersections, interactions, interdependencies, and horizontal linkages, the entire way people are managed and led has altered (Bowes, 2008). It is in the context of such changes and developments that a systemic coaching approach that focuses on the whole organisation can be useful in the systemic development of leadership capabilities across different levels of the organisational structure (Kets de Vries, 2010; DeChurch et. al., 2010 & Dalakoura, 2010).

However, in the latter part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, the very foundation of work, and thus leadership, changed as new models evolved with the advent of information technology and knowledge workers and their impact on society. In this new world of intersections, interactions, interdependencies, and horizontal linkages, the entire way employees are managed and led has altered (Bowes, 2008). It is in the context of such changes that a systemic coaching approach which focuses on the whole organisation can be useful.

The use of coaching in organisations as a means of leadership development, enhancing performance and facilitating workplace learning is now commonplace across much of the developed Western world (International Coach Federation, 2012). In the USA, between 25% and 40% of US Fortune 500 companies regularly use the services of external executive coaches, with similar rates reported in Europe and Australia (International Coach Federation, 2011).

Despite the limitations of the dyadic form of coaching, many organisations still source coaching services in an ad hoc, and merit based manner. This approach hinders the systemic, enterprise-wide development of a leadership cadre in organisations (Ward, 2008; Schein, 2003).

In view of the global trends and of the emerging organisational coaching trends, the study presents systemic coaching, and argues for the increased use of systemic coaching in organisational settings, alongside dyadic coaching (Cavanagh, 2006). The researcher contends that the personal growth and change benefits of dyadic coaching when combined with the systemic growth and change benefits of organisational process, better enables performance improvement at the individual, group and organisational levels. This argument is based on the emerging systemic coaching literature as well as the recorded tradition of group interventions within the organisational development field (Kets de Vries, 2010; DeMeuse et al., 2009)

2.2.1 Hierarchical Top down leadership approach

In most organisations, leadership remains the prerogative of the top leaders. This practice had led to employees 'outsourcing' leadership responsibilities to those powerful, idolised and heroic figures (Wry-Bliss, 2013). The increasing failures of leaders in effectively leading organisations and the complexity that has arisen suggest that these idolised and heroic leaders cannot function and drive organisational successes as was previously assumed.

In most organisations, the leadership hierarchy presents various challenges to internal structures. Such hierarchies can be identified by the:

a) Top down leadership characterised by few at the top and many below. According to Bedeian and Hunt (2006), leaders get to be identified by their position or location rather than their value and contribution to organisational success. Anderson and Brown (2010) argue that this perception of leadership as only located at the top has many implications for the mobilisation of talent within organisations, among which are:

   i. Those at the top tend to dictate to those reporting to them and often exclude them from critical decision making processes that might have an impact on their functions. This exclusion tends to lead to a disconnection of top leadership from the important inputs from their employees necessary for organisational effectiveness.

   ii. Less meaningful participation by employees becomes the norm rather than the exception to the detriment of organisational success. Employee disengagement follows and support for organisational programmes are based more on compliance than on commitment.

   iii. Inequality between the top and employees widens and resources and opportunities are reserved for the few at the top.

The preceding arguments against leadership hierarchy are also stated by Morgeson et al. (2010) who postulate that the notion of leadership by hierarchical and managerial position can be misleading, as it can suggest that leaders can only be leaders by level and title. According to DeRue (2011), hierarchical organisations are replete with unequal relations where employees are perceived as means to achieve the end rather than viewed as partners.

Hence, Carson et al. (2007) advances the idea of leadership being distributed in organisations to optimise and spread leadership capabilities across all levels. Ensley et al., (2006) maintains that such shared leadership in organisations can take the form of formal and informal interactions. Thus, the formal appointments to positions can be neutralised by the recognition of the informal leadership relations.

According to the research by Jarvempaa and Tanriverdi (2003), a need for a strategic shift from hierarchical structures towards networks and flexible structures has compelled organisational leadership to reconsider how work assignments are designed and implemented. Working in teams has since assumed importance over and above the prevalent practice of work arranged around individuals. As a result, Hawkins (2011) and Brown and Grant (2010) suggest that one way of ensuring that these teams are coherent and that they collaborate is to make use of coaching across all levels and across internal organisational boundaries.

2.2.2 Power and Domination

Power display perpetuates domination and inequality in the workplace. Domination manifests itself in the control of organisational resources by a few in favour of their sectional interests rather than serving organisational interests (Maner & Mead, 2010). Since resources are dominated and held at the absolute discretion of the powerful few executives, the way coaching is sourced for leaders' development has since followed suit. In other words, leaders often cannot transcend the individualist thinking of leader development towards the broader development of leadership. Excessive leader domination and control is not without adverse consequences which include, among others, employee disengagement, which to a large extent can lead to compliance rather than genuine commitment to organisational goals and loss of value adding talented employees (Hogan & Nelson, 2009).

In summary, although top-down practices of hierarchical power display, control and domination are rife in organisations, they tend to influence how financial resources are deployed and for whom, rather than focusing on building leadership capabilities for organisational effectiveness. However, as articulated below, contemporary approaches have emerged to advance a different way of thinking and leading in organisations.

2.3 CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATIONS

In view of the traditional approaches to leadership, the world of work has moved and different approaches have been largely adopted, mainly through progressive thinking influenced by pervasive complexities (Hernez-Broome, 2004). Contemporary approaches to leadership emphasise the following: the focus on leadership development that transcends leader individual development; focus on followers and employee engagement, shared leadership and that leadership is a relational phenomenon (Kets de Vries, 2011).

As shown above, the foci of progressive and contemporary approaches to leadership and leadership development are an attempt to move away from top-down hierarchical tendencies in organisations towards a more inclusive, interconnected working environment (Srivastava, 2014). Coaching has been identified in literature as one of the interventions that can be of use in enhancing leadership collaborations in organisations towards a culture of collective and shared leadership (De Meuse et al. 2009). Drivers for collective and systemic leadership emerged because of the ever-changing complex world in which leaders find themselves, which demands more than just the greatness of one leader. Some of the key factors and drivers towards an inclusive, interconnected working environment are mentioned and discussed below. If there is a move towards a more inclusive working environment, then notions of shared and collaborative leadership become central.

2.3.1 Focus on Leadership development than on leader development

Top management has been assumed as the actual leaders and others as followers (Day,2009). As a consequence, leader development took centre stage rather than leadership development (Dalakoura, 2010). As Senge (1999) observed, everyone not senior in the organisational

hierarchy is seen as not a leader, meaning, leadership is a function of a position, not resourcefulness. The tendency of ignoring other levels of the organisational structure for leadership development can be self defeating for contemporary organisations that seek to be effective and competitive in an increasingly complex world (Pearce & Manz, 2005).

2.3.2 Focus on followership and employee engagement

For too long under the hierarchical leadership formal structures, followers were subjects of their leaders (Baker, 2007). Hence, the bulk of research was spent on studying leaders as though leaders exist by themselves or operate in a vacuum (Levin & Gottlieb, 2009). Progressive perspective has eventually emerged and researchers have produced studies of the role of followers in leadership and what impact this can have on contemporary organisations (Bass & Riggio, 2007). In other words, leaders exist because followers are (Baker, 2007). According to Bjugstad et al. (2006), the importance and the role played by followership have been downplayed. This is opposed to the reality that without followers there is no leadership (Kesby, 2008). One of the qualities embedded in followership is their ability to influence the direction of production through their mass power and thus influence organisational direction. Therefore it behooves leadership to appreciate the fact that they achieve and attain organisational objectives through the direct efforts of followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006).

Employee engagement becomes critical then if organisations are to achieve success through the direct efforts of followers (Terry, 2010). Those followers need to stay engaged and committed to realise and exceed their organisational objectives (Hogan & Nelson, 2009).

2.3.3 Shared leadership

Shared leadership, by definition, exists when more than one person performs the leadership functions of the team (Pearce & Sims, 2000). This leadership approach flies in the face of most leadership research that utilises a framework in which leadership resides with a single person (Yukl, 2002). However, with the increasing complexity and responsibility of team tasks, it becomes less likely that a single team member will be able to perform all of the needed leadership functions (Barry, 1991; Pearce & Manz, 2005).

In summary, the preoccupation with inclusive leadership has increased as discussed earlier (Storey, 2005; Serfontein, 2009). The hierarchical and controlling tendencies in organisations by organisational leadership is diminishing in favour of a collective and shared leadership for the common purpose of organisational effectiveness. Followers have become a reasonable force to be acknowledged in leading their organisations with their leadership. Thus, the importance of positions should give way to collaborative wisdom as it emerges across the organisation structures. As suggested by Block (2009), a different and progressive approach to leadership has emerged, one that respects collective wisdom rather than individual wisdom and promotes collaborations rather than silos.

It is in the light of the preceding section on leadership and leadership development that the following section discusses the coaching definitions and how coaching relates to leadership development.

2.4 THE ROLE OF COACHING IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

According to Kemp (2009), the link between leadership development and coaching has been recorded in the literature by researchers such Boyatzis, et al., (2006); Zenger and Stinnett, 2006; Groothof (2007) and Burdett (1998) and is thus not a new phenomenon. Direct connections of leadership effectiveness as a result of coaching interventions were established in various research studies (Simpson, 2010; Dalakoura, 2010; Ely & Zaccaro, 2010; Duke, 2008). Before delving into the link between coaching and leadership development, definitions of coaching are necessary.

2.4.1 Definitions of coaching

Several diverse definitions of this concept of coaching are found in the literature. Hamilton (2000), for example, postulates that no universally agreed definition on coaching exists. Similarly, Eggers and Clark (2000) posit that there are diverse definitions of coaching. However, several authors in peer-reviewed articles and in books have made efforts towards articulating the definition of coaching in individual, team or organisational contexts. Among those contributors is Schein (2005), who defined coaching as a profession intended to help coachees by making use of structured tools and techniques. These techniques are designed to

assist the coachee to develop and appreciate different ways of behaving, seeing and responding and adapting to various contexts and challenges. According to Grant (2007), coaching should be viewed a collaborative offering that is geared towards helping, facilitating the coachee's new ways of navigating his/her challenges. Coaching is also defined and described by Hamlin et al. (2008) as thought provoking partnership between a coach and a coachee. The International Coaching Federation likewise defines coaching as a thought-provoking and creative partnership between a coach and a coachee (ICF, 2011).

Some authors have indicated that coaching is collaborative (Grant, 2007), helping, and facilitative (Hamlin et al., 2008). According to Cox, Bachkirova and Clutterbuck (2010), coaching can be defined as a process whose core purpose is to augment a coachee's performance and individual effectiveness. Coaching can also be defined as a one-on-one relationship geared towards improving the coachee's development, especially in enhancing individual learning and self awareness (Joo, 2005). According to Douglas and McCauley (1999), coaching can be described as facilitating the achievement of goals and behavioural change for the coachee and in enhancing performance.

Coaching to a large extent has been described as a tool that evolved to advance the careers of executives in organisations (Griffin, 2006; Ozkan, 2008). According to Toit (2007), coaching can be described as an intervention to assist coachees to learn in a safe non-judgemental work space. This point is further supported by Grant et al. (2010) who posit that coaching is essential and important in building leadership capabilities in leaders. In addition to sentiments shared by Grant (2010), Kets de Vries (2005) defines and views coaching as an intervention that can be maximised to include the organisational context rather than simply embracing and upholding an individual dimension. This idea was similarly observed by Orenstein (2002), who posited that for coaching to have maximal impact it should be extended to include other organisational stakeholders beyond the top executives if organisations are serious about building leadership capabilities across organisational levels.

As shown in the study, the researcher subscribes to the notion as articulated by Orenstein (2002); Grant (2006) and Kets de Vries (2005) that coaching should be inclusive and not reserved for the few if the expansion and building of leadership capabilities is to be realised. The rationale for the selection and subscribing to the above definition by the researcher is because, if coaching is systemic and prioritises the system, appreciates the context and

transcends the dyadic approach, organisational leadership can be widely and positively affected and more return on investment in coaching can be realised. This definition is one that constitutes the core of the study topic and is fundamental to the research study.

However, this argument does not discard the role dyadic coaching plays in leader development but rather advances that both dyadic and systemic coaching can be complementary and reinforcing each other than seen as exclusive.

In summary, this review of the literature on the definitions of coaching revealed various definitions and descriptions. No single definition exists, however, similarities are observable. What can be observed is that coaching was initially conceptualised and used as an individual focused solution and as a remedial intervention. An individual focused solution is often characterised largely by the empowerment of the individual to develop his or her inherent potential and reach specific goals. It is only later that the thought is advanced that this intervention can be maximised for better value especially in the light of limited organisational resources, so that more rather than just a few can benefit.

2.4.2 Coaching and Leadership development

According to Ajani's (2010) study, coaching has been recorded as having positive results in the following leadership areas: organisational leadership capacity; individual development; team enhancement and strengthening; talent retention and in strategy implementation, among others. Similarly, Thompson (2008), in his study, recorded the following aspects of coaching's positive impact on leadership and organisational development: organisational performance; employee engagement; improving individual performance; improving retention levels; improving recruitment outcomes and assisting in developing leadership development and succession.

According to an earlier study by McGovern et al. (2001), coaching can positively impact on the personal and professional development of directors, of which effective leadership coupled with strong confidence has been the outcome. According to MacKie (2007), coaching can be viewed as impactful when it has a direct positive influence on the following aspects, namely: increased self awareness; increased knowledge and increased skills. These skills can be

observed through individual behavioural change, improved individual and organisational performance. A later study by Benavides (2009), further confirms that coaching can be a useful leadership development offering to empowering minority talent pools and for improving performance.

In the South African environment and context, coaching has also been found to be a valuable tool in cultivating leadership development as highlighted in the following studies by Abbott, Goosen, and Coetzee, (2010); Aricksamy (2011); Lee (2010); and Roman (2011).

In summary, both international and local studies show clearly that coachees participating actively in coaching have observed and experienced improvements in the following areas: intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, organisational performance, self-awareness, team coherence and collaborations.

2.5 ORIGINS, SOURCING AND INTRODUCTION OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

This section briefly records the literature in the following aspects of coaching: historical origins; sourcing and introduction of coaching in organisations. This is important for the reader to appreciate the contextual origins of coaching and how it has evolved to the extent that is now been used in the business world.

2.5.1 Coaching historical origins

According to Charan (2009) and Raskin (2009), the emergence of coaching may be traced from the sporting world initially and then later to the business world, eventually emerging in business schools as a field of study. Coaching arose from several independent disciplines and intellectual traditions, spreading through a complex and somewhat unpredictable series of relationships (Bono et al., 2009). Although coaching in the context of the workplace is relatively new, the roots of coaching may be traced as far back as the 1880s (Kilburg, 2007).

According to Bono et al. (2009); Kilburg (2007); Carey, Philippon, and Cummings (2011); Cox, et al., (2010); Biswas-Diener, (2009), coaching emanates from a diverse range of

disciplines, including philosophy, learning perspectives, human and organisational development, sports psychology and performance, business management and motivational theories and other related fields, such as education depicted in figure 1 diagram below.




Figure 1. Root disciplines of coaching

Adapted from "Professional Challenges Facing the Coaching Field from an Historical Perspective," by V. Brock, 2009, *International Journal of Coaching in Organizations, 1*, p. 28.

This diagram of the root disciplines of coaching shows that coaching per se is not a new phenomenon. Coaching emerged to a large extent in response to the need for alternative or complementary approaches to leadership development in organisations (Kets de Vries, 2010).

2.5.2 Sourcing and introduction of coaching

According to Evered and Selman (2001) and Gray (2006), coaching as an emerging discipline is often described as having been introduced to business and leadership literature in the early 1950s. Though coaching is considered a discipline in its infancy, individual leaders and

organisations are continuing to source and invest significant financial resources in coaching services for various reasons, chief among them being leadership development (Grant, 2006; International Coaching Federation, 2012). This point is also reflected in Stout-Rostron (2009)'s work, who posited that the sourcing of coaching remains largely for the benefit of middle managers who are high performers and selected candidates on the leadership pipeline of contemporary organisations.

Sourcing of coaching shifted from being predominantly aimed at restoring the careers of derailed employees to elevating and empowering employees in organisations (Whitherspoon & White, 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004; Kets de Vries, 2010). Grant and Cavanagh (2004) provide descriptive reports in which managers act as internal coaches. In other words, several researchers, including Grant and Cavanagh (2004) in their work, identified the emergence and the introduction of coaching in the corporate boardroom. Gershman, according to Grant and Cavanagh (2004), produced the first coach-specific doctoral study in 1967 relating to coaching in organisations. Huffington (2007) noted that some of the coaching pioneers seemed to have made a successful effort to bring his model of therapy from a family-coaching perspective into the workplace. According to Cushion et al. (2006), these ground-breaking research efforts aided the coaching offering to survive all odds of criticism, finding expression in the 21st century. Researchers noted a trend towards the development of scientific models and approaches in coaching. An illustrative case at hand is the birth of international coaching bodies making an effort to professionalise coaching. In other words, coaching appears to be embraced and is showing signs that it is here to stay (Hamlin et al., 2008).

Coaching has since received attention in contemporary business schools and institutes (Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007). This signifies the growth of the coaching profession which is being taken seriously, and thus is receiving attention from both business schools and organisations.

2.6 PURPOSE, USES AND DELIVERY OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

The changing global market place, matrixed organisations, trends to downsize in times of trouble, and the retirement of employees in the ages between 42-60, have contributed to struggling executives (Kampa & White, 2002: Orenstein, 2006). Businesses have come to

realise that ineffective leadership by their senior executives can result in financial decline for the organisation. As a result, consultation to senior leaders in organisations has been used frequently and has been increasingly referred to as executive coaching (Kilburg, 1999). According to Barner and Higgins (2007), coaching is used and viewed as an invaluable way of enhancing the performance of those in leadership positions and involves the use of various tools and techniques by coaches to assist their clients. Such a method, as posited by Barner and Higgins (2007), is largely and increasingly used in the organisational and business world to enhance organisational effectiveness.

The use of coaching has become increasingly widespread during the past decade hence organisational leadership often source coaching for their executives ((Feldman & Lankau, 2005). The purpose of coaching and its uses have been largely in favour of the advancement of a privileged few elite rather than being maximised for the benefit of many in the organisation (Kahn, 2011). According to Coutu and Kauffman (2009), the privileged few are mostly made up of senior executives and high achievers. The senior executives and high achievers were the most common recipients of coaching programmes (Stout-Rostron, 2009). One of the reasons advanced for the use of dyadic coaching is to optimise the leadership capabilities of the individual identified for either promotion or for behavioural change (Ward, 2008; Hall et al, 1999). It has often been on a case by case basis and less about embedding it and integrating it into other organisational programmes for organisational effectiveness (Mukherjee, 2012). Due to such an ad hoc approach to the uses of coaching, measuring coaching impact has become difficult (Ashley-Timms, 2012).

Coaching dyadically may be used to enhance an executive career by refining an executive's skills and optimising his or her strengths. It may help him or her move on to take more leadership responsibilities (Stern, 2004; Tobias, 1996). Thompson's (2008) global study of coaching practices with 1 000 participants indicates that leadership development is among the top reasons for using coaching. Kets de Vries (2004) suggests that the purpose of coaching is to develop a focused strategy to enhance the productivity of individuals, teams and organisations. This is particularly relevant when success depends on personal commitment and interactions with others at a deeper emotional level. Roberts and Jarrett (2006) and Hawkins (2011) argue for the extension of coaching not only to a selected few at the top but that it should also be considered for a larger employee base. Individuals with strategic

responsibilities across the organisational structure, such as planning and implementing organisational tasks, are thus suitable beneficiaries of coaching (Grant et al., 2009).

In summary, it is evident from the preceding literature that the purposes and uses of coaching were first and foremost for the empowerment of the individual executive or leader. However, some authors and researchers argue for the extension of coaching to other organisational levels. As posited by Stern (2004), coaching should be regarded as an organisational strategic intervention to augment a broader leadership capacity for organisational effectiveness. The link between coaching and leadership development has also been discussed. This section suggests that coaching as an offering is pivotal to the development of leadership in organisations. However, to derive maximum benefits from a coaching intervention, the coaching model or approach employed matters and does reflect different results. The above have laid a foundation for understanding the distinction between dyadic and systemic coaching and how each relate or contribute to leader or leadership development in organisations.

2.7 DYADIC, SYSTEMIC COACHING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATIONS

2.7.1 Dyadic coaching approach

Dyadic coaching refers to an exclusive one-to-one coaching between the coach and the coachee. According to Orenstein (2002), coaching should be seen as dyadic intervention when it is conducted with an executive to improve his or her leadership skills. In other words, one-on-one coaching completely focuses on the coachee, often to the exclusion of his or her team and organisational environment. Although the one-to-one coaching provides the coachee with a safe space for reflection and thinking without any disruptions (Paige, 2002), concerns were raised in terms of this approach's historical conceptualisation and its effectiveness in building leadership, not only leaders in organisations. Cushion et al. (2006) posits that dyadic coaching tends to promote the individual leader development over the collective. This coaching approach, according Hawkins (2011), tends to make leadership

development an individual trait rather than an organisational collective capacity (Hawkins, 2011).

Bass (2007) maintains that the conceptualisation of coaching as an individual trait rather than an organisational quality influences the way in which organisations source coaching externally. Most organisations usually source coaching intervention externally and in haste, based on their personal needs, rather than on their motivation to strengthen and cultivate leadership and organisational capabilities (Bass, 2007). This practice has various unintended consequences, as identified by various authors (Kets de Vries, 2005; Grant, 2012), as it compels human resources and organisational development practitioners to source coaching interventions in haste, without spending sufficient time understanding the actual needs of their internal clients (these mostly being the executives). This further lessens the importance of coaching and its relevance to the organisational strategic vision. Consequently: i. Active participation is compromised, as is return on investment; ii. Human resources practitioners often engage outside coaches without any idea which coaching model is relevant and appropriate for their context and needs; iii. Less regard is given to planning and how such intervention would be rolled out and co-ordinated successfully in augmenting the organisational leadership effectiveness; iv. The entire intervention is thus left to the external coaches, less time is being spent in positioning such coaching interventions strategically within organisations (Goldsmith, 2008).

Mthembu (2010) revealed that sourcing coaching externally is compounded further by the misplaced idea by human resources practitioners of always focusing on selecting the coaching intervention with the lowest investment cost, often compromising quality and overlooking requisite expertise and appropriate models. Decision making is thus conducted at a lower level and yet is aimed for a strategic purpose (Bass, 2007). Effective coaching programmes require and involve substantial commitment in terms of resources, budgets, prolonged timescales, potential disruption, and alignment with running projects or programmes, and major business or organisational change (Peters, 2009). Not having a clear and precise idea of the purpose and uses of coaching within an organisation, leadership creates and allows confusion, thus compromising the maximisation of coaching benefits and return on investment (Nelson & Hogan, 2009; Paige, 2002; Marion, 2001). The above-cited factors have the potential to compromise the integrity and impact of such interventions within organisations.

Dyadic coaching is often conducted individually often at the exclusion of the leader's team, peers and the organisational context (Brown & Harvey, 2006). A dyadic coaching approach is seen as lacking an appreciation of factors that are systemic in nature which often manifest within a coaching engagement (Wheelan, 2003). The Leader's preoccupation with leader development as though it is the same as leadership development has influenced how coaching is sourced in organisations (De Meuse, 2009). Hence the dyadic coaching is leader driven development. By neglecting collective leadership development, individualised development is condoned; collective wisdom is compromised and the heroic hierarchical leadership notion is entrenched (Senge, 2006). Therefore, the client organisation, according to Fine (2013), should have a systemic leadership development model or approach to grow, empower and retain capable leadership across organisational levels and divisional boundaries (Fine, 2013).

The next section discusses limitations to dyadic coaching and the presenting implications thereof.

2.7.1.1 Limitations of dyadic coaching

According to several authors' critique of the dyadic approach to coaching, such as Paige (2002) and Wheelan (2003), a dyadic approach is seen as lacking the appreciation of factors that are systemic in nature which deserve a systemic response. A systemic response to recurrent organisational challenges is beyond the capacity of an individual leader and thus requires a collective approach (O'Neill, 2000).

Several organisational learning theorists position the awareness of the system at the core of their learning models (e.g., Scharma, 2007; Senge, 2006). Such individuals argue that, to foster real change and development in organisational settings, it is critical that individuals and groups have a high level of systemic awareness and an understanding of organisations, and their various subgroups, as dynamic and complex systems (Senge, 2006).

Extending this line of reasoning, proponents of systemic-level interventions argue that group work develops 'systems thinking' in its participants. They argue that the group itself becomes a microcosm of the organisational environment, and that individual and group performance improves due to the broader awareness, alignment and accountability achieved through the

process of dialogue with others (Scharma, 2007; Schein, 2003; Senge, 2006). As a result of these and other proposed benefits, there is currently an emerging shift by coaching practitioners towards promoting and offering systemic coaching programmes (Ward, 2008). Paige (2002) views the inability of the individual coachee to make changes within the existing organisation culture or at a systemic level as one of the major limitations of dyadic coaching as the individual efforts cannot be sufficient for organisational transformation and change.

Despite considerable organisational development research and practice suggesting that interventions in organisations should also be targeted at the organisational level, most organisational coaching remain dyadic (one-to-one) and few models of group coaching have been developed.

According to Kets de Vries (2005), the traditional individual approach is often characterised by infrequent unco-ordinated intervention for a select few. These coaching interventions that are disparate are often difficult to co-ordinate. Although one-on-one coaching is currently predominant, it remains a privilege that few in organisations enjoy and often is not informed by organisational needs. This traditional coaching presents some problematic assumptions that include: i. that executive development programmes can be conducted successfully in isolation of other key stakeholders - team, peers and other systems; ii. that coaching is often positioned as a cure-all which will ensure executive success; iii. that executive leadership quality and wisdom is only residing at the level of an executive; that overall system performance can be optimised by augmenting the capabilities of an individual rather than that of the whole enterprise (Kets de Vries, 2005).

2.7.1.2 Implications of dyadic coaching for organisational leadership development

According to Grant (2010), the executives that are coached are thus missing: i. the opportunity of aligning themselves and their teams to organisational strategic objectives through coaching; ii. for the executive coached to grow and be aligned with his/her team and peers, dyadic coaching is inadequate; iii. often dyadic coaching ignores the organisational context within which the executive operates; ii. the executive coached misses a platform of practising coaching skills; iii. and the organisation misses an opportunity in systemically

building their own 'bench strength', sharing of knowledge, embedding and institutionalising positive coaching behaviours in their organisations (Sullivan & Decker, 2009).

When coaching remains ad hoc and unfocused, it tends to lose momentum and relevance in the organisational system. What compounds this situation further is when an organisation enlists the services of different external coaching organisations to coach their executives without a clear coaching strategy and model (Grant, 2012). The concern is when reporting time comes, consolidation of the feedback becomes disparate as coaching organisations often do not use similar approaches or models, learning is lost as it is unco-ordinated and the coaching purpose of alignment and integrated leadership development is lost. Return on investment remains unaccounted for (Kats & Miller, 2014).

This approach further facilitates and confuses secrecy of the individualised coaching sessions with confidentiality. If coaching is done behind a veil of secrecy how then will a leader be held accountable and be assisted in his/her development by the organisation? This practice often portrays coaching as a private affair rather than an organisation affair (Kets De Vries, 2005). This approach further assumes that executive intelligence and leadership strength resides solely at the top. In modern organisations populated by knowledge workers this proves incorrect as leadership capabilities are often spread through various levels of the organisation. Therefore, the assumption that quality of leadership and capacity for decision-making can only be located and found at the top of the organisational chart is misleading (Sullivan & Decker, 2009).

This traditional approach further assumes that the overall system performance can be optimised by an optimisation of the individual elements rather than the whole. This sometimes subtly leads to unbalanced teams that grow in a skewed way (Grant, 2007). Though dyadic coaching is often seen and accepted as an effective tool to assist in improving individual performance, its value and impact is not fully realised as a tool for overall organisational alignment, performance and effectiveness.

In summary, the traditional dyadic coaching (one-on-one approach) remains limited and not appropriate to addressing the increasing needs of organisational leadership, especially within complex, uncertain operating environments, which places greater pressure and demands on

leaders. This complex, demanding operating environment requires adaptive and systemic leadership for organisations to thrive. As a result, single-solution approaches to leadership development are not robust enough to assist in building the leadership capabilities required today. Hence a need for a complementary coaching approach that prioritises the system, advances the strategic expansion of coaching by complementing the conventional dyadic focus of coaching, one that remains conscious of the environment within which such the leadership operates (Grossman & Valiga, 2009). The systemic approach evidently calls for leadership development to transcend and yet include, leader development.

Following is a discussion on the systemic and complementary approach to dyadic coaching, namely, systemic coaching.

2.7.2 The systemic approach

According to Cociveria and Cronshaw (2004), effective and dynamic coaching within organisations should be holistic. In other words, coaching should be concentrated on various organisational dimensions, namely, organisational context, team, and individual, rather than on the individual alone. A systemic coaching approach draws its orientation from the acceptance that leaders are a product of their own environmental systems, and thus their development cannot be isolated from their context (Ungerer, 2007).

