Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'

Robert G. Hamlin, University of Wolverhampton, Priorslee Hall, Telford, UK.

Andrea D. Ellinger, Human Resource Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA.

Rona S. Beattie, Business School, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK.

Abstract

During the past few years, the growth of an emergent 'coaching industry' has resulted in some scholars calling for the development of a genuine coaching profession. Yet contemporary organization development (OD) and human resource development (HRD) practitioners conceive of coaching as an extant core component of their respective fields of study and practice. This paper reports the results of a qualitative study that examined different conceptualizations and definitions of 'coaching,' OD, and 'HRD' found in the respective literatures. The results suggest all three fields of practice are very similar, both in terms of their intended purpose and processes. This finding poses a dilemma and challenge for those who believe a genuine coaching profession with its own identity and unique body of empirically tested knowledge can be distinctly defined and delineated.

Keywords: Coaching, Organization Development (OD), Human Resource Development (HRD),

Introduction

Recent literature has reported the growth of an emergent 'coaching industry' in various countries which appears to be expanding rapidly. In 2003, *The Economist* estimated that organizations worldwide were spending upwards of $1 billion providing coaches for their employees, and that this was expected to rise to $2 billion by 2005. Palmer (2003) has claimed between 25% and 40% of US Fortune 500 companies use executive coaches, whilst Shuit (2005) suggests that the business of coaching in the United States alone has grown to $1 billion per annum and estimates there are 40,000 coaches operating throughout the world. In 2006, the American based International Coach Federation (ICF) had about 11,000 people worldwide registered as members (ICF, 2007a). In particular, executive coaching, a variant of coaching, is becoming one of the fastest growing interventions in the professional development of managers, especially managers in large organizations (Gray & Goregaokar, 2007). A recent UK survey found that almost 90% of the 664 organizations surveyed had regularly used coaching by line managers, with a further two-thirds saying they had used external practitioners to coach staff (CIPD, 2005). Throughout Europe coaching associations have been formed in countries such as Austria, France, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. Several have also been formed in the UK, the leading one arguably being the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC) which is the largest, and is steadily growing and expanding. In 2007 it had 2,700 coaches and mentors in membership, including many different types of coaches such as 'executive coaches,' 'business or corporate coaches' and 'life coaches'. Both the ICF and EMCC share many interests and concerns

related to the state of coaching, specifically regarding the credentialing of coaches, quality assessment, professional conferences, governance, and regulatory affairs (EMCC, 2007).

Given the growing popularity of the many variants of coaching, and the increasing number of 'professional' coaches offering coaching services, Grant and Cavanagh (2004) have suggested the 'coaching industry' has reached a key point in its maturation. This maturation, they argue, is driven by at least three interrelated forces: coaching experiences that have led to increasing awareness among coaches of the need to ground their practice in solid theory and empirically tested models; the increasing entry into coaching of individuals from various professional fields such as psychology, psychiatry, adult education, and organizational change and development; and, the increasing sophistication of management and human resource (HR) professionals who have become increasingly wary of what they perceive to be pseudo-qualified coaches. Grant and Cavanagh (2004) have argued that coaching needs to move from a service industry to a genuine *coaching profession;* but as yet the coaching industry is far from meeting the basic requirements of a true profession, because it lacks an holistic theoretical framework derived from a sound and sufficient empirical base and shared body of general knowledge. Consequently, as they suggest, it is inappropriate for self styled 'professional' coaches to name or represent coaching as a profession when it is not yet a fully established professionally oriented occupational field. In arguing the case for a move towards a genuine *coaching profession* that has an established identity, with clear boundaries around what is professional coaching and what is not, and a shared common body of empirically tested knowledge, they make the claim that no existing profession holds a corner on the market of coaching knowledge. Additionally, Grant (2001) has suggested that coaching is distinctively different to and separate from other forms of professional learning facilitation and performance enhancement, such as mentoring and training. This view is supported by Clegg, Rhodes and Kornberger (2003) who claim 'business coaching' differs from traditional business [and management] training and consulting. However, many if not most professional practitioners and scholars operating within the closely related fields of organization development (OD) and human resource development (HRD), would likely question the feasibility of establishing a genuine coaching profession, because coaching has been an integral core component of these two respective fields of practice for several decades. An added complication is the fact that many if not most full time practitioners from all three fields engage in coaching, OD and HRD activities to a greater or lesser extent. In light of this, we anticipate the process of trying to distinguish coaching from OD and HRD could, potentially, prove to be a challenging if not an impossible task.

Nevertheless, we are in agreement with Grant and Cavanagh's (2004) argument that a distinction needs to be made between 'professional *coaching'*, which can mean practitioners of coaching behaving in a professional manner, and a '*coaching profession'* or coaching related profession that fully conforms with, or is working towards meeting the key criteria commonly identified with all true professions. By definition, the term profession refers to an occupation, usually full time, and involving academic training, formal qualifications and membership of a professional regulatory body that confers professional status upon its members. As Grant and Cavanagh (2004) have summarized, professional status is defined by several key criteria, as follows: (i) significant barriers to entry, (2) a shared common body of knowledge rather than proprietary systems, (3) formal qualifications at university level, (4) regulatory bodies with the power to admit, discipline and meaningfully sanction members, (5) an enforceable code of ethics, and (6) some form of state-sanctioned licensing or regulation for certain professions, or parts of professions (Bullock & Trombley, 1999; Perks, 1993; Roberts & Dietrich, 1999). It should be noted that although there are two regulatory bodies in the UK to which professionally qualified HRD practitioners can belong, namely the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), and the Institute of Training and Organizational Learning (ITOL),

neither of these professional institutes have gained (or to our knowledge are striving to gain) state-sanctioned licensing or regulatory powers, as exists in professions such as medicine, dentistry, nursing, psychotherapy, pharmacy, law, architecture and some areas of engineering. Hence, one could argue that HRD and OD are not yet genuine professions, but rather professional fields of practice, albeit possessing many of the characteristics of a genuine profession. From this premise we can agree with Grant and Cavanagh (2004) that "no existing [genuine] profession holds a corner on the market of coaching knowledge" (p. 2). However, we suggest there could be a far greater overlap between the 'coaching', 'OD' and 'HRD' fields of study and practice than many in the emergent coaching industry might believe, and that all three fields are strongly relevant to coaching (and mentoring). Consequently, and in light of the rhetoric about such distinctions, the aim of this study has been to conduct a definitional examination of the terms 'coaching', 'OD' and 'HRD', to identify the commonalities, similarities and differences, and to examine the extent of overlap in purpose and process.

Problem Statement and Theoretical Orientation

The concept of coaching has been widely discussed in various fields, and first appeared in the management literature in the 1950's as an approach to developing employees through a master-apprentice type of relationship (Evered & Selman, 1989; McLean, Yang, Kuo, Tolbert & Larkin, 2005). Coaching has been variously defined as a process for improving problem work performance (Fournies, 1987); as a day to day hands on process of helping employees recognize opportunities to improve their performance and capabilities (Orth, Wilkinson & Benfari, 1987; Popper & Lipshitz, 1992); and, as a "process by which one individual, the coach, creates enabling relationships with others that make it easier for them to learn" (Mink, Owen, & Mink, 1993, p. 2). Some scholars have conceptualized 'coaching' as the 'facilitation of learning' (Beattie, 2002; Mink *et al.*, 1993; Redshaw, 2000), and this has been supported by research which suggests these two terms are synonymous (Ellinger, 1997; Ellinger & Bostrom, 1999).

