

**Expanding the Reach of Coaching: Effectively Scaling Dyadic Leadership Coaching Model
to Group Leadership Coaching Modality**

Christine Wales

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Seminar Paper

Dr. Caryn Stanley

December 17, 2021

Abstract

Organizations utilizing dyadic and group coaching as leadership interventions is increasing as evidenced by the revenues of the business coaching industry increasing at an annualized rate of 5.6%, standing at USD\$15 billion in the year 2019. Trends predict that coaching, as part of leadership development, will increase by 89%.by the year 2022. As organizations look for effective interventions to close the leadership skills gap facing the current workforce, this research investigates the potential of effectively scaling dyadic coaching models to a group coaching model. An analysis of academic literature, government statistics, professional coaching associations content, reputable researching center findings, related websites, books, and business periodicals relevant to dyadic and group coaching were reviewed to capture data on the theories and practices of dyadic and group coaching modalities. The analysis showed there are foundational elements of dyadic coaching that can be scaled; however, group coaching has different complexities that preclude the ability to directly scale the dyadic coaching models using a multiplier effect.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Research.....	7
Significance of the Research.....	8
Literature Review.....	9
Definitions.....	10
Dyadic Coaching Models.....	12
Dyadic Coaching Process	19
Dyadic Coaching Effectiveness	25
Group Coaching Models	27
Group Coaching Process.....	35
Group Coaching Effectiveness	41
Existing Meta-Analysis Review of Coaching Effectiveness	43
Successful Dyadic Coaching Attributes.....	47
Successful Group Coaching Attributes.....	49
Dyadic Coaching Structure Effectiveness	53
Scaling of Dyadic Coaching Structure to Group Coaching Structure	55
The Impact of Dyadic Coaching on Leadership Skill Acquisition/Augmentation	68
The Impact of Group Coaching on Leadership Skill Acquisition/Augmentation	69
The Impact of Group Coaching on Organizational Performance	71
Conclusion	73
Recommendations.....	77
References.....	79

List of Tables

Table 1: The GROW Model	12
Table 2: Domains of Competence.....	16
Table 3: Functions of a Coaching Model.....	18
Table 4: ICF Team Coaching Competency Integration Points.....	57

Expanding the Reach of Coaching: Effectively Scaling Dyadic Leadership Coaching Model to Group Leadership Coaching Modality

This paper will explore the process and outcomes of dyadic leadership coaching and group leadership coaching models, evaluate the value of each modality and investigate the supposition that individual coaching can be effectively scaled in size and scope to accommodate the needs of individual leaders in a group setting.

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

When evaluating the definition of both dyadic and group coaching, Segers et al. (2011) described coaching as:

An intensive and systematic facilitation of individuals or groups by using a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help them attain self-congruent goals or conscious self-change and self-development in order to improve their professional performance, personal well-being and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of their organization. (p. 204)

Ashkenas (2020) stated various studies suggesting that there are upwards of 50,000 leadership coaches (globally). In the first meta-analysis in the field of coaching, De Meuse et al. (2009) used meta-analytic techniques to estimate the effects of executive coaching interventions and concluded that coaching can have moderate to large positive effects depending on who was responsible for the rating. Theeboom et al. (2014) focused their meta-analysis on answering the question ‘Does coaching work?’ and their results showed that coaching had a positive and significant impact on performance/skills, well-being, coping, attitudes and self-regulation. Evidence that coaching has a significantly positive impact on individual-level results in

particular indicates that businesses can expect positive performance and impact improvements from investing in coaching (Jones et al., 2016). The literature suggests that coaching can be a positive intervention.

Kaigh et al. (2014) explored the current leadership skills gap:

The American Productivity & Quality Center (APQC) conducted research on the deficits found within organizations when it comes to leadership skills with the largest skill gaps occur for soft skills (i.e., knowledge sharing, listening, and emotional intelligence) and skills that require a mixture of hard and soft skills (i.e., situation analysis, planning, and change management). (p. 5)

In the United State alone, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2020) classified 18,564,000 persons employed in management occupations (chief executives, general and operations managers, etc.). The number of retired Baby Boomers rose more from 2019 to 2020 than in prior years, 3.2 million more Boomers than the 25.4 million who were retired in the same quarter of 2019 (Fry, 2020). A growing rate of retiring leaders coupled with a significant leadership skills gap in the existing workforce, exploration of scaling the group coaching modality from the dyadic coaching model may prove to be a useful tool in effectively addressing leadership skills gaps.

Purpose of the Research

The primary purpose of this research is to explore the potential of effectively scaling the group coaching modality from the dyadic coaching model to address identified leadership skills gaps. Skill gaps have been identified for both new and tenured leaders. In reviewing skills gaps of newly graduated doctors, Malling et al. (2020) discovered physicians who attended coaching sessions report improvements in skills related to communication, building collegial relations,

conflict management and leadership, skills that might contribute to a more effective organisational practice among newly graduated doctors. Jones (2020) observed U.S. law students, many of whom are of the Millennial generation and Generation Z, are learning to be lawyers in times of great change and have been labeled “the Pivot Generation,” marking the transformation from an old legal market to a new one which will require an advanced skillset.

Previous literature published on this topic have not clearly delineated meta-analysis findings of a positive dyadic coaching experience and if this scales to an effective group coaching experience, the skillset necessary to successfully coach an individual and if this skillset is transferrable to a group coaching setting, the process of exemplary individual coaching experience and if this process can be aligned to fit a group coaching modality, and tangible metrics to assess the value of a dyadic coaching encounter and if similar metrics can be used in a group coaching situation.

Significance of the Research

The significance of this research will highlight the potential evolution of an effective individual leadership coaching experience and broaden this experience to leaders in a group setting. Kets de Vries (2014) asserted “... one-on-one coaching is not as powerful for creating tipping points for change ... there is not the same intensity and focus in a single session compared with what we see happening in a group coaching session” (p. 5). O’Connor et al. (2017) believed the group itself becomes a microcosm of the organisational environment, and that individual and group performance improves due to the broader awareness, alignment and accountability achieved through the process of dialogue with others. This research has the potential to expand the current reach of coaching, reduce the costs of a valuable coaching

experience for organizations, and improve the well-being of organizational members, and through a cascading effect, improve organizational performance.

Literature Review

The global market size of the workplace learning and development industry is estimated at USD\$370.3 billion (Mazareanu, 2020). Coaching is considered a tool in the workplace learning and development industry. Coaching has been mentioned as a modality in peer-reviewed studies as early as 1937 and since that time, the use of coaching has grown significantly (Sherman & Freas, 2004). In 1999, 2,100 coaches were operating globally, 47,500 in 2012, and 53,300 in 2016 turning coaching into a USD\$2.356 billion industry (Hastings & Pennington, 2019). Just over half of the coaches globally, about 28,000 are believed to work in the field of business, executive or leadership coaching (Grover & Furnham, 2016). The revenues of the business coaching industry, increasing at an annualized rate of 5.6%, stood at USD\$15 billion in the year 2019; the trends for the year 2022 predict that coaching as part of leadership development will increase by 89% (Uta, 2019). Team coaching as a method to develop team effectiveness has continued to grow, with the 6th Ridler survey reporting that while team coaching represents only 9% of total coaching, 76% of organizations expected an increase in team coaching over the next two years (Widdowson et al., 2020).

Dyadic and group coaching are two methodologies that can be utilized to develop the skills of organizational members. This literature review explores whether positive outcomes can be achieved for both members and the organizations supporting the coaching experience when coaching is scaled from a dyadic structure to a group structure. The literature search was conducted from May 2021 through November 2021. An analysis of academic literature, government statistics, professional coaching associations content, reputable researching center

findings, related websites, books, and business periodicals relevant to dyadic and group coaching were reviewed.

Definitions

The literature posits several definitions for dyadic coaching. Hamlin et al. (2009) observed that coaching, OD and HRD are, ““very similar, both in terms of their intended purpose and processes” (p. 13) and that their theoretical underpinnings are, “nearly identical” (p. 21). Helping individuals and organizations through a form of facilitated activity or other intervention forms via a ““one-to-one helping relationship”” is another definition (Hamlin et al., 2009, p. 18). Grant (2003) suggested ““a collaborative solution-focused, result-oriented, systematic process in which the coach facilitates the enhancement of life experience and goal attainment in the personal and/or professional life of normal, non-clinical clients”” (p. 254). Coaching can also be defined as a “process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective” (Liu et al., 2009, p.43). The International Coaching Federation (2021) defined coaching as partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential. For purposes of this paper, dyadic coaching will be defined as a collaborative, results-oriented partnering in a thought provoking and creative process, inspiring clients to maximize their personal and professional potential.

The literature has a wide range of definitions for group and team coaching. In many contexts, these terms are used interchangeably (Farmer, 2015). Ostrowski (2018) stated group coaching can be defined as the application of coaching principles (such as active listening, meaningful questioning, designing actions, and managing accountability) to a small group, across multiple sessions, facilitated by a skilled professional, and in service of individual,

collective, personal, and/or organizational learning and goals (p. 54). Hackman and Wageman (2005) defined team coaching as a “direct interaction with a team intended to help members make coordinated and task-appropriate use of their collective resources in accomplishing the team’s work” (p. 269). Brown and Grant (2010) compared and contrasted both definitions:

Team coaching can be distinguished from group coaching in that team coaching can be understood as relating specifically to groups where the individuals are working closely together towards a defined and mutually accountable goal (Bloisi, Cook, & Hunsaker, 2003). In contrast, ‘group coaching’ is a broader category that relates to any group of individuals, including but not limited to teams, whether participants are working together towards specific goals or not. (p. 31)

Britton (2013) suggested team and group coaching are related sisters:

They share a common foundational skill set, and in many instances will utilize the same approaches in terms of design, marketing and implementation. What makes the two very different is the role of relationships, the role of leadership, the lifecycle of the grouping (team versus group), the stance (or position/philosophy) of the coach and also what may be at stake . (p. 18)

Van Dyke (2016) shared “It is a facilitated group process led by a professional coach and created with the intention of maximizing the combined energy, experience and wisdom of the participants to achieve organizational and/or individual goals (G. Cockerham, personal communication, July 7, 2008)” (p. 10). Farmer (2015) defined team coaching as:

A process that involves the collaboration of its members through the integration of different skills and perspectives which steadily evolve and cohere over a period of time toward shared goals. executive and team coaching involves a collaborative process of

sharing team members' skills and reflections, over time, so as to enhance performance to engage with future challenges in the pursuit of a common goal. (p, 73)

For purposes of this paper, Cockerham's definition will be utilized and group coaching will be the terminology used when referencing scaling to the group coaching modality with the understanding that ideas and terminology will be drawn from both team and group coaching literature where there is an overlap of process and focus.

Dyadic Coaching Models

Dembkowski et al. (2006) stated "executive coaching is the art and science of facilitating the personal and professional development, learning and performance of an executive by expanding his options for behaving authentically" (p. 11). There are a multitude of leadership coaching models in the marketplace today. A coaching model is a framework that guides the coaching experience. Models outline what happens, or will happen, in the coaching conversation (micro) and in the overall coaching intervention or journey (macro) (Stout-Rostron, 2014a). The literature reviewed identifies a variety of dyadic coaching models used to facilitate the growth of leaders and others: GROW, CIGAR, PRACTICE, Purpose, Perspectives, and Process; Four Phase Coaching, Domains of Competence, Cognitive Behavioral Coaching and ACHIEVE.

The GROW model is the best known and most popular model. It is the model that is the foundation of many subsequent models. GROW is an acronym for the coaching process: G (goal)-client sets goals for the coaching episode as well as for each session, R (reality)-focus on the detail of the reality, O (options)-discuss the way forward, W (will)-client commits to a course of action with an anticipated achievement date (Brunning, 2006). Grant concurs with this model definition:

Table 1: The GROW Model

G-Goal	Client clarifies what they want to accomplish at the end of the coaching episode as well as each session.
R-Reality	Create awareness of current situation and how it may impact client's goals.
O-Options	Identify and review options. Focus on brainstorming and solutions
W-Wrap-Up	Helps the client determine next steps. Develops an action plan and builds motivation

Source: Grant, 2011

GROW aims to foster the client's sense of personal choice, control, and ownership of the process and its outcomes. The coach works in partnership with the client rather than directing their attention and actions. Brunning (2006) stated the GROW model is a popular coaching model that supports growth through outcome clarification, creating awareness, option identification and review with an action orientation.

The CIGAR approach evolved from the GROW and STAR models of coaching. Like both GROW and STAR, it helps the coachee discuss their current situation, set future-focused goals and then develop approaches to address the gap in performance (Cook, 2009, p. 39). This model also has roots in Egan's Skilled Helper Model:

Some models take a gap analysis approach, where the current or existing situation is initially discussed before moving on to detailing the preferred outcome or goal and then, through a gap analysis process, developing action steps or strategies to facilitate goal attainment. Perhaps the oldest model of this type, is Egan's (1974) Skilled Helper Model. This has three key stages: (1) Current scenario; (2) Preferred scenario; and (3) Strategies to get there. Each of these three stages has itself three sub stages which are: (1) story; blind spots; leverage; (2) possibilities; agenda; commitment; (3) strategies; best fit; plan.

A simplified version of Egan's work is represented by Greene and Grant's (2003) CIGAR model (Current situation; Ideal outcome; Gap analysis; Action plan; Review). (Grant, 2011, p. 121)

By using this model, goal attainment is reached by focusing on the gap in performance and developing interventions that close this gap.

The PRACTICE coaching model was created in 2007 and initially considered a solution seeking, cognitive behavioral approach (Palmer, 2007). Originally the PRACTICE model had seven detailed steps or sections: (1) Problem identification; (2) Realistic, relevant goals developed; (3) Alternative solutions generated; (4) Consideration of consequences; (5) Target most feasible solution/s; (6) Implementation of Chosen solutions; (7) Evaluation (Palmer, 2011, p.156). However, PRACTICE has continued to evolve with a greater emphasis on the solution-focused approach to coaching (e.g., Palmer, 2008; Williams, Palmer & Wallace, 2011). The revised PRACTICE sequence highlights additional solution-focused methods during step one, in particular. In purely solution-focused coaching, problem-talk is usually avoided and it may be preferable that the 'P' in the PRACTICE model represents another aspect of the coaching process such as 'Presenting issues' instead of 'Problem identification'. (Palmer, 2011b, p.156). In its evolved state, there is focus on an issue in which a solution must be created to reach a stated goal.

