EXECUTIVE COACH SELECTION: DOES
PERSONALITY PLAY A ROLE?

by

Grant M. Batchelor

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Industrial-Organizational Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University
August 2016

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Mark Frame, Chair

Dr. Michael Hein

Dr. Judith Van Hein

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, and foremost, I want to raise all of the honor and glory of this thesis and my graduate education to God. If it were not for his provision and guidance in my life, I would not be where I am today. Completing this thesis was one of the most challenging experiences of my life and I am grateful for the perseverance with which God equipped me in order to endure and come out a better researcher, writer, and student. I also will be forever grateful for my amazing wife, Becky, and the support she constantly gave me throughout this process. Becky was a blessing during times of stress as she constantly encouraged me to do my best work. I am also indebted to her for her financial support as she worked two jobs tirelessly for two years to ensure that the bills were paid while I was in school.

Next, I must thank my family, for all of the hard work they put forth so that I could pursue my dreams. Mom, you have sacrificed anything you ever wanted in life to ensure my needs were met and taught me how to love endlessly. Dad, you taught me what a hard day's work is and have instilled a strong work ethic in me. Brendan, you have taught me what perseverance looks like and I wish to model you in that way all the days of my life. I also want to thank my stepparents and step siblings who have always supported me and welcomed me into their family from day one.

Throughout my two years as a student at MTSU, I came across many wonderful people and I am grateful for their support and guidance. Thank you to Dr. Kim Sokoya for offering to assist me in my thesis from day one and making every effort to provide me with high quality participants. Thank you to Dr. Eric Klumpe for always having your door open for me and teaching me how to navigate school, work, and marriage. Thank

ABSTRACT

Little research has been done on the antecedents of Executive Coaching from the perspective of the client. Using an online research platform, this study investigated two potential antecedents to an Executive Coaching engagement: 1) The educational credentials of an Executive Coach and 2) The personality profile of a potential coaching client. Participants either were enrolled in an MBA program, alumni of an MBA program, or working in a managerial role at the time of participation. The HEXACO-PI-R was used to measure the personality profiles of participants (Ashton & Lee, 2009). Educational credentials of a coach were not found to influence the selection of a coach alone, but rather were influenced by the gender of the coach. Various personality factors were found to predict a participant's ratings and selection of a coach. Limitations, areas for future research, and the implications of the current research are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Successful companies have effective leaders and research has revealed that

leadership is not innate; rather it is something that can be developed within someone

(Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959; Chemers, 1997). It takes focus and determination for a

person to become a leader in an organization; however, focus and determination is often

not sufficient. That is why many high potential leaders in today's workplace take

advantage of opportunities for leadership development. Leadership development can be

the result of many different experiences, whether through developmental assignments as

a part of their job, feedback-intensive programs, formal training, or developmental

relationships (McCauley, Kanaga & Lafferty, 2010). Of these approaches to leadership

development, the use of developmental relationships, most notably leadership coaching,

is becoming a common way for organizations to develop their leaders. A more commonly

used term for leadership coaching is executive coaching. For our purposes, executive

coaching will be defined as "a one-on-one relationship with the purpose to change

behavior through learning to improve organizational effectiveness by setting goals to

achieve the desired results" (Schutte & Steyn, 2015). Additionally, throughout the

following pages the terms *leader*, *client*, *executive*, and *participant* will be used

interchangeably when referring to the client, or the person receiving coaching.

In the past two decades the use of executive coaching has grown significantly, as

evidenced in part by the International Coaching Federation (ICF) membership growing

from about 2,100 members in 1999 to more than 20,000 members in 2014 (ICF, 2014). In

2003, *The Economist* estimated that executive coaching had a market value of one billion

dollars. What's more, each year the market for executive coaching includes nearly half of Fortune's top 500 companies, which allocate money for providing their employees with an Executive Coach (Battley, 2007). What was once seen as remedial attention to executives that were one mistake from being kicked to the curb is now seen as a status symbol for "high potential" employees (Andrews, 2007; Elmer, 2011; McKenna, 2009; Reeves, 2006). Coaching has been identified as a way to: prepare high potential employees for the next step in their career; increase the chances that a recently promoted executive will have success; assist top executives in the development of management skills, leadership skills and behavioral issues; and improve the overall outcomes of their employees (Lewis, 2002; Rein, 2013). While the use of executive coaching is at an all-time high, there seems to be more questions than answers with regards to if coaching works, why coaching works, and how coaching works.

Relative to its widespread use, very little research has been done in the field of executive coaching (Lowman, 2005; Grant, 2011). Prior to the year 2000, very little research had been conducted on the topic of coaching. This led researchers to look to similar fields from which the coaching process could be modeled. The characteristics of coaching are much like that of counseling and this comparison has led to an extensive amount of research designated to delineating the coaching process from the counseling process (de Haan, Duckworth, Birch, & Jones, 2013; Del Giudice, Yanovsky, & Finn, 2014; Passmore, Holloway & Rawle-Cope, 2010). The practices and methods of coaches are similar to that of therapists, by using testing and measurement at the start of the engagement and maintaining a collaborative and inferential focus to the relationship rather than relying solely on facts in order to provide a prescriptive solution (Del Giudice

et al., 2014; Passmore et al., 2010). With a well-researched field to compare practices to, coaching research has been able to broaden and deepen in the past decade.

By identifying that there are similarities between the practices of psychotherapy and executive coaching, Davis and McKenna made inferences in applying the "active ingredients" of therapy to the field of coaching (McKenna & Davis, 2009). One of the active ingredients can be explained as the individual differences a client brings to coaching. A comprehensive review of research on therapy outcomes suggests that approximately forty percent of the variance in outcomes of therapy is a result of factors that are external to the therapy session, which includes the individual differences of the client (Asay & Lambert, 1999). Relating this information to the field of coaching, researchers understand that it is likely that the individual characteristics of a person have a similar impact on the outcomes of executive coaching. One model of the coaching process identifies that when preparing for a leader to receive coaching, organizations will provide their leader with a choice between a few coaches (Wycherley & Cox, 2007). In having a choice, the leader must distinguish what they would prefer in a coach. These preferences might be rooted in the individual differences of the leader, such as the leader's personality. Currently, there is no research to support this inference. The current research explored the relationship between a leader's personality and their perceptions of various coaches and their choice of coach they would work with, if given the opportunity.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The utilization of executive coaching in businesses has skyrocketed in recent years; however, coaching is a field where the practice is well ahead of the research. This has led to concerns about what type of practices are ahead of the research and whether or not these exemplify best practices in executive coaching. As the practice of coaching increased in utilization in the 1990s, the research followed suit in order to address concerns of invalidated methodology that practitioners were implementing at a growing rate. To put this increase in research into perspective, from 1937 through 1994 only 50 peer-reviewed articles were published regarding executive coaching, yet from 1995 through 2010 there were 584 articles published (Grant, 2011). With such an increase in research on the topic, various approaches to the research have been taken including: 1) seeking to identify the characteristics of a coach, 2) the purposes of a coach, 3) the level of involvement of the coach, the client and the organization in the process, 4) the common techniques/methods of coaching, and 5) the overall effectiveness/outcomes of coaching. The topic of coaching outcomes is the most discussed topic in the aforementioned coaching research where Grant (2011) found 234 outcome studies since the year 1980, as organizations want to make sure that the significant investment they are making in sending their executives to coaching is worth it. Overall, it has been determined that executive coaching is in fact an effective practice in performance improvement of the clients that receive coaching (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001).

Coaching Effectiveness

 While the research on coaching to this point is limited, there has been much research on the effectiveness of various coaching practices. Given the amount of money spent on coaching each year, it is understandable why determining whether executive coaching is effective, and if so to what magnitude, has been a primary concern to researchers and practitioners alike. As previously mentioned, the first and most common way that research on the topic has drawn conclusions is through surveying both coaches and clients on their reactions to coaching and beliefs about the outcomes of coaching. Along with reactions to coaching, research has sought to measure the impact of coaching practices, through individual performance on the job and the return on investment of coaching.

 The measurement of coaching effectiveness has proven to be one of the more difficult aspects of research on executive coaching. Many studies have measured coaching effectiveness by surveying client satisfaction and perceptions of effectiveness. The findings of this research were largely positive revealing that clients are often satisfied with their coaching experience and believe that the coaching did in fact improve their abilities as an executive (Evers, Browers & Tomic, 2006; Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999; Kombarakaran, Yang, Baker & Fernandes, 2008; Bersin, 2007). This information is beneficial to the field; however, it does not reveal the actual results of coaching on performance improvement. Executive Coaching is much like training in its traditional sense; the primary difference being that coaching is a one-on-one interaction. Given the similarities to training, it is natural to acknowledge that the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation is a useful tool in determining the various ways to measure

coaching outcomes (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). It is worth noting that these level-one reactions to coaching are a vital first step in moving toward effective coaching practices.

Unfortunately, the majority of coaching evaluation studies look at level-one reactions. However, there is some research that seeks to measure learning (level two), behavior (level three), and/or results (level four) (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). In seeking to evaluate the effectiveness of coaching beyond level one, Nieminen, Smerek, Kotrba, and Denison (2013) measured the ratings that direct reports, peers and supervisors gave the leader on various performance dimensions across time. There were two groups: the control group, which participated in a feedback workshop, and the experimental group, which participated in the feedback workshop and then proceeded to receive several sessions of coaching afterwards. Researchers found that the change in ratings that direct reports, peers, and supervisors provided changed similarly in the control group and the experimental group. They also measured the leader's perceptions over time, finding that leaders that received coaching had a significantly larger increase in self-ratings over time. These findings suggest that coaching is viewed in a positive light by participants of a coaching intervention; however, there are not clear business results from coaching.

Despite the mixed results of the effectiveness of coaching as rated by self and others discussed above, research has also been conducted to determine the financial results of coaching, also known as return on investment or ROI. Both Anderson (2002) and Phillips (2007) conducted studies within organizations to determine the financial impact coaching had for that specific company. Anderson worked with a company that

was identified as a Fortune 500 company and Phillips worked with Nations Hotel Corporation, one of the larger hotel firms with locations in fifteen different countries. Each of the studies found a significant return on investment, as Anderson found an ROI of 529%, and Phillips found an ROI of 221%. These two studies are able to bolster the limited amount of research that suggests that coaching is an effective practice; however, there is still much work to be done in order to provide sound evidence that coaching is as effective as believed.

Current Issues in Research

It is encouraging to see the foundation of research on executive coaching quickly being built, but the field clearly still lacks consistency in its use of executive coaching (MacKie, 2014; Peterson, 2011). Given the lack of consistency in the practice of coaching, it is the hope of researchers that the research on coaching will identify some best practices for coaching moving forward. The unfortunate truth is that it can be difficult to come across research on coaching with sound methodology and effective methods for measuring coaching outcomes. This has surfaced concerns about what we actually know about coaching and how current research will allow us to move forward in identifying coaching best practices and the performance measurement of these best practices.

