

Coaching in a Diverse World:
Coaches' perceptions of culture and intercultural competence in coaching

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Akiko Maeker

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Advisor: Michael P. Goh, Ph.D.

July 2017

© Akiko Maeker, 2017

Acknowledgment

I would like to first express gratitude to my academic adviser Dr. Michael Goh for his guidance, as well as his encouragement and patience with me. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Alexander Ardichvili, Dr. Darwin Hendel, Dr. Barbara Kappler, and Dr. Michael Goh for their feedback and the thought-provoking conversation during the final oral exam. I would like to acknowledge two mentors, Dr. Michael Paige and Dr. John Cogan, who were instrumental in my graduate studies. Dr. Paige introduced me to the field of intercultural education and guided me as my academic advisor until his retirement. Without Dr. Cogan, I would not have considered pursuing a Ph.D. degree. He believed in my potential and push me to go further. A special appreciation goes to Dr. Mitchel Hammer and his family and staff at IDI, LLC. In addition to Dr. Hammer being a long-term mentor in the field of IDI Guided Development, IDI, LLC graciously offered a scholarship to use the IDI instrument at a doctoral research rate. This study was not possible without the professional coaches who volunteered their time and insight for this research project. I am very grateful for their interest and engagement. I would like to thank all my friends, colleagues, clients, and other mentors whom I did not name above.

Furthermore, all family members who continuously encouraged me played a major part in my life during this process. Among them, I would like to acknowledge my husband Paul Maeker and our two sons Noa and Kai for their day-to-day support and understanding. My intercultural family is my inspiration and hope.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Norio and Michiko Sasada, and my grandmother, Kumi Sasada, who instilled in me the value and power of education.

Abstract

The current study employed a mixed method approach to explore two research questions: How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive the role of culture in their work? How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to their work? To explore these questions, data were collected from 21 participants, using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and individual qualitative interviews. The interviews yielded 1,137 minutes (18 hours and 57 minutes) of transcribed data. Through inductive analysis of these data and creating groupings using the IDI scores, 46 themes under 13 domains emerged. The results presented a general trend in each domain and throughout the domains that the coaches with more intercultural competence viewed and talked about culture with more interest and rigor as well as considered intercultural competence to play an important role in coaching and discussed it with more complexity.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xiv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Significance of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Key Concepts	4
Coaching	4
Culture.....	4
Intercultural competence.....	4
Research Assumptions	5
Verstehen	5
Interpretive constructionism	6
Interculturalism	6
Research Questions.....	7
Chapter Two: Literature Review	9
Introduction.....	9
Culture and Coaching	10
Coaching	10
Culture.....	10
Culture in coaching	12
Coach-client relationships.....	13
Client’s goals	14
Intercultural Competence.....	15
Intercultural competence in therapy.....	17
Existing Cultural Coaching Frameworks.....	19
Cultural orientations framework.....	19
Culturally proficient coaching	20
Shortcomings of existing frameworks	21
A Developmental Approach to Intercultural Competence and its Assessment	22
Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity	22

IDI and IDC	23
Predictability of the IDI	24
Theoretical contribution of this study	25
Defining interculturally competent coaching.....	25
Intercultural competence as a measurable coaching competency.....	27
ICCD	27
Summary	28
Chapter Three: Research Methods and Instruments	30
Participants.....	30
Interviewer	30
Instruments.....	31
The IDI.....	31
Demographic, contexting, and customized questions.....	32
Individual qualitative interviews.....	33
Procedures for Collecting Data.....	34
Recruiting participants	34
Administering the IDI.....	34
Interviewing	35
Procedures for Analyzing Data.....	35
Coding.....	36
Categorizing into Domains	36
Theorizing	36
Role of the IDI Data.....	37
Ethical Considerations	37
Protecting Participant Identities.....	37
Avoiding Misunderstanding.....	37
Setting the Scope of Feedback.....	38
Limitations and Researcher’s Subjectivity	38
Small Number of Interviews	39
Defended Subjects	39
Other Instruments.....	40

Researcher’s Subjectivity.....	41
Chapter Four: Findings	42
Introduction.....	42
Findings from Data Collection Phase One: IDI.....	42
Demographics of respondents.....	42
IDI Group Profile.....	44
PO	44
Developmental Orientation (DO)	45
OG between PO and DO.....	45
Findings of Data Collection Phase Two: Interviews	45
Modification to Grouping of Participants	45
Initial grouping of participants.....	46
Modified grouping	46
Rationale for the modification	48
Interview Analysis Results	50
Domain A: Cultural factors.....	50
Theme 1: As coaches developed interculturally, the number of cultural factors mentioned grew.....	50
Theme 2: Monocultural coaches tended to talk about culture primarily as it relates to language difference and clients’ nationalities	51
Theme 3: Mid- to High-Minimization coaches tended to discuss culture as it relates to organizational culture	52
Theme 4: Low-Acceptance coaches tended to discuss culture as it relates to cultures within a country.....	53
Theme 5: Low-Adaptation coaches tended to jump to discussing intercultural competence without talking about culture	53
Domain B: Distinction between personality and culture	54
Theme 6: Low-Polarization and Low-Minimization coaches made no distinction between personality and culture.....	54
Theme 7: Some Low-Minimization coaches saw personality and culture separately and in relation to each other.....	55
Theme 8: Mid-Minimization coaches tended to see cultural difference as part of individual uniqueness	56

Theme 9: Mid-Minimization to High-Acceptance coaches hesitated to “call it cultural	57
Theme 10: High-Minimization to Low-Acceptance coaches struggled to articulately discuss personality and culture and the distinction between the two.....	59
Theme 11: A Low-Adaptation coach made a clear distinction between personality and culture and talked about how to use them to tailor his own actions	60
Domain C: Is culture positive or negative?.....	61
Theme 12: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches saw culture primarily as a problem	61
Theme 13: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches expressed simple positivity toward culture without substantive examples, only after they were prompted	63
Theme 14: Mid-Minimization to Low-Acceptance coaches saw the mix of positive and negative of culture	64
Theme 15: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches had positive and constructive views of culture	67
Domain D: Attention to and curiosity for culture.....	68
Theme 16: Polarization coaches had not considered culture much before and dismissed cultural influence in coaching	69
Theme 17: Some Minimization coaches acknowledged cultural influence in coaching	71
Theme 18: Some Minimization coaches were unsure or acknowledged cultural influence in coaching in limited or inconsistent ways.....	73
Theme 19: Intercultural coaches paid stronger and more consistent attention to cultural influence on coaching.....	75
Domain E: Talking with clients about culture	78
Theme 20: Polarization coaches had limited experience of and interest in talking about culture with their clients.....	79
Theme 21: Minimization coaches reluctantly talked with clients about culture because it had to be brought up.....	80
Theme 22: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches asked clients cultural questions	83
Domain F: Readiness to talk about intercultural competence	85

Theme 23: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches were unfamiliar with intercultural competence	85
Theme 24: Mid-Minimization coaches explored intercultural competence and related terminologies as they talked.....	86
Theme 25: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches more readily discussed intercultural competence and related terminologies	89
Domain G: Intercultural competence is about awareness	90
Theme 26: To Polarization to Mid-Minimization coaches, intercultural competence was about being aware of and understanding different cultures.....	90
Theme 27: Intercultural coaches talked elaborately about awareness and about other things beyond awareness	91
Domain H: Nature or nurture	98
Theme 28: Monocultural to Low-Minimization coaches were unclear on whether people are born with intercultural competence or can be taught	98
Theme 29: Low-Acceptance coaches connected own intercultural competence with their experience.....	100
Domain I: Relationship to difference.....	102
Theme 30: To a Low-Polarization coach, intercultural competence was about being able to deal with different people.....	102
Theme 31: To a High-Polarization coach, intercultural competence was about not being prejudice toward difference	102
Theme 32: Mid-Minimization coaches discussed commonality and difference .	104
Theme 33: High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches discussed difference in more complex and nuanced ways	106
Domain J: Importance of intercultural competence in coaching	110
Theme 34: To Monocultural coaches, intercultural competence had limited importance in coaching and would not alter coaching conversations.....	110
Theme 35: Low-Minimization coaches believed that intercultural competence was important in coaching	112
Theme 36: Mid- to High-Minimization coaches saw intercultural competence more relevant in some coaching situations than others while they felt their own intercultural competence to be adequate	113
Theme 37: Intercultural coaches considered intercultural competence as a critical key to coaching	117