The Purpose, Perspectives, Process model was developed by David Lane of the Professional Development Foundation (PDF) and the Work-Based Learning Unit at London's Middlesex University (Lane and Corrie, 2006). "This shared framework centres on the three core themes... as follows: What Purpose is the formulation designed to serve? What Perspective informs the development of the formulation? Given the Purpose and Perspective, what Process is

needed?” (Lane and Corrie, 2009, p. 198). Stout-Rostron (2014a) summarized this approach by breaking out each section of the model. When considering perspective consider how each world may be brought together, purpose is what is hoped to be gain from the coaching experience, and process ties to how the coach and coachee work together to achieve the desired outcome. Once there is context of how a client’s purpose is defined as well as an understanding of the role perspective, then an informed opinion can be made as approaches, methods and/or tools are considered for process.

Fortune 500 executive coach and author Karol Wasylyshyn (2014) has developed a four-phase coaching model: data-gathering, feedback, coaching, and consolidation. Her data-gathering phase incorporates the six domains that are contemporaneously present during the executive coaching sessions and constitute a legitimate and appropriate focus of work: the client’s personality; the client’s life story; the client’s skills, competencies, abilities and talents; the client’s aspirations, career progression so far and future direction; the client’s current workplace environment in which he/she performs; current organizational role. (Bunning, 2006, p. 220). Wasylyshyn constructs a life history of her executive clients, 360-feedback to gather insight into the client’s competencies, abilities, and talents, creates a thorough understanding of the client’s organizational culture, has a deep understanding of the current organizational role of the client, and a clear understanding of which competencies need to be developed so her clients can attain their career aspirations. Wasylyshyn also incorporates the three dimensions of perspective making (truth-telling, acknowledgment, and hope) as well as reinforcing key lessons learned as a tool for ongoing development during the consolidation phase. Wasylyshyn’s approach leverages her background as a psychologist to coach executives, staying within the bounds of coaching, and enhances their leadership development.

The Domains of Competence model, based on constructs from Habermas, takes a holistic approach. Stout-Rostron (2014a) suggested using this model as a coaching model. Habermas defined three domains of reality in the world that exist concurrently: I, We, It (Stout-Rostron, 2014a). O’Flaherty and Everson (2005) linked various leadership competencies under each domain.

Table 2: Domains of Competence

Domain	Competencies in Domain	Skills
I-personal mastery	Purpose Self-knowledge Self-correction Persistence	Self-observation Daring Self-remembering Self-consistency Self-management
We-relationships	Relationship Communication Leadership Inspiration	Listening Speaking Setting standards Learning Innovating
It-tasks, process and things	Process Technology Measurement Statistics	Analyzing Predicting Simplifying Building models Prioritizing

Source: Divine and Flaherty, 2002

Griffiths (2005) stated domains of learning can be mirrored in the outcomes of coaching, as clients experience technical learning of skills and content to reach their goals, practical learning as they become more aware of and enhance their interpersonal relationships and emancipatory learning, during which they develop heightened self-awareness, self-understanding and transformation in terms of shifts in perspective. Taking this approach, the focus is on developing leadership competencies that will propel the leader forward on a growth trajectory.

The Cognitive Behavioral Coaching approach (CBC) is not designed to give people the answers to their problems or difficulties, but through a collaborative process called guided discovery, helps them to reach their own conclusions and solutions (Neenan & Palmer, 2001). It utilizes Socratic questioning to increase awareness. This approach is designed so the coachee creates a number of problem-solving strategies and then chooses the path that is right for them. CBC is time-limited, goal-directed and focused on the here and now (historical material, if used, is examined to provide valuable lessons to help guide current behavior and decision-making). (Neenan & Palmer, 2001).

The ACHIEVE model also used the GROW model as the starting point for its development (Dembkowski & Eldridge, 2003). This model has seven steps: assess the current situation, creative brainstorming of alternatives, hone goals, initiate options, evaluate options, valid action, and encourage momentum (Grant, 2011). As with many of the previous coaching models, it is important to develop a clear understanding of the current state. The model then segues into brainstorming ways the situation could be different and what actions the client could take to create this change. Further refining of the change is explored and then the client defines the goals they would like to work towards. Options are then gathered to address the gap between the current state and the desired future state and then these options are evaluated to

determine which ones the client will pursue. Valid action is a process where sub-steps and actions are articulated in service of the goal(s). Providing encouragement is a tool that can be used to keep momentum to help leaders attain their goal(s) (World of Work Project, 2021).

Coaching models are diverse and yet there are commonalities. Lennard (2010) suggested four central functions of a coaching model with correlating objectives.

Table 3: Functions of a Coaching Model

Function 1: Organize coaching framework	Objective: Communicate understanding of order and logic of the coaching structure.
Function 2: Focus on key element of coaching process	Objective: Promote questioning tied to the process and key points throughout the coaching experience
Function 3: Guides coaching decisions and actions	Objective: To help the coach navigate process and clarify complexities
Function 4: Serves as a tool for ongoing learning	Objective: Assist in new insights and plan for improved coaching effectiveness

Source: Lennard (2010)

Stout-Rostron (2014b) stated every model has essentially three aspects: a structure , a process and an underlying philosophy or rationale (p. 88). When comparing the various coaching models above, each meet Leonard’s definition of the functions of a coaching model as well as Stout-Rostron’s addition of an underlying philosophy or rationale.

The preceding coaching models present both divergent and common process methods. Brunning (2006) shared “there is broad agreement that coaching is a two-way developmental process that enhances performance, and in which the coach’s role is primarily facilitative,

enabling clients to find their own solutions rather than providing answers” (p. 47). McAdam (2005) expressed in simple terms that coaching is the process by which the coach uses appropriate listening and questioning to work with the participant (coachee) to enable them to review and ultimately own solutions to issues upon which they seek a resolution. Britton (2015) supported this viewpoint through her belief that the coaching philosophy is grounded in a strengths-based orientation with a present and future focus. The client themselves are the expert and are the ones defining the issues they want to explore. There is agreement that regardless of the steps involved in coaching models, the client is responsible for developing and executing a plan in which enables the client to address identified issues of exploration.

Dyadic Coaching Process

When reviewing the literature related to the coaching process, there is considerable overlap between model and process. Kouzes et al. (2016) presented the 6Cs coaching process: clarify the agreement, create a partnership, collect and analyze data, construct a development plan, collaborate and challenge, and complete and celebrate (p. 293). For purposes of this paper, this framework will be used to describe the coaching process with additional suggestions based on the literature review.

Clarifying the agreement facilitates a basic premise of a successful coaching process, that it is co-created. It involves the willingness and the motivation of the coachee to engage fully in order to achieve a desired state. One critical step in the coaching process is to ensure the coachee is a willing participant in the coaching process. Chidiac (2005) stated “for behavior change to be successful it needs to arise from the ground of the individual’s choice and desire to be different” (p. 13). When a coach is approached about a coaching engagement, it is crucial to conduct “precoaching scrutiny” (Wasylyshyn, 2014). It is important to initially meet with the

client and assess whether the potential client is ready and committed to the coaching process. It is also wise gauge the chemistry between the coach and the leader. Chidiac (2005) also observed the importance of chemistry between the coach and leader: “The executive must have confidence that the coach is the right person for him/her. Similarly, the coach must be comfortable working with that particular individual” (p. 19).

Once the right fit has been determined by the coach and coachee the next step is to establish a coaching agreement explaining the coaching process and approach to the coachee. A review of the coaching model used, coaching ethics and the standards of coaching, and the bounds of confidentiality all aid in mutual understanding and building trust. This is particularly important if the coachee has a sponsor for their coaching engagement. Best practice would be to only disclose information the has been previously agreed upon by the coach and coachee; and the coachee has the final say on what can be disclosed to a third party (Chidiac, 2005, p. 19). The establishment of initial and ongoing coaching agreements allow for clarity of goals and an ongoing evolution of these goals. Jones et al. (2016) encouraged “a formally defined coaching agreement or contract, setting personal development objectives” (p. 250) as a step in the coaching process. The International Coaching Federation (2021) shared a similar stance and highlights the importance of partnering with the client and relevant stakeholders to create clear agreements about the coaching relationship, process, plans and goals in addition to establishing agreements for the overall coaching engagement as well as those for each coaching session. The GROW model alludes to this step under G-Goal. Providing clear context around the coaching relationship, process, plans and client goals creates understanding around what is required for a successful coaching engagement and documents agreement.

Creating a partnership with the client creates a safe environment where the client can be vulnerable and share freely without judgement, a key to establishing trust and rapport. Stout-Rostron (2014a) shared “part of a coach’s code of ethics is to honour confidentiality in the coaching conversation; the client entrusts the coach with confidences, and must feel safe to do so. A coaching alliance is built on trust” (p. 77). Gyllensten and Spaten (2020) state that without trust and transparency, an alliance will not be established and the coaching engagement will fail.

There are a number of approaches to collecting and analyzing data. Wasylyshyn (2014) constructed a life history of her executive clients, 360-feedback to gather insight into the clients’ competencies, abilities, and talents, having a thorough understanding of the client’s organizational culture, a deep understanding of the current organizational role of the client, a clear understanding of which competencies need to be developed so her clients can attain their career aspirations. Marshall Goldsmith uses a stakeholder centered process, interviewing stakeholders chosen by the coachee, providing 360-feedback to the client, and surveying the stakeholders at varying intervals to measure improvement in targeted areas (Gross, 2019). The ultimate goal of gathering and analyzing data is to determine the current state and the desired state. “The difference, or the gap between the two, is the change that must occur” (Kouzes et al., 2016, p. 303).

Once the data has been digested and formed into discernable feedback, a development plan must be constructed in order to turn insight into actions. Jones et al. (2016) tied action steps related to goals into learning:

Goals generally feature activities undertaken whilst at work, promoting experiential forms of practice and learning (e.g., Kolb, 1984). Related to this and thirdly, by

encouraging learning through practice at work, coaching rather directly promotes translation of learning to work performance behaviour, addressing the issue of transfer, often cited as a barrier to performance benefits of training (e.g., Baldwin & Ford, 1988). (p. 251)

Constructing a development plan can take many forms. The idea of “SMART” goals is a concept that can be found in much of the literature, but a goal which is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound is meaningless if the coachee is not in agreement with the goal set. SMART goals must be development and championed by the coachee to be included in the developmental plan. Action plans are another valuable tool in executing a developmental plan. Exploring obstacles to completing actionable items and developing plans to address these obstacles give the client a roadmap to dealing with likely roadblocks as they arise. Co-creating a specific, actionable development plan in which the coachee is fully vested is an accountability tool that improves the chance of a successful coaching engagement outcome.

Creating awareness is another step in the coaching process. Having a mindset that is “open, curious, flexible, and client-centered” (International Coaching Federation, 2021) deepens the coaching alliance and opens the door to initial and ongoing collaboration. Curiosity through the use of questioning is an essential element of the coaching process and a powerful awareness tool. The ability to ask questions that move coachees forward in a coaching interaction is a key to coaching effectively. Powerful questions with the intent of discovery, move the coaching conversation forward and can challenge their current perspective. “Provocative queries may force someone to look at their situation from another perspective, thereby encouraging the breakthrough they need to succeed” (Forbes, 2018).

Experiential learning is another tool to leverage in the spirit of collaboration and challenging leaders. Stout-Rostron (2014b) encouraged the integration of the four adaptive modes of Kolb's learning model (concrete, abstract, reflective and conceptual) into the coaching process:

Kolb's model can be used to structure the coaching conversation and the coaching journey overall. A further definition of the coaching conversation could be "an integration of reflection and thinking on action and experience". Kolb's definition of each of his experiential learning quadrants is particularly helpful: CE (concrete experience) is about feeling and experiencing; RO (reflective observation) is about observing and watching; AC (abstract conceptualisation) is about thinking We gain knowledge through our own experience; each individual filters their worldview through their own experience. In reflecting on our concrete experiences, we can transform experience into some kind of useable knowledge. Some people prefer to step into the experience itself; others prefer to watch, reflect and review; some like to conceptualise, hypothesise and theorise; others like to experiment with doing something new. All four work in conjunction with each other. (p. 99)

Experience, reflection, and application is another educational cycle that can be helpful in moving a coaching conversation forward, leading a client to take action. "Asking three simple questions related to each area can trigger deeper awareness and insight into the specific focus area of the coachee. Experience-what? Reflection-so what? Application-now what?" (Britton, 2009, p. 57). "Adult education models can also be represented as a four-stage model (ERGA: experience, reflection, generalization— seeing how it fits into wider contexts, often known as the aha! moment— and application)" (Britton, 2009, p. 57). Lewin's dictum that behavior (B) is a

function of the person (P) and his/her environment (E) ($[B = f(P, E)]$) is one of the most influential principles in social psychology. As this equation suggests, neither personal nor environmental characteristics alone account for an individual's behavior, but rather these forces interact to shape behavior (Lewin, 1951). Construct a development plan while collaborating and challenging are two stages that cycle throughout the coaching engagement. Awareness discovered during the collaborate and challenge phase will lead to modifications to the development plan to create action to continue to facilitate behavior change.

Ending the coaching engagement and celebrating the results in the last step in the 6Cs coaching process (Kouzes et al., 2016). The terms of ending the coaching relationship should clearly be stated when clarifying the agreement. "If the ending is not discussed, planned and celebrated and the relationship is left to fade or to end abruptly without closure, then the potential for marking achievement and fully integrating changes may be lost" (Palmer & McDowall, 2010, p.180). Kouzes et al. (2016) suggested three steps to signify the end of the coaching relationship: reach agreement with the leader that it is time to end the relationship, bring closure to the formal relationship, and identify ways to celebrate success. "Transitioning a leader at the end of the coaching relationship in a comprehensive manner positions the leader to sustain their behavioral shifts and growth" (p. 316).

Wasylyshyn (2014) introduces the concept of an additional role after ending the coaching relationship, that of trusted advisor. Wasylyshyn states:

While some may argue that long-term relationship of this nature foster dependency, my experiences underscore something quite different. Specifically, the enduring trust, mutual respect, and committed presence of an objective outsider who, in my case, has a dual background in business and clinical training in psychology provides the executive

with an additional and distinctive resource for leading effectively. This includes the trusted advisor providing unfiltered feedback as well as ensuring the executive leverages relevant insights and lessons learned during the coaching. There are four elements to the trusted advisor role: echo, anchor, mirror and spark.

This post coaching engagement role has the potential to serve the leader as a resource for ongoing development and grounded well-being.

Dyadic Coaching Effectiveness

The literature supports the effectiveness of dyadic leadership coaching. One approach to measuring the effectiveness is to compare an element of the coaching process against a specific outcome. A study focused on the impact of problem-focused and solution-focused coaching questions on a range of variables relevant to the creation of purposeful positive change; namely positive and negative affect, self-efficacy goal approach, and action planning uncovered that both types of questions were effective in enhancing goal approach, the solution-focused group had significantly greater increases in goal approach compared to the problem-focused group. (Grant, 2012). Limitations of this study noted small sample size and full-coaching sessions were not conducted.