Although the research on executive coaching is growing rapidly, the usefulness of the results raises concerns when making inferences about the practice of coaching. One of the primary concerns of the current research on coaching is that very few studies can be considered a true experiment, a study that has a control group. In Grant's (2011) annotated bibliography, 234 outcome studies were reported, however only 25 of these

studies used a between-subjects design, while the majority of the studies were only case studies. Without a control group, it is difficult to determine if the coaching intervention led to improvement or if there was an external influence, in which case a control group would likely indicate such extraneous variables to the researcher. Without a control group, the results are left to the interpretation of the researcher.

Along with not being able to accurately measure the impact coaching has on a leader, much of the research evaluates perceived effectiveness. As mentioned previously, perceived effectiveness has limits to its accuracy. The research on perceived effectiveness varies in the source from which the perceptions come; in both cases, cognitive dissonance can affect the accuracy of the ratings. When a coach is asked to rate their perceived effectiveness of the coaching they provided to a leader, they are more inclined to rate it as positive given that they are the person who was supposed to help the leader. From the perspective of the leader, when asked to rate the effectiveness of the coaching they just spent months receiving, they are also likely to rate the coaching as effective. Thus, the results of a study that measures perceived effectiveness may not actually identify an effective coaching intervention or at the very least, it is difficult to draw such conclusions.

A point that cannot be over-emphasized is the fact that the research on coaching is still in the very early stages. It is easy to identify flawed research, and the flaws should be identified in order to improve the research. In the past twenty years, much has been done in order to improve the research on executive coaching. These current flaws in the coaching research will lead to future improvements in the techniques for research and the background knowledge needed in order to make such improvements. Recent

developments in research have begun to carve a new direction for the advancement of research in executive coaching. The current research study seeks to move in this new direction, now that there is evidence that coaching is effective, and seeks to begin exploring the antecedents of coaching.

New Direction in Research

Much of the research on coaching has remained surface level, with findings that clients believe that coaching is an effective method for developing and improving leaders and that organizations that invest money into coaching see greater financial gains than companies that do not. With this knowledge, it is important to focus the current research on determining the antecedents of such positive outcomes of coaching.

To begin searching for the antecedents of successful coaching, it is worth examining the process of coaching to determine the aspects of coaching that are likely to be influential on the outcomes of such an intervention. As previously mentioned, much research has been done to reveal that the process of executive coaching is very similar to that of psychotherapy. With that in mind, McKenna and Davis (2009) related the active ingredients of psychotherapy to the executive coaching relationship. McKenna and Davis (2009) extended the previous research that revealed similarities in practice between therapists and coaches by looking beyond the differences and similarities between coaches and counselors and instead delineated the actual processes. They explain how the four "active ingredients" of psychotherapy practice (Client/extratherapeutic factors, the therapeutic relationship, expectancy, hope and placebo effects, and theory and techniques) can be applied to executive coaching based on current practice and research in the field (McKenna & Davis, 2009). This application of the "active ingredients" to

executive coaching has helped practitioners better understand the likely components and antecedents of a successful coaching engagement.

The greatest contributor to the variance in the outcomes of psychotherapy is the client/extratherapeutic factors that are brought to the therapy sessions. In applying this to executive coaching, we can understand that the primary cause for a successful or unsuccessful coaching experience lies in the individual differences that the client bring to the coaching sessions. These differences are rooted in the client and the client's environment; the individual differences in the client are of interest to the current research. These client factors can be described as the unique personal characteristics of a client that affect the experiences of a client, such as the client's personality. Such personal characteristics not only influence the actual process, but also the experiences that precede the actual coaching process.

The Leadership Coaching Model

With an understanding that executive coaching is an effective practice for developing upper-level talent in an organization, it is worth considering the antecedents to a coaching relationship. One of the more under-researched areas of executive coaching is the process of hiring a coach. Sometimes, the leader pursues a coach on his or her own time. More often, however, organizations initiate the relationship on behalf of the leader, because either they see high potential in the leader or they see derailing characteristics in the leader. The organization will either contract out an external coach or, less frequently, utilize a coach that works within the organization. When contracting coaches externally, organizations will vet a handful of coaches and identify a few coaches that match the needs of the leader that will receive the coaching (Peterson, 2011). They will then allow

the leader to select which coach they would like to work with. This part of the coaching

relationship is where the current research will focus, by seeking to identify what

influences a leader to select a certain coach.

In their book, *Advancing Executive Coaching*, Boyce and Hernez-Broome

(editors) begin with an introduction that reflects upon the state of coaching and

introduces their Leadership Coaching Framework. The Leadership Coaching Framework

follows a systems theory approach, whereby the coaching lifecycle is explained with an

input-process-output (I-P-O) model. This type of model breaks down the coaching

engagement by identifying and describing a) the input, or what is brought to the coaching

relationship, b) the process, or the relationship itself, and c) the output, or the results of

the relationship (Boyce & Hernez-Broome, 2011).

The input of the Leadership Coaching Framework includes the characteristics of

both the coach and the client. The characteristics of relevance to the coaching relationship

include the readiness, motivation, and personality of both the coach and the client.

Readiness of both the coach and the client is important and includes the coach's level of

experience, their competencies, and their coaching philosophies, as well as the client's

experience, skills and needs. Additionally, the client and the coach bring a certain level of

motivation to the coaching engagement as well as their unique personality styles and

preferences. Following the input is the coaching process, which includes the mechanics

of the coaching engagement, the program content, the relationship, and the tools and

techniques used during coaching. Finally, leading to the outcomes of coaching which

includes the reactions to coaching, the learning that took place, the ability to demonstrate

skills learned, and the impact on the invested organizations.

In consideration of this I-P-O structure, the coaching relationship is moderated by many things, three of the more consistent and vital moderators are the support of the coach's and the client's organization, the match between the coach and the client, and the method of coaching used (face-to-face, technology use, or blended). These three components affect the process and subsequently the result of the coaching engagement.

Although each of the previously mentioned moderators has a large impact on the success of the coaching relationship, the current research seeks to focus on the fit between the coach and the client. The fit between the coach and the client is vital to the outcome of the coaching engagement (Hall et al., 1999; Boyce & Hernez-Broome, 2011). In psychotherapy, the relationship between the therapist and client is said to account for 30 to 54 percent of the variance in psychotherapy outcomes (McKenna & Davis, 2009). McKenna and Davis (2009) go on to explain how this research can be applied to the value of the relationship in a coaching engagement between the coach and the client. When done appropriately, by using robust standards and criteria for the objective selection of a coach for a client, matching coaches to clients can reap benefits for the outcome of a coaching engagement (Wycherley & Cox, 2008). Overall, research has found that the match between a coach and client is an important contributing factor to the success of a coaching relationship, thus supporting the Leadership Coaching Framework.

Within the coach-client match section of the Leadership Coaching Framework, Boyce and Hernez-Broome (2011) identify "personality preferences, areas of common interest or experience, and a coach's experience and capabilities relative to a client's developmental needs" as three factors for practitioners to consider when matching coaches with clients. In the investigation of fit between a client and coach, the current

research will specifically seek to identify the preferences that clients have for certain

coaches and identify whether the personality profile of the client is related to these

preferences. To date, there is no research on this aspect of the matching process.

Research has been conducted that has revealed that clients and coaches should not be

matched for their similarities or differences in personality, however the impact that

personality has on a client's preference of various coaching candidates has not been

researched. The current research will assist the field in understanding if/how a client's

personality impacts the process of matching a coach with a client.

Personality

Before discussing the role that personality might play in the coach-client

relationship, a brief overview of personality and the relevant constructs will be presented.

Personality is something that differs from person to person, but within one person,

personality is relatively stable over time. In the last century, measurement of personality

has developed rapidly as psychologists begin to pinpoint the best ways to measure one's

personality by identifying specific personality traits. Personality traits have been studied

rigorously and models have been developed to explain the different traits within one's

personality.

Since being revealed in the early 1990s, the Five-Factor Model (FFM) has been a

widely accepted model for personality (Funder, 2001; Gurven, von Rueden, Massenkoff,

Kaplan & Vie, 2013). The FFM contains five personality factors (i.e. traits or

dispositions), which are Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism,

and Openness to Experience. A person high in extraversion is comfortable talking with

others and enjoys social situations and friendships. A person high in agreeableness

believes in the good of all people, cares for the welfare of others, and demonstrates respect to others. A person high in conscientiousness attends to the details, maintains an organized schedule, and has a plan and prepares for that plan. A person high in neuroticism is often dissatisfied with their self, panics over minor issues, and is easily irritated. A person high in openness to experience appreciates the beauty and detail of art, considers change to be a good thing, and has a good understanding of abstract ideas (Goldberg, 1992). While this model is the most reliable and valid measure to date, research has found that, when used cross-culturally, there is a sixth personality factor found through factor analysis, which suggests that the FFM may not be an effective measure of personality on a global level (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, Di Blas, Boies & De Raad, 2004).

Currently the most reliable six-factor personality model is the HEXACO Personality Inventory – Revised (Thalmayer, Saucier & Eigenhuis, 2011). The HEXACO Model, a name based on the number of factors and the names of each factor in the model, includes Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience as the six personality factors in the model (Lee & Ashton, 2004). In the HEXACO Model extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are nearly identical to these factors within the FFM. The remaining three factors present the differences from the well-established FFM. The most notable difference is the addition of the Honesty/Humility factor, in which a person high in honesty/humility does not seek to exploit others, follows the rules, and does not make decisions based on the personal gain that could result. In addition, the emotionality factor in the HEXACO Model differs from that of the neuroticism factor in the FFM. The

HEXACO exclusively uses intra-personal measures of emotion with the emotionality factor, while the FFM measures both intra- and inter-personal measures of emotion within the neuroticism factor. Additionally, neuroticism is reverse scored, whereas emotionality is not. The interpersonal measures of emotion can be measured in the HEXACO through the agreeableness factor, something that is not included in the agreeableness factor of the FFM. In summary, the FFM includes social and emotional facets in both the neuroticism and agreeableness factors, yet the HEXACO Model measures social facets with the agreeableness factor and the personal emotions with the emotionality factor (Dinger, Dickhaeuser, Hilbig, Mueller, Steinmayr & Wirthwein, 2015). As previously stated, these differences have been found to have greater reliability in cross-cultural studies.

Digging into the role that personality plays in the coaching engagement, many researchers have adamantly spoken against using personality to match clients (Peterson, 2011; Wycherley & Cox, 2008). Wycherley and Cox (2008) go on to further explain that personality tests can be a valuable tool in the coaching process itself as well as in research, however personality tests are not a direct reflection on a person's true personality, "but rather a clue to existing tendencies." The authors suggest that personality should not be used for the purposes of matching or selecting a coach for a specific client. This notion speaks directly to the use of matching a coach with a client based upon each of their personalities. However, this does not seek to explain the role that personality may have in a client being more "attracted" to certain characteristics in a coach. This is the direction of the current research.