Domain K: Interculturally competent coaching.....	119
Theme 38: Low- to Mid-Minimization coaches struggled to describe what interculturally competent coaching might look like	120
Theme 39: High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches had seemingly endless examples of how they did or could alter how they coach	122
Domain L: Coaching for clients' intercultural competence.....	129
Theme 40: Mid-Minimization coaches wanted their clients to develop intercultural competence	129
Theme 41: Low-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches talked about specific coaching situations where they were able to help develop their clients' intercultural competence	130
Domain M: Intercultural competence in coach training	132
Theme 42: High-Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches thought that current coach training programs were not sufficiently teaching intercultural competence	132
Theme 43: A Mid-Minimization coach believed that intercultural competence should naturally develop as part of being trained as a coach.....	135
Theme 44: A Mid-Minimization coach asserted that most coaches lacked the awareness of importance of intercultural competence.....	136
Theme 45: Low-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches talked about partial learning opportunities for developing intercultural competence, currently available in or outside coach training programs	137
Theme 46: A Low-Adaptation coach talked about a need for deselection to be a coach	140
Summary	140
Chapter Five: Discussions.....	141
Introduction.....	141
Researcher Bias.....	141
Researcher's expectation	142
Challenges in handling data	143
Discussion of Research Question 1.....	144
Domain A: Cultural factors.....	144
Domain B: Distinction between personality and culture	146
Domain C: Is culture positive or negative?.....	150

Domain D: Attention to and curiosity about culture.....	151
Domain E: Talking with clients about culture	153
Summary discussion of Research Question 1	154
Discussion of Research Question 2.....	154
Domain F: Readiness to talk about intercultural competence	155
Domain G: Intercultural competence is about awareness.....	155
Domain H: Nature or nurture.....	157
Domain I: Relationship to difference.....	159
Domain J: Importance of intercultural competence in coaching	161
Domain K: Interculturally competent coaching.....	162
Domain L: Coaching for clients' intercultural competence.....	163
Domain M: Intercultural competence in coach training	165
Summary discussion of Research Question 2.....	166
Summary of Major Findings: Illustrations of Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural Coaches	167
Illustration of Monocultural coaches	168
Illustration of Transitional coaches.....	169
Illustration of Intercultural coaches	169
Interviews as Unintended Intervention	170
Chapter Six: Recommendations and Conclusion.....	172
Study Strengths and Limitations.....	172
Strengths	172
Limitations	174
Coaching Research Recommendations.....	174
Conceptual shift from intercultural awareness to intercultural competence.....	174
Empirical research on coach-client engagement.....	175
Coaching Practice Recommendations.....	175
Using the IDI for own intercultural learning and development	176
Intercultural coach supervision.....	176
Using the IDI to assess the effectiveness of intercultural coaching.....	177
Coach Training Recommendations.....	177

Cultural factors.....	177
Personality and culture.....	177
Intercultural competence development.....	178
Conclusion	178
References.....	180
Appendix A Guiding Interview Questions	189
Appendix B Initial Invitation to the Study.....	191
Appendix C Invitation to the IDI.....	192
Appendix D Invitation to Potential Interviewees.....	194
Appendix E Consent Information	196

List of Tables

1. Definitions of Coaching.....	11
2. Cultural Orientations Framework’s Categories and Dimensions	20
3. Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity Orientations	23
4. Intercultural Coaching Competence Development.....	29
5. Coach Demographics	43
6. IDI Scores and Groupings.....	50

Chapter One: Introduction

The world is culturally diverse. Edward T. Hall (1977) said, “There is not one aspect of human life that is not touched and altered by culture” (p. 14). Coaching is not an exception. As the world becomes more interconnected and people become more mobile, the diversity of societies continues to grow, both globally (i.e., across national borders) and locally (i.e., within each country). As a result, the need for coaching spans cultures. Coaches can no longer choose whether to pay attention to culture. It is imperative that they do so. It has been overdue that the coaching profession integrates the perspective of culture and intercultural competence into its work.

Statement of the Problem

To account for changing societal realities, coaches must be interculturally competent to be able to coach globally and locally diverse clients. There is limited scientific knowledge around the topic of the intercultural competence of coaches, and, to date, there has been neither a clear understanding of what it means to be an interculturally competent coach, nor an assessment tool, grounded in theory, with which an interculturally competent coach can be trained and evaluated.

Significance of the Problem

According to the International Coach Federation (ICF), founded in 1995 and currently the largest professional association for coaching worldwide, the ICF’s membership has grown from 2,122 all based in North America in 1999 to 20,636 in 110 countries in 2012 (ICF, 2012b). Representing the global and multicultural body of coaches, ICF membership includes 9,447 coaches who are located in more than 80 countries and who hold one of the three levels of ICF credentials: Master Certified Coach

(MCC), Professional Certified Coach (PCC), or Associate Certified Coach (ACC; ICF, 2012b). The 2012 ICF Global Coaching Study also reported that an estimated 47,500 professional coaches worldwide generate a total revenue/income of close to \$2 billion U.S. dollars (ICF, 2012a).

The recent popularity of coaching has led to a growing number of publications on various topics related to coaching (Grant, 2009), with the main three contributing disciplines being management, psychology, and training (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001). However, currently, the coaching field is only at an early stage of thinking about culture and intercultural competence. For example, intercultural competence is not part of required coaching competencies determined by the ICF. In other words, being interculturally competent is not accounted for with practicing coaches and coaches in training.

As the coaching field begins to investigate the role of culture and intercultural competence in coaching, it is essential that the coaches' lived experiences are considered. Capturing coaches' views through their own voices is key because, from the inception of the ICF, it has been a self-governing body by coaches that has "taken the lead in developing a definition and philosophy of coaching, as well as in establishing ethical standards among its members" (para. 2) according to the Ethics and Regulation page on the ICF website. Coaches themselves are accountable for maintaining the quality of their coaching services and advancing the profession. To this end, through this study, coaches' perceptions of culture and intercultural competence as they relate to their coaching were collected and analyzed.

Purpose of the Study

The current study was exploratory in nature and employed a mixed method research approach to generate new knowledge. Through the administration of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), which assesses one's current stage of intercultural development, and subsequent individual qualitative interviews with the coaches, this study examined how coaches at different developmental stages of the intercultural competence development process perceived the role of culture and intercultural competence in coaching differently or similarly.

By collecting coaches' voices, through the interviews, the data can generate their perspectives. However, a key contribution of this study's design is in using the mixed method approach. When utilizing the IDI data along with the interview data, I was able to pay attention not only to *what* each coach voiced on this topic but also from *where* he or she were voicing it. The *where* in this case points to one's stage in one's own intercultural development. The strength of this study's design is to explore whether a coach's voice on this topic was influenced by *where* in his or her own development he or she was coming from, in addition to *what* he or she actually said about the topic.

In addition to understanding coaches' perceptions, the findings from these data helped generate recommendations for the coaching field to take the steps toward incorporating discussions of culture and intercultural competence in the practice of coaching as well as in coach training. Below, I discuss the research assumptions, research questions, research methods and instruments, and finally data collection and analysis procedure for the study.

Key Concepts

Coaching. One of the most widely accepted definitions of coaching is that of the ICF, “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential” (ICF, 2010, p. 1). Coaching in this thesis refers to this partnership between a coach and a client, where the coach, the person who coaches, supports the client, the person being coached, through a process of achieving the goals the client sets. A coach is a person who is trained in coaching competencies and works with individual and/or organizational clients through professional coaching engagements.

Culture. Geert Hofstede (2010) defined culture as the “software of the mind.” It shapes human behavior, and the “behaviors are the visible part of cultural practices, and the reasons behind behaviors, which constitute the underlying values and belief systems, are the invisible part of cultures” (Bhawuk, Landis, & Munusamy, 2008, p. 8). In thinking about culture in the context of coaching, it is meaningful to define culture to include both visible and invisible parts. Also, it is important to note that, when culture is discussed in this paper, it refers not only to that of a national or ethnic group but also that of a gender, generation, race, religion, sexual orientation, class, and other type of human variations as well, because, as Daouk-Öyry and Rosinski (2010) stated, “Each individual can be influenced by several cultures at one time, all of which impact on behaviour” (p. 122).

Intercultural competence. Intercultural competence is the “ability to engage in effective interaction across cultures” (Hammer, 2009, p. 205). Such competence must be present between a coach and their client as well. In the context of coaching relationships,

intercultural competence becomes a part of the coach's ability to create and nurture appropriate and effective interactions between them and their clients who represent different or divergent affective, cognitive, and behavioral orientations to the world.

