COACHING MODELS FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: AN INTEGRATIVE REVIEW

WENDY CAREY, DONALD J. PHILIPPON, AND GRETA G. CUMMINGS

The purpose of this article was to describe and compare coaching models and to address their relevance to the advancement of leadership. Coaching has become a popular strategy for leadership development and change in complex environments. Despite increasing popularity, little evidence describes the necessity and impact of coaching. An integrative literature review from 1996 to 2010, retrieved through seven databases, reference tracking, and consultation with academic networks, led to inclusion of peer-reviewed articles on coaching models. Themes and critical elements in the selected coaching models were analyzed. The search yielded 1,414 titles. Four hundred twenty-seven abstracts were screened using inclusion/exclusion criteria, and 56 papers were retrieved for full-text screening. Ten papers were included: two coaching models from health care settings, seven from business settings, and one from a medical education institution. Critical components of coaching models are: coach–coachee relationship, problem identification and goal setting, problem solving, transformational process, and mechanisms by which the model achieves outcomes. Factors that impact positive coaching outcomes are: coach's role and attributes, selection of coaching candidates and coach attributes, obstacles and facilitators to the coaching process, benefits and drawbacks of external versus internal coaches, and organizational support. The elements of coaching models identified in this review may be used to guide future research on the effectiveness of coaching as a leadership strategy.

Introduction

Continuity of leadership is a fundamental requirement for success in any organization. Primarily focusing on patient care, the majority of health care organizations do not have leadership development programs in place (Beckham, 2003). Challenged with an aging workforce, nursing shortages, and rapid change in health systems, there is a need to retain and prepare health care personnel

JOURNAL OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES, Volume 5, Number 1, 2011

View this article online at wileyonlinelibrary.com • DOI:10.1002/jls.20204

to assume leadership positions in order to meet future organizational demands. Professional coaching is seen to have the potential to assist leaders in meeting professional and personal goals, to retain leadership talent, to support succession planning, and to improve individual and organizational performance (McNally & Lukens, 2006). As a long-term strategy to enhance the execution of an organization's mission, coaching is widely believed to influence positively leadership, increase charismatic behaviors, and inspire and affect followers (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Kowalski & Casper, 2007). Emphasizing action, accountability, and personal responsibility, coaching support provides leaders and potential leaders with a safe environment for learning how to creatively manage change and conflict, improve communication, strengthen self-confidence, retool skills, and foster multicultural relationships in a positive, constructive way (Bennet & Bush, 2009; Grant, 2007).

Concerns are rising in health care over challenges in leading a sector besieged with rising costs, ever-changing regulations, unprecedented growth in technology, and a frustrated workforce (Hartman & Crow, 2002; Scott, 2002). The degree to which leaders will be able to meet these new trends and requirements will depend on their abilities to forgo the status quo and lead with courage, taking risks, and embracing change (Parker, Hall, & Kram, 2008). Skills and attitudes in leadership development are shifting from maintenance of the status quo to leading with commitment to the organization's mission and constantly growing to meet the challenges of changing organizational needs (Saporito, 1996; Scott). Developing leaders by training alone may be insufficient. Cultivating new attitudes and behaviors that help leaders move from ways of thinking and acting that were common, workable, and dependable in the past will create a shift to generate new perceptions, different outcomes, and a different future. Coaching is increasingly seen as a part of the solution for sustainable change (Scott; Sherman & Freas, 2004).

Assertions that challenge and complexities are inherent in health care sectors undermine the commonalities in mission, vision, and goals between business and health care sectors (Beckham, 2003; Kraemer, 2003). Possibilities for similar strategies for succession planning are underutilized under the assumption that leadership development innovation, policy, and strategic direction used in corporations will not support a primary focus on patient care (Abrams, 2002). However, as markets and financial shortages strain health care organizations, the pressure to devote more resources and attention to their operations as a business escalates, and continuity of leadership is essential to guide the course and direction of the organization (Abrams). By studying successful strategies used by businesses that thrive in similarly complex and dynamic environments, the health care industry has much to gain.

HISTORY AND TRENDS

The term *coaching* is derived from a French term that means to convey a valued person from one point to another (Haas, 1992). While the term referred to travel by a stagecoach-like conveyance, the meaning fits well in the current context of the coaching process that is moving valued people forward. It is proposed that the earliest form of coaching can be traced back 2,400 years. Socrates may be seen as among the first known coaches (Nielsen & Norreklit, 2009). Through his use of dialogue and questioning, Socrates was able to elicit greater insight and understanding through reflective reasoning and questioning. The process of the Socratic method is still seen as a means to enhance self-confidence in our ability to reason by encouraging ordinary human reflection in a dialogue setting (Neilsen & Norreklit; Saran & Neisser, n.d.).

In the mid-20th century, coaching in the business world focused on remediation for derailing executives, then shifted to preparing high-potential employees for career advancement (Bono, Purvanova, Towler, & Peterson, 2009; Giglio, Diamante, & Urban, 1998). As the concept of coaching developed, organizations began employing psychologists, or using psychoanalytical theory, to understand employee motivation and development needs, as well as for employee recruitment, selection, and assessment. Within the same time period, the title *coach* was given to a person who prepared athletes and performers and directed team strategy (Haas, 1992). Sports strongly influenced the rise of coaching with the development of milestone coaching methods. Gallwey (1974) described a psychological approach to maximize sports performance, and later Whitmore (1992) published *Coaching for Performance,* in which he developed the most influential and adaptable model

of coaching—the GROW model: goal, reality, options, will (as cited in Performance Coaching International, 2006).

Increasingly, many large private, public, and voluntary-sector organizations (as well as small and medium-sized businesses) use coaching as a stand-alone development solution or juxtapose coaching with other organizational development programs and formal succession plans. Bluckert (2004) noted that dyadic (one-on-one) consultation has existed in some form for decades and will continue to be practiced well into the future.

Contemporary organizations are recognizing the need to develop leader competencies that enhance leaders' capacity to understand and distinguish their own feelings, manage their own behavior, and manage relationships (Blattner & Bacigalupo, 2007; Grant, 2007). As cornerstones of emotionally intelligence (EI) leadership theory, these attributes are believed to leverage emotional and cognitive energy that facilitates positive communication, improve decision making and task delegation, enhance self- and public image, attenuate personality defects, and accentuate personality strengths (Blattner & Bacigalupo; Boyatzis, 2007; Wolfe, 2007). Together with psychology theories, coaches often adapt elements of EI into coaching to help leaders acquire emotional competence. As coaching practice evolves, more coaches may explicitly incorporate processes and components of EI into coaching to assess EI abilities, create an understanding of the emotional landscape, help clients to understand and manage their own reactions to events, and produce more effective solutions.