Grover and Furnham (2016) reviewed quantitative studies that included both control group and non-control studies that measured the “efficacy of business, executive and leadership coaching interventions with employed adults in organisational settings” (p. 8). Grover and Furnham found a number of individual-level outcome measures increased through the use of coaching, including well-being, career satisfaction and goal attainment. Initial organizational results show an increase in peer and subordinate ratings of coachees’ leadership behaviors and having positive effects on those that work close to coachees. Losch et al. (2016) examined the

relative effectiveness of coaching in comparison with other interventions and provided evidence for the different impact they have on individual-level outcomes included enhanced performance and goal attainment. Britton (2015) also gave voice to the positive impact from coaching:

Research from the International Coach Federation (2013) has identified both productivity and positivity impacts from coaching. Increased productivity measures include improved work performance (70 percent), business management (61 percent), time management (57 percent), and team effectiveness (51 percent). On the positivity front, coaching has impacted positivity measures including increased self-confidence (80 percent), relationships (73 percent), improved communication skills (72 percent), and improved work-life balance (67 percent). (p. 117)

As previously stated, the literature supports the effectiveness of dyadic coaching, however, the summary of the meta-analysis conducted in the field will specify concerns related to all coaching studies and share suggestions to remedy these concerns. It is important to note Stout-Rostron (2014b) observed:

Coaching models help us to understand the coaching intervention from a systems perspective, and to understand the need for “structure” in the interaction between coach and client. Models help us to develop flexibility as coach practitioners. They offer structure and an outline for both the coaching conversation and the overall coaching journey. However, although models create a system within which coach and client work, it is important that models are not experienced as either prescriptive or rigid. (p. 88)

When evaluating an effective coaching experience, models and structure are important, however being flexible and present while adapting to the fluid interactions between a client and coachee are also important factors to consider.

Group Coaching Models

According to Grant (2017), group coaching has evolved through three stages of organization management during the century. It was first constructed to increase the performance of employees that were having issues, then its focus was to cope with change, and now it is designed to influence the mindset and behavior of group members to achieve common goals set by the organization. Group coaching can be used for the development of all employees, aiding them in discovering and increasing their potential to address present and future changes and challenges. Fumoto (2016) concurs with this assessment that organizations have shifted their focus and are working on developing the capabilities of their members vs. focusing on realizing high performance. Salas et al. (2015) stated coaching is crucial for the development of collaboration and teamwork. Coaching in this context is defined as “the enactment of leadership behaviors to establish goals and set direction that leads to the successful accomplishment of these goals” (Salas et al., 2015, p. 5).

Group coaching has been referenced by Van Dyke (2016) as “a facilitated group process led by a professional coach and created with the intention of maximizing the combined energy, experience and wisdom of the participants to achieve organizational and/or individual goals (G. Cockerham, personal communication, July 7, 2008)” (p.10). Ostrowski (2019) asserted “group coaching includes the coaching of intact work teams in organizations (team coaching), as well as coaching that involves other types of groups that may or may not have an organizational focus (Brown & Grant, 2010; Thornton, 2010)” (p. 54). Farmer (2015) stated “since Hackman and Wageman’s description of a team coaching model (2005), subsequent commentary and research has been relatively limited compared to that of executive coaching targeted at individuals

coaching” (p. 72). Even with this limitation, the literature reviewed explores several named group coaching models and group coaching model frameworks.

The literature reviewed identifies a variety of group coaching models used to facilitate the growth of leaders and others: theoretical model of team coaching, GROUP, RE-GROUP, The Group Coaching Model, Pure Group Coaching, 6 step model, Shape Shifting, Covision Model, and Psychodynamic Group Leadership Coaching Model

Coaching a group of individuals to use their skills and gifts to achieve individual and group goals is a complex task. Hackman and Wageman’s (2005) theoretical model of team coaching, proposed that coaching is an “act of leadership” conducted by coaches to help people perform tasks (Hauser, 2012). This model has three distinguishing features:

- (1) focuses on the functions that coaching serves for a team, rather than on either specific leader behaviors or leadership styles, (2) identifies the specific times in the task performance process when coaching interventions are most likely to have their intended effects, and (3) explicates the conditions under which team-focused coaching is and is not likely to facilitate performance (Hackman & Wageman, 2005, p. 269).

Lawrence and Whyte (2017) highlighted the fact that “Thornton’s (2010) approach to group dynamics is highly relational and Martin (2006) suggested that Hackman & Wageman’s (2005) model be amended to include relationship factors. This developmental approach encourages the coach to evaluate where the team is on its developmental journey and to design interventions to enhance the journey” (p. 96). Motivational, consultative, and educational styles of coaching were identified in relation to this theoretical model. These styles address commitment to the group and its work, performance strategy, and knowledge and skills (Hauser, 2012). Farmer (2015) concluded that not only is coaching at the right time important, but it is also vital that the

right people are chosen for the right intervention. The goal of this theoretical approach is to elevate the level of success by inspiring commitment, executing strategy, and improving the skillset of the team.

The GROUP model offers a practical guide for the coaching process when coaching teams (Hauser, 2012). GROUP is an abbreviation for goal, reality, options, understanding others, and perform. This model is goal-focused, similar to other dyadic leadership models; however, it also takes into consideration the complexities of group dynamics, group process perspective of groups, and the systemic nature of groups (Hauser, 2012). The GROUP model was designed to help the coach navigate through the coaching process. Brown and Grant (2010) stated the model “is a guide to the terrain, not the terrain itself” (p. 42) and it is “iterative with conversation moving backwards and forwards between phases to refine and clarify the best course of action” (p. 38). The fourth phase differs from GROW with a focus of understanding others which is critical to successfully coaching groups. Generative dialogue is central to the understanding others phase (Hauser, 2012). Developed by Scharmer (2007), generative dialogue is designed to foster deep collaborative learning when working within a group or team. It is intended to help shift individual and group-level awareness (Hauser 2012).

The role of the group coach in the understanding others phase is “to help the group members to suspend judgment, become more comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity, to be open, to listen to others, and most importantly to listen to their own personal internal processes” (Brown & Grant, 2010, p. 40). Hauser 2012 continues:

The perform phase expands Tuckman’s (1965) group stages and other concepts such as double-loop learning (Argyris, 1977) during which groups learn from “the future as it emerges” (Scharmer, 2007, p. 8). Brown and Grant (2010) presented the GROUP serves

as a possible alternative to other group dynamics or psychodynamic approaches described in the coaching literature. It appears to integrate and reflect the literature related to groups: the task perspective (such as goal phase), the systemic thinking and learning perspective (understanding others phase), and the group development stages perspective (performing phase).

The RE-GROUP model is an extension of the GROUP model during subsequent GROUP model sessions. Brown and Grant (2010) stated subsequent sessions follow a process of RE-GROUP (Review, Evaluate, Goal, Reality, Options, Understand Others, Perform). Ideas generated during GROUP sessions are continually reviewed and evaluated before new goals are set. Brown and Grant (2010) proposed:

This process should be conducted at two or three levels of looped learning. The action steps taken since the previous meeting are reviewed and evaluated (single looped learning). In addition, the group coach encourages participants to examine their underlying assumptions and mental models (double looped learning), and where appropriate, encourages the group to identify areas where personal change or transformation has occurred (triple looped learning) (p. 41).

Hargrove's (2003) expanded on this thought of double looped learning, describing triple loop learning as altering an individual's way of being and their sense of self. In his view single loop learning is about altering techniques, double loop learning is altering people's mental models and thinking, and triple loop learning is about fundamental changes in the way people are transformation.

The Group Coaching Model utilizes a four-part design incorporating core coaching principles, relevant contextual knowledge areas, supervised practice, and reflective writing.

Core coaching principles include: generate dialogue, listen actively, question powerfully, reflect critically, design actions, and manage accountability. Relevant contextual knowledge is enhanced through readings and discussion related to targeted improvement areas. Supervised practice is implemented through subgroups meeting to share experiences, learn from others, receive and provide coaching and feedback from peers, all under the supervision of an experienced group coach. Turk and Saue (2021) touched on this concept when expounding on the benefits of the covision method, where suitable solutions are found by supporting the competencies and opinions of the group. Reflective writing is a tool used to consolidate and apply learning. Findings of a study based on this model noted groups members learn vicariously from others and they also gained knowledge through feedback (Ostrowski, 2019).

A Pure Group Coaching Model is predicated on a small group of individuals who hire a coach and each person has a certain amount of one-on-one coaching time during a session. Similar to the Group Coaching model, participants listen to each other being coached and can participate in the process (learning vicariously through others and feedback) (Britton, 2009, p. 17). Britton (2013) stated “in a pure group coaching approach, there is going to be minimal content, less talking from the coach, more experiential discovery for the client, and a heavy use of core coaching skills and competencies, such as powerful questions” (p. 26).

Britton shared her Co-Vision Coaching model practice including: creating a vision board or tableau of the vision, reflection, guided visualizations, reflective writing, vision creation, and wrap up. (Britton, 2021). ANIMA Co-Vision groups used: role modeling, personal development, learning vicariously through others, feedback, and participant support to move the coachees to vision creation (ANIMA, purpose, power, presence 11/7/21). The goal of this model is for the group to achieve either an individual or collective vision for change.

Another variation of a group coaching model in the Psychodynamic Group Leadership Coaching model. Ward (2008) stated this model:

...uses a combination of group dynamics (group pressure, diverse perspectives, peer coaching, shared experience, and support), motivational interviewing (increased ambivalence, discrepancy, self-actualising), and brief therapy (self exploration, past and future self to diminish issues, expand confidence, and expand conscious). (p. 72)

The coaching groups are similar to Lewin's T-Groups (or action learning groups) which include: feedback, unfreezing-from Lewin's change theory, participant observation, and cognitive aids. For group coaching to function well, the four principles of the T-Group must be in place. This model also incorporated Lewin's concept of "action research." It has to be collaborative, yet the research (or learning) of the group is only achieved through the critically examined action of the group members (Ward, 2008, p. 76).

A six-step team coaching model was developed by Carr and Peters (2013): agreement with team, pre-coaching assessment, team offsite, team coaching sessions, re-assessment and review; and research interviews and validation (p. 84). Hastings and Pennington (2019) observed that the study that used this model led to improvements in: collaboration and productivity, relationships, personal learning, communication and participation, impact beyond the team and peer coaching.

Shape Shifting is considered a behavioral team coaching model. Four role behaviors are identified in this model: advisor, educator, assimilator, and catalyzer (Hauser, 2014). The literature highlighted how this model overlaps the elements of other group coaching models. Hastings and Pennington (2019) expounded further on this model:

...the four behaviours show some elements of the coach roles outlined by Reich et al. (2009); the educational behaviour aligns closely with Clutterbuck's position; coaches reported changing their role behaviours depending on the stage of the coaching assignment, supporting the findings of Hackman and Wageman (2005); key outcomes of team coordination, team learning, team cohesion and team transition were suggested, drawing parallels to some of the stages of the coaching process identified by Carr and Peters (2013) and also aligning with the interpersonal and educational intentions of Thornton, Hawkins and Clutterbuck. (p. 177)

When considering the coaching roles of a group coach Hicks (2010) highlighted, through Reich's research, five fundamental coaching roles: consultant (problem-focused intervention due to urgent product or process related needs), supervisor (problem-focused intervention due to high authority of the coach), instructor (problem-focused guidance to impart knowledge and expertise), facilitator (coaching as a loose, independent relation that focuses on the offer of specialised services by the coach) and mentor (coaching as voluntary, sometimes emotionally-related interaction that focuses on mental support, environmental protection and non-expert task-related help (p. 10).

Stout-Rostron (2014a) summarized the nested model works first at the horizontal level of "doing", eventually moving into deeper "learning" one level down; reflecting about self, others and experience at a third "ontological" level where new knowledge emerges about oneself and the world. Tredway et al. (2021) highlighted an example of this model in action in an educational setting:

Leadership coaches: A coaching director meets with leadership coaches at monthly meetings. Together, they calibrate instructional and equity coaching (Aguilar, 2020).

Using common protocols, they collaboratively design the monthly school leader community meetings.

School leaders: Leadership coaches meet monthly with groups of six and in one-to-one sessions. The protocols support leaders to reflect on theory and make plans for application to facilitate what Freire (1970) calls praxis (reflect in order to act) that leads to substantive change.

Teachers: School leaders facilitate teacher communities that focus on classroom academic discourse and include groups of three to five teachers and possibly a school-based instructional coach or another administrator (p. 53).

The example above showed how this model was used as “a supportive mechanism for bringing instructional and equity leadership to life” (p. 53). The model deepened learning and ensured viewpoints were shared at all levels of the organization; cultivated trust; and created an experimental and evidenced-based space to have conversation academic discourse. The nested model amplifies the scaling of a group coaching modality through multiple organizational layers.

Group coaching literature is not as robust as dyadic coaching. In terms of literature volume, it is in its early stages (Ostrowski, 2019). There are a variety of approaches with varying degrees of documented, evidence-based success. Whether it’s developmental, goal-focused, behavioral, or a variation on these themes, each model reviewed would benefit from further empirical study analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Widdowson et al. (2020) stated “regarding what model a team coach should use, Thornton (2016 p. 123) has commented “models have their uses, if we remember they offer a starting point, not an end point” (p. 41).

While foundational knowledge is important, how a model is used is also of major significance.

As group coaching continues to develop, other models will be proposed. Matching the right model for the needs of the group to achieve the desired outcomes is paramount.

Group Coaching Process

The literature review yielded limited information on defined group coaching process. This section will explore processes identified as well as incorporate other literature highlights that suggest topics that will impact group coaching processes as the definition and structure evolves.

Britton (2013) outlined the components of a group coaching process as: pre-program, first session, ongoing sessions, last session, and an optional group follow-up. The pre-program phase includes establishing a written coaching agreement with key stakeholders/sponsors, meeting with group members one-on-one through a variety of communication channels, and sharing material with details that may be pertinent. Hicks (2010) agreed with the importance of establishing a written coaching agreement:

Due to the lack of a commonly accepted definition for team coaching, organisations must be sure that what they wish to gain from the coaching is in alignment with what the coach is offering. Team coaches must be sure that this is exactly what they are offering as opposed to team facilitation or team building. (p. 10)

The first session incorporates team/group agreements and discussion on the framework that will be used. Britton (2009) stated one of the biggest distinctions with group coaching is that the agenda comes from the group. “The group itself will drive the process and strongly determine and/or influence the direction, pace, and themes you discuss. The group will also inform and influence the exercises you include in your work” (p. 25). Ongoing sessions will highlight themes to be explored, client check-in at the beginning of the session and check-out at the end of

the session, coaching exercises related to the theme, and field work to deepen learning and support action. Britton (2009) reiterated the importance of flexibility when coaching groups since the group creates its own agenda. The last session outlines next steps, accountability, future goals, closure and celebration, and setting up any follow-up actions. The optional group follow-up step may include discussion of actions taken since the last session, celebrations, challenges, discussion on sustained learning and action, etc. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) also highlighted the importance of learning and action: “Reg Revans defined action learning as a social process in which a group of people learn from each other’s experiences. Action learning is often defined specifically as a group intervention rather than a team intervention (e.g. Clutterbuck, 2007; Thornton, 2010)...” (p. 108).