When investigating intercultural competence, this study built largely on the work of intercultural scholars such as Milton Bennett (1986, 1993, 1998, 2004), Mitchel Hammer (2005, 2009, 2011), Bennett and Bennett (2001, 2004), and Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003).

Research Assumptions

Verstehen, interpretive constructionism, and interculturalism are the three philosophical underpinnings of the design and implementation of this study. The relevance of each for this study is explained below.

Verstehen. The philosophical understanding of *Verstehen* describes the core of my thinking and decision-making in terms of designing this study. *Verstehen* describes the “process by which all of us in our everyday life interpret the meaning of our own actions and those of others with whom we interact” (Bernstein, 1978, p. 139). As a researcher, I respect and rely on the research participants' interpretations of their own experience. Therefore, the concept of *Verstehen* describes well the nature of this study, which attempted to construct new knowledge from the meanings that the participants extracted from their own actions, the actions of others, and the world surrounding them. More specifically, to achieve the goal of this study, which was to understand the perceptions of coaches, I relied on these coaches' own perceptions—meanings they generated—of their own actions, the actions of others, and the world surrounding them.

Interpretive constructionism. Interpreting meaning from research participants' Verstehen, this study took an interpretive constructionist approach to research. Interpretive constructionism “argues that the core of understanding is learning what people make of the world around them, how people interpret what they encounter, and how they assign meanings and values to events or objects” (Rubin & Rubin, 2011, p. 19). I took this interpretive constructionist approach with the purpose being to “describe particular events, processes, or culture from the perspectives of the participants” (Rubin & Rubin, 2011, p. 22). In the case of the current study, this was about describing coaching practices, coaching processes, or coaching culture from the coaches' perspectives.

Interculturalism. The third philosophical foundation to this study was an interculturalist lens in understanding the world. Interculturalism refers to “support for cross-cultural dialogue and challenging self-segregation tendencies within cultures” (The Free Dictionary, n.d.) and “seeks to promote the development of cultural creativity and innovation in diverse societies” (Zapata-Barrero, 2015, p. 6). Interculturalism in this thesis was not intended to offer any particular political perspective as it might in other contexts. It was the philosophical assumption that the Verstehen, the understanding of the world through the eyes of those who observe and experience it, is always influenced by culture.

A key assumption I brought to the study was that intercultural competence is an influential factor in people's lives. Consequently, this study approaches the current research topic from the assumption that intercultural competence is an influential factor in coaching. The theoretical foundation and motivation for this study were immensely

shaped by my knowledge in the field of intercultural studies and, therefore, the design of this study reflects the perspective of interculturalism.

Based on the three research assumptions described above, I conducted qualitative individual interviews with practicing coaches to collect their perceptions, interpretations, and meanings they assigned to what has happened in their coaching. Through analyzing these coaches' perceptions and examining how, if in any way, their own intercultural competence, as assessed by the IDI, affects their perceptions, I hope I presented their interpretations and meanings of the role of culture and intercultural competence in coaching in such a way that it can advance the knowledge base of coaching and contribute to the improvement of the profession.

Research Questions

This study explored the following research questions:

1. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive the role of culture in their work?
2. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural) perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to their work?

Exploring these research questions generated ideas and thoughts, from various stages of intercultural competence development, concerning the role of culture and intercultural competence in coaching. In addition, elicited from the coaches were case examples of coaching situations where culture played a significant role and where the intercultural competence of the coaches and/or their clients became relevant.

Exemplifying such developmental perceptions of coaches, the findings help illustrate how a coach can be trained and evaluated along the developmental process of intercultural coaching competence. Specific interview questions, as well as data collection and analysis procedure, are discussed further in Chapter Three.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the relevant literature concerning the topic of culture and intercultural competence in coaching. With the goal of illustrating the past and current trends, terms such as *intercultural coaching*, *cross-cultural coaching*, *multicultural coaching*, and *coaching across cultures* were explored.

First, the definitions of the key concepts, coaching, culture, and intercultural competence, are reviewed. Second, the importance of intercultural competence in coaching is discussed. Third, the review focuses on the ways in which culture has been discussed specifically within the coaching literature. The review of the relevant literature identified two key manifestations of how culture has been talked about in coaching: one as in the relationship between a coach and his or her client who have different cultural backgrounds and the other as in clients' coaching goals having cultural implications. Each of these manifestations of culture in coaching is described further.

The fourth part of this chapter introduces relevant examples of coaching frameworks that are available for coaches to utilize in relation to culture in the coaching context, as well as their shortcomings. The fifth part of the chapter discusses intercultural competence as a coaching competency. Building on the existing knowledge, a new framework, Intercultural Coaching Competence Development (ICCD), is proposed, which builds on the framework of the IDI in the training and assessment of coaches. Last, the chapter concludes by offering a definition of an intercultural coach.

Culture and Coaching

Coaching. According to John Whitmore (2009), coaching is about unlocking people's potential to maximize their own performance. The definitions of coaching vary across individuals and organizations due to the variation in their coaching philosophies, approaches, and purposes. One of the most commonly known definitions of coaching is one by the ICF (2012b), "partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential" (p. 1).

The ICF explained that a coach's responsibility is to:

- discover, clarify, and align with what the client wants to achieve,
- encourage client self-discovery,
- elicit client-generated solutions and strategies, and
- hold the client responsible and accountable,

with the goal of helping clients "dramatically improve their outlook on work and life, while improving their leadership skills and unlocking their potential" (Coaching FAQs, para. 1).

As mentioned earlier, definitions by major coaching-related associations vary.

They are presented in Table 1.

Culture. In this study, coaching refers to the partnership between a coach and a client with the purpose of achieving the goals that the client sets. Culture becomes a salient issue to consider in this coaching partnership because culture shapes human behavior (Bhawuk et al., 2008). How culture affects the coach's and client's behavior is an important topic to explore because, as Hall (1984) wrote, we are unaware of the effects of culture until we pay intentional attention:

There is an underlying, hidden levels of culture that is highly patterned—a set of unspoken, implicit rules of behavior and thought that controls everything we do. This hidden cultural grammar defines the way in which people view the world, determines their values, and establishes the basic tempo and rhythms of life. Most of us are either totally unaware or else only peripherally aware of this. (p. 6)

Table 1

Definitions of Coaching

Entity	Definition
ICF	partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential
American Coaching Association (ACA)	help[ing] people to meet the opportunities and challenges life presents
International Institute of Coaching (IIC)	a simple yet effective form of personal development where the client and coach create an alliance that promotes and sustains the client's personal growth and competence
International Association of Coaching (IAC)	a transformative process for personal and professional awareness, discovery and growth
Coaches and Mentors of South Africa (COMENSA)	a professional, collaborative and outcomes-driven method of learning that seeks to develop an individual and raise self-awareness so that he or she might achieve specific goals and perform at a more effective level
Worldwide Association of Business Coaches (WABC)	the process of engaging in regular, structured conversation with a Client: an individual or team who is within a business, profit or nonprofit organization, institution, or government and who is the recipient of business coaching, and the goal is to enhance the client's awareness and behavior so as to achieve business objectives for both the client and their organization.

According to Geert Hofstede (1981), culture is “the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from those of another” (p. 24). Because “each individual can be influenced by several cultures at one time” (Daouk-Öyry & Rosinski, 2010, p. 122), it is important to view culture as having many factors, of which it can be the basis. Culture includes factors beyond race, ethnicity, or gender and can be defined as “values, beliefs, attitudes, preferences, customs, learning styles, communication styles, history/historical interpretations, achievements/

accomplishments, technology, the arts, literature, etc.—the sum total of what a particular group of people has created together, share, and transmit” (Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, & Lassegard, 2007, p. 43). Culture consists of both visible parts, such as artifacts, and invisible parts, such as value systems. Because “behaviors are the visible part of cultural practices, and the reasons behind behaviors, which constitute the underlying values and belief systems, are the invisible part of cultures” (Bhawuk et al., 2008, p. 8), it is meaningful in the context of coaching to define culture to include both visible and invisible elements.

Culture in coaching. The discussion of culture in coaching gained attention in 2003 when Philippe Rosinski asserted, “Coaching across cultures is, in essence, a more creative form of coaching,” (p. xviii) in his pioneering book, “Coaching Across Cultures.” According to Rosinski (2003):

Whereas traditional coaching tends to operate within the confines of your own cultural norms, values, and assumptions, coaching across cultures challenges your cultural assumptions and propels you beyond your previous limitations to discover creative solutions that lie “outside the box.”

