

## Chapter I: Introduction

### *Problem Statement*

Executive coaching is a rapidly developing field devoted primarily to improving the performance of executives and secondarily the performance of their organizations (Falla, 2006). While coaching has been the subject of a large volume of books and practice literature, little empirical research has been done on the topic (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001). A review of the existing literature reveals several gaps including a lack of quantitative proof that coaching provides measurable outcomes, weak methodological design including poor sampling methods, researcher bias, small sample size, and a lack of pre-test and post-test data, an overly-positive spin on the research, a lack of a basis of comparison for coaching with few studies comparing the effectiveness of coaching to other leadership development tools and practices, and a lack of data on the financial return of coaching services (Baron & Morin, 2010; Barrett, 2006; Bougae, 2005; Brantley, 2007; English, 2006; Huggler, 2007; Kampa-Kokesch, 2001; Kleinberg, 2001; Passmore, 2010; Ring, 2006; Seamons, 2004; Starman, 2007). This study will address many of the gaps in the current literature by discerning whether six key coaching dimensions (Emotional Support, Tactical Support, Challenge the Status Quo, Challenge to Stretch, Active Learning, and Learning Orientation) can accurately predict Transformational Leadership and Leadership Outcomes as measured by the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire.

However, why should the relationship between coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership be examined? In a review of the leadership literature from 2000 – 2009 Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, and Cogliser (2010, p.936) concluded that neo-charismatic leadership (including Transformational Leadership) is “the single-most dominant

[leadership] paradigm.” According to Lowe and Gardner (2001, p.481) neo-charismatic leadership styles “have generated considerable enthusiasm and been the subject for a substantial amount of theory and research.” Between 1990 – 1999 neo-charismatic leadership theories made up a third of all of the articles published in *The Leadership Quarterly* (Low & Gardner, 2001). Between the years of 2000-2009 “A total of 86 articles were coded as reflecting the neo-charismatic approaches, which represented the largest specific category of leadership theories” (Gardner et al., 2010, p.935-936). The dominance of neo-charismatic approaches in the leadership literature strongly supports the theoretical focus of this study on Transformational Leadership.

Furthermore, a positive correlation between executive coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership is suggested by a number of studies (Dawdy, 2004; Evans, 2007; Gettman, 2008; Gonzalez, 2003; Hale, 2008; Liljenstrand, 2004; Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008; Newsom, 2008). Evans (2007) hypothesized that if the role of an executive coach is to encourage clients to become life-long students of leadership then it follows that coaches should have a comprehensive knowledge of leadership as well. Evans (2007) further suggested that coaches should be required to have the same competencies that are demanded of today’s leaders, if they are to be successful. Evan’s (2007) suggestions are supported by evidence from numerous studies that elucidate the connection between the competencies required of a superior coach and the behaviors demonstrated by transformational leaders (Appendix L) (Dawdy, 2004; Evans, 2007; Gettman, 2008; Gonzalez, 2003; Hale, 2008; Liljenstrand, 2004; Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008; Newsom, 2008). Combined, this body of research suggests that coaching dimensions should be correlated with Transformational Leadership behaviors. This body of knowledge gives rise to the first research question: What is the relationship between six key coaching dimensions

and Transformational Leadership as measured by the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)?

Determining the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership is an important research question, however previous research has also called for an examination of the relationship between key coaching dimensions and outcome or performance measures (Gettman, 2008). In this regard it is important to look at the outcome measures that have been associated with Transformational Leadership.

Transformational Leadership behaviors have been linked to a number of subjective and objective performance criteria including organizational and group effectiveness, perception of leader's performance, innovation and creativity, sales efforts, work attitudes, leadership satisfaction, follower commitment, ethics, and turnover intention across management level, work environments, and national cultures (Antonakis, 2001; Bommer, Rubin, Baldwin, 2004; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2009). Therefore the case can be made that if key coaching dimensions can predict changes in Transformational Leadership behaviors, key coaching dimensions should also be able to predict changes in objective and subjective performance criteria (Antonakis, 2001; Bommer, Rubin, Baldwin, 2004; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2009). Gettman (2008) also found initial evidence that nine coaching dimensions were related to outcomes from other research studies and were correlated with many of the International Coaching Federation's core competencies. However, no existing research has specifically looked at coaching dimensions and any type of outcome variable. The current study will empirically examine the relationship of six coaching dimensions to Leadership Outcomes measured by the MLQ including Extra Effort (the extent that the associate (follower) goes above and beyond their job duties for the leader), Effectiveness (how effective the associate is at their