THE PRACTICE OF COACHING LEADS RESEARCH

To meet increasing challenges in complex environments, coaching has become one of the top five strategies for leadership development and change over the last decade (Underhill, as cited in Bennett & Bush, 2009). Despite limited evidence of coaching's necessity and impact, there are an estimated 30,000 coaches worldwide, generating revenue of US$1.5 billion (Gray, 2006). Notwithstanding the growing popularity of coaching across sectors with the explosion of coaching consulting companies and marketing initiatives over the past 10 years, there is a paucity of supporting empirical research on the efficacy of coaching.

A review of five known empirical studies reported that "there is evidence that executive coaching may positively impact individual productivity at the most senior levels" and that "coaching results in increased learning, increased self-awareness and development" (Kampa & White, as cited in Kilberg, 2004). The majority of current coaching literature is experiential, opinion, and case study based, and there is a dearth of literature that generalizes experience to theory. In an emerging area of practice, experiences that are reported in case studies are useful for generating theory and empirically testable hypotheses. Subsequently, researchers (such as Kilberg) work to generalize coaching from experience to theory, and in testing theory against phenomenology (Lowman, 2005).

The purpose of this literature review was to integrate and analyze dyadic (one-to-one) coaching models in use across a variety of sectors. Specifically, our objectives were to examine: how leaders are coached; theoretical models/frameworks for coaching used by leaders; mechanisms that coaching models propose to achieve outcomes; and commonalities and differences among coaching models.

Definitions

Definitions of coaching vary based on perspective, intended recipients, objectives, and setting. Milner and Bossers (2004) defined coaching as a short-term relationship for providing feedback on areas requiring change. Others defined coaching as a one-on-one relationship of trust aimed at fostering learning and professional growth, where such relationships provide the impetus for "professional breakthroughs"; that is, significant change in practice achieved through increased personal growth (Haynor, 1994; Price, 2009). Similarly, executive coaching refers to a "one-on-one relationship between a professional coach and an executive (coachee) for the purpose of enhancing coachee's behavioral change through self-awareness and learning, and thus ultimately for the success of individual and organization" (Joo, 2005, p. 468).

Coach refers to the one who provides one-on-one coaching, while the *coachee* (or *executive* in executive coaching) refers to the one who gets the coaching service. The *organization* may be interchanged with the *business* and

refers to the firm, institution, and stakeholders, who hire the coach. *External coaches* are hired from outside the organization, usually from a coaching agency. *Internal coaches* are employees of the organization who may or may not have coaching training and skills (Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2009).

Methods

Based on revised methodologies proposed by Torraco (2005) and Whittemore and Knafl (2005), an integrative review method was used to guide this analysis. As an approach that allows for the combination of literature and research types, the integrative review allows amalgamation of data from a variety of sources when little empirical research has been done. An initial scope revealed a plethora of articles and books on the application of coaching models and reported positive effects resulting from their use, but few of these can be classified as research. In light of the lack of research and the subjective nature of coaching interventions that do not lend themselves easily to traditional research methods, the majority of current coaching literature is experiential, opinion, and case study, and little is written that generalizes experience to theory, or vice versa.

DATA SOURCES

Seven electronic databases were searched using these search terms: coach* AND (model OR theor* OR framework) AND leadership for the time period 1996–2010. Databases included Emerald Fulltext, Business Source Complete, Medline, CINAHL, ISI Web of Knowledge, PsychINFO, and Academic Search Complete. Google Advanced Search was browsed using the same search terms, using the exclusion option to eliminate students, patients, and sports. Google Scholar was searched using the terms: coach* [professional development] [leadership] [theor* or model or framework]. Reference tracking was conducted for each publication selected for inclusion (Table 1). Relevant titles found were classified and sorted according to established inclusion criteria.

INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

Opinion papers, experiential, theoretical, case study, qualitative, and quantitative papers were included. Articles were published in English, and between 1996 and 2010. Papers eligible for inclusion met all of the following criteria: an aligned view or definition of coaching, and detailed description of a coaching model or framework with structure, clear concepts, and sufficient detail in the description of the model to the point it could be feasibly replicated. Included papers addressed coaching for leadership development, and adults in a work setting. To facilitate amalgamation of different avenues of inquiry, coaching literature from business and health care sectors were included. Coaching models developed for management levels were included exclusively. Student coaching, clinical coaching, sales, and sport or youth coaching were excluded. To facilitate comparisons of one-on-one coaching, team and group coaching were excluded. Secondary publications were excluded to avoid representing duplicates of primary models. A deadline was set, after which date any article found would not be included.

SCREENING

Article titles and abstracts that referred to coaching in business or health care settings were retained for further evaluation. A checklist in chart format was devised by the primary author using the inclusion/exclusion criteria to determine final article selection (available from primary author on request). Articles were then screened to exclude student coaching, clinical coaching, sales and sport or youth coaching, as well as team and group coaching. Of the remaining articles, the first author screened full articles using the four inclusion criteria: (a) coaching for leadership; (b) coaching at a management level in a work setting; (c) aligned definition of coaching; and (d) detailed description of a coaching model with: (i) structure, (ii) clearly stated concepts and processes, and (iii) feasibility for replication. "Structure" and "clearly stated concepts and processes" were rated on a scale of 0 (no detail) to 5 (full explanation). Scores of 3 or greater were eligible for inclusion provided the remaining criteria were met. One secondary publication that met the inclusion/exclusion criteria was excluded in favor of the eligible primary article. Decisions made during the screening process were recorded, and there was no disagreement regarding eligibility between the authors in paper selection.

DATA EXTRACTION

Data extraction involved three stages. In the first stage, a matrix of general information about the articles was

Table 1. Search Strategy

Database 1996–2010	Search Terms	Yield/ Titles Included	Abstracts Screened for Inclusion/Exclusion	Full Text Screening	Searched
Emerald Fulltext	Coaching AND leadership AND model or theory	697	252	14	1
Cinahl	Coach* AND theor* or model or framework	43	4	4	2
Business Source Complete	Coach* AND theor* or model or framework AND leadership	144	46	11	1
Academic Search Complete	Coach* AND model or theor* or framework AND leadership	110	20	4	0
Medline	Coach* AND (model or theor* or framework) AND leadership	45	20	4	0
PsychInfo	Coach* AND (model or theor* or framework) AND leadership	276	52	13	3
ISI Web of Knowledge	Coach* AND model or theor* or framework AND leadership	74	8 (duplicates)	0	0
Google Scholar	Coach* [professional development] [leadership] [theor* or model] abandoned	22,303	—	—	—
Google Advanced Search	Coach* AND model or theor* or framework AND leadership abandoned *Exclusion option:* patients, students, sports	7,490,000	—	—	—
Academic networks		1	1	1	1
Reference tracking		24	24	5	2
Total		**1,414**	**427**	**56**	**10**

developed (Table 2). Stage 2 involved deconstructing the coaching models to identify themes and ideas, which facilitated a full description of the critical components of the coaching model into the following elements: coach–coachee relationship, problem identification/goal setting, problem solving, transformational process, mechanisms by which the model achieves the proposed outcomes (Tables 3 and 4). Stage 3 involved the examination of other key elements that affect the coaching process. A matrix was used to enter frequently mentioned individual and environmental elements that were related to the model itself (see Table 5).