Coach Personality

Within the coaching relationship is the individual role of the coach. A second definition of coaching can be defined as "a one-on-one relationship between a coach and a client, in which they identify the client's strengths and areas for development, implement a plan for accomplishing the identified goals, and track progress throughout the coaching engagement" (Kilburg, 1996). This interaction often is a very personal relationship in which the coach must point out the flaws of the client in hopes that the client will respond positively and seek further advice from the coach on how to improve. Thus, the personality of the coach can influence how the coach discusses strengths and weaknesses with the client. As valuable as this idea is, research on the personality types of executive coaches found little variability as the majority of coaches are idealists or rationalists (Passmore et al., 2010). Therefore, matching clients with coaches based solely on a coach's personality profile would be poor practice.

Client Personality

The variability in personality profiles of clients is believed to be larger than that of coaches and thus begs for discussion on how this may affect the matching of a coach to a client. This topic, in fact, raises many of its questions through the term coachability. A client's personality is likely to affect their relationship with a coach based on their comfort with the coach, their acceptance of feedback, and their level of engagement in the coaching (Boyajian & Colarelli, 2015). A client's level of coachability is seen to have a direct influence their perceptions of coaching as well as the outcomes of the coaching engagement. In more of a direct application, Jones, Woods, and Hutchinson (2014) found that executives that measure high in extraversion respond more positively to coaching

than executives that are introverted (or low in extraversion), while none of the remaining Big-Five personality factors were found to be significantly correlated to perceived coaching effectiveness. The authors of this study explain that the minimal correlations may be a result of more things influencing perceived effectiveness than simply the executive's personality. The personality of clients may also influence the perceptions that clients have regarding the qualifications and credibility of a coach. While several writers have discussed the credentialing and credibility of executive coaches, the views published heretofore rarely take into account the perceptions of coaching clients.

Coach Credibility

There is much (and often surprising) variability in the education and training of Executive Coaches. It can be said that Executive Coaching has little professional standardization, no regulation, and no education requirements. Coaching certification programs abound and the background of Executive Coaches in today's workplace are varied. Hollenbeck (2004) found that one organization offered the coaching services from coaches with Doctoral degrees in Psychology, Doctoral degrees in Systems Engineering, Master's degrees in Social Work, Master's degree in Future Studies, and a Bachelor's degree in Japanese Studies. Another report noted that drama instructors were getting in on Executive Coaching (Judge & Cowell, 1997). Some have argued that the psychologists are "uniquely qualified" to serve as coaches (Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn, 1998; p. 40) and others have gone so far as to argue that I/O Psychologists are even more suited for such roles (Harris 1999). The extent to which the educational background of a coach affects the results they achieve is largely unknown.

One study of 2,231 coaches found that coaches with different educational backgrounds do approach coaching differently (Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008). The same study also revealed that coaches with a background in Psychology are more likely to be hired by organizations to coach the organization's employees. Coaches with backgrounds in education, business, and other fields are more likely to be hired by the individuals seeking to be coached (Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008). Coaches with a background in psychology are also less likely to be concerned with certifications and are less likely to attend coaching related seminars and workshops than are coaches from other disciplines (Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008). Similarly, Bono, Purvanova, Towler, and Peterson (2009), in surveying current coaches, found that the majority of coaches with a PhD have formal education in psychology as opposed to non-psychology degrees. Additionally, they found that there are not significant differences in the quality of a coach based on their educational background (psychologists vs. non-psychologists), but rather this difference in education merely affects their approach to coaching, which differs between psychologists and non-psychologists.

The extent to which clients are concerned with the educational background of a coach has largely been unexplored. In one survey, of 87 executives that had been coached, 82% of respondents reported that having "graduate training in psychology" was one criteria in choosing a coach (Wasylyshyn, 2003; p. 97). The preferences of the executives in the aforementioned study, however, may not translate to general impressions about coaching. An examination of seventy-two popular press and academic literature articles related to coaching found that Psychology is not generally or regularly recognized as relevant or pertinent to the field of coaching (Garman, Whiston, &

Zlatoper, 2000). Thus, the impact that a coach's background might have on a client's perceptions of her or his credibility is not fully understood.

The Present Study

To this point, the research on executive coaching has grown significantly, yet there are still many areas of coaching that need further exploration. One of the more popular areas of research currently is the exploration of the antecedents to a coaching relationship. Once these antecedents have been identified, researchers will be able to determine the impact of such antecedents on the outcomes of coaching. The relationship between the coach and the client is critical to the success of the coaching engagement in a similar fashion to that of a psychotherapeutic relationship between a therapist and client (McKenna & Davis, 2009). In some cases, the relationship begins with the client selecting a coach they wish to work with. The current research seeks to explore the antecedent of coach selection and hopes to reveal whether a client's choice of a coach is impacted by the personality of the client.

In the current research, clients will be able to select coaches with differing education levels. The first two research questions seek to determine if clients believe that coaches with different educational degrees would serve them well as a coach. Thus, the researchers seek to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Does the educational background of an Executive Coach impact participants' ratings of the Executive Coach?

   *RQ1a: Does the educational background of an Executive Coach impact participants' ratings of the Executive Coach's **experience**?*

RQ1b: Does the educational background of an Executive Coach impact participants' ratings of the Executive Coach's **effectiveness***?*

RQ1c: Does the educational background of an Executive Coach impact participants' ratings of the Executive Coach's **qualifications***?*

RQ2: Does the educational background of an Executive Coach impact participants' selection of an Executive Coach?

The present study will then seek to determine if a client's personality traits will impact their view of an Executive Coach and her/his experience, effectiveness, and qualifications. Similarly, the current study will determine if there are personality traits that make a client more or less likely to hire a coach for their own development.

RQ3: Does the participant's personality (HEXACO scores) impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

RQ3a: Does a participant's Honesty-Humility score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

RQ3a-i: Does a participant's Honesty-Humility score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience***?*

RQ3a-ii: Does a participant's Honesty-Humility score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness***?*

RQ3a-iii: Does a participant's Honesty-Humility score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications***?*

RQ3b: Does a participant's Emotionality score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

RQ3b-i: Does a participant's Emotionality score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience***?*

RQ3b-ii: Does a participant's Emotionality score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness***?*

RQ3b-iii: Does a participant's Emotionality score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications***?*

RQ3c: Does a participant's Extraversion score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

RQ5a-i: Does a participant's Extraversion score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience***?*

RQ5a-ii: Does a participant's Extraversion score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness***?*

RQ5a-iii: Does a participant's Extraversion score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications***?*

RQ3d: Does a participant's Agreeableness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

RQ6a-i: Does a participant's Agreeableness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience***?*

RQ6a-ii: Does a participant's Agreeableness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness***?*

RQ6a-iii: Does a participant's Agreeableness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications***?*

RQ3e: Does a participant's Conscientiousness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

    *RQ7a-i: Does a participant's Conscientiousness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience**?*

    *RQ7a-ii: Does a participant's Conscientiousness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness**?*

    *RQ7a-iii: Does a participant's Conscientiousness score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications**?*

RQ3f: Does a participant's Openness to Experience score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

    *RQ8a-i: Does a participant's Openness to Experience score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **experience**?*

    *RQ8a-ii: Does a participant's Openness to Experience score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **effectiveness**?*

    *RQ8a-iii: Does a participant's Openness to Experience score impact their ratings of an Executive Coach's **qualifications**?*

RQ4: Does the participant's personality (HEXACO scores) impact their ratings of an Executive Coach?

    RQ4a: Does a participant's Honesty-Humility score impact their selection of an Executive Coach?

    RQ4b: Does a participant's Emotionality score impact their selection of an Executive Coach?

RQ4c: Does a participant's Extraversion score impact their selection of an

Executive Coach?

RQ4d: Does a participant's Agreeableness score impact their selection of an

Executive Coach?

RQ4e: Does a participant's Conscientiousness score impact their selection of an

Executive Coach?

RQ4f: Does a participant's Openness to Experience score impact their selection

of an Executive Coach?

The current research will be the first of many steps in improving the coach selection process. The results of this research will not provide practitioners with a map on how to match coaches to clients based on the client's personality profile. Rather, it will begin to reveal the relationship between a client's personality profile and their preferences regarding the education level of coach that they believe would best help them to develop their skills as a leader and/or an executive.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants and Method

A total of 184 participants began the study, however only 159 participants

completed all portions of the study relevant to the current research, which included

completing the HEXACO, evaluating all four profiles presented, and choosing a coach

that they would work with if given the opportunity. Given that the focus of the current

study was on the relationship between the education of the coach and the perceptions of

participants, the researchers wanted to ensure that participants were attentive to the

education of each of the coach profiles. Participants were screened out if they failed to

answer the education manipulation check item correctly for all four of the coach profiles;

this led to 25 participants being excluded from the analyses (see Appendix J, item 2).

This resulted in 134 responses that were included in the data analyses.

The participant pool was diverse and included current students and alumni of

MBA programs and managers that worked full-time within an organization. Participants

were invited to participate in the study via email, social media, and through a panel that

was recruited via Qualtrics. None of the participants, who were current students, was

offered the opportunity to earn course credit for their participation. However, the

participants that were recruited via the Qualtrics Panel were provided compensation for

their participation through Qualtrics in the form of "points" which they could redeem for

gift cards, sky miles, etc.

The present study is one part of a larger research project that examined three

different potential antecedents of coach selection. The larger study sought to examine the

personality of the participant, the gender of the participant, and the motivation of the participant. These antecedents will be evaluated in relation to the level of education of the coach (Master's vs. Ph.D.), the gender of the coach (male vs. female), and the method of coaching used by the coach (in-person vs. over the phone). The current research, however, focused solely on the relationship between the personality of a client and the client's beliefs about potential coaches as they relate to the level of education of the coach. Given this, at times the design of the present study was dictated by the larger research project.

Participants were directed to an online study administered via Qualtrics, an online research system. Upon arriving at the study's website, participants reviewed information about the study including the purpose, procedure, potential risks and benefits, and confidentiality of results (see Appendix A). Participants were then asked to provide electronic consent to participate in the study as well as indicate whether or not they are 18 years or older. Only participants that consented to participate in the study and indicated that they were at least 18 years of age were eligible to participate in the study. Any participants that failed to meet either of these contingencies were informed that they were not eligible to participate and were redirected to the end of the survey.

In the first part of the study, participants were asked to complete the 60-item HEXACO Personality Inventory - Revised (Ashton & Lee, 2009), along with other self-report measures. At the conclusion of the first part of the study, participants were asked how familiar they were with Executive Coaching. Regardless of their level of familiarity with Executive Coaching, participants were provided information explaining what Executive Coaching is and the various activities in which Executive Coaches engage.