job), and Satisfaction (how satisfied is the associate with the leader) (Avolio & Bass, 2004). A strong research case for the relationship between coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes is made by the notion that coaches should possess the same leadership proficiencies as their clients and the strong overlap shown between Transformational Leadership and various coaching dimensions in previous studies (Dawdy, 2004; Evans, 2007; Gettman, 2008; Gonzalez, 2003; Hale, 2008; Liljenstrand, 2004; Liljenstrand, 2008; Newsom, 2008). Further evidence is seen in the results of MLQ research demonstrating a correlation between Transformational Leadership and Leadership Outcomes (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The second research question stems out of this body of research: what is the relationship between six key coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes as measured by the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Dawdy, 2004; Evans, 2007; Gettman, 2008; Gonzalez, 2003; Hale, 2008; Liljenstrand, 2004; Liljenstrand, 2008; Newsom, 2008)?

*Defining executive coaching.*

Executive coaching is a management consulting intervention that's geared towards individuals in senior or executive levels within an organization (Falla, 2006). While many definitions for coaching exist, Kampa-Kokesch and Anderson (2001, p. 208) defined coaching as:

a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client's organization within a formally defined coaching agreement.

Additionally, the International Coaching Federation (ICF) gives the following definition of coaching:

Executive coaching is a facilitative one-to-one, mutually designed relationship between a professional coach and a key contributor who has a powerful position in the organization. This relationship occurs in areas of business, government, not-for-profit, and educational organizations where there are multiple stakeholders and organizational sponsorship for the coach or coaching group. The executive coaching is contracted for the benefit of a client who is accountable for highly complex decisions with [a] wide scope of impact on the organization and industry as a whole. The focus of executive coaching is usually organizational performance or development, but many also have a personal component as well. The results produced from this relationship are observable and measurable (Falla, 2006, p.20).

There are three important aspects of these definitions. The first is that coaching is chiefly defined as an individually tailored consultation. This differentiates coaching from other management consulting services such as class-room instruction or group sessions. The second aspect of the definition of coaching is the lack of a chain of command between the client and coach, which separates executive coaching from the routine workplace coaching which occurs with a client's supervisor. The final aspect of the coaching definition is the inter-organizational context in which it applies as executive coaching differs from career counseling or therapy in that the goal of coaching is to improve performance within the organization the client is employed in (Falla, 2006).

*The coaching process.*

Natale and Diamante (2005) identified five stages of executive coaching that include alliance check, credibility assessment, likeability link, dialogue/skill acquisition, and cue based action plans. Coaches analyze and recognize the actions that led to the coaching engagement during the alliance check. Other key components of this stage include removing or eliminating the client's resistance through the writing of a process roadmap. The second stage is the creditability assessment. The creditability assessment revolves around the coach supplying their credentials and background to the client and the client becoming aware that the coach might be helpful. The likeability link stage sees the client comparing and contrasting their preferential style to the coach's style and making a decision on whether or not they ultimately admire the coach. The dialogue and skill acquisition stage begins with the coach integrating the executive's emotion into the coaching process and ends with the executive achieving a higher level of self-awareness. Finally, the coach and the executive outline an action plan along with a timeline for completion for the client in the cue-based action plans stage (Natale & Diamante, 2005).

The executive coach helps the client move through the stages of the coaching process by using a wide range of tools and techniques. Coaches use a variety of tools including personality and leadership inventories, interviews, psychological instruments, and 360-degree feedback questionnaires (Falla, 2006). These instruments serve to give the client a better picture of themselves and give the client data to work with. This data, in conjunction with feedback, helps the client "come to understand patterns in the data gathered; work through their resistance to hearing the data; and identify and generate a developmental plan for behavioral change" (Falla, 2006, p.41). Clients begin to trust the coaching process when they understand and trust the data

given to them and are given the ability to provide feedback on the data (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001).