Cook and Viedge (2011) posit that systemic oriented coaching as a holistic offering to organisations should be positioned likewise in current modern business contexts, especially in the light of a management and leadership theory which tends to advance the need for effective teams and collective learning in support of organisational effectiveness.

The systemic orientation evolved from systems thinking which refers to seeing inter-relationships instead of cause and effect (Senge et al. 1994; Flood, 1991). Systems thinking encourages seeing things holistically to appreciate the whole rather than the single parts (Bridges, 2004). In modern organisations, systems thinking encourages leaders to look far beyond organisational boundaries and hierarchies (Hawkins, 2011). Systems thinking encourages organisations to develop their leaders in a systemic way. Systems thinking appreciates that most organisational challenges are systemic in nature and thus warrant a

systemic response. Seeing beyond organisational boundaries will assist leadership to anticipate what can in future affect, or is currently affecting their growth and progress. Metaphors associated with systems thinking include seeing forest for the trees and seeing the fish pond for the fish (Sherwood, 2002 & Tate, 2010).

The systemic refers to the system and its interrelationships with other systems (Daft, 2007). For example, a system-wide intervention involves having a view of the whole rather than individual parts (Stacey, 2011). Organisational problems that are recurrent are often a signal of a deeper systemic problem, therefore blaming one individual will be inadequate (Collier, 2000). Dealing with the symptoms of a problem is easier than uprooting the root cause. Often in organisations, organisational ills are attributed wholly to leaders as though they were acting alone. Hence a systemic approach to leadership should be an organisational development (OD) activity. In practical terms, this means working across organisational hierarchies and relationships between leaders rather than focusing on individuals (Grant, 2011).

In summary, the systemic approach is relevant and critical in organisational contexts as in most instances people belong to various work teams (Anderson et al., 2008). According to Kets de Vries (2010), team or collective coaching does indeed result in a better return on investment in coaching than dyadic coaching. Interestingly, Ibarra et al. (2010) view coaching systemically as another way of reducing the isolated development of women from men and this can then assist in cultivating an integrated leadership development of all genders for organisational effectiveness. This point is further advanced by O'Neill (2000), who posits that systemic approaches to leadership development are key to coaching within organisations as they cover more than one individual. This approach is pivotal in ensuring a collective execution for the organisational benefit.

2.7.2.1 Systemic coaching and the larger organisational system

A systems approach to organisations rests with alignments between different systems, understanding that constant non-linear change is driven by multiple invisible and influential feedback loops (O'Neill, 2000). Organisations have direct interactions with not only the internal environment, such as employees, managers, teams, technology, and resources, but also interactions with its external environment, such as customers, competitors, suppliers, and government agencies (Daft, 2007; Morgan, 2006). It is these collective and systemic aspects of the organisation and its context that can either enhance or undermine performance.

Huffington's (2007) review of the literature found that coaching is a subset of organisational consultancy that bears in mind the organisation as the "third party to the wings", meaning the organisation where the client works. Thus, she advocated a whole systems perspective that positions the work of the coach and client in contrast and in relation to the wider organisational context. The larger system substantially influences the client's actions and outcomes, whether the client is in a team or an individual. When the coach pays attention to the larger system while coaching the client, the client cannot use coaching to turn away from the organisation and avoid his or her relatedness to the organisation. Rather, the coach helps the client face, and manage, its challenges. Huffington (2007) described this way of working with a client as a process consultancy approach (Schein, 1988) or a coach–consultant approach whereby organisational consulting and coaching are combined (Kilburg, 2001; Peltier, 2010).

Hawkins (2011) extended a systems perspective to leadership coaching. Similar to Hackman and Wageman (2005), Hawkins suggested that the focus of coaching a team is on the team's purpose, performance, and processes and secondarily on the interpersonal development of the team. Second, the focus of coaching is on the team's systemic context, helping them engage and relate to their various stakeholders in a way that leads to jointly transforming the larger business. The systemic context of organisations has important implications for coaching practice, including the coaching of work teams. Several authors have discussed the implications of systems theory for coaches (Cavanagh, 2006; O'Neill, 2000; Peltier, 2001).

Grant (2011) argued that coaching clients is inherently and inextricably part of a larger system, such as the organisational context. Neglecting these systemic issues means ignoring the powerful and very real forces at work in the client's life. Grant (2011) concluded, for example, that coaching education should include training in general systems theory, organisation change theory, as well as complexity theory so that aspiring coaching practitioners will better understand groups and teams, their dynamics, the complexities of human systems, and the nature of change in complex adaptive systems.

Organisational learning theorists (e.g., Scharmer, 2007; Senge, 1994) place systemic awareness at the centre of their learning models. In order to foster change and development, "it is critical that individuals and groups have a high level of systemic awareness and an understanding of organisations, and their various subgroups, as dynamic and complex systems" (Brown & Grant, 2010). Morgan (2006) deepened the understanding of organisations and advocated that in order for organisations to learn and change, members must be skilled in systems thinking, as developed by Senge (1994). Systems thinking focuses on how the phenomenon being studied interacts with other elements of the system to produce certain behaviours. Rather than isolating small parts of the system as the focus of study, a systems thinking approach takes into account larger numbers and types of interactions while studying the phenomenon.

Systemic perspectives also facilitate learning in groups (Senge,2006). Despite the current shortage of robust scientific evidence that explicitly links group coaching interventions based on interpersonal or group dynamic perspectives with increased organisational performance, there is longstanding support for a range of other interventions at the group or system level (e.g., Argyris, 1991; Brown & Harvey, 2006; Schein, 1999; Senge, 2006). Indeed, systems-level thinking stands out across the coaching literature as both a common benefit of group interventions and a criticism of dyadic coaching. O'Neill (2000) sees systems perspectives as being central to effective coaching, more cost effective than individual coaching, is scalable and sustainable and is appropriate for the relational context of leadership.

In a similar vein, the broader organisational development and change literature supports a systemic approach to change and growth. Wheelan (2003) also advances the importance of educating leaders on systems thinking. Kets de Vries (2005) views systemic coaching as

more effective than dyadic coaching because it deals with both cognition and affect within the organisational system rather than focusing merely on individual goal attainment. Kotter's (2007) work on organisational change stresses the importance of a guiding coalition and the need to plan systemically because of the natural tendency of the organisation to resist change.

In summary, from a systemic theoretical perspective the argument is for coaching to take place in a group with broader representation of the system itself and accompanied with multiple benefits is compelling.

2.7.2.2 The design and process of systemic coaching

Systemic coaching is deliberately designed to be inclusive and holistic in developing leaders in organisations across levels and hierarchy. The primary focus of systemic coaching is the system. The major assumption of this approach is that most organisational challenges are systemic and can only be resolved by engaging systemic interventions (Kahn, 2011). Organisational challenges have proven to be beyond individual wisdom, hence a collective wisdom is paramount and the execution thereof can only be through an effective collective effort (Kets de Vries, 2010).

This approach is expressed and conducted in various forms as conceptualised and presented by the following researchers and practitioners. According to Grant (2012), leadership is spread out throughout the organisational structures and is not only resident at the top. Therefore, when embarking on the development of leaders, there is a need to ensure leaders are selected across the hierarchy to the coaching programme or intervention. In embracing this approach, key outcomes can emerge, such as integrated and collaborative learning, as matters get discussed in a facilitated open forum. A commitment to an action plan follows as participants' views are strategically integrated. A partnership among leaders emerges to the elimination of silos in organisations. Collective development and knowledge sharing becomes the norm rather than the exception (Grant, 2011). The organisational bench strength is enriched though the identification of leaders by their contribution not only by position.

In summary, the design of systemic coaching is inclusive of a broader organisational employee community which is simultaneously inclusive of individual leaders, hence it

transcends and yet includes leader development. The following section discusses the making of systemic leadership.

2.8 Systemic Leadership

The systemic approach to leadership development emerged from the acknowledgment in the literature that hierarchical, heroic leadership lacks relevance in today's complex world (Painter-Morland, 2008). The success of organisations can no more be attributed to single individuals at the top but should be seen as a collective effort. In other words, leadership should not be seen as restricted to the top few by virtue of their authority and position in organisations. According to Senge (2006), traditional and individualistic perspectives of leadership can be a hindrance to the flourishing of collective and distributed leadership.

It is in the context of the limitations of the heroic and reductionist view of leadership that the systemic perspective of leadership becomes relevant (Senge, 2006). Coaching, as demonstrated in this chapter, has been acknowledged as one of the invaluable interventions for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. Systemic leadership is often referred to in the literature as collective leadership beyond the top leadership and distributed across organisational structural levels. Such collective leadership capacity assists in sustaining organisations far beyond individual efforts (Collier & Estenban, 2000). The advocating of collective leadership evidenced in the literature represents a departure from an inadequate top-down form of leadership restricted to an appointed few. Systemic leadership, by prioritising the system and by acknowledging the whole instead of its parts, has been viewed as adequate and helpful in dealing with complex organisational issues (Uhl-Bien, 2006).

It is this kind of leadership that this study, through coaching, seeks to understand how that leadership is developed for organisational effectiveness. According to Painter-Morland (2008), systemic leadership does not suggest a total elimination of organisational structures in organisations but rather suggests a broader platform for leadership across different levels to find expression for organisational effectiveness and success. In other words, the call for a broad participation in leadership does not cancel the importance of leadership structure in organisations.

2.8.1 Systemic coaching and the systemic development of leadership in organisations

According to Kets de Vries (2010), systemic coaching facilitates a space and a platform where real interpersonal dynamics find expression and affords leaders with opportunities to appreciate and set goals related to a purpose larger than their individual selves (Kets de Vries, 2010; Thornton, 2010). Ward (2008) further posits that coaching executives in groups or teams tends to leverage their collective experience. The support they give to each other is a powerful transformational tool for executives (Ward, 2008).

Brown and Grant (2010) mentioned that enterprise wide leadership coaching is better able to extend the value of coaching beyond the individual basis. This argument suggests that systemic coaching can be scalable and carries the capacity to integrate team and organisational learning (Kets de Vries, 2010; Thorton, 2010). This then suggests that a systemic designed coaching offering can better capacitate managerial leadership to respond to current and future organisational complex challenges. (Cook & Vierge, 2011). It follows therefore that a systemic coaching intervention presents a greater potential than a dyadic approach in intentionally establishing systemic leadership in organisations.

2.9 FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR SYSTEMIC COACHING IMPLEMENTATION

Among the factors cited as critical in the literature when it comes to factors to consider when implementing coaching in organisations are: i. Organisational culture; ii. Top leadership support and participation; iii. Consent of coaching participants; iv. Reporting and accountability.

.

2.9.1 Organisational culture

Organisational culture influences leadership development and so does leadership influence culture. In other words, the employee actions and leadership orientations are largely shaped by the organisational culture (Martins & Martins, 2003). A supportive organisational culture is key in the flourishing of strategic interventions, such as coaching, as it is for talent

retention (Booysen & van Wyk, 2008). In other words, the cultural context as a platform for coaching will determine how it will be implemented and can assist in determining the success of such an intervention (Ashley et al., 2010; Lloyd, 2005).

2.9.2 Top leadership participation and support

Top Leadership support for such an organisation-wide coaching intervention will surely require time and leadership support, hence several authors (Hoojiberg & Lane, 2009; Joo, 2005; Keil et al., 1996; McNally & Lukens, 2006) advance the point that the success of coaching and effective implementation thereof is subject to consistent leadership support and availing time for active participation in coaching sessions. Similarly, Goldman et al. (2012) argued that coaching success is largely premised on the unwavering support of senior leadership. According to Avolio et al. (2010), sufficient resources and active leadership support are critical factors in ensuring coaching is successfully implemented in organisations. Similarly, Ward (2008) and Kahn (2011) argue that coaching interventions cannot be successful by themselves without the active participation of executives and the involvement of participants.

Finally, meaningful sponsorship and top leadership support are mentioned by Harman (2008) as paramount in ensuring development interventions in organisations' succeed. Of equal importance is coaching goals to be followed through as that will assist in measuring the coaching impact versus objectives set.

2.9.3 Consent of coaching participants

The tendency of leaders to impose coaching and developmental programmes to subordinates has proven unhelpful as genuine participation and change will be compromised (Kets de Vries, 2005). According to Kets de Vries (2005), neglecting or overriding participant consent is no different to putting participants under duress thus behaving unethically as a leader. Reasons for consent arise most in group coaching settings, where issues of confidentiality occur and hence Anderson et al. (2008) advises the use of dyadic coaching as appropriate to deal with such matters.

2.9.4. Reporting and accountability

Kahn (2011) mentions that coaches coming into organisations need to be alert to the fact that internal organisational accountability and reporting structures by the coach can be complex. Therefore, it becomes important for coaches to clear the reporting and accountability conundrum at the point of contracting rather than waiting to do so later.

In summary, factors to consider in implementing systemic coaching cannot be ignored as shown above. Enormous efforts need to be employed to ensure the above factors are transformed into advantages rather than disadvantages.

2.10 THE POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OR BENEFITS OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

The literature review conducted revealed commonly reported domains which were used for the purpose of this research study. The six identified coaching outcomes from the literature review include the following: i. Improved organisational culture and values; ii. Alignment of employees and organisational strategy; iii. Enhanced organisational innovation; iv. Enhanced leadership capabilities; v. Improved peer coaching and leadership development and; vi. Improved employee engagement.

2.10.1 Improved organisational culture and values

A supportive organisational culture is central in employee and leadership development. According to Ashley et al. (2010), coaching that is integrated in the organisational culture and leadership can guide and align the employee to the organisational imperatives which can lead to organisational effectiveness. Of equal importance and proximity to culture is the importance of embracing positive organisational values by employees. Positive coaching principles, according to Mertel (2010), can influence and enrich organisational values through coaching conversations. These coaching conversations are critical in shaping the coachee to transcend self interests by embracing the greater good.

2.10.2 Alignment of employees and organisational strategy

In the era of the knowledge economy and increasing complexity and fierce competition, organisations are constantly shaping up to remain in business. Central to the organisational success is employee and leadership alignment to the organisational strategy so as to achieve organisational goals (Anderson, 2013). According to Brown and Grant (2010), coaching across and within the organisational hierarchy affords the organisation the chance to eliminate the silo mindset by shifting the focus of employees to the achievement of organisational goals rather than the attaininment of individual interests. This point was initially attested to by McDermott (2007), who acknowledged coaching as a tool for organisations to experience team work and alignment of resources to the achievement of a common goal rather than being embroiled in internal fierce competition.

2.10.3 Enhanced organisational innovation

In a global competitive context, innovations in the workplace represent the springboard for competitive advantage (Bowen et al., 2010). According to Hamlin et al. (2006), adopting coaching behaviours can improve and increase team and organisational results. Coaching is viewed as instrumental in prompting motivational behavioural processes that can result in innovation (Burke et al., 2006; Kozlowski et al., 2009; Morgeson et al., 2010).

Innovation cannot realise itself unless organisational leadership facilitates, supports and provides a conducive platform for employee innovation to find expression and coaching can be of value in this regard (Hammond et al. 2011; Rosing et al., 2011). This view is confirmed by Rousseau (2013) who mentioned that innovation can be part of the organisational system once punitive free culture is in place where employees are allowed to demonstrate their innovation uninhibited.

2.10.4 Enhanced leadership capabilities

Characteristics of capable leadership identified in the literature and relevant to the study and where coaching had an influence include effective leadership which contains strategic ability, decision making skills and communication; accountable and caring leadership; leadership style and leadership trust.

Building and enhancing leadership capabilities has increased given the leadership failures and changing complex business environment. According to Mukherjee (2012), coaching has been identified as key in enhancing leadership capabilities throughout the organisation. This view is confirmed by Faulkner et al. (2013), who argued that coaching has a pivotal role in enhancing the development of leadership capabilities.

Effective leadership relates to how leaders competently discharge their responsibilities in the interest of their organsiations. According to Goleman and Cherniss (2001)'s study, a significant difference of 90% was recorded between high performers coached and those not coached. This is indicative of the coaching influence and impact on organisational leadership. Coaching influence and impact in improving leadership comunication skills is recorded by the research of Berrriman (2007), Turner (2006), McDermott (2007) and Natale (2005).

Effective decision making by leadership reflects effective leadership (McGovern et al. (2001). Coaching as a non-judgmental space and a platform for learning has been recorded as having assisted leadership to make better leadership decision (Zeus and Skiffington (2002). Day et al. (2009) argues that key to effective leadership is what they termed a strong "internal core" that coaching assist to develop in leaders.

According to Peterson (2008), fundamental in effectively discharging leadership responsibilities is leadership accountability and being held accountable to organisational goals. Goal setting facilitated in coaching has directly influenced the leaders' way of making or take decisions (King & Force, 2008; Locke & Latham, 2002). Effective leadership cannot be discharged alone without recognising followers as partners in achieving organisational results (Katz & Miller, 2004).

Leadership style reflects effective leadership. Coaching does have a positive influence and impact on leadership behaviours and styles as recorded by the research of Evensong (2009); Peterson (2009); and Kombarakaran et al. (2008). According to Dietz and Den Hartog, (2006); Schoorman, Mayer, and Davis, (2007), coaching does assist the attainment of efficacy by leadership who delegate more to their subordinates as they begin to trust and have confidence in them. This confidence in subordinates by leadership can be instrumental in opening up and restoring good working relations and coaching is a vital tool in this regard, as articulated by Rousseau et al. (2013) DeRue et al. (2010); Bledow et al., (2009); Cheung and Wong (2011). Finally, leadership trust strengthens employee relations and coaching is central in influencing leader-followers relations, as articulated by Ladegard and Gjerde (2014).

2.10.5 Improved peer coaching and leadership development

According to Waddell and Dunn (2005), cordial employee work relations can be enhanced and augmented by engaging the practice of peer coaching. Peer coaching is also viewed as a valuable tool for leadership strengthening each other as articulated by Parker et al. (2008) who argued that as a safe platform for enhancing collaborations within organisations, peer coaching is necessary. This view is supported by Sekerka and Chao (2003) who mentioned that personal reflection and learning that is critical to augment self efficacy can be facilitated by peer coaching.

2.10.6 Improved employee engagement

Employee engagement remains a challenge for most organisations as it is linked to productivity (Hogan & Nelson, 2009; Aiken, 2009; Terry, 2010). Coaching has been recorded by Kombarakaran, Yang, Baker, and Fernandes (2008) as an intervention that can assist organisations to realise increased and sustained productivity though meaningful employee engagement. This view was first raised by McDermott (2007) who mentioned that coaching can assist organisations to enhance team work necessary for employee engagement. Central to employee engagement is employee commitment as articulated by Hsia et al. (2012) who mentioned systemic coaching is fundamentally relevant in focusing employees' attention on the attainment of organisational goals.

In addition to employee engagement is employee transitions as articulated by Bond and Naughton (2011), who highlighted the importance of transition coaching so as to mitigate leadership failures. This view is supported by Hogg and Terry (2000); Stahl and Voight (2008) who mentioned that through systemic coaching, leaders can be empowered to manage their transitions and be able to adapt to and transcend organisational cultural limitations.

2.11.EMBEDDING AND SUSTAINING COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

This section addresses the key aspects relating to embedding coaching in organisations. These aspects include: integrating and aligning coaching to other organisational programmes and internal coach training.

2.11.1 Integrating and aligning coaching to other organisational programmes

According to Chapman (2010), for coaching to have sustained impact, it has to be strategically integrated into other important organisational programmes. Since coaching cannot be a cure for all, it has to be incorporated in the fabric of the organisational system (O'Relly, 2010).

2.11.2 Internal coach training

To strengthen and embed principles of interventions such as coaching, the training of internal change agents has become critical. It is critical for purposes of continuity and in realising a positive coaching culture (Wilson, 2004). According to Mukherjee (2012), internal coach training is important because it enables leaders to learn to coach, develops their ability to listen, builds their level of confidence, and enhances their interpersonal skills.

According to Passarelli and Van Oosten (2014), internal coach training carries the advantage of expanding coaching skills across different levels of the organisation rather than just coaching for a selected few. Rock and Donde (2007) posit that coach training has a systemic advantage for the entire organisation. Tichy (2005) further advances the benefit of coach training in organisations as such training creates a platform to embed a coaching culture and values whilst simultaneously aligning everyone's attention to the organisational strategy.

Systemic coaching, according to Mukherjee (2012), is one of the available useful tools to assist towards building leadership capabilities and that can happen through coaching organisationally, coupled with coach training. However, some researchers (Figlar et al. 2007; Boyatzis, Smith & Blaize, 2006) caution against coach training for the sake of ticking the box and forgetting who the organisation takes through such a training programme, who later can be committed change agents to sustain the coaching culture in organisations. They view coaching as critical to the enrichment of the organisation's leadership pipeline.

2.12 CONCLUSION

In seeking to understand the literature in relation to leadership and coaching, this chapter has discussed various aspects, including the cultural and leadership context as key aspects on which coaching impacts and is equally influenced by. Understanding the importance of culture and leadership prior to coaching implementation can serve as a predictor of the coaching impact and outcomes. For example, the leader and leadership development distinction and how such difference is able to influence how coaching is conceptualised, sourced and implemented in organisations in instructive. The discussion on traditional and contemporary leadership approaches to leadership development further demonstrated the point that leadership thinking can influence the decision making on which model of coaching interventions should be preferred, based on their understanding of what leadership really is.

The role of coaching in leadership development was discussed in the context of how coaching has and is still defined and described, thus influencing the uses thereof. Hence, the sourcing and delivery and implementation of coaching continue to reflect the leadership thinking that operates within a particular organisational culture. For example, dyadic coaching seems to be aligned to leaders' development and the systemic coaching seems to be aligned to leadership development. The purpose and uses of coaching in organisations also reflected this dichotomy. Factors to consider when implementing systemic coaching have been identified as important to ensure an effective implementation of a coaching programme. Those identified, but not exhaustively, range from giving attention to organisational and client readiness to issues relating to reporting and measuring return on investment. All these factors

are also a reflection of how serious leadership should consider them as they serve as a platform upon which the success of a coaching intervention is premised.

However, as argued above, when systemic coaching is strategically coupled with dyadic coaching this can maximise the broader leadership empowerment towards realising leadership bench strength. It is evident from the literature that dyadic coaching is still preferred as a result of less understanding of the difference between leader and leadership development. There is paucity in the literature in relation to the empirical implementation and evaluation of the systemic coaching and hence this current study. An attempt to demonstrate empirically that systemic coaching can empower leadership capabilities across levels of the organisational hierarchy was presented and that included the benefits and outcomes of coaching. The potential benefits and outcomes of coaching are indicative of the impact coaching can have when implemented strategically and in a systemic way. As discussed above, these range from coaching as enhancer of leadership capabilities to coaching viewed as pivotal in facilitating organisational innovation.

Finally, embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations appeared to be critical in securing the gains of coaching interventions and in ensuring that a positive coaching culture is cultivated and sustained over time. Hence, the mentioning of integrating coaching to other organisational programmes as coaching is no panacea for all organisational challenges. The coach training was mentioned in the literature as key in embedding the positive coaching leadership behaviours and culture.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study sought to investigate how coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations can be realised in a specific organisation. The following section contains a description of both dyadic and systemic coaching interventions as conducted at NAC, the research paradigm, research design, population and sample, the research instrument, procedure for data collection, data analysis and interpretation, limitations of the study, validity and reliability, ethical considerations.

3.1 Systemic coaching as conducted in NAC

This approach was facilitated by two coaches trained in systems thinking and systemic coaching approaches and understanding the deeper team dynamics with the purpose of aligning organisational capabilities towards organisational effectiveness. The process entailed the following focus: the main purpose was to expand the capabilities of leadership across the hierarchical structure of the organisation, not only developing the leaders at the top. Another purpose was to complement the dyadic coaching approach, which was found to be limited in enhancing collborative leadership. It was designed to be delivered across silos and divisional structures. It was delivered in workshops and smaller groups that were attended by different leaders across the hierarchy.

In other words, there was no use of titles in those coaching conversations in which all were participants. The organisational strategy, values, culture, and performance were among the primary documents that informed the coaching conversations. NAC clients pervaded every coaching conversation in terms of how to serve the clientele better. A major focus on what works in the organisation preceded conversations on what is not working. A reason advanced was that investing more energy on what works will eventually assist in changing the culture and mindset of employees in the organisation. This approach is supported by Kets de Vries (2005, 2010) who advocates the collaborative and systemic approach to leadership development.

3.2 Dyadic coaching as conducted at NAC

Dyadic coaching was secured for each of the five executives, meaning each executive met and arranged sessions directly with the coach. One session of two hours long per month were scheduled over a period of 12 months. Reports of progress were confined to the dyadic relationship and no emerging themes were shared across executives. Teams led by the executives were not part of the programme as the sessions were design to restore some 'derailed' and non-performing executives. This meant that coaching sessions were remedial and individual leader specific and had no collaborative development of leadership intention.

3.3 Research Paradigm

The paradigm underpinning this study is interpretivist in nature. The foundation of an interpretivist paradigm is to seek understanding of how human and social interaction makes and creates meaning. In other words, the interprevitist paradigm focuses on factors that are perceived as meaningful and important (Symes, 2010). Human beings are assumed to create meaning through their interactions (Harding, 2009).

According to Neuman (1997), an interpretive qualitative research seeks to inquire and reveal an understanding of the social and environmental context in which individuals exists. This method afforded the researcher an opportunity to understand the phenomenon under investigation rather than making assumptions about it (Babbie & Mouton, 2002).

Various previous coaching research studies have employed the interprevitist paradigm, these studies include, but are not exclusive to, studies by Symes (2010); Harding (2009); Groenewald and Schurink, (2007). According to Zikmund et al. (2010), qualitative research affords the researcher the capacity to interpret the phenomenon under study and position it within its proper context. The choice of the interprevitist paradigm is relevant to the study as the study seeks to identify meaning underlying respondents' responses through interviews.

3.4. Research Design

The study research design was aimed at an investigation of the uses, implementation and effects of both dyadic and systemic coaching interventions for the systemic development of leadership at NAC. Systemic coaching was contrasted to dyadic coaching, which the organisation experienced at different times. As the design was interpretive and the study methodology qualitative (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), the study focused on seeking responses of the respondents' experiences of both dyadic and systemic coaching. These respondents' perspectives and insights in response to the research questions were critical to the study to extract meaning (Leedy & Ormond, 2010).

The research design was a case study. As discussed in Chapter 2, coaching is a complex, multi-faceted phenomenon that requires a thorough understanding of the organisational context. This makes the case study design particularly suitable for exploring the complexities of systemic coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. According to Yin (2003), the emergence of case studies is a result of a need to understand complex phenomena and to capture real-life experiences.

According to Stake (2003) and Le Roux (2003), case studies are meant for optimisation of learning and the search for deeper insights into a specific case, and not for generalisability. As in this study, the purpose is to specifically establish how coaching for the systemic development of leadership in an organisation is realised. Thus, the study took place in a single organisational context. The organisational context, according to Leedy and Ormrod (2010) and Yin (1993), is important as a phenomenon under investigation and cannot be isolated from its occurring context.

Finally, respondent triangulation was effected through interviewing those officials who experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching experiences respectively.

In summary, this design enabled the meanings of the respondents to be recorded in a way that captures and represents their essence.

3.5. Population and sample

3.5.1 Case selection

The focus of the researcher was on the depth of the experience and insights into coaching received by the respondents rather than just the size of the sampled population.

The population for this study comprised executives, senior managers, managers, specialists and general workers in a public sector organisation. All South African race groups were represented in the population. The location of the research site and respondents was in the city of Pretoria, Gauteng Province. The research site was the National Aid Corporation (NAC). It can be described as a national head office of the aid corporation and has a national footprint in all provinces. Each provincial office is run and led by a provincial manager. The employee complement at the head office is approximately 180, including the CEO and the executives. This is where policy and decision making are centralised. Each floor houses a division of NAC, with the executives and their divisional staff. This population was delineated on the basis of NAC having recently undergone systemic and dyadic coaching interventions. The industry type was a state owned enterprise focusing on developing aid programmes to community based businesses.

3.5.2 Sample and sampling method

A purposive sampling was used in the study that included executives, managers, specialists and general workers who have experienced either dyadic or systemic coaching. In purposive sampling, the researcher uses his or her own judgment to choose participants (Bachman & Schutt, 2003; Neuman, 1997). The criterion of selection was a predefined group who had recently undergone either or both coaching interventions and could also represent diverse aspects of that group (Leedy & Ormond, 2010). They could therefore provide the most information about the problem being explored or were knowledgeable about the subject matter under study (Bachman & Schutt, 2003; Schutt, 2006).

Upon selection and with the help of NAC programme manager, 18 respondents were invited to participate in the study. The researcher ensured hierarchical representivity, given the interest in both systemic and dyadic nature of the coaching experienced. This was also to

ensure that representation of respondents who participated in both dyadic and systemic coaching across the organisational structure was followed.