DATA ANALYSIS

Using data analysis procedures outlined by Torraco (2005) and Whittemore and Knafl (2005), retained articles were read three times to determine the writing quality, to reduce and compare data within the articles, and to analyze and synthesize themes, patterns, and variations within the articles. Data matrices categorically displayed all the extracted data from each article and were iteratively compared. The quality and relevance of the literature was determined by the degree to which description showed the main workings of the coaching model, the individual and environmental elements that

Table 2. Characteristics of Included Manuscripts

Author	Journal	Country	Design/Theory	Purpose/Objective	Setting
Giglio, Diamante, & Urban (1998)	*Journal of Management Development*	USA	Descriptive model	Describes a coaching model that develops executive's resilience to adjust to long-term change	External (outsourced) executive coaching in the business sector
Joo (2005)	*Human Resource Development Review*	USA	Integrative review & descriptive model	Integrates executive coaching literature, presents coaching framework	Leadership development in organizations
Hoojiberg & Lane (2009)	*Academy of Management Learning and Education*	Switzerland	Qualitative grounded theory approach	Explores multisource feedback within coaching models and expectations of the coach	External coaching within an executive education program
Keil, Rimmer, Williams & Doyle (1996)	*Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*	UK/USA	Descriptive model, case example. Theory based: Humanistic/existential/ behavioral	Presents a system-oriented structured coaching model for leadership development	External executive coaching in the business sector
Kowalski & Casper (2007)	*Nursing Administration Quarterly*	USA	Descriptive model	Describes a coaching model for nurses' leadership development	Internal coaching in the health care sector
McNally & Lukens (2006)	*Journal of Nursing Administration*	USA	Descriptive model, case example	Describes an internal–external coaching partnership model that supports leaders	Joint external and internal coaching in health care
Passmore (2007)	*Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*	UK	Integrated theory: Cognitive/behavioral/ emotional intelligence	Presents an integrative coaching model to enhance executive performance	External coaching in the business sector
Saporito (1996)	*Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*	USA	Descriptive model, case example	Describes an executive coaching model based on the unique needs of the executive and the organization's requirements	External executive coaching in the business sector
Sherman & Freas (2004)	*Harvard Business Review*	USA	Instructive	Provides an executive coaching framework; describes benefits to organization	External executive coaching in the business sector
Truijen & Woerkom (2008)	*Journal of Workplace Learning*	Netherlands	Qualitative, case study	Describes a colleague-to-colleague coaching model aimed at enhancing teaching; presents findings of effectiveness	Internal (collegial) coaching in a university medical school

Table 3. Common Elements of Coaching Models

Author	Relationship Building	Problem Defining	Problem Solving	Transformation Process
Giglio, Diamante, & Urban (1998)	Coach's knowledge and interest of organization essential. Coaching is job focused, nonpersonal. Trust important.	Direct questions about decision-making strategies, interpersonal styles, and behavior. Establish where/who/what is problem.	Objective feedback presented by coach. Action/developmental plan for goals. Coachee recognizes his/her connection to problems.	Coach teaches self-monitoring skills to attain continuous improvement and self-generated motivation.
Hoojiberg & Lane (2009)	Coach's provision of high level of direction and own ideas creates trust and supportive environment.	Use of multisourced feedback (from managers, peers, and direct reports) to assess performance and personal development.	Coach interprets the multisource feedback to develop action/developmental plan.	Multisource feedback influences change in mind-set and facilitates reevaluation.
Joo (2005)	Requires interpersonal chemistry, and consideration of gender, status, and experiences.	Use of 360-degree feedback tool to provide honest, challenging feedback, and define problems.	Cognitive, attitudinal and motivational learning (based on receptivity to feedback).	Increased self-awareness that leads to behavior change will impact individual success.
Keil, Rimmer, Williams & Doyle (1996)	Maintain confidentiality. Acquire knowledge of coachee's personal and professional life. Level of trust must be sufficient to allow openness to change and willingness to be influenced. Use of two external coaches (clinical and business experience).	Coach conducts in-depth interviews first with coachee about work and personal life, followed by psychological testing. Also, individual interviews with 20 colleagues.	Developmental plan based on collected data requires collaboration from coachee, coach, higher management, and client's personal realm. Coach teaches leadership skills.	Information gathered on coachee's personal and work life increases understanding of behaviors that affect performance, and thereby fosters change.
Kowalski & Casper (2007)	Trust essential. Coachee chooses coach from within organization. Coach is thoughtful and kind.	Coachee brings self-identified problems to coach. Coach listens, reflects back, questions.	Action plan written by coachee. Coach offers alternatives and discusses consequences.	Coach provides alternate, nonjudgmental perspectives from which to mobilize action.
McNally & Lukens (2006)	Use of 2 coaches (internal and external) creates both subjectivity and objectivity. Trust important.	Goals determined by higher management. Use of valid assessment tools to identify strengths and learning needs.	Learning plan developed from assessment tools. Coach provides leadership strategies, models, tools, and reading material.	Rehearsal, dialogue, and feedback create shift in thinking and behavior to generate new perceptions.

(*Continued*)

Table 3. (Continued)

Author	Relationship Building	Problem Defining	Problem Solving	Transformation Process
Passmore (2007)	Maintain confidentiality. Empathy. Coach's use of emotional intelligence. Long-term process.	Socratic learning style, open-ended questions to explore and challenge irrational thoughts.	Use of techniques: reframing, visualization, homework. Manage reactivity produce solutions.	Reframing technique moves coachee away from irrationality by adopting different positions.
Saporito (1996)	Maintain confidentiality. Coach credibility established through understanding organization's culture and requirements.	Use of 360-degree feedback from interviews with directors, peers, and subordinates. Assess leadership postures, challenges.	In-depth discussion over feedback. Developmental plan has specific initiatives, and support from all parties to ensure ownership.	Continual reference to development plan. Monitor executive's progress by interviewing others and relaying feedback to executive.
Sherman & Freas (2004)	Establish clear boundaries. Maintain confidentiality. No-fault escape clause to terminate failed relationship. Chemistry between coach and coachee important.	Use of 360-degree feedback from boss, peers, and direct reports to generate information on behavior. Collaborative problem definition.	Action plan that sets measurable goals to change specific behavior. Modify as new insights emerge.	Before and after feedback. Candid and vigorous debate enhances self-awareness, perceives choices, and assumes responsibility.
Truijen & Woerkom (2008)	Trust and support between coachee and coach essential. Hierarchical relationship will have less successful coaching outcome.	Coach observes coachee behavior, then uses reflection and dialogue to determine change.	Feedback from coach should describe coachee behavior, not provision of immediate solution.	Dialogue should focus on coachee behavior, not experience and superior knowledge of coach.