*History of executive coaching.*

At the present three time periods have been identified in the history of executive coaching. The first period covers the time from 1950 – 1979 and was characterized by a combination of organizational development and psychological practices. The second period covers the time from 1980 to 1994. This period saw a standardization and professionalization of the coaching profession. The current period, which covers from 1995 – present, has seen a rise in research and publications along with the development of professional organizations dedicated to coaching (Falla, 2006).

Executive coaching stems out of a series of social changes in the United States following World War II (Falla, 2006). The diversification of the workplace, dependence on institutional employment, and the rise of outsourcing were all changes that led to the development of the coaching field. The enterprising recruitment of women into the workplace to fill the positions of men fighting in the war led to a generational divide between a new class of working women and their mothers. This new generation of workers, often lacking role models and mentors, turned to psychology and organizational counseling as a means to learn new skills. Additionally, the rise of the feminist movement led women to demand training and counseling to help with their new responsibilities (Falla, 2006). The dependence on institutional employment following the war also sparked a change in the culture and skills needed to succeed in business. The pre-World War II era focused heavily on individualism and self-reliance, whereas the post-war era was characterized with a rise of new skills including sales, teamwork, and personnel management. The vehicle for learning these new skills became workshops and training courses run by

psychologists (Falla, 2006). Outsourcing of workshops and training courses became prevalent after World War II when returning GIs required assistance in job searching and learning needs. This outsourcing evolved into a new workplace culture dependent on seeking outside consultants to increase organizational efficiency (Falla, 2006).

Other cultural changes were beginning in organizations as well. During the 1960s and 1970s top-down, authoritarian structures were firmly in place in many companies. Management was defined by decision makers in upper management positions and middle level management who were responsible for implementation of decisions. By the 1970s and 1980s the strict hierarchical structure of the past began crumbling and a collaborative environment between workers and management grew (Bougae, 2005). However, before a truly open and cooperative organization could emerge from the ashes of the authoritarian structures of old, employees needed to learn new skills and behaviors. In other words, they had to learn to become leaders themselves. Seminars, training, and the use of consultants became more widespread and the movement towards coaching began. During the 1980s and early 1990s the change in focus shifted from pressing corporate issues to making long-term changes in individuals and systems. The emphasis on the individual and the system led to introspective leadership training, change management, and ultimately executive coaching (Bougae, 2005).

The evolution of the coaching field is tied closely to the evolution of leadership roles in organizations. Historically, leaders were responsible for making profits and the means used to create revenue were not the subject of study or concern (Bougae, 2005). Today, leaders are still responsible for a company's bottom line, but the focus has shifted more to the importance of creating an environment where the relationship and interpersonal dynamics between leaders and followers is the subject of attention and the area of leader development (Bougae, 2005).

### *Theoretical Rationale*

Despite the recent surge in growth, executive coaching lacks a clear theoretical foundation (Joo, 2005). Executive coaching has its roots in a few disciplines including consulting, management, organizational development, and psychology (Joo, 2005; Kleinberg, 2001). Due to the immature stage of the executive coaching field, the number of theories, frameworks, and disciplines is large and diverse. Theories mentioned in various studies include, but are not limited to Transformational Leadership, adult learning theory, humanistic psychology, cognitive psychology, social cognitive theory, grounded theory psychoanalytic theory, person-centered therapy, the inner game, zone of proximal development, transformative learning, human performance technology process (HPT), and motivational interviewing (Huggler, 2007; Moen & Allgood, 2009; Passmore, 2010; Starman, 2007). However, while a wide range of theories have been used in previous studies this dissertation will focus exclusively on Transformational Leadership for a number of reasons. Transformational Leadership is chosen as the theory of choice due to its mention in dissertations with strong methodological underpinnings, the large amount of research done on the theory, and its dominance in the leadership literature (Gardner et al., 2010; Hopf, 2005; Kampa-Kokesh, 2001, Lowe & Gardner, 2001). Additionally, *The Leadership Quarterly* reported that neo-charismatic leadership theories (including Transformational and Charismatic Leadership) represented the single largest percentage of articles written in 1990-1999 and 2000-2009 (Gardner et al., 2010; Lowe & Gardner, 2001).