Because coaching is about helping people to unleash their potential, coaching across cultures makes it possible to deploy even more potential by tapping into various possible worldviews and also by expanding your repertoire of options. (p. xix)

Peterson (2007) stated, “many executive coaches today find themselves working with leaders from a variety of cultural backgrounds, as well as coaching leaders who work with culturally diverse teams” (p. 261). To grasp the current understanding in the

literature of culture in coaching, terms such as intercultural coaching, as well as cross-cultural coaching, multicultural coaching and coaching across cultures were used to search for relevant literature. These terms were often used interchangeably and shared two common meanings. When coaching is intercultural, cross-cultural, multicultural, or across cultures, coaching had one or both of the following characteristics:

- coach and client come from different cultural backgrounds, and/or
- client has intercultural, or culture-related, goals.

Each of these characteristics is further discussed below.

Coach-client relationships. A good relationship between a coach and the client is a critical success factor of coaching engagement (Baron & Morin, 2009; Bluckert, 2005), and one of the key indicators of relationship building is the coach's self-awareness and awareness of his or her client (O'Broin & Palmer, 2010). Peterson (2007) asserted that having cultural knowledge of the client could help customize coaching to meet the needs of the client and "the greater the coach's knowledge of cultural differences, the more likely the coach will anticipate and handle the process smoothly" (p. 270).

As Passmore and Law (2009) pointed out, migration between countries is increasing. Thus, the consideration of national contexts is critical. In addition, it is also important to realize that culture is present in coaching within a single national culture. When culture is understood beyond nationality and includes (e.g., human variations of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientations, class, generations, and religions), cultural diversity in various forms exists between a coach and a client locally as well as globally.

Culture plays an important role, as Peterson (2007) explained, in coaching situations where the cultural difference may be easily noticeable:

A coach is expected to exercise a high level of interpersonal skills when relating to coachees. When there is a cultural difference between the coach and the coachee, which effectively means in most, if not all, coaching relationships, a new factor “culture” is present and it magnifies the coach’s challenge. (p. 264)

Client’s goals. The second way in which culture is talked about in the context of coaching is when clients have intercultural or culture-related goals. A client may be hoping to lead his or her global or multicultural team or organization better (Curry, 2015) or to adjust to a new work environment across cultures better.

Expatriate coaching is an application of coaching where the coach is helping his or her clients make a cultural transition and adjustment. Abbott, Stening, Atkins, and Grant (2006) offered insight into the effectiveness of expatriate coaching. They stated, “from a cultural perspective, an executive coach who is highly effective in the homeland culture might not be the best person to work in an expatriate environment” (p. 307), and a critical issue to consider in the coaching of expatriates is the importance of coach selection, “particularly the need for the coach to be informed by cross-cultural theory and experience” (p. 296). They suggested that the following traits be held by coaches who work with expatriates:

- a sound appreciation of the cultures of the client and the host country;
- self-awareness in terms of the coach’s own cultural background;
- personal experience in cultural adaptation and acculturation; and
- thorough familiarity with theory and research in cross-cultural psychology and management (p. 306).

In coaching expatriates and their families, Miser (2010) also offered recommendations that a coach should have the following traits:

- professionally trained;
- certified;
- experience working with expatriate assignees, their spouses, and their families;
- cross-cultural expertise; and
- international experience.

Intercultural Competence

Psychologist Jerome Hanley (1999) traced the introduction of the concept of cultural competence to Carter G. Woodson in 1927. Hanley wrote about Woodson (1999):

Dr. Woodson believed that if a people understood their history and contributions to the society in which they lived, then (1) they would feel better about themselves, (2) other groups of people would feel better about the oppressed group and be more accepting of them, (3) there would be greater acceptance between and within groups of people, reducing the level of racism in the society.

(p. 1)

These three stages described by Woodson speak to the process of reducing the level of racism in the context of the United States. Even though Woodson is addressing the racism in the U.S. context specifically, the idea of people advancing their understanding of themselves and others to a greater acceptance is developmental, and this conceptual approach to (inter)cultural competence aligns with that of the current study.

Intercultural competence is the “ability to engage in effective interaction across cultures” (Hammer, 2009, p. 205) or appropriate and effective management of the interaction between people who represent different or divergent affective, cognitive, and behavioral orientations to the world (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Bennett and Bennett (2001) described intercultural competence as the unity of mindset (or heartset) and skillset:

While the primary emphasis of intercultural communication is on behavior, no behavior exists separately from thought and emotion. This necessary unity can be called the intercultural mindset and skillset. The mindset refers to one’s awareness of operating in a cultural context. This usually entails some conscious knowledge of one’s own culture (cultural self-awareness), some frameworks for creating useful cultural contrasts (e.g., communication styles, cultural values), and a clear understanding about how to use cultural generalizations without stereotyping. The mindset (or better, “heartset”) also includes the maintenance of attitudes such as curiosity and tolerance of ambiguity that act as motivators for seeking out cultural differences.

The intercultural skill set includes the ability to analyze interaction, predict misunderstanding, and fashion adaptive behavior. The skillset can be thought of as the expanded repertoire of behavior—a repertoire that includes behavior appropriate to one’s own culture, but which does not thereby exclude alternative behavior that might be more appropriate in another culture. (pp. 6-7)

In their 2014 review of intercultural competencies literature, Leung, Ang, and Tan sorted varying conceptualizations of intercultural competence in three groups:

intercultural traits, intercultural attitudes and intercultural worldviews, and intercultural capabilities. One of the key contributions of their study was this comprehensive review and synthesis of personal characteristics, which could serve as a basis for further research on effective behaviors of interculturally competent individuals. Leung, And, and Tan stated:

The majority of intercultural competence models emphasize generalized or decontextualized intercultural competencies. We know a lot about the personal characteristics of people with high intercultural competence, including their traits, attitudes and worldviews, and capabilities. The general assumption is that interculturally competent individuals are able to function effectively across different intercultural contexts because of these personal attributes. In this sense, general-ized intercultural competence reflects a person's potential to be effective across cultures and job roles, such as by being an effective intercultural negotiator or intercultural counselor. By contrast, we know much less about what interculturally competent people actually do in specific intercultural job contexts. (p. 510)

Intercultural competence in therapy. In examining the critical importance of intercultural competence, much insight can be learned from the professional fields that have already been paying great attention to culture. One such field that most closely resembles coaching and can offer insight is therapy. It is meaningful to look to the field of therapy because both therapy and coaching “seek to bring about behavior change and both involve a relationship between a professional (e.g., therapist, coach) and a client (e.g., patient, executive)” (Smither, 2011, p. 135).

In therapy, “a basic assumption of effective practice is that therapists will consider the use of culturally sensitive treatment with culturally diverse clients” (Sperry, 2010, p. 213). Sperry (2010) asserted that to make decisions about when and if to plan and implement culturally sensitive treatments, the client’s cultural identity, level of acculturation, explanatory model, and treatment expectations need to have been elicited and both client and therapist need to be willing to discuss treatment options.

Goh (2005) summarized the following four reasons to argue the need for juxtaposing cultural competence with expertise in mental health counseling:

- Cultural competence and expertise in mental health counseling are conceptually similar and intertwined.
- Counselors and therapists need to be trained to work with the increasing cultural diversity in our communities.
- Developing cultural competence is required for ethical practice.
- Meaningful research on expertise in mental health counseling must include and involve cultural diversity.

Endicott, Bock, and Narvaez (2003) studied college students’ moral development and intercultural development and found a statistically significant relationship. This finding points to the importance of Goh’s third reason for considering cultural competence development for therapists, that it is necessary for therapists’ ethical practice to develop their own intercultural competence.

Based on this, a parallel assertion could be made for coaching as well that a coach must develop intercultural competence to improve moral reasoning ability and, therefore, likely to practice coaching more ethically. The example of the field of therapy alerts the

coaching profession to consider immediate and more substantial investment in intercultural competency development as part of coach training and evaluation. It calls for close attention given the increasingly culturally diverse nature of clientele internationally and locally.

Existing Cultural Coaching Frameworks

Utilizing the available resources that can lead coaches from a general awareness of culture to the acquisition of a deeply integrated knowledge of cultural difference, coaches must “understand that interactions between people are also interactions between cultures” (Moral & Warnock, 2005, p. 134). To help coaches, coaching experts have suggested frameworks, such as the cultural orientations framework (Rosinski, 2003) and culturally proficient coaching (Lindsey, Martinez, & Lindsey, 2006). Each framework is described in Table 2.