Table 4. Mechanisms to Achieve Proposed Outcomes

Author	Mechanisms to Achieve Outcomes	Proposed Outcomes
Giglio, Diamante, & Urban (1998)	Celebration of successes. Achievement is gratifying and motivates creativity and productivity. Development of resilience requires support from peers and higher levels of management.	Focus on action, improvement, performance, development, team cooperation, and personal dynamics leads to superior performance.
Hoojiberg & Lane (2009)	Creating and implementing action plans and goals sets a focus on change. Taking action and seeing positive change facilitates taking further action.	Behavior change and improved performance.
Joo (2005)	Self-awareness, behavior change, and learning that leads to individual success and organizational success.	Development of leadership and interpersonal skills enhances ability to lead teams through upheaval and transformation.
Keil, Rimmer, Williams, & Doyle (1996)	Flexible coaching approach, using whatever works within legal and ethical bounds. Structured continuing support provided by the model supports sustained growth, maintains momentum. Benefits to organization are accrued through increased effectiveness in any area of the client's life.	Ultimately for the business to become more successful.
Kowalski & Casper (2007)	Coaching model provides positive, constructive approach to problem solving. The process of performance evaluation improves future performance.	Creation of different work environment by replacing traditional management activities such as checking, supervising, monitoring, and controlling with new behaviors.
McNally & Lukens (2006)	Success dependant on participants dedication to the process and outcomes of coaching, such as keeping appointments, completing self-assessment tools, using the 360-feedback results, and contributing to group coaching discussion. Structured program serves as a road map to maintain focus on desired outcomes, and is reviewed and updated as needed.	For client: Increased competence in leadership skills, assume new managerial role. For health system: Retention of leadership talent, enhanced ability to meet organizational goals due to improved leadership skills.
Passmore (2007)	Enhances awareness of feelings and thoughts that inform behavior. Cultivates understanding of thoughts and motivations that inhibit effective behavior performance.	Mix of tools and techniques from coaching and psychological methodologies improve behavior and enhance workplace performance.

(*Continued*)

Table 4. (Continued)

Author	Mechanisms to Achieve Outcomes	Proposed Outcomes
Saporito (1996)	Client recognizes the recommendations and support are central to his/her experience. The relevance of coaching is its focus on the work of the individual, as well as the unique context and business objectives of the organization.	Modification of enough behavior that helps company to meet its imperatives. Rarely do coaches make complete changes in their behavior, and will occasionally revert back to old behaviors.
Sherman & Freas (2004)	Coaching gets clients to slow down, gain awareness, notice the results of their words and actions, perceive choices rather than react to events, and assume responsibility for their impact on the world.	Produce learning, behavior change, and growth for the economic benefit of the organization.
Truijen & Woerkom (2008)	Coaching dialogue should give coaches the opportunity for reflection; develop greater understanding of their behavior and the impact of this behavior on performance.	Collegial coaching did not affect reflection, or enhance teaching skills. Choose coaches who are motivated to switch from “expert role” to role as “coach”. Requires intensive training.

Table 5. Factors That Impact Coaching

Author	Benefits and Drawbacks of Internal/ External Coaching	Coach's Role and Attributes	Selection of Candidates and Coachee Attributes
Giglio, Diamante, & Urban (1998)	External coach is neutral outsider, offers fresh perspective, has nothing to gain by taking a position.	Deciphers available information and makes psychological and business decisions that aid the organization.	All executives should be periodically coached.
Hoojiberg & Lane (2009)		Interprets multisource feedback results and makes recommendations to the coachee.	
Joo (2005)	External coaches appropriate for extreme confidentiality; for varied business experience of coach; when "speaking the unspeakable" is necessary.	Possesses character and insight derived from personal experience and formal training.	Proactive, goal oriented, and motivated.
Keil, Rimmer, Williams & Doyle (1996)	Externally coached programs provide objectivity, safe environment, impartial direction, and assistance.	Allows individual to choose own direction. Maintains momentum. Adopts multisystem view. Flexible.	Choose likely candidates for advancement, solid senior players, and derailment candidates.
Kowalski & Casper (2007)	Internal coach (selected by coachee) presents problem if coach is direct report or friend.	Confidence and personal mastery of reflection. Experience in changing behavior with intention.	Choose highly functioning individual.
McNally & Lukens (2006)	Partnership of both internal and external coaches allows combination of: 1. Objectivity, nonbias, coaching expertise (from external coach). 2. Knowledge of organization's culture and policies, and credibility from workplace reputation (from internal coach).	Has knowledge of organization's norms, structure and history. Aligns coaching with organizations business strategy. Clarifies stakeholders' roles and expectations. Designs coaching program. Provides clear orientation to program.	
Passmore (2007)	External psychiatrist coach holds knowledge of psychological specialist approaches and techniques, and has awareness of ethical, legislative, and organizational boundaries and codes.	Background in psychotherapy and counseling. Incorporates emotional intelligence into model, with cognitive, behavioral, and unconscious elements to lever change.	
Saporito (1996)		Knowledge of organizational imperatives, culture, philosophy, requirements, and context. Understands unique needs of executive.	Potential for advancement. Willingness to confront traditional, top-down management style.
Sherman & Freas (2004)	Outsourced coaches supply candor and objective feedback.	Possesses acute perception, diplomacy, sound judgment, ability to navigate conflict with integrity.	Concentrate coaching on best employees. Ensure executive is valuable enough and motivated enough to justify the cost of coaching.
Truijen & Woerkom (2008)	Senior colleagues chosen from within organization tend to adopt mentoring role as opposed to coaching role. Reciprocal peer coaching may be more appropriate.	Senior colleagues as coaches require intensive training. Careful coach selection necessary to ensure senior colleague is able and motivated to switch to role as coach.	Open and willing to work with a coach.

affect the coaching process, and the degree to which the authors communicated ideas effectively and clearly in an unbiased way. All elements presented in the coaching models were then categorized and synthesized to determine patterns across the models. Using the objectives of the review, the entire sample was then critically analyzed to identify commonalities across the coaching models, and determine congruencies, differences, and patterns across the models.