Once the participant completed this section, they were directed to the coach evaluation

portion of the study.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions, which varied

based on each of the variables being used in the larger research project. As previously

mentioned the educational background of the Executive Coaches was the variable of

interest in the current research and as such, the profiles that were presented to participants

varied in the highest level of education attained by the coach. For each condition,

participants were randomly presented with four different fictitious coach profiles, one at a

time. Educational background was a dichotomous variable of which two coaches had

both a Master's degree and a Ph.D., and two coaches had two Master's degrees.

Following each profile, participants were presented with items that verified that the

participant read and understood the information presented (manipulation check items), as

well as items that asked the participant to evaluate the Coach based upon the coach's

work experience, qualifications, and education. After evaluating all four coaches,

participants were asked to identify the coach they would choose to work with, if given the

opportunity. Upon the completion of this section, participants proceeded to answering

demographic questions. After completing the demographic items participants were

informed that they had completed the study.

Measures

Hexaco-pi-r. This is a six-dimension personality inventory developed by Kibeom

Lee and Michael C. Ashton. The six dimensions are Honesty-Humility, Emotionality,

Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience (see

Appendix B for a full description of each factor). The authors of the HEXACO measure

developed a 100-item measure and a 60-item measure. For the current study, the researchers elected to use the 60-item measure, considering the time needed for participants to complete the research study and the acceptable reliability of the 60-item measure ($.76 \leq \alpha \leq .80$ per factor). The following are example items for each factor. Honesty-Humility: "I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed." Emotionality: "I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions." Extraversion: "I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall." Agreeableness: "I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me." Conscientiousness: "I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute." Openness to Experience: "I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries." Participants responded to each item using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree. (For the HEXACO 60-item measure, see Appendix C).

Coach profiles. Participants were presented with four (4) fictitious coach profiles in random order (see Appendix D for the experimental condition matrix). The current researchers developed the four profiles and the content reflected coach profiles on professional websites (e.g. The International Coaching Federation). Each of the profiles was similar in previous experience, philosophy, style, expertise, and coaching practices. To confirm that the profiles were similar in these ways, pilot testing was done by asking undergraduate students in Intro to I/O Psychology to view the four profiles and evaluate them on various aspects of the profiles. Aspects of the profiles that were inequivalent were adjusted based upon the results of the pilot testing. In an effort to control for the possible effect that coach gender could have had in the present study, the profiles

presented to the participant included two male coaches and two female coaches. The four profiles differed in the educational background of the coach in such a way that one coach with a Master's degree was male and the other was female and one coach with a Ph.D. was male and the other was female (see Appendix E for a sample coach profile).

Coach rating items. For each profile, participants were asked to evaluate and rate each coach that was presented to them through various items that pertained to the coach's experience, effectiveness, and qualifications. The researchers developed these items for use in this study. The experience of the coach was measured by asking participants to rate the relevance of the coach's work experience to their role as a coach and the degree to which the coach's experiences were relevant to the participant's experiences. The effectiveness of the coach was measured by asking participants to rate the coach's ability to help them and the coach's way of working on the participant's development. The qualifications of the coach were measured by asking participants to rate the coach's qualifications and identify the various types of employees the coach would be qualified to work with. In order to make meaningful comparisons of the average ratings across criterion, all items were recoded to fit a five-point scale, such that the seven-point Likert scales were converted to five-point Likert scales by combining the second and third highest ratings and the second and third lowest ratings. The coach qualifications item that asked participants to identify the various levels of managers/executives that the coach would be qualified to work with was converted to a five-point scale by giving each level a point value, such that when all levels were selected the coach would receive a five. The point values were increased as the organizational level increased (for all coach rating items, see Appendix F).

Checks for inattentive responding. To ensure that participants were attentive when rating each of the coach profiles, four (4) quality assurance items were inserted throughout the coach rating process, one (1) for each profile. These items prompted the participant to select a specific response (e.g. "for quality assurance purposes select strongly disagree"). Preliminary research on these types of items has found that screening participants on their accuracy on these questions does not improve model fit; however, an increase in internal consistency of measures was found (Batchelor, Hein, Calarco, Marlow, 2015). The researchers felt that correctly answering three out of the four items was a reasonable standard of quality. After using the education manipulation check to remove participants, the remaining participants all got at least three of the quality assurance items correct, thus no participants were removed using the checks for inattentive responding.

Familiarity with executive coaching. Prior to viewing the coach profiles, participants indicated their familiarity with executive coaching as well as what they believe executive coaches do and what they believe executive coaches should do. The researchers developed these items for use in this study. Once the participants responded to these items they were presented with general information regarding executive coaching as well as facts and figures that explain what executive coach is and what it is not (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009). See Appendix H for the items and Appendix I for supplemental information.

Manipulation check items. In order to ensure that the participants read and understood each of the coach profiles, manipulation check items were presented prior to the rating of each coach. These questions asked participants to provide demographic

information pertaining to the coach profile: education, gender, years of experience,

method of communication, coaching practices, areas of expertise, and current

employment. For this research study, the manipulation check item pertaining to the

education of the coach was used to qualify participants; participants were required to

answer this item correctly for all four of the profiles that were presented; 25 participants

were removed for failing to meet this standard. For full measure, see Appendix J.

Demographics. Participants were asked to provide demographic information

including their birth year, gender identity, race, and various questions related to their

personal background, education, and work experience. For all demographic items, see

Appendix K.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Demographics

As previously noted, 159 participants completed the study; however, only 134 participants were included in the analyses due to 25 participants failing to pass the quality checks. The age of participants ranged from 19 to 74 years old with participants falling into the following age ranges: 29 years or younger (23.9%), 30 to 39 years old (39.6%), 40 to 49 years old (14.9%), 50 to 59 years old (14.2%), and 60 years or older (6.0%), while two participants did not report their age. Men made up 53% of the sample and women made up 45.5%, while two participants did not report their gender. The majority of participants were white (69.4%), followed by Hispanic (10.4%), Asian/Pacific-islander (9.7%), Black (7.5%), and other ethnicities (1.4%), while two participants did not report their race. Nearly half of participants reported their highest level of education completed as a Bachelor's Degree or lower (48.4%), followed by MBA and Executive MBA (32.8%), MS/MA (11.2%), and Doctoral/Professional Degree (6.7%), while one participant did not report their highest level of education completed. More than half of participants reported that they were currently enrolled in an academic program, with 70.4% of those enrolled in an MBA or Executive MBA, followed by 9.9% of participants in each of the remaining programs: Bachelor's degree, MS/MA degree, and Doctoral/Professional degree. The majority of participants were employed (90.2%), while 74.2% of employed participants were currently in a managerial role, ranging from first line management to CEO/President. Regarding the level of familiarity that participants had with Executive Coaching, 4.5% had an Executive Coach at the time of their

participation, while 31.3% of participants reported that they were very familiar with Executive Coaching, and 15.7% of participants reported knowing someone who has benefited from Executive Coaching. However, 24.6% of participants reported that they have heard about Executive Coaching but were not sure what Executive Coaches do, and 23.9% of participants were not at all familiar with Executive Coaching.

Preliminary Analyses

The six items that evaluated the Executive Coach's experience, effectiveness, and qualifications were analyzed for differences in the ratings of coaches with the same education across conditions. One-way ANOVAs were run for each type of profile and item of measurement, none of which were significant, suggesting that the profiles of the same educational level were rated similarly across the four conditions. This provided the researchers with statistical permission to collapse the conditions and evaluate all of the similarly educated coaches together (Male PhD Coaches; Female PhD Coaches; Male Masters Coaches; Female Masters Coaches; See Appendix D for the collapsed condition matrix). Then, Pearson correlations were calculated for the two items used to evaluate coach experience, as well as effectiveness and qualifications, for each type of profile. This determined if the items could be combined into one measure of coach experience, effectiveness, and qualifications. See Table 1 for correlations for each profile type and rating criteria.

Table 1

Pearson Correlations for Each Pair of Executive Coach Ratings

	Experience	Effectiveness	Qualifications [a]
	r	r	r
Male, PhD	.688***	.739***	.264**
Female, PhD	.620***	.669***	.242**
Male, Masters	.596***	.597***	.200*
Female, Masters	.686***	.773***	.265**

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
[a] low correlations (albeit still significant) are likely due to the difference in measurement type for the two Qualifications items (see Appendix F)

Research Question 1

Unless otherwise noted, a familywise alpha of .05 was used for all analyses. Paired samples *t*-tests were run to determine whether the ratings of coach experience could be averaged across gender for each education level (Masters vs. PhD). There was not a significant difference in the average ratings of experience between the Female PhD profile and the Male PhD profile, $t(133) = 1.50$, $p = .135$. Additionally, there was not a significant difference in the average ratings of experience between the Female Masters profile and the Male Masters profile, $t(133) = 1.41$, $p = .161$. Thus, the ratings of coach experience could be averaged across gender for each education level. To compare the mean rating of experience for the coach profiles presented to participants, a one-way RM ANOVA was run, using the multivariate approach. The perceived ratings of the work experience of the coach was not rated differently between the PhD level profiles and the Master's level profiles, *Pillai's F* $(1, 133) = 2.47$, $p = .119$, $\eta_p^2 = .018$. See Table 2 for descriptive statistics.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Ratings of Coach Experience

	M	95% CI
PhD	**4.13**	**4.02, 4.24**
Male, PhD	4.10	3.98, 4.22
Female, PhD	4.16	4.05, 4.28
Masters	**4.08**	**3.97, 4.19**
Male, Masters	4.05	3.94, 4.17
Female, Masters	4.11	4.00, 4.23

Note. $N = 134$.

Paired samples *t*-tests were calculated to determine if the ratings of coach effectiveness could be averaged across gender for each education level (Masters vs. PhD). There was not a significant difference in the average ratings of effectiveness between the Male PhD profile and the Female PhD profile, $t(133) = 0.59$, $p = .555$. Additionally, there was not a significant difference in the average ratings of effectiveness between the Female Masters profile and the Male Masters profile, $t(133) = 0.68$, $p = .500$. Thus, the ratings of coach effectiveness could be averaged across gender for each education level. In order to compare the mean rating of effectiveness for the coach profiles presented to participants, a one-way RM ANOVA was run, using the multivariate approach. The perceived ratings of effectiveness of the coach was not rated differently between the PhD level profiles and the Master's level profiles, *Pillai's F* $(1, 133) = 1.40$, $p = .239$, $\eta_p^2 = .010$. See Table 3 for descriptive statistics.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Ratings of Coach Effectiveness

	M	95% CI
PhD	**3.78**	**3.66, 3.90**
Male, PhD	3.80	3.66, 3.94
Female, PhD	3.76	3.62, 3.89
Masters	**3.83**	**3.72, 3.94**
Male, Masters	3.81	3.69, 3.93
Female, Masters	3.85	3.72, 3.99

Note. $N = 134$.