Coaching has been considered an important part of HRD practice for decades and has been recognized in numerous competency studies as a core role provided by HRD professionals (McLagan, 1999). The UK Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) recognizes coaching as an important role of HR professionals, and offer various postgraduate level professional qualifications in this area of HRD practice. Similarly, the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has acknowledged that coaching is a specific area of expertise that is required of workplace learning and performance professionals (Davis, Naughton & Rothwell, 2004). Plunkett and Egan (2004, p. 558-60) identify 'executive coaching' as a "fast growing human resource development (HRD) role." They define the 'executive coach' as "a trained HRD specialist who utilizes knowledge, skills and techniques from psychology and HRD-related fields in the design, development, and implementation of individually focused change efforts aimed at improving executives' effectiveness, learning and performance." From an Australian perspective, Vaartjes (2005, p.1) also argues that "coaching is rapidly emerging as a widely applied means of human resource development (HRD) in business". Additionally, other scholars perceive coaching in general to be an important organization development intervention practiced by both OD and HRD specialists (Cummings & Worley, 2008). Furthermore, OD has been conceptualized either explicitly or implicitly for several decades as a specific core component of HRD (See Hamlin, 2004; Harrison & Kessels, 2004; McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989; Stewart, 1999). Interestingly, Grieves (2003) argues Strategic HRD has its roots in OD and has emerged as the logical evolution and development of the OD tradition. Others contend that OD is a separate field of study and practice (Cummings & Worley, 2008) that is complementary to HRD.

Organization Development has a longer history than HRD, having been born as a 'discipline' in the late 1950s, and having flowered in the 1960s (Albrecht, 1983). As Grieves (2003) observes, the initial OD focus on T-groups and force field analysis was followed in the 1970s by a 'theory of practice' through intervention strategies and team development, and 'a proliferation of training approaches to personal growth and empowerment' through self directed learning; the emergence of systems thinking approaches and quality management in the 1980's, and in the 1990's by downsizing and business process reengineering using value-driven approaches to facilitate visioning, organizational learning and problem solving in the interests of a collaborative management of the organization's culture. Throughout the whole of the 'history' of OD, practitioners have incorporated traditional training, education and development' and/or contemporary HRD processes -including coaching and mentoring- as part of their OD intervention strategies. This has progressively increased since the early 1990s. Hence, as fields of practice HRD and OD strongly overlap and are integrally linked. Therefore, the question arises as to whether coaching can be thought of as a distinct field of study and practice that is different to and separated from HRD and OD. Indeed, the question also arises as to whether these three fields of practice, which to date have largely operated independently of each other, should be re-conceptualized as core components of a single unified professional field of study and practice informed by its own fully integrated unique body of conceptual and instrumental knowledge based on existing and developing 'coaching', 'OD' and 'HRD' literatures.

Research Questions

Given the various claims and assertions about coaching being uniquely different from other forms of learning facilitation and change in organizational settings, the purpose of the current study was to review and compare the literature on 'coaching,' 'OD' and 'HRD', in order to identify any distinctive differences in terms of their stated purpose and the processes deployed by practitioners. The research questions addressed were as follows:

(1)   What are the conceptual commonalities, similarities and differences in the multiple descriptions, definitions and variants of coaching?

(2)   In light of Question 1, do 'professional' coaches do anything that is significantly different to what many OD and HRD practitioners currently do?

Methodology

For the present qualitative study the authors adopted a neo-empiricist stance (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000) by assuming a critical realist ontology and epistemology falling somewhere between postpositivism and constructivism-interpretivism (Ponterotto, 2005). Critical realism in the social sciences is concerned with general questions about the nature of 'social structure' and the exploration of 'intentional human agency' and 'real entities' that have 'causal efficacy', have 'an effect on behaviour' and 'make a difference' (Fleetwood, 2005; Kemp, 2005). For critical realists there is an inherent subjectivity in the production of knowledge, but they use triangulation within a realist framework to assess the reliability and dependability of their qualitative analyses (Madill, Jordon & Shirley, 2000). This can involve the use of multiple researchers, research methods and sources to assess the consistency of findings (Flick, 1991) and, through such convergence, to provide evidence of the accuracy, credibility, confirmability and objectivity of the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Madill et al., 2000). The mode of reality explored by the present study conforms with Fleetwood's (2005) term 'ideally real', which refers to

conceptual entities such as discourse, language, genres, ideas, beliefs, meanings, understandings, explanations, opinions, and concepts. The data used in this study were based on published research and textbook literature relating to coaching, OD, and contemporary HRD respectively.   Articles were obtained from both academic and practice-based journals including: *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research; International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring; Evidence-based Coaching;   Journal of Workplace Learning; Leadership and Organizational Development Journal; Human Resource Development International;   Human Resource Development Quarterly; Human Resource Development Review; Career Development International; Industrial and Commercial Training; Journal of Management Development; Management Learning; International Journal of Leadership Studies, Public Administration Review; Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* In addition, books and book chapters on coaching, the specific variants of coaching, organization development, and human resource development were also explored.

The various identified conceptualizations (definitions) of coaching were clustered and categorized into particular categories (variants), as determined by the common meanings of the descriptive labels used by the respective authors; for example 'executive coaching'. The purpose and processes of each and every definition within a category were then compared to identify the commonalities and differences. The research methods deployed were content analysis (Flick, 2002) and thematic analysis applied at the semantic level (Braun & Clarke, 2006) using first-level open coding (Flick, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This involved the explicit and surface meaning of key words and part sentences being compared and contrasted for evidence of sameness, similarity and congruence.   Based on the commonalities so identified, a 'composite conceptualization'- *unified perspective* (Worrall, 2005)- was synthesized for each variant of coaching. These were then compared against a range of HRD and OD definitions with the aim of searching for commonalities and differences, using as before content analysis, open coding and thematic analysis.

Ensuring Internal Consistency and External Validity A form of 'investigator triangulation' involving 'multiple researchers' was used in order to ensure and enhance the validity, plausibility, trustworthiness and credibility of the research (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe, 1991; Madill et al., 2000). The comparative analyses were initially carried out independently by two of the authors, one of whom was based in the USA and the other in the UK. Their respective results were then compared and contrasted through several digital exchanges in order to arrive at a mutual confirmation of where their analyses and interpretations converged and diverged (Knafl & Breitmayer, 1991). Where discrepancies occurred these were resolved through further critical examination and digital exchange. The mutually agreed upon analyses were scrutinized by the third author, and then by all three authors to reach a consensus on the findings.

Results

This section briefly outlines the results from the data collection and data analyses according to each research question.

Addressing Research Question 1
Using the results of the literature searches carried out by Grant (2001) and Joo (2005) from their respective studies into the 'psychology of coaching' and 'executive coaching,' a list of coaching definitions was collated. This was then supplemented with additional definitions resulting from our own search of other literatures. In total, 36 definitions were collated and grouped according to the type

of coaching they appeared to be defining. From this initial scrutiny it appeared there were four categories or variants of coaching practice within this service industry, namely - 'coaching', 'executive coaching', 'business coaching', and 'life coaching' (See Appendix 1). The content of each definition was scrutinized to identify the particular intention/purpose and stated processes associated with this particular type of planned coaching intervention. These were highlighted in **bold** type and *italics* respectively, with bold referring to intentions/purposes and italics referring to processes. The key words describing the identified purpose and processes were compared and contrasted against those describing the purpose and processes of the other definitions grouped within the same category (variant) of coaching, the aim being to search for commonalities. These were then used to synthesize a composite conceptualization for each category (variant) of coaching, the results of which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Synthesized [Unified Perspectives]/Composite Conceptualizations of the Variants of Coaching [**Bold** = intended purpose; Italics = processes]