3.5.3 Table of Respondents

For the sake of anonymity, names and titles of the respondents are intentionally omitted to protect the confidentiality of their direct quotes. Table 1 lists the 18 interviewees and the roles they played during the interview process. In terms of race distribution, 17 were black and one white female. The gender distribution was 60% female and 40% male.

Table 1: Profile of respondents

Description of respondent type	Number to be sampled
Executives	5
Managers	4
Specialists, Shop stewards, General workers (including PAs)	9

Table 2: Levels of respondents

Respondent type	Number sampled	Coaching Intervention
Executives that had been coached	5	Dyadic and Systemic
Senior Managers	2	Systemic
Managers	2	Systemic
Specialists	2	Systemic
Shop stewards	2	Systemic
General workers (including PAs)	5	Systemic
Total	**18**	

According to Cohen et al. (2011), a sampling method is critical as the research output can be directly linked to a chosen sampling strategy. With the help of the programme manager in NAC, the researcher was able to select a sample of respondents who had undergone coaching, both dyadic and systemic, or either of the two. The knowledge, availability and the experiences of the respondents was paramount in the sampling process in order to assist in answering the research questions (Leech, 2007; Yin, 2010; Sanders & Lewis, 2012).

Ideally, the sample should provide information not only about how things are on average but also about how much variability exists in the phenomenon under investigation. A purposive sample may not represent a large population but it is sufficient to address the issue under investigation (Schutt, 2006).

3.5.4 Demographic profile of respondents

The study was conducted in the Gauteng province of South Africa. All respondents interviewed were based at the head office of NAC in Pretoria. All respondents represented a hierarchical level. To have a broad view, the respondent sample was constituted of 18 participants from difference South African race groups, 12 females and 6 males. All respondents were full-time employees of NAC with varying years of experience and of service in NAC. Five of the respondents were executives and served in the executive committee of NAC. The remainder were two senior managers, two managers, two specialists, two shop stewards, and five general workers. All the respondents went through either dyadic or systemic coaching or both.

Race representation of the study was: 1 White female, 1 Indian male, 11 African females, and 5 African males. The oldest respondent was 55 and the youngest 28. They have diverse qualifications, including 2 MBAs, 3 M.Coms, 2 Honours degrees, 5 BA degrees, 1 B.Com degree, 2 diplomas, and 2 matriculants.

3.6. Research Instrument

An interview schedule was used (see appendix A). The main purpose of the interview questions was to guide the interview discussion. The instrument was developed based on the literature review and gaps in the area of investigating the use, implementation, effects and outcomes of systemic coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. The interview questions were based on their relevance to the problem statement and the study's purpose (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1990). Follow-up questions were then used to ensure that the respondents' personalised views and experiences were explored (Rubin & Rubin, 2011).

The interview schedule or protocol questions are grouped below and linked to research questions as informed by the literature review in the following way:

Table 3: Aligned interview schedule and research questions

Interview schedule question	Research question	How the 2 questions relate
Interview schedule question 1	relates to research sub-question 1	which seeks to understand the coaching intervention as described by respondents based on their own understanding and experience
Interview schedule question 2	relates to research question 1	which seeks to understand the actual purpose of the coaching intervention and what it intended to achieve
Interview questions 3 & 4-	these questions are directly related to the research question 2	which seek to understand how coaching was delivered and who were the beneficiaries and why
Interview schedule questions 5 & 6	both questions relate to research question 3	which seek to understand the reception of coaching at NAC, given the cultural context and leadership context of the organisation and which focus the coaching intervention had
Interview schedule questions 7,8,9,10,1& 12	relate to research question 4	which seek to understand the potential outcomes or benefits of a systemic coaching intervention in

		organisations.
Interview schedule questions 13,14 & 15	relate to research question 5	that asked the how of embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations.

3.7 Procedure for data collection

All interviews were tape recorded (Yin, 2010). They all took place at the respondents' business premises in Pretoria. This enabled the respondents to be at ease, in the comfort of their own surroundings, ensuring the integrity of interviews in the context of their working environments. None of the interviews were done telephonically but rather face-to-face. The researcher considered this an important part of developing trust and rapport with the respondents and enabled the researcher to ask follow-up questions of clarity. All interview sessions were held in private, quiet environments, which enabled respondents to give thought to the questions and responses. Each respondent was asked standard questions within an hour time allocation (White, 2002). The researcher endeavoured to remain impartial though the interview process, by listening and asking open-ended questions, and did not lead respondents with questions indicating one answer as more preferable to another (Shank, 2006).

To assist with validity and reliability, verbatim transcripts were made from the recordings, and recordings subsequently used to verify interview data. However, in the final report, some minor editing was done to facilitate the legibility of some of the material. The data from the interviews was anonymised and was subsequently stored safely (Remenyi, 2011). Given the experience of respondents, the researcher anticipated that the data from the study participants would cover the range of data needed to sufficiently address the research questions of the study. Indeed, data did cover the research questions.

The name of the organisation has also been changed to a pseudonym, the National Aid Corporation (NAC). As a result, direct quotations were given codes such as R1/R2 to ensure compliance to anonymity and confidentiality.

Finally, the letter addressed to respondents motivating for their participation in the study is annexed as Appendix B. The letter to the potential respondents was preceded by brief meetings through the assistance of the NAC programme manager. These meetings were aimed at soliciting in person the participation of the prospective respondents.

3.8. Data Analysis and interpretation

Transcripts of the interviews were stored electronically, with back–ups and hard copies filed separately. The respondents' responses upon being collected, were analysed using an analysis method called content analysis (Cole, 1998; Hsieh & Shannon (2005). As a research technique, content analysis is suitable for studies whose purpose is to describe a phenomenon. This method is able, as a research technique, to make valid inferences from data that can be replicable (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Weber, 1990; Cole, 1998). Generally, given that coaching research is context specific, one of content analysis' advantages is that it is by design a method that is context-sensitive and thus able to facilitate pertinent information to emerge from data outside preconceived categories (Creswell, 2012). The researcher avoided using preconceived categories (Kondracki & Wellman, 2002, in Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and instead immersed himself in the data to allow new insights to develop and the categories and names for categories to emerge.

A general analytic procedure was carried out on the content of the interviews to establish the salient factors (Hussey, 1997), using Atlas software to code topics, build them into categories and summarise those into themes. Saldana (2009), quoting several other authors, suggests that 70-90 codes, 10-15 categories and five to seven themes are appropriate. This research resulted in 100 codes, 15 categories, and eight themes. A discussion guide as a structure to develop a set of codes, as shown in appendix C, was used. These codes were then applied to the transcripts, so that patterns emanating out of the data could be identified. As the analysis proceeded, these codes were then sorted into families, then categories and finally themes. Although the findings are summarised, the importance or weighting of the findings'

comments is based more on the number of respondents who mentioned it, rather than the absolute number of quotations. Some respondents would have several quotes on the same topic coded within their transcript.

As a general approach, qualitative analysis emphasises the significance or importance of the statements, rather than implying importance from the number of occurrences (Saldana, 2009). Summary analysis of respondents was carried out to better understand relevant aspects of their backgrounds, such as their experience and qualifications as shown in Table 1: Profile of respondents on page 5 above.

Finally, a research report detailing the findings (Yin, 2009) was written up. Authentic citations were used in the report to allow the respondents to use their own voices (Creswell, 2012) to verify information and increase the trustworthiness of the research (Patton, 1990).

3.9. Limitations of the Study

- The interview process is also inherently subjective, where the data collected was dependent on the interviewer's own interpretation and assumptions.

- The focus of the study was limited to a single discussion of coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations.

- The sample used was based on the organisation which made use of systemic coaches from one coaching organisation which used one form of coaching approach.

- The fact that the trustworthiness of the findings may only become evident from feedback some time after its presentation.

- The limited amount of time for the research.

3.10. Validity and Reliability

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), the researcher, as the key research instrument, comes with some subjectivity and bias that can adversely impact the data validity and reliability of the study. However, such adversity can be mitigated by many other ways including triangulation. In the context of this study, triangulation relates to those who received dyadic coaching and those who received systemic coaching respectively, in order to draw valid contrasts.

Validation in qualitative research refers to an attempt to evaluate the accuracy of findings as per the respondent responses and researcher's interpretation and analysis. This is the strength of qualitative research as much time is spent in the field, on detailed descriptions and in close proximity to participants (Creswell, 2007).

According to White (2002), validity is about whether the selected research design is appropriately addressing the research topic or questions. According to Sinkovics et al. (2008), concepts such as reliability, validity, generalisability and objectivity are methods deemed appropriate for quantitative research. Fundamentally, qualitative research is premised on a search for deeper insights and adopts a phenomenon in its contextual setting (Golafshani, 2003). According to Golafshani (2003), qualitative research does not treat reliability and validity separately. In other words, validity is sufficient to demonstrate the presence of reliability. Validity is not conceptualised as distinct, but is embedded in the research process (Golafshani, 2003).

Two forms of validity are recorded in the literature, namely, internal and external validity and both are discussed below.

3.10.1 External Validity

As the research is interpretive and qualitative, and the researcher interprets information to gain understanding and meaning, the researcher cannot be entirely objective. Various factors can undermine validity, poor sampling, faulty research procedures and research errors (Cohen

et al., 2011). This study safeguarded research process appropriateness by ensuring that potential bias in the data source has been triangulated by way of the selection of the research population sample (respondent triangulation). This enabled the *"corroborating evidence"* (Creswell, 2007) from the different respondents to inform the particular theme. In other words, the respondents purposefully had knowledge of the research topic and adequately represented the research topic. In this case, it entailed selecting 18 respondents who held executive, managerial, specialists, shop stewards and generalist positions in the organisation and were representative of all hierarchical levels.

3.10.2 Internal validity

Internal validity is the extent to which conclusions are unambiguously drawn from data collected and plausible alternative outcomes are ruled out (Christensen & Carlile, 2009).
Internal validity assumed various ways as recorded below:

- Verbatim interview transcripts using Atlas software were treated rigorously in their coding to reduce this possibility.
- The study dealt with internal validity by triangulation of the interviews with respondents from multiple data sets. Triangulation occurred by comparing dyadic coaching data with systemic coaching data (Cohen et al., 2011).
- The same questions in the interview guide were repeated throughout the interview process. This was followed by a comparison exercise showing the responses and how such responses compared with the research question.
- Multiple sources contributed to internal validity.

3.10.3 Reliability

Reliability, in qualitative research, focuses on the constancy of responses to varied codes of sets of data. Reliability refers to the replicability of research findings in another context. According to Carlile and Christensen (2004), if another researcher can arrive at the same conclusion, the research is deemed reliable In the context of this study, reliability is reflected by how consistent the findings were when compared to collected data (Merriam, 1988). Such data was collected from 18 respondents, which was useful to finding depth. Researcher's time was also devoted to the coding. This was done by way of agreed code words to passages and

through the use of a codebook (Creswell, 2007). To ensure reliability, the researcher kept the records of research processes and data (Richard, 2008).

3.11 Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that no harm to the participants occurred, according to Cooper and Schindler (2003). As an administrative research requirement, all participants were invited, and presented with an informed-consent form. This was completed by the researcher after the participants had read what the research covered and was signed by the respondents. All of the participants were informed about the nature of the research and the methods that were to be used during the study. As a result, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study, including how the findings of the research would be used and distributed within professional contexts and academic communities. The participants were given the option of participating or not, as this was voluntary for them (see Appendix E).

The researcher maintained a transparent process, encouraging the respondents to feel free to communicate any concerns should any arise during the course of their participation in the research study. The respondents all signed, agreeing to participate. The researcher took heed of Mason's (2002) warning for the researcher to be aware of the fact that the nature of qualitative research entails close interaction with the participants' lives and that unforeseen ethical dilemmas could occur while research is being conducted. As a result, given the sensitive conversation held upon receiving the final permission to conduct the study, the identity of the participants and their organisations had to remain confidential. Hence the NAC as a pseudonym was used instead of the proper organisational name. This information therefore would not be exposed without their written consent.

3.12 Summary

The chapter described initially both the coaching interventions as conducted at NAC, followed by the methodology and research design that was adopted in the study to explore and understand coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations. Key among these points discussed, were the study population and sample and how data was collected and what limitations were experienced. Two data sets were analysed in the study,

which included dyadic and systemic coaching data. Of equal importance is how the researcher dealt with the issues of confidentiality, anonymity and ethics. The study is a case study which employed a qualitative research approach that was suitable, given the complexities of understanding coaching in organisations.

CHAPTER 4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings from this study are presented within the context of the research problem and research questions. The responses derived from the interview transcripts were analysed by applying codes. These were initially generated from a set of codes that were derived from the research questions and interview discussion guide, and complemented by a few further codes generated in the analysis during the coding process. During the analysis, these were subsequently summarised into 22 categories that accumulated into five major themes .

This section highlights the differences between respondents (executives) who have received dyadic coaching and those who received systemic coaching (other employees). It also presents findings on what factors to consider when implementing coaching, benefits and outcomes of coaching and how to embed and sustain coaching in an organisation.

4.1 CULTURAL CONTEXT

The organisational culture, though not one of the research questions, was fundamentally important to the study. It was important for the following reasons: a) to appraise the reader of the culture of the organisation in which coaching was conducted; b) this also assists the reader in appreciating how such culture influenced leadership development approaches and leadership behaviour, c) conversations that were characterising the organisation at the time of the coaching intervention; c) finally, this section is critical for the reader to understand in depth the context of responses to the research questions. Below a table reflecting the respondent responses is inserted to appraise the reader of the ensuing discussion.

Table 4: Respondents responses and descriptions relating to NAC cultural context

Theme: Cultural Context	Description by respondents
• 'Person' culture	Person culture referred to excessive power vested in hands of one individual
• Non-consultative culture	Domineering culture that did not value consultation.

• Culture of empowerment of a selected few and nepotism	No budgetary constraints existed for top leader development and those they favour
• Silo Mindset	Divisions competed for resources often at the expense of organisational strategic and operational objectives
• Culture of individualism	Individual appraisals and subsequent rewards; Individual development preferred

4.1.1 'Person' culture

In this context, person culture referred to excessive power in the hands of the organisation's chief executive officer (the CEO) and executive team. Respondents mentioned that most critical decisions, especially when relating to financial resource allocation and filling in of strategic positions, were the prerogative of the executives. Respondents referred to person culture as a culture in contrast to a collective and empowering culture. What the top leader says goes. Officials who were coming from progressive and empowering organisations reportedly did not stay long at NAC once they experienced such culture.

Respondents mentioned that the CEO held too much decision-making power. In the view of respondents this translated to a 'person' culture that was characterised by abuse of power. The CEO was perceived by the respondents as someone bigger that the organisation rather than as serving the interest of the organisation. The CEO just did what she wanted regardless of how her decisions would affect the organisation. Appointments of her choice were never contested, regardless of evidence to the contrary.

> *No one dare challenge her or else one's job was at risk. You rather shut up and do as told. (R8). I felt strongly that the personalised culture fuelled some of the nepotic tendencies we witnessed that were rampant. (R5)*

4.1.2 Non-consultative culture

The majority of respondents mentioned that the culture of the organisation was largely domineering and did not value consultation. Corporate decisions were imposed on employees. The majority of operational targets and programmes were imposed, for example, the new performance management system and salary band structures made most respondents upset as they favoured leadership and were never discussed with employees.

> *Our leaders here saw no point in inviting our inputs. Whatever was done came from the top down and was imposed on us (R2)*

4.1.3 Culture of empowerment of a selected few and nepotism

The respondents mentioned that budgetary constraints were a common occurrence when it came to employee development. Individual development remained the culture at NAC as noted by the respondents.

> *I observed that even the personal development plans were just a joke as the executives paid lip service to them (R9)*

No budgetary constraints existed for top leader development to the extent that respondents reported wasteful expenditure on seemingly irrelevant activities made in the name of leadership development for the top management elite. This was in contrast to reportedly there being no budget for leader development lower down.

> *We even witnessed them taking themselves to expensive trips abroad in the name of leader development and in polishing their industry skills (R6)*

Respondents highlighted that the responsibility for staff development was considered an individual matter rather than an organisational one. The leaders' attitude towards employee development was influenced by their experience of employees leaving the organisation after being developed from the organisation's limited resources. Therefore the leaders' response to

employee development was that of requiring employees to save for their own development and thereby reducing the risk of investing into employees who are a flight risk.

> *I often wonder why employees expected NAC to invest scarce resources on their development and later we hear they are gone. Let employees save for their own development (R2)*

Nepotic practices were revealed by some respondents and specific examples were cited. For example, a few favoured employees were sent abroad for developmental purposes and later promoted above those they started with and who happened to be more highly experienced than them.

> *This happened in broad daylight where some of my peers with whom we started together at NAC got all of a sudden a scholarship from NAC for a year in Harvard and got a senior position upon return (R3)*

4.1.4 Silo Mindset

It was revealed by the respondents that NAC's culture over the years had an entrenched silo mindset to such an extent that divisions competed for resources often at the expense of organisational strategic and operational objectives.

> *In NAC we worked in silos, not much was done to bring the divisions together to work for a common goal (R15)*

4.1.5 Culture of individualism

Respondents highlighted that individual appraisals and subsequent rewards were not done at team level but on the individual level. Individual development was preferred, development of leaders in isolation of their teams, as indicated by the respondents, was found inadequate and unhelpful in crafting a future-fit NAC leadership.

Never was I ever been invited in team development session with our leader (R1)

4.1.6 Summary

In an attempt to understand the cultural context of NAC, respondents highlighted different aspect of their culture. The interview conversations revolved largely around the power that the executives wield and how such power translated itself and influenced the culture of leadership development. The respondents were unanimous that their culture before any systemic coaching intervention was non-consultative, fraught with a silo mindset and the deliberate empowerment of a few to the exclusion of others.

Furthermore, the respondents discussed the implications of such culture which included, among others, the high employee turnover of talented and experienced officials which has led to low levels of employee productivity, resistance to progressive interventions, such as coaching, as employees were always suspicious that any intervention sourced from outside was in favour of the narrow interests of leaders. The culture of NAC, as described above, provided a context of the type of leadership that existed before systemic coaching and the type of leadership that influenced the usage of dyadic coaching. The culture had an adverse impact on how leadership development programmes, such as coaching, were sourced, introduced and co-ordinated. The culture of individualism seems to have permeated every decision on leadership development in the organisation.

4.2 LEADERSHIP CONTEXT

During the interviews, the respondents revealed that the style of leadership was equally important to understanding of the context into which leadership coaching was introduced. The leadership context refers to how leadership was displayed in the organisation and how systemic coaching was able to assist the organisation to build leadership capabilities rather than only focusing on developing a few selected leaders. Below a table reflecting the respondent responses is inserted to appraise the reader of the ensuing discussion.

Table 5: Respondents responses and descriptions relating to NAC Leadership Context

Theme: Leadership Context	Description by respondents
• Leading with fear	Challenging leaders was equal to a career limiting unwise move
• Leadership not being visible and effective	Distant and remote leadership
• Remedial development	An employee is targeted for training or development programme mostly when that employee had derailed or not performing
• Political appointees and deployees	NAC leadership woes was the deployment of political appointees who in most instances lack requisite skills and experience
• Leadership development at NAC	Development of leadership has been found in NAC to mean leader development hence the preferred sourcing of dyadic coaching

4.2.1 Leading with Fear

The majority of respondents revealed that a leadership practice of leading with fear was rampant in their organisation. Senior leaders resorted to leading with fear rather than with inspiration and integrity. This promoted an environment in which employees found it difficult to challenge leadership about critical organisational matters. Most approvals by leaders had to be recorded in writing as they often turned against their own decisions and their direct reports, in most instances, had to take the blame for failed projects. Their leaders were subsequently exonerated. Respondents further mentioned that challenging leaders was equal to a career limiting unwise move. "Do as you told was the norm".

In all your communication you had to make sure you had a back up, that can be of use one day when things turn against you (R2)

Here you had to be careful not to refuse what your boss said, and never try to challenge

leadership (R1)

4.2.2 Leadership not being visible and effective

The majority of respondents highlighted the absence of, or lack of, leadership visibility and the effective leading of the organisation. Distant and remote leadership made employees feel less valued and viewed themselves as tools and means to an end rather than capable employees. Respondents believed that leadership visibility and presence is critical to: raising employee morale; inspiring the employees; and mobilising the employee community to realise the organisational vision. Respondents recounted leadership promises of being visible and supportive and yet the failure to honour such promises. An example cited was the CEO and the executive committee promised on numerous occasions in their road shows to be visible in organisational corridors and in provincial offices, thereafter, as a gesture of care which they never honoured. Respondents highlighted that it was an open secret that the CEO often and plainly expressed no interest in visibility as that was not part of her employment mandate. She was deployed to fix the mess not to get familiar with those who caused the mess.

> *My main task is to stabilise the organisation and get it back on track. Other matters are peripheral for now (R1) R7)*

Respondents mentioned that the above is typical of leaders' attitude in state owned organisations and how leadership views the general development of employees.

4.2.3 Remedial development

The majority of respondents revealed that there was a high turnover of human resource executives that adversely affected the human capital strategy development process. This resulted in employee development initiatives being driven reactively rather than proactively. Respondents mentioned that an employee is targeted for training or development programme mostly when that employee had derailed or not performing. Long-term developmental plans were rare and employee development followed only when there was a performance problem and thus lacked foresight. Respondents mentioned that much was said about employee

development but no strategic action was taken to ensure that employee development was strategic and sustainable over time.

> *Employee development was taken serious only when one had failed to perform. We had many personal development plans which went nowhere (R10)*

The majority of respondents indicated that, even the dyadic coaching as it unfolded, was used or sourced to target executives who were failing to achieve clean audits, thus compromising the reputation of the organisation. Respondents highlighted that in the top leader's eyes, coaching was to fix the weak and was not really for developmental purposes or for broader leadership development.

> *What I know is that, coaching for the executives was rather remedial intended for derailing executives who were not coping in their positions and who were faltering in discharging their responsibilities which often led to adverse audit findings (R1)*

4.2.4 Political Appointees and deployees

The majority of respondents revealed that what compounded NAC leadership woes was the deployment of political appointees. Requisite skills and experience was in most instances a serious concern as a result, deployment had negative consequences for NAC's leadership development. Respondents mentioned that what was critical for these political deployees was to serve their political masters more than advancing the mandate of the organisation. Their interpretation of leadership development also meant investing in people who might be a formidable opposition for one's job and also creating unnecessary expectations for promotion in the organisation. The respondents further revealed that for one's job to be secured, one needed to strategically always be in alignment with one's political connections in higher places of influence so as to remain relevant for further deployment elsewhere.

> *My association with the Minister and Director General ensured the safety of my job, however his removal also posed a danger to my job. This job for me was not permanent in that sense as it was a 5 year contract, therefore prioritising*

development of direct reports was not attractive to me at all unfortunately and not what my principals were interested in (R8)

4.2.5 The CEO and executives five year term of office

The respondents revealed that the five year term of office for top leadership in state agencies or enterprises, such as NAC, has an adverse impact on the leadership development focus of those in power. These leaders tend to focus more on building their own careers for future deployment rather than to giving much attention to capacitating organisations. Respondents mentioned that the traditional leadership development approach is compounded in government agencies by the five-year contract arrangement, which compels executive management to push goals, policies and state agendas often at the neglect of sustainable organisational employee development.

Often the revolving door syndrome, five year contracts and cadre deployment in which one leader is here today and somewhere else tomorrow, tends to affect the attention of leaders in seeing through employee development initiatives and in building leadership capabilities. Not being measured on them, thus the empowerment of staff is grossly undermined (R12)

4.2.6 Leadership Development at NAC

The majority of respondents considered that the development of leaders is important. However development of leadership has been found in NAC to mean leader development. This approach favoured a select few and constituted an individual approach to development. The respondents further revealed that no team development was promoted. Most respondents mentioned that dyadic coaching sessions isolated their leaders from their work teams, thus perpetuating leader development to the exclusion of other levels of leadership in the organisation. The respondents further revealed that this individualised one-to-one coaching approach had made leaders miss the opportunity to develop together with their direct reports and to learn collectively, especially in the light of limited human capital budgets.

Leadership development in NAC was an executive committee privilege. It was only us as executives who had an opportunity to have our own coaches from different companies (R12)

Most respondents strongly believed that the reason for such a coaching option was due to the prevailing culture of the organisation which largely upholds and promotes individual achievements over team efforts. An important observation mentioned by the respondents was that the human capital development budget was at the individual executive's discretion. This meant that the leader had absolute power to disburse or not to disburse as he/she pleased. Most respondents mentioned that dyadic coaching not necessarily planned for them and therefore it almost felt like it did not necessarily really have an objective for the supporting teams. Dyadic coaching was more focused on the executive's individual career development.

Development was only concentrated fully and exclusively for the executives. All these executive coaching sessions were so exclusive as though something wrong was about to be avoided (R4)

4.2.7 Summary

In an attempt to understand the NAC cultural and leadership context and style, respondents shared, among other things, the unsupportive person culture, a culture of the empowerment of a few and the exclusion of the majority of the employees. On leadership context, the following were discussed, among others, the practice of leading with fear, leadership not being visible and effective, remedial development, the five year contract dynamics, political appointees and their impact on employee morale and leadership development. The responses from the respondents highlighted the weaknesses of a leadership development approach as it was confused with leader development that is hierarchically focused and not inclusive. Finally, the discussion focused on the invisibility of leadership and how they dealt with employee development which was unlikely to take the organisation forward. As shared by the respondents above, the conceptualisation of leadership development had dire implications in relation to the retention of potential leaders and how leadership was distributed within the organisation at different levels. The respondents clearly highlighted the non-sustainability of

leader development and showed concern over the remedial approach to leadership development.

Having highlighted the background upon which coaching was introduced in NAC, the following section specifically answers the research questions as outlined in chapter 1 of this study.

4.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: HOW IS DYADIC AND SYSTEMIC COACHING SOURCED, INTRODUCED AND CO-ORDINATED IN ORGANISATIONS

The majority of respondents were asked to provide how dyadic and systemic coaching was sourced, introduced and co-ordinated in NAC. Coachees responses that were confirmed in the literature review and confirmed in the research mentioned on the left column of the table and those not directly related to existing literature are presented on the right column.

Table 6: Respondents responses on dyadic and systemic coaching

Research Question 1: Sourcing, Introduction and coordination of coaching	**Research Question 1: Sourcing, Introduction and coordination of coaching:**
Dyadic coaching: • Sourced for individual executives • Private introduction • Infrequent and ad-hoc coordination of coaching	**Dyadic coaching:** • Sourced by PA's
Systemic coaching: • Enterprise wide intervention across hierarchical levels • Organisation wide introduction • Coordination for lessons learnt and collective leadership development	**Systemic coaching** • Dedicated internal coach champion • Proper launching of coaching in an organisational public forum • Knowledge sharing and transfer

4.3.1 The sourcing, introduction and co-ordination of coaching of dyadic coaching in NAC

The respondents were asked to provide their views on how dyadic coaching was sourced, introduced and co-ordinated in the organisation in relation to research question 1. This section presents responses from respondents in relation to dyadic coaching that the five executives experienced. One of the major points emanating from the interviews was that respondents observed that the sourcing of dyadic coaching excluded the involvement of human resource practitioners and was rather given to executive personal assistants to source coaches for the respective executives. Respondents mentioned that giving such a strategic task to a personal assistant who had no training in sourcing such interventions was unwise. Respondents indicated that a coaching panel was not considered and constituted and the organisational development unit was not consulted. Respondents mentioned that coaches were sourced for each executive on an ad hoc basis with no strategic foresight.

> *We chose our own coaches with the assistance of our PA's and friends and referrals. I was going to be the coachee surely I had to choose a coach for me not via HR who knew less of me anyway (R1)*

> *I was to be the first person to be asked to source such an intervention but my services were not requested as the OD manager (R14)*

Respondents revealed that the introduction of dyadic coaching was to the selected few only. This was a concern for the respondents because executives are not working in isolation but within teams. Therefore developing them individually and in isolation could only augment the leader's abilities and capabilities alone.

> *No results were shared by executives and coaches, no teams were informed nor invited to participate in executive coaching sessions (R12)*

Coaching co-ordination was handled poorly as respondents remarked. It was revealed by some respondents that knowledge of coaching was limited in the organisation and this led to

haphazard and unfocused coaching. In other words, coaching lacked proper co-ordination as there was no dedicated internal coach champion selected to assist in overseeing the coaching contribution to the leaders' development. All sessions were done privately and in isolation from each other. No themes emerging across sessions could be connected and be shared to the benefit of the teams and the organisation at large.

> *Since the instruction by the CEO that we all need coaching, I took the initiative personally to get a coach as I needed help of how I should go forward in life. I never bothered to check how other executives are doing and who they are sourcing (R11)*

4.3.2 Dyadic coaching implications for NAC leadership development

Respondents were asked their views on what the implications of dyadic coaching were for NAC leaders. Dyadic coaching had been preferred by NAC leadership and was largely influenced by the organisational culture and leadership contexts, as discussed earlier. The majority of respondents indicated that the one on one-coaching model promoted individualism as the meetings were only between the executive and the coach behind closed doors to the exclusion of the team. Respondents mentioned that a remedial approach to leaders' development characterised those sessions rather than assisting leaders to be more effective and inclusive.