Gorell (2013) took a simplistic approach to the group coaching process. At the start she suggested a loop of input, activity, output/input, activity, out/input, activity, until the loop is finished with a desired outcome (p. 46). To highlight the process in action she took the example of a client who is experiencing anxiety when giving a presentation (p. 50). Starting with the input of exploring the reasons for seeking coaching, developing the coaching, defining how success will be measured, agreeing to coaching timeframe, conducting coaching sessions, and ending with the output of reviewing outcome of coaching sessions. The simplicity of this process lies in the belief that the group coaching process is co-created. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) shared:

Many coaches seemed adaptable, having a structured approach to hand if required, but often making decisions in the-moment to go with the energy of the team. This flexible approach appears consistent with Thornton’s (2010) approach, in which the extent to which the team coach is structured depends on the degree to which the team or group feels secure. If the team or group is not feeling safe and secure then the coach may be

wise to structure a session, providing team members with clear sight as to what's going to happen. As team members become more confident, so the team coach may facilitate a more emergent process. (p. 108)

Hastings and Pennington (2019) found that “team coaches take an “eclectic and agnostic approach” towards their use of tools, theories and methods” (p. 183), again highlighting the importance of a flexible approach. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) also suggest that not only is flexibility important but also “the general lesson appears to be less around adopting a specific approach, as to be confident” (p. 105).

Another overview of the team coaching process asserts the coach should have an understanding of the organization and its context, meet with key sponsors to provide clarity around the expected coaching experience, develop a proposal that mirrors the expectations; meet with the coachees individually and as a team to conduct assessments, consider psychological impact (individually); clarify expectations, timelines, roles and confidentiality; engage in the first final review (Farmer, 2015, p. 76).

Jones et. al (2016) uncovered a four-step coaching process the aides in the development of leadership skills:

The formation and maintenance of a helping relationship between the coach and coachee; a formally defined coaching agreement or contract, setting personal development objectives; the fulfilment of this agreement (i.e., achievement of the objectives) through a development process focusing on interpersonal and intrapersonal issues; and striving for growth of the coachee by providing the tools, skills, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective (Bono et al., 2009; Kilburg, 1996;

McCauley & Hezlett, 2002; Peterson & Hicks, 1996; Smither, 2011; Witherspoon & White, 1996). (p. 250).

Later, Jones et al. (2019) explored the definition of team coaching and discovered four essential themes that outline parts of the team coaching process: common goal, team performance, team learning and reflection, and team coaching activities (p.69).

Another group coaching process presented by Kets de Vries (2005) placed the coachee/members of the group at the center of the process. The foundations of trust and confidentiality enable this to be a space of transition. Elements of transition include: a journey of self-discovery and validation of personal experience; boundaryless behavior and knowledge/management; as well as leadership coaching skills. An additional loop of narrative, group interaction, vicarious experiencing and building a sense of community is also a part of this process.

Hackman and Wageman (2005) broke down the team coaching process into three distinct stages: beginning, mid-point, and end. Beginning framework includes: connect with each other and understand the task at hand. Midpoint considerations: feedback on what is going well /poorly and strategically address potential team anxiety related time constraints. End opportunity: integrate lessons learned. Further exploration of this topic:

The group performance processes that are key to performance effectiveness are relatively unconstrained by task or organizational requirements; the team is well designed and the organizational context within which it operates supports rather than impedes team work; coaching behaviors focus on salient task performance processes rather than on members' interpersonal relationships or on processes that are not under the team's control; and coaching interventions are made at times when the team is ready for them and able to

deal with them—that is, at the beginning for effort-related (motivational) interventions, near the midpoint for strategy-related (consultative) interventions, and at the end of a task cycle for (educational) interventions that address knowledge and skill (Hackman & Wageman, 2003, p. 283).

There is much to consider when reviewing a group coaching process. The literature consistently referenced the importance of understanding group dynamics to effectively execute a group coaching engagement. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) reviewed Wheelan's (2003) suggested four stages in the development of leadership teams: dependency and inclusion, counterdependency and fight, trust and structure, and work. "Wheelan (2003) reported data from more than 200 work teams suggesting the stages are real and that teams are more or less equally distributed across the four stages (Lawrence & Whyte, 2017, p. 96). Lawrence and Whyte (2017) also shared that:

Thornton's (2010) psychodynamic approach to team and group coaching further builds on the role of the coach in being able to manage relationships and to adopt a systemic perspective. She suggests that many of the ways in which team members communicate with each other are unconscious, and learning is both an intellectual and emotional experience. Nevertheless the coach's primary task is to help the team to achieve its goal and the coach will only call out those aspects of process that are likely to prove meaningful and relevant to the team (p. 98).

The role of dialogue is also a critical consideration. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) stated:

Clutterbuck (2007), Hawkins (2011) and Thornton (2010) all refer explicitly to the importance of dialogue in coaching. Clutterbuck's (2007, p.77) earlier definition of team coaching included explicit reference to dialogue: "Helping the team improve

performance, and the processes by which performance is achieved, through reflection and dialogue”. Thornton (2010) points to the role of dialogue in achieving mutual understanding. This focus on dialogue is echoed by other workers (e.g. Brown and Grant, 2013; Airo & Dahl, 2015) making reference to the work of Bohm (1996) and Isaacs (1999). The dialogic coach’s role is to help the team reflect together upon the nature of their common challenge, empowering the team to set their own agenda. Kantor’s (2012) early work on structural dynamics is cited by Isaacs (1999) and provides a lens and a language with which to view and talk about process in terms of dialogue. (p. 107)

There are other factors to consider when contemplating the group coaching process. The coach/coaches (skill level, values, behavioral patterns), implicit and explicit contracting, team coaching framework, individual participants, stages of group or team development, customs and culture of the organization, leadership, relationships, psychological phenomena, ethics and dilemmas, external influences, and evaluation progress reviews (Hodge, 2020). O’Connor et. al (2017) “revealed key themes that should be incorporated into any group coaching process: clear and explicit goal focus, need for upfront and solid preparation and communication, group process structure, program sponsorship and follow-up, and right people/genuinely engaged participants” (p. 7).

There is some debate over what length of time should be consider a true group coaching engagement. Ostrowski (2019) page 65) supported the view that:

Group coaching may best be conceived as an experiential and recursively organized phenomenon that allows for (a) the unfolding of experience over time and (b) the revisiting of experience and its meaning by group members. This view is supported by Thornton (2010) “a multi-session format is necessary in order to reinforce and build on

previous learning through continued reflection” Brown and Grant (2010) “idea development” over multiple sessions (p. 41), and Stelter et al. (2011) who noted that engaging in multiple sessions over time helped participants develop durable social networks with their peers in the group. (p. 65)

There is diversity of thought related to group size. Turk and Saue (2021) observed:

Group coaching is mainly used in a group of up to 10 people, which ensures everyone has equal opportunities for posing questions and expressing opinions and it helps to increase the effectiveness of employees and self-confidence in the area of independent thinking and operating. Aas and Vavik (2015) and Flückiger et al. (2017) recommend 4-6 people as the optimal size for group coaching groups, which enables elaborate discussion of the work case, to reflect and devise a suitable action plan. (p. 161)

The International Coaching Federation (2021) recommends groups of 15 participants or less.

It is also important to link team and group coaching processes to other organizational initiatives. It encourages coaches to deepen the coaching conversation by including related disciplines. It’s also key for a coach to let the group know when they are operating outside their scope of practice. “Whether we are using an OD intervention such as the Six Thinking Hats, leading from an appreciative approach, or utilizing assessments coaches need to be aware of when they are moving outside of the terrain of “coaching” as defined by our ICF competencies and to define this with the groups and teams they are working with” (Britton, 2015, p. 120).

Transformational change does not happen on demand, it is a fluid process. When all the elements of the process are in flow, such change will emerge from the group process. Many factors must be considered when scaling from a dyadic to a group coaching process.

Group Coaching Effectiveness

The literature related to the effectiveness of group coaching did not yield a plethora of sources. Turk and Saue (2021) stated an analysis of the data indicates that:

Group coaching enables many benefits including problem solving, conflict resolution, self-awareness, self-confidence, stress management and well-being. It has also shown to strengthen employee independent thinking, self-reflection and develop cooperation skills and a better understanding of the aims and nature of their organization (p. 158).

“Group coaching has a healing effect and provides support and added abilities to enable the leadership of difficult situations for all by increasing the learning environment for all participants” (p. 170). De Lasson et al. (2016) study shared “the participants found that the group-coaching course supported their professional identity formation (thinking, feeling and acting as a doctor), adoption to medical culture, career planning and managing a healthy work/life balance” (p. 165). Liu et al. (2009) study showed that team coaching directly affected team member effort and skills and knowledge, but did not lead teams to apply the appropriate strategy for task completion. Team performance process was defined as a single entity. Salas et al. (2015) noted further benefits:

By recognizing the performance and process gaps that occur within a team, coaching can serve to dynamically guide and foster team development and performance throughout the team life cycle (Hackman & Wageman, 2005; Kozlowski, Watola, Jensen, Kim, & Botero, 2009). In particular, coaching is necessary to recognize and help correct vital team errors or problems, as well as to provide guidance in challenging situations (p. 609).

This literature review supports group coaching as an effective intervention; however, a number of studies rely on feedback from the coach and coachee. De Lasson (2015) asserted bias may play a role in these types of studies due the significant bond that develops between a coach and

coachee during an effective coaching experience. O'Connor et al. (2017) also shared their concerns regarding the literature in the field of group coaching "In many ways the current state of the group coaching literature resembles the state of the individual coaching literature of the early 2000's in that there are more conceptual or opinion-based publications than rigorous empirical studies" (p. 2).

Existing Meta-Analysis Review of Coaching Effectiveness

Several meta-analyses have been conducted regarding the effectiveness of coaching. This literature review highlighted six meta-analyses along with their conclusions.

De Meuse et al (2009) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of the research evaluating the effectiveness of executive coaching. Twenty-two studies were identified and divided into two categories: twelve empirical studies where the gain from coaching could be observed or indirectly inferred and ten retrospective studies where the effectiveness was reported. The study criteria for the empirical meta-analysis included the intervention of executive coaching only, the use of an external coach, methodological design including pre-and post-coaching ratings and statistics needed to be reported in the article so effect size could be calculated. Upon further evaluation, only six empirical studies met the criteria with three of the remaining studies completely dismissed for not meeting criteria and three shifted for retrospective analysis. The meta-analysis found a positive effect for executive coaching however the low number of studies in this meta-analysis could not lead the authors to conclude when coaching will or will not lead to positive results.

The content analysis of the retrospective studies reviewed reactions to coaching, if the coachee had a change or improvement in performance, and the impact of coaching at the organizational level. The findings from this group of studies were also very positive. Coachees

were satisfied with the coaching provided, felt their skills had improved, and had a significant impact on business results. The authors do caution that these results may be skewed by bias since those who are reporting the results noted the studies reviewed have a vested interest in the coaching experience. DeMeuse et al. (2009) concluded the observations from this analysis included:

- (1) Overall, executives and companies are favorable toward coaching.
- (2) Coaching works. Specifically, the meta-analysis demonstrated that executives made a moderate-to-large gain in skill and/or performance.
- (3) Individuals who experience the coaching (self-ratings) report stronger effects than do others (others' ratings).
- (4) Coaching impacts a wide array of individual and organizational outcomes, such as individual skills and behaviors, team performance, productivity, employee job satisfaction, and some measures of business deliverables.
- (5) Some research suggests that coaching has the most positive impact when tied directly to coaching objectives.
- (6) The return from coaching was inconsistent. Coaching impact varies from situation to situation, and even may lead to negative outcomes in some circumstances. (p. 128)

Another meta-analysis focused on the effects of outcomes when coaching individuals in an organizational context. One hundred and seven articles were reviewed and in the final analysis, 18 studies were used. The analysis examined the relationships between coaching interventions and outcomes at the individual level that impact both the individual and the organization they serve. Theeboom et al. (2013) stated the results confirmed coaching has significant positive effect on performance and skills, well-being, coping, work attitudes, and self-

regulation. This analysis concludes that coaching is an effective means for improving how individuals function in organizations. Similar to DeMeuse et al. (2009) meta-analysis, this study observes that the majority of the studies included relied on self-reporting outcome measures which can lead to overestimation. Another conclusion states the existing literature does not provide thorough examination showing why coaching interventions are effective (Theeboom et al. 2013).

The next meta-analysis measured the effectiveness of workplace coaching focusing on learning and performance outcomes. Unlike the previously mentioned meta-analyses, this study targeted organizational samples as well as coaching provided by coaching practitioners. The study spanned both workplace and executive coaching. Fifty-four studies were identified in the literature search and 17 met the meta-analysis study criteria. Jones et al. (2016) stated the meta-analysis supports the positive effects of workplace coaching as an approach to employee learning and development in organizations. Coaching was more effective when conducted by internal coaches and when multisource feedback was excluded. Workplace coaching was effective whether conducted face-to-face or using blended techniques. This study shared similar concerns of the previous analyses, there is a lack of detail of coaching interventions applied and a need for studies to be structured so a specific intervention/process can be measured.

The next meta-analysis reviewed explored coaching as a developmental intervention in organizations (Grover and Furnham, 2016). This review focused on papers that included quantitative analysis results and of the 183 abstracts identified as relevant, 52 were selected for study inclusion. “Although, the final number of studies included in this review was three times the number included by De Meuse et al. it is still a very low number of studies for a definitive meta-analysis” (Grover & Furnham, 2016, p. 4). The authors also highlight the following

limitations regarding this and other coaching meta-analysis: purely qualitative papers were not included, lack of longitudinal research, overreliance on self-reporting, and gaps in research. Considering these limitations, the authors concluded there is an increase in well-being, career satisfaction and goal attainment through the use of coaching. Initial organizational results suggest coaching impacts peer and subordinate ratings of coachees' leadership behaviors and have a positive effect on those who work closely with the coachee.