Categories/Variants of Coaching	Derived Unified Perspectives /Composite Conceptualizations of Coaching
'Coaching'	…is a *helping* and *facilitative process* that enables individuals, groups/teams and organizations to **acquire new skills**, to **improve existing skills**, **competence** and **performance**, and to **enhance their personal effectiveness** or **personal development** or **personal growth**.
'Executive Coaching'	…is a *process* that primarily (but not exclusively) takes place within a *one-to-one helping and facilitative relationship* between a coach and an executive (or a manager) that enables the executive (or a manager) to **achieve personal**-, **job- or organisational-related goals** with an intention to **improve organizational performance**.
'Business Coaching'	…is a *collaborative process* that *helps* businesses, owner/managers and employees **achieve their personal and business related goals** to ensure **long-term success.**
'Life Coaching'	…is a *helping* and *facilitative process*-usually within a *one-to one relationship* between a coach and a coachee-which brings about an **enhancement in the quality of life** and **personal growth** of the coachee, and possibly a **life changing experience.**

As can be seen from this table, the coaching process common to all four variants is that of providing *help* to individuals and organizations through some form of *facilitation* activity or intervention. In the case of 'executive' and 'life' coaching this is performed primarily (though not exclusively) in a *one-to-one* helping relationship. There is also a high degree of commonality between the variants of coaching regarding their respective purposes. Held in common to all variants is the explicit and implicit intention of helping individuals to improve their performance in various domains, and to enhance their personal effectiveness, personal development, and personal growth. In the case of 'life coaching' the personal growth aims may intentionally extend to include life changing experiences. The only significant difference between the four variants is the additional explicitly stated intention within the composite conceptualization of 'Coaching' relating to helping individuals, groups and/or organizations to acquire new skills, and to improve existing skills/competencies. As many readers will appreciate, this is a core purpose of contemporary HRD. As can be seen from Table 1, there are few substantive differences between the four variants of coaching in terms of their respective fundamental purposes and processes.

Furthermore, many of the definitions and conceptualizations within each variant/category of coaching specifically embrace features strongly identified with other variants. For example, the 'improvement and enhancement of a coachee's quality of life, personal life, life experiences and personal growth', which are some of the intended outcomes of 'life coaching' are also embedded within the professional 'coaching' definitions of Grant (2006), Grant and Cavanagh (2004) and the ICF (2007a), and of the 'executive coaching' definitions of Zeus and Skiffington (2000), Kilburg (2000), and Grant (2001). Similarly, the purpose of helping coachees 'to develop and advance their organizations and achieve both business and personal goals,' which is a key feature of 'business coaching,' is also in part a feature of the 'executive coaching' definitions of Kilburg (2000) and others, and also the professional 'coaching' definitions of Grant (2006) and the ICF (2007a). In light of these observations and the results of addressing Research Question 1, it would appear the weight of evidence suggests there is very little substantive difference between the four variants of coaching as presented in many 'practice-based' books.

Addressing Research Question 2
A range of organization development (OD) definitions was collated, firstly by drawing upon Egan's (2002) review of literature and then expanding the range to include the conceptualizations of other scholars. A total of 29 definitions were examined and analyzed (See Appendix 2). Each 'definition' was scrutinized to identify the respective intended purpose and processes of that particular OD conceptualization. These were then highlighted in **bold** and *italic* type face respectively, as had been the adopted procedure for the coaching definitions. The analysis, performed using the same procedures for addressing Research Question 1, revealed a constant and common purpose over the decades and, since the early 1990's, the emergence of and great emphasis on individual and organizational learning and development. From this examination a composite conceptualization of OD was derived as follows:

> Organization Development is: *any systematic process or activity* which **increases organizational functioning, effectiveness and performance** through the development of an organization's capability **to solve problems** and bring about **beneficial change** and **renewal** in its structures, systems, and culture, and which helps and assists people in organizations to **improve their day to day organizational lives** and **well being**, and **enhances both individual, group, and organizational learning and development.**

Based on what could be found in the HRD-related journal and textbook literature, a range of HRD definitions offered by various writers since the early 1970s was collated. Adopting the same procedure as had been used for the coaching and OD data, a total of twenty one (21) HRD 'definitions' were scrutinized to identify the respective intended purpose and processes of each particular conceptualization which, as before, were highlighted in **bold** and *italics* respectively (See Appendix 3). A thorough review and comparison revealed three of the HRD definitions offered since 2001 to be composite type conceptualizations that encapsulated the core meaning of most of the definitions that had preceded them, and are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Three Recent Definitions of Human Resource Development (British and Dutch and American Perspectives) [**Bold** = intended purpose; *Italics* = processes]

Harrison & Kessels (2004) *British and Dutch perspective*	HRD as an organizational process 'comprises the skilful *planning* and *facilitation* of a variety of formal and informal *learning and knowledge processes and experiences,* primarily but not exclusively in the workplace, in order that **organisational progress and individual potential can be enhanced** through the competence, adaptability, collaboration and knowledge-creating activity of all who work for the organisation'
Hamlin (2004) *British perspective*	HRD 'encompasses *planned activities* and *processes* designed to **enhance organizational** and **individual learning**, **develop human potential**, **maximize organizational effectiveness and performance,** and help bring about **effective and beneficial change** within and beyond the boundaries of organizations'
Yorks (2005) *American perspective*	HRD is defined as 'both an organizational role and a field of professional practice. The fundamental purpose of HRD is **to contribute to both long-term strategic performance and more immediate performance improvement** through *ensuring that organizational members have access to resources for developing their capacity for performance and for making meaning of their experience* in the context of the organization's strategic needs and the requirements of their jobs.'

Discussion

The extent of the commonalities and similarities existing between the various conceptualizations of the four variants of coaching identified in Table 1, and (a) the composite conceptualizations of OD developed after an exhaustive review of 29 OD definitions, purposes, intentions, and processes, and (b) the three recent definitions of HRD that encapsulate the core meanings of definitions that have preceded them, suggests 'professional' coaching is substantively the same as many aspects of contemporary OD and HRD practice. This finding challenges some scholars who have suggested that coaching is distinctly different from HRD functions such as training (Clegg, Rhodes & Kornberger, 2003; Grant, 2001). Yet innovative approaches to individual, group and organizational learning have been deployed for many years by OD and HRD professionals. These have included such learning processes as learner-centred learning, work-based learning, work-place learning, learning facilitation, and action learning. From first hand experience, two of the present authors can attest to the fact that for several decades these innovative learning methods have been key features of professional trainer training and management training in the UK. For example, in the UK, work-based and work-place learning, along with action learning and action research, have been the predominant learning facilitation methods used on the MSc in HRD/HRD and Organisational Change programmes offered and delivered by the University of Wolverhampton Business School (UWBS) since 1993. Furthermore, there is ample evidence that the alumni of these UWBS postgraduate programmes have used these well established innovative learning approaches in their everyday practice as HRD professional practitioners. Most of the approaches are examples of participative and non-directive learning, where learners have an opportunity to base their development on real-time professional experiences at their place of work, and

through their work. They are also examples of *critical HRD methods* as discussed recently by Rigg, Stewart and Trehan (2007).

In their arguments regarding business coaching, Clegg *et al.* (2003) have compared and contrasted the process of coaching against traditional [*expert*] consulting, which they claim is focused on providing advice and developing solutions rather than helping clients solve their own problems. Yet ever since the mid 1980s, professional trainers, developers and other HRD practitioners have provided *collaborative* consulting services to 'clients' in their roles as internal or external 'training consultants,' 'learning consultants' and 'organisational change consultants' (Phillips & Shaw, 1989). Furthermore, 'organizational change and development' has increasingly become a core component and everyday practical reality of HRD practice and research (See, McLagan, 1989; Hamlin, Keep & Ash, 2001). Additionally, contemporary OD practice has, for many years, been adopting an action research perspective that is highly participatory and *collaborative* (See Grieves, 2003; McLean, 2006). We can agree with Clegg *et al.* that the process of coaching within business contexts can be perceived as being different to the process of consulting when performed by consultants operating in an *expert mode,* often with the intent of imposing solutions. However, we suggest there is little or no difference when business consultants operate in a *collaboration mode* using facilitative methods, including HRD and coaching, to bring about behavioural and strategic change through a participatory process in which the client is building internal capacity and transferring knowledge and skill into the client system.