> *Only executives were assisted during the coaching process. It was coach and executive behind closed doors. None of us as direct reportees were ever invited, am not sure to do what but I think to hear how he was doing or going through and if anything we can do to support our boss (R1)*

The majority of respondents highlighted that such an individually focused approach had unintended consequences as it promoted leader self-importance rather than assisting leaders to build their leadership capabilities and to become effective for the development of the organisation. Respondents further mentioned that the way some executives behaved during the coaching programme was as if coaching was a badge of honour. To the executives it really appeared that coaching was an award of some sought for leader elevation.

My observation rightly or wrongly, I personally didn't recognise a change in my boss after one-to-one coaching or hear him mentioning what he learnt from his coach. Instead observed some pride when my boss referred the opportunity he was given of having a coach (R14)

Respondents revealed that general feedback and executive support by direct reports or project teams were never factored in the coaching sessions. The respondents take on this, is that "a coach is a stranger and does not work daily with our boss as we are, why then isolate us instead of involving us".

The coach focus on the one executive only deprived our boss to invite our feedback that would assist the coach to have a better bigger picture of how our boss operates and how to assist him (R15)

The individual leader development was understood by respondents as a self-defeating exercise as leaders could not grow in a vacuum or develop alone to the exclusion of their subordinates.

Coaching in isolation I believe sends a misleading message to potential leaders that investing in and developing an individual leader is wise yet forgetting such thinking led also to dis-investment in others (R10)

The majority of respondents argued that this singular development practice indirectly sent a message that leader development is worthwhile and forgetting that leaders create culture and such culture will be unhelpful going forward.

The way development was skewed in favour of top leaders gave the signal that for one to be developed at NAC one had to be in an executive leadership position first. In my view this ended up becoming a way we do things around here, than how the world does things (R14)

Executives who received one-to-one coaching agreed that such an offering could have been conducted differently and benefitted a larger pool of people rather than just a privileged few.

Respondents who received dyadic coaching mentioned that they found themselves talking about "them and us than we". Oddly, some respondents observed that there are officials whom they found at NAC who taught them a lot. As a result they felt that those officials would have been instrumental in their development coaching programme, however the programme was one-to-one not team coaching.

> *Though it afforded me a private space to think, it also excluded me from my team and fostered my seniority in the organisation (R13)*

An executive further expressed her reservations in relation to how and what dyadic coaching intended to achieve as it often lacked substance and context. By context here, respondents meant that both the internal and external environments in which the executive operated needed to be recognised and him/her be empowered to work effectively in both. Respondents highlighted that their ultimate aims were for the link to be made between their careers, work challenges and how to navigate organisational challenges, wisdom to lead their teams and balancing work life and family life.

> *Though coaching builds one, but without looking at my work and not being concerned for my strategy was kind of fluffy for me (R11)*

Respondents further highlighted that the agenda and conversations in dyadic coaching sessions often drifted towards personal matters rather than team matters where the actual work occurs. This led some executives to often reschedule their sessions. The respondents revealed that NAC primarily deals with clients on the ground and to collectively know how to better serve them to meet better their organisational objectives is critical. Respondents felt that despite their qualifications and experience, coaching could be delivered collaboratively as the focus on the individual only limited the opportunities of learning from others, including peers.

> *I think it was very personal and often superficial and led me to often reschedule my sessions as I felt career wise I don't see myself growing much. I felt the coaching sessions were lacking a kind of a line of sight important for me to organise my thinking. Am not sure whether it was my coach or me only but hearing from peers as*

Respondents who received dyadic coaching mentioned that they found themselves talking about "them and us than we". Oddly, some respondents observed that there are officials whom they found at NAC who taught them a lot. As a result they felt that those officials would have been instrumental in their development coaching programme, however the programme was one-to-one not team coaching.

> *Though it afforded me a private space to think, it also excluded me from my team and fostered my seniority in the organisation (R13)*

An executive further expressed her reservations in relation to how and what dyadic coaching intended to achieve as it often lacked substance and context. By context here, respondents meant that both the internal and external environments in which the executive operated needed to be recognised and him/her be empowered to work effectively in both. Respondents highlighted that their ultimate aims were for the link to be made between their careers, work challenges and how to navigate organisational challenges, wisdom to lead their teams and balancing work life and family life.

> *Though coaching builds one, but without looking at my work and not being concerned for my strategy was kind of fluffy for me (R11)*

Respondents further highlighted that the agenda and conversations in dyadic coaching sessions often drifted towards personal matters rather than team matters where the actual work occurs. This led some executives to often reschedule their sessions. The respondents revealed that NAC primarily deals with clients on the ground and to collectively know how to better serve them to meet better their organisational objectives is critical. Respondents felt that despite their qualifications and experience, coaching could be delivered collaboratively as the focus on the individual only limited the opportunities of learning from others, including peers.

> *I think it was very personal and often superficial and led me to often reschedule my sessions as I felt career wise I don't see myself growing much. I felt the coaching sessions were lacking a kind of a line of sight important for me to organise my thinking. Am not sure whether it was my coach or me only but hearing from peers as*

we talk about such things the frustration was similar (R15)

If you can ask me whether I would have taken a loan for such coaching I would definitely said no (R17)

Respondents mentioned that significant investment spent on dyadic coaching did not tally with returns promised. As a result, the dyadic coaching investment would have been better spent and maximised on team sessions rather than on the benefit of a few at such high cost.

When I calculated and compared the coaching cost over twelve months per executive and having the same coach facilitating the team it can be much more impactful to a wider audience than to one person (R16)

4.3.3 Summary

It is evident from the above responses that the dyadic coaching approach was not inclusive and was conducted behind closed doors to no benefit of the teams. It also appears that dyadic coaching sourcing, introduction and co-ordination was individualised, haphazard and unstructured to the detriment of collective learning and leadership cohesion.The respondents further showed discontent towards the individualised isolated development approach given the increasing developmental needs at other leadership levels in the organisation. Participation according to the respondents meant assisting their executive leaders to be better leaders, therefore their contribution could have helped to influence and enrich the leader dyadic coaching intervention.

An organisation-wide systemic coaching was sourced after the dyadic coaching due to the change of the head in the human resources department at NAC who had an experience of a systemic coaching intervention and had a vision to roll it out to a broader NAC audience. The section, following, assists in understanding the discussions with respondents in relation to the sourcing, introduction and co-ordination of systemic coaching in their organisation.

4.4 The sourcing, introduction and co-ordination of systemic coaching in NAC

Respondents revealed that, the change from dyadic to systemic coaching was due to an appointment of a new human resources executive who had experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching approaches form his former employers. She then identified a gap in leadership development at NAC that led her to opt for collaborative development of leadership rather than individual leader development. Respondents were asked to provide their experiences and views on how systemic coaching was sourced, introduced and co-ordinated.

4.4.1 Sourcing of a coaching intervention and coaches

A coaching sourcing panel was established. It consisted mainly of the executive human resources, the organisational development (OD) manager, the head of learning and development, and the internal coaching champion. This panel was formulated in consultation with the CEO of the organisation. The major purpose of the coaching panel was to ensure that the broader strategic interests of the human capital development programme were recognised and that the objectives of the coaching intervention were outlined upfront to assist in assessing the impacts of coaching against the set objectives.

Subsequent to the formulation of the panel, guidelines were drawn up as to how coaching would be introduced and launched, how communication would be disseminated and from whose office, how and when coaching reviews would take place, how the organisation would be able to leverage on potential learnings emanating from the coaching sessions across the organisation, how to measure coaching impact and how to ensure coaching skills remain within the organisation.

In line with the above guidelines, coaching organisations, not coaches, were invited to respond to the request for proposals on an enterprise wide systemic coaching intervention. The idea from the panel was to use coaches preferably from the same organisation. The reasons advanced were so that there can be a better co-ordination of coaches from the same organisation. Secondly, the panel assumed that coaches from the same organisation would subscribe to the same coaching philosophy and code of ethics instead of having coaches from

different organisations thus confusing co-ordination. After invitations were sent to coaching organisations, a shortlist was compiled and eventually each coaching organisation shortlisted came to make an oral presentation to the panel. Subsequent to that, the preferred coaching organisation with a systemic coaching approach was selected.

The setting up of the coaching panel, coaching guidelines and a coaching champion was the first and best thing that ever happened in NAC interventions (R1)

Sourcing was one step towards bringing coaching to NAC, preparation were made for the selected coaching organisation to put a plan together in conjunction with the coaching panel as to how coaching would be introduced in the organisation as articulated below.

4.4.2 Introduction of Coaching in NAC employee community

Given the insight of the new executive of human resources in conjunction with the coaching organisation, the way in which systemic coaching was introduced was different to how dyadic coaching was initially sourced. Respondents were informed and a proper schedule was crafted and followed. A dedicated internal champion was appointed to co-ordinate the coaching programme and, working together with the coaches, ensured that themes emanating from each coaching session were shared across other groups without compromising confidentiality. A proper launch was organised where the preferred coaching organisation was properly introduced. The initial aim of the systemic coaching intervention was for the systemic development of leadership within the organisation that was plagued by deep rooted silos, build leadership capabilities across organisational levels, assist in building cohesion at each level of leadership in the organisation, to assist in building a positive coaching culture and to ensure that each executive and his/her team were empowered and growing together rather than in dyadic coaching where there was separation. A fortnightly and monthly internal reporting was done, which highlighted scheduling of teams across divisions. Coaches from the coaching organisation were to meet as and when necessary to share emerging themes without compromising anyone's confidentiality.

The launching of coaching internally led by the CEO was on course to encourage participants that something at last was happening to advance other employees as well than

just a few (R5)

4.4.3 Co-ordination of Coaching intervention in the organisation

Co-ordination of coaching in NAC was facilitated by the internal coaching co-ordinator and its functions ranged from: ensuring that scheduling and attendance took place as the right venues and dates, keeping coaches on their toes in terms of preparations, ensuring that coaches shared their experiences emanating from different teams and groups, co-ordinating such reporting and escalating it to relevant authorities without compromising confidentiality of participants. Coaching themes and learnings were a standing agenda item in the executive committee meetings.

Themes were shared across in sessions indicating our progress in thinking of our organisation (R6)

4.5 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: HOW IS DYADIC AND SYSTEMIC COACHING DELIVERED AND CONDUCTED IN ORGANISATIONS

The majority of respondents expressed appreciation of how different these two approaches were delivered, namely, dyadic and systemic coaching and of the potential benefits of the latter.

Table 7: Respondents responses relating to delivery and conducting of coaching

Research Question 2: Delivery and conducting of coaching **Dyadic coaching:** • Elite few • By individual coaches • Private session group sessions • Coaching agenda informed by personal development interests	**Research Question 2: Delivery and conducting of coaching** **Systemic coaching:** • Organisational/ Across hierarchical levels • By External coaches for organisational coaching • Group and team sessions

	• Coaching agenda informed by the organisational strategic goal and values

4.5.1 How systemic coaching is delivered and conducted at NAC

Respondents mentioned that the organisational strategic objectives and divisional plans were given to coaches to study and understand where NAC was going and the context of NAC operations.

The strategic objectives of the organisation informed and guided the coaching conversations. Key to the coaching philosophy was to ensure that systemic challenges in every level of the organisation expressed through coaching conversations were unearthed so that coaching took place on a deeper level and to validate NAC challenges rather than just dealing with symptoms. The focus was the organisational system, teams and individual participants. The respondents mentioned that team sessions in and across divisions were facilitated in a workshop format. Respondents mentioned that one of the purposes of the coaching team sessions was for coaches to understand the organisational systemic issues that were persistent over time and the type of conversations within the organisational system.

> *This type of coaching was different from the first one received by our executives. This one was more inclusive than individualistic. It reminded me of how some community projects use scarce resources for a broader benefit (R7)*

The majority of respondents explained that the systemic coaching engaged and involved everyone regardless of rank and on an equal basis, including the tea ladies, which is something never seen at NAC. Respondents mentioned that the way systemic coaching unfolded and delivered made them hope that there is indeed a future in NAC.

We think this coaching approach also tapped into the cognitive, the emotions, individuals, and team. I mean, if I'm saying individual, I'm talking to even the lowest level. It makes everybody feel important (R2)

The respondents revealed that unlike the dyadic coaching roll out, systemic coaching was designed differently with a broader purpose in a number of ways. First, it was initially planned for the entire organisation to build and enhance leadership capabilities across different levels of the organisational hierarchy, create collaborations and cohesion within and across functional teams and divisions. Second, it was intended to eliminate the silo effect that was a factor in making the organisation ineffective. Third, it was designed to reduce acrimonious relations that existed due to the culture of the organisation. The respondents further mentioned that the aim of conducting coaching across all hierarchical levels was influenced by the thinking that leadership qualities are not only the privilege of the top executives but can be found spread across the organisation.

Though nothing good could be come from HR this time we were impressed that we could grow with our leaders and say anything without being judged and still be one organisation (R5)

Respondents observed that their attitudes were being refined and shaped during this coaching intervention and deeper consideration for the respect of others in junior levels were brought to the fore. Alignment of leaders to general employees was evident across divisions. New ways of doing things emerged as a result.

I think for me, I saw it as an institutional intervention to address certain challenges some of us were not even aware of (R9)

I felt that our egos were being addressed in a sensitive and respectful way and were being challenged to consider the organisation as a whole first and then our teams and divisions (R13)

Respondents further revealed that through systemic coaching, cross team sessions were facilitated to ensure productive working relationships, collaborative learning and sharing of

knowledge were entertained and took centre stage. This meant the deliberate reduction of silos and the promotion of working together as NAC employees.

> *Given our culture of rigid silos, working across and seeking help or information from each other was more on closed circle and friendship basis (R18)*

Respondents mentioned that serving the interest of their bosses first was NAC's most difficult aspect to overcome. According to respondents, the systemic coaching design made them realise how ineffective the silo mindset was that executives upheld. According to respondents, serving the interest of the organisation rather than the interests of the individual leader as it was the culture was key in realising the organisational objectives. The respondents further explained that this preoccupation with serving the narrow interests of one's boss who might later resign was not taking the business of the organisation forward.

> *In my first interview in which my current boss was part of the panel, he asked me where my loyalty will lie if I had to choose between him and the organisation, though I can't disclose my answer as I am ashamed of it. It was clear with hindsight that leader authority and loyalty in NAC was primary and NAC was secondary. This clashed for a while with my experience and values, but now with this coaching approach, am vindicated that NAC first and then my boss (R1)*

Respondents highlighted that the design and the way in which this intervention was planned to be delivered and conducted often influenced how the intervention was cascaded and the potential outcomes of the intervention. Respondents mentioned that the continuous reference to what they are expected to be doing collectively to realise their organisational objectives, was the main focus of this coaching.

> *It started at the top then cascaded to all levels. In my view it went beyond NAC hierarchical levels and guided by what NAC strategy is all about (R7)*

How NAC's various parts interconnect seem to be one of the fundamental components of coaching, as indicated by the some of the respondents. Inter-connectedness refers to how

various NAC divisions interconnect to ensure a joint response to clients rather than disparate approaches from the same organisation towards the same clientele.

> *From a bird's eye view I sense the coaching programme was seeking to dissolve disconnections that led to silos and foster among the divisions a form of networked type of an organisation that are depended on each other's division to serve the NAC's clientele (R9)*

> *To me excelling in serving the clientele lies in our strengthening of our internal relationships that should result in excellent client service (R5)*

4.5.2 Summary

In an attempt to understand the nature of systemic coaching, its introduction, delivery and how it was conducted, respondents highlighted the differences in how systemic coaching was introduced and ultimately delivered. Respondents mentioned how useful systemic coaching was in terms of assisting them to deal with systemic organisational challenges. Those systemic challenges included; culture, an entrenched silo mindset and the conceptualisation of the leadership development programme which was largely influenced by the location of leadership and which ignoring that leadership could be found across the organisational hierarchy. Notably, as mentioned by the respondents, was the benefit of systemic coaching assisting teams to collaborate and align to the organisational strategic objectives.

4.6 RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT FACTORS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHEN IMPLEMENTING COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

This section presents the factors to be considered when implementing coaching at NAC in order to derive maximum results. These factors were identified by coaches and are first presented in a table format and then discussed.

Table 8: Factors to be considered that emerged from data

Research Question 3: Factors that should considered when implementing coaching in organisations:	**Research Question 3: Factors that should be considered when implementing coaching in organisations:**
• Organisational culture • Top leadership support and participation • Consent of coaching participants • Reporting and accountability	• Long drawn out coaching interventions • Proper closure of coaching programme • Dedicated internal coach champion

4.6.1. Organisational culture

The majority of respondents highlighted that culture is necessary and affects the leadership styles and behaviours as leaders often create culture. Respondents mentioned that an unsupportive culture as experienced in NAC can reverse the gains of coaching if the new coaching culture is not maintained.

Culture of the organisation plays an important role in upholding gains of change (R8)

4.6.2 Top leadership participation and support

Respondents mentioned that top and senior leadership active participation is crucial from the start, implementation and success of coaching in their organisation. Respondents revealed that, the respect of the coaching intervention for leadership development is largely dependent on top leadership demonstrating such leadership and taking their teams along. This point is capture in the following respondent comment.

> *The launching of coaching internally led by the CEO was on course to encourage participants that something at last was happening to advance other employees as well*

than just a few (R5)

It is evident from above the senior leadership support and active participation cannot be substituted by nay level.

4.6.3 Consent of coaching participants

Respondents highlighted the concern that coaching can be better received if it is not forced or imposed on them. These comments came from the executives whom their leader the CEO decided and instructed them to go for coaching without soliciting their views on it. As result most of the executives participated to avoid a reprimand from the CEO. This practice of putting direct reports under duress in capture in the following respondent comment.

> *Since the instruction by the CEO that we all need coaching, I took the initiative personally to get a coach as I needed help of how I should go forward in life. I never bothered to check how other executives are doing and who they are sourcing (R11)*

It is indicative from the above that the non-consultative culture was rampant and affected decision making and openness to engage without fear.

4.6.4 Reporting and accountability

Respondents mentioned that without clear accountability and lines of reporting by the coaches within the organisation, confidentiality can be compromised, as witnessed at NAC. Respondents revealed that it matters to whom the external coaches really account to. For example, respondents mentioned if their team coach also coaches their boss, how will the coach maintain lines of confidentiality? Respondents added that often the one that carries the purse tends to dictate terms to coaches. So clearing up the 'who is who' in the organisation in respect of reporting and accountability is critical.

Though systemic coaching is effective participants raised concerns of confidentiality. As you know bosses like to ask how his team is doing or what they think of him or her (R12)

It is evident from the above, that issues of confidentiality are important. Hence matters relating to reporting and accounting lines needs to be cleared upfront by the organisation and the coaching organisation.

4.6.5 Dedicated internal coach champion

The majority of respondents highlighted the need to have an internal coach champion that will ensure coaching introduction, implementation and evaluation. Respondents mentioned that having a dedicated person would also assist the organisation in retaining coaching investments.

Without a dedicated internal champion, a loss of coaching lessons going forward is possible (R6).

4.6.6 Long drawn out coaching interventions

The respondents believed that, in general, for coaching to have an impact, it needs to be done in reasonable time if fatigue is to be avoided and value realised. Therefore, respondents supported a well-designed intervention that will keep on celebrating achievements every step of the way to keep respondents motivated and inspired. Respondents revealed that business does not stop with the arrival of a coaching intervention, employees still need to deliver and meet organisational targets, so coaching needs to be done quickly and yet strategically executed, considering time limitations.

When something is run over a long period of time, the impact gets diluted by other things that we do (R5)

It is evident from the above responses that unreasonable long drawn out coaching interventions might lose mileage, integrity and might not effectively realise its intended

benefits.

4.6.7 Proper closure of coaching programme

Respondents highlighted the opportunities missed in bringing coaching to a proper closure rather than an abrupt one. This will help the future coaching interventions to be welcomed rather than being resisted due to lack of feedback upon the completion of the programme. The respondents mentioned that just as people were actually getting to grips with coaching, it stopped. In addition, there was no publicised information on the closure.

> *I couldn't see the closure of it. I don't know whether it's still running or what? There's no closure. I didn't get, even a feedback (R6)*

It appears from the preceding responses from the respondents that proper closure and exit strategies by coaches and by the organisation are critical in order to assist in leaving a lasting impact on the organisation. Follow up sessions were identified as equally important to reduce default tendencies to old behaviours.

4.6.8 Summary

In an attempt to understand the factors to consider when implementing systemic coaching, respondents highlighted aspects relating to organisational readiness and how important it is to have a proper closure which will likely influence future similar interventions. Of equal importance, as mentioned by the respondents, is the importance of measuring coaching against set objectives. Coaching is no panacea to all organisational ills so having clear coaching objectives could assist the organisation to measure outcomes in context. Respondents also highlighted a way that is to celebrate achievements and milestones as coaching advances as that can serve as an inspiration to participants.

4.7 RESEARCH QUESTION 4: WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OR BENEFITS OF COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

Respondents were asked to provide their experiences and observations in relation to coaching benefits and outcomes of coaching in their organisation. Six coaching outcomes were identified and further additional three outcomes were identified which were not directly identified during the process of the literature review. These outcomes are tabled below.

Table 9: Coaching outcomes that emerged from the data

Coaching outcomes as identified in the literature review :	**Coaching outcomes identified in this study**
• Improved organisational culture • Alignment of employees and organisational strategic objectives • Enhanced organisational innovation • Enhanced leadership capabilities • Improved peer coaching and leadership development • Improved employee engagement	• Improved non judgemental leadership • Improved open feedback and conversations • Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains

4.7.1 Improved organisational culture and values

As articulated above, organsiational coaching outcomes per the respondents responses include: coaching can facilitate a positive enabling organisational culture, coaching can assist employees to embrace organisational values, coaching can foster organisational alignment and collaborations, coaching can influence an organisational behavioural change, coaching fosters diversity, coaching can enhance organisational innovation, coaching can guide the recruitment processes.

The majority of respondents indicated that NAC culture was extremely challenging. The transformation of the NAC's culture through the influence of the coaching principles led to a positive culture emerging. Respondents mentioned that coaching assisted them to shift from a negative to positive outlook at NAC. They were able to discuss challenges and organisational bottlenecks freely unlike before where leaders had all the answers. Hence, after every session, teams concluded with a statement of how much better NAC can be, rather than how bad NAC is. Respondents highlighted that coaching was beginning to make a dent in the NAC's unsupportive culture.

> *So, I think our culture is one of community service, willingness and recommitment and passion and drive to change and to be client focused is amazing (R16)*

It is evident from the above that coaching can facilitate an enabling, positive culture. This is critical, given the cultural and leadership context, as described in earlier in this chapter.

Respondents highlighted that NAC values can act as a glue to the employee community. According to respondents, organisational values can assist employees to jointly embrace and, in turn, be held accountable for their behaviours as dictated by the organisational values. Respondents mentioned that, within the coaching sessions, NAC values were thoroughly discussed, explained and that made it easier for one to learn how to live or align oneself to organisational values.

> *NAC values can be lived not only fixed on the wall. This was insightful for me as it was indicative of the influence coaching had on awakening us to live up to our own values (R4)*

Respondents mentioned that organisational values are critical for cementing organisational relations and thus warranted attention during the coaching process.

4.7.2 Alignment of employee and organisational strategic goals

Respondents highlighted that collaborations at all fronts were difficult and almost impossible as every division often competed for resources and office space at the expense of giving attention to the organizational mandate. Respondents mentioned that the coaching intervention brought about a change of perspective on how leadership should think about maximising organisational resources

> *Fierce competition for organisational resources for narrow interest of division diminished as efforts were towards realizing the greater organizational goal. Though this was not easy at the beginning, leadership started to collaborate (R8)*

Respondents further mentioned that the efforts towards meaningful collaborations assisted the organisation to be outward looking and client centred rather than inward looking.

> *Remarkably, our management session were occupied with organisational and client matters less divisional matters (R10)*

Respondents further reported that observed the diminishing of individualistic tendencies by the executives towards the pursuit of working together for the benefit of the organisation. This assisted in the reduction of silo mindset and behaviours towards organisational alignment for organizational effectiveness. This even led to physical eradication of silos as captured below.

> *The executive committee in planning where divisions will be in the building we are in now, considered that all executives to be close and in the same levels with their teams, unlike before where executive had their own floor and team in lower floors. Part of the purpose was for leaders and teams to have access to each other at any time (R3)*

Respondents mentioned that the design of the new building afforded executives an opportunity to be able to see whether they are integrating people fairly well.

Respondents mentioned how critical a client centred approach is as NAC exists for and because of the development aid sector. Hence, any idea aimed at shortening the response turnaround time to expedite client support is important. Alignment of internal resources to assist development aid clients by NAC, started to make inroads in the sector's challenges. The respondents indicated, because of internal working relations having improved through coaching, joint ownership of client challenges and solutions started to emerge across divisions.

> *Through coaching we learnt that it is not about me and NAC first but who we serve namely our clients. The development aid sector people out there who are supposed to be supported by our services should be our preoccupation (R9)*

As shared by the respondents, it is evident that client centricity is central in the delivery of services to NAC clients. Coaching has become pivotal in ensuring organisational thinking is aligned towards client service delivery.

The majority of respondents mentioned that the way the organisation was perceived and behaving was influenced by the individuals in the organisation. Individual leadership behaviours dictated the course of the organisation. Each division was run at the discretion and of the executive often as an organisation within the organisation. Through coaching a change in perception of each other changed and that led to frequent collaborations among divisions.

> *Initially, the way the organisation is run one might think we not an organised entity even how divisions were run by the executives reflected how teams behaved. However now one can now see a change in behavior and in internal integration and cooperation*

Interests and effort in availing resourced to assist each other to achieve NAC organisational objectives became visible during coaching and though the coaching intervention.

The majority of respondents highlighted that NAC has not fully exploited the benefits of diversity. Respondents mentioned that diversity can strengthen the organisational capabilities

in the organisation and assist in mitigating the culture of conformity and tribalism. The advent of coaching assisted to foster diversity to the advantage of the organisation

> *NAC is rich in diversity at all levels of the organisation. Embracing diversity and eliminating tribalism can in my view invoke NAC innovation and progress as skills and experience lies across race, creed and colour.*

Respondent mentioned that seeing diversity as strength rather than a liability can influence the mindset of leadership.

4.7.3 Enhanced organisational innovation

This outcome of coaching is further subdivided into different points or areas, namely, coaching can foster an alignment of resources for better client services, coaching can guide the recruitment processes.

The majority of respondents highlighted the lack of innovation across the organisation, which was in stark contrast to the core of their mandate of development aid to flourish through innovative support. Respondents further revealed that leadership did not invest sufficient time and resources in ensuring that creativity and innovation becomes part of the NAC culture.

With the advent of the systemic coaching, respondents expressed a shift in leadership perception towards availing resources for international trips for employees to go and learn how other similar entities have managed to overcome similar hurdles.

The majority of respondents revealed that knowing your employees better and what they are able to deliver could assist NAC in having targeted recruitment based on the current skills, and the requirements of the managerial and leadership skill-set. Respondents further highlighted that this can assist organisations to recruit wisely for the future, unlike the case formerly when positions had to be filled regardless of merit, experience and qualifications. The respondents further highlighted that though they knew each other's strengths after coaching, they realised they knew little about each other and that the executives knew little about them. As a result, respondents remarked that coaching could inform the recruitment

processes and the type of candidates that can take the organisation to the future.

> *I think from the coaching principles and experience, you more or less know the kind of leaders you want and what calibre of employees you need to realise NAC's objectives going forward. I think for future recruitment, human resources department can integrate coaching questions rather only asking only technical questions (R14)*

4.7.4 Enhanced leadership capabilities

Respondents mentioned the following leadership outcomes that include: Enhanced leadership capabilities; Enhanced effective leadership; Improved accountable and caring leadership; Improved non judgemental leadership; Improved individual leadership awareness; Improved leadership styles, Enhanced leadership trust, Improved peer coaching and leadership development

Respondents highlighted the role capable leaders had on the running of the organisation. The lack of capable leaders partly as a result of leaders who came via political patronage was a challenge at NAC. Respondents observed that due to 'debt' owed to political principals and in ensuring their re-election was more paramount rather than leaders executing their functional mandates. However with the advent of coaching respondents observed a shift in thinking about the organisation and servicing the clientele of NAC as paramount.

> *Knowing where we come from it was revealing a change in behavior in our leadership as they show signs of prioritizing organisational matters and keen in nurturing employees (R7)*

Mobilising employee strengths and resources to realise NAC's strategic objectives was mentioned by respondents as sign of an improving leadership. Respondents mentioned that coaching and mentoring were identified as key aspects to NAC leadership development.