Cultural orientations framework. This is a framework proposed by Rosinski (2003) and designed to give coaches “a language to talk about culture” (p. 49). It provides a set of cultural dimensions grouped into seven categories: *sense of power and responsibility, time management approaches, definitions of identity and purpose, organizational arrangements, notions of territory and boundaries, communication patterns, and modes of thinking*. The cultural dimensions that are suggested to consider in each category are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Cultural Orientations Framework's Categories and Dimensions

Categories	Dimensions
Sense of power and responsibility	Control/harmony/humility
Time management approaches	Scarce/plentiful Monochronic/polychronic Past/present/future
Definitions of identity and purpose	Being/doing Individualistic/collectivistic
Organizational arrangements	Hierarchy/equality Universalist/particularist Stability/change Competitive/collaborative
Notions of territory and boundaries	Protective/sharing
Communication patterns	High context/low context Direct/indirect Affective/neutral Formal/informal
Modes of thinking	Deductive/inductive Analytical/systemic

Culturally proficient coaching. This is a framework proposed by Lindsey, Martinez, and Lindsey (2006) and is designed for coaches who work in school settings, and it is defined as coaching that “intends for the person being coached to be educationally responsive to diverse populations of students” (p. 5). A meaningful contribution of this framework is that it suggests a developmental approach to cultural proficiency, named the cultural proficiency continuum. The cultural proficiency continuum consists of the following six points (Lindsey, Martinez, & Lindsey, 2006):

1. Cultural destructiveness—seeking to eliminate vestiges of the cultures of others.
2. Cultural incapacity—seeking to make the culture of others appear to be wrong.
3. Cultural blindness—refusing to acknowledge the culture of others.
4. Cultural precompetence—being aware of what one doesn’t know about working in diverse settings.

5. Cultural competence—viewing one’s personal and organizational work as an interactive arrangement in which the educator enters into diverse settings in a manner that is additive to cultures that are different from the educator.
6. Cultural proficiency—making the commitment to lifelong learning for the purpose of being increasingly effective in serving the educational needs of cultural groups (pp. 45-46).

Lindsey, Martinez, and Lindsey (2006) asserted that the knowledge of this continuum “allows you to shift from talking about *others* as the source of cross-cultural problems to talking about your *practices* as what needs to change and evolve in order to be effective in cross-cultural environments” (p. 46).

Shortcomings of existing frameworks. The cultural orientations framework by Rosinski can function as a guide for creating one’s cultural profile to identify clients’ cultural defaults and begin to think about and talk about others’ as well. Although this framework does not take a developmental approach, it can be a useful tool for coaches and clients.

The culturally proficient coaching framework by Lindsey, Martinez, and Lindsey offers a developmental approach to coaches’ and clients’ intercultural competence development. While Lindsey, Martinez, and Lindsey (2006), in their book, present self-check assessments, reflective questions, and learning activities to support the reader’s learning of culturally proficient coaching, a foremost shortcoming is the lack of assessment tool. This framework can be a valuable coach training tool but does not suffice as a framework for rigorous assessment. A challenge for identifying a framework

for intercultural coaching that takes a developmental approach to coach training and that accompanies a reliable assessment tool still remains unmet.

A Developmental Approach to Intercultural Competence and its Assessment

Based on the idea of culture, including a wide variety of cultural factors, affecting coaching relationships, intercultural competence as a coaching competency can add a new possibility to how culture needs to be addressed in coaching. To explore the possibility of training and preparing coaches to be interculturally competent, this researcher drew the conceptual understanding most heavily from the intercultural competence theories, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC), that are developmental in nature and offer a valid and reliable assessment of intercultural competence, and the IDI, that can function as a powerful learning tool as well as function as an assessment tool for the coaches' developmental progress.

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The formation of the DMIS began with Milton Bennett's question, "why some people seem to get a lot better at communicating across cultural boundaries while other people didn't improve" (Bennett, 2004, p. 62), and he came to notice "as people became more interculturally competent it seemed that there was a major change in the quality of their experience (Bennett, 2004, p. 62)." Bennett called this change in competence a move from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism.

According to Bennett (2004), the term *ethnocentrism* refers to the experience of one's own culture seen as "central to reality," and the term *ethnorelativism* means that the experience of one's own beliefs and behaviors are seen as just one organization of reality

among many viable possibilities. In the DMIS, this move, or development, from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism is illustrated as a linear progression from the three orientations on the left side, namely Denial, Defense (and Reversal), and Minimization, to the three orientations on the right side, namely Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration. Figure 3 shows the development model of these six orientations and the descriptions of each, which were derived from Bennett’s article (2004).

Table 3

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity Orientations

Ethnocentrism			Ethnorelativism		
Denial	Defense	Minimization	Acceptance	Adaptation	Integration
the state in which one’s own culture is experienced as the only real one—that is, that the patterns of beliefs, behaviors, and values that constitute a culture are experienced as unquestionably real or true.	the state in which one’s own culture is experienced as the only viable one—the most “evolved” form of civilization, or at least the only good way to live. <i>Reversal</i> : an adopted culture is experienced as superior to the culture of one’s primary socialization.	the state in which elements of one’s own cultural worldview are experienced as universal.	the state in which one’s own culture is experienced as just one of a number of equally complex worldviews.	the state in which the experience of another culture yields perception and behavior appropriate to that culture.	the state in which one’s experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews.

IDI and IDC. The IDI is a 50-item online questionnaire, which is “constructed to measure the orientations toward cultural differences described in the DMIS” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 421). The IDI was developed based on the DMIS, and through multiple phases of research-based refinement, it has come to take the current form (Hammer, 2011). It is the “premier cross-culturally valid and reliable measure of intercultural competence” (Hammer, 2009, p. 205).

The central theory to the IDI is that one's intercultural competence develops, as "a progression from a less complex perception of and consequently a less complex experience of culturally based patterns of difference to a more complex experience around cultural diversity" (Hammer, 2009, p. 205). This developmental process, emerged from the DMIS and now measured by the IDI, is termed the IDC and is comprised of five core orientations: Denial, Polarization, Minimization, Acceptance, and Adaptation (Hammer, 2009). Hammer (2009) described this intercultural development process as that a "movement along the continuum begins with the more Monocultural orientations of Denial and Polarization (defense/reversal), through a more transitional mindset of Minimization, to the more intercultural or global mindsets of Acceptance and Adaptation" (pp. 206-207). The further descriptions of each IDI orientation can be found in Table 4.

Predictability of the IDI. The IDI's rigor is witnessed in the increasing number and variety of studies pointing to its predictability. When a study analyzed the relationship between the IDI results of recruiting and staffing teams within a multinational organization and their achievement level of diversity and inclusion benchmarks (Hammer, 2011), the analysis revealed that the teams with a higher IDI results achieved more benchmarks.

Hammer (2011) offered another example. When 1500 high school students studying abroad and 638 control group students were studied, it was found that the "observed increases in study abroad outcomes of knowledge of the host culture, intercultural anxiety, intercultural friendships, and satisfaction with the study abroad experience are significantly associated with increases in intercultural competence as

assessed by the IDI” (Hammer, 2011, p. 485). These findings are compelling evidence for hypothesizing that increases in intercultural competence might be an indicator of increases in coaching competence.

Theoretical contribution of this study. The existing coaching frameworks introduced earlier provide helpful insight and guidance to coaches in a culturally diverse society who are challenged to perform effectively in an intercultural capacity. However, substantively assessing coaches’ intercultural competence remains a challenge. Whether a coach incorporates a cultural orientations framework, culturally proficient coaching, or other coaching frameworks, how do clients or the coaches themselves know when or if they are able—competent—to practice interculturally competent coaching?

Defining interculturally competent coaching. Rosinski and Abbott (2006) asserted that a coach needs not only to embrace diversity at an intellectual level but also be convinced in his or her heart that a different truth or ideal can be legitimate. Practicing effective interculturally competent coaching, “whether it be with an executive who is working cross-culturally or who has a cultural background different from the coach’s—requires greater cross-cultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and an increased understanding of one’s own cultural biases” (Handin & Steinwedel, 2006, p. 20). Based on the discussions far thus, a coach who is interculturally competent is expected to build effective coach-client relationships and in achieving clients’ culture-related goals. When working in a society with culturally diverse organizational and individual clients, coaches must look deeply into themselves and open themselves to the possibility that their own cultural values, assumptions, or backgrounds might potentially inhibit their effectiveness with a client (Rosinski & Abbott, 2006). As Peterson (2007) stated, “A good coach

recognizes that people look at the world through different lenses” (p. 264). He also asserted that such a coach assumes “to walk into every coaching engagement prepared to learn about new ways to be helpful to the person, and even prepared to learn new ways of going about their own learning, so they can readily adapt to new cultures and styles” (Peterson, 2007, p. 265).