#### *Transformational Leadership.*

Transformational Leadership has been defined by four groups of scholars: James Macgregor Burns, Bass and Avolio, Bennis and Nanus, and finally Kouzes and Posner

(Northouse, 2007). James Macgregor Burns was one of the first researchers to focus on the relationship between the leader and the follower in contrast to previous leadership theories that focused on traits a leader needed to possess or the way they reacted to a given situation (Burns, 1978). Specifically, Burns believed that there were two distinct types of leadership: Transactional Leadership and Transformational Leadership. Transactional Leadership was defined as an exchange of the follower's services and commitment for an incentive or reward (Burns, 1978). An example of Transactional Leadership in business occurs when a manager or supervisor promises a raise for exceeding a performance target (Northouse, 2007). Alternatively, Transformational Leadership is "more concerned with end-values, such as liberty, justice, and equality" (Burns, 1978, p.426). Transformational Leadership goes above and beyond simply getting the follower to do the will of the leader, but rather motivates the follower to reach their highest potential (Burns, 1978). Burns states that transforming leaders "raise" their followers up through levels of morality (Burns, 1978, p.426). The work of Bernard Bass further expanded on the initial work of Burns by focusing on the follower's needs, considering the use of Transformational Leadership for negative outcomes, and placing Transactional and Transformational Leadership on a continuum as opposed to seeing the concepts as mutually exclusive (Northouse, 2007). Bass believed there were three ways in which transformational leaders motivate followers to do more than what was required.

First, transformational leaders give the follower a better understanding of the value and importance of goals set forth by the leader. Second, transformational leaders move followers beyond their own self-interest to the interest of the organization. Finally, transformational leaders induce followers to consider higher-level needs (Bass, 1985).

Bass also expanded on Transformational Leadership by considering the consequences of Transformational Leadership for negative outcomes, calling this phenomenon pseudo-Transformational Leadership (Northouse, 2007). Pseudo-Transformational Leadership occurs when the leader possesses characteristics of Transformational Leadership, but uses these characteristics to advance their own agendas without taking into consideration the interest of the followers (Northouse, 2007). Bass also expanded on the concept of Transformational Leadership by reconfiguring the theory from conceptualizing Transformational and Transactional Leadership as opposing concepts to thinking that Transformational and Transactional Leadership belong on a single continuum (Bass, 1985). A model developed by Bass and Avolio further expanded on this continuum and described factors associated with transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio, 1999).

Bass and Avolio listed seven factors in total: four transformational factors, two transactional factors, and one non-leadership, non-transactional factor. The four transformational factors were defined as idealized influence (being a role model for followers), inspirational motivation (communicating expectations to followers), intellectual stimulation (giving followers the freedom to be creative and to challenge their own beliefs and those of the leader and organization), and individualized consideration (providing an open and caring climate to share feedback) (Avolio, 1999). The two Transactional Leadership factors include contingent reward (the follower exchanges work for a reward) and management-by-exception (actively or passively using corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement to get the follower to do to the will of the leader) (Avolio, 1999). Finally, there is the laissez-faire, non-leadership factor which is characterized by a lack of feedback, decision-making, and responsibility (Avolio, 1999).