Paired samples *t*-tests were calculated in order to determine if the ratings of coach qualifications could be averaged across gender for each education level (Masters vs. PhD). There was not a significant difference in the average ratings of qualifications between the female, Masters profile and the male, Masters profile, $t(133) = 0.00$, $p = 1.000$. However, there was a significant difference in the average ratings of qualifications between the male, PhD profile and the female, PhD profile, $t(133) = 2.40$, $p = .018$. Thus, the ratings of coach effectiveness could not be averaged across gender for each education level.

In order to compare the mean rating of qualifications for the coach profiles presented to participants, a one-way RM ANOVA was run, using the multivariate approach. The perceived ratings of effectiveness of the four coaches was not rated differently based on the combinations of gender (man vs. woman) and education (Masters vs. PhD), *Pillai's F* $(3, 131) = 2.19$, $p = .093$, $\eta_p^2 = .048$. The results suggest that the educational background of an Executive Coach does not affect a participant's ratings of the Executive Coach's experience, effectiveness, or qualifications. See Table 4 for descriptive statistics.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Ratings of Coach Qualifications

	M	95% CI
Male, PhD	3.19	3.03, 3.34
Female, PhD	3.01	2.85, 3.17
Male, Masters	3.06	2.90, 3.21
Female, Masters	3.06	2.90, 3.21

Note. *N* = 134.

Research Question 2

First, a chi-square test of goodness-of-fit was performed to determine whether coaches with different educational backgrounds were equally selected. The selection of an Executive Coach was equally distributed between levels of education, χ^2 (1, *N* = 134) = 1.46, *p* = .227. The results suggest that the educational background of an Executive Coach does not influence a participant's selection of an Executive Coach. Upon further evaluation, the researchers considered how gender co-varied with education. A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit was performed to determine whether coaches with different educational backgrounds and genders were equally selected. The selection of an Executive Coach was not equally distributed between levels of education and gender, χ^2 (3, *N* = 134) = 11.55, *p* = .009. See Table 5 for contingency table.

Table 5

Contingency Table for Choice of Coach

	Observed N	*Expected N*	Residual
PhD	**60**	**67.0**	**-7.0**
Male PhD	30	33.5	-3.5
Female PhD	30	33.5	-3.5
Masters	**74**	**67.0**	**7.0**
Male Masters	24	33.5	-9.5
Female Masters	50	33.5	16.5

The results suggest that, although the educational background of an Executive Coach alone does not influence a participant's selection of an Executive Coach, differences are found when also considering the coach's gender. Specifically, female masters-level coaches were selected at a significantly higher rate.

Research Question 3

Linear regression with stepwise selection was used to determine the personality factors that best predicted the perceived rating of experience, effectiveness, and qualifications of an Executive Coach. An alpha to enter of .05 and an alpha to remove of .10 was used when selecting predictors. The HEXACO factors, Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience, were considered as possible predictors for the perceived rating of experience, effectiveness, and qualifications of an Executive Coach. See Table 6 for descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha, and Table 7 for correlations.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics and Reliability for HEXACO

	M	*SD*	Cronbach's α
Honesty-Humility	3.49	0.60	.692
Emotionality	3.03	0.60	.701
Extraversion	3.70	0.64	.813
Agreeableness	3.35	0.52	.629
Conscientiousness	3.90	0.58	.783
Openness to Experience	3.55	0.60	.721
Coach Experience (C Exp)	4.11	0.61	-
Coach Effectiveness (C Eff)	3.81	0.62	-
Coach Qualifications (C Qual)	3.08	0.77	-

Note. N = 134

Table 7

Pearson Correlations for HEXACO and Ratings

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. H	-.25**	.12	.40**	.54**	.08	-.09	-.12	.08
2. E		-.22*	-.13	-.17*	-.10	.02	.08	-.07
3. X			.36**	.33**	.41**	.35**	.44**	.16
4. A				.31**	.23**	-.01	.16	.03
5. C					.42**	.002	.04	.02
6. O						.10	.18*	.21*
7. C Exp							.72**	.50**
8. C Eff								.40**
9. C Qual								

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Extraversion was selected as a useful predictor of perceived ratings of coach experience, $F(1, 132) = 18.68$, $MSE = 0.32$, $p < .001$, $Adj\ R^2 = .12$ such that more extraverted participants were more likely to rate coaches as more experienced (See Table 8 for regression model).

Table 8

Linear Regression Model for Predicting Coach Experience

Predictor	B	SE(B)	95% CI
Constant	2.87***	0.29	2.30, 3.44
Extraversion	0.34***	0.08	0.18, 0.49

***$p < .001$.

Extraversion and Emotionality were selected as useful predictors of perceived ratings of coach effectiveness, $F(1, 131) = 19.26$, $MSE = 0.30$, $p < .001$, $Adj\ R^2 = .22$ such that more participants that scored higher on extraversion and emotionality were more likely to rate coaches as more effective (See Table 9 for regression model).

Table 9

Linear Regression Model (Stepwise Selection) for Predicting Coach Effectiveness

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	
	B	B	95% CI
Constant	2.22***	1.49**	[0.66, 2.31]
Extraversion	0.43***	0.47***	[0.32, 0.62]
Emotionality		0.19*	[0.03, 0.36]
Adj. R^2	.19***	.22***	
F	31.79***	19.26***	
ΔAdj. R^2		.03	
ΔF		5.62*	

CI = confidence interval.

p < .05. **p* < .01. ***p* < .001.

Openness to Experience was selected as a useful predictor of perceived ratings of coach qualifications, $F(1, 132) = 6.05$, $MSE = 0.57$, $p = .015$, $Adj\ R^2 = .04$ such that more participants that scored higher in Openness to Experience were more likely to rate coaches as being more qualified (See Table 10 for regression model).

Table 10

Linear Regression Model for Predicting Coach Qualifications

Predictor	B	SE(B)	95% CI
Constant	2.13***	0.39	1.35, 2.90
Openness to Experience	0.27*	0.11	0.05, 0.48

p < .05. ***p* < .001.

Thus, the results of the present study suggest that the personality of a participant does – in part – influence their ratings of Executive Coaches. Specifically the HEXACO factors of Emotionality, Extraversion, and Openness, have some bearing on participants' ratings of experience, effectiveness, and qualifications of an Executive Coach.

Research Question 4

Logistic regression with stepwise selection was used to determine the personality factors that best predicted the selection of a coach based upon their education level (PhD vs. Masters). An alpha to enter of .05 and an alpha to remove of .10 was used when selecting predictors. The HEXACO factors, Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness, were considered as possible predictors for coach selection. Agreeableness was selected as a useful predictor of selecting a coach with a PhD, $\chi^2(1, N = 134) = 5.94$, $p = .015$. The Hosmer and Lemeshow GOF test indicated that the model adequately fit the data, $\chi^2(8, N = 134) = 7.51$, $p = .483$. We can accurately predict 58% of the coach selections when using Agreeableness as a predictor. Of the total number of participants that selected a PhD coach, 32% were predicted to select a PhD coach. Of the total number of participants that selected a Masters coach, 80% were predicted to select a Masters coach. Of the total number of participants that selected a PhD coach, 68% were predicted to select a Masters coach. Of the total number of participants that selected a Masters coach, 20% were predicted to select a PhD coach. See Table 11 for descriptive statistics and correlations, and Table 12 for the regression model.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for HEXACO and Coach Choice

	M	*SD*	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. H	3.49	0.60	-.25**	.12	.40**	.54**	.08	.06
2. E	3.03	0.60		-.22*	-.13	-.17*	-.10	.09
3. X	3.70	0.64			.36**	.33**	.41**	.02
4. A	3.35	0.52				.31**	.23**	.21*
5. C	3.90	0.58					.42**	-.003
6. O	3.55	0.60						.01
7. Choice[a]	1.45	0.50						

Note. N = 134.
[a]Masters = 1 and PhD = 2.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 12

Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Coach Choice

Predictor	B	SE(B)	OR	OR 95% CI
Constant	-3.05*	1.22	0.05	
Agreeableness	0.85*	0.36	2.33	[1.15, 4.70]

Note. CI = confidence interval. OR = odds ratio.
*p < .05.

Thus, the results suggest that the personality of a participant does influence their choice of an Executive Coach. Specifically, the higher that a participant's agreeableness score is, the higher the likelihood that a participant will choose a coach with a PhD.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The current research study examined two potential antecedents of Executive Coaching: a) The educational credentials of a coach and b) The extent to which the personality profile of a potential coaching client might influence a person's perceptions and choice of a coach. Specifically, the current research sought to evaluate the client's perceptions of a coach's experience, effectiveness, and qualifications, as well as their final choice of an Executive Coach. The first research question was sought to determine whether coaches are perceived as more or less experienced, effective, or qualified, based upon differences in their educational credentials (Master's vs. Ph.D.). The results indicated that coaches with different educational credentials were not rated differently in these three areas. In other words, potential coaching clients were unlikely to view two coaches differently solely due to differences in the educational credentials of the Executive Coach.

The second research question investigated the choice a potential coaching client might make regarding the Executive Coach they wish to work with, depending on the educational credentials of the Executive Coach. Given that there were no significant differences in the ratings of coaches based on educational credentials, it is reasonable to expect that coaches with different educations would be chosen at a similar rate. This was the case when comparing the rate at which Master's level coaches were selected compared to Ph.D. level coaches. However, post-hoc analysis found that the gender, while not the primary focus of this study, did affect the rate at which Master's level and Ph.D. level coaches were chosen. When the coach profiles were analyzed based upon

their gender, differences in coach selection became apparent. Interestingly, the differences in selection, based on coach gender, were not similar across education levels. Instead, Ph.D. coaches were selected equally, regardless of the coach gender. Female Masters level coaches were selected far more frequently than Male Masters level coaches were. Interestingly, Female Masters level coaches were selected more frequently than the Ph.D. level coaches were. Given the demographics of the sample, one possible explanation for this difference is the fact that nearly half of the participants reported their highest level of education to be a Bachelor's degree or lower and the potential for similar-to-me bias of performance evaluation to influence the choice of coach (Frank & Hackman, 1975).

While the first two research questions focused on the education level of the coach, the third and fourth research questions focused on the role that a potential coaching client's personality has in their ratings and choice of a coach. When considering the ratings of coach experience, the extraversion level of a potential coaching client was found to be a useful predictor, accounting for approximately 12% of the variability in ratings of coach experience. Such that, the more extraverted a participant was, the higher their rating of a given coach's effectiveness. Ratings of coach effectiveness were predicted more fully, with both the level of emotionality and extraversion of the potential coaching client being useful predictors and accounting for approximately 22% of the variability in ratings of coach experience. Such that, the more extraverted and/or emotional a participant was, the higher their rating of a given coach's experience. Finally, ratings of coach qualifications could also be predicted by a personality factor; however, in this instance openness to experience of the client was a useful predictor, however only

accounting for approximately 4% of the variability in ratings of coach qualifications. Such that, the more open to experience a participant was, the higher their rating of a given coach's qualifications.