Results

SEARCH RESULTS

Google Scholar and Google Advanced Search yielded 22,303 and 7,490,000 hits, respectively, whereupon the Internet search was abandoned. The search of seven databases located 1,414 titles. Four hundred twenty-seven abstracts were retrieved for screening, and 56 papers were read in full (see Table 1 for full search strategy and search results). Twenty-four papers were retrieved after reviewing references from the 56 articles, seven of which met the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Two papers were included through the reference tracking process. Academic networking produced one paper that met the criteria for inclusion and was retained for the review. Independent reviewers read four articles to ensure inclusion eligibility, and consensus was achieved through joined analysis. In all, 10 papers were retained for the review including two qualitative studies, one integrative review, one theoretical article, three case examples, and three opinion papers (see Table 2 for characteristics of included papers).

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Of the 10 included articles that presented coaching models, two reported theoretical underpinnings. These coach-authors have backgrounds in clinical or counseling psychology. Keil, Rimmer, Williams, & Doyle (1996) drew on humanistic, existential, behavioral, and psychodynamic psychology to inform coaching techniques within the model. Passmore (2007) integrated cognitive and behavioral theory and the emotional intelligence model as a foundation. While both coaching models laid claims to a consultant coaching approach as opposed to a therapy or counseling approach, there were distinct alignments to the counseling approach in style and coaching methods. The consultant approach is task focused and involves structure and concrete action plans (Joo, 2005). The counseling approach has a less defined process of uncovering and discovering behavior and feelings, and is often remedial (Passmore, 2007). Which approach is appropriate varies by the context and needs of the organization and coachee. The counseling approach emphasizes self-awareness and is often used for floundering leaders (Giglio et al., 1998), whereas the consulting approach focuses on learning and development to prepare leaders for a new or expanded role, or job that requires additional skills and competencies (Joo). The remaining eight coaching models used a consulting coaching approach and, with the exception of Kowalski and Casper (2007), firmly entrenched the organization's input and requirements that shape the leadership factors to be considered in the coaching process (summarized in Table 2).

COMMON ELEMENTS OF COACHING MODELS

From all 10 articles, five common elements within the coaching models were identified: relationship building, problem-defining and goal setting, problem-solving processes, action and transformation, and the mechanisms by which the model proposed that outcomes are achieved. Additionally, certain factors that impact positive coaching outcomes were proposed by the authors: the coach's role and attributes, the selection of coaching candidates and their attributes, specific obstacles and facilitators to the coaching process, the benefits and drawbacks of external versus internal coaches, and organizational support and involvement.

Key Elements of Coaching Models

RELATIONSHIP BUILDING

Eight papers endorsed the creation of an open, trusting, nonjudgmental, and supportive environment for effective coaching (Giglio et al., 1998; Hoojiberg & Lane, 2009; Joo, 2005; Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006; Passmore, 2007; Sherman & Freas, 2004; Truijen & Woerkom, 2008). Giglio and colleagues endorsed objectivity, empathy, and curiosity

on the part of the coach, and Kowalski and Casper suggested the coach display thoughtful and unexpected acts of kindness that demonstrate the importance of the relationship. The essentiality of trust was deemphasized by Keil and colleagues (1996), who proposed that trust levels need only be sufficient to garner the client's openness to change and willingness to be influenced. Saporito (1996) further curbed the importance of trust by characterizing coaching as a practical activity, and maintained that reducing skepticism regarding the coach's usefulness is sufficient. According to Saporito, understanding the organizational requirements, culture, philosophy, and context within the industry establishes coach credibility. Other authors, with the additional contention that developing expertise about the individual coachee's duties, responsibilities, decisions, and position within the organization is an effective way to build the relationship (Giglio et al.; Keil et al., 1996; Kowalski & Casper; McNally & Lukens), echoed the importance of this contribution. Both of the executive/psychodynamic models (Keil et al.; Passmore) endorsed a long-term relationship to instill and maintain behavior change.

PROBLEM DEFINING AND GOAL SETTING

To assess coachee performance and personal development, the majority of the coaching models used in-depth assessment tools to gain comprehensive feedback from the coachee in areas such as strengths, shortfalls, integrity, use of power, motivations, expectations, and approach to challenges and conflict (Hoojiberg & Lane, 2009; Joo, 2005; Keil et al., 1996; McNally & Luken, 2006; Saporito, 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004). Four coaching models extended the assessment to include perceptions of the coachee from peers, managers, and subordinates, with the use of instruments such as 360-degree assessments (Saporito, 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004), individual interviewing (Keil et al.), and questionnaires (Hoojiberg & Lane). Involving the perceptions of colleagues was seen by these authors to add face validity to the process, as well as establishing a realistic understanding of the coachee's leadership status and evaluate its alignment to the needs of the organization. In lieu of formatted assessment tools, other models used questioning and exploratory methods such as reflection, elaboration, and classifying to identify developmental areas that need to be targeted (Giglio et al., 1998; Passmore, 2007; Truijen & Woerkom, 2008). Passmore's psychodynamic approach described a Socratic learning style, using open-ended questions that raise self-awareness and that explore and challenge irrational thoughts that inhibit successful performance. The Kowalski and Casper (2007) model, using often inexperienced internal coaches from upper management, suggested that the coachee is responsible for identifying, then bringing developmental issues to the coach's attention for questioning, reflection, and clarification.

With the exception of McNally and Lukens (2006), goal setting was based on interpretation of the feedback and data obtained either from the coachee only, or from the coach, coachee, and others (as described earlier). Three coaching models mentioned joint (coach–coachee) problem identification as essential to the problem-defining and goal-setting process (Giglio et al., 1998; Keil et al., 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004). Giglio and colleagues (1998), Keil and colleagues (1996), and Saporito's (1996) models procure upper management participation, support, or recommendations in goal setting that pertain to the organization's needs, culture, and vision. McNally and Lukens went further to propose that upper management solely determine the focus and priorities of goal setting.

For the coachee, behavior change is the common goal of coaching in all of the models, by developing resilience, leveraging strengths, and overcoming weaknesses and thus unleashing potential. In the health care models (Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006), the organizational goals reported were to replace traditional management culture from control to collaboration (Kowalski & Casper), and improve leader performance, retain leaders, and support succession planning (McNally & Lukens). Effectively dealing with internal and external change pressures (Giglio et al., 1998), organizational growth, and achieving increased profits emerged as organizational goals in the executive coaching models presented by Keil and colleagues (1996), Saporito (1996), and Sherman and Freas (2004).