A number of revisions have been made to the Transformational Leadership model proposed by Bass and Avolio over the years including changing the original factor structure and name of the theory (Bass & Avolio). In its current state the theory has been renamed the Full Range Leadership Theory and includes twelve factors. The five Transformational Leadership factors include Idealized Influence – Attributed, Idealized Influence – Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. The two Transactional Leadership factors are Management by Exception Active and Contingent Reward. The two non-leadership factors include Management by Exception Passive and Laissez-Faire. Finally, three Outcomes of Leadership are included (Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction) (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Bennis and Nanus (1997) developed a different model that expanded Transformational Leadership by analyzing responses of 90 leaders to questions including strengths and weaknesses (Bennis & Nanus, 1997). Bennis and Nanus reviewed the interviews and observational data they collected from leaders for a period of two years before developing four themes that all leaders embodied (Bennis & Nanus, 1997). The first theme that emerged was attention through vision. All of the leaders had a drive and a vision of what the organization should be and what the result of any project should be, “Leaders are the most results-oriented individuals in the world, and results get attention” (Bennis & Nanus, 1997, p.26). The second theme was meaning through communication. Bennis and Nanus believed that vision was only one part of leadership and without communication vision will never lead to action. Communication is the tool that shares a leader’s vision with the rest of the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1997). Trust through positioning is the third theme presented by Bennis and Nanus. Trust gives workers a sense of stability and helps maintain the organization’s virtue. Leaders are trustworthy when they let the

organization know about themselves, their thoughts, and their opinions, “The truth is that we trust people who are predictable, whose positions are known and who keep at it; leaders who are trusted make themselves known, make their positions clear” (Bennis & Nanus, 1997, p.41). The final theme present in the analysis by Bennis and Nanus is the deployment of self through positive self-regard. Leaders put their best self forward. They trust themselves, know their strengths and weaknesses, and know how to make up for their flaws. When leaders meet with employees they portray their strengths and their abilities and they compensate for their faults. Leaders constantly improve themselves; they are eager to get feedback and equally keen to improve themselves for the next assignment. This positive self-regard transfers from leaders to the rest of the organization and gives workers their own self of positive self-regard in return (Bennis & Nanus, 1997).

A final model of Transformational Leadership has been developed by Kouzes and Posner. Kouzes and Posner’s model is based on the “personal best” experiences of over 1,300 leaders in the public and private sector (Northouse, 2007, p.188). Through an analysis of these “personal best” experiences, the authors developed five best practices that help leaders to accomplish their goals (Northouse, 2007, p.188). The first practice is modeling the way. Simply put, leaders must be role models for everyone else in the organization. Leaders must communicate their thoughts and ideas and more importantly they must act in accordance with their own personal values (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Inspiring a shared vision is the second practice. Inspiring a shared vision is the leader’s way of setting the direction for the future of the organization. Leaders need to present their dream for the future of the organization and need to get employees to see that they are capable of making it a reality (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The third practice is challenging the process. Leaders are not content with the way things are, aren’t

afraid to make changes, and are frequent adopters of new ideas and new ways of doing things. Leaders are also willing to listen to others to find better ways of doing things (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The fourth practice is enabling others to act. Leaders create an open environment where others feel like they are part of the team, “They foster collaboration and build trust” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Enabling others to act means using inclusive language and relying on the synergy of the group as opposed to the power generated from centralized authority. The final practice is encouraging the heart. Encouraging employees and creating a “culture of celebration” are ways that leaders can keep employees performing through ups and downs (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 19). To further their model, Kouzes and Posner also offer 10 commitments or behaviors that are associated with each of the five practices (Appendix B).

*Building a conceptual framework around executive coaching and Transformational Leadership.*

While a definitive theory has yet to emerge for executive coaching, Joo (2005) reviewed the literature on executive coaching and attempted to build a conceptual framework for coaching using a systematic research process (Appendix C). Joo’s model is directly linked to several important themes, practices, and factors associated with Transformational Leadership. The conceptual framework presented by Joo (2005) sees the coach as a leader using Transformational Leadership practices and themes to get the client (follower) to reach their full potential and become a transformational leader themselves. When the client returns to his or her organization and retains their leadership position, they will ideally be using the themes, practices, and factors of Transformational Leadership and consequently functioning at a higher capacity. If the leader has embraced Transformational Leadership practices, themes and factors learned through coaching, they will be more likely to transform their organization and their employees.

The antecedents of Joo (2005) model included the coach and clients characteristics and organizational support. Joo (2005) suggested that coaches must have integrity, confidence, experience, and a high developmental level. The models of Transformational Leadership presented by Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1997), and Kouzes and Posner (2002) all stressed the importance of a leader's integrity (trust through positioning), confidence, experience, and high developmental level (deployment of self through positive self-regard, modeling the way, intellectual stimulation).