Overall, these results are not as useful as the researchers were expecting. The lack of meaningful results may be due, in part, to the lack of unstandardized measures for rating coaching candidates. Another possible reason for the lack of meaningful results is that the variability in scores for the sample in this research study is lower than the reported standard deviations for five of the six personality factors; however, the factor (extraversion) that had higher variability was only marginally higher. The overall lack of variability in the scores for each factor may have contributed to the minimal number of personality factors that predicted each of the three evaluations of the coaches.

The final research question sought to identify whether there are personality factors of a potential coaching client that are related to the selection of a coach based on the coach's educational credentials. It was determined that the more agreeable a participant was, the more likely they were to select a coach with a Ph.D. The results for this research question are minimally useful given that only 58% of selections could be predicted based on an individual's level of agreeableness.

Limitations and Future Research

Given the novelty of the current research study, limitations were likely and at times unavoidable. One of the most obvious limitations is the composition of the sample. The desired implications of this current research was to identify characteristics of both Executive Coaches and potential coaching clients that predict a potential coaching client's choice of an Executive Coach. Although nearly all of the participants were

currently employed, the majority of which in managerial roles, nearly half of the participants did not know what Executive Coaching was prior to participating in the study. In anticipation of some portion of participants not being familiar with Executive Coaching, the researchers provided all participants with information about Executive Coaching prior to them viewing the coach profiles; however, the impact that this information had for those unfamiliar is unknown. Future research could either gauge the participants' understanding of coaching after being provided with the informational materials, choose to limit the sample to persons that are familiar with Executive Coaching prior to their participation, or ideally only recruit participants that are actively searching for an Executive Coach.

A second limitation of the current study was the time required to complete the study. With the study requiring approximately 45 minutes of focused attention, there was a large number of participants that began, but did not complete the study, thus making their time and effort put into the study for naught. This limitation was somewhat unavoidable as the current research was only one portion of the larger research project and the need to collect data on multiple preliminary measures prior to the participant's evaluation of the coaches. Future research could consider only those aspects of this current larger research project that were of significance, in order to ensure a more focused and complete sample.

A third limitation, which also pertains to the time required of participants, is the amount of content in the profiles. As seen in the example profile in Appendix E, participants were presented with a large amount of extraneous information for each coach profile. The intention of the researchers was to present a comprehensive coach profile

that resembled profiles currently used on professional coaching websites, such as the

International Coaching Federation. While the coach profiles presented to participants had

a sense of realism regarding the content areas provided, much of this information was

irrelevant to the current research project and likely distracted participants from the

intended focus of the research. Future research may consider profiles with a smaller

portion of irrelevant information in order to hone in on the true differences in the coach

profiles.

A final limitation is the restriction of range when it came to participants rating the

coaches. After reviewing each profile, participants were asked to rate the coaches in

various ways that pertained to the coach's experience, effectiveness, and qualifications.

Of the six items used, the five Likert-style items had averages that were above three, on a

five-point scale, for all of the profile types, the majority of which were close to or above

four. For the most part, participants viewed all four of the coach profiles as high in

relevant experience, effectiveness, and qualifications, thus making it difficult to delineate

differences between the profiles.

Research Implications

Although the current research was imperfect, it was a solid start at beginning to

identify whether educational training of Executive Coaches and the personality of

potential coaching client's influences the ratings and selection of a coach. Specifically,

future research may seek to gain a better understanding of how the education and gender

of a coach affects a participant's choice of Executive Coach. Additionally, this research

provided preliminary evidence suggesting that certain personality factors of participants

affect the ratings and choice of coach. Ultimately suggesting that personality does in fact play a role and this role should be researched further for better clarity and understanding.

Granted, the findings were limited, the evidence of the current research is sufficient to continue investigating how the personality of potential coaching clients influence their decisions on what Executive Coaches they view as experienced, effective, and qualified, and ultimately their decision on whom they choose to work with. Further, down the road, researchers should begin to link these antecedents to the overall effectiveness and outcomes of the coaching engagement, although this is many steps removed from the current stage of this research. Overall, the findings of this initial research suggest that further research is necessary and may provide useful clues towards better understanding the Executive Coach selection process from the perspective of the potential coaching client.

Practical Implications

Given the infancy of the current research, it is difficult to identify solid implications for the practice of Executive Coaching. However, the current research should inform business leaders and executives that Executive Coach selection is not all about the coach, but that the personality of the client may have an impact on the type of coach that is preferred. This information may begin to inform Human Resource departments of the preliminary work that may be vital to finding a coach to best fit with a high potential leader or other executive, whose development is vital to the success of the company. Businesses may want to begin considering the use of personality profiles for their leaders and executives in order to best match them with an Executive Coach, as it may better inform them on the types of coaches that are perceived to be highly

experienced, effective, and qualified. Overall, however, the practical implications of the current research are limited and should be applied cautiously until further research is completed.

Conclusions

The present study represents an important first step in understanding the role of clients' and potential clients' perception of Executive Coaches. There is still very little research in the field of executive coaching (Lowman, 2005; Grant, 2011). The present study offers preliminary evidence which suggests that the personality of a potential coaching client may play a role in determining who a potential coaching client would prefer to work with based upon their educational credentials, or their disposition towards Executive Coaches in general. Additionally, the interaction between the educational credentials and gender of a coach and the impact it has on coach selection may begin to reveal the preferences of potential coaching clients. While the results of this study are not conclusive, they do offer interesting insight into a domain that has not been examined. Ideally future research efforts will expound upon the present study's findings with the aim of developing a more comprehensive understanding of the role that personality factors influence the choice of Executive Coaches, as well as the effectiveness and outcomes of Executive Coaching interactions.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. (2002). *Executive briefing: Case study on the return on investment of executive coaching*. Bothell, WA: Synergism Coaching, LLC.

Andrews, G. (2007, June 18). Leadership: Executive coaching — fuel or folly? *Fast Company.* Retrieved from http://www.fastcompany.com/

Asay, T. P., & Lambert, M. J. (1999). The empirical case for the common factors in therapy: Quantitative findings. In M. A. Hubble, B. L. Duncan, & S. D. Miller, (Eds.), *The heart & soul of change: What works in therapy* (pp. 23-55). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ashton, M. C. & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(4), 340-345. doi: 10.1080/00223890902935878

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., de Vries, R. E., Di Blas, L., Boies K. & De Raad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*(2), 356-366. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.356

Batchelor, G. M., Hein, M. B., Calarco, H. N., & Marlow, K. K. (2015). *Evaluating the usefulness of quality assurance items using confirmatory factor analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

Battley, S. (2007). When to call in an executive coach. The Center for Association Leadership. Retrieved from http://www.asaecenter.org/Resources/ANowDetail.cfm?ItemNumber=25765.

Bersin, J. (2007). *High-impact talent management: Trends, best practices and industry solutions*. Oakland, CA: Bersin & Associates.

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

Boyajian, M. E. & Colarelli, S. (2015, April). *Are your employees coachable? The development of a coachability scale*. Poster presented at the Thirtieth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Philadelphia, PA.

Boyce, L. A. & Hernez-Broome, G. (2011). Introduction: State of executive coaching. In G. Hernez-Broome & L. A. Boyce, (Eds.), *Advancing executive coaching* (pp. xliii-lxi). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brotman, L. E., Liberi, W. P., & Wasylyshyn, K. M. (1998). Executive coaching: The need for standards of competence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 50*, 40–46.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Coutu, D. & Kauffman, C. (2009, January). What can coaches do for you? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org.

De Haan, E., Duckworth, A., Birch, D., & Jones, C. (2013). Executive coaching outcome research: The contribution of common factors such as relationship, personality match, and self-efficacy. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *65*(1), 40-57. doi: 10.1037/a0031635

Del Giudice, M. J., Yanovsky, B., & Finn, S. E. (2014). Personality assessment and feedback practices among executive coaches: In search of a paradigm. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 66*(3), 155-172.

Dinger, F. C., Dickhaeuser, O., Hilbig, B. E., Mueller, E., Steinmayr R. & Wirthwein, L. (2015). From basic personality to motivation: relating the HEXACO factors to achievement goals. *Learning and Individual Differences, 40*, 1-8.

Economist. (2003, November 15). Corporate therapy. *Economist*, *369*, 61.

Elmer, V. (2011, August 29). Coaching is hot. Is it right for you? *Fortune.* Retrieved from http://www.fortune.com/

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2006). A quasi-experimental study on management coaching effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 58*(3), 174-182. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.58.3.174

Frank, L., & Hackman, R. (1975). Effects of interviewer-interviewee similarity on interviewer objectivity in college admissions interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(3), 356-360.

Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 197–221.

Garman, A. N., Whiston, D. L., & Zlatoper, K. W. (2000). Media perceptions of executive coaching and the formal preparation of coaches. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 52*(3), 201-205.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the big-five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 26-42.

Grant, A. M. (2011). *Workplace, executive and life coaching: An annotated bibliography from the behavioral science and business literature (1ˢᵗ Jan 2011),* Coaching Psychology Unit, University of Sydney, Australia.

Gurven, M., von Rueden, C., Massenkoff, M., Kaplan, H., & Vie, M. L. (2013). How universal is the big five? Testing the five-factor model of personality variation among forager–farmers in the bolivian amazon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*(2), 354–370. doi: 10.1037/a0030841

Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L. & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics*, *27*(3), 39-53. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(99)90020-7

Harris, M. (1999). Practice network: Look, it's an I-O psychologist . . . No, it's a trainer . . . No, it's an executive coach! *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 36*(3), 38–42.

Hollenbeck, G. P. (2004). This ain't your momma's doublewide! or Executive coaching at the crossroads. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 42*(1), 16–23.

International Coaching Federation (19 October, 2015). *Background Information & Membership Facts—August 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.coachfederation.org/

Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Hutchinson, E. (2014). The influence of the five factor model of personality on the perceived effectiveness of executive coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 12*(2) 109-118.

Judge, W. Q., & Cowell, J. (1997). The brave world of executive coaching. *Business Horizons, 40*(4), 71–77.

Kampa-Kokesch S. & Anderson M. Z. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(4), 205-228.

Kilburg, R. R. (1996). Toward a conceptual understanding and definition of executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 134-144.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3ʳᵈ ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Kombarakaran, F. A., Yang, J. A., Baker, M. N., Fernandes, P. B. (2008). Executive coaching: It works! *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *60*(3), 267-278. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.78

Lee, K. & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(2), 329-358. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lewis, D. E. (May 2002). *Companies are hiring coaches to teach executives how to sharpen management skills and communicate effectively*. www.bostonworks.com/globe/artciles/112600_coach.html.