The majority of respondents revealed that effective leadership in the development aid sector is critical as such leadership deals with various stakeholders. Respondents further remarked that capable leadership in the context of NAC means leadership that is able to rally people

behind the organisational visions not only leadership with technical skills. Respondents mentioned that, though the majority have technical experience in the development aid sector, they were not effective in leading strategically and mobilising people behind the NAC vision and strategy. Respondents mentioned that one of the best things as leaders they reflected on through the coaching sessions was how behind they were in embracing the resourcefulness of their teams and how to nurture them in the direction NAC was going, rather seeing themselves as fixers and know-it-alls. Respondents cited the example that in their teams they have some talented employees that were sometimes not fruitfully engaged. The systemic coaching assisted them in paying more attention in spotting talent and engaging such for their own sake, team and organisation.

> *Since the systemic coaching our leadership gaps were exposed and we were given tools to capacitate our own employees without being made to feel incapable ourselves (R15)*

The respondents revealed that most of their peers who resigned have largely done so due to their manager's unbearable treatment. Respondents further revealed that the key to retaining talented employees was in ensuring that they remain empowered and engaged. Through the advent of coaching, executive leadership has started to be accessible, unlike before. General treatment of staff has changed and employees' views were being considered as valuable, thus being integrated in some of the organisational projects going forward. Leadership has begun to demonstrate responsibility and accountability in most projects. In respondents' observations, coaching assisted to avail a platform for leaders to be honest and sensitive towards others. Practical examples to illustrate this development, mentioned by the respondents, were the active display of a change of heart by the CEO by proposing annually a best employee award and inviting employees to participate in the bursary fund approved by executive committee and the board of directors.

> *As a result of coaching intervention I'm observing even the CEO encouraging people to make use of the professional development budget we didn't even know exists. Subsequent to that the CEO asked me to ensure that we include best employee awards for each division every year, something that never happened before (R7)*

Respondents revealed that having judgment and bias free conversation was not easy in NAC given its culture and its leadership. Respondents mentioned that, for example, it was hard for some of them to appreciate people and accept them as leaders in their teams, now they have learnt to see their direct reports as partners, not as workers only. When they saw them as partners, more ideas started coming forward to improve and advance the way they work.

> *One of the things I personally found helpful in the coaching sessions was to learn to run meetings better and solicit people's views without judging them per level and rank (R3)*

Deeper awareness of self assists one in relating better to others. Though coaching impacted largely on teams and the organisation, individual self-awareness has been observed by respondents and viewed as equally important since teams consist of individuals. One example cited by respondents was how one executive who was very negative when coaching started ended up becoming a self-appointed executive champion of coaching as he saw this intervention as important in positioning him as an executive with some value to add to the organisation. Examples cited by respondents were that coaching naturally and skilfully made one respectful of others' opinions as one of the coaching practices. In meetings they kept on reminding themselves to subscribe to and uphold the coaching principles.

> *What I became aware of was the impact of the coaching, at least in my own space. I started to journal and reflect on how my actions as a leader and a peer affect others around me. This is something I never had a habit of doing until coaching impressed it on me. We even made jokes that our team members have undergone a miracle surgery (R15)*

It is evident from the above responses that respondents are conscious of the impact coaching had on their personal awareness, which is where the deepest changes take place and in the improvement towards responsive leadership. Improvement in leadership can only be seen through leadership styles which ensue.

Even the executive leadership at NAC shared that they have observed a change personally and that coaching has indeed positively influenced their own leadership styles and their

perspective of their teams. Key for respondents was the ability to embrace their teams wholeheartedly. Unlike previously where executives were only after targets and putting pressure of employees, respondents remarked that through coaching, a time of reflection on leadership and how to better lead teams took place. The result thereof was learning to practice a different leadership style that reflects inclusiveness.

> *For me coaching opened a platform of honest personal reflections, transparent and embracing myself and my team (R2)*

Respondents shared their experiences when it comes to trust among themselves and from their direct reports. Most of the respondents mentioned that in spite of the coaching progressive principles, this will take time to mature. Respondents remarked that trusting their direct reports was a challenge for them given what happened to some of them in their previous roles in NAC and outside NAC.

> *The coach approach in facilitating team effectiveness has made me to shift my mind by appreciating others and I have since started to trust, though I believe I can only do so over time you know old habits die hard (R15)*

The majority of respondents highlighted that a lack of delegation was due to lack of trust and confidence on the part of leadership towards their teams - hence micro-management was rampant in NAC. Even in the event delegation has taken place, management still applies micro-management by demanding reports in shorter periods of time, instead of allowing direct reports to learn through their work.

> *I suppose it is not that easy for one to just change one's hard earned behaviours both good and bad. But coaching was instrumental for me to review my delegation skills and will to empower others (R18)*

4.7.5 Improved for peer coaching and leadership development

Peer coaching can be viewed as an activity aimed at and used to support individuals within teams within the organisation. Respondents mentioned that this mutual and voluntary help between two equals aimed at fast tracking people can assist in collective learning.

The majority of respondents before systemic coaching expressed a lack of peer support in the organisation due to a silo mindset. This lack of support has resulted in individualistic practices and has exacerbated the silo mentality in the organisation.

> *The culture of the organisation promoted individual achievements and downplayed team contribution (R4)*

With the advent of the systemic coaching, respondents expressed and noted some change and movement towards peer support, given the mandate of NAC that cannot be achieved through silo and individualistic practices.

4.7.6 Improved employee engagement

Employee Outcomes include: coaching can promote employee engagement, Improved employee commitment, Improved employee retention, Improved employee transitions, Improved open feedback and conversations.

Employee engagement is critical for various reasons, including retention of capable employees. Respondents revealed that, as a consequence of better working and employee relations through coaching, employee engagement became natural as managers started to solicit their employee's inputs without judging them. Through this coaching, some of these discomforts and assumptions about each other were exposed and that made employees see their teams as leaders as well. Respondents observed more working together in NAC as they say in Afrikaans, "samewerking" (working together). Respondents mentioned that as they witness working together, they believed that the consequences of coaching served as a platform for some form of cohesion and the willingness to stand together and work together. Some respondents remarked that now they observed synergies and employee commitment rather than disengaged employees.

> *More importantly we starting to work and build each other and knowing our contributions towards the organisation. Last week after our late evening strategy session with our executive, we had dinner and one could see that, yes, people are*

starting to be comfortable around each other and freely engaging our executive on issues otherwise we would not have discussed before (R17)

It appears from the respondents that employee engagement is paramount in realising a committed and effective workforce. Coaching was highlighted as one of the tools that can assist leaders to rally their teams for a common purpose.

Respondents mentioned that employee commitment was low as a result of an unsupportive culture and leaders who care less of employee development and their career progressions. Instances of resignation of employees who just joined the organisation were mentioned by respondents as alarming. Though NAC was known for lack of retention capacity and high employee turnover, a change has emerged where efforts are made to engage employees and soliciting their ideas to improve things in the organisation. Respondents reported that with the advent of coaching NAC employees seem to be staying as the culture is beginning to change for the better and leaders listening more.

Though some of us thought of leaving NAC we observe changes in leadership that is promising and probably this can make me stay.

Respondents reported a change towards synergies and collaborative work rather engaging in unproductive divisional battles.

Committed and productive employees were mentioned by participants as being influenced and inspired by such responsible leadership. Respondents indicated that micro management has affected innovation and employee growth. As a result of coaching, leadership is open to employees' creative and innovative ways to improve operations. This has resulted in employees having a control over their work and having an opportunity to contribute their opinions, rather than being restricted by organisational old ways of doing things.

I have some control and influence over my work unlike before coaching where I had to produce similar work to my peers and never think of how to improve on my work. Our work was run and dictated by templates (R7)

As shared by respondents, it is evident that committed and engaged employees can be of great resource in advancing the organisational objectives, especially when one works across divisions, not in silos. However, a degree of freedom needs to be offered to team members to find themselves and to enable them to contribute meaningfully to their jobs. Of equal importance is that coaching can contribute to the productivity of employees.

Respondents believed that, due to some changes in leadership and employees relations, the problem of staff retention has turned the corner and was improving. Respondents mentioned that teams started open up and shared their fears of having to leave NAC and that openness helped to encourage them to stay and leaders promised to do their best to support their development. Coaching was thus seen as an intervention that could also assist in the retention of employees and for leaders to act on time and avert capable and talented employee leaving the organisation.

> *We are still at NAC and there is a ray of hope that if things keep on going this way, one can stay. We will watch and see if such changes are permanent as we never really wanted to leave NAC as we believe in the mandates of the organisation, it was just how we were treated (R6)*

It is evident from the respondents that retention for NAC is critical, especially of talented employees and that the coaching and responsible caring leadership have been seen as key in assisting retention of experienced and skilled employees.

The respondents revealed that preparations for employee transition to senior levels or to expanded work scopes within their organisation are important to ensure that those promoted are empowered and not set up to fail. Respondents mentioned, through the coaching intervention, awareness came to leaders that promoting employees from one level to another requires proper transitions to ensure the promoted candidate thrives in his/her new role. This was an issue in NAC as promotions had been done haphazardly and little support, if any, was given to new managers in particular. Failure of the promoted candidates has since made leadership rather employ from outside than promoting from within the ranks of the organisation. This has brought about general tension within the employee community and

was one of the reasons cited for the departure of the talented employees in search of greener pastures as they felt undermined by external appointments.

> *The benefits of coaching were already showing when my boss was promoted and I was asked to act in her role it was not difficult to say yes as my confidence was somewhat boosted by coaching and that I will be leading people that had open and frank conversations with and be able also function better (R13)*

The respondents revealed that traditionally, NAC was like a closed organisation that did not appreciate open conversations, managerial and leadership feedback was critical, especially external feedback either from politicians, clients and potential clients. Fear of being victimised frustrated the culture of open debates and frank conversation. The majority of respondents were of the view that the advent of coaching that was inclusive assisted NAC leadership to appreciate, open up, and embrace honest feedback rather than being defensive and critical. Respondents further highlighted that coaching assisted employees in embracing a collective mindset. On a personal and peer level, employees have begun to be comfortable with even sharing anything that pertains to challenges facing the organisation. This collective mindset assisted in the reduction of personality clashes.

Respondents highlighted that management and divisional meetings are now a place of idea exchange and genuine feedback that is being delivered sensitively and respectfully. These weekly meetings are now a platform for an expression of divergent thoughts and ideas without fear of judgement or ridicule.

> *The direct feedback from my team was very enlightening as I never in my career life had a direct team feedback delivered to me other than anonymous feedbacks through 360 degrees assessments (R9)*

As respondents have shared, a positive culture for the thriving of leadership development initiatives is critical. Such a culture, as respondents highlighted, includes the discipline of living and embracing organisational values, creating a platform of open feedback and conversations. Idea exchange and knowledge sharing in an effort to sharpen each other across

departments and to seek collaborations and building collective leadership can be facilitated by coaching.

The majority of respondents revealed that because of coaching, a positive attitude change, cordial working and employee relations in and across divisions emerged and has improved. Respondents have indicated that this coaching has also pushed individuals in teams to hold each other accountable, rather than forming cliques and alliances against each other. This openness has also reduced divide and rule tactics that leaders often employ to exploit situations in their favour. Respondents further mentioned that artificial silo barriers were beginning to crumble and are slowly disappearing, giving way to functional collaborations where employees see themselves as one family rather than as a divided entity. This was a huge shift as teams had previously been working in silos and upheld their divisions above others.

> *Our leadership tapped into each horizontal and vertical collaboration and have since recognised team performance by awarding teams first then individuals and this pushed us to work hard together and keep each other accountable all the way. For example, in enforcing oneness, our CEO encouraged executives to be first and foremost NAC executives before being divisional heads (R11)*

From the responses discussed above, the cultivation of employee relations needs to be taken seriously in NAC for the purpose of retaining cordial productive internal relationships and coaching has been deemed key in realising such positive relations.

The wielding of power and the consistent conflict between the executive committee and the board of directors were mentioned by respondents as unproductive.

Position power clouded executive judgment and perspectives as revealed by the respondents. However, a change appears to be emerging. Respondents mentioned that executives were conscious of their positions as the culture of the organisation was supporting such behaviour. With the advent of the systemic coaching, collaboration emerged and organisational conversation across divisions started to point towards improving working relations with their

own teams. These cross divisional relations were previously characterised by fierce competition for resources and being critical of each other instead of servicing NAC first and foremost.

> *We as NAC executives were conscious of our positions and rightly so because the culture condones such behaviour. Now with this coaching we see change of behaviour at executive committee level R3)*

The respondents mentioned uppermost in their leaders mind in exco was to please the board of NAC often at the expense of excellent service to their clients. Respondents mentioned that coaching was key in assisting them to see things differently as one can be disappointed by the people one trusts. Respondents further revealed that it does not matter how close one was to the board members, one cans still be disappointed with their levels of support. An example cited by the respondents was that the CEO and executives can try to meet all the demands of the board often at the expense of their family time and yet when performance appraisal comes, the board pretended to forget all the hard work and sacrifices by executives and their teams. The board of NAC's interference in running the organisation was highlighted by the majority of the respondents as a concern.

> *Serving and pleasing the board was foremost in our minds, nothing wrong with that but I think we were overdoing it often at the expense of the business and our people (R3)*

4.8 RESEARCH QUESTION 5: HOW TO EMBED AND SUSTAIN COACHING IN ORGANISATIONS

Respondents were asked to provide their views on how coaching can be embedded and sustained in their organisation. Two points were identified in the literature and confirmed in this study. One point not directly linked to literature was identified in the study. These views are presented in a table format and then discussed.

Table 10: Respondents response to embedding and sustaining coaching in NAC

Research Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organsations: • Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes • A need for internal coach training	**Research Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organsations:** • Living and leading by coaching principles

4.8.1 Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes

The majority of respondents revealed that though coaching was systemic, NAC could have ensured that coaching was fully integrated into other programmes, such as performance appraisals, organisational strategy and managerial transitions. According to respondents, coaching could also assist NAC to mobilise resources and encourage employees to put NAC first. This then can easily inspire productivity and employees can hold each other accountable through coaching principles.

> *Coaching principles could easily be applied in almost everything we do at NAC, that is how I see it even more so the coaching design has already mobilised the employees and made them think NAC first (R12)*

Integration of coaching to other currently running programmes is critical, as revealed by respondents, to ensure that coaching is not delivered on an isolated basis but rather used to optimise other programmes for the benefit of organisational effectiveness. Respondents were generally of the opinion that coaching cannot be viewed as a panacea nor the cure for all organisational challenges, but should be used as a strategic intervention to ensure alignment and integration of organisational programmes.

4.8.2 A need for internal coach training

The respondents highlighted that to strengthen and embed principles of interventions, such as coaching, the training of internal change agents has become critical. According to respondents, it is critical for purposes of continuity and in realising a positive coaching culture. It was mentioned by the respondents that coach training is critical if NAC is to remain on a progressive path of a learning organisation and did not default to previous undesirable practices. Respondents mentioned that training internal change agents to carry on with the legacies of coaching is important and strategic. Coach training is important to assist in embedding the learnings and for cultivating a positive coaching culture beyond the coach time at NAC.

> *It's important that we have this group of internal coaches or people that will be able to take coaching forward. This is so important even if coaches leave, that there's a continuous group of people that are able to coach other people (R2)*

It is evident from the respondents that to ensure a lasting culture and the empowerment of internal change agencies, coach training is critical. Respondents highlighted that efforts to embed a coaching culture is a critical process that can yield benefits for organisational effectiveness in the long term.

4.9 Chapter Summary

It is evident from the above that the initial NAC culture was, from the outset, challenged by various complexities, including cultural and leadership contexts. Leaders and leadership development from such a platform was bound to be problematic if based only on a dyadic coaching model. Such coaching fuelled, as shared by respondents, a silo mentality and encouraged the leader's importance over the importance of shared and collective leadership. A stifling culture, as described earlier, was not helpful in taking NAC forward. Such culture, instead, permeated the leadership thinking and how they conceptualised leadership development. That thinking unfortunately influenced leadership thinking to view coaching as remedial rather than developmental. However, in spite of cultural and leadership contexts that characterised the organisation, as shared earlier, NAC, through coaching interventions,

managed to shift from an unsupportive culture to a positive one. As mentioned by respondents, coaching moved from being viewed as an event to become as strategic intervention in bringing about leadership capabilities at every level of the hierarchy to ultimately embedding coaching principles in the organisation.

Factors to be considered were discussed and included among others, organisational culture, client and organisational readiness and to the proper closure of a coaching intervention. The notable benefits of the systemic leadership development coaching programme after the one-to-one coaching were not disputed by both beneficiaries of dyadic and systemic coaching. It is evident from the above that leadership capabilities are mostly realised through an organisation-wide systemic coaching programme that is inclusive and intended to realise the achievement of NAC's objectives by the collective rather than the few. Mechanisms for embedding coaching in NAC were suggested. These included training of internal agents to continue to entrench the positive coaching culture and by strategically integrating coaching into other organisational programmes such as talent management and performance appraisals.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This chapter discusses the findings of the study with reference to research questions and literature as presented in chapters 1 and 2.

As discussed in Chapter 1, both dyadic and systemic coaching experiences and comments were captured and compared. Comments from those who only received systemic coaching were also recorded. The reason for this is that five of the 18 respondents received both dyadic and systemic coaching, whereas 13 received only systemic coaching. This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data from the respondents. The format followed in this section evaluates the insights and experiences of the respondents before, during, and after systemic coaching. Hence, the first analysis reflects the status of the organisation pre-systemic coaching and what has since emerged as a result of systemic coaching interventions in the organisations.

5.1 Demographic profile of respondents

Gender, race and age were not considered in the research as factors influencing coaching outcomes. The research conducted was investigative and exploratory and not intended to explore differences between groups. Analysis of the profile of respondents shows that these respondents have all been notably successful in their careers. Race representation of the study was: one White female, one Indian male, 11 African females, and five African males. The oldest respondent was 55 and the youngest 28. They have diverse qualifications including two MBAs, three MComs, two Honours degrees, five BA degrees, one BCom degree, two diplomas, and two matriculants.

5.2 Discussion of results from an integrated perspective

The purpose of this study was to investigate and explore how coaching is used, implemented and what outcomes can be expected. This study, as a result, investigated the following questions:

5.2.1 Main research question

How is coaching implemented in the systemic development of leadership in organisations?

Sub-questions

- How is dyadic and systemic coaching sourced, introduced, and coordinated in organisations?
- How is dyadic and systemic coaching delivered and conducted in organisations?
- What factors should be considered when implementing coaching in organisations?
- What are the potential outcomes or benefits of a systemic coaching in organisations?
- How to embed and sustain coaching in organisations?

5.3 Discussion of research question 1: The sourcing, introduction and coordination of coaching as identified in the literature review, confirmed, contrasted and extended in the research

During the research, three aspects emerged that are critical in the initial phase of a coaching intervention. These aspects were the sourcing of coaching, introduction of coaching and the co-ordination of coaching. These were ranked in order of prominence as indicated by the number of quotations for each code and were discussed with reference to the literature as per chapter 2 and the data presented in Chapter 4. This section begins with a summary table of the discussion points as emerged from data, then a discussion follows.

5.3.1 The Sourcing of dyadic and systemic coaching

Respondents reported that dyadic coaching was sourced for the individual development of the executive elite. This finding supports the findings of CIPD, (2009); and Tompson, et al., (2008) and a South African study (COMENSA, 2011) who reported that coaching is most often used for a leader performance enhancement and development and less for organisational and team development. Similarly, Rostron (2009) reported that coaching is largely used to improve leaders' performance.

Respondents reported that dyadic coaching was used for remedial rather than for organisational developmental purposes. This finding confirms the findings of Stern (2004), who reported that coaching is often used for remedial rather than for developmental purposes.

Kets de Vries (2006) reported that although one-on-one coaching can be beneficial to the individual leader, leadership coaching in an organisational setting will have a much higher pay-off because changes in leadership behaviour are more likely to occur. Similarly, Stober (2008) reported that coaching can be a valuable tool to use in organisational change and organisational development. This point is further confirmed by the findings of Sherman and Freas (2004) and Kets de Vries (2010), who reported that coaching should be sourced for the purpose of empowering employees in organisations rather than for the derailed employees. Kilburg (2001) reported that sourcing coaching for fixing poor performers rather than for cultivating future leadership might compromise its value and taint its reputation.

Respondents reported that dyadic coaching was sourced without proper internal diagnosis and assessments of both organisation and the individual leader's needs. This finding contradicts the findings of Grant (2012), who reported that needs assessments are necessary and should be done to inform the coaching intervention and in ultimately addressing the needs of the client. Therefore, according to Grant (2012), not having done needs assessments for each prospective coaching participant is not sustainable practice. Similarly, Wood (2012), FitzGerald et al. (2010) and Bass (2007) reported that for any organisational intervention, proper processes and mechanisms need to be put in place to strategically determine the likely outcomes of coaching. Given the cost of coaching, diligence in ensuring the relevant coaching intervention is sourced and implemented is critical to the reception and success of coaching in the organisation.

Compared to dyadic coaching, respondents reported that systemic coaching was sourced as an intervention for the development and expansion of leadership capabilities across the hierarchical structure and silos of the organisation, meaning that the coaching recipients received transcended and yet included the individual executives. Systemic coaching was also sourced to complement the dyadic coaching approach which was previously implemented in the organisation and was found to be limited to leader development. This finding corresponds with the findings of Thornton (2010) and Kets de Vries (2010), who reported that systemic coaching can better capacitate a broader leadership that is able to respond to current and future complex organizational challenges rather than just empowering a few executive elite. Similarly, Cook and Vierge (2011) reported that a systemic coaching intervention presents a greater potential compared to a dyadic approach in cultivating systemic leadership in

organisations. The sourcing plan included the selection of an organisation that is experienced in systemic coaching.

5.3.2 Introduction of dyadic and systemic coaching

Most of the respondents lamented the way dyadic coaching was introduced and promoted within the organisation prior to its execution. The dyadic coaching programme was introduced to executives only by their respective coaches. Joint leadership introduction and a proper coaching launch were not done. This finding contradicts the findings of Britton (2010), who recorded that proper introduction of interventions, such as coaching, is central in securing the commitment and participation of coachees. However, a systemic coaching introduction was launched jointly by the CEO and the coaching organisation in an organisational forum. Every internal information disseminating platform, including their newsletter, was used to inform employees of the imminent coaching intervention and on the scheduling of sessions' and progress milestones.

5.3.3 Co-ordination of dyadic and systemic coaching

Respondents reported that co-ordination of dyadic coaching was infrequent and ad hoc. This was compounded by various factors including: limited knowledge of coaching in the organisation, absence of an internal coaching co-ordinator or champion, absence of coaching strategy, measurement and evaluation. Coaching sessions were held privately and in isolation from each other. This finding confirms the findings of Kets de Vries (2010), who reported that the lack of proper coaching co-ordination often leads to ad-hoc and fragmented learnings and unfocused coaching. Similarly Britton (2010) reported that if less regard is given to proper planning and co-ordination of coaching, coaching implementation will be left entirely in the hands of coaches who might exploit such disarray and line their own pockets instead of adding value.

Respondents reported that, coaches were not obliged to share lesson critical to the collective development of leaders within the organisation. This finding contradicts the findings of Thompson et al. (2006) who reported that coaching interventions should be used as a platform of knowledge sharing for organisational learning and effectiveness. Similarly, the

findings of Dalakoura (2010) and Katz and Miller (2012) reported that the lack of proper co-ordination of coaching lessons compromises the knowledge sharing and insights critical for the collective development of leadership.

The co-ordination of systemic coaching compared to dyadic coaching was made easier by the appointment of a dedicated internal coaching champion, whose role included, among others: effective scheduling, informing of changes, follow up sessions, organising team sessions, constantly keeping coaching and coaches engaged, reporting on the coaching progress to leadership, facilitating the knowledge and lesson sharing and ensuring that the original coaching programme was followed and adhered to. This finding extends the findings of Thompson (2010) who recognises the importance of knowledge sharing during the coaching intervention.

5.4 The sourcing of coaching as identified in the research

The findings identified in the study and not directly reflected in the literature review are supported by some direct comments from chapter 4 of this study.

The sourcing of dyadic coaching as identified in the research reflects a limited understanding of executives of what coaching is as compared to the sourcing of systemic coaching. Respondents reported that dyadic coaching excluded human resources input in which skill and competence of sourcing interventions such as coaching lie. The study reveals that personal assistants were used in sourcing coaching for their executives. The coachee comments such as "We chose our own coaches with the assistance of our PA's and friends and referrals. I was going to be the coachee surely I had to choose a coach for me not via HR who knew less of me anyway", and "I was to be the first person to be asked to source such an intervention but my services were not requested as the OD manager" (interview transcript)

It is evident from the comments by coaches that the executives with their PA's sourced and selected coaches without an informed input and guidance from human resources. The coachee comments such "Since the announcement by the CEO that we all need coaching, I took the initiative to personally get a coach as I needed help of how I should go forward in life. I never bothered to check how other executives are doing and who they are sourcing"

(interview transcript). This approach to sourcing and selecting coaches might compromise the integrity of coaching and the development of executives.

The interests of coachees once they see no value in coaching might diminish and investment to coaching wasted as captured in this coachee comments "I think it was very personal and often superficial and led me to often reschedule my sessions as I felt career wise I don't see myself growing much. I felt the coaching sessions were lacking a kind of a line of sight important for me to organise my thinking. Am not sure whether it was my coach or me only but hearing from peers as we talk about such things the frustration was similar", and "If you can ask me whether I would have taken a loan for such coaching I would definitely said no" (Interview transcript).

5.5 Discussion of research question 2: Dyadic and systemic coaching delivery and conducting as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research

Respondents reported that dyadic coaching was reserved for and delivered to the executives only and the following steps were followed. The CEO determined the need for coaching for her executives. Coaches were secured and one-to-one coaching started. Each executive had his/her own coach to discuss mainly the executive development areas. These sessions were not team based nor were 360 degrees assessments made to ascertain what the executive could be really focusing at other than just based on individual aspirations, meaning that the dyadic coaching agenda was largely informed by the coaches developmental and career interests. These findings confirm the findings of Kets de Vries (2010) who reported that dyadic coaching promotes individual leader development often at the exclusion of collective leadership development. This then can lead to a leadership void once those few empowered leaders leave the organisation.

Compared to dyadic coaching, respondents reported that systemic coaching delivery was for the benefit of the employees and leadership at every level rather than only a few leaders. This finding supports the findings of Dalakoura (2010), who reported that individual coaching and empowerment of leaders rather than leadership is inadequate in today's complex world where complex solutions to organisational challenges cannot lie in the ability and wisdom of a few top leaders. Similarly, Collier (2000) reported that the systemic development of leadership

should take centre stage to enable leadership to effectively deal with increasingly multifaceted leadership challenges. This point is further confirmed by the findings of De Meuse et al. (2009) who reported that extending coaching to empower leaders across hierarchical levels in organisations can result in higher sustainable returns rather than dyadic development of leaders (De Meuse et al., 2009).

Respondents reported that systemic coaching compared to dyadic coaching was conducted and implemented in the following steps: This approach was facilitated by coaches trained and competent in systemic coaching techniques and understanding deeper team dynamics with the purpose of building and expanding leadership capabilities across hierarchical levels and aligning employees and organisational strategic goals. The organisational strategy, values, culture, and performance informed and influenced the coaching conversations rather than career and personal development discussions as occurred in dyadic coaching. This finding extends the findings of Kets de Vries (2005), who reported that for coaching to be meaningful and impactful it has to be informed by the organisational strategic objectives.

The coaching intervention was delivered in workshops, smaller groups that were attended by different leaders across the hierarchy. There was no use of titles in those coaching conversations as were equal participants. NAC clients needs and mandate pervaded every coaching conversations in terms of how to serve the clientele better and fulfilling the national development mandate. The major focus was on what works in the organisation rather than what is not working. The main reason was to invest more energy on what works which will eventually assist in changing the culture and mindset of the organisation. This approach extends the work of Kets de Vries, (2005) who reported that the importance of a collaborative approach to leadership development is facilitated by the focus and attention to organisational rather than individual matters.

5.6 Discussion of research question 3: Factors to consider when implementing coaching as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research

Implementing coaching in organisations can be complex. Literature review identified and this research confirmed the following factors to consider when implementing coaching in

organisations: Organisational culture, top leadership participation and support, consent of participants, reporting and accountability.

5.6.1 Organisational culture

Organisational culture was identified as a factor to consider when implementing coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that their organisational culture influenced NAC leadership. This finding reflects and confirms the findings of Ashley et al. (2010) and Lloyd (2005) who reported that the cultural context as a platform for coaching will determine how coaching will be implemented and in determining the success of such an intervention. Similarly, Booysen (2007) reported that a supportive organisational culture is pivotal in the flourishing of strategic leadership interventions, such as coaching. Martins and Martins (2003) reported that leadership orientations are largely shaped by the organisational culture and thus having a positive and supportive coaching culture is important.