Hammer (2009) explained that one acquires a more intercultural and global mindset when developing into Acceptance and Adaptation. As described in Table 4, a coach in the Acceptance orientation begins to explore cultural differences more deeply, is able to experience his or her own cultural patterns of perception and behavior as one of a number of different but equally complex sets of perceptions and behavioral patterns, and is committed to the cultural topics in coaching contexts. When a coach develops into the Adaptation orientation, he or she is capable of shifting perspective to another culture and adapting behavior according to cultural context. Applying this understanding based on the ICCD framework, an interculturally competent coach can be reasonably expected to be an individual who has attained the Developmental Orientation of Adaptation, if not, minimally Acceptance, as measured by the IDI.

To illustrate what it means for a coach to be interculturally competent the ICCD framework is offered, which is theoretically sound, developmental in approach and, most importantly, offers the capability to assess coaches’ learning by a valid and reliable assessment tool.

When cultural difference or cultural diversity is seen as more than national, racial, or ethnic variations, every coaching engagement becomes intercultural. In this scenario, intercultural competence becomes a key coaching competency.

Intercultural competence as a measurable coaching competency. Abbott, Stening, Atkins, and Grant (2006) stated, “The principal limitation of having coaching services available to expatriate managers systematically and on a global scale seems to be the availability and deployment of suitably qualified and experienced coaches” (p. 296). The inability to accurately assess and, therefore, ensure the competence of the coaches practicing—or intending to practice—intercultural coaching is a critical issue. Through learning and development as a professional coach, coaches in a multicultural society must possess the ability to assess the efficacy of their intercultural coaching. Various coaching-related organizations, such as the ICF, offer coach training programs and coach certifications to educate and certify those who wish to attain coaching competencies and practice as a professional coach. Without a tool of assessment, are these coaches who are trained and certified through these training programs sufficiently prepared to be interculturally competent? How can the coach training programs ensure that their graduates have the intercultural competence that allows them to facilitate intercultural coaching situations successfully? The theoretical framework, ICCD, was used to respond to these questions.

ICCD. How does a coach’s intercultural coaching competence develop? The ICCD table displays an illustration of how a coach’s intercultural competence can change through the developmental process.

The ICCD is based on the work of intercultural scholars, particularly Milton Bennett and Mitchel Hammer. The DMIS was first coined by Milton Bennett (1986, 1993) and later led to the creation of an assessment tool, the IDI (Hammer et al., 2003). Each orientation is described in brief statements elicited and paraphrased from Hammer

et al. (2003) in the left column and from Hammer (2009) in the middle column. The right-hand side column gives a description for each orientation, painting a picture of how a coach in that orientation might approach intercultural coaching situations. These statements of intercultural coaching competence are not to describe all coaches in a given orientation, but rather, to give an example of how a coach's intercultural competence could be observed in his or her coaching within each particular orientation. When imagining a coach in each orientation of the intercultural competence development process, it becomes clear that the coach's intercultural competence, where he or she is at any given time in the developmental process, affects the coaching being practiced.

When the ICCD is applied as a framework for training and assessing intercultural coaches and aspiring intercultural coaches and accompanied by the IDI as an assessment tool, they can present a potential predictability of coaching effectiveness and outcome.

Summary. Through reviewing the relevant literature, I came to realize that the importance of culture in coaching is reasonably shared by coaching researchers and practitioners, but the conceptual frameworks are limited. In this chapter, I summarized key elements of existing knowledge to explore the area of research and practice around culture and coaching. This review of existing knowledge revealed an important gap. Although there is a level of awareness and discussion of the impact of culture on coaching, the existing coaching literature is missing a clear vision of what an interculturally competent coach should look like and lacks a theory-based intercultural competence training and evaluation tool for coaches that is valid and reliable across cultures.

This current study addressed this gap. In designing and conducting this study, the framework, the ICCD served as a conceptual foundation while the IDI and qualitative interviews served as the methods of inquiry. The methodology for the study is described further in the following chapter, Chapter Three.

Table 4

Intercultural Coaching Competence Development

	Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman (2003)	Hammer (2009)	Intercultural Coaching Competence
Denial	one's own culture is experienced as the only real one	low level of capability for understanding cultural differences and adapting to these differences (which are likely to go unnoticed)	A coach sees his or her experience as the only reality and unable to understand or adapt to the coachee's view that may be different.
Defense	one's own culture is experienced as the only viable one	a judgmental orientation grounded in a sense of "us" and "them," where "our" ways of doing things are seen as superior to the ways things are done in other cultural communities	A coach sees the relationships between people (e.g., coach and coachee) from a polarized, judgmental perspective, often assuming his or her view is superior.
Reversal	an adopted culture is experienced as superior to the culture of one's primary socialization	a judgmental orientation grounded in a sense of "us" and "them," where the cultural practices and values of the "other cultural group" are viewed as superior	A coach sees the relationships between people (e.g., coach and coachee) from a polarized, judgmental perspective, often assuming the other's (e.g., coachee's) view is superior.
Minimization	elements of one's own cultural worldview are experienced as universal	an orientation which is able to recognize some patterns of cultural difference but emphasizes dealing with these identified differences through a commonality lens that can mask underlying differences	A coach applies his or her own cultural worldview to coachees' experience and emphasize dealing with differences between himself or herself and the coachee through the lens of commonality.
Acceptance	one's own culture is experienced as just one of a number of equally complex worldviews	an orientation which begins to more deeply explore cultural differences, recognizing that these differences need to be understood from the perspective of the other culture, is able to experience his or her own cultural patterns of perception and behavior as one of a number of different but equally complex sets of perceptions and behavioral patterns, and is committed to the cultural diversity agenda	A coach begins to more deeply explore cultural differences, recognizing that coachee's experiences need to be understood from the perspective of the coachee, is able to experience his or her own cultural patterns of perception and behavior as one of a number of different but equally complex sets of perceptions and behavioral patterns, and is committed to the cultural diversity agenda in coaching contexts
Adaptation	the experience of another culture yields perception and behavior appropriate to that culture	an orientation which involves the capability of shifting perspective, at least partially, to another culture and adapting behavior according to cultural context	A coach is capable of shifting perspective to another culture and adapting behavior according to cultural context.

Chapter Three: Research Methods and Instruments

This chapter describes the research design, methods, and instruments used in this study. The process of data collection took a two-phase design. The first body of data were collected using the IDI, which yielded quantitative data. The individual qualitative interviews were then conducted with some of the individuals who had completed the IDI. Below, the details of the research participants, interviewer, instruments, interview protocol, and finally data analysis methods are discussed.

Participants

The target population of this research was practicing professional coaches. To contribute to a better understanding of culture and intercultural competence in coaching, hearing coaches' voices was vital, particularly as the coaching profession has historically been created, advanced, and self-regulated by coaches themselves. The new knowledge that emerges from the study helps shape future coach training and evaluation, with the hope that future empirical research will follow this current study. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, no further requirement was set such as coaching credentials, nationalities, or types of coaching they specialize. The priority in recruiting participants for the current study was to cast the invitation widely to the coaching community.

Interviewer

As a practicing, professional coach with more than 10 years of experience, I, the investigator of this study, continually witness that culture matters in coaching. Culture often plays a significant role in clients' goals, work responsibilities, and learning, as well as in the coaching relationships between clients and their coaches.

As the sole investigator of this study, I conducted all interviews. The interviews were intended to collect qualitative information through semi-structured interviews, using a set of prepared guiding questions that allowed the interviewer to ask some consistent questions to all interviewees and, yet, still have room for clarifying and follow-up questions depending on how the interview conversations developed.

To be able to navigate such dynamic and fluid conversations effectively, it was essential that the interviewer was knowledgeable in both the coaching and intercultural fields. I qualify for this criterion, first for the coaching field, by being trained and certified as a coach by the ICF and having coached professionally for more than 10 years at the time of conducting this study. For the intercultural field, I hold a master's degree and am a Ph.D. candidate in an academic program focusing on intercultural studies and have founded an intercultural consulting firm, which I still lead. This knowledge and experience enabled me to understand interviewees' professional contexts and conduct effective semi-structured interviews.

Instruments

There were two research instruments used to collect data for this study: The IDI and individual qualitative interviews. Each instrument is discussed further below.

The IDI. The IDI was developed by two intercultural scholars, Milton Bennett, and Mitchel Hammer (Hammer et al., 2003) based on the theoretical framework, the DMIS (Milton Bennett, 1986, 1993). According to Hammer et al. (2003), the IDI was “constructed to measure the orientations toward cultural differences described in the DMIS” (p. 421).