With regard to processes, Joo (2005) states that the coaching approach is central to a successful outcome and that the approach should be tailored to the client through listening and feedback. The models of Transformational Leadership presented by Bennis & Nanus (1997) and Kouzes and Posner (2002) both place a high emphasis on communication and feedback between leader (coach) and follower (client). Additionally Joo (2005) places emphasis on the relationship between the coach and client much in the same way that Transformational Leadership focuses on the interaction between leader and follower.

The proximal outcomes outlined by Joo (2005) highlight self-awareness and learning as the keys to behavioral change. One theme presented in Bennis and Nanus's transformational model is the deployment of self through positive self-regard, which includes persistent self-improvement and finding ways to do things better next time. Kouzes and Posners (2002) practice of challenging the process also suggests that leaders should be eager to learn new things. Finally, Joo (2005) suggests that the distal outcome of executive coaching is organizational (follower) success resulting from individual (leader) success. Central to Transformational Leadership is the idea that the leader can move the follower beyond contingent reward or management by exception to reach the full potential of both the individual and subsequently, the organization

(Bass, 1985). The Transformational Leadership models presented by Bass (1985), Bennis and Nannus (1997), and Kouzes and Posner (2002) all suggest that employees will set aside their personal interests and motivations for the goals and interests of the organization when leaders act as role models, communicate their visions, and listen to workers.

### *Purpose of the Study*

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership behaviors. Additionally, the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes will also be examined. Third, the differences in the Transformational Leadership and Leadership Outcomes will be examined when controlling for the rater (coach vs. raters [peers, supervisors, and direct reports]). Finally, differences in the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership behaviors and the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes when controlling for the rater will also be examined.

### *Research Questions*

The research questions in this study stem from the research of Evans, 2007, Gettman, 2008, Hale, 2008, Liljenstrand & Nebeker, 2008, and Newsom, 2008. These research questions include:

1. What is the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership behaviors as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5x short form? (R1)
2. What is the relationship between key coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes (Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction) as measured by the MLQ 5x short form? (R2)

3. Do coaches and raters (peers, supervisors, and direct reports) differ in their ratings of the coach on Transformational Leadership behaviors and Leadership Outcomes? (R3) More specifically will differences be found in the relationship between the six coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership as rated by the coach vs. Transformational Leadership as rated by the raters? (R3A) Furthermore will differences be found in the relationship between the six coaching dimensions and Leadership Outcomes as rated by the coach vs. Leadership Outcomes as rated by the raters? (R3B)

### *Significance of Study*

This is the first study to look at the relationship between key executive coaching dimensions and outcomes. This research builds on the foundation established by Gettman (2008) who was the first researcher to create and administer scales that could accurately measure key coaching dimensions. In discussing important areas for future research Gettman (2008) stated that examining the relationship between the coaching dimensions and outcomes or performance data would be important for future research. This study seeks to answer this question by examining the relationship between Leadership Outcomes (Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction) and the key coaching dimensions. Furthermore the relationship between the key coaching dimensions and Transformational Leadership behaviors will also be significant due to the prominence of this theory in leadership scholarship over the last 20 years and the number of additional outcome measures and performance criteria that have been related to this theory (Gardner et al., 2010; Lowe & Gardner, 2001). Specifically, Transformational Leadership behaviors have been linked to organizational and group effectiveness, perception of leader's performance, innovation and creativity, sales efforts, work attitudes, leadership satisfaction, follower commitment, ethics, and turnover intention across management level, work

environments, and national cultures (Antonakis, 2001; Bommer, Rubin, Baldwin, 2004; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2009). Therefore the case can be made that if key coaching dimensions are shown to predict changes in Transformational Leadership behaviors, the coaching dimensions should also be able to predict changes in objective and subjective performance criteria (Antonakis, 2001; Bommer, Rubin, Baldwin, 2004; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2009). Additionally, if key coaching dimensions are able to predict changes in Transformational Leadership behaviors the door will be open for future research to directly examine the relationship between the above-mentioned performance criteria and key coaching dimensions.