The last meta-analysis reviewed for this paper focuses on the value of executive coaching through randomized controlled studies. Burt and Zenoia (2017) selected eleven published and unpublished studies to include in this study. Two limitations of this study were noted: seven of the eleven studies were related to one research group which may be considered too much influence over the outcome of this meta-analysis and the coaching interventions and outcomes varied. The conclusion of this study supports that coaching has a moderate positive affect on well-being, work-related attitude, coping strategies, and self-directed goal attainment. Further research is needed to answer with a higher degree of certainty 'what is the value?' and 'how do we measure the value?'

Hastings and Pennington (2019) asserted:

Interestingly, the studies and theories reviewed thus far have either focused on internal leaders or managers as coaches or didn't explicitly refer to external coaches. This causes some concern, as internal coaches would often have some form of direct authority over the team (Hackman & Wageman, 2005). Furthermore, given that 83% of coaching is provided by external coaches (ICF, 2016), it stands to reason that there should be more focus on the role and function of the external coach in research moving forward. (p. 177)

Grant (2016) also concluded:

There has been an almost exponential growth in the amount of coaching specific and coaching-related research over the past ten years. At the same time there has been considerable interest in the development of evidence-based approaches to coaching ... the level of professional wisdom is no longer enough. (p. 74)

This literature review suggests the need for further empirical studies using randomized controlled studies as well as studies designed to discern the individual elements that contribute to an effective coaching experience.

Successful Dyadic Coach Attributes

What characteristics determine a successful leadership coach? Sherman and Freas (2004) concluded no one has yet demonstrated conclusively what make an executive coach qualified or what makes one approach to executive coaching better than the other. In 2019, the International Coaching Federation along with the Human Capital Institute conducted research that revealed 83% of organizations plan to increase the use of coaching skills by managers and leaders over the next five years and 75% of the respondents agree that employees and executives in their organizations value coaching (ICF 2019). With this trend in mind, it would be beneficial for executive coaching decision makers to understand the skillset of a coach and how this skillset will impact and influence the leaders of their organization. The literature reviewed highlights core characteristics that can be attributed to the success of a dyadic coach without the benefit of a study focused on this topic.

The International Coaching Federation (ICF) updated its coaching core competency model in October 2019:

This competency model is based on evidence collected from more than 1,300 coaches across the world, including both ICF Members and non-members and representing a

diverse range of coaching disciplines, training backgrounds, coaching styles and experience levels. Some new elements and themes that emerged from the data...include a paramount emphasis on ethical behavior and confidentiality, the importance of a coaching mindset and ongoing reflective practice, the critical distinctions between various levels of coaching agreements, the criticality of partnership between coach and client, and the importance of cultural, systemic and contextual awareness.

Stout-Rostron, (2014a) echoed the importance of a coach having an “explicit ethical code” (p. 76). Building on the ethics theme, Jones et. al (2016) added a coach must provide privacy, a non-judgmental perspective, and confidentiality providing a safe environment for the coachee to reflect feedback and work on improving performance. Turk and Saue (2021) asserted “coaching creates the conditions for developing self-awareness, self-confidence and responsibility (Whitmore, 2017)” (p. 159). Sherman and Freas (2004) reported coaches must provide candor and honest feedback in relation to the coachees performance and behavior. McAdam (2005) asserted:

Coaches need to know themselves, their strengths and limitations; they need to have undergone a professional training programme with observation practice as part of the process; they need to understand the organizational context in which coaching takes place; they need to be passionate about learning from their work and through subsequent review with an experienced supervisor; and have the ability to communicate understanding or another person’s experience from that person’s perspective. (p. 12)

Dembkowski et al. (2006) listed seven core capabilities of executive coaching including: rapport building, deep listening, creative questioning, giving effective feedback, clear goal setting, intuition, and presence. The use of language is also an effective dyadic coaching attribute. “A

leadership coach highlights the effectiveness of metaphors and analogies to emphasize a point and to open the doorway to a new perspective and encourage deeper thinking” (Stout-Rostron, 2014b, p. 87). Wasylyshyn (2003) conducted an outcomes study and reported the top personal characteristics of an effective executive coach include: 85% forms connection with client (empathy, warmth, trust, listening skills, engages quickly), 82% professionalism (intelligence, integrity/honesty, confidentiality, objectivity), and 30% sound coaching methodology (honest and constructive feedback, contextual grounding, uncovers core issues, use of psychometrics) (p. 65).

This list of core characteristics, reflected in the literature, highlighted the attributes of an exemplary coach.

Successful Group Coach Attributes

The literature on successful group coach attributes built on the foundation of the dyadic coach attributes. Farmer (2015) maintained team coaching “is a complex and demanding intervention approach requiring an understanding of coaching, psychology, organizations and their systems, planning, and team dynamics” (p.78). Widdowson et al. (2020) suggested that a team coach needs to have knowledge of group dynamics, team psychology, team coaching models, theories on stage development of teams, and types of teams, including virtual teams (Grijalva et al., 2020; Hawkins, 2017; Leary-Joyce & Lines, 2018; Mathieu et al., 2017; Carr & Peters, 2013; Thornton, 2019)” (p. 40).

Facilitation skills is another key theme when exploring a core competency of a group coach. “Unlike one-to-one coaching, facilitation appears to be a key competency that shows up repeatedly in team coaching. Similarly, Heron (1999) indicated that teams need skilled facilitators to work with them on team structure, goals, process, and behaviour” (Widdowson et

al., 2020, p. 41). Britton (2013) has also discussed the need for team coaches to develop their facilitation skills and experience. Britton (2009) further stated:

I believe that great group coaches bring to their profession solid group facilitation skills, as well as mastery of core coaching skills and approaches. They create a solid and intimate connection with their groups, and listen for what the participants want is important to them, so that the group's agenda is respected. Great group coaches adopt their style and approach based on the different needs, creating the space for clients to learn from each other and share experiences is paramount in the group coaching process. Most significantly, group coaches distinguish themselves from other group facilitators with their strong focus on having the client identify and take action on their goals. A key priority for group coaches is to hold the space for clients to be account able for taking steps in achieving their goals and integrating their learning to their "real life" and work. It is this focus on making the learning and results stick that drew me to coaching years ago, and continues to be a primary focus and driver in my work (p. 9).

O'Connor and Cavanagh (2013) shared "the effectiveness of the group coaching process is best supported when coaches have a degree of mastery in group facilitation" (p.12).

Ostrowski (2019) had a different perspective on facilitation skills in conjunction with role fluidity:

Group coaching requires the coach to step back from the role of primary helper and focusing instead on holding (Winnicott, 1971) the group and on facilitating coaching competency in others. A central role of the group coach, then, is to enable group members to be successful in their roles as both coachees and peer coaches, and to encourage productive interaction and movement between these roles (p. 63)

Stout-Rostron (2014b) highlighted the importance of both facilitation and the teaching of group coaching skills. “It is important for anyone coaching teams or groups to be skilled not just in facilitating group-learning processes, but also in teaching coaching skills and competences for individual team members who need to develop their own direct reports in a coaching manner” (p. 177). Berry (2009) added the importance of developing group process skills so a coach can help navigate the socialization process. This process gives structure, creates boundaries, and ground rules. Brown and Anthony (2010) had a different point of view and suggested that group coaching is more goal focused than the process orientation of group facilitation.

The literature also supported deep knowledge of systems. Stout-Rostron (2014b) referenced this necessity:

The coach also needs to have an in-depth understanding of organisational systems – seeing the coaching intervention from a systems perspective, and understanding the need for “structure” in the interaction between coach, individual client, team and the organisational system. A danger of not understanding the “system” in which the client operates is that the coach risks becoming another part of that system (p. 178).

Brunning (2006) also supported this view and summarized “... the coach would need to be reasonably knowledgeable in the sphere of human systems, psychology, organizational and group dynamics, the impact of change, and individual development, both psychological and professional” (p. 222). Hauser (2012) emphasized that coaches need flexibility and skill related to teams, particularly in group dynamics and systems thinking. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) reiterated the importance of understanding team dynamics, social psychology, ethnography, and can set boundaries as well as self-regulate. “Working in a complex and unpredictable environment where there is no place to hide and in which the coach may need to adapt quickly to

what is happening in the room” (p. 105) requires an agile skillset. Like dyadic coaching, listening, being patient, knowing when to challenge and when to support, and comfort with silence are also important to coaching skills.

Similar to dyadic coaching, Britton (2015) observed “The ability to create a safe environment where group members feel confident to engage in a coaching conversation, the ability to step back and let the group lead the process...” (p. 119). Listening and powerful questions skills are also critical to the success of the group coach. Turk and Saue (2021) asserted “the main components of group coaching are mutual listening and asking coaching-type questions, which enables to make sure that the discussion and development includes all group members. Listening to colleagues helps to understand them and is a prerequisite to cooperation and creativity” (p. 159). Britton (2015) highlighted additional skills: the ability to create a common vision, facilitate team agreements on team operation, develop team goals through group conversations, support the participants continued development over time, and hold them accountable for goals set by the team. Finally, Ostrowski (2019) findings suggested:

The role of the group coach includes collaborating with group members to promote critical reflection, meaning generation, and the invention of new narratives that impact on identity and self-concept. Part of this process involves helping group members reflect on and make sense of their learning over time. (p. 63)

The literature supports the conclusion that many of the dyadic coach attributes can provide a foundation for a successful coaching experience but additional attributes must be added to this foundation for an optimal group coaching experience. Group coaching attributes such as group facilitation, human systems, psychology, group and organizational dynamics, systems thinking, etc. are complex concepts yet Lawrence and Whyte (2017) pointed out that

very few coaches receive targeted team/group coaching training “Typically training is attained through reading, facilitating, being mentored, observing others and/or learning on the job” (p. 105). Clutterbuck and Hodge (2017) suggested further study, as the field of coaching develops, that touch on the key successful group coach attributes: skill level of team coaches, the role of supervision, the skillset and experience of supervisors, and use of supervisory perspective related to the coaches learning experience.

Dyadic Coaching Structure Effectiveness

There are several benefits associated with the utilization of the dyadic coaching structure as an intervention. Brunning (2006) shared the results of two studies, one focused on the most useful factors in the coaching the clients received and the other reviewed the impact of executive coaching on performance, salary, and advancement. The first study found constructive feedback, trusting relationships, information on developing specific skills, and information on organizational strategy; specific actionable advice the most useful factors. The second study reviewed also suggested significant impact when utilizing executive coaching. High performers with high potential reported salary increases that were 145% greater than the company average and 70% experienced moderate to substantial development. For those individuals who were regarded at the outset as high performers with high potential, 70% reported moderate to substantial development and their average salary increase was 145% of the company average at their level. Solid performers reported 41% achieved moderate to substantial development and salary increases in line with other solid performers. For those with significant performance issues, 80% reported little or no development and salary increases were lower than the average for their positions (p. 68). Wasylyshyn’s (2003) outcome survey reported successful organizational engagement results:

63% noticed a change in behavior (building relationships, work/family integration, sustained progress), 48% increased understanding of self (motivational insight, accurate self-awareness, emotional competence, proactive career objectives, perception clarity, understanding company “fit”), 49% more effective leader (confidence, motivational ability, results, increased optimism), and 31% company satisfaction (shift in others’ perception of coachee, retention). (p.65)

Another common financial metric for measuring the outcome of an intervention is return on investment (ROI). McGovern et al. (2001) attempted to measure the ROI of dyadic executive coaching. “Estimates were reported between \$100,000 and \$1 million. Seventy-five percent of the sample (participants and stakeholders) indicated the value of the coaching was “considerably greater” or “far greater” than the money and time invested” (p. 7). Grover and Furnham (2016) stated due to the difficulty of isolating the specific impact of a coaching intervention on an individual, group of individuals, and organization’s performance, “the links between coaching and monetary changes within an organisation are likely to be complex and there is no reliable way to measure or calculate the benefits of coaching in terms of a financial ROI estimation” (p. 6). McGovern et al. (2001) study highlighted the challenges of helping executives determine an ROI estimate for their coaching process. There is tremendous diversity in how a coachee can assess its worth, having a variety of methods for determining ROI. “Without a standard calculation method, the range of responses for measuring ROI does not yield an accurate comparison methodology” (McGovern et. al., 2001, p. 7). Grant (2012b) suggested moving away from traditional organizational metrics to a more holistic, person-centered measure of effectiveness of coaching focused on well-being and engagement. Measuring the impact on subordinates’ satisfaction, retention and performance, the impact on relationships or

communication between different teams and the impact on the overall organizational or team culture could prove more effective measurements than the traditional metric of ROI.

The literature suggested that the structure of dyadic coaching is effective, however more research is needed to verify this conclusion. Brown and Grant (2010) highlighted “A major criticism of the dyadic approach is that it fails to position systemic factors at the core of the coaching process (O’Neill, 2000; Paige, 2002; Wheelan, 2003)” (p. 31). What approach would position systemic factors at the core of the coaching process?

Scaling of Dyadic Coaching Structure to Group Coaching Structure

Is there a method by which existing dyadic coaching structures can be scaled to a successful group coaching structure or are the models so diverse that the effectiveness of the coaching experience would be diminished by scaling? Are existing group models without scaling dyadic models? Is there a different methodology that would improve the current approach to group coaching? Manfred Kets de Vries study (2015) asserted that “one-on-one coaching is not as powerful for creating tipping points for change ... there is not the same intensity and focus in a single session compared with what we see happening in a group coaching session“ (p. 5). The literature mentioned several dyadic models that can be scaled to a group coaching model.

Hastings and Pennington (2019) referenced the GROW, Cognitive Behavioral Coaching, and PRACTICE models:

Whitmore (2009) suggests that the behavioural-based GROW model can be utilised in team coaching to improve task performance. Similarly, Hultgren et al (2013) proposed a model for Cognitive Behavioural Team Coaching (CBTC), to increase well-being and prevent stress, and suggest that the PRACTICE model (Palmer, 2007) provides a suitably solution-focussed approach that could be effective for use with teams. Both offer the

opinion that well-grounded, individual coaching models may be of use in team coaching. (p. 177).

Brown and Anthony (2010) made the case for scaling the dyadic GROW model to the GROUP model. The GRO of GROUP mirrors that of GROW (goal setting, reality exploration and option generation. The difference can be found in the UP of GROUP (understanding others and performing) The “understanding others” phase is designed to create group dialogue and enhance to concept of learning vicariously through others. The goal is to shift individual and group awareness which “enables generative solutions at a systemic level rather than the more common reactive responses on a symptom level” (Brown & Anthony, 2010, p.39). In the performing stage, the group migrates from options and dialogue into action and implementation. Action steps are created by the group and this leads to an exchange of ideas where group members have a clear understanding of the deliverables expected. The term ‘performing’ in this context draws from Tuckman’s (1965) notion of group stages, and it is important to note that the performing stage incorporates activities both within the coaching session and activities outside of the coaching session (Brown & Anthony, 2010, p. 40).