Since the IDI was first introduced, it has gone through multiple iterations of research-based validation and refinement efforts. The result is its current form: a 50-item online or paper questionnaire, the IDI version 3, which is now based on a modified version of the theoretical framework, and the IDC (Hammer, 2011), as discussed in Chapter Two.

When one completes the IDI, it assesses his or her orientation toward difference and informs where he or she is currently in the process of developing intercultural competence based on five core developmental orientations: two Monocultural orientations of Denial and Polarization, a transitional orientation of Minimization, and two intercultural orientations of Acceptance and Adaptation (Hammer, 2009).

The way in which the IDI describes one's profile, the outcome of completing the IDI, is unique and complex. A profile offers two central scores, a Perceived Orientation (PO) score, and a Developmental Orientation (DO) score. One's PO indicates the orientation toward a difference in his or her own perception, meaning where one feels he or she should be on the continuum of intercultural development. One's DO indicates the current orientation as measured by the IDI, meaning where one actually operates at the time of the IDI administration. Subsequently, these PO and DO determine an orientation gap (OG) score, which is the distance between the PO and DO. The OG scores are useful in understanding how much or how little the individual overestimates or underestimates his or her own intercultural competence.

Demographic, contexting, and customized questions. In addition to the 50 items that assess one's orientations explained above, the IDI provides opportunities to ask three other types of questions as part of the instrument: demographic, contexting, and

customized questions. The demographic questions gather basic background information of each participant such as nationality and age range, and the contexting questions provide the participant's contextual background information such as cultural backgrounds and cultural challenges he or she faces in the work or life context. The background information from these questions could become helpful in getting to know the participants and smoothly starting a conversation when interviewing. The third type of question, the customized question, was utilized to collect information regarding the participants' coaching experience, including the number of years coaching, number of hours coached, number of clients coached, and credential(s) held.

Individual qualitative interviews. While I hoped to conduct a total of 24 individual qualitative interviews for the study, with 8 interviewees from each of the 3 Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural orientations, as assessed by the IDI, I was able to recruit a total of 21 individuals to participate in the interviews.

For the interviews, I, as the interviewer, spoke with each of the interviewees independently in person or virtually. Twenty of the interviews were conducted virtually by phone or Skype, and one was conducted in person at the interviewee's office. The means of interviews and the location were determined by consulting with each interviewee to ensure the safety, comfort, and convenience of both the interviewee and interviewer.

Upon each interviewee's consent, the interviews were audio taped. This allowed me to focus on the interviewing instead of note-taking, revisit the interviews for analysis, and correctly quote the participants' comments.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The data collection was conducted in two phases, as mentioned earlier. In the first phase, the IDI was administered to coaches. The second phase of the data collection was the individual qualitative interviews. This process is further outlined below.

Recruiting participants. To elicit research participants, I requested the ICF, which holds the largest membership among all existing coaching-related associations, to help reach as many coaches as possible. Upon contacting, I received a suggested instruction from the ICF that I should use a LinkedIn group to post an invitation to participate in my study. LinkedIn is an online networking platform where working professionals create their profile pages and connect with each other. It also has a capability for the users to create groups within the platform to discuss and exchange information on a specific topic. One such group is the ICF Cultural Competence in Coaching Interest Group; this is where I was suggested to recruit participants. As of January 15, 2015, this group had 246 members. In addition to posting on this group, I had two other streams of invitations I was able to cast. One was through an introduction by a friend, and I had two individuals who responded. The other was through the ICF's Cultural Competency in Coaching Community of Practice group. Through this group, I also had two individuals who participated in the study.

Administering the IDI. As a result of the above recruitment efforts, 88 individuals responded to the invitation for participation. I sent instructions and the access information to complete the IDI out to these individuals; 49 of them completed it (55.7% response rate).

Interviewing

The first phase of data collection described above allowed me to progress to the second phase, individual qualitative interviews. To those individuals who completed the IDI, I sent out an invitation to participate in an individual follow-up interview. Twenty-one individuals who responded were interviewed (42.9% response rate).

The interviews were guided by a set of semi-structured questions listed in Appendix A. As the interviews progressed, I tailored, added to, or eliminated some of the questions to allow flexibility in how the conversations evolved. Such flexibility was important because the interviews for this study focused on the interviewees' narratives. I employed the narrative interviewing technique that requires the interviewer to be a good listener and to allow the interviewees to be storytellers rather than respondents to more conventional question- and answer-based, or survey-type, interviewing (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). The purpose of employing this interviewing technique was to ensure that each interviewee would be able to freely express and articulate his or her perceptions and tell the stories of the lived experiences while the semi-structured questions offer a general direction for the interview conversations.

Procedures for Analyzing Data

The interview data collected was first transcribed and then analyzed using inductive analysis. The primary purpose of the inductive approach to analysis is "to allow research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant, or significant themes inherent in raw data" (Thomas, 2006, p. 238). Below, the three steps taken for the interview data analysis for this study are discussed.

Coding

To begin the interview data analysis, an initial examination of the data was done using line-by-line coding. This coding technique comprises “examining each line of data and then defining actions or events within it” (Charmaz, 2000, p. 515). In this initial coding process, a concept or a meaning was assigned to each line of transcribed data.

Categorizing into Domains

As coding occurs, the codes are continually being compared with each other. During this continual comparison between codes, the task was to look for “recurring regularities in the data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 180). This process allowed for a sorting of the codes and, as a result, categories emerged. Categories are the “abstractions derived from the data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 181) and “conceptual elements that ‘cover’ or span many individual examples of the category” (Merriam, 1998, p. 182). In other words, a category is the umbrella term that “subsume[s] several codes” (Charmaz, 2000, p. 517). Each category consisting of many codes was analyzed further to find themes.

Theorizing

Subsequently, after coding and categorizing, as Merriam (1998) stated, the third level of analysis took place, which involved “making inferences, developing models, or generating theory” (p. 187). This process of linking the categories that emerged from data into a theory or theories was “an interactive process by which the analyst becomes increasingly ‘grounded’ in the data” (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p. 783), which Merriam (1998) described as “having a conversation with the data” (p. 181).

Role of the IDI Data

This process of having a conversation with the data was a complex one. As described above, I had many codes that were grouped into categories. Within each category, I looked to find themes. Then, these themes were further compared with the IDI data to group the themes according to the IDI orientations.

Ethical Considerations

The conduct of data collection for this study required ethical considerations in three areas. The three areas of ethical consideration and how I accounted for each of them are discussed below.

Protecting Participant Identities

First, revealing individual information such as the IDI data or the identities of research participants can result in creating a sense of discomfort or exposing them to the risk of unexpected disclosure of their personal information. During the data collection process, I discussed any possible risks with the participants and explained that they could withdraw from the study at any point without any adverse consequences to them. Additionally, I let the participants know that I would be handling the research data with proper care and that it would not be accessed by others without permission.

Avoiding Misunderstanding

Second, there was a potential risk of causing in the participants a feeling of being judged due to misunderstanding or misperceiving the purpose or design of this study. More specifically, if a participant perceives the IDI as a tool to make any judgmental conclusions on the taker, he or she may feel negatively judged. To account for this possible negative scenario, all participants needed to be correctly informed that the IDI

was not used in this study as an evaluative tool to assign any value or judgment to the takers. I was very mindful in communicating such information to the participants so that they would correctly understand and positively perceive the purpose and design of this study and participate with curiosity and a good sense of contribution.

Setting the Scope of Feedback

Last, another ethical aspect of the data collection for this study was that the participants were asked to take the IDI but did not receive their individual feedback on the results. The purpose of the administration of the IDI was solely for the data collection in the study, rather than giving feedback on the results to the participants. There was an assumed possibility of some of the participants feeling disappointed about not finding out their individual IDI results. To minimize the disappointment and ask for their understanding, the purpose of using the IDI and how their input would be making a valuable contribution to the current study were clearly explained prior to them completing the IDI.

Limitations and Researcher's Subjectivity

Because the purpose of this study was to discover the perceptions of the coaches at the various stages of intercultural competence development, data collection relied on individual qualitative interviews. While this research design fulfilled the objectives of capturing the perceptions and narratives of the participants from the perspectives of each of the Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural orientations, it had a few limitations. Four limitations and the researcher's subjectivity are discussed below.

Small Number of Interviews

I recognized the benefit of conducting a larger number of interviews. However, at the same time, I needed to be realistic in the design. I planned to recruit 24 interview participants in total with 8 individuals in each of the three groups, Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural groups as measured by the IDI. I was only able to find 21 individuals to participate.