For most of the coaching models, feedback received and resultant developmental planning were expected to increase self-awareness, stimulate reflection, and increase

understanding of behaviors that affect performance, thereby influencing and fostering the desire to change.

PROBLEM SOLVING

The creation of developmental and action plans with specific initiatives to address goals were recommended in all models, except Passmore (2007) and Truijen and Woerkom (2008). Tools and strategies, such as role playing, reading material, rehearsal, clarification, and dialogue that help develop needed skills and attitudes, were provided by the coach in three models (Giglio et al., 1998; Keil et al., 1996; McNally & Lukens, 2006). Passmore used psychological techniques such as reframing, immersion, visualization, and homework.

Measures to determine developmental progress and success varied across the models or were not stated. Some suggested incorporating measurable outcomes (not specified) into the action plan for evaluation (Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006; Sherman & Freas, 2004). Giglio and colleagues (1998) endorsed self-monitoring taught by the coach, while Keil and colleagues (1996) and Saporito (1996) used periodic spot-check interviews with selected others to gauge coachee performance and retune goals.

TRANSFORMATION PROCESS

Behavior change and a shift in thinking is induced when the client raises self-awareness, reevaluates his/her own perceptions and generates new perceptions (Joo, 2005; Keil et al., 1996; Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006; Passmore, 2007), and begins to experience successes and see the future with optimism, energy, and responsibility (Giglio et al., 1998; Kowalski & Casper). Personal transformation is also provoked by intense strengthening of the focus and commitment to change, monitoring by the coach and others (Giglio et al.; Saporito, 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004), and understanding the consequences of certain behavior (Passmore; Sherman & Freas).

OUTCOMES

The mechanisms by which the coaching models achieved outcomes are both structural and intrinsic. Described as a road map by McNally and Luken (2006), the steps and structures within the coaching process are seen to maintain focus on behavior change by creating and implementing action plans, setting goals (Hoojiberg & Lane, 2009; Keil et al., 1996; Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006; Sherman & Freas, 2004), and providing progress reports to supervisors (Keil et al.). Both psychodynamic coaching models identified intrinsic factors. Passmore (2007) used four evidence-based approaches to facilitate change—behaviorism, cognition, unconscious cognition, and systemic—and Keil and colleagues proposed that benefits to the organization would accrue through increased effectiveness in any area of the coachee's life. Hoojiberg and Lane (2009), and Giglio and colleagues (1998) suggested that seeing achievement is gratifying and motivates creativity and action. With practicality, Saporito (1996) pointed out that if the coaching recommendations and support are seen as relevant to the context and business objectives, the executive will adjust behavior. With the exception of Hoojiberg and Lane, and Truijen and Woerkom (2008), all of the coaching models reported the expected outcomes to be improved personal performance, adding value to the organization, and ultimately for the organization to become more successful (also see Table 4).

Factors Proposed to Impact Coaching

Key factors that affect the coaching process are described in this section (also detailed in Table 5).

INTERNAL OR EXTERNAL COACHING?

Based on the included models, there was little consensus and even less supporting evidence that suggests external coaching models are superior to internal coaching models. The predominance of external coaching methods in this review does not reflect a higher use of external coaches over internal coaches in general. Seven of the models targeted senior leaders and executives as candidates for coaching, and these clients typically choose coaching consultation firms offering external professional coaches. Both of the coaching models from the health care sector use internal coaches. Kowalski and Casper (2007) suggested the coach be chosen from within the organization by the coachee, but caution that choosing a friend or a direct report may cause problems. Truijen and Woerkom (2008) cautioned that because

senior colleagues chosen as coaches from within the organization took on a mentoring role as opposed to a coaching role, reciprocal peer coaches might be more appropriate. McNally and Lukens (2006) advocated the partnering of an external coach with a chosen individual from within the organization, reasoning that the combination of an internal and external coach allows objectivity, nonbias, and expertise from the external coach, and knowledge of organizational culture and policies from the internal coach.

COACH'S ROLE AND ATTRIBUTES

In mid- to long-term coaching programs, the coach works in collaboration with the client to encourage and motivate the client to learn, and to help surface and test assumptions, as well as understand patterns and relationships among people, organizations, and events (Giglio et al., 1998; Joo, 2005; Keil et al., 1996; Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006; Passmore, 2007; Saporito, 1996; Sherman & Freas, 2004). Hoojiberg and Lane (2009) noted that in their short-term coaching program, coachees wanted more direction and proposed that the coach should both interpret the multisourced feedback and make direct recommendations. Truijen and Woerkom (2008) noted that senior colleagues who were selected as coaches tended to adopt mentoring roles as opposed to coaching roles. Because of the hierarchical relationship, superior knowledge, and experience, the coach provided immediate solutions to the coachee rather than employing coaching techniques such as feedback, dialogue, and reflection (Truijen & Woerkom).

Although discussed extensively in coaching literature, few of the included models referred to specific coach attributes. Acute perception, diplomacy, sound judgment, confidence, and the ability to navigate conflict with integrity were coach competencies described by three models (Joo, 2005; Kowlaski & Casper, 2007; Sherman & Freas, 2004).

CANDIDATE SELECTION AND COACHEE ATTRIBUTES

Although the majority of coaching literature deems essential coachee attributes to be the desire and willingness to change, with discipline and commitment to make progress, only seven of the models discussed coachee selection criteria. For the process to be successful, Saporito (1996) recommended that the coaching candidates demonstrate potential for advancement, and a willingness to confront tradition and top-down management style. Kowalski and Casper (2007) favored high-functioning individuals. Sherman and Freas (2004) maintained that the coachee should be valuable enough and motivated enough to justify the cost of coaching. Keil and colleagues (1996) identified three types of leaders likely to benefit from coaching intervention: possible candidates for advancement, solid senior players, and derailment candidates. Giglio and colleagues (1998) contended that all executives should be periodically coached.

OBSTACLES AND FACILITATORS TO EFFECTIVE COACHING

The key facilitator to effective coaching was manifested by organizational support that provided incentives and time, and set organizational coaching goals (Hoojiberg & Lane, 2009; Joo, 2005; Keil et al., 1996; McNally & Lukens, 2006). Obstacles were noted at the individual level, and were attributed to skepticism for coaching (Saporito, 1996), nonalignment with the organizational goals, unwillingness to change (Hoojiberg & Lane; McNally & Lukens), and choosing the wrong coach for the context (Truijen & Woerkom, 2008).