Contrary to Grant and Cavanagh's (2004) view that 'no existing profession holds a corner on the market of coaching knowledge', the results of our comparative analyses suggest all four variants of coaching could be seen as aspects of OD and HRD to a greater or lesser extent, which also suggests the emergent field of 'professional coaching' could be conceptualized as a core component within these existing and firmly established fields of practice. Indeed, a simple comparison of the core areas of the shared body of coaching knowledge suggested by Grant and Cavanagh (2004) against the theoretical foundations of HRD theory postulated by Swanson (2001), reveals a high degree of commonality. Grant and Cavanagh argue that as a means of achieving behavioural change [individual, group, organizational], "all forms of coaching must be linked into the broader knowledge base of the behavioural sciences", and for business coaching, "additional expertise in business and economics is also important" (p. 3). According to Swanson, HRD must integrate economic theory, psychological theory and systems theory into disciplined thinking and action, because HRD relies on these three core theories in order to understand, explain and carry out its process and roles effectively. The economic theory principles for practice include: scarce resources theory, sustainable resource theory and human capital theory; the psychological theory principles for practice include: gestalt psychology, behavioural psychology and cognitive psychology; whilst the systems theory principles for practice include: general systems theory, chaos theory and futures theory. A similar argument can be made in relation to OD which, as a field of study and practice, also draws upon organization behavior, individual psychology, group dynamics, management and organization theory, and systems theory (Cummings & Worley, 2008). As can be seen, the perceived foundational theoretical underpinnings of coaching, HRD, and OD are nearly identical.

We suggest the definitional findings from our study, together with the obvious overlaps between the theoretical foundations of all three current 'silo' fields of practice, raise a question regarding the feasibility of the 'coaching industry' creating a new *coaching profession* with a clear identity, clear boundaries, and a unique common body of empirically tested knowledge that is sharply differentiated from those of the OD and HRD fields.

Limitations of the Study

It is possible that despite our reliance upon syntheses of the literature that have included coaching, OD, and HRD definitions, there are additional conceptualizations of coaching, OD, and HRD that we may not have had access to and therefore they may not have been included in our study. As Joo (2005), Weinberger (1998) and Egan (2002) have acknowledged, there are multiple definitions of coaching, OD and HRD that have been advanced, and we have not been exhaustive in including them in our analysis. The definitions we have used represent some of the most commonly cited conceptualizations of coaching, OD and HRD in the US, UK, the Netherlands, Australia and more broadly, yet may not be inclusive of non-Western perspectives.

Conclusions and Implications for Coaching, OD and HRD Research and Practice

From an exploration of current conflicting paradigms in the emergent coaching industry, Ives (2008) draws attention to the emergence of two trends in coaching, namely 'directive, personal development and therapeutic' approaches *versus* 'non-directive, goal-focused and performance-driven' approaches. However, as Gray (2006, p. 475) points out, "it is far from clear why coaching should necessarily so often adopt a psychotherapeutic approach" when coaching is designed primarily to address the healthy population. Indeed, both Hodgetts (2002) and Saporito (1996) argue that while psychotherapy focuses on the individual's personal issues and the holistic person, coaching needs to focus on achieving work related improvements, which is the same focus of most OD and HRD interventions. This observation lends support to the empirical findings of the present study, namely that the purpose and process of all variants of 'coaching' within business and organizational contexts, are predominantly the same as those of 'OD' and 'HRD'.

Consequently, scholars and practitioners might argue that 'coaching' should be considered a strand of OD and HRD practice. However, regardless of how compelling the empirically supported logic upon which this viewpoint might be based, we recognize it would likely be unpalatable and unacceptable to many 'professional' coaches, particularly those with professional backgrounds in, for example, 'business management,' 'consulting psychology' and 'psychiatry'. Furthermore, from our experience, many if not most 'professional' coaches, executive coaches and business coaches do not and would not necessarily identify themselves as HRD professionals. This is because they tend to think of HRD either in terms of traditional training and development which historically has been a comparatively low level activity in many organizations, or as a branch of adult education and adult learning, or as a minor component and sub-set of the human resource/personnel management function which, in many organizations, is held in low regard by many practicing managers (Hamlin, 2001). In light of this type of thinking, antipathy towards any identification or affiliation with the HRD and OD fields might be expected. However, just as modern day OD and HRD professionals are skilled as coaches, professional coaches need similarly to be professionally skilled and qualified in many aspects of OD and HRD. In our view, this means they should be ready to recognize many aspects of contemporary HRD and OD as being critical to the success of much professional coaching practice, and that they need to be professionally qualified in these other areas of people and organization development.

The above observations and conclusions pose a dilemma and challenge for 'coaching,' 'HRD' and 'OD' scholars and practitioners. As Chalofsky (2004) has observed, the firmly established field of HRD study and practice rests on three constructs; *people*, *learning*, and *organizations*. It could also be argued that OD similarly rests upon these constructs. But, as can readily be seen from the various definitions of the variants of coaching explored by the present study, 'professional' coaching also rests

on these three same constructs. Therefore, if 'professional' coaches and researchers within the emergent 'coaching industry' support a move towards the creation of a *coaching profession* with its own unique body of empirically tested knowledge, as called for by Grant and Cavanagh (2004), and if the fast growing HRD role of 'executive coach' continues to expand, together with the current rapid expansion of a concomitant body of coaching related HRD research, significant problems of differentiation will inevitably arise. With coaching already an extant component of the long established HRD and OD fields of practice, in which it is firmly recognized and accepted as an area of expertise by the various professional organizations that represent these occupational fields, it is possible that efforts to create a *coaching profession* which appears distinctively different to the *OD* and *HRD professions,* could lead to much confusion for the purchasers of coaching services and may be unnecessarily duplicative.

Resolving such problems could prove to be a serious challenge for 'coaching', 'OD' and 'HRD'. However, we suggest the three fields of study and practice might wish to consider the possibility of collectively moving towards the creation of a new all embracing genuine profession, with its own unique yet eclectic body of empirically tested knowledge to which all 'developers' who currently identify themselves as coaching, OD or HRD professionals would wish to belong. Perhaps the time is right for this sort of development, because although historically OD and HRD have evolved and developed as distinctive fields in their own right, a recent analysis of their respective evolutionary paths by Ruona and Gibson (2004) has indicated a clear and strong convergence. A new profession that embraced all aspects of people and organization development could prove to be highly beneficial to 'professional' coaches, particularly executive coaches and business coaches who find themselves deploying a wide range of HRD and OD intervention tools and techniques as part of their everyday coaching practice. It could also be an advantage to HRD professionals in the UK who, as already mentioned, are too readily identified and stereotyped by line managers as predominantly HRM or personnel management people concerned primarily with running training courses and/or administering training systems. Consequently, many HRD practitioners lack sufficient 'credibility' to gain access to, and work with or through top managers on strategic change and organizational development issues. A similar 'credibility' problem exists in the USA because most HRD related postgraduate qualification programmes are offered by university schools of education, rather than by university business schools. Consequently, line managers too readily perceive HRD as a 'specialized form of teaching and education' far removed from their world of 'business and organization.' Again, this can lead to HRD practitioners experiencing difficulties in gaining access to or being invited by top level managers, particularly within private sector organizations, to help them address strategic change and organizational development issues.