Liljenstrand, A. M. & Nebeker, D. M. (2008). Coaching services: A look at coaches, clients, and practices. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *60*(1), 57-77. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.57

Lowman, R. L. (2005). Executive coaching: The road to dodoville needs paving with more than good assumptions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *57*(1), 90-96. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.57.1.90

MacKie, D. (2014). The effectiveness of strength-based executive coaching in enhancing full range leadership development: a controlled study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 66*(2), 118-137.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 241-270.

McCauley, C. D., Kanaga, K. & Lafferty, K. (2010). Leader development systems. In E. Van Velson, C. D. McCauley & M. N. Ruderman, (Eds.), *The center for creative leadership: Handbook of leadership development, 3rd Edition* (pp. 44-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McKenna, D. (2009, August 4). Who needs an executive coach? *Forbes.* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/

McKenna, D. D. & Davis, S. L. (2009). Hidden in plain sight: The active ingredients of executive coaching. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *2*, 244-260.

Nieminen, L. R. G., Smerek, R., Kotrba, L., & Denison, D. (2013). What does an executive coaching intervention add beyond facilitated multisource feedback? effects on leader self-ratings and perceived effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *24*(2), 145-176. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.21152

Passmore, J., Holloway, M., & Rawle-Cope, M. (2010). Using MBTI type to explore differences and the implications for practice for therapists and coaches: Are executive coaches really like counsellors? *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *23*(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1080/09515071003679354

Peterson, D. B. (2011). Executive coaching: A critical review and recommendations for advancing the practice. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, vol 2: Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 527-566). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/12170-018

Phillips, J. J. (2007). Measuring the ROI of a coaching intervention, part 2. *Performance Improvement, 46*(10), 10-23.

Reeves, W. B. (2006). The value proposition for executive coaching. *Financial Executive*, *22*(10), 48-49.

Rein, L. (2013, April 22). What is executive coaching? *Design Intelligence.* Retrieved from http://www.di.net/

Schutte, F. & Steyn, R. (2015). The scientific building blocks for business coaching: A literature review. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(1), 11 pages.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Thalmayer, A. G., Saucier, G. & Eigenhuis, A. (2011). Comparative validity of brief to medium-length big five and big six personality questionnaires. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*(4), 995-1009. doi: 10.1037/a0024165

Wasylyshyn, K.M. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 55*(2), 94-106. doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.55 2 94

Wycherley, I. M., Cox, E. (2008). Factors in the selection and matching of executives in organisations. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, *1*(1), 39-53. doi: 10.1080/17521880701878075

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STUDY INTRODUCTION

Project Title:
Which executive coach could best serve you?
Purpose of Project:
To gain a better understanding of the factors that lead to selecting an executive coach.
Procedures:
Participants will be asked to answer questions about themselves, their, beliefs, their values, and review four resumes to determine the best executive coach. The study will take approximately 30-45 minutes.
Risks/Benefits:
There are no expected risks to participants. While it is unlikely, it is possible that some participants may find that some questions in the study could illicit feelings of discomfort. Participants' involvement will help researchers gain a better understanding of the factors that lead to more accurate selection of executive coaches.
Confidentiality:
Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. A copy of the records from this study will be securely stored in the Department of Psychology for at least three (3) years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming you as a subject. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the MTSU IRB, and personnel particular to this research (Dr. Mark Frame) have access to the study records. Your responses, informed consent document, and records will be kept completely confidential according to current legal requirements. They will not be revealed unless required by law, or as noted above.
Principal Investigator / Contact Information:
If you should have any questions or concerns about this research study, please feel free to contact Mark Frame, Ph.D. at Mark.Frame@mtsu.edu or at (615) 898-2565. Participating in this project is voluntary, and refusal to participate or withdrawing from participation at any time during the project will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled. All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private but total privacy cannot be promised, for example, your information may be shared with the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board. In the event of questions or difficulties of any kind during or following participation, the subject may contact the Principal Investigator as indicated above. For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact the MTSU Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918.
Consent
I have read the above information and my questions have been answered satisfactorily by project staff. I believe I understand the purpose, benefits, and risks of the study and give my informed and free consent to be a participant.

APPENDIX B: HEXACO-PI-R FACTOR DESCRIPTIONS

Honesty-Humility: Persons with very high scores on the Honesty-Humility scale avoid manipulating others for personal gain, feel little temptation to break rules, are uninterested in lavish wealth and luxuries, and feel no special entitlement to elevated social status. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale will flatter others to get what they want, are inclined to break rules for personal profit, are motivated by material gain, and feel a strong sense of self-importance.

Emotionality: Persons with very high scores on the Emotionality scale experience fear of physical dangers, experience anxiety in response to life's stresses, feel a need for emotional support from others, and feel empathy and sentimental attachments with others. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale are not deterred by the prospect of physical harm, feel little worry even in stressful situations, have little need to share their concerns with others, and feel emotionally detached from others.

eXtraversion: Persons with very high scores on the Extraversion scale feel positively about themselves, feel confident when leading or addressing groups of people, enjoy social gatherings and interactions, and experience positive feelings of enthusiasm and energy. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale consider themselves unpopular, feel awkward when they are the center of social attention, are indifferent to social activities, and feel less lively and optimistic than others do.

Agreeableness (versus Anger): Persons with very high scores on the Agreeableness scale forgive the wrongs that they suffered, are lenient in judging others, are willing to compromise and cooperate with others, and can easily control their temper. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale hold grudges against those who have harmed them, are rather critical of others' shortcomings, are stubborn in defending their point of view, and feel anger readily in response to mistreatment.

Conscientiousness: Persons with very high scores on the Conscientiousness scale organize their time and their physical surroundings, work in a disciplined way toward their goals, strive for accuracy and perfection in their tasks, and deliberate carefully when making decisions. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale tend to be unconcerned with orderly surroundings or schedules, avoid difficult tasks or challenging goals, are satisfied with work that contains some errors, and make decisions on impulse or with little reflection.

Openness to Experience: Persons with very high scores on the Openness to Experience scale become absorbed in the beauty of art and nature, are inquisitive about various domains of knowledge, use their imagination freely in everyday life, and take an interest in unusual ideas or people. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale are rather unimpressed by most works of art, feel little intellectual curiosity, avoid creative pursuits, and feel little attraction toward ideas that may seem radical or unconventional.

APPENDIX C: HEXACO-PI-R 60-ITEM MEASURE

Directions: Please carefully read the following statements and respond to each item using the five-point scale below based on your level of agreement with each statement. Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

1 = strongly disagree   2 = disagree   3 = neutral   4 = agree   5 = strongly agree

1. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
6. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
7. I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
9. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
10. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
11. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
12. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
14. When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
15. People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
20. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
21. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
24. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
26. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
28. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
30. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
31. I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
32. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
33. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
34. In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
35. I worry a lot less than most people do.

36. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
37. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
38. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
39. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
40. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
41. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
42. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
43. I like people who have unconventional views.
44. I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
45. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
46. Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
47. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
48. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
49. I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
50. People often call me a perfectionist.
51. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
52. I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
53. Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
54. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
55. I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
56. I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
57. When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
58. When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
59. I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
60. I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.

APPENDIX D: EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION MATRIX

	Condition	Stimulus	Coach Ratings	Stimulus	Coach Ratings	Stimulus	Coach Ratings	Stimulus	Coach Ratings	Overall Rankings
HEXACO Personality Inventory	A	David Ph.D	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Jane Ph.D	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	James MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Lisa MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	
	B	David Ph.D	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Jane Ph.D	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	James MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Lisa MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	**Rank Coaches:** - experience - effectiveness - qualifications **Select a Coach**
	C	David MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Jane MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	James PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Lisa PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	
	D	David MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Jane MS	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	James PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Lisa PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	
HEXACO	Collapsed	Male PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Female PhD	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Male Masters	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	Female Masters	*Experience* *Effectiveness* *Qualifications*	**Rank Coaches:** - experience - effectiveness - qualifications **Select a Coach**

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE COACH PROFILE

David Reynolds
Ph.D., Villanova University
Executive MBA, Washington University
15+ years of coaching experience

Current Employment:
Partner at Talent Management Services

Previous Experience (Abbreviated):
August 2010-December 2014: Certified Management Consultant at OMRI
May 2003-August 2010: HR Talent Management Supervisor at Build It, Inc.
February 2000-April 2003: External Consultant at Oracle

Coaching Summary or Philosophy:
"I see coaching as a relationship. A relationship between the coach the person being coached. Good coaches know how to balance giving direct feedback and input with asking questions and seeking clarity of understanding. I believe that achieving this balance is one of my core strengths."

Coaching Style:
I evaluate the effectiveness of my coaching based upon the results obtained by my clients. Sometimes those results are relational, other times they are more planning and operational in nature. I aim to find the right balance of these relationship and execution improvements for each of my clients.

Areas of Expertise:	**Common Coaching Practices:**
• Talent management	• Psychology of change training
• Strategic planning	• Conflict resolution training
• Conflict resolution	• Work/life balance strategies
• 360-degree feedback	• Work burnout interventions
• Goal setting	• Communication workshops
• Coaching	

Preferred Coaching Method:
Remotely (Over the Phone)

Dr. Reynolds has successfully worked with clients at the following organizations:
• Goodwill
• Nestle
• Richardson Technology Inc.
• Hickman University

APPENDIX F: COACH RATING & SELECTION ITEMS

Experience
1. Please select the degree to which you consider the individual's work experience relevant to their role as a professional coach.

Very irrelevant (1)   Irrelevant   Neutral   Relevant   Very relevant (5)

2. Please select the degree to which the coach's experiences are relevant to your experiences.

Very irrelevant (1)   Irrelevant   Neutral   Relevant   Very relevant (5)

Effectiveness
1. I am confident in this individual's ability to help me.

Strongly Disagree (1)   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree
Agree   Strongly Agree (5)

2. I believe the way that this individual would work on my development would be correct.

Strongly Disagree (1)   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree
Agree   Strongly Agree (5)

Qualifications
1. Please select the degree to which you would consider this individual to be a qualified coach.