Discussion

Rising concerns that a lack of long-term leadership planning in a turbulent environment will increasingly impact leadership in health care agencies have amplified the need for proactive business plans to ensure the survival of health care organizations (Hartman & Crow, 2002). Identifying future leaders now is critical to ensure smooth leadership transition (Abrams, 2002). Succession planning is seen as an essential strategy to promote qualified candidates into leadership positions, and coaching is an important element of succession planning frameworks (Carriere, Muise, Cummings, & Newburn-Cook, 2009).

Leadership coaching remains a work in progress. There are divergent views on the definition and processes of coaching, and no agreed-upon set of competencies. In the literature of this review, coaching activities include data gathering, competencies, deficiencies and skills assessment, confrontation, goal setting, action planning, structured learning, analysis of

personality dynamics, creative problem solving, role playing, and more. With the unanimous objective of overcoming resistance to change and embracing new paradigms, coaching can help managers lead smooth transitions through change and to success. Traditional learning and development programs that focus on workshops, retreats, e-learning, and university programs may not address what people need to do this, and there is an argument for programs that are focused on a "real world" perspective (Hartman & Crow, 2002).

In this review, the models differed in the use of an internal versus external coach, and it is apparent that the choice varies by the situation within the organization and needs of the coachee. Internal coaching (from supervisors or managers) has the benefits of prior knowledge and experience of the organization's culture, mission, and politics, as well as measurement ability, and consistency and embeddedness of coaching processes (Kowalski & Casper, 2007; McNally & Lukens, 2006). Rock and Donde (2008) noted that over a few years, internal coaching may cost just 19% of the cost of external coaching. External coaches can cost anywhere between $10,000 and $100,000 per person, but to train an internal coach generally costs less than $10,000 (Rock & Donde). This coach could in turn train several people a year, and over the course of several years bring costs in line with existing training and development budgets. Internal coaching also has the benefit of ensuring consistency in coaching models, process and structure, engagement of coaches, and cost of coaches (Strieker, 2008). In one case study of internal coaching (Thomas, 2004), 41% of recipients of internal coaching were promoted compared with 15% of the noncoachee group, and leadership and job satisfaction improved (as cited in Rock & Donde). In addition, many internal coaches state that because of learning to coach formally, they have embedded change in how they run their meetings, organize their time, and interact in daily conversations, with a resultant positive impact on their own efficiency and effectiveness (Rock & Donte). Critics of internal coaching argue that supervisory or management coaching may be useful for building learning around puzzles with known answers, but may have a limited effect in assisting people to resolve problems that require innovation and a breakthrough in traditional thinking (Bowerman & Collins, 1999).

In addition to ensuring confidentiality for the client (Keil et al., 1996; Passmore, 2007; Saporito, 1996), external coaches are seen as agents that can provide reliable, honest feedback (Katz & Miller, 1996; Saporito). Most people close to leaders do not confront them with their behavior and leadership problems, and as a result, leaders frequently have difficulty procuring honest opinions of their abilities and weaknesses within the organization (Ducharme, 2004; Hartel, Bozer, & Levin, 2009; Kampa & White, 2002). In addition, senior leaders prefer to receive feedback from people with similar social characteristics and background (Blackmore, Thomson, & Barry, as cited in Hartel et al., 2009). If effective leadership is dependent on accurate self-perception, external coaching provides an opportunity for gaining an understanding of how one is perceived by others in the organization. Further, by offering outsourced coaches, the coaching model offers busy managers the opportunity to invest in their employees' development without compromising their attention to other priority commitments. Giglio and colleagues (1998) believed that external coaches are more capable of deciphering the abundance of gathered assessment data using a fresh perspective and approach when analyzing organizational processes, and have nothing to gain by taking a position.

Complicating the process of choosing a coaching model, apart from type and structure, is the selection of the coach. No universal credential seems to exist to identify competent coaches, and there is wide disagreement about the necessary professional qualifications for coaches (Bluckert, 2004; Bono et al., 2009). According to Wasylyshyn, Gronsky, and Haas (2006), talented coaches should be grounded in both business and psychology, yet research by Bono and colleagues (2009) revealed very small differences between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Without regulation or real barriers to those who profess to be coaches, the number of coaches has risen rapidly, and they hail from wide-ranging backgrounds such as academics, human resources, teachers, retired executives, management trainers, engineers, religious leaders, police officers, sports coaches, psychologists, and counselors (Bluckert; Brightman, 2003). While diversity has the advantage of enriching the field with new influences and perspectives, concerns rise about poorly trained and inexperienced

coaches creating unrealistic expectations by rolling off one-week wonder courses (Brock, as cited in Harvey, 2008; Grant, 2007).

Coaching accreditations range from short skills-focused programs to an academic master's degree. There are calls for standards, research, and metrics to ensure coaching efficacy (Bluckert, 2004; Hauser, 2009). Organizations want to know that their money is being spent wisely and are asking for clarity about what they are buying (Downey Coaching and Consulting, n.d.). With heavy investments in coaching, they are becoming increasingly intolerant of anecdotal evidence and want a stronger and more robust case being made for coaching value (Bennett & Bush, 2009). While coaching evolves as a discipline and a profession, organizations would be wise to investigate the education, coaching certifications, and experience of the coach and what processes they are using.

Limitations of the Review

While integrative reviews involve protocol, search, appraisal, and synthesis and because of this are more likely to be rigorous and unbiased than traditional reviews, bias can occur at any stage (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). Further, coaching articles typically show a positive response bias in that mostly successful cases are published (Lowman, 2005). In addition, case examples in each included article were presented within the context of that author's perspective, and discussion did not always address the influence of variables such as race, age, gender, and educational background. Generally, authors did not identify the extent to which the presented case was prototypical of those in practice. In this review, we attempted to mitigate the limitations by analyzing case examples and experiential/opinion literature that carefully described and identified coaching interventions and that report, given the state of the research, subjectively observed outcomes with unverified measurement tools, but which, according to Lowman (2005), are the bits and pieces from which theories and ultimately empirical tests can be derived.

Conclusion

In this review, 10 one-on-one coaching models from the health care and business sectors were examined and integrated into five elements of coaching practice and four factors that affect the coaching process. Coaching is becoming the initiative of choice in organizations undergoing change while there is little evidence of its necessity. The elements of coaching models identified in the review should be used to guide future research on the effectiveness of coaching as a leadership strategy.

References

Abrams, M. (2002). Succeeding at succession planning. *Health Forum Journal, 45*(1), 27–30.

Beckham, D. (2003). Sustainable leadership. *Health Forum Journal, 46*(3), 43–44.

Bennett, J., & Bush, M. (2009). Coaching in organizations. *OD Practitioner, 41*(1), 2–7.

Blattner, J., & Bacigalupo, A. (2007). Using emotional intelligence to develop executive leadership and team and organizational development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59*(3), 209–219.