5.6.2 Top leadership participation and support

Top or senior leadership participation and support was identified as a factor to consider when implementing coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that the CEO was required to represent and support the coaching programme at the executive committee as that will reduce the tendency of leadership to just pay for coaching and not fully participate in it. This view confirms the findings of Goldman et al. (2012), who reported that the active support of coaching at a senior level is critical in sustaining the integrity of the coaching intervention and consequently an improved meaningful participation of participants. Similarly, Avolio et al. (2010) reported that, coaching rests largely on the leadership support and availed resources to achieve its outcomes. Therefore, failure to give attention and support to the success of coaching by leadership may result in such intervention being compromised and ensuring proven ineffective. This point is further confirmed by the findings of Allen and Harman (2008) who reported that one of the critical factors in making leadership development programmes a success is top leadership's active participation and sponsorship. This then proves clearly that top leadership involvement is vital in giving the development programmes, such as coaching an opportunity to achieve the intended outcomes.

5.6.3 Consent of coaching participants

Participant consent was identified as a factor to consider when implementing coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that dyadic coaching compared to systemic coaching was imposed by the CEO and outcomes were never established. This led to participants attending to comply with their leaders' instruction. This finding contradicts the findings of Kets de Vries (2005) who highlighted the importance of participant consent by raising ethical concerns regarding participants who are required under duress to participate in group coaching programmes, particularly where discourses of a personal nature may occur. Confidentiality issues in coaching are important factors to consider, hence Anderson et al. (2008) suggest the use of dyadic coaching as an appropriate option when it comes to certain sensitive or personal issues.

5.6.4 Reporting and accountability

Establishing reporting and accountability processes were identified as factors to consider by respondents. Respondents reported that, to whom coaches will account is critical. Respondents reported that without clear accountability lines of reporting by the coaches to the organisation, confusion can arise. To whom a coach is responsible often dictates to whom coaches open up. Therefore, issues of confidentiality arise and the integrity of the coaching programme can be compromised. This finding corresponds with the findings of Kahn (2011), who reported and cautioned coaches coming into organisations to be alert to the fact that internal organisational accountability and reporting structures and demands can be complex. Therefore, it becomes important for coaches to establish reporting and accountability structures at the point of contracting rather than waiting to do so later. This can avoid the coaching intervention not to be politically manipulated internally.

5.7 Factors to consider when implementing coaching as identified in the research

This research confirmed the following factors to consider when implementing coaching in their organisation: dedicated internal coaching champion, avoiding long drawn out coaching

interventions, proper closure and a follow up coaching programme. These findings identified in the study and not directly reflected in the literature review are supported by some direct comments from chapter 4 of this study.

5.7.1 Dedicated internal coaching champion

Having a dedicated internal coach champion was identified as a factor to consider when implement coaching by the respondents. Respondents reported that it is impossible to have a successful coaching intervention without a dedicated internal resource whose prime function is to ensure the smooth introduction, implementation and evaluation of coaching in the organisation. This champion should be competent and passionate about organisational development. This finding extends the findings of Kahn (2011) and Ward (2008) who reported that the success of a coaching intervention is partly attributable to the support of senior leadership. The coachees comments such as "Without a dedicated internal champion, the loss of coaching lessons going forward is possible" (interview transcript) reflect that the coaching interventions cannot be compromised unless a dedicated competent internal resource is appointed. The champion is to ensure the strategic coordination of the coaching programme and the coordination of lessons learnt to advantage of the entire organisation.

5.7.2 Long drawn out coaching interventions

Avoiding a long drawn out coaching intervention was identified as a factor to consider when implementing systemic coaching by respondents. Such interventions have the potential of losing momentum partly due to participant change fatigue. The respondents referred to this change fatigue as unhelpful, as change that has been achieved could be reversed. Therefore, respondents reported that change milestones reached as the coaching programme progresses need to be celebrated. Maintain the coaching momentum can also inspire coaches to honour their coaching schedules in order to register better coaching outcomes. This finding extends the findings of McDermott et al. (2007) who reported that there are advantages of contracting reasonable time as coaching interventions can take time.

The coachees comments such as "When something is run over a long period of time, the impact gets diluted by other things that we do" (interview transcript) reflects the importance

of paying attention to the coaching momentum and to ensure that it is conducted as per contracting. This will also involve the active involvement of the coaching champion to also ascertain and weight the interests of coachees as coaching intervention progresses.

5.7.3 Proper closure and a follow up coaching programme

Proper closure of a coaching programme was identified as an important factor to consider when implementing coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that an agreed exit strategy with external coaches is important. This finding extends the findings of Goldsmith (2009) who reported that a proper introduction of a coaching intervention is critical as this will help future coaching interventions to be welcomed rather than being resisted. The coachee comments such as "I couldn't see the closure of it. I don't know whether it's still running or what? There's no closure. I didn't get, even a feedback" (interview transcript) reflect the observations employees might have about coaching that has no proper closure.

Respondents reported that post coaching intervention follow up is important to mitigate possible defaults to old behaviours at the departure of coaches. Hence a structured follow up programme post the coaching intervention can assist in embedding new coaching behaviours and coaching principles to the augmenting of supportive organisational culture.

5.8 Discussion of research question 4: The outcomes or benefits of coaching intervention as identified in the literature review and confirmed in the research

The following six outcomes were identified during the literature review and are discussed with reference to the literature and data presented in chapter 4. The majority of respondents reported that, though coaching is not an answer to all NAC challenges, improvements occurred over time and cannot be ignored. Six outcomes were identified, namely, i. Improved organisational culture and values; ii. Alignment of employees and organisational strategic goals; iii. Enhanced organisational innovation; iv. Enhanced leadership capabilities; v. Improved peer coaching and leadership development and; v. Improved employee engagement.

5.8.1 Improved organisational culture and values

A positive enabling organisational culture was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding corresponds and expands the findings of Milner et al. (2013), who reported that a coaching culture plays a critical role in building a responsive team of committed leadership. Jenkins (2006) reported that coaching can be used to assist leadership to develop intercultural skills and leadership capabilities. Ashley et al. (2010) reported that coaching integrated in the organisational culture with leadership development can help create a clear ''line of sight'' between the individual and the organisation and builds broader accountability for the success of organisational change initiatives. It is evident from the above that a positive and supportive coaching culture is critical for the organisation to remain effective and competitive.

Improved embracing of organisational values was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that since systemic coaching was informed by the strategic objectives, organisational values were discussed extensively in coaching sessions as they are central in keeping the organisation together and defines how NAC responds to clients. This finding confirms the findings of Mertel (2010) who reported that no matter which model is selected, for a coach to recognise his/her values and those of the client will enhance the coaching interaction. By developing an ear for hearing the clients' values as a coach, an opportunity exists to deliver coaching that may not only support coaching clients' goals but also enhance the meaning of their world and themselves.

5.8.2 Alignment of employees and organisational strategic goals

Improved employee alignment and organisational strategic goals were identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding confirms the findings of Brown and Grant (2010) who reported that coaching across teams and divisions helps to eliminating silos or a silo mindset as employees are aligned to organisational strategic goals rather than being stark in their personal divisional interests. This point was confirmed in the findings of McDermott (2007), who reported that coaching was viewed to have a large impact on alignment and teamwork amongst leadership teams, thus was instrumental in reducing silos in organisations.

5.8.3 Enhanced organisational innovation

Improved and enhanced organisational innovation was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding confirms the finding of Hamlin et al. (2006) who reported that coaching behaviours facilitate a capability improvement process that increases team results. Similarly, Burke et al. (2006); Kozlowski et al. (2009); and Morgeson et al. (2010) reported that leaders who engage in coaching behaviours are likely to prompt motivational and behavioural processes that are conducive to innovation. Therefore coaching can enhance innovation in work teams. It is evident from this discussion that coaching may be conducive to innovation in teams rather than in individual settings because this style of leadership may motivate team members to behave in a way that leads to innovation.

Respondents further reported that for innovation to flourish, NAC leadership should invest resources in ensuring that creativity and innovation becomes part of the NAC culture. Stretched employee assignments were identified as useful in provoking creativity in employees. This finding extends the findings of Hammond et al. (2011) and Rosing et al. (2011) who reported that the importance of innovation for organisational success calls for leadership to play a facilitative role through coaching for an innovative culture to emerge. This can partly be realised by giving employees a platform to be creative and innovate in their teams. Innovation as a strategic activity needs to be prioritized by the organisation and coaching was identified as one of the critical interventions that can cultivate innovation in the workplace.

5.8.4 Enhance leadership capabilities

Improved and enhanced leadership capabilities were identified as outcomes by respondents. Capable leadership was identified as an outcome of systemic coaching by respondents. This finding confirms the findings of Mukherjee (2012), who reported that coaching is one of the useful tools to assist towards building leadership capabilities that can occur through coaching organisationally, coupled with coach training. Similarly, Faulkner et al. (2013) reported that coaching can play a pivotal role in leadership development by enhancing leadership capabilities for adaptive leadership especially in view of the complexities with which leadership are faced.

Improved communication as a leadership capability was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding is supported by the findings of Berrriman (2007), Turner (2006), McDermott (2007) and Natale (2005) who reported that as result of coaching improvement in leadership communication skills occurred.

Improved decision making skills as a leadership capability were reported as outcomes of coaching by respondents. This finding supports the findings of McGovern et al. (2001) and Zeus and Skiffington (2002), who reported that coaching helps managers to develop better interpersonal skills by identifying their decision making approaches. This is made possible by providing leadership with a safe non-judgmental space where they learn to reflect and self correct and coaching provides such a platform. Similarly, Day et al. (2009) reports that as leaders develop an "internal core", effective leadership and decision making abilities may follow as a natural "by-product". The consequence of strengthening the internal core through coaching may be pivotal in accelerating leadership development.

Improved accountable and caring leadership as a leadership capability was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding confirms the findings of King and Force (2008); Locke and Latham (2002); Peterson (2009) who reported that coaching leaders in goal setting can help hold leaders accountable to their goals and positively impact the productivity of their organisation. Similarly, the findings of Hsia et al. (2012) reported that through the emphasis of clear goal setting, systemic coaching can influence organisation-wide development by holding key leaders and their goals accountable to the organisational objectives.

Improved positive leadership styles were identified as outcomes by respondents. Respondents reported that coaching opened an avenue of honest personal confirmations where leaders shifted towards being transparent and embracing themselves and their teams. This finding confirms the findings of Peterson (2009); and Kombarakaran et al. (2008) who reported that while there is little empirical evidence directly linking coaching and organisational performance, there is considerable circumstantial evidence regarding the impact of coaching on leadership styles. Respondents further reported that this change of leadership style has also led to leaders delegating more to subordinates. This finding confirms

the findings of Dietz and Den Hartog, (2006); Schoorman, Mayer, and Davis, (2007); who reported that as leaders through coaching develop and increase in leadership, confidence in their subordinates and the willingness to take risks and be vulnerable in the sense of "giving up control" increases. It is evident therefore that coaching may facilitate the leader's willingness to engage in risk-taking behaviour through sharing authority and delegating responsibilities. Similarly, Rousseau et al. (2013), DeRue et al. (2010); Bledow et al. (2009); Cheung and Wong (2011) reported that a coaching style of leadership allows team members the freedom to decide how to achieve the desired results which bolsters team members to involve themselves in the innovation process that encompasses both the generation of creative ideas (i.e. novel and useful ideas) and the implementation of these ideas within the teams. Thus, leaders who adopt a coaching style are likely to boost members' commitment toward team and organisational goals.

Improved leadership trust as central to leadership capabilities was identified as an outcome by respondents. Respondents reported that the way coaching was facilitated in teams made leaders begin to trust again their team members as inaccurate assumptions previously held against each other were removed. This finding corresponds with the findings of Ladegard and Gjerde (2014), who reported that the degree of facilitative behaviour from the coach positively affected the changes in both leader role-efficacy and trust in subordinates. Furthermore, the results regarding trust in subordinates represent contributions to the development of a relational perspective on leadership development. This point is further confirmed by the findings of Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011); Uhl-Bien (2006) who reported that leadership is produced and enabled by relational processes that include mutual influence process between leaders and subordinates as well as other organisational actors, where organisational practices are shaped through dialogue and interaction. From these arguments, it is clear that a leader's trust in subordinates is regarded as a crucial element of a high-quality leader–subordinate relationship that can be facilitated by coaching.

5.8.5 Improved peer coaching and leadership development

Improved peer coaching was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding confirms the findings of Parker et al. (2008), who reported that peer coaching as an

activity aimed at supporting individuals within teams is indispensable in enhancing leadership collaborations within a safe space.

Respondents reported that peer coaching can fast-track collective learning rather than promoting individualistic practices which promote the silo mentality in the organisation. This finding confirms the findings of Sekerka and Chao (2003) who linked the benefits of peer coaching to collective and personal learning and enhancing reflective practices of leaders. Respondents reported that working relations have improved as the result of peer coaching. This finding complements the findings of Waddell and Dunn (2005) who reported that peer coaching does bring about desirable results such as improved work relations in teams and later in organisations.

5.8.6 Improved employee engagement

Promotion of employee engagement was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. This finding is supported by the findings of Kombarakaran, Yang, Baker, and Fernandes (2008) who reported that coaching can result in increased engagement and productivity, and more effective dialogue and communication. The importance of employee engagement is also reported Hogan and Nelson (2009) who reported that keeping employees engaged should be an organisational priority. This view is similarly expressed by Aiken (2009) and Terry (2010), who described employee engagement as important in enhancing a positive mindset and attitude of the employee towards the organisation and each other.

Respondents reported that they had developed, as a consequence of systemic coaching better working and employee relations and employee engagement became natural as managers started to solicit their employees' inputs without judging them. This finding confirms the findings of McDermott (2007), who reported that coaching can result in improved interpersonal relations and team work among employees. Respondents reported that improved relations have led to better employee performance and improved turnaround time. This finding complements and confirms the findings of Kombarakaran, Yang, Baker, and Fernandes (2008), who reported that coaching can lead to better relationships with managers, improved goal-setting and prioritisation, and employee productivity. Similarly, McDermot (2007) further reported that the process of a coaching conversation enables coachees to

reflect on their relationships from a distance without being in the relationship. Through this process of objective reflection, the coachee is better able to identify the other individual's needs and be more empathic in their behaviour. In this way, respondents were able to build and develop stronger interpersonal relationships, both at work and within their personal lives.

Improved employee commitment was identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents as a basis for employee engagement. This finding confirms the findings of Hsia et al. (2012) who reported that a crucial role of systemic coaching is to help leaders redirect allegiances from their personal interests towards their functional role in support of the organisational goals. Therefore, organisations should strive to ensure their employees stay committed and engaged in order to realise their organisational strategic goals and coaching can help.

Improved focus on employee transitions as a part of employee engagement and development was identified as an outcome of coaching by the majority of respondents. Employee transitions enabled the newly promotes to move from one level of responsibility to another without inhibitions. It can also capacitate them to deal wisely with complexities that come with the new position. This finding confirms the findings of Bond and Naughton (2011), who reported that for there to be a sustained success rather than a failure at leadership level, transition coaching is necessary and critical for both the individual and the organisation. Coaching therefore can assist in ensuring that potential failure, derailment and self-defeating qualities of those earmarked for promotions are mitigated and avoided. Similarly, Hsia et al. (2012); Hogg and Terry (2007) ; Stahl and Voight (2008) reported that systemic coaching can help leaders manage their own transition, and/or the transition of their team members from previously held social identities to their new organisational role. This transition is important as social identity, social categorisation, and organisational culture boundaries can result in a type of social segregation in organisations.

5.9 The outcomes or benefits of coaching intervention as identified in the research

Coaching outcomes as identified in the research are as follows: Coaching can facilitate a non-judgemental leadership, coaching can facilitate a platform for open feedback and conversations, coaching can empower leaders to better handle organisational political terrains.

5.9.1 Improved non-judgmental leadership

Improved non judgemental behaviours by leaders were identified as an outcome of coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that an effective conducting of management meetings improved as leaders started to solicit team views without judging employees on the employee rank. This also facilitated improved employee relations as interpersonal skills of leaders were enhanced through coaching. Respondents reported that coaching was able to reduce leaders relational problems, such as poor interpersonal skills, demeaning or arrogant behaviour. Respondents reflected that non-judgmental behaviour was reduced as a result of personal and collective leadership reflections during the coaching process. As a result, trust relations were restored.

Coaching provides an environment of personal reflection in which coaches can learn how to lead differently. A coachee reported the following outcomes "One of the things I personally found helpful in the coaching sessions was to learn how to run meetings better and solicit people's views without judging them per level and rank" (interview transcript). This outcome reflects that a process of learning and internalising change by respondents to an extent of taking action occurred.

Improved non-judgmental leadership was not mentioned directly in the literature review. However, it may be an element linked to leadership capabilities critical for mobilising and inspiring followership.

5.9.2 Improved open feedback and conversations

An improved platform for open feedback and constructive conversations were identified as outcomes of coaching by respondents. Respondents reported that as a result of this platform, myths and assumptions about each other and their organisation, and the imposing of targets by management without consultations has decreased. Sabotaging each other's projects and fierce scrambling for financial resources has decreased. Coaching affords the coachee the opportunity to reconsider their approaches to organisational life. Coachees reported the following outcome "Fierce competition for organisational resources for narrow interest of

division diminished as efforts were towards realising the greater organisational strategic goal. Though this was not easy at the beginning, leadership started to collaborate" (interview transcript)

Being too critical of each other to a point of delaying important projects lessened. Leaders who engage and demonstrate coaching behaviours frequently can encourage and experience spontaneous and timely feedback. In so doing, feedback will naturally emerge as a result of leadership proximity and open relations. Coachees reported the following outcomes "The direct feedback from my team was very enlightening as I never in my career life had a direct team feedback delivered to me other than anonymous feedbacks through 360 degrees assessments" and "For me coaching opened a platform of honest personal reflections, transparent and embracing myself and my team" (Interview transcript).

Improved open feedback and conversations of equals were not mentioned directly in the literature review. However it may be an element of leadership's ability linked to trust in organisations that is critical to cement better working relations.

Respondents highlighted that management and divisional meetings are now a place of idea exchange and genuine feedback that is being delivered sensitively and respectfully. These weekly meetings are now a platform for an expression of divergent thoughts and ideas without fear of being judged and ridiculed. It is evident therefore that, for employee partnerships to improve in the workplace, an open and supportive work environment is critical.

5.9.3 Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains

Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains was identified as an outcome by respondents. Political appointees to senior roles and the five-year contract of executives compounded the internal political terrain even more. Respondents reported that coaching afforded them the ability to reason and reflect about their conduct and to choose which battle to engage and which one to let go. Coachees reported the following outcomes "Serving and

pleasing the board was foremost in our minds, nothing wrong with that but I think we were overdoing it often at the expense of the business and our people" and "We as NAC executives were conscious of our positions and rightly so because the culture condones such behaviour. Now with this coaching we see change of behaviour at executive committee level (interview transcripts).

Respondents reported that the deep coaching conversations assisted them to review their personal internal alliances and circles of trust. In other words, coaching was of help to some to better identify and engage with organisational politics as these constantly emerge in their organisation.

Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains was not mentioned directly in the literature review. However it may be an element of leadership's ability linked to leadership ability to deal with ambiguity in organisations.

5.10 Embedding and sustaining systemic coaching as identified in the literature review and in the research

5.10.1 Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes

Leadership development is one of the main reasons for organisations using coaching which should therefore be integrated with and aligned to the organisation's leadership development programme. This would ensure that coaching intervention is congruent with the organisation's business strategy. Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes was identified as one way of embedding coaching in organisations. This finding confirms the findings of Chapman (2010), who reported that for coaching to have sustained impact, it has to be strategically integrated into other important organisational programmes, such as the business strategy. Similarly, O'Relly (2010) reported that since coaching cannot be a cure for all, it has to be incorporated in the fabric of the organisational system. The findings of Kets de Vries (2010); Brown and Grant (2010) reported that an isolated implementation of the coaching programme in organisations has proven unhelpful as coaching requires a strategic approach to be seamlessly interwoven in other organisational programmes.

Respondents further reported that coaching was not integrated in their business strategy as it was seen as a human resources intervention. This finding confirms the findings of a study by COMENSA (2011) which reported that coaching is largely used as stand-alone programme. This can be partly attributed to the perception that coaching is viewed as remedial and is not used as an organisational developmental tool.

5.10.2 A need for internal coach training

A need for internal coach training was identified as an outcome by the respondents. To strengthen and embed principles of interventions such as coaching, training of internal change agents has become critical. This finding reflects and confirms the findings of Wilson (2004), who reported that coach training is critical for purposes of continuity and in realising a positive coaching culture.

Respondents reported that for the sake of ensuring that the NAC remains on a progressive path of a learning organisation and does not default to previous undesirable practices, coach training is crucial. NAC has now prioritised coach training in the form of a manager as a coach or leader as a coach, hence, the relations between employees and leadership are better than before. This finding confirms the findings of Mukherjee (2012) who advocates for internal coach training as it affords leaders the ability to learn to coach, develops their ability to listen, builds their level of confidence, and enhances their interpersonal skills.

Respondents further cited the exposing to coaching of other levels of leadership as one of the advantages of systemic coaching. This finding corresponds with the work of Passarelli and Van Oosten (2014), who reported that the internal coach training carries the advantage of expanding the coaching culture across different levels of the organisation rather than just coaching for a selected few. They also reported that coach training will increase the chances of the organisation moving from an unsupportive culture to embracing a positive collaborative coaching culture. According to Rock and Donde (2007), coach training has a systemic advantage for the entire organisation. Tichy (2002) further advances the benefit of coach training in organisations as such training creates a platform to embed a coaching culture and values while simultaneously aligning everyone's attention to the organisational strategic purpose.

It is indicative from the above that for organisations to successfully thrive, leadership empowerment is necessary and critical. However, some researchers (Figlar et al. 2007; Boyatzis, Smith & Blaize, 2006) caution against coach training for the sake of ticking the box and forgetting who the organisation takes through such a training programme. Focus should be to build committed change agents to sustain the coaching culture in organisations. They view coaching as critical to the enrichment of the organisations' leadership pipeline.

5.11 Living and leading by coaching principles

This finding was identified in the study and not directly reflected in the literature review and is supported by direct comment reflected in chapter 4 of this study.

Respondents reported that one way of embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations is to live and demonstrate positive coaching principles. Living and leading by these coaching principles can be challenging and yet is necessary. Respondents reported that to build and sustain a positive culture will take more than training and integration but living and practising the coaching values. This was captured by a coachee comment "NAC values can be lived not only fixed on the wall. This was insightful for me as it was indicative of the influence coaching had on awakening us to live up to our own values (interview script). If though coaching organisational values can be lived, then coaching integrated to organisational values can be lived".

5.12 Summary of discussion of Results

This study identified outcomes that had previously been identified through the literature review. The summary of results and outcomes are linked and aligned to the five research questions as they are articulated under 5.2.1 of this chapter. The literature review was confined to the major themes or most commonly occurring themes.

The outcomes discussed in the research were divided by those that can directly be linked to research conducted previously and those identified during the process of this research and both relate to the study research questions.

Table 11: Respondents reported outcomes of coaching per research question

Literature Review Outcomes per research question	The Study outcomes per research question
Research Question 1: Sourcing, Introduction and coordination of coaching **Dyadic coaching:** • Sourced for executives • Private introduction • Infrequent and ad-hoc coordination of coaching **Systemic coaching:** • Enterprise wide intervention across hierarchical levels • Organisation wide introduction • Coordination for lessons learnt and collective leadership development	**Research Question 1Sourcing, Introduction and coordination of coaching:** **Dyadic coaching:** • Sourced by PA's **Systemic coaching** • Dedicated internal coach champion • Proper launching of coaching in an organisational public forum • Knowledge sharing and transfer
Research Question 2: Delivery and conducting of coaching **Dyadic coaching:** • Elite few-Dyadic offering • Private session group sessions • Coaching agenda informed by personal development interests **Systemic coaching:** • Organisational/ Across hierarchical levels • Group and team sessions • Coaching agenda informed by the organisational strategic goal and values	**Delivery and conducting of coaching**

Research Question 3: Factors to consider when implementing coaching in organisations: • Organisational culture • Top leadership support and participation • Consent of coaching participants • Reporting and accountability	**Factors to consider when implementing coaching in organisations:** • Long drawn out coaching interventions • Proper closure of coaching programme • Dedicated internal coach champion
Research Question 4: Coaching outcomes: • Improved organisational culture • Alignment of employees and organisational strategic objectives • Enhanced organisational innovation • Enhanced leadership capabilities • Peer coaching and leadership development • Improved employee engagement	**Research Question 4: Coaching outcomes** • Improved non judgemental leadership • Improved open feedback and conversations • Enhanced ability to navigate organisational political terrains
Research Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations: • Integrating coaching to other organisational programmes • A need for internal coach training	**Research Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations:** • Living and leading by coaching principles

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes this study. It summarises the main contributions of this research against the research problem and the literature on leaders and leadership and coaching. The chapter further makes specific recommendations for organisational leadership, coaching practitioners, institutional bodies, learning and development practitioners and recipients of coaching within relevant areas of practice. It closes with suggestions for further research in this field of study.

6. 1. Summary of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate and explore coaching interventions in an organisation that received and experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching for leadership development. In so doing, the aim was to add a measure of credibility to the process, and prove its benefit as an organisational development tool. The primary purpose of the study remained at investigating how coaching was used, conducted and the outcomes thereof, in relation to the systemic development of leadership in organisations.

The research design that was used for collecting data was a case study. Interviews were used as a tool for data collection. The aim of the study was to address a gap in the literature and sought to contribute meaningfully to the body of knowledge relating to the uses, conducting and outcomes of systemic coaching in organisations. The researcher has sought to explore the key outcomes of a coaching programme in a South African public sector organisation called National Aid Council. The results, which are summarised below, corroborate, contradict or extend the existing body of literature on this subject, and have further added new insights on the outcomes of coaching in organisational settings.

The outcomes discussed in the research were divided by those that can be directly linked to research conducted previously and those identified during the process of this research.

The research topic was 'Coaching for the Systemic Development of Leadership in Organisations'. One main research question and five sub-questions were formulated and guided the interviews and data collection.

6.2 Main research question:

How is coaching implemented in the systemic development of leadership in organisations?

Sub-questions:

- How is dyadic and systemic coaching sourced, introduced and co-ordinated in organisations?
- How is dyadic and systemic coaching delivered and conducted in organisations?
- What factors should be considered when implementing coaching in organisations?
- What are the potential outcomes or benefits of a systemic coaching in organisations?
- How to embed and sustain coaching in organisations?

The findings and analysis of this research have been detailed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 respectively. The conclusions of the study follow.

6.3 Conclusions of the study

Although coaching is a growing phenomenon both internationally and in South Africa, businesses are still not able to justify the investment in coaching programmes. This is compounded even more by the lack of proper sourcing, delivery of coaching, factors to consider when implementing coaching and how to embed and sustain coaching in organisations, as concluded below.

6.3.1 *Conclusions pertaining to question 1: Organisations can better source, introduce and co-ordinate coaching in organisations*

This study indicates that the success of most organisational interventions depend primarily on how such offerings are designed, sourced, introduced, and co-ordinated and how coaching intervention is positioned and received by internal stakeholders. This is important in securing commitment, participation towards a collective development of leadership in organisations.

The findings show that dyadic coaching was only sourced for an executive elite, which then promoted individual leader development and systemic coaching was sourced for a broader

organisational audience, which promoted leadership development. The majority of respondents indicated that the dyadic coaching model promoted individualism and was inadequate in cultivating a systemic leadership pool. The findings indicate clearly that coaching that is sourced as a wider organisational intervention can have a larger positive impact for the organisation, leadership, teams and individuals.

The study highlights that the introduction of dyadic coaching was limited to executives. This led to coaching being treated secretly and the lessons and insights restricted to individuals being coached. Lessons were not shared and could not benefit the teams and the organisation. Since each executive had his or her coach, co-ordination of results was ad hoc and fragmented and thus impossible, as the coaches were not sharing emerging themes. Though dyadic coaching is still preferred and still relevant for leader development, it remains unable to foster a collaborative development of leadership development.

The study shows that systemic coaching was sourced for an expanded leadership rather than top leaders only. Introduction was broad, as participation was extended to other levels of the organisational structure. Lessons, experience, insights and knowledge were shared. Thus, systemic coaching platforms were used for knowledge exchange. Co-ordination of the programme and outcomes were more strategic compared to dyadic coaching.

The study further highlights that for any organisational intervention success, proper processes and mechanism need to be put in place to strategically determine the likely outcomes of such a project. Given the cost of coaching, diligence in ensuring that a relevant model is sourced and implemented is critical to the coaching process and its success.

6.3.2 *Conclusion pertaining to question 2: Delivery and conducting of systemic coaching in organisations*

The study findings indicate that the systemic coaching focus at NAC was inclusive and broadly focused. Conducting and implementing coaching to empower leadership across hierarchical levels in organisations can simultaneously facilitate the growth and development of individuals as well as the organisation, compared to dyadic development of leaders. The maximisation of coaching is, as shown in the study, also important in aligning employee and

organisational capabilities towards organisational effectiveness by ensuring that more employees have access to coaching.