Chapman (2010) scaled the Integrated Experiential Coaching Model to team coaching for a large organization in order to increase the number of team members participating in coaching, experience the benefits and improved performance as well as enjoy the lower cost of scaling the model. In this particular case, it appears this model was scaled “with the greatest of ease” (p. 328). The stages include: concrete experience, reflective observation, conceptualization and active experimentation. Questions asked at each stage include: “What is the issue we want to work on? (Concrete experience); Why is it an issue? Why is it manifesting? (Reflective

observation); What are our options? What are the different scenarios? (Abstract conceptualization).” This proved to be a successful scaling experience.

In a Hastings and Pennington study, group coaches shared a different point of view related to the effectiveness of scaling. “Group coaches suggested that individual coaching models are, by design, not fit to scale to a group coaching structure because they do not consider the systemic context or the complexities of a team. The tools they used led to “creating the coaching space, catalysing team self-awareness and insight and building autonomy and accountability” (Hastings & Pennington, 2019, p. 183). A focus on the interpersonal relationships, relational dynamics and systemic context of the team, full participation by group members, and creating a coaching space where members feel safe all support the supposition that safety is central to the team coaching process, another theme that can also be found in dyadic coaching. Lawrence and Whyte (2017) noted in their study coaches agreed that you cannot scale a dyadic approach into a group due to complexities of managing the group process. Team coaching focuses on process vs content which can present challenges.

The ICF created a team coaching competency model, integrating the dyadic ICF core competency model with additional team coaching competencies, suggesting the dyadic core competencies can be scaled with additional skillsets and knowledge ICF (2012).

Table 4: ICF Team Coaching Competency Integration Points

Demonstrates Ethical Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Coaches the client team as a single entity -Maintains the distinction between team coaching, team building, team training, team consulting, team mentoring, team facilitation, and other team development modalities
-------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Demonstrates the knowledge and skill needed to practice the specific blend of team development modalities that are being offered -Adopts more directive team development modalities only when needed to help the team achieve their goals -Maintains trust, transparency, and clarity when fulfilling multiple roles related to team coaching
Embodies a Coaching Mindset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Engages in coaching supervision for support, development, and accountability when needed -Remains objective and aware of team dynamics and patterns
Establishes and Maintains Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explains what team coach is and is not, including how it differs from other team modalities -Partners with all relevant parties, including the team leader, team members, stakeholders, and any co-coaches to collaboratively create clear agreements about the coaching relationship, processes, plans, development modalities, and goals -Partners with the team leader to determine how ownership of the coaching process will be share among the coach, leader, and team.
Cultivates Trust and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Creates and maintains a safe space for open and honest team member interaction

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promotes the team viewing itself as a single entity with a common identity -Fosters expression of individual team members' and the collective team's feelings, perceptions, concerns, beliefs, hopes, and suggestions. -Encourages participation and contribution by all team members -Partners with the team to develop, maintain, and reflect on team rules and norms -Promotes effective communication within the team -Partners with the team to identify and resolve internal conflict
Maintains Presence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Uses one's full range of sensory and perceptual abilities to focus on what is important to the coaching process -Uses a co-coach when agreed to by the team and sponsors and when doing so will allow the team coach to be more present in the team coaching session -Encourages team members to pause and reflect how they are interacting in team coaching sessions -Moves in and out of the team dialogue as appropriate
Listens Actively	<p>Notices how the perspectives shared by each team member relate to other team members' views and the team dialogue</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Notices how each team member affects the collective team energy, engagement and focus -Notices verbal and non-verbal communication patterns among team members to identify potential alliances, conflicts, and growth opportunities -Models confident, effective communication and collaboration when working with a co-coach or other experts -Encourages the team to own the dialogue
Evokes Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Challenges the team’s assumptions, behaviors, and meaning-making process to enhance their collective awareness or insight Uses questions or other techniques to foster team development and facilitate the team’s ownership of their collective dialogue
Facilitates Client Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Encourages dialogue and reflection to help the team identify their goals and the steps to achieve those goals

*source ICF Team Coaching Competencies (2021)

This table suggests that the competencies can be scaled with the dyadic competencies providing the foundation and the team competencies building upon this foundation.

Several authors also share the need for additional model competencies when scaling to a group coaching model. Farmer (2015) shared that when comparing dyadic executive coaching to team coaching, the team coach works with the team and the team coach facilitates an intervention process over a period of multiple coaching sessions. The team coach observes

meetings and has dialogue with participants and other stakeholders to gain feedback about the team's performance and level of connection and engagement. Team coaches also need to be able to be self-motivated and comfortable with environments that may present a challenge as well as team that are focused on performance (p. 78). Kets de Vries (2005) asserted one of the keys to making group leadership coaching so effective is that the group members are committed to help each other change and stay on track. Group members set boundaries by encouraging each member to follow through on their commitments. They also provide support and acceptance, providing a sense of hope about the future. As group members share life stories, experiences, and feedback they receive, they undergo a journey of self-understanding. Listen to the stories of others can enable vicarious learning through role modeling and encourages empathy. All of this can take place only if there is deep trust among the participants. With trust, conflicts can be addressed and deepen commitment and accountability. All of these factors that have a tremendous impact on the bottom line of an organization. Farmer (2015) highlighted the connection to the importance of the coaching agreement in a group coaching scenario, mirroring the importance of this step in dyadic coaching:

Even before a prospective team coach responds to an invitation to meet with a potential sponsor, the need to have a full understanding of the latter's organisation is essential if the former is to have any credibility or concrete foundation to preparing for engagement (Haug, 2011). Clutterbuck (2007) spells out the importance of all parties establishing a shared understanding of: goals and timescales; what is meant by performance and how it is measured; and, team readiness and possible resistance. (p. 75)

Britton (2015) also suggested that in the group coaching setting it is important for group members to define their own goals and focus areas as well as collective goals. As in dyadic

coaching, coaching is a conversation designed to create awareness and insights that expedite results.

Hauser (2012) concluded coaching a work team is more complex than coaching individuals due to the systemic context; the effect of working with a team's larger organizational system is greater than coaching only one part of the system, and coaching work teams, compared to coaching individuals, requires a broader base of knowledge, skills, and experience, notably related to team performance, group dynamics, team development, and system. Stout-Rostron (2014b) supported Hauser's view stating group coaching structure needs to take a wider systemic view; a broader temporal horizon; and focus on connectedness and process. "Listening for meaning, displaying empathy, mindfulness, questioning, identifying assumptions and rules, extending the system and frames, turning toward tensions, seeking different voices, identifying purposes, keeping goals flexible, noticing patterns, and building genuine dialogue are important aspects of the group coaching structure. (Cavanagh, 2013a)" (p. 103). Hodge (2020) urged a systemic approach to team coaching and evaluating the impact of the interdependency of the systems. This includes: individual participants, leadership, contracting and recontracting, stages of team development, development., psychological phenomena, relationships, customs and culture of the organization, external influences, ethical issues and dilemmas, evaluation and progress reviews, and the role of the coach.

Brown and Grant (2010) compared dyadic and group coaching, acknowledging both tend to be focused on change and growth. They highlighted that group coaches need a strong understanding of group-based dialogue processes in addition to the interpersonal and rapport-building skills found in effective dyadic coaching. In order for group coaches to establish rapport at the group level, there must be a clear understanding of group dynamics. There are

various approaches group coaches can use to effective change: a combination of individual and group coaching, coaching individuals on their individual goals within a group setting, coaching the group as a unique entity with a focus on the group dynamics or some combination of these approaches. There is also support for a systemic approach to change and growth.

Kets de Vries (2005) views group coaching as more effective than dyadic coaching because it deals with both cognition and affect within the organisational system rather than focusing merely on individual goal attainment. Kotter's (2007) work on organisational change stresses the importance of a guiding coalition and the need to plan systemically because of the natural tendency of the organisation to resist change (Brown & Grant, 2010, p.34).

Staying with the systems theme, an understanding of power dynamics is also an important consideration. Positional, personal and systemic could have influence over of group interactions. Positional power can cause the group to defer to a member that has seniority, one that carries and leadership title, have an extended tenure at the organization, etc. Personal power could impact how an individual is able to influence the group and systemic power (cultural rules) can guide the behavior of group members (Gorell, 2013). Farmer (2015) built upon this and reminded readers that when comparing group coaching to one-on-one coaching, the range of roles and responsibilities within the team must be recognized.

Jones et al. (2019) analyzed how team coaching is different from dyadic coaching. Two themes were identified: focus on the team as a system and advanced coaching skills.

“Individuals form an interconnecting network which can be viewed as a complex whole” (p. 70). This system is a unit, with its own unique needs and challenges. Coaching a group is risky and complex, with the constant shifting of the group dynamic. It is a balancing act between the

relationship between the unit and the individuals that are engaged in the coaching experience. Participants in group coaching identified several core skillsets of effective team coaching: the ability to listen to and take into account multiple perspectives; the ability to observe and interpret interactions; a grasp of team facilitation techniques; building trust within the sessions; and creating a strong sense of safety. Ostrowski (2019) weighed in and agreed that group coaching is a unique process when compared to dyadic coaching. At issue are the distinctions that make group coaching uniquely itself. A number of social processes support or enhance coaching in a group context. Most importantly, participants' meaningful experiences involved learning from peer feedback or learning vicariously by engaging in peers' experiences. This type of learning is enhanced through the group members' interactions with each other vs. solely with a coach. "Thus, in group coaching, the coaching relationship expands beyond the dyad to encompass the entire group" (p. 62). "Group coaching appears to facilitate individual learning and change over time through the social processes of learning vicariously and learning through feedback" (p. 68).

Organizational systems may include an internal coach. Hicks (2010) stated many large organizations have internal dyadic coaches and "60% of these organizations thought it would be very easy for their internal coaches to coach teams as well as individuals" (p. 7). This point of view runs counter to the experience of tenured coaches. The fundamentals of dyadic coaching are magnified in the group coaching setting. Imagine having to coach ten individuals simultaneously. Core dyadic skills do transfer to the group coaching setting and there needs to be an awareness of the increase dynamics in group coaching. The ability to work within these dynamics as well as a clear understanding of group learning processes are additional necessary skills when scaling to group coaching. It is also important to consider what may be driving the group dynamic. What might be the agendas of those participating? What are they avoiding?

Seasoned coaches support additional training for coaches considering group coaching opportunities (Hicks, 2010). Jones et al. (2019) “argues that the coaching provided by an independent coach is conceptually different from the coaching provided by a supervisor or leader (Jones et al., 2016); primarily because the power relationship that exists between line managers and their subordinates is absent in the helping relationship between an independent coach and coachee” (p. 64). Using an external coach may add an element of safety for the group members participating in the group coaching experience.

A difference noted between the dyadic and group coaching is the use of supervision as a tool to ensure an optimal group coaching experience. Clutterbuck and Hodge’s (2017) survey revealed team coaches typically utilize supervisors in their team coaching practice while this is not a common practice is dyadic coaching. It is recommended that coaches in a supervisory role have extensive experience in systems, group processes, and team dynamics. It is also preferable that they conduct team coaching so they have firsthand experience of the issues that may present themselves through this coaching modality.

Just as in dyadic coaching, group coaching is a collaborative experience not only with the coach but with the group at large. Farmer (2015) stated:

As with all forms of coaching psychology, familiarisation with the client and their context, contracting, and a purposeful, collaborative process are paramount in team coaching. In addition, it carries with it the expectation that the team takes joint responsibility for identifying, working towards and achieving their objectives, and reviewing performance and learning points at the end. This process occurs over a number of sessions, and may also include observations of in situ team interactions with each other and with other stakeholders. (p. 78)

Ward (2008) also highlighted the collaborative nature of the group coaching experience. “They form alliances and networks so that transformation transcends the physical group process” (p. 76). They coach each other providing support and accountability. Group members challenge each other, share personal experiences, and make suggestions with the presence of their coach. By deep sharing, displaying vulnerability, committing to change, all participants observe transformation in action. Once the group members are “all in” the change process is initiated.

For group coaching to be effective and appropriate, individuals must be willing participants, just as in dyadic coaching. “Kets de Vries (2005) discusses the importance of participant consent, and voices ethical concerns regarding participants who are required under duress to participate in group coaching programs” (Brown & Grant, 2010, p. 34). Britton (2015) agreed with Kets de Vries assessment regarding the importance of coachee readiness. “Are they committed to the coaching process, ready to engage and be an active participant in their learning and growing?” (p. 119).

Britton (2009) shared that “group coaching is gaining popularity because it leverages time and resources, enjoys economies of scale, effects change by harnessing the collective wisdom of the group, and it is scalable” (p. 34). “As the industry continues to grow and evolve, movement beyond the one-on-one executive coaching model typically offered at the highest levels of organizations to a more collaborative group and team model can provide an effective and scalable solution for expansion.-Cockerham and Mitsch” (Britton, 2008, p. 36).

The use of group coaching vs. dyadic coaching can save time, deepen learning, and be a cost-effective alternative.

Hicks (2010) cautioned to consider these key points to consider when making the decision to scale from dyadic coaching to group coaching: don’t underestimate the complexity of

working with teams; acknowledge internal coaches may need more training in group dynamics in addition to their one-to-one coaching skills; consider the best time for the team to be coached, take into account the team's life cycle, structure, and specific tasks they are working on. Farmer (2015) echoed this when offering reasons why teams may not benefit from team coaching. The situation or team life-cycle stage may require an intervention other than coaching. The timing of team coaching is crucial. If the timing is not correct, the result could be further damage to the group.

Implementing team coaching as an intervention can “help new leaders and their teams manage all aspects of transition, transformation and change (Stout-Rostron, 2014b, p. 182). Group coaching is not a solution for all situations. Training, performance management, dyadic coaching, and mediation may be more appropriate interventions based on the specific need (Britton, 2015).

It is a cost-effective alternative to individual executive coaching; however, it can also be used as a complement to dyadic executive coaching. “Team coaching has been identified as essentially about the results experienced through the relationship between the coach, the individuals in the team and the resulting team dynamic which ultimately can impact on the culture and performance of the organisation“ (p. 182). Britton (2021b) also suggested a hybrid approach, a mix of dyadic and group coaching. Individuals enjoy the benefits of both coaching experiences. “This hybrid approach allows for focus on core foundations and common interest areas of the group. It allows each individual client an opportunity to explore their own interest areas in a more focused way” (6) A Hybrid Approach). Brown and Grant (2010) also offer this hybrid approach as a way to mitigate the discomfort participants may feel utilizing a group coaching approach. “...it may be that a judicious combination of individual and group coaching

is optimal, and this has been recommended by many of the proponents of group coaching (e.g., Anderson, et al., 2008) as well as some members of the broader organisational development community (Schein, 1999)” (p. 34).