Bluckert, P. (2004). The state of play in corporate coaching: Current and future trends. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 36*(2), 53–56.

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

Bowerman, J., & Collins, G. (1999). The coaching network: A program for individual and organizational development. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counseling Today, 11*(8), 291–297.

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

Brightman, B. (2003). Viewpoint: Coaching irrational exuberance or a new paradigm? *Measuring Business Excellence, 7*(2), 4.

Carriere, B., Muise, M., Cummings, G., & Newburn-Cook, C. (2009). Healthcare succession planning: An integrative review. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 39*(12), 1–8.

Corporate therapy (2003, November 13). *Economist, 369,* 61.

Downey Coaching and Consulting. (n.d.). The emergence of coaching. http://www.downeycoaching.com

Ducharme, M. (2004). The cognitive-behavioral approach to executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56*(4), 214–224.

Feilden, S., Davidson, M., & Sutherland, V. (2009). Innovations in coaching and mentoring: Implications for nurse leadership development. *Health Services Management Research, 22,* 92–99.

Friedman, T. (2007). *The world is flat.* Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre.

Gallwey, T. (1974). *The inner game of tennis*. New York, NY: Random House.

Giglio, L., Diamante, Y., & Urban, J. (1998). Coaching a leader: Leveraging change at the top. *Journal of Management, 17*(2), 93–105.

Grant, A. (2007). Enhancing coach skills and emotional intelligence through training. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 39*(5), 257–266.

Gray, D. (2006). Executive coaching: Towards a dynamic alliance of psychotherapy and transformative learning process. *Management Learning, 37*(4), 475–497.

Haas, S. (1992). Coaching: Developing key players. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 22*(6), 54–58.

Hartel, C., Bozer, G., & Levin, L. (2009). Family business leadership transition: How an adaptation of executive coaching may help. *Journal of Management & Organization, 15*(3), 378–391.

Hartman, S., & Crow, S. (2002). Executive development in healthcare during times of turbulence. *Journal of Management in Medicine, 16*(5), 359–370.

Harvey, P. (2008). Building a team of leaders. *Smart Business Atlanta,* p. 18.

Hauser, L. (2009). Evidence-based coaching. *OD Practitioner, 41*(1), 8–13.

Haynor, P. (1994). The coaching, precepting, and mentoring roles of the leader within an organizational setting. *Holistic Nurse Practitoner, 9*(1), 31–40.

Hoojiberg, R., & Lane, N. (2009). Using multisource feedback coaching effectively in executive education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8*(4), 483–493.

Joo, B. (2005). Executive coaching: A conceptual framework from an integrative review of practice and research. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(4), 462–488.

Kampa, S., & White, R. P. (2002). The effectiveness of executive coaching: What we know and what we still need to know. In R. L. Lowman (Ed.), The California School of Organizational Studies: *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology: A comprehensive guide to theory, skills, and techniques* (pp. 139–158). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Katz, J., & Miller, F. (1996). Coaching leaders through culture change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 104–114.

Keil, F., Rimmer, E., Williams, K., & Doyle, M. (1996). Coaching at the top. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 67–77.

Kilberg, R. (2004). Trudging toward Dodoville: Conceptual approaches and case studies in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56*(4), 203–213.

Kowalski, K., & Casper, (2007). The coaching process: An effective tool for professional development. *Nursing Administration Quarterly, 31*(2), 171–179.

Kraemer, H. (2003). Keeping it simple. *Health Forum Journal, 46*(3), 16–21.

Lowman, R. (2005). Executive coaching: The road to Dodoville needs paving with more than good assumptions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 57*(1), 90–96.

McNally, K., & Lukens, R. (2006). Leadership development: An external-internal coaching process. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 36*(3), 155–161.

Milner, T., & Bossers, A. (2004). Evaluation of the mentor-mentee relationship in an occupational therapy mentorship programme. *Occupational Therapy International, 11*(2), 96–111.

Nielsen, A., & Norreklit, H. (2009). A discourse analysis of the disciplinary power of management coaching. *Society and Business Review, 4*(3), 202–214.

Parker, P., Hall, D., & Kram, K. (2008). Peer coaching: A relational process for accelerating career learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(4), 487–503.

Passmore, J. (2007). An integrative model for executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59*(1), 68–78.

Performance Coaching International. (2006). http://www.performancecoachinginternational.com/resources/articles/historyofcoaching.asp

Price, A. (2009). Using coaching interventions to develop clinical skills. *Nursing Standard, 23*(44), 48–55.

Rock, D., & Donde, R. (2008). Driving organizational change with internal coaching programs: Part one. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 40*(1), 10–18.

Saporito, T. (1996). Business-linked executive development: Coaching senior executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 96–103.

Saran, R., & Neisser, B. (n.d.). The Socratic method and education: Introduction. *Sister Organistions Philosophisch Politische Akademie PPA and Dutch Network of Socratic Facilitators.* http://www.sfcp.org.uk/introduction.htm

Scott, G. (2002, November/December). Coach, challenge, lead: Developing an indispensable management team. *Healthcare Executive.*

Sherman, S., & Freas, A. (2004, November). The wild west of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review,* pp. 82–90.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2009). When to use internal versus external coaches. http://www.siop.org

Strieker, B. (2008). Coaching done right. *Business to Business.* http://www.btobmagazine.com

Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management.* Retrieved from www.forgottenbooks.com

Thomas, M. (2004). "Coaching in NHS Fife: An evaluation." NHS Fife, Kirkcaldy, August.

Torraco, R. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–367.

Truijen, K., & Woerkom, M. (2008). The pitfalls of collegial coaching. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 29*(5), 316–326.

Wasylyshyn, K., Gronsky, B., & Haas, J. W. (2006). Tigers, stripes, and behavior change: Survey results of a commissioned coaching program. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 58*(2), 65–81.

Whitmore, J. (1992). *Coaching for Performance*. London, UK: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*(5), 546–553.

Wolfe, C. J. (2007). The practice of emotional intelligence coaching in organizations: A hands-on guide to successful outcomes. In R. Bar-On, J. Maree, & M. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 169–182). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Wendy Carey completed her Masters of Nursing at the University of Alberta, Faculty of Nursing in 2010, with a focus on the Leadership and Management Stream. She can be reached at wendy.carey1@gmail.com.

Donald J. Philippon serves as co-chair of the Canadian Health Leadership Network (CHLNet) and special advisor to the Saskatchewan Academic Health Sciences Network (SAHSN). He received his Ph.D. from the University of Alberta.

Greta G. Cummings is an associate professor in the Faculty of Nursing at the University of Alberta. She can be reached at gretac@Ualberta.ca.