6.3.3 *Conclusions pertaining to Question 3: Factors that should be considered when implementing systemic coaching in organisations*

Findings indicate that there are factors to be considered when implementing systemic coaching, such as:

6.3.3.1 Organisational culture

The study findings indicate that organisational culture influences leadership development and leadership in turn influences the organisational culture. Therefore organisational culture needs attention as it is key in the success of interventions, such as coaching, which can serve as a platform for collaborative leadership development.

6.3.3.2 Top leadership participation and support

As the findings show, the importance and participation is vital to the integrity and how coaching is received in organisations. it is not only resources that matter most but how top leadership is seen to be driving strategic interventions such as coaching to their ultimate success.

6.3.3.3 Consent of coaching participants

As findings show return on investment on coaching intervention can be compromised when participant's consent is neglected. Unwilling coaching participation in any developmental intervention such as coaching might just lead to unintended consequences.

6.3.3.4 Reporting and accountability

The study findings indicate that the coaching reporting structure and coach accountability in organisations are critical to mitigating unnecessary confusion and compromising the

intervention. Therefore, it becomes important for coaches to establish clear reporting and accountability requirements at the point of contracting, rather than waiting to do so later.

6.3.3.5 Dedicated internal coach champion

The study findings indicate that an internal coach champion, coupled with a senior executive sponsor, is important for coaching intervention success in organisations. As revealed in Chapter 4 and 5, the absence of an internal coach champion to drive coaching can compromise the integrity and how coaching can be seriously taken in organisations.

6.3.3.6 Long drawn out coaching interventions

The study findings indicate that avoiding long drawn out coaching interventions is necessary in maintaining the coaching momentum. The advantages of starting and concluding the coaching programme within the contracted duration can be helpful to both organisation and individual participants as change fatigue can be mitigated.

6.3.3.7 Proper closure and exit

The study findings indicate that a proper closure of the coaching programme is equally important as the start of the programme. An exit strategy needs to be effected even before the coaching intervention commences. This will assist in focusing the coach, as well in ensuring that some form of skills transfer takes place.

6.3.4 *Conclusions pertaining to question 4: The potential outcomes or benefits of systemic coaching in organisations*

Coaching, whether systemic or dyadic, is no panacea to organisational challenges. However, the findings of this study indicate that coaching can advance leadership development strategically and make systemic leadership development an organisational capacity when implemented across hierarchical levels. This research has shown that leadership development is one of the main reasons for organisations using coaching, which should therefore be integrated with and aligned to the organisation's leadership development programme. This

would ensure that the coaching intervention is congruent with the organisation's leadership strategy.

The study identified coaching related outcomes both form literature review and from data. These outcomes are spelt out and discussed in chapter five. These coaching outcomes are also summarised in a table 11 below. These are the six outcomes are those identified in the literature and confirmed in the study:

- Improved organisational culture and values
- Alignment of employees and organisational strategic goals
- Enhanced organisational innovation
- Enhanced leadership capabilities
- Improved peer coaching and leadership development
- Improved employee engagement

Following are the three outcomes identified in the study and not directly linked to literature review:

- Improved non jugdmental leadership
- Improved open feedback and conversations
- Enhanced ability to navigate organizational political terrains

6.3.5 *Conclusions pertaining to Question 5: Embedding and sustaining coaching in organisations*

The study findings indicate that integrating coaching to other organisational programmes and conducting effective internal coach training can assist in embedding and sustaining coaching principles and behaviours in the organisation. Integration can take the form of aligning coaching to human capital programmes, such as talent management or business strategy instead of using coaching as a stand-alone programme. Coach training in organisations can assist in transforming organisational cultures to positive collaborative and nurturing cultures and can have a systemic advantage for the entire organisation.

Finally, living and leading by coaching principles as a this study finding was deemed important as the displaying and practicing coaching values might better entrench these values more than just talking about them.

6.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, there are several recommendations that can be made to each of the key stakeholders in the coaching process.

6.4.1 Organisations

Coaching not only has an impact on the individual, but can also impact the individual's team and the organisation. Coaching should therefore be integrated with the organisation's talent management or business strategy, instead of using coaching as a stand-alone programme. This would ensure that coaching does not conflict with the organisation's strategic objectives. International organisations are more inclined to implement coaching across all levels of the organisation than the leading companies of South Africa. Implementing coaching across all levels of the organisation ensures that more employees have access to coaching and can facilitate the growth and development of individuals as well as the organisation.

Finally, organisations should set up policies and procedures for coach supervision. Currently, coach supervision is mostly decided by the coaches themselves. If organisations are to use internal coaches, supervision for coaches should be made available and encouraged. External coaches should also be encouraged to attend coach supervision. Coach supervision offers various benefits to coaches, such as raising awareness of their practices, providing support, discussing ethical and confidentiality issues and ensuring the development of the coach.

6.4.2 Leadership

Given the limited resources, the coaching budget can be maximised to cultivate a broader leadership rather than only leaders. As found earlier, though dyadic coaching can be beneficial to the individual, it lacks the ability to build collaborative leadership in organisations. As decision makers, leadership can, before making a decision in investing in

coaching, conduct a true cost-benefit analysis, even if it is only in qualitative terms initially. Studies such as this can potentially provide executive managers with empirical evidence as to what could be gained from the coaching process, thus justifying to a large extent, the investment therein. In other words, leadership awareness and knowledge can be broadened to make a reasonable choice that is likely to yield better results.

Pertaining to a coaching model or approach, leadership in organisations, when undecided, can make use of the findings in this study to assist in making them aware of the appropriate model for whom and when and what factors are necessary for the coaching intervention to be successful. This will assist leadership to have an idea what outcomes to expect from coaching interventions. Of equal importance for organisational leadership is the selection process of coaches, as findings suggest that a coaching panel to search for an appropriate and reputable coaching organisations or coaches is paramount in ensuring return on investment on coaching.

6.4.3 Coaching practitioners

Coaching practitioners are mushrooming and are increasingly finding themselves coaching leadership teams in organisations rather than just individuals. Systemic awareness and the ability to thinking in systems have become requisite skill sets to be able to help leadership teams across hierarchical levels. Coaches need to be mindful of the fact that coaching is more than just an individual purchasing a product or service; it is an experience that affects people's personal and professional lives. Coaches should also familiarise themselves with the differences between Eurocentric and African cultures and leadership styles. In modern organisations, work takes place increasingly in teams; therefore the need for coaching is towards team empowerment and development. Coaching practitioners' work has become systemic in nature; therefore it might be useful for coaches to start reviewing and redesigning their coaching approaches and add to their development coaching programmes systems thinking skills. Having the theoretical knowledge is not sufficient, if coachees are to obtain the complete value-adding experience that coaching could potentially deliver to them.

Finally, organisations increasingly integrate their coaching interventions with their talent management and business strategies. Coaches should therefore be aware of the impact that

the coaching intervention can make at individual level, team level and organisational level. Coaches can view the coaching as a systemic intervention, as suggested by Kahn (2011), and ensure that they ask the necessary questions to ensure their coaching interventions are aligned to the organisation's strategy.

6.4.4 Coach training institutions

Based on this research, coach training institutions can adapt and develop their coaching. It is recommended that these institutions align their coaching qualifications with the needs of the buyers of coaching and the suppliers of coaching. Training programmes should enable coaches with the necessary skills and tools to compete in a competitive and dynamic market. Coach training programmes can include coaching modules, business modules and practical modules. Training institutions can assist companies in training their internal coaches and can also provide specialised training for experienced coaches wanting to become coach supervisors.

6.4.5 Learning and organisational development practitioners

Coaching as an organisational development (OD) intervention or tool can be used for learning and development and by OD practitioners in enhancing and embedding positive coaching principles in their cultures. They can also use the findings of this study to inform their awareness of how coaching can work to effect organisational effectiveness and what limitations coaching can have to internal change agents. These practitioners can learn through this study how to embed learning in their organisation through the use of coaching. Therefore, insights from this study will assist OD practitioners in making appropriate decisions for their internal clients.

6.4.6 Recipients of Coaching

Although coaches have to be credible and effective, coachees need to equally make use of what coaching offers by availing time, embracing and following the coaching process and actively participating in the coaching. Therefore coachees should not view coaching as training, as is often the case, but rather as a positive journey of personal and collective

transformation and change. In this way, coaches can maximally benefit from the coaching intervention.

6.5. Suggestions for further research

During this study a number of areas for further research became apparent. Although these areas were touched on in the findings and discussion of this report, they were not explored in-depth because of the limited scope of this report. The areas listed below are suggestions for further research.

6.5.1 Structured questionnaire

A structured questionnaire could be created using the findings identified in this study so these findings can be tested quantitatively.

6.5.2 Sample size

Generalisation of the study results can happen through a qualitative and a bigger and more representative sample. The sample size can be increased by including those who did not receive coaching at all and be compared to those who received coaching in a larger number of organisations nationally. These could then be more readily generalised than the qualitative method used here.

6.5.3 Study limitations

The focus of the study was coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisation; other tools for the systemic development of leadership were excluded. The study can be broadened and expanded by including sectors other than the public sector and can be spread across the country.

6.5.4 Longitudinal study

A longitudinal study can be done to observe the gains of systemic coaching over time not just over a period of a year, in other words, conducting a longitudinal study exploring the impact of coaching and learning. The participants could be followed over time to assess the impact on the organisation as well as the individual. This could elicit some interesting results, such as the changes of coaching practices and needs of organisations.

6.5.5 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework for organisational and team dynamics when implementing a systemic coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations, can be explored.

6.5.6 Strategy for sustaining coaching gains

A strategy for coaches to have an effective approach in keeping and sustaining coaching gains and an effective strategy to inspire leaders to embrace being coaches and mentors in their organisations

6.5.7 Compare learning experiences

Compare the learning experiences of clients engaged in executive coaching as a stand-alone offer vs. clients involved in a more blended approach to leadership and management development (e.g., includes other components, such as action learning projects, rotational assignments, and classroom training, etc.). What is the benefit of each for the organisation and the individual?

6.5.8 Evaluating the long term effects of coaching

Evaluating the impact of coaching was covered in this study but more research is needed to assess the long-term effects of coaching on the coachee as well as the organisation.

6.6 Conclusion

This study investigated how dyadic and systemic coaching was used, conducted and implemented in the systemic development of leadership in NAC. Dyadic coaching was examined in relation to leadership development in the organisation. The dyadic coaching approach was found inadequate in enabling collective leadership development in the organisation. It was limited as it promoted individual leader development rather than leadership development. An alternative and complementary approach was implemented in the organisation which is referred to as *systemic coaching*.

This coaching approach was found adequate in enabling the systemic development of leadership in the organisation as it promotes collective leadership development, coherence and synergies in teams, and is preoccupied with the optimisation of the entire organisation rather than just individuals. This report has derived experiences from the literature as well. Due to the paucity in the literature on an empirical evaluation of systemic coaching, this study aimed to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of coaching in organisations as an enabler of the systemic development of leadership in organisations.

REFERENCES

Abbott, P., Goosen, X., & Coetzee, J. (2010). Developing and supporting coordinators of structured mentoring schemes in South Africa. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*(1), 1-10.

Aiken, K. (2009). *How Gap Inc. elevates engagement and improves organizational capability.* Paper presented at the Talent Management Magazine Strategies 2009 - Innovation to Impact conference, Laguna Niguel, CA.

Ajani, Y. (2010). *A comparative study of the employment equity at the University of Limpopo and the University of Venda for Science and Technology.* Master Thesis of Administration in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, University of Limpopo, Turfloop Campus, Polokwane.

Allen, S. J., & Harman, N. S. (2008). Leader development: An exploration of sources of learning. *Organization Development Journal, 26,* 75–87.

American Society for Training and Development. (2010). The ASTD WLB competency model. http://www.astd.org/content/research/competency/AreasofExpertise.htm.

Anderson, M.C., Anderson, D.L., & Mayo, W.D. (2008). Team coaching helps a leadership team drive cultural change at caterpillar. Global Business and Organisational Excellence, May/June, 40-50.

Anderson, D. W., Krajewski, H. T., Goggin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (2008). A leadership self-efficacy taxonomy and its relation to effective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19,* 595-608.

Anderson, C., & Brown, C. E. (2010). The functions and dysfunctions of hierarchy. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 30,* 55–89.

Anderson, M. C. (2011). Evaluating the ROI of coaching. In G. Hernez-Broome & L. A. Boyce (Eds.), *Advancing Executive Coaching.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aricksamy, S. (2011). *A study into the factors affecting broad-based black economic empowerment in South Africa.* MBA research report, University of KwaZulu Natal, Durban.

Ashley M. Guidroz Karen W. Luce Daniel R. Denison, (2010),"Integrated change: creating synergy between leader and organizational development", *Industrial and Commercial Training, 42*(3), 151 - 155

Arnolt, J. (2005). *Work psychology: Understanding human behaviour in the workplace.* (4th ed.). London: Prentice Hall Financial Times.

Ashley-Timms, L. (2012). Return on investment guaranteed: effecting transformation and sustaining change with coaching. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 44* (3), 159 – 163.

Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2009). Leader developmental readiness. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology — Perspectives on Science and Practice, 2*(3), 284–287.

Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Quisenberry, D. (2010). Estimating return on leadership development investment. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 633–644.

Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2002). *The Practice of Social Research.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, R. and Schutt, R. K. (2003). *The practice of research in criminology and criminal justice.* Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

Baker, W., & Dutton, J. E. (2007). Enabling positive social capital in organizations. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work* (pp. 325-346). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Barner, R., & Higgins, J. (2007). Understanding implicit models that guide the coaching process. *Journal of Management Development, 26*(2), 148-158.

Barry, D. (1991). Managing the bossless team: Lessons in distributed leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *20*, 31–47.

Barry, T. (1994) How to be a good coach, *Management Development Review*, *7*(4), 24 – 26.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baron, L., & Morin, L. (2010). The impact of executive coaching on self-efficacy related to management soft-skills. Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, *31* (1), 18-38.

Bass, B.M. (2007). Executive and strategic leadership. *International Journal of Business, 12*(1), 34–52.

Bedeian, A. G., & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(2), 190-205.

Benavides, L. (2009). *The relationship between executive coaching and organizational performance of female executives as a predictor for organizational success.* Doctoral Thesis, University of San Francisco, San Franscisco.

Berg, L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 4th ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berriman, J. (2007) can coaching combat stress a work? Occupational Health, 59(1), 27-29.

Biswas-Diener, R. (2009). Personal Coaching as a Positive Intervention. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 65*(5), 544-553.

Bjugstad, K., Thach, E., Thompson, K., & Morris, A. (2006). A fresh look at followership: A model for matching followership and leadership styles. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, *7*, 304-319.

Blanche, T., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2007). *Research in practice*: *applied methods for the social sciences.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Bledow, R., Frese, M., Anderson, N., Erez, M., & Farr, J. (2009), "A dialectic perspective on innovation: conflicting demands, multiple pathways, and ambidexterity". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 2*(3), 305-337.

Block, P. (2009). *Community: The Structure of belonging.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Boal, K.B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: moving on. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 515–549.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S.K. (1992).*Qualitative research for education* (2nd. ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bond, A.S., & Naughton, N. (2011). The role of coaching in managing leadership transitions. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 6*, (2).

Bono, J. E., Purvanova, R. K. Towler, A. J. & Peterson, D. B. (2009). A survey of executive coaching practices. *Personnel Psychology, 62*(2), 361-404.

Botha, H. (2009). Origins, phenomena and importance of leadership. *Management Today, 27*(5), 29–31.

Bowen, F.E., Rostami, M. & Steel, P. (2010). Timing is everything: a meta-analysis of the relationships between organizational performance and innovation. *Journal of Business Research, 63* (11), 1179-1185.

Bowes, B. J. (2008). The business case for workplace diversity. *CMA Management,* 81/8, 14-16.

Boyatzis, R.E., Smith, M. & Blaize, N. (2006). Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion, *Academy of Management Journal of Learning and Education, 5*(1), 8-24.

Boyatzis, R. (2007). Developing emotional intelligence through coaching for leadership, professional and occupational excellence. In R. Bar-On, J. Maree, & M. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 155–168). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Boyce, L. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Wisecarver, M. M. (2010). Propensity for self-development of leadership attributes: understanding, predicting, and supporting leader self-development performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 21,* 159–178.

Boyce, L. A., Jackson, R. J., & Neal, L. J. (2010). Building successful leadership coaching relationships: examining impact of matching criteria in a leadership coaching program. *Journal of Management Development, 29* (10), 914-931.

Booysen, L., & van Wyk, M. W. (Eds.). (2008). *Culture and leadership in South Africa.* Boston: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77.

Renton, A.L., & Driskill, GW. (2011). *Organizational culture in action: A cultural analysis workbook.* Thousand Hills: Sage.

Britton, J. J. (2010). *Effective group coaching: tried and tested tools and resources for optimum group coaching results.* New York: Wiley.

Brock, V. (2009). Professional challenges facing the coaching field from an historical perspective. *International Journal of Coaching in Organizations, 1*, 27–37.

Brown, D., & Harvey, D. (2006). AN Experiential Approach to Organisational Development. (7th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education

Brown, S. W., & Grant, A. M. (2010). From GROW to GROUP: Theoretical issues and a practical model for group coaching in organisations. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice, 3*(1), 30–45.

Burdett, J. (1998). Forty things every manager should know about coaching. *Journal of Management Development, 17*(2), 142-152.

Burke, C.S., Stagl, K.C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G.F., Salas, E. & Halpin, S.M. (2006), "What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis". *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(3), 288-307.

Burkus, D., & Bramwell, O. (2011). Faulty Intel in the War for Talent: Replacing the Assumptions of Talent Management with Evidence-based Strategies. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 3*(2), 1-9

Cacioppe, R. (1998). Leaders developing leaders: An effective way to enhance leadership development programs. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 19*, 194-198.

Camilleri, C.S. (2013). The power of one-the role of workplace coaching in engaging salient stakeholders in Yalumba's commitment to sustainable winemaking programme. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 6*(2), 177–201.

Carey, W., Philippon, D. J., & Cummings, G. G. (2011). Coaching models for leadership development: An integrative review. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5* (1), 51-69.

Carlile, P. R., & Christensen, C. M. (2005). *The cycles of theory building in management research.* January, Working Paper no 05-057, Version 6.0 available from http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/05-057.pdf, accessed on?

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1217-1234.

Cavanagh, M. J. (2006). Coaching from a systemic perspective: A complex adaptive conversation. In D. Stober & A. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence based coaching handbook* (313–354). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Cavanagh, M., & Lane, D. (2012). Coaching psychology coming of age: the challenges we face in the messy world of complexity? *International Coaching Psychology Review, 7(*1), 75–90.

Chapman, L. (2010). *Integrated experiential coaching: Becoming an executive coach.* London: Karnac Books.

Charan, R. (2009). The Coaching Industry: A work in progress. *Harvard Business Review*, January.

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2011). *The Coaching Climate*. London: CIPD.

Cheung, M.F.Y., & Wong, C.S. (2011), "Transformational leadership, leader support, and employee creativity". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 32* (7), 656-672.

Christensen, C. M., & Carlile, P. R. (2009). Course research: Using the case method to build and teach management theory. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education ARCHIVE, 8*(2), 240-251.

Cilliers, F. (2005). Executive Coaching Experiences: A Systems Psychodynamic Perspective. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 31*(3), 23-30.

CIPD. (2009). *Taking the temperature of coaching* London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development

Cocivera, T., & Cronshaw, S. (2004). Action frame theory as a practical framework for the executive coaching process. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research, 56*(4), 234-245.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education.* London: Routledge.

Cole, P. L. (1998). Content analysis: process and application. *Clinical Nurse Specialist, 13*, 313-321.

Collier, J., & R. Esteban. (2000). Systemic Leadership: Ethical and Effective. *The Leadership and Organizational Development Journal 21*(4), 207–215.

COMENSA. (2011). *Positioning coaching in South Africa 2011: National coaching survey of coaches, coachees and organisations that utilise coaching.* South Africa: Coaches and Mentors of South Africa.

Cook, J., & Viedge, C. (2011). *Teaching and coaching: The nexus between knowing and doing.* Place: Publisher.

Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). *Business Research Methods.* McGraw Hill International Edition, Statistics and Probability Series. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cox, E., Bachkirova, T., & Clutterbuck, D. (2010). *The Complete Handbook of Coaching.* London: Sage Publishers.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cunliffe, A. L., & Eriksen, M. (2011). Relational leadership. *Human Relations*, *64*(11), 1425–1449.

Cushion, C., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Locating the coaching process in practice: Implications for coach education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *11*(1), 83-99.

Daft, R. L. (2007). *Organization theory and design*. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Dalakoura, A. (2010). Differentiating leader and leadership development. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(5), 432 – 441.

Day, D.V. (2001). Leadership development: a review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11,* 581-613.

Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development. Connecting adult development, identity and expertise*. New York: Psychology Press.

DeChurch, L.A, Hiller N.J, Murase, T., Doty, D., & Salas, E. (2010). Leadership across levels: Levels of leaders and their levels of impact. *The Leadership Quarterly 21,* 1069–1085.

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., & Lee, R. J. (2009). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Executive Coaching: Beyond ROI? Coaching: *An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 2*(2), 117-134.

DeRue, D. S., & Wellman, N. (2009). Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 859-875.

DeRue, D.S., Barnes, C.M., & Morgeson, F.P. (2010), "Understanding the motivational contingencies of team leadership", *Small Group Research, 41*(5), 621-651.

DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 7-52.

DeRue, D. S. (2011). Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive process. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 31*, 125-150.

Diedricht, R. C. (2001). Lessons learned in—and guidelines for—coaching executive teams. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(4), 238–239.

Dietz, G., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2006). Measuring trust inside organisations. *Personnel Review, 35*(5), 557–588.

Douglas, C. A., & McCauley, C. D. (1999). Formal developmental relationships: A survey of organisational practices. *Human Resource Development Review, 10*(3), 203-220.

Eggers, H. (2000). Executive Coaching that wins. *Ivey Business Journal,* September/October.

Elenkov, D.S., Judge, W., & Wright, P. (2005). Strategic leadership and executive innovation influence: an international multi-cluster comparative study. *Strategic Management Journal, 26*, 665–682.

Elenkov, D.S. (2008). Effects of leadership at strategic level and its moderators on innovation: an international empirical study. *International Journal of Business Strategy, 8*(2): 37–47.

Ellinger, A. D., A. E. Ellinger, & S. B. Keller. (2005). Supervisory Coaching Behavior, Employee Satisfaction, and Warehouse Employee Performance: A Dyadic Perspective in the Distribution Industry. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 14 *4*, 435–457.

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107-115.

Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leadership coaching: A review and integrated framework. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(4), 585–599.

Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(3), 217-231.

Evered, R. D., & Selman, J. C. (2001). Coaching and the art of management. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(2), 16-32.

Faulkner, E., Cartine, K.L., & Morris, JB. (2013). An Integrated approach to leadership development. *Training and Development*. Vol, issue, pages

Feldman, D. C., & Lankau, M. J. (2005). Executive coaching: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 829–848.

Figlar, M., Adams, M., & Hornyak, L. (2007). Strengthening the leadership pipeline through internal human-resources-based executive coaching: A white paper, *12th Annual Global Forum for Action Learning*, Retrieved from www.InquiryInstitute.com Accessed on?

Fine, A. (2013). Coaching Culture: More Leaders Coaching More Often. *Leadership excellence essentials*. HR.com

FitzGerald, P., Moss, S., & Sarros, JC. (2010). *Sustainable Coaching: A Primer for Executives & Coaches*. Sidney: TUP.

Flood, G., Jackson, M. (1991). *Critical Systems Thinking: Directed Readings*. New York: Wiley.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Claudia, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership in the study of leadership: A review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 922–958.

Gibbons. J. (2006). *Employee engagement: A review of current research and its implications.* New York: The Conference Board.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8 (4)*, 597-607.

Goldman, E., Wesner, M., & Karnchanomai, O. (2012). Reciprocal Peer Coaching: A Critical Contributor to Implementing Individual Leadership Plans. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 24, 1.

Goleman, D. & Cherniss, C (2001). *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace: How to Select for, Measure, and Improve Emotional Intelligence in Individuals, Groups and Organizations.* Los Angeles: Jossey-Bass.

Goldsmith, M. (2009, March 25). How to spot the "uncoachables." *HBR Blog Network.*Retrieved from http://blogs.hbr.org/goldsmith.

Goldsmith, M. (2008). *When Leadership Coaching works (And when it doesn't).*[Online] Available: www.blogs.hbr.org/ Accessed: 2 December 2014.

Goldsmith, M. (2009). Executive coaching: a real world perspective from a life coaching practitioner. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, *4*(1), 22-24.

Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2007). Evidence-based coaching: Flourishing or languishing? *Australian Psychologist, 42*(4), 239 – 254.

Grant, A. M., Curtayne, L., & Burton, G. (2009). Executive coaching enhances goal attainment, resilience and workplace well-being: a randomised controlled study. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*(5), 396–407.

Grant, A. M. (2011). The solution-focused inventory: a tripartite taxonomy for teaching, measuring and conceptualising solution-focused approaches to coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist, 7*(2), 98–106.

Grant, A. M. (2012). ROI is a poor measure of coaching success: towards a more holistic approach using a wellbeing and engagement framework. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 5*(2), 1–12.

Gray, D. E. (2006). Executive coaching: Towards a dynamic alliance of psychotherapy and transformative learning processes. *Management Learning, 37*(4), 475-497.

Griffiths, K., & Campbell, M. (2009). Discovering, applying, and integrating: The process of learning in coaching. *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring, 7*(2), 16-30.

Groenewald, T., & Schurink, W. (2007). The Contribution Of Co-Operative Education In The Growing Of Talent In South Africa: A Qualitative Phenomenological Exploration. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 1*(3), 94.

Grossman, S., & Valiga, T. M. (2009). *The new leadership challenge: creating the future of nursing.* Philadelphia, Pa.: F.A. Davis Co.

Groothof, C. (2007). *The changing environmental context and the relevancy of existing leadership models.* PhD Thesis, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.

Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2005). When and how team leaders matter. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 26*, 37–74.

Hagen, A. F. Hassan, M. T., & Amin, S. G. (1998). Critical strategic leadership components: an empirical investigation. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 63*(3), 39–44.

Hageman, B., & Stroope, S. (2013). Developing the next generation of leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 45* (2), 123-126.

Hallberg, U.E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminantd from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist, 11*, 119-127.

Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. (2008). The emergent coaching industry: A wakeup-call for HRD professionals. *Human Resource Development International, 11*(3), 287-305.

Hammond, M.M., Neff, N.L., Farr, J.L., Schwall, A.R. & Zhao, A.R. (2011), "Predictors of individual-level innovation at work: a meta-analysis", *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *5*(1), 90-105.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. Leadership Quarterly, *19*(6), 669–692.

Hannah, S. T., & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Ready or not:how do we accelerate the development readiness of leaders? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(8), 11-18

Harding, C. (2009). Researcher as Goldilocks: searching for a methodology that is 'just right' for a coaching and mentoring study. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 3*, 11-21.

Harris, A., & Spillane, J. P. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education*, *22*(1), 31-34.

Hauser, L. (2009). Evidence-based coaching: A case study. *OD Practitioner, 41*(1), 8–13.

Hawkins, P. (2011). *Leadership team coaching: Developing collective transformational leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Kogan Page.

Hernez-Broome, G., & Hughes, R. L. (2004). Leadership development: past, present, and future. *Human Resource Planning, 27*, 24-33.

Hogan, R., & Nelson, E. (2009). *Personality, values, and employee engagement.* Paper presented at the mid-winter conference of the Society of Consulting Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Hogbin-Mills, D. (2014). Right on Time. *Coaching at Work*, 9 (5), 24-27.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 121-140.

Holton, B. C., Mitchell, T.R., Lee, T.W., & Eberly, M.B. (2008). Turnover and Retention Research: A Glance at the Past, a Closer Review of the Present and a Venture into the Future. *Academy of Management Annals, 2*(1), 231–274

Hooijberg, R., & Lane, N. (2009). Using multisource feedback coaching effectively in executive education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8*(4), 483-493.

Hsia, S., Molvik, D., & Lambie, S. (2012). Systemic Coaching: An OD Strategy Applied to Mergers and Acquisitions. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 12*(3/4), 47-55.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.

Huffington, C. (2007). A contextualized approach to coaching. In H. Brunning (Ed.), *Executive coaching: systems-psychodynamic perspective*. London, UK: Karnac Books Ltd.

Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). *Business Research.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Ibarra, H., Snook, S., & Ramo, L. G. (2010). Identity-based leader development. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook on leadership theory and practice* (pp. 657-678). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

ICF. (2011). The International Coaching Federation. Retrieved 25 February, 2012, from http://www.coachfederation.org/about-icf/

International Coaching Federation. (2012). *2012 ICF Global Coaching Study.*Retrieved from www.coachfederation.org/coachingstudy.

Ives, Y. (2008). What is coaching? An exploration of conflicting paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring*, *6*(2), 100-113.