The complexities of the group coaching process do not lend itself to the ability to simply scale a dyadic coaching model to meet the needs of a group. The dyadic coaching model may provide a foundation but other competencies must be put in place to meet the unique needs of groups. Another approach suggests it is not an either-or proposition, but the inclusion of both the dyadic and group coaching experiences to meet the needs of leaders and improve organizational performance. Regardless of the approach taken Gyllensten et al. (2020) suggested a need for more research for both group and executive group coaching that include “qualitative exploratory studies of the experiences of the coaching, and larger scale studies focusing on individual or organisational outcomes” (p. 42).

The Impact of Dyadic Coaching on Leadership Skill Acquisition/Augmentation

The literature suggested there is a positive impact on leadership skill acquisition and/or augmentation through the use of dyadic coaching. DeMeuse et al. 2009 explored the premise that dyadic coaching leads to sustained behavioral change and concluded the literature supports that it does contribute to an increased level of learning, effective in goal achievement, increased leadership effectiveness, improved leadership behaviors, increased self-awareness, enhanced team building, improved overall performance as well as sustained behavioral change (p. 122). Anthony (2017) also reviewed literature related to the effectiveness of dyadic coaching on leadership skill attainment and/or improvement. Findings suggest coaching improved leadership skills, job performance, skills development, attitude, self-efficacy, motivation, organizational

commitment, confidence, persuasive communication, mentoring, delegation, supervision as well as reducing stress (p. 931).

Stout-Rostron (2014b) reviewed the ICF Global Coaching Client Study which includes an index of “return on expectations”, which measures areas of impact that are important to the coachee. “The study provides qualitative evidence that cites the positive effects of coaching on these areas: self-esteem or self-confidence, communication skills, interpersonal skills, work performance, work– life balance, wellness, personal organisation, business management, time management, team effectiveness, corporate culture, and financial organisation (ICF et al., 2009:67– 75)” (p. 180). This study did not exclusively focus on those in positions of leadership however, it does show consistent findings to the other sources cited in this area.

The Impact of Group Coaching on Leadership Skill Acquisition/Augmentation

The literature reviewed suggested that in addition to dyadic coaching, group coaching also provides leadership skill acquisition and/or augmentation. “Team coaching helps with critical thinking skills and builds...longer-term skills and capacity to manage new challenges from their own resources over an extended period of time. (Hicks, 2010, p.4). Britton (2009) cited Ginger Cockerham, MCC who noted group coaching benefits individuals: support from the coach and other members of the group; increased motivation for forward movement; bigger vision for what is possible; collegial relationships; personal development enabled in a safe, confidential environment; professional development skills and tools; and improved health and well-being (p. 36). Ostrowski (2019) shared several skills learned though the a group coaching modality experience: learning new theories of effective action from another group member uncovering a new business opportunity; learning about one’s entrepreneurial identify; learning new business tactics which led to new product development; developing new strengths via

feedback resulting in a new business opportunity and creation of a new practice; achieving clarity about priorities through in improved work/life balance; and acquiring new self-awareness resulting in different work approaches and new claims to entrepreneurial identity. Gyllensten et al. (2020) executive group qualitative study resulted in four main themes: group engagement that created a high level of activity; space for thinking about strategic issues; taking a different perspective, and increased self-awareness and courage. It has the potential for positive group effects such as the development of support within the group, improved listening and communication skills, and knowledge transfer between group members. The members of the executive group coaching were highly engaged in the process, given an opportunity for reflection and creativity, increased self-awareness, and the ability to think in new and different ways. The study concluded that executive group coaching can be useful in helping managers to develop skills that are useful in leadership practice, and can also “provide opportunities for managers to give and receive well needed peer support” (Gyllensten et al., 2020, p. 43). Kets de Vries (2005) pleaded “my experience has shown that leadership coaching in a group setting has the highest payoff: high-performance organizations; results-oriented and accountable people; boundaryless organizations; and true knowledge management” (p. 75). Malling et al. (2020) study noted “improvement in communication skills, building collegial relations, conflict management, and leadership” (p. 7). This particular study suggested further studies were needed to explore the effects of this behavior on the organization.

Ward (2008) the INSEAD Global Leadership Centre (IGLC) collected data on around 3000 group coaching participants over 7 years, “much of which testifies that the group leadership coaching process is not only powerful, but in many cases life changing” (p. 67). “In group coaching the client is subject to many different perspectives about their behavior... (this

approach) seeks to short circuit those behaviours helping people to understand the causes of resistance and to recognise where and how they can become more effective (Kets de Vries, 2007)” (p. 68). De Lasson et al. (2016) studied the effect of group coaching as a tool to support junior doctors and concluded group coaching is an effective way to support professional identity during times of transformation and deepened the connection between participants who bonded over their shared experiences (p. 5). Vaartijes (2005) outlined a case study where a group consisting of a CEO and four senior managers were coached as a group over a period of six months. Gains were documented in the following categories: personal (understanding of differences, contribution, self-awareness), teamwork (trust, behavior, open-mindedness.), leadership (change management, engagement, etc.), decision making, and strategic focus. Brown and Grant’s (2010) literature review summarized a list of the benefits of group coaching (e.g., Anderson et al., 2008; Ascentia, 2005; Kets de Vries, 2005; Ward, 2008): understanding of acceptable group behaviors, insight into the psychodynamic process of the group, sustained behavior change, development of trust and support, improved listening and communication, conflict resolution, alignment, commitment and accountability, increased emotional intelligence, systemic awareness, prevention of silos, and better organizational results (p. 33). The literature supported a wide-array of leadership skill acquisition and/or or enhancement upon completion of a group coaching experience.

The Impact of Group Coaching on Organizational Performance

As with any intervention, organizations must be able to evaluate the benefit in order to validate its effectiveness. Britton (2009) cited Maureen Clarke, a certified coach who measured the effectiveness of her group coaching program related to organizational performance pre and post program. At the end of the program 84% felt their productivity had increased. 86%

developed concrete strategies to balance work and personal lives, 25% of participants performed their jobs without work-life conflict over a two-month period. Impact on stress indicators: 28% increase in healthy habits; 22% decrease in overall stress; and 14% increase in psychological well-being. Clarke noted that the changes identified with group coaching clients translate to an average annual savings of \$6,000 per employee (p. 41). Britton (2009) also cited Ginger Cockerham, MCC who noted “companies see results in the areas of production, retention, and initiative successes individuals in the groups make” (p. 36). McGovern et al. (2001) study measured the tangible and intangible impacts of executive coaching based on the feedback of the coachees.

Intangible business impacts include: improved relationship of direct reports, improved relationship of stakeholder, improved teamwork, improved relationship with peers, improved job satisfaction, reduced conflict, increased organizational commitment, improved relationships with clients, and other intangibles. Tangible positive business impacts include productivity, quality, organizational strength, customer service, reduced complaints, own retention, cost reductions, bottom line profitability, top line revenue, reduced turnover, and other miscellaneous benefits. (p. 5)

Britton (2009) shared other benefits to organizations: “fostering long-term sustainable change, happier and healthier employees, cost efficiencies, and more integrated thinking and connections across the organization” (p. 36). In a recent article Britton (2021c) added scalability, cross-functional fertilization and support for culture change, and reinforcement intervention. Group coaching is a way to cascade coaching to all leaders of an organization, regardless of their level in the organization. This form of coaching can also breakdown functional silos and promote new relationship that aid in culture change. Group coaching is also an effective vehicle to reinforce

key learning initiatives (Group Coaching Benefits for Organizations). DeMeuse et al. (2009) reviewed the impact of coaching at the organizational level and the benefits shared based on participant feedback included: “lower rates of absence among subordinates, a significant or very significant impact on at least one of nine business measures, productivity, employee satisfaction, improved on leadership, improved management team, improved on business deliverables, and improved on personal balance (‘When Coaching Measures Up,’ 2005)” (p. 123).

O’Connor et al. (2017) agreed that group coaching has much potential, but it is also difficult to measure the effective implementation of group coaching in large organizations. Hauser (2012) suggests that the practice of coaching...could serve as a potential means to create change and improve performance at the individual, team, and organizational levels...a paucity of coaching theories and frames specific to teams exists...much more research and development of the practice needs to be done (p. 66).

Conclusion

Successful dyadic coaching models may be used as a foundation for a group coaching model but due to complexities of group coaching, the models cannot be scaled by simply using a multiplier effect to accommodate a larger number of participants. Common themes emerged from the dyadic coaching models reviewed: identifying the current situation, stating an ideal outcome, determining gaps, utilizing the creative problem-solving technique of brainstorming for options to consider, setting goals, developing actions steps, executing action steps, evaluating the results of the actions taken in service of the outcome desired, and encouraging momentum can all be scaled as part of a group coaching model but cannot be the entirety of the model. Feedback from group coaches support this conclusion, stating that individual coaching models are not designed to scale to a group coaching structure because they do not consider the systemic context

of the complexities of a team and that dyadic coaching models do not address the interpersonal relationships, relational dynamics and system context of the team, full participation by group members and creating a coaching space where members feel safe.

The GROW dyadic model was scaled to the GROUP/RE-GROUP coaching model, taking into consideration the complexities of group dynamics, process perspective of groups, and the system nature of groups. The GRO portion of both models are the same (goal, reality, options), it's the addition of the UP that makes the model scalable to meet the needs of a group. The U stands for understanding others and is designed to create generative dialogue, help the group be open, listen to others, and be more comfortable with uncertainty. This section of the model addresses both systems thinking and learning. P is for perform and this portion of the model supports double- and triple-looped learning focused on group development. The RE-GROUP model that can be used for subsequent GROUP sessions with the addition of review and evaluate (RE-) steps. There is mention of the successful scaling of the Cognitive Behavioral Coaching model and the PRACTICE model for use in groups but the literature reviewed did not have the size and scope of study that GROUP/RE-GROUP demonstrated for leadership coaching.

When reviewing the coaching process, the elements of the process can be scaled to meet the unique needs of group coaching participants. Clarifying the coaching agreement, ensuring participants are willing to fully engage, checking for coach/group fit, review of the model to be used, ethical practices (including the bounds of confidentiality), creating awareness, developing SMART goals, experiential learning, reflection points, wrapping up, and celebrating are all elements of the dyadic coaching process. These elements can be scaled to meet the needs of

group coaching participants with the caveat that the additional complexities of the group coaching experience are intertwined with the elements of the process.

The literature does support the effectiveness and positive impact of dyadic coaching on leadership skill acquisition and/or augmentation. The data supports coaching contributes to sustained behavioral change, increased self-awareness and understanding, and more effective leadership. It also leads to improved goal achievement, staff development, team building, management effectiveness, as well as personal and workplace attitude. Dyadic coaching also increases confidence, ability to communicate persuasively, job performance, skills development, delegation, and ability to mentor and support staff members. It reduced the reliance on close supervision as a leadership style. The literature also supports the effectiveness and positive impact of group coaching on leadership skill acquisition and/or augmentation. Group coaching contributes to increased critical thinking skills, ability to manage new challenges from their own resources, increased motivation, improved vision for what is possible, collegial relationships, personal development, professional development skills and tools, improved health and well-being, priority clarity, business identity (personal brand), creative problem solving, increased self-awareness and courage, ability to shift perspective, improved communication skills, improvement, including improved: well-being, career satisfaction, goal attainment, work performance, productivity, time management, team effectiveness, and work-life balance. It also supports the effectiveness of group leadership coaching including improved: problem-solving, conflict resolution, self-awareness, self-confidence, stress management, well-being, independent thinking, self-reflection, cooperation skills, professional identity formation, emotional intelligence, and team performance. By leveraging the power of group accountability, it

improved the likelihood of sustained behavior change through the support of peers when space was created for deep trust and sharing between participants.

The literature also supports the premise that utilizing the group coaching modality has a positive effect on organizational performance. Improved retention, increased productivity, improved quality, increased employee engagement, improved customer service, reduced complaints, cost reductions, reduced turnover, and silo breakdown all contribute to improved profits and increases in revenue. What is lacking in the literature is shared definitions in which to effectively evaluate what is meant by “increased critical thinking”, “more effective leadership”, “improved communication skills”, etc. Without the benefit of shared definitions and the corresponding criteria that can specifically be measured to demonstrate improvement for individuals and groups, it makes it difficult to ascertain exactly what has improved. Developing a standardized methodology with larger study sizes would help clarify what is being measured and how the gaps in leadership skills are improving. When measuring the impact group coaching has on organizational performance it is difficult to determine causation vs. correlation. If a group coaching intervention is utilized for a sales team and one year later the revenue numbers increase by 100%, was the intervention the cause of this increase or was it another factor i.e., recruiting a top performer from a competitor, a new sales bonus that tripled the existing bonus, the acquisition of a vertical organization that has been mandated to buy the organization's products, etc. Shared definitions and criteria may be a bit easier to discern (metrics related to business objectives), however, the methodology used must be able to isolate variables and their impact on organizational performance.

The skill level of the coach directly impacts the success of any coaching outcome yet the literature reviewed did not yield a study specifically highlighting the attributes of dyadic and/or

group leadership coaches. The literature did reference such attributes in the context of other areas of study. The attributes of dyadic leadership coaches can be used as a foundation for group leadership coaches including: ethical behavior, confidentiality, growth mindset, genuine connection, ongoing reflective practice, clear communication with on-going clarification, cultural awareness, creating psychological safety, deep rapport and trust building skills, ability to provide honest and comprehensive feedback, attended a professional training program including practicums, recognition of verbal and non-verbal communication patterns, creative questioning, goals setting, focus and presence and use of language (metaphor, analogy, storytelling, voice modulation, etc.). Successful group leadership coach attributes include all of the attributes cited for a dyadic leadership coach and an understanding of: group coaching, psychology, organizations and their systems, planning, team dynamics, group dynamics, states of development of teams, types of teams, and facilitation skills. The literature states very few coaches receive formalized education/training and instead rely on reading, facilitation, mentoring, observing, or on the job training. Standardizing group coaching credentialing, similar to what may be achieved as a dyadic coach through an accreditation body, would assist organizations in selecting credentialed coaches from an ever-growing pool of group coaching candidates.