Very unqualified (1)   Unqualified   Neutral   Qualified   Very Qualified (5)

2. Please select the individuals to whom you would consider this coach qualified to give professional coaching. (More than one can be selected.)
   ☐ Entry-level employee (1/7)
   ☐ Manager/Director (4/7)
   ☐ Mid-level executive (7/7)
   ☐ Vice-President or a company (10/7)
   ☐ CEO of a company (13/7)

Selection
1. Of the four coaches that you evaluated, which one would you select if you were given the opportunity to have one of them as your Coach? (Choose ONLY one)
   ○ Lisa Gregory
   ○ David Reynolds
   ○ Jane Thompson
   ○ James Knott

APPENDIX G: FAMILIARITY WITH COACHING ITEMS

1. How familiar are you with Executive Coaching (or Executive Coaches)?
   - ❍ I have an Executive Coach
   - ❍ I am very familiar with Executive Coaching and Executive Coaches
   - ❍ I know someone who has benefited from Executive Coaching
   - ❍ I have heard of Executive Coaching but I'm not sure what an Executive Coach does
   - ❍ I am not at all familiar with Executive Coaching and Executive Coaches

2. Which of the following describes what you think an Executive Coach does? Choose all that apply.
   - ❑ Diagnose and treat dysfunctional people
   - ❑ Motivate people in large sessions or events
   - ❑ Keep poor performers from losing their job
   - ❑ Tell a business person what to do in a given situation
   - ❑ Tell a person how to fix their behavioral problems
   - ❑ Be an adviser on business issues and problems
   - ❑ Help people discover their own path to success
   - ❑ Focus on helping people chance ineffective behavior
   - ❑ Other (please specify) _____

3. Which of the following describes what you think an Executive Coach *should* do? Choose all that apply.
   - ❑ Diagnose and treat dysfunctional people
   - ❑ Motivate people in large sessions or events
   - ❑ Keep poor performers from losing their job
   - ❑ Tell a business person what to do in a given situation
   - ❑ Tell a person how to fix their behavioral problems
   - ❑ Be an adviser on business issues and problems
   - ❑ Help people discover their own path to success
   - ❑ Focus on helping people chance ineffective behavior
   - ❑ Other (please specify) _____

APPENDIX H: EXECUTIVE COACHING INFORMATION

Today's business leaders often have advisers called Executive Coaches.

To understand what an Executive Coach does, Harvard Business Review (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009) conducted a survey of 140 leading coaches. They found that most coaching is about developing the capabilities of high-potential performers. As a result there is ambiguity around how coaches define the scope of coaching relationships, how they measure and report on progress, and the credentials a coach should have in order to be considered qualified.

Did you know...

Top 3 reasons coaches are engaged
Coaches are no longer most often hired to usher toxic leaders out the door.

1 Develop high potentials or facilitate transition **48%**
2 Act as a sounding board **26%**
3 Address derailing behavior **12%**

Who is involved?
Though they acknowledged that confidentiality was central to successful coaching, respondents said that in most cases, they gave updates on coachees' progress to other stakeholders in the organization.

How much it costs
Most often you can expect to pay about $500 an hour – the cost of a top psychiatrist in Manhattan.

Median hourly cost of coaching
$500
LOW $200   HIGH $3,500

Who typically initiates the coaching relationship?

Manager 23%   HR 29.5%

Other 18.7%   Coachee 28.8%

Is coaching personal?
Companies may not hire coaches to attend to issues in executives' personal lives, but more often than not, personal matters creep in.

Are you frequently hired to address personal issues?
Yes 3%   No 97%

Have you ever assisted executives with personal issues?
Yes 76%   No 24%

Who is kept apprised of progress?

Coachee 97.9%
Manager 67.9%
HR 55.7%
Other 27.1%

What to look for in a coach
Respondents had mixed views on what qualifications are important.

How necessary is certification?
Very 29.2%
Not at all 28.5%

How necessary is psychological training?
Very 13.2%
Not at all 45.9%

How long it takes

Typical duration
7 mos.   12 mos.

As the business environment becomes more complex, business leaders will increasingly turn to coaches for help in understanding how to act. Twenty years ago, coaching was mainly directed at talented but abrasive executives who were likely to be fired if something didn't change.

Today, coaching is a popular and effective method for ensuring top performance from an organization's most critical talent.

Almost half the coaches surveyed in this study reported that they are hired primarily to work with executives on the positive side of coaching—developing high-potential talent and facilitating a transition in or up. Another 26% said that they are most often called in to act as a sounding board on organizational dynamics or strategic matters. Relatively few coaches said that organizations most often hire them to address a derailing behavior.

While it can be difficult to draw explicit links between coaching intervention and an executive's performance, it is certainly not difficult to obtain basic information about improvements in that executive's managerial behaviors. Coaching is a time-intensive and expensive process, and organizations that hire coaches should insist on getting regular and formal progress reviews, even if they are only qualitative.

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

APPENDIX I: MANIPULATION CHECK ITEMS

1. Which of the following best describes this coach's gender?
   Man   Woman

2. This coach had one or more graduate degrees.
   True   False

3. This coach had one or more years of hands-on coaching experience.
   True   False

4. Where does this coach currently work?
   Talent Management Services
   NNIT
   Leadership Foundation, Inc.
   Growth Consulting, Inc.

5. Name one of this coach's areas of expertise.
   o 360-degree feedback   o Performance management
   o Change management   o Project management
   o Coaching   o Rebranding
   o Conflict resolution   o Recruiting
   o Emotional intelligence   o Strategic planning
   o Employee branding   o Talent management
   o Goal setting   o Training
   o HR consulting

6. Select one of this coach's commonly used coaching practices.
   o Coaching assessment centers   o On the job training
   o Communication workshops   o Psychology of change training
   o Conflict resolution training o Role-playing exercises
   o Cultural awareness workshops o Strategic planning workshops
   o Delegation strategies   o Time management and planning workshops
   o Individual and team goal setting o Training needs analyses
   o Leaderless group exercises   o Work burnout interventions
   o Leadership modeling   o Work/life balance strategies
   o Executive and leadership coaching assessment centers

7. What was this coach's preferred method of communication?
   Face to Face
   Remotely (Over the Phone)
   Other

APPENDIX J: DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS

1. In what year were you born?
   _____

2. Which of the following do you identify with most?
   Man　　　　　　Woman

3. What is your race?
   White　　　　　　　　Black
   Hispanic　　　　　　　Asian/ Pacific-islander
   Native American　　　　Other _____

4. In which geographic location did you spend the majority of your childhood (birth to 18 years old)?
   Africa　　　　　　　　Asia/ Pacific
   Australia　　　　　　　Europe
   Central America　　　　North America
   South America　　　　　Other (please specify): _____

5. In what country did you spend the majority of your childhood (birth to 18 years old)?
   _____

6. Are you currently enrolled in an academic program?
   No　　　　　　　　Yes

7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Bachelors degree　　　　　　　　Executive MBA
   Masters of Science or Arts　　　　Doctoral/Professional Degree (PhD, MD, JD)
   MBA　　　　　　　　　　　　　Other (please specify): _____

8. If you are currently enrolled in an academic program, in what type of academic program are you currently enrolled?
   Bachelors degree　　　　　　　　Executive MBA
   Masters of Science or Arts　　　　Doctoral/Professional Degree (PhD, MD, JD)
   MBA　　　　　　　　　　　　　Other (please specify): _____

9. What is the highest level of education you desire to complete?
   Bachelors degree　　　　　　　　Executive MBA
   Masters of Science or Arts　　　　Doctoral/Professional Degree (PhD, MD, JD)
   MBA　　　　　　　　　　　　　Other (please specify): _____

10. In your view, what is your ultimate advancement potential?
    Top Management (company CEO; president)
    Senior Executive (SVP; EVP; business group head)
    Executive (VP; business unit/division head; plant manager)
    Upper Middle Management (director; major function/department manager)
    Not Suited for an Executive Role

11. What is your risk of experiencing career difficulty due to factors under your own control?
    Little to no Risk
    Slight Risk
    Moderate Risk
    High Risk
    Very High Risk

12. Are you currently employed?
    No   Yes

13. If currently employed, what is your current employer's primary area of business?

Aerospace	Financial non-bank	Nonprofit
Automotive	Food	Office Equip/Computers
Banks	Fuel	Paper & Forest Products
Chemical	Government	Publishing & Broadcasting
Conglomerate	Health Care/ Medicine	Service Industries
Consumer Products	Housing & Real Estate	Social Services
Containers & Packaging	Insurance	Telecommunications
Discount & Fashion Retail	Leisure time industry	Transportation
Education	Manufacturing	Utilities and Power
Electrical & Electronic	Metals & Mining	Other (please specify):
Entertainment Industry (Film, Television, Music)		_____

14. How many employees does your current organization employ?
    Less than 100   5,000 to 9,999
    100 to 199   10,000 to 24,999
    200 to 499   25,000 to 49,999
    500 to 999   50,000 to 99,999
    1,000 to 4,999   100,000 or more

15. How long have you been with your current employer?
    Less than one year
    1 to 2 years   3 to 5 years   6 to 10 years
    11 to 20 years   More than 20 years

16. How long have you held your current position?
    Less than One year
    1 to 2 years
    3 to 5 years
    6 to 10 years
    More than 10 years

17. Which of the following best represents your current level in the organizational for which you work?
    Top Management (company CEO; president)
    Senior Executive (SVP; EVP; business group head)
    Executive (VP; business unit/division head; plant manager)
    Upper Middle Management (director; major function/department manager)
    First Line Management (supervisor of professionals/technicians/specialists)
    I do not manage other employees
    Other (please explain): _____

18. How many employees report directly to you?
    _____

19. How many total employees report to you (directly and indirectly)?
    Less than 5
    5 to 9
    10 to 19
    20 to 49
    50 to 99
    100 to 499
    500 to 999
    1,000 to 9,999
    10,000 or more

20. Which of the following functional or business areas do you manage? Please mark all that apply. If your position spans many areas because you are a general manager (e.g. CEO, president, group executive), please mark "general management."

General Management

Business Unit

Product Line

Marketing

Sales

Customer Service

Purchasing/Buying

Product Distribution/Warehousing

Research and Development

Engineering

Credit Administration

Quality Assurance

Operations

Manufacturing/Production

Administrative Services

Corporate Development/Strategic Planning

Finance/Accounting

Human Resources/Personnel

Information Systems/Data Processing

Legal

Public Affairs/Government Relations

Real Estate/Property Management

Other (please specify): _____

21. Are you taking this survey in order to earn credit for a course in which you are currently enrolled?

No   Yes

APPENDIX K: IRB APPROVAL LETTER

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

EXEMPT APPROVAL NOTICE

9/25/2015

Investigator(s): Grant Batchelor; Kallie Revels; Colbe Wilson
Department: Psychology
Investigator(s) Email: gb2t@mtmail.mtsu.edu; ksr3p@mtmail.mtsu.edu;
csw4k@mtmail.mtsu.edu
Protocol Title: "Which Executive Coach could best serve you? "
Protocol ID: 16-1061

Dear Investigator(s),

The MTSU Institutional Review Board, or a representative of the IRB, has reviewed the research proposal identified above and this study has been designated to be EXEMPT.. The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b) **(2) Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, or Observations**

The following changes to this protocol must be reported prior to implementation:
- Addition of new subject population or exclusion of currently approved demographics
- Addition/removal of investigators
- Addition of new procedures
- Other changes that may make this study to be no longer be considered exempt

The following changes do not have to be reported:
- Editorial/administrative revisions to the consent of other study documents
- Changes to the number of subjects from the original proposal

All research materials must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion. Subsequently, the researcher may destroy the data in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity. IRB reserves the right to modify, change or cancel the terms of this letter without prior notice. Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University
NOTE: All necessary forms can be obtained from www.mtsu.edu/irb.