In light of the findings of this study and the above observations, and of our research epistemology which values multiple researchers, methods and sources, we suggest that the existing 'coaching', 'OD' and 'HRD' fields of practice might wish to open a dialogue so as to collaborate and cross-fertilize ideas around the theory-practice issues of coaching. We envision the dialogue might include an in-depth examination and reflection upon the apparent current trajectories of development as 'silo' fields of professional practice, and upon the possibility of convergence into a 'single unified' field of study and practice, which might ultimately lead to the creation of a new inclusive profession embracing all aspects of people and organization development.

References

Albrecht, K (1983). *Organization Development: A total systems approach to positive change in any business organization*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. London: Sage

Beckhard, R. (1969). *Organization development strategies and models*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Beattie, R.S. (2002). Developmental managers: line managers, as facilitators of workplace learning in voluntary organizations. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow.

Beer, M. (1980). *Organization change and development: A systems view*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

Beer, M., & Walton, E. (1987). Organization change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 229-272.

Bennis, W. (1969). *Organization development: Its nature, origins, and prospects*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1969). *Building a dynamic corporation through grid organization development*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101

Bullock, A. & Trombley, S. (1999). *The new Fontana dictionary of modern thought*. London, Harper-Collins

Burke, W., & Hornstein, H. (1972). *The social technology of organization development*. Fairfax, VA: Learning Resources.

Burke, W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices*. New York, NY: Little, Brown & Co.

Burke, W., & Schmidt, W. (1985). Management and organization development. *Personnel Administration*, March, 43-55.

Burke, W. (1994). *Organization development: A process of learning and changing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chalofsky, N. (2004). Human and organization studies: The discipline of HRD. In T. Marshall, & M. L. Morris, (Eds.), *2004 AHRD Conference Proceedings* (pp.422-427). Bowling Green; OH: AHRD.

Church, A., Waclawski, J., & Seigel, W. (1996). Will the real OD practitioner please stand up? A call for change in the field. *Organization Development Journal, 14*(2), 5 – 14.

CIPD (2005). *Training and development 2005: Annual survey report.* London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

Clegg, S., Rhodes, C., & Kornberger, M. (2003). *An overview of the business coaching industry in Australia. OVAL Research Working Paper 03-11*. Sydney: The Australian Centre for Organisational, Vocational and Adult Learning.

Cummings, T. G. & Worley (C. G.). (2000). *Organization development and change* (7th ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson South-Western.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C.G. (2008). *Organization development and change* (9th ed.). Mason, Ohio: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Davis, P., Naughton, J., & Rothwell, W. (2004). New roles and competencies for the profession. *Training & Development*, *58*(4), 26-36.

Davis, S. (1983). What OD means to me. *Organization Development Journal*, Fall, 17-18.

Dyer, W. (1997). Organization development as I have experienced it. *Organization Development Journal, 15*(2), 29-34.

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. & Lowe, A. (1991). *Management research: An introduction*. London: Sage.

Egan, T. M. (2002). Organization development: An examination of definitions and dependent variables. *Organization Development Journal, 20*(2), 59-70.

Ellinger, A.M. (1997). Managers as facilitators of learning in learning organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Ellinger, A. D., & Bostrom, R. P. (1999). Managerial coaching behaviors in learning organizations. *The Journal of Management Development, 18*(9), 752-771.

EMCC (2007). EMCC and ICF dialogue. In *Newsletter of the European Mentoring and Coaching Council,* March.

Evered, R. D., & Selman, J. C. (1989). Coaching and the art of management. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(2), 16-32.

Fleetwood, S. (2005). Ontology in organization and management studies: A critical realist perspective. *Organization 12*(2), 197-222.

Flick, U. (1991). Triangulation revisited: Strategy of validation or alternative? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 22*(2), 175-197.

Flick, U. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research.* (2nd ed.) London: Sage.

Fournies, F. F. (1987). *Coaching for improved work performance*. Liberty Hall Press.

French, W. (1969). Organization development: Objectives, assumptions, and strategies. *California Management Review, 12*(2), 23-34.

French, W., & Bell, C., Jr. (1978). *Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organization improvement* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall.

French, W., & Bell, C., Jr. (1999). *Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organization improvement* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

French, W., Bell, C., Jr., & Zawacki, R. (Eds.) (1989). *Organization development theory, practice and research*. Dallas, TX: Business Publications.

Gilley, J. W., & Eggland, S. A. (1989). *Principles of Human Resource Development*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Golembiewski, R. T., (1969). Organization development in public agencies: Perspectives on theory and practice. *Public Administration Review*, July-August, 367-372.

Grant, A. M. (2001). *Towards a psychology of coaching*. Coaching Psychology Unit, School of Psychology, University of Sydney [www.psych.su.oz.au/psychcoach/Coaching_review_AMG2001.pdf].

Grant, A. M. (2006). Solution-focused coaching. In Jonathan Passmore (ed.), *Excellence in coaching: The industry guide.* London: Kogan Page.

Grant, A. M. & Cavanagh, M. J. (2004). Toward a profession of coaching: Sixty-five years of progress and challenges for the future. *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring*, *2*(1), 1-16.

Gray, D.E. (2006). Executive Coaching: Towards a dynamic alliance of psychotherapy and transformative learning processes. *Management Learning, 37*(4), 475-497

Gray, D., & Goregaokar, H. (2007). Executive coaching in SMEs: Experiences and impact of the coaching process. In proceedings of the *UFHRD/AHRD 8th International Conference on HRD Research and Practice Across Europe*, Oxford, UK.

Grieves, J. (2003). *Strategic human resource development*. London: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, R. H., (1977). *Organizations: Structure and process*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hamlin, R. G. (2004). *Toward evidence-based HRD through HRD professional partnership research*. Inaugural Professorial Lecture, University of Wolverhampton, UK.

Hamlin ,R. G., Keep. J. & Ash, K. (2001) *Organizational Change and Development: A reflective guide for managers, trainers and developers*. Harlow|: FT Prentice Hall

Harrison, R., & Kessels, J. (2004). *Human resource development in a knowledge economy: An organizational view.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hodgetts, W.H. (2002). Using executive coaching in organisations: What can go wrong (and how to prevent it). In C.Fitzgerald, & G.J. Berger (Eds.) *Executive Coaching: Practices and Perspectives*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

International Coach Federation (2007a). Definition of coaching. Retrieved April 5, 2007 from http://www.coachfederation.org/For+Coaching+Clients/What+is+ICF/ .

Ives, Y. (2008). What is 'Coaching'? An exploration of conflicting paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, *6*(2), 100-113).

Joo, B-K. (2005). Executive coaching: A conceptual framework from an integrative review of practice and research. *Human Resource Development Review,* 4(4), 462-88.

Kemp, S. (2005). Critical realism and the limits of philosophy. *European Journal of Social Theory, 8*(2), 171-191.

Kilburg, R. R. (2000). *Executive coaching: Developing managerial wisdom in a world of chaos.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Knafl, K. A., & Breitmayer, B. J. (1991). Triangulation in qualitative research: Issues of conceptual clarity and purpose. In J.M. Morse (Ed.), *Qualitative nursing research: A contemporary dialogue.* (Rev. ed., pp. 226-239). London: Sage.

Lippitt, G. (1969). *Organization renewal*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts

Madill, A., Jordon, A., & Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist and radical constructionist epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology, 91*(1), 1-20.

McLagan, P. (1989). *Models for HRD prac*tice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

McLagan, P. (1999). As the HRD world churns, *Training and Development, 53*(12), 20-29.

McLagan, P., & Suhadolnik, D. (1989). *Models for HRD practice: The research report*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

McLean, G.N. (2006). *Organization development: Principles, processes ,performance.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

McLean, G. N. Yang, B., Kuo, M. C., Tolbert, A. S., & Larkin, C. (2005). Development and initial validation of an instrument measuring managerial coaching skill. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16*(2), 157-178.