Janesick, V. J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209–219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jarvempaa, S. L., & Tanriverdi, H. (2003). Leading virtual Knowledge Networks. *Organizational Dynamics, 31*, 403–412.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Dividends & Interest: Coaching Meets the Cross-Cultural Challenge. *Leadership in Action, 26*(5), 23-24.

Jone, R. A., Reafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). The Executive Coaching trend: towards more flexible executives. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(7), 584-596.

Joo, B. K. (2005). Executive coaching: A conceptual framework from an integrative review of practice and research. *Human Resource Development Review*, *4*(4), 462–488.

Kahn, M. S. (2011). Coaching on the Axis: An integrative and systemic approach to business coaching. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 6*,(2), 194-210.

Kampa, S., & White, R. (2002). The effectiveness of executive coaching: What we know and what we still need to know. In R. Lowman (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology: A comprehensive guide to theory, skills, and techniques* (pp. 139-158). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, J. H., & Miller, F. A. (2012). Inclusion: The HOW for the next organizational breakthrough. *Practising Social Change,* 5.

Kauffman, C., & Linley, P. A. (2007). A pragmatic perspective: Putting positive coaching psychology into action *International Coaching Psychology Review, 2*(1), 97 - 102.

Keil, F., Rimmer, E., Williams, K., & Doyle, M. (1996). Coaching at the top. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 67–77.

Kemp, T. (2009). Is coaching an evolved form of leadership? Building a transdisciplinary framework for exploring the coaching alliance. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 4*(1), 105-109.

Kesby, D. (2008). Day-to-day leadership. *Human Resource Management International Digest, 16*, 3-5.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (2004). Organisations on the couch: A clinical perspective on organisational dynamics. *European Management Journal, 2* (2), 183-200.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (2005). Leadership group coaching in action: The Zen of creating high performance teams. *Academy of Management Executive*, *19* (1), 61-76.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (2007). Decoding the team conundrum: The eight roles executives play, *Organizational Dynamics*, *36*(1), 28-44.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (2010). Leadership Coaching and the Rescuer Syndrome: How to manage both sides of the couch. *Academy of management executive*, 24.

Kilburg, R. R. (2000). *Executive Coaching: Developing Managerial Wisdom in a World of Chaos*. New York: American Psychological Association.

Kilburg, R. R. (2001). *Facilitating intervention adherence in executive coaching: A model and methods. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research, 53*(4), 251-267.

Kilburg, R. (2007). Introduction: The historical and conceptual roots of executive coaching. In R.R. Kilburg & R.C. Diedrich (Eds). *The wisdom of coaching: Essential papers in consulting psychology for a world of change* (3-15). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

King, D. R., & Force, U. S. A. (2008). Reducing causal ambiguity in acquisition integration: Intermediate goals as mediators of integration decisions and acquisition performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(4), 744-767.

Kombarakaran, F. A, Yang, J. A, Baker, M. N., & Fernandes, P. B. (2008). Executive coaching: It works! *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(1), 78-90.

Kondracki, N. L., Wellman, N. S., & Amundson, D. R. (2002). Content analysis: review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior, 34*(4), 224-230.

Kotter, J. P. (2007). Complexity theory: The changing role of leadership. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 32*(1), 15-18.

Korotov, K., Florent-Treacy, E. Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Bernard, A. (2011). *Tricky coaching: Difficult cases in leadership coaching*. Hampshire: Palgrave/ Macmillan.

Kozlowski, S.W.J., Watola, D.J., Jensen, J.M., Kim, B.H. & Botero, I.C. (2009). "Developing adaptive teams: a theory of dynamic team leadership", in Salas, E., Goodwin, G.F. and Burke, C.S. (Eds), Team Effectiveness in Complex Organizations: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives and Approaches, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 113-155.

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*, 631–646.

Lee, H. A. (2010). *Racial Inequality and Affirmative Action in Malaysia and South Africa.* PhD Thesis, University of Massachusetts - Amherst, Boston.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002).Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705-717.

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 22(4),* 557.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormond, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: planning and design* (9th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2011). *Practical research: planning and design.* (10th ed.). Upper Saddler River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Le Roux, J.R.J. (2003). *Corporate reputation in the information technology industry: A South African case study*. Masters Dissertation. University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

Levenson, A. (2009). *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(2), 103-121

Levin, I., & Gottlieb, J. (2009). Realigning organization culture for optimal performance: Six principles & eight practices. *Organization Development Journal, 27*(4), 31-46.

Liu, X. & Batt, R. (2010). How supervisors influence performance: a multilevel study of coaching and group management in technology-mediated service. *Personnel Psychology, 63*, (2), 265-298.

Lloyd, B. (2005). Coaching culture and leadership: Team performance Management. *An International Journal, 11*, 133-138.

Lok, P., Westwood, R., & Crawford, J. (2005). Perceptions of organisational subculture and their significance for organisational commitment. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 54*(4), 490-514.

Lobovitz, G.H. (2004). The power of alignment: how the right tools enhance organisational focus. *Business Performance Management*, October: 30–35.

Long, C. (1999). To create value, first understand your client. *Journal of Management Consulting, 10*(4), 12–19.

Maak, T. (2007). Responsible Leadership, Stakeholder Engagement, and the Emergence of Social Capital. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74*, 329–343.

MacKie, D. (2007). Evaluating the effectiveness of executive coaching: Where are we now and where do we need to be? *Australian Psychologist, 42*(4), 310 – 318.

Maner, J. K., & Mead, N. L. (2010). The essential tension between leadership and power: When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(3), 482–497.

Man, S., & Smith, S. (2014). Expanded coaching culture drives results. *Training & Development,*36-41

Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *Leadership Quarterly,* 12, 389-418.

Martins, N & Martins, E. (2003). Organisational culture. In S.P. Robbins, A. Odendaal & G. Roodt Eds). *Organisational behaviour: Global and South African perspectives* (pp. 379-400). Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage Publications Limited

McDermott, M., Levenson, A., & Newton, S. (2007). What coaching can and cannot do for your organization. *Human Resource Planning, 30*(20), 30–37.

McGovern, J., Lindemann, M., Vergara, M., Murphy, S., Barker, L., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2001). Maximizing the impact of executive coaching: Behavioural change, organizational outcomes, and return on investments. *The Manchester Review*, *6*(1), 1–31.

McGregor, J. (2007). The world's most innovative companies, *Business Week Online*, May 4, 9.

McNally, K., & Lukens, R. (2006). Leadership development: an external-internal coaching partnership. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 36*(3), 155.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mertel, T. (2010). Using meaningful coaching for maximum results. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 42(*4), 186-191.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20–52.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Milner, J., Ostmeier, E., & Franke, R. (2013). Critical Incident in Cross-cultural coaching: The view from German coaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring,11*(2), 19-32.

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1990). *In-Depth Interviewing: Researching People*. Hong Kong: Longman Chesire.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of Management, 36*(1), 5-39.

Morton-Williams, J. (1985). Making qualitative research work—aspects of administration. *Applied qualitative research*, 27-44.

Mthembu, M. D. (2010). *The State and Nurture of the Gauteng Department of Education and Progress on Coaching Programme*. Landelahni Group, 2010: Building a Coaching Culture for Change and Excellence.

Mukherjee, S. (2012). Does Coaching Transform Coaches? A Case Study of Internal Coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 10, 2.

Natale, S. M., & Diamante, T. (2005). The Five Stages of Executive Coaching: Better Process Makes Better Practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *59*, 361-374.

Natti, S., & Still, J. (2007). The Influence of Internal Communities of Practice on Customer Perceived Value in Professional Service Relationships. *The Service Industries Journal*, *27*, (7), 893–905.

Nelson, E. & Hogan, R. (2009). Coaching on the dark side. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 4*(1), 9-21.

Neuman, W. L. (2005). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th ed.). Harlow: Allyn & Bacon.

Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Neill, M. B. (2000). *Executive coaching with backbone & heart: A systems approach to engaging leaders with their challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

O'Relly, C.A., Caldwell, D.F., Chatman, J.A., Lapiz, M., & Self, W. (2010). How leadership matters: the effects of leaders' alignment on strategy implementation. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 104–113.

Orenstein, R. L. (2002). Executive Coaching: Its not just about the executive. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 38*(3), 355-374.

Paige, H. (2002). Examining the Effectiveness of Executive Coaching on Executives. *International Education Journal*, *3*(2).

Painter-Morland, M. (2008). Systemic Leadership and the Emergence of Ethical Responsiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*,509–524.

Parker, P., Hall, D. T., & Kram, K. E. (2008). Peer coaching: A relational process for accelerating career learning. *Academy of Management Learning* and *Education, 7*, 487–503.

Passarelli, K., & Van Oosten, E. (2014). Coaching and Positive Emotions-Exploring a Collection of Resources in the Health and Wellness Domain. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 13*(2), 290-292.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods, 2nd ed., Sage Publications Inc, Newbury Park, CA.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. In M. Beyerlein, D. Johnson, & S. Beyerlein (Eds.), Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams (Vol. 7, pp. 115–139). New York, NY: JAI Press.

Pearce, C. L., & Manz, C. C. (2005). The new silver bullets of leadership: The importance of self-and shared leadership inknowledge work. Organizational Dynamics, 34, 130–140.

Pearsall, M.J., Christian, M.S., & Ellis, A.P.J. (2010). Motivating interdependent teams: individuals rewards, shared rewards, or something in between?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(1), 183-191.

Peltier, B. (2010). *The Psychology of Executive Coaching: Theory and Application.* New York: Routledge.

Peterson, D. (2009). Does your coach give you value for your money? *Harvard Business Review*, *1*, 94.

Pittorino, L. (2009). *The relationship between culture, commitment and performance in a South African electricity utility.* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers (2010). Managing people in a changing world. Key trends in human capital — A global perspective. : PriceWaterhouseCoopers Saratoga. (Retrieved on July 2014, from http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/hr-management-services/hr-management-key-trends-in-human-capital.jhtml)

Rashid, ZA, Sambasivan, M & Johari, J. (2003). The influence of corporate culture and organisational commitment on performance. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(8), 708-728

Ratiu, L., & Baban, A. (2012). Executive coaching as a change process: An analysis of the readiness for coaching. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal,16*(1) 139–146.

Raymoned, L. & Croteau, A. (2009). Manufacturing strategy and business strategy in medium-sized enterprises: performance effects of strategic alignment. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *56*(2): 192–202.

Razak, B., & Conkling, W. (2006). Executive Coaching for Diversity: An Opportunity for Leaders to Learn and Change. *Managing Diversity Communications,14*, 2.

Remenyi, D. (2011). *Field Methods for Academic Research – Interviews, Focus Groups and Questionnaires in Business and Management Studies*. Reading: Academic Publishing International Ltd.

Roberts, V.Z., & Jarrett, M. (2006). 'What is the difference & what makes the difference: A comparative study of psychodynamic & non-psychodynamic approaches to executive coaching', in H. Brunning (Ed), *Executive coaching: Systems psychodynamic perspective*. London: Karnac.

Rock, D. & Donde, R. (2007). *Driving organizational change with internal coaching programmes,* Retrieved from www.davidrock.net. Accessed on?

Roman, K. C. (2011). *Assessing talent management within the Western Cape Provincial Treasury (WCPT).* Master of Public Administration thesis, University of Stellenbosch, Cape Town.

Rosing, K., Frese, M. & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadershipinnovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 956-974.

Rostron, S. S. (2009). *Business Coaching Wisdom and Practice: Unlocking the Secrets of Business Coaching.* Knowres Publishers.

Rousseau, V., Aubé, C., & Tremblay, S. (2013).Team coaching and innovation in work teams. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *34*(4), 344 – 364.

Rowe, G., & Nejad, M.H. (2009). Strategic leadership: short-term stability and long-term viability. *Ivey Business Journal, 73*(5), 6–11.

Rubin, I. S., & Rubin, H. J. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* London: Sage.

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandelowski, M. (2000) Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health. 23*(4), 334-340.

Satrya, A., & Parasuraman, B. (2007), 'Partnership as Union Strategy – Does it Work in Asia? Case Studies in Indonesia and Malaysia'. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, *42*(4), 589-616.

Saunder, M., & Lewis, P. (2012). *Doing Research in Business Management: An Essential Guide to Planning Your Project.* Boston: Pearson Education Limited.

Sharma, P. L. (2006). *Adult learning methods*. Sarup Teaching Learning Series, Vol. 22. New Delhi: Sarup.

Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges. The social technology of presencing.* Cambridge, MA: Society for Organisational Learning

Schaifeli, W. B. & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations. In S.W. Gilliland, D.D. Steiner, & D.P. Skarlicki (Eds), *Research in social issues in management* (pp. 135-177). Greenwich, CT.: Information Age Publishers.

Schein, E. H. 1988. *Process consultation,* vol. 1. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E.H. (1999). Process consultation revisited. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. H. (2003). On dialogue, culture, and organisational learning. *Reflections, 4*(4), 27–38.

Schein, E. (2005). Coaching and consultation revisited: Are they the same. In M. Goldsmith, & L. S. Lyons (Eds.), *Coaching for leadership: The Practice of leadership coaching from the world's greatest coaches* (2nd ed., pp. 17-25). Washington DC: Pfeiffer

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 344–354.

Schutt, R. K. (2006). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research.* Thousands Oak: Sage.

Sekerka, L. E., & Chao, J. (2003). Peer coaching as a technique to foster professional development in clinical ambulatory settings. *The Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 23*, 30–37.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Coaching and positive psychology. *Australian Psychologist, 42(4)*, 266-267.

Senge, P. M. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: strategies and tools for building a learning organization.* New York: Currency, Doubleday.

Senge, P. M. (1995). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* Doubleday/Currency, New York, NY.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organisation.* London: Random House.

Serfontein, J.J. (2009). *The impact of strategic leadership on the operational strategy and performance of business organisations in South Africa.* DBM thesis, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch.

Seymour, S. (2008). Boost your business value with succession planning. *Management Services, 52*(1), 37–39.

Shank, G. (2006). Six alternatives to mixed methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(4), 346-356.

Sherman, S., & Freas, A. (2004). The Wild West of Executive Coaching. *Harvard Business Review,* November.

Siddiqi, M. (2014). Job resources as organisational support, organisational citizenship behaviour and customer satisfaction: Some evidences of Linkage. *Journal of Services Research, 13*(2), 95-115.

Simpson, J. (2010). In what ways does coachng contribute to effective leadership development? *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring, 4,* 114-133.

Sinkovics, R. S., Penz, E. & Ghauri, P.N. (2008). Enhancing the trustworthiness of qualitative research in international business. *Management International Review, 48*(6), 689 - 713.

Stacey, R. D. (2011). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics: the challenge of*

complexity to ways of thinking about organisations (6th ed.). New York, NY: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Stake, R. E. (2003). Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 134-164). London: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work.* Guilford: The Guilford Press.

Stahl, G. K., & Voigt, A. (2008). Do cultural differences matter in mergers and acquisitions? A tentative model and examination. *Organization Science*, *19*(1), 160-176.

Stelter, R. (2009). Coaching as a reflective space in a society of growing diversity towards a narrative, postmodern paradigm. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 4, 2.

Stern, L. R. (2004). Executive coaching: A working definition. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *56*(3), 154-162.

Stoker, J. I. (2008). Effects of Team Tenure and Leadership in Self-ManagingTeams. *Personnel Review 37*(5), 564–582.

Storey, J. (2005). What next for strategic-level leadership research? *SAGE Publications*, *1*(1), 89–104.

Srivastava, V.N. (2014). Powerful Leadership &Excellence in Public Enterprises. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 50(1),* 165-179.

Sullivan, E. J., & Decker, P. J. (2009). *Effective leadership and management in nursing.* Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Sundaray, B. K., & Sahoo, CK. (2013). Impact of Strategic Industrial Relations Measures on Quality of Work Life: The Indian Experience. *Employment Relations Record.* 2013, *13(*1), 25-44.

Symes, J. (2010). Phenomenological research: How methodology supports effective research into middle managers perceptions of engagement in coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, *4*, 78.

Tate, W. (2010). "Think, Manager and Lead Systemically'. Business Strategy Review. London Business School: Wiley.

Tate, W. (2013). Managing leadership from a systemic perspective. *Centre for Progressive Leadership, A White Paper, January.*

Terry, P. E., Fowles, J. B., & Harvey, L. (2010). Employee engagement factors that affect enrollment compared with retention in two coaching programs—the ACTIVATE study. *Population health management*, *13*(3), 115-122.

Thomas, D. R. (2003). A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis (School of Population Health): University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Thompson, G. N., Estabrooks, C. A., & Degner, L. F. (2006). Clarifying the concepts in knowledge transfer: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 53*(6), 691–701.

Thornton, C. (2010). *Group and team coaching: the essential guide.* London: Routledge.

Tichy, N. M., & Cardwell, N. (2002). *The Cycle of Leadership: How Great Leaders Teach Their Companies to Win.* New York: Harper Collins.

Tobias, L.L. (1996). Coaching executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *48*(2), 87–95.

Toit, A. D. (2007). Making sense through coaching. *Journal of Management Development*, *26*(3), 282-291.

Tompson, H. B., Bear, D. J., Dennis, D. J., Vickers, M., London, J., & Morrison, C. L. (2008). Coaching: A global study of successful practices. New York: American Management Association (AMA).

Turner, C. (2006) Ungagged: Executives on executive coaching. *Ivey Business Journal*, May/June 2006.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the Social Processes of Leadership and Organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly 17*, 656–676.

Uhl-Bien, M., R. Marion, A & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era. *The Leadership Quarterly 18*(4), 298–318.

Ungerer, M., Pretorius, M., & Herholdt, J. (2007). *Viable Business Strategies.. A systemic people-centric approach.* 2nd updated edition. Johannesburg:Knowledge Publishing (Pty) Ltd.

Quinn, R. E., & Wellman, N. (2011). Seeing and acting differently: Positive change in organizations. In K. S. Cameron & G. M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Van Oosten, E. (2014). *Coaching for Change*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Valerio, A. M., & Deal, J. J. (2011). The client: Who is your coachee and why does it matter? In G. Hernez-Broome & L. A. Boyce (Eds.), *Advancing Executive Coaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Varelas, E. (2014). Talent Wars Rethinking Talent Management for Future Success. *MWorld*, *13*(4), 42-44.

Van Stuyvesant Meijen, J. (2007). The influence of organisational culture on organisational

commitment at a selected local municipality. (Unpublished Master's dissertation). Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Waddell, D. L., & Dunn, N. (2005). Peer coaching: The next step in staff development. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 36*, 84–9.

Waldman, D.A., Javidan, M. & Varella, P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: a new application of upper echelons theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15: 355–380.

Ward, G. (2008). Towards executive change: A psychodynamic group coaching model for short executive programmes. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring, 6*(1), 67-77.

Wardsworth, Y. (2008). Is it safe to talk about systems again yet? Self organ- ising processes for complex living systems and the dynamics of human inquiry. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 21*, 153-170.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic Content Analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Wenger, E. C., & Snyder, W. M. (2000). Communities of practice: the organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(1), 139-45.

Wheelan, S. A. (2003). An initial exploration of the internal dynamics of leadership teams. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 55*(3), 179–188.

Wheeler, S., McFarland, W., & Kleiner, A. (2007). A blueprint for strategic leadership. *Strategy and Business*, *49*, 1–13.

White, B. (2002). *Writing your MBA dissertation.* Cornwall: Thomson Learning.

Williams, D. & Parr, T. (2006). *Enterprise Programme Management: Delivering Value.* Basingstoke;Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, C. (2004). Coaching and coach training in the workplace. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 36*(2), 3, 96.

Wilson, C. (2011). Developing a coaching culture. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. *43*(7), 407 – 414.

Willshire, L. (1999). Workplace Observation: Not Knowing and Coming to Know, *Socio-Analysis*, *1*(2), 191-215.

Witherspoon, R., & White, R. P. (1996). Executive coaching: A continuum of roles. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *48*(2), 124-133.

Wood, P. (2012). Creating a coaching culture. *Human Resources*. December 2011/January 2012.

Wright-Bliss, E. (2013). A crisis of leadership: towards an anti-sovereign ethics of organisation. *A European Review* , *22*(1), 86-101.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yin, R. K. (2010). *Qualitative Research from start to finish.* Guildford:Guildford Press.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:Prentice-Hall.

Zenger, J., & Stinnett, K. (2006). Leadership coaching: Developing effective executives. *Chief Learning Officer, 5*(7), 44-47.

Zeus, P., & Skiffington, S. (2002) *The Coaching at Work Toolkit.* New York:McGraw-Hill.

Zikmund, W.G., Carr, J. C., & Griffin, M. (2010). *Business Research Methods.*Cengage. Brain.com.

APPENDIX A: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Letter to respondents explaining the research

Dear respondent,

Research study

I am completing my Masters in Management in Business and Executive Coaching (MMBEC) through the University of the Witwatersrand, (Wits Business School campus). My research study is aimed at evaluating how is coaching implemented in the systemic development of leadership in organisations.

To explore this research topic, I will be collecting data by means of face to face interviews with selected respondents. It would be helpful if you would be willing to participate in one such interview.

During this interview I would ask you a range of questions on your view of the coaching received and experienced in your organisation. In addition to this, questions on what, in your view, constitutes effective coaching will be discussed.

The interview will remain confidential and the results will be analysed, collated and reported on in a final research report. I would be most grateful if you could assist in this research. I am available to meet with you at your convenience.

Many thanks

Eric Kumkani
0744272768

Kumkanie@yahoo.com

APPENDIX B: DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. Background demographics

Name of participant Date, location and time	
Title Position of participant in organisation (ask for org chart)	
Where they grew up as a child (urban or rural region)	
Where they went to school (geography and institution)	
Number of years working	
Number of years working as a manager (of others)	
Number of years working as a manager of other managers	
Highest level of education	
Qualification From which institution	

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview questions

Name of the interviewee:

Date of the interview:

1. Describe in your own words the coaching intervention that you and the organisation received?
2. What did the coaching intervention intend to achieve within the organisation?
3. How was coaching delivered or rolled out within your organisation?
4. How were the beneficiaries of the intervention selected? Describe the process of the coaching intervention.
5. How was the above approach received by various internal stakeholders?
6. What was the focus of the coaching programme?
7. What value, if any, has the coaching approach added to your organisation?
8. What was the coaching approach/model role in the development of your strategic leadership?
9. How has the organisational system been affected by the coaching intervention within your organisation?
10. How has the coaching intervention impacted on or influenced other organisational human-capital-development and management processes?
11. What, in your view, has changed in respect of how your departments and work teams relate to one another?
12. How has the organisational culture been influenced or impacted by the roll-out of the coaching intervention within your organisation and teams?
13. How would you rate the change in any of your leaders, as result of coaching?
14. Which elements of the coaching intervention that you went through, would you change?
15. Do you have any recommendations on how to improve coaching interventions?

APPENDIX D: Research participants' information document

Name of researcher	Mxolisi Kumkani
Employer	ENC Consulting
Title of research project	Coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations
Purpose of study	To investigate and explore how a coaching intervention assist in the systemic development of leadership in organisations
What is involved and how long will it take?	Participants will be asked to take part in an interview. You will be asked if you are prepared to have a voice recording made of the interview and you may decline to do so. The time required is approximately one hour.
Why have you been asked to participate?	You have been asked to participate due to your participation in coaching in your organisation
What will happen to the information given in the study?	The information will be held in a confidential manner while the work is being collated. Notes, transcripts and recordings will be kept under lock and key
In what way will the study be beneficial and to whom?	It is hoped that this study will provide useful knowledge to executives, HR practitioners and coaches on factors relating to leadership development and establish how coaching can assist
Who has reviewed this study to ensure that it complies with all the requirements and ethical standards of the University?	The Ethics committee at the University of the Witwatersrand have approved this research in proposal form and granted permission for the research to commence.
Can permission be withdrawn having previously been granted?	Yes, all participants retain the right to have their contributions to the research withdrawn at any time prior to the submission of the document.
Can you refuse to answer any question?	Yes. The participant has the right to refuse to answer any question in the interview, and to end the interview at any time

APPENDIX E: Letter of Consent



The Graduate School of Business Administration

2 St David's Place, Parktown,
Johannesburg, 2193,
South Africa
PO Box 98, WITS, 2050
Website: www.wbs.ac.za

Masters of Management RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

Coaching for the systemic development of leadership in organisations

INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM

Who I am

Hello, I am Mxolisi Kumkani. I am conducting research for the purpose of completing my Masters in Management in Business and Executive Coaching at Wits Business School.

What I am doing

I am investigating and exploring a coaching intervention in an organisation that received and experienced both dyadic and systemic coaching for leadership development.

Your participation

I am asking you whether you will allow me to conduct an interview with you. If you agree, I will ask you to participate in one interview for approximately one hour. I am also asking you to give us permission to record the interview. I record interviews so that I can accurately capture what is said and confirm later that my notes are completely accurate.

Please understand that **your participation is voluntary** and you are not being forced to take part in this study. The choice of whether to participate, or not, is yours alone. If you choose not take part, you will not be affected in any way whatsoever. If you agree to participate, you may stop participating in the research at any time (up until the research is submitted) and tell

me that you do not want to go continue. If you do this there will also be no penalties and you will NOT be prejudiced in ANY way.

Confidentiality
Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including my academic supervisor. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.)

All study records will be destroyed after the completion and marking of my research report. I will refer to you by a code number or pseudonym (another name) in the thesis and any further publication.

Risks/discomforts
At the present time, I do not see any risks in your participation. The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life.

Benefits
There are no immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, this study will be extremely helpful to us in understanding how black executives see coaching helping them to develop in being better leaders. If you would like to receive feedback on the study, I can send you the results of the study when it is completed sometime in 2015.

Who to contact if you have been harmed or have any concerns
This research has been approved by the Wits Business School. If you have any complaints about ethical aspects of the research or feel that you have been harmed in any way by participating in this study, please contact the Research Office Manager at the Wits Business School, contact number 011 7173510.

CONSENT
I hereby agree to participate in research on how black executives see coaching helping them to develop in being better leaders. I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced in any way to do so. I also understand that I can stop participating at any point (up to the submission of the research report) should I not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect me negatively.

I understand that this is a research project whose purpose is not necessarily to benefit me personally in the immediate or short term.

I understand that my participation will remain confidential.

.....
Signature of participant Date:.....

I hereby agree to the -recording of my participation in the study.

.....
Signature of participant Date:.....

Turnitin Originality Report
MMBECRESEARCHREPORT1STTURNITINATTEMPT4SEPTEMBER 2015.doc by Eric Kumkani
From Research Reports (S4ut3mQQHBVPbLE63zvynA6N7y6q3k0W7CO3hkW2j964jCSY9U928w7j6kdlHF4ea1nOL7dMIytEK1i8YH8y5fCb46BtDrO16yr)

- Processed on 4-Sept-2015 3:28 PM SAST
- ID: 522513482
- Word Count: 42891

Similarity Index
10%
Similarity by Source
Internet Sources:
2%
Publications:
2%
Student Papers:
10%

sources:

1

8% match (student papers from 18-May-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-05-18

2

1% match (student papers from 19-Jul-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-07-19

3

< 1% match (publications)

4

< 1% match (student papers from 02-May-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-05-02

5

< 1% match (student papers from 21-Nov-2014)
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2014-11-21

6

< 1% match (student papers from 09-May-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-05-09

7

< 1% match (Internet from 15-Aug-2011)
http://www.citeulike.org/user/pigironjoe/tag/organisational_development

8

< 1% match (student papers from 20-Feb-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-02-20

9

< 1% match (student papers from 30-Apr-2013)
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2013-04-30

10

< 1% match (student papers from 21-Jan-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-01-21

11

< 1% match (Internet from 30-May-2011)
http://www.denisonconsulting.com/resources/ResourcesbyTopic/LeadershipDevelopmentResources.aspx

12

< 1% match (student papers from 30-Apr-2013)
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2013-04-30

13

< 1% match (Internet from 06-Nov-2014)
http://thestrategygroup.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/From-GROW-to-GROUP-theoretical-issues-and-a-practical-model-for-group-coaching-in-organisations-2010.pdf

14

< 1% match (student papers from 13-Sep-2012)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2012-09-13

15

< 1% match (Internet from 26-May-2009)
http://eprints.usq.edu.au/698/2/02whole_Dissertation_March6_2006.pdf

16

< 1% match (Internet from 02-May-2010)
http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/documents/06/003/MDS/DISSERTATIONS/N%20Mayanga.pdf

17

< 1% match (student papers from 18-Feb-2013)
Submitted to University of Witwatersrand on 2013-02-18

18

< 1% match (student papers from 05-Nov-2014)
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2014-11-05

19

< 1% match (student papers from 15-Mar-2013)
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2013-03-15

20

< 1% match (Internet from 24-Jan-2013)
http://www.stclements.edu/grad/gradabdu.pdf

21

< 1% match (Internet from 16-Sep-2012)
http://www.new-oceans.co.uk/coaching/corporate-coaching.htm