Recommendations

Elements of dyadic models may be utilized in group coaching models however group coaching models must address the complexities of group dynamics, process perspective of groups, and the systemic nature of groups. The RE-GROUP model illustrates the successful scaling of a dyadic coaching model (GROW) to a group coaching modality and its properties should be examined when consideration is being given to scaling an existing dyadic coaching model. The successful outcome of a group coaching intervention hinges on the background and

experience of the coach selected for the coaching engagement. Credentialing group leadership coaches through a respected coaching governing body will assist organization in selecting a coach that meets standardized skillset requirements. Group leadership coaching is an effective intervention but the much of the reported benefits are anecdotal rather than evidenced based. Additional empirical and comparison studies are needed to validate this recommendation. A hybrid of both dyadic and group leadership coaching may yield the best outcomes however, additional studies are needed to validate this hypothesis.

References

- Ashkenas, R. (2020). Executive coaches, your job is to deliver business results. *Harvard Business Review*.
<https://hbr.org/2020/08/executive-coaches-your-job-is-to-deliver-business-results>
- ANIMA. (n.d.) Co-Visions groups. Retrieved November 7, 2021,
<https://purpose-power-presence.com/anima-co-vision-groups/>
- Anthony, E. L. (2017). The impact of leadership coaching on leadership behaviors. *The Journal of Management Development*, 36(7), 930-939.
- Ashkenas, R. (2020). Executive coaches, your job is to deliver business results. *Harvard Business Review*.
<https://hbr.org/2020/08/executive-coaches-your-job-is-to-deliver-business-results>
- Berry, K. (2019). Developmental modalities and team coaching.
<https://www.dentalgrouppractice.com/developmental-modalities-and-team-coaching.html>
- Britton, J. (2021) 5 ways to explore vision with groups or teams.
<https://www.thecoachingtoolscompany.com/5-ways-to-explore-vision-with-groups-or-teams-by-jennifer-britton/>
- Britton, J. (2021b). 6 key team and group coaching approaches to create connection and engagement.
<https://www.thecoachingtoolscompany.com/the-6-key-approaches-for-team-and-group-coaching-to-create-connection-and-engagement-by-guest-author-jennifer-britton/>
- Britton, J. (2021c). What are the benefits of group coaching?
<https://www.thecoachingtoolscompany.com/group-coaching-benefits-coaches-clients-organizations-by-jennifer-britton/>
- Brunning, H. (2006). *Executive coaching: Systems-psychodynamic perspective*. Taylor &

Francis Group

- Brown, S. & Grant, A. (2010) From GROW to GROUP: Theoretical issues and a practical model for group coaching in organisations. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 3(1), 30-45
- Burt, D. & Talati, Z. (2017). The unsolved value of executive coaching: A meta-analysis of outcomes using randomized control trial studies. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 15(2), 17-24
- Carr, C. & Peters, J. (2013). The experience of team coaching: A dual case study. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 8(1), 80-98.
- Chapman, L. (2010). *Integrated experiential coaching: Becoming an executive coach*. Karnac Books Ltd.
- Chidiac, M. (2006). Getting the best out of executive coaching: A guide to setting up a coaching process. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 20(3), 13-15.
- Clutterbuck, D. & Hodge, A. (2017) Team coaching supervision survey.
<https://alisonhodge.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/team-coaching-supervision-survey-2017.pdf>
- Cook, S. (2009). *Coaching for high performance: How to develop exceptional results through coaching*. IT Governance Ltd.
- De Lasson, L., Just, E., Stegeager, N., & Malling, B. (2016). Professional identity formation in the transition from medical school to working life: a qualitative study of group-coaching courses for junior doctors. *BMC Medical Education*, 16(1).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0684-3>
- De Meuse K.P., Dai G., & Lee R.J. (2009). Evaluating the effectiveness of executive

- coaching: Beyond ROI? *Coach International Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2, 117–134.
- Dembkowski, S. & Eldridge, F. (2003). Beyond grow: A new coaching model. *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching* 1(1).
- Dembkowski, S., Eldridge, F., & Hunter, I. (2006). *The seven steps of effective executive coaching*. Thorogood Publishing.
- Divine, Laura & James Flaherty (2002), Coaching Essential Competencies for Leaders. <https://centreforcoaching.ch/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Coaching-in-leadership-development-by-Craig-OFlaherty-and-Janine-Ahlers.pdf>
- Farmer, S. (2015). Making sense of team coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 11(2), 72-80.
- Forbes Coaches Council. (2018). 16 powerful questions coaches ask their clients to help achieve their goals. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2018/06/21/16-powerful-questions-their-clients-ask-to-help-acheive-their-goals/>
- Fry, R. (2020). The pace of boomer retirements has accelerated in the past year. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/11/09the-pace-of-boomer-retirements-has-accelerated-in-the-past-year/>
- Fumoto, E. (2016). Developing a group coaching model to cultivate creative confidence. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 10, 110-127.
- Gorell, R. (2013). Group coaching. Kogan Page Ltd.
- Grant, A. (2003). The impact of life coaching on goal attainment, metacognition and, mental health. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 31(3), 253-264.

- Grant, A. (2011). Is it time to REGROW the GROW model? Issues related to teaching coaching session structures. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 7(2), 118-126.
- Grant, A. (2012). Making positive change: A randomized study comparing solution-focused vs. problem-focused coaching questions. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 31(2), 21-35.
- Grant, A. (2012b). ROI is a poor measure of coaching success: Towards a more holistic approach using a well-being and engagement framework. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 5, 1-12
- Grant, A. (2016). What constitutes evidence-based coaching? A two-by-two framework for distinguishing strong from weak evidence for coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1, 74-85.
- Grant, A. (2017). Solution-focused cognitive-behavioral coaching for sustainable high performance and circumventing stress, fatigue, and burnout. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 69(2), 98-111.
- Griffiths, K. (2005). Personal coaching: A model for effective learning. *Journal of Learning Design*, 1(2), 55-65.
- Gross, J. (2019). The process executive leadership coaches use to elevate world-class leaders: using Marshal Goldsmith stakeholder centered coaching to enhance leadership capabilities. <https://medium.com/swlh/the-process-executive-leadership-coaches-use-to-elevate-world-class-leaders-5c5d2e6a90ad>
- Grover, S., & Furnham, A. (2016). Coaching as a developmental intervention in organisations: A systematic review of its effectiveness and the mechanisms underlying it. *PloS one*, 11(7), 1-42.
- Gyllensten, K., Henschel, C., & Jones, G. (2020). The experience of executive group coaching:

- A qualitative study. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 15(1), 37-43
- Gyllensten, K. & Spaten, O. (2020). The role of the coaching relationship in the coaching process. *Coaching Psykologi the Danish Journal of Coaching Psychology*, 9(1).
- Hackman, J.R., & Wageman, R. (2005). A theory of team coaching. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 269-287.
- Hamlin, R., Ellinger, A., & Beattie, R. (2009). Toward a profession of coaching? A definitional examination of coaching, organisation development, and human resource development *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Hargrove, R. (2003). *Masterful Coaching*. Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Hastings R. & Pennington, W. (2019). Team coaching: A thematic analysis of methods used by external coaches in a work domain. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*. 17(20), 74-88.
- Hauser, L. (2012). *Shape-shifting: A conceptual framework for coaching work teams* (Publication No. 3543873) [Doctoral thesis, Fielding Graduate University]
<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/shape-shifting-conceptual-framework-coaching-work/docview/1220493789/se-2?accountid=9253>
- Hauser, L. (2014). Shape-shifting: A behavioral team coaching model for coach education, research and practice. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 5(2), 48-71.
- Hicks, B. (2010). Team coaching: A literature review. *Institute for Employment Studies*.
www.employment-studies.co.uk
- Hodge, A. (2020) *Mapping the dynamics of team coaching*. Alison Hodge.
alisonhodge.com/mapping-the-dynamics-of-team-coaching

- International Coaching Federation Introduces: Coaching in Organizations. (2020, December 5). *Investment Weekly News*, 195.
- International Coaching Federation. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved November 1, 2021 from <https://coachingfederation.org>
- International Coaching Federation (2021). *ICF Team Coaching Competencies: Moving Beyond One-to-One Coaching*. <https://coachingfederation.org>
- Jones R. & Lyubovnikova, J. (2019). Conceptualizing the distinctiveness of team coaching. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(2), 62-78.
- Jones, R., Woods, S., & Guillaume, Y. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 249-277.
- Jones, S. (2020). The Case for Leadership Coaching in Law Schools: A New Way to Support Professional Identity Formation. *Hofstra Law Review*, 48(3), 659–680.
- Kaigh, E., Driscoll, M., Tucker, E., & Lam, S. (2014). Preparing to lead: Finance professionals are essential in narrowing leadership gaps. *Corporate Finance Review*, 19(2), 5-12.
- Kets de Vries, M. (2005). Leadership group coaching in action: The Zen of creating high performance teams. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, 19(1), 61–76.
- Kets de Vries, M. (2014). The group coaching conundrum. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 12(1), 79–91.
- Kets de Vries, M. (2015). Vision without action is a hallucination: Group coaching and strategy Implementation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44, 1- 8.
- Kouzes, J., Posner, B., Biech, E., & Kouzes, T. (2016). *A coach's guide to developing exemplary*

leaders : Making the most of the leadership challenge and the leadership practices inventory. Pfeiffer.

- Losch, S., Traut-Mattausch, E., Muhlberger, M. & Jonas, E. (2016). Comparing the effectiveness of individual coaching, self-coaching, and group coaching: How leadership makes the difference. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1-18.
- Lane, D.A., and Corrie, S. (2006). *The modern scientist-practitioner: A guide to practice in Psychology*. Routledge.
- Lane, D. and Corrie, S. (2009). Does coaching psychology need the concept of formulation? *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 4 (2), 193-206.
- Lawrence, P. and Whyte, A. (2017). What do experienced team coaches do? Current practice in Australia and New Zealand. *International Journal of Evidenced Based Coaching and Mentoring.*, 15(1), 94-113.
- Lennard, D. (2010). *Coaching models : A cultural perspective : a guide to model development for practitioners and students of coaching*. Taylor and Francis Group.
- Lewin K. (1951). *Formalization and progress in psychology*. Harper.
- Liu, C., Pirola-Merlo, A., Yang, C., & Huang, C. (2009). Team effectiveness: Evidence from high-tech industries in Taiwan. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 2009, 37(1), 41-58.
- Malling, B., De Lasson, L., Just, E., & Stegeager, N. (2020). How group coaching contributes to organisational understanding among newly graduated doctors. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(1), 1-8.
- Mazareanu, E.W. (2020), Workplace learning and development: statistics & facts. <https://tinyurl.com/y4xpkemr>
- McAdam, S. (2005). *Executive coaching : How to choose, use and maximize value for yourself*

and your team. Thorogood Publishing

McGovern, J., Lindemann, M., Vergara, D., Murphy, S., Barker, L., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2001).

Maximizing the impact of executive coaching: Behavioral change, organizational outcomes, and return on investment. *The Manchester Review*, 1(6), 1-9.

O'Connor, & Cavanagh. (2013). The coaching ripple effect: The effects of developmental coaching on wellbeing across organisational networks. *Psychology of Well-Being: Theory, Research and Practice*, 3(2), 1-23.

O'Connor, S., Studholme, I., & Grant, A. (2017). Group coaching in a large complex

organisation: Lessons learnt from experience. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 15(2), 1–16.

Ostrowski, E. (2018). *Coming in from the cold: The experience of group coaching as a setting for entrepreneurial learning and change* (Publication No. 10746488) [Doctoral dissertation, Fielding Graduate University]. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Ostrowski, E. (2019). Using group coaching to foster reflection and learning in an MBA classroom. *Philosophy of Coaching: An International Journal*, 4(2), 53-74.

Palmer, S. (2007). PRACTICE: A model suitable for coaching, counselling, psychotherapy and stress management. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 3(2), 72-77.

Palmer, S. (2011). The PRACTICE model of coaching: towards a solution-focused approach. *Coaching Psychology International*, 1(1), 4-6.

Palmer, S. (2011b). Revisiting the “P” in the PRACTICE coaching model. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 7(2), 156-158.

Palmer, S., & McDowall, A. (2010). *The coaching relationship : Putting people first.* Taylor &

Francis Group.

Salas, E., Shuffler, M. L., Thayer, A. L., Bedwell, W.L. & Lazzara, E.H. (2015) Understanding and improving teamwork in organizations: A scientifically based practical guide.

Human Resource Management, 54(4), 599-622.

Sherman, S. & Freas, A. (2004). The wild west of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review*
<https://hbr.org/2004/11/the-wild-west-of-executive-coaching>

Segers, J., Vloeberghs, D., Henderick, X., & Inceoglu, I. (2011). Structuring and Understanding the coaching industry: The coaching cube. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2), 204-221.

Stout-Rostron, S. (2014a). *Business coaching international : Transforming individuals and organizations*. Taylor and Francis Group.

Stout-Rostron, S. (2014b). *Leadership coaching for results : Cutting edge practices for coach and client*. Knowres Publishing.

Theeboom T., Beersma B., & Van Vianen A. (2014). Does coaching work? A meta-analysis on the effects of coaching on individual level outcomes in an organizational context. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9, 1–18.

Tredway, L., Simon, K., & Militello, M. (2021). Nested coaching links learning from coach to leader to teacher. *The Learning Professional*, 42(2), 52-55.

Turk, K. and Saue, K. (2021). Employee development through group coaching and its applications in organisations. *Estonian Discussions on Economic Policy*, 157-173.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348566304>

Ward, G. (2008) Towards executive change: A psychodynamic group coaching model for short

- executive programmes. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(1), 67-78.
- Wasylyshyn, K. (2014). *Destined to lead*. Palgrave Macmillian.
- Wasylyshyn, D. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 55(2), 94-106.
- Whitmore, J. (2017). *Coaching for Performance*. Performance Consultants International
- Widdowson, L., Rochester, L., Barbour, P., & Hullinger, A. (2020). Bridging the team coaching competency gap: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring 2020*, 18(2), 35-50.
- World of Work (2019). The ACHIEVE coaching model.
<https://worldofwork.io/2019/08/the-achieve-coaching-model/>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020). *Labor Force Statistics from Current Population Survey*. <https://www.bls.gov/cps/spsaat11.htm>
- Vaartjes, V. (2005). Integrating action learning practices into executive coaching to enhance business results. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* 3(1), 1-17.
- Uta, I.C. (2019). Business coaching industry to top \$15 billion in 2019. *Brand Minds*,
<https://tinyurl.com/y2c4rt7v>
- Van Dyke, P. (2014) *Virtual group coaching: A research study*. (Publication No. 3545895).
 [Doctoral dissertation: Fielding Graduate University]. Retrieved from ProQuest
 Dissertations and Theses database.