Megginson, D., Joy-Matthews, J., & Banfield, P. (1993). *Human resource development*. London: Kogan Page.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mink, O. G., Owen, K. Q., & Mink, B. P. (1993). *Developing high-performance people: The art of coaching*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Nadler, L., & Nadler, Z. (1989). *Developing human resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Neilsen, E. (1984). *Becoming an OD practitioner*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Orth, C. D., Wilkinson, H. E., & Benfari, R. C. (1987). The manager's role as coach and mentor. *Organizational Dynamics*, *15*(4), 66-74.

Palmer, B. (2003). Maximizing value from executive coaching. *Strategic HR Review*, *2*(6), 26-29.

Perks, R.W. (1993). *Accounting and society*. London, Chapman & Hall.

Phillips, K. & Shaw, ((1989). A Consultancy Approach for Trainers. Aldershot: Gower

Plunkett, B.L. & Egan, T.M. (2004). Application of Psychology-based theoretical approaches to executive coaching: A summary and exploration of potential utility. In T. Marshall & L. M. Morris, (Eds.), *AHRD Conference Proceedings* (pp.558-65). Bowling Green; OH: AHRD.

Ponterotto, J. (2005). Qualitative Research in Counseling Psychology: A Primer on Research Paradigms and Philosophy of Science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 126-136.

Popper, M. & Lipshitz, R. (1992). Coaching on leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 13*(7), 15-18.

Porras, J., & Robertson, P. (1982). Organization development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., volume 3) (719-822). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Redshaw, b. (2000). Do we really understand coaching? How can we make it work better? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32(3), 106-108

Rigg, C., Stewart, J.D., & Trehan, K. (2007). A critical take on a turn in HRD. In C. Rigg, J. Stewart & K. Trehan (Eds.), *Critical human resource development: Beyond orthodoxy*. Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.

Roberts, J., & Dietrich, M. (1999). Conceptualizing professionalism: Why economics needs sociology, The *American Journal of Economics and Sociology,* October.

Ruona, W.E.A., & Gibson, S.K. (2004). The making of the Twenty-First-Century HR: An analysis of the convergence of HRM, HRD, and OD, *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 49-66

Ruona, W. E. A., & Lynham, S. (1999). Toward a philosophical framework of thought and practice. In K.P Kuchinke (Ed.), *AHRD Conference Proceedings* (pp. 206-215), Baton Rouge, OH: AHRD.

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

Schmuck, R., & Miles, M. (1971). *Organization development in schools*. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.

Shuit, D. P. (2005). Huddling with the coach. *Workforce Management*, *84*(2), 53-57.

Stewart, J. D. (1999). *Employee development practice*. London: FT Pitman Publishing.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Vaartjes, V. (2005). Integrating action learning practice into executive coaching to enhance business results. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 3*(1), 1-17.

Vaill, P. (1989). Seven process frontiers for organization development. In W. Sikes, A. Drexler, & J. Gant (Eds.), *The emerging practice of organization development*. La Jolla, CA: NTI Institute.

Warrick, D. D. (1984). Organization development. In W. R. Tracey (Ed.). *Human resources management and development handbook* (915-925). New York: American Management Association.

Watkins, K. (2000). Aims, roles and structures for human resource development. In W.E.A. Ruona & G. Roth (Eds.) *Advances in Developing Human Resources Vol 17. Philosophical foundations of human resource development practice* (pp 54-59). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Weinberger, L. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. *Human Resource Development International, 1(*1), 75-93.

Worrall, L. (2005). Fiat Lux: A reflection on management research. *International Journal of Management Concepts and Philosophy*, *1*(3), 248-261.

Zeus, P., & Skiffington, S. (2000). *The complete guide to coaching at work.* Roseville, NSW: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix 1
A range of definitions of coaching grouped within identified categories (variants) of coaching
[**Bold** = intentions/purposes; *Italics* = processes]

Authors	Definitions, Purposes and Processes
Coaching Fournies (1987)	*A process* for **improving problem work performance**.
Evered & Selman (1989)	Coaching…refers to *the managerial activity of creating, by communication only, the climate, environment, and context* that **empowers individuals and teams to generate results**.
Orth, Wilkinson & Benfari (1987)	Coaching….is a hands-on process of *helping employees recognize opportunities* to **improve their performance and capabilities.**
Popper & Lipshitz (1992)	Coaching…[is] a *process of creating a culture of development, an atmosphere of learning*. It has two components: **improving of performance at the skill level**; and, **establishing relations allowing a coach to enhance his trainee's psychological development.**
Mink, Owen & Mink (1993)	*Coaching is the process* by which one individual, the coach, *creates enabling relationships with others **that make it easier for them to learn.***
Hargrove (1995)	Coaching is about *interacting with people in a way that teaches them* t**o produce often spectacular results in their business**. Coaching is about challenging and supporting people, giving them the gift of your presence.
Burdett (1998)	Coaching is, exclusively, *a process* focusing on **enhanced performance**.
Clutterbuck (1998)	Coaching is 'a pragmatic approach to *help* people manage their **acquisition or improvement of skills'** and can be either 'directive or non-directive'……….
Hudson (1999)	A coach is 'a person who *facilitates* experiential learning that results in **future-oriented abilities**' and who 'is *trained* and devoted to *guiding* others into increased **competence, commitment** and **confidence'**.
Redshaw (2000)	This *process of giving guidance, encouragement and support to the learner* is…what we call coaching.
Grant (2006)	Coaching is 'a *collaborative solution-focused*, *results-orientated* and *systematic process* in which the coach *facilitates* the **enhancement** of **performance**, **life experience, self-directed learning** and **personal growth** of individuals and organizations'.

Peterson (1996)	Coaching is 'the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge and opportunities they need to **develop themselves** and become **more effective'.**
Kampa-Kokesch and Anderson (2001)	Coaching is 'a form of *systematic feedback intervention* aimed at **enhancing professional skills**, **interpersonal awareness**, and **personal effectiveness'**.
Parsloe (1995) Grant and Cavanagh (2004)	Coaching is 'a process that enables **learning and development to occur** and **performance to improve'.** Professional coaching is 'a theoretically grounded, *systematic*, *goal-directed process* designed to *facilitate* **sustained change** and foster the on-going **self-directed learning** and **personal growth** of the coachee' and is 'aimed at **skills development**, **performance enhancement** and **personal development'**.
International Coaching Federation (2007b)	Professional coaching is an ongoing *professional relationship* that *helps* people produce extraordinary results in their lives, careers, businesses or organizations. It deepens learning to **improve performance** and **enhance quality of life.**
Executive Coaching	
Zeus and Skiffington (2000)	…is 'a *collaborative*, *individualized relationship* between an executive and a coach, the aims of which are to bring about **sustained behavioural change** and to **transform the quality** of the executive's **working** and **personal life'**.
Kilburg (2000)	…is 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 assist the client to 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'.
Peltier (2001)	…is about '*facilitating* **positive changes** that can be leveraged down to **enhance the entire organization'.**
Orenstein (2002)	…is referred to as a *one-to-one intervention* with a senior manager for he purpose of **improving** or **enhancing management skills.**
McCauley and Hezlett (2001)	…..involves a series of *one-to-one interventions* between a manager or executive and an external coach in order to further the **professional development** of the manager.

Hall, Otazo and Hollenbeck (1999)	…is meant to be a practical , *goal-focused* form of *personal, one-to-one learning* for busy executives and may be used to **improve performance** or **executive behavior**, **enhancing a career** or **prevent derailment**, and work through organizational issue or **change initiatives.**
Grant (2001)	Workplace coaching for executives is '*a solution-focused*, *results-orientated systematic process* in which the coach *facilitates* the **enhancement of work performance** and the **self-directed learning** and **personal growth** of the coachee.
Caplan (2003)	…..is 'about bringing out the best in people and conveying them from where they are now to where they want to be. It is a *highly personalized learning process* that is tailored to the learner's knowledge base, learning style and pace. It **raises self-awareness**, **uncovers blind spots** and enables the executive to **accomplish more** than otherwise he or she would have.
Plunkett, Egan and Garza (2004)	….is 'defined as *processes* and *interventions facilitated* by qualified consultants utilizing psychology and other HRD-related knowledge, skills and techniques to assist positional leaders in the **improvement of individual effectiveness**, **learning** and **performance'**.
Dingman (2006)	…is 'a *one-to-one interaction* between a coach and an executive in a *helping relationship* offering experiential learning and dialogue that *facilitates* an executive's desire to **reach specified goals** and may affect **individual self-, job**-, and **organizational-related outcomes'**...the effects of which 'are intended to extend to **improved organizational performance'**.
Business Coaching	
Sanders (1996)	The job of a [business] coach is 'to *help* employees understand how their behaviors may be going out of bounds and to **illuminate appropriate alternative behaviors** that will **ensure long-term success'.**
Hill (1998)	Business coaching is 'designed to be non-directive, in that its focus is usually on *skilful questioning* in order to *help* businesses **find their own solutions'**
Zeus and Skiffington (2000)	Business coaching 'can be applied to all types of businesses'. It 'ranges from individual and executive team coaching in large corporations (including local authorities and public institutions), to coaching owners and managers of small-to medium-sized businesses and other organizations'. Business coaches *help* 'business owners/managers and organizations 'to **develop, promote** and **grow their business, their staff** and **themselves'**.

Storey (2003)	A business coach 'establishes a *collaborative partnership* with his or her client, the nature of which is co-designed *to help* the client **achieve their goals'**
Bacon and Spear (2003)	Coaching in business contexts can generally be defined as an *informal dialogue* whose purpose is the f*acilitation* of **new skills, possibilities**, and **insights** in the interest of individual learning and organizational advancement
Clegg, Rhodes and Kornberger (2003)	Business coaching is 'a form of *organizational intervention'* which 'typically involves a third party contracted from outside of an organization to work with individuals or small groups to diagnose the current business situation, elaborate on future goals, identify internal and external resources, and assess and plan for the process of **achieving those goals'**, and is focused on '**achieving business success'**.
Taylor (2007)	Business coaching is any and every intervention that enables people, teams and organizations **to be their very best**
Life Coaching	
Grant (2001)	..is a *solution-focused*, *results-orientated systematic process* in which the coach *facilitates* the **enhancement** of the coachee's **life experience** and **performance in various domains** (as determined by the coachee), and **fosters the self-directed learning** and **personal growth** of the coachee
Zeus and Skiffington (2000)	..is 'an *individual relationship* between a coach and a coachee to **bring about life transforming experiences'** and involves 'clarifying values and visions, and setting goals and new actions so that
Richardson (2004)	.. is 'a powerful process that *supports* people in **releasing their true potential** and in **making changes in their lives'**.
International Coaching Federation (2007a)	…is '*partnering* with clients in a thought *provoking* and *creative process* that inspires them to **maximize their personal potential'**. It is '*an on-going relationship* which focuses on clients taking action toward the **realization** of their **visions**, **goals** or **desires'**.

Appendix 2
A range of definitions of organization development (OD)
[**Bold** = intentions/purposes; *Italics* = processes]

Authors	Definitions, Purposes and Processes
Beckhard (1969)	Organization development is an effort (i) planned, (ii) organization-wide, and (iii) managed from the top, to (iv) **increase organizational effectiveness and health** through (v) *planned interventions in the organizations' "processes,"* using behavior-science knowledge.
Bennis (1969)	Organization development (OD) is a response to change, *a complex educational strategy* **intended to change the beliefs, attitudes, values, and structures of organizations** so that they can better adapt to new technologies, markets, and challenges and the dizzying rate of change itself.
Blake & Mouton (1969)	Organization development emphasizes the "O" in every sense of the word. It means **development of the entire organization or self-sustaining parts of an organization from top to bottom and throughout.** True OD is theory based, team-focused and *undertaken by means of self-help approaches which place a maximum reliance upon internal skills and leadership for development activities.* It is top led, line managed and staff supported. Development activities focus on the "system," those traditions, precedents, and past practices which have become the culture of the organization. Therefore, development must included individual, team, and other organization units rather than concentrating on any one to the exclusion of others. OD is thus this comprehensive approach which integrates the management sciences, business logic, and behavioral systems of an organization into an organic, interdependent whole.
French (1969)	Organization development refers to a long-range effort **to improve an organization's problem-solving capabilities and its ability to cope with changes in its external environment** *with the help of external or internal behavioral-scientists consultants, or change agents*, as they are sometimes called.
Golembiewski (1969)	Organizational development implies a normative, *re-education strategy* **intended to affect systems of beliefs, values and attitudes within the organization so that it can adapt better to the accelerated rate of change in technology, in our industrial environment and society in general**. It also includes formal organizational restructuring which is frequently initiated, facilitated and reinforced by the normative and behavioral changes.
Lippitt (1969)	Organization development is the *strengthening of those human processes in organizations* which **improve the functioning of the organic system so as to achieve its objectives.** Organization renewal is the process of initiating, creating, and confronting needed changes so as to make it possible for organizations to become or remain viable, to adapt to new conditions, to solve problems, to learn from experiences, and to move toward greater organizational maturity.

Schmuck & Miles (1971)	Organizational Development can be defined as a planned and sustained effort to apply behavior science **for system improvement** *using reflexive, self-analytic methods.*
Burke & Hornstein (1972)	Organization development is *a process of planned change* – **change of an organization's culture from one which avoids an examination of social process (especially decision making, planning, and communication) to one which institutionalizes and legitimizes this examination**.
Hall (1977)	Organizational development refers to a long-range effort **to improve an organization's problem-solving capabilities and its ability to cope with change in its external environment** *with the help of external or internal behavior-scientist consultants or change agents.*
French & Bell (1978)	Organization development is a long-range effort **to improve an organization's problem-solving and renewal processes**, particularly through a more effective and collaborative management of organization culture – with special emphasis on the culture of formal work teams – *with the assistance of a change agent, or catalyst, and the use of the theory and technology of applied behavioral science including action research.*
Beer (1980)	Organization development is a system-wide *process of data collection, diagnosis, action planning, intervention, and evaluation* **aimed at (1) enhancing congruence between organizational structure, process, strategy, people, and culture; (2) developing new and creative organization solutions; and (3) developing the organization's renewal capacity**. *It occurs through collaboration of organizational members working with a change agent using behavioral science theory, research, and technology.*
Beer (1980)	Organizational development *is a process for diagnosing organizational problems* by **looking for incongruencies between environment, structures, processes, and people.**
Burke (1982)	Organization development is **a planned process of change in an organization's culture** *through the utilization of behavioral science technology, research, and theory*.
Davis (1983)	Organization development *consists of a series of theory based workshops, techniques, programs, systematic approaches and individual consulting interventions* **designed to assist people in organizations in their day-to-day organizational life and the complex processes this involves.** All of this is backed up with beliefs, biases, and values held by the organization development practitioner.
Nielsen (1984)	Organization Development is the attempt **to influence the members of an organization to expand their candidness with each other about their views of the organization and their experience in it, and to take greater**

	responsibility for their own actions as organization members. The assumption behind OD is that when *people pursue both of these objectives simultaneously*, they are likely to discover new ways of working together that they experience as more effective for achieving their own and their shared (organizational) goals. And that when this does not happen, such activity helps them to understand why and to make meaningful choices about what to do in light of this understanding.
Warrick (1984)	Organization development *is a planned, long-range systems and primarily behavioral science strategy for understanding, developing, and changing organizations* **to improve their present and future effectiveness and health.**
Burke & Schmidt (1985)	Organization development is *a process* which attempts **to increase organizational effectiveness** *by integrating individual desires for growth and development with organizational goals*. Typically, this process is planning change effort, which involves a total system over a period of time, and these change efforts are related to the organization's mission.
Beer & Walton (1987)	Organization development comprises *a set of actions* undertaken **to improve organizational effectiveness and employees' well being.**
French, Bell & Zawacki (1989)	Organizational development is *a process of planned system change* that attempts **to make organizations better able to attain their short and long term objectives.**
Vaill (1989)	Organization development is *an organizational process* for **understanding and improving any and all substantive processes an organization may develop for performing any task and pursuing any objective.** A "process for improving process" – that is what OD has basically sought to be for approximately 25 years.
McLagan (1989)	Organization Development: *Assuring healthy inter- and intra-unit relationships and helping groups initiate and manage change*. Organization development's primary emphasis is on relationships and processes between and among individuals and groups. Its primary intervention is influence on the relationship of individuals and **groups to effect and impact on the organization as a system.**
Porras & Robertson (1992)	Organizational development *is a set of behavioral science-based theories, values, strategies, and techniques aimed at the planned change of the organizational work setting* **for the purpose of enhancing individual development and improving organizational performance**, *through the alteration of organizational members' on-the-job behavior.*
Burke (1994)	Organization development is **a planned process of change in an organization's culture** *through the utilization of behavioral science technologies, research, and theory.*

Church, Waclawski & Siegal (1996)	Organization development is a field based on values – **promoting positive humanistically oriented large-system change in organizations** – plain and simple…if they are not morally bound to the core values of the field then they simply are not doing O.D. …OD is about **humanistic change on a system-wide level**…It is about **improving the conditions of people's lives in organizations**….O.D. is about **helping people in organizations.**
Dyer (1997)	Organization Development *is a process whereby actions are taken to release the creative and productive efforts of human beings* at the same time **achieving certain legitimate organizational goals such as being profitable, competitive, and sustainable**.
French & Bell (1999)	Organization development is a long-term effort, led and supported by top management, **to improve an organization's visioning, empowerment, learning, and problem solving processes,** *through an ongoing collaborative management of organization culture – with special emphasis on the culture of intact work teams and other team configurations – using the consultant-facilitator role and the theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including action research.*
Cummings & Worley (2000)	Organization development is *a systemwide application of behavioral science knowledge* to **the planned development and reinforcement of organizational strategies, structures, and processes that lead to organization effectiveness.**
Cummings & Worley (2005)	Organization development is *a systemwide application and transfer of behavioral science knowledge* to **the planned development, improvement, and reinforcement of the strategies, structures, and processes that lead to organization effectiveness.**
McLean (2006)	Organization development is any process or activity, based on the behavioral sciences, that, either initially or over the long term, has the potential **to develop in an organizational setting enhanced knowledge, expertise, productivity, satisfaction, income, interpersonal relationships, and other desired outcomes, whether for personal or group/team gain, or for the benefit of an organization, community, nation, region, or, ultimately, the whole of humanity.**

Appendix 3

A range of human resource development (HRD) conceptualizations/definitions, purposes and processes offered by various authors since the early 1970s [**Bold** = intended purpose; *Italics* = processes]

Authors	Conceptualizations/Definitions and Purposes
Human Resource Development Nadler (1970)	HRD is '*a series of organized activities* conducted within a specified time and designed **to produce behavioral change'**
Jones (1981)	HRD is 'a *systematic expansion of people's work-related abilities*, focused on **the attainment of both organization and personal goals**.'
Chalofsky and Lincoln (1983)	The discipline of HRD 'is the study of how individuals and groups in organization **change through learning.'**
Nadler and Wiggs (1986)	HRD is 'a *comprehensive learning system* for **the release of the organization's human potentials** – *a system that includes both vicarious (classroom, mediated, simulated) learning experiences and experiential, on-the-job experiences* that are keyed to the organization's reasons for survival.'
Swanson (1987)	HRD is '*a process* of **improving an organization's performance** through the capabilities of its personnel. HRD includes activities dealing with work design, aptitude, expertise and motivation.'
Smith (1988)	HRD consists of '*programs and activities, direct and indirect, instructional and/or individual* that positively affect **the development of the individuals and the productivity of and profit of the organization**.'
Nadler and Nadler (1989)	HRD is '*organized learning experiences* provided for employees within a specified period of time to bring about the possibility of **performance improvement** and/or **personal growth**'.
McLagan (1989)	HRD is 'the integrated use *of training and development, career development, and organizational development* to **improve individual and organizational effectiveness**.'
Gilley and Egglund (1989)	HRD is about 'the **advancement of knowledge, skills and competencies**, and the **improved behavior** of people within the organization for both their **personal** and **professional use**'
Watkins (1989)	HRD is 'the field of study and practice responsible for the **fostering of a long-term, work-related learning capacity** at the individual, group and organizational level of organizations. As such, it includes – but is not limited to – *training, career development and organizational development*.'

Smith (1990)	HRD is the *process* of determining the optimum methods of developing and improving the human resources of an organization and the systematic improvement of the performance and productivity of employees *through training, education and development and leadership* for the **mutual attainment of organizational and personal goals.'**
Garavan (1991)	HRD is 'the *strategic management* of *training, development* and of *management/professional education* interventions, so as **to achieve the objectives of the organization** while at the same time ensuring the full utilization of the knowledge in detail and skills of individual employees. It is concerned with the *management* of **employees learning for the long-term**, keeping in mind the explicit corporate and business strategies'
Megginson et al. (1993)	HRD is 'an integrated and holistic approach to **changing work related behaviour**, using *a range of learning techniques* and *strategies*'
Swanson (1995)	HRD is 'a *process of developing and unleashing human expertise through organization development and personnel training and development* **for the purpose of improving performance**.'
Ruona and Lynham (1999)	The purpose of HRD 'is to **enhance learning**, **human potential** and **high performance** in work related systems'
Stewart (1999)	HRD 'encompasses *activities* and *processes* which are intended to have **impact on organizational** and **individual learning'** and 'is constituted by *planned interventions* in organizational and individual learning processes'.
Watkins (2000)	The aims of HRD are to **bring learning and change** into an organizational context'
Hamlin (2004)	HRD 'encompasses *planned activities* and *processes* designed to **enhance organizational** and **individual learning**, **develop human potential**, **maximize organizational effectiveness and performance,** and help bring about **effective and beneficial change** within and beyond the boundaries of organizations'
Harrison and Kessels (2004)	HRD as an organizational process 'comprises the skilful *planning* and *facilitation* of a variety of formal and informal *learning and knowledge processes and experiences,* primarily but not exclusively in the workplace, in order that **organisational progress and individual potential can be enhanced** through the competence, adaptability, collaboration and knowledge-creating activity of all who work for the organisation'.
Yorks (2005)	HRD is defined as 'both an organizational role and a field of professional practice. The fundamental purpose of HRD is **to**

	contribute to both long-term strategic performance and more immediate performance improvement through *ensuring that organizational members have access to resources for developing their capacity for performance and for making meaning of their experience* in the context of the organization's strategic needs and the requirements of their jobs.'
Werner and De Simons (2006)	HRD can be defined as '*a set of systematic and planned activities* designed by an organization **to provide its members with the opportunities to learn necessary skills to meet current and future job demands.'**