Defended Subjects

According to Hollway and Jefferson's premise (2000), all research subjects are "meaning-making and defended subjects" (p. 26). While this study relied on the participants' "meaning-making," as discussed in Chapter One, the idea of the participants as defended subjects poses a potential limitation. One of the characteristics of defended subjects is that they "are invested in particular positions in discourses to protect vulnerable aspects of self" (p. 26). Because the interview participants for this study were experienced professionals in their own field, coaching, it was reasonable to presume that they would like to be regarded as a respectable and competent professional. If this conscious or subconscious desire was, in fact, present, they might have wished to protect any vulnerable aspects of themselves, which would make them defended subjects. Because this is a potential limitation in collecting data from interviewees, as Hollway and Jefferson (2000) proposed, this study employed a narrative interviewing technique designed to elicit stories through open-ended questions. Consequently, the interviewees would feel freer to express themselves in a safe conversation where they had the ability to manage the degree to which they shared their narratives.

Other Instruments

There are other instruments that claim to measure variables similar to those of the IDI (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013) and could have been used for this study, such as the Cultural Intelligence Scale (Ang et al., 2007; Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006; Earley & Ang, 2003) and the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000). Although I was aware of these other instruments available, the IDI was selected for data collection for this study for the following three reasons.

The first reason was the IDI's ability to assess the takers' stages of intercultural competence from a developmental perspective. Because the coaches would have a varying range of knowledge and experience of different cultures, it was meaningful to explore their perceptions from the varying stages of development. The IDI provided the data to developmentally stratify the participants based on the stages of intercultural competence development.

The second reason for deciding to use the IDI was my strong knowledge of and experience with this particular instrument. I believe that a researcher should utilize the strengths that she already possesses. As one of the only 14 individuals worldwide who are identified as senior IDI Qualified Administrators and instructors of the IDI Qualifying Seminars, through which people are trained and qualified to become IDI Qualified Administrators, I believe that my expertise in the IDI should be leveraged to maximize the effectiveness in conducting this study.

Third, no one instrument measures everything. No instrument is perfect. A researcher can only attempt to identify the best possible instrument of all that are available. The IDI was developed based on a concrete theoretical framework, is utilized

widely in research and practice, and has been studied increasingly for its validity, which led me to believe that it was a reasonably suitable instrument for this study.

Researcher's Subjectivity

There may have been biases due to my own subjectivity affecting the study. While I was cautious of not projecting my own beliefs and perspectives, it was reasonable to consider the possibility that my subjectivity influenced how I conducted this study.

I am a practicing coach and intercultural consultant; therefore, I have my own feelings, perspectives, and opinions on the current research topic. Even though this familiarity and expertise in the coaching and intercultural fields that I brought to the study were positive assets to the research, it also created a potential bias. Taking this into consideration, my belief in conducting research was that, in the end, the researcher is an instrument. Therefore, the researcher's subjectivity being part of the research process is a fundamental condition. Depending on how it is leveraged, it can be a great strength and, with this awareness, the negative influences of bias can be minimized.

Chapter Four: Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the data collected for this study. The data, as described in Chapter Three, come from the two-phase data collection process.

The first set of data comes from the administration of the IDI. In response to the invitation cast to the coaching community worldwide, 93 individual coaches responded indicating their interest in participating in the study. Next, an email invitation was sent to all 93 individuals providing secure access to the IDI online, and 48 of them completed it. The response rate was 51.6%.

The second set of data comes from the individual qualitative interviews, following the IDI completion. Those 48 individuals who completed the IDI were once again contacted to participate in an interview. Of the 48 individuals, 21 agreed and engaged in an interview. The response rate was 43.8%. The total amount of time recorded from these 21 interviews was 1,137 minutes, or 18 hours and 57 minutes. All interview data were transcribed, resulting in 815 pages or 147,862 words of transcripts in total.

The analysis of the data began with the line-by-line coding and yielded 47 themes. These themes were grouped into a total of 13 domains. Below, I report the findings from each of the two phases of data collection.

Findings from Data Collection Phase One: IDI

Demographics of respondents. The first phase of data collection yielded the IDI results from 48 respondents. The demographic information of this group of 48 respondents is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Coach Demographics

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Gender		
Female	34	70.83%
Male	13	27.08%
Age		
61 and over	12	25.00%
51-60	15	31.25%
41-50	17	35.42%
31-40	3	6.25%
30 and under	0	0.00%
Education level (completed)		
Other	2	4.17%
Ph.D. degree or equivalent	12	25.00%
M.A. degree or equivalent	18	37.50%
Post Secondary (university)	14	29.17%
Secondary (high) school	2	4.17%
Did not complete secondary (high) school	0	0.00%
World region primarily lived during formative years to age 18 (select one)		
Other	1	2.08%
Eastern Europe	5	10.42%
Western Europe	7	14.58%
Asia Pacific	7	14.58%
Australia	2	4.17%
Africa	2	4.17%
Middle East	0	0.00%
South America	4	8.33%
Central America	1	2.08%
North America	19	39.58%
Member of an ethnic minority in your country		
No	35	72.92%
Yes	12	25.00%
Number of years coaching		
11-15 years	7	14.58%
6-10 years	12	25.00%
1-5 years (including less than 1 year)	18	37.50%
Number of client coaching hours		
More than 2501 hours	9	18.75%
751-2500 hours	16	33.33%
101-750 hours	17	35.42%
1-100 hours	5	10.42%
Number of coaching-specific training hours		
No formal coaching-specific training	0	0.00%
More than 200 hours	20	41.67%
126-200 hours	10	20.83%
61-125 hours	15	31.25%
1-60 hours	2	4.17%

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Type of coaching credential		
ICF-ACC 16 33.33%	16	33.33%
ICF-PCC 9 18.75%	9	18.75%
ICF-MCC 2 4.17%	2	4.17%
Other (entry-level credential designation within credentialing body)	7	14.58%
Other (highest credential designation within credentialing body)	2	4.17%
No formal coaching credential	9	18.75%
Primary country of citizenship (passport country)		
Greece	1	2.08%
Belgium	1	2.08%
Poland	1	2.08%
France	2	4.17%
Australia	3	6.25%
Uruguay	1	2.08%
Portugal	1	2.08%
Israel	1	2.08%
Germany	1	2.08%
United Kingdom	2	4.17%
Canada	4	8.33%
Romania	1	2.08%
Brazil	2	4.17%
India	4	8.33%
Switzerland	2	4.17%
United States	18	37.50%

IDI Group Profile

To understand the overall picture of how this group of 48 coaches responded to the IDI, an IDI group profile was generated. The IDI group profile shows how these 48 coaches as a group tended to view cultural difference and commonality. The IDI group profile resulted in the group's PO to be 123.67 and Developmental Orientation (DO) to be 96.84. The PO and DO are two central scores that the IDI generates. Each of these scores is explained further below.

PO. The PO of the IDI reflects “where the individual or group places itself along the intercultural development continuum” (Hammer, 2009, p. 212). With a PO of 123.67, this means that the coaches who participated in this study, as a group, placed themselves within the Acceptance orientation.

Developmental Orientation (DO). The DO of the IDI identifies “the main or primary orientation of the individual or group along the intercultural development continuum” (Hammer, 2009, p. 212). With a DO of 96.84, this means that the group of participating coaches has a main or primary orientation in Minimization.

OG between PO and DO. The gap between PO and DO, calculated by subtracting DO from PO, is called the OG, and an OG score of seven points or higher can be considered a meaningful difference between where one perceives or places himself or herself on the intercultural developmental continuum and where the IDI places his or her level of intercultural competence (Hammer, IDI Profile Report). In the case of the participating coaches, their group profile showed an OG of 26.83, which is a meaningful difference.

Findings of Data Collection Phase Two: Interviews

Following the completion of the IDI, 21 people participated in individual interviews. In the following sections, the results of the interview data analysis are presented, including the adjustment made to the grouping of the participants, as a result of the initial line-by-line coding; the themes and domains emerged through the analysis. Accompanying interview quotes are also presented for each theme to offer contexts.

Modification to Grouping of Participants

Before presenting the results of the interviews, there needs to be a clarification concerning how the participants were groups in the process of data analysis. Using the IDI’s DO scores of < 85, 85 to 115, and > 115, respectively, initially, the participants were placed in three groups: Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural.

Initial grouping of participants. The reason for applying the DO scores for the grouping, instead of the PO scores, was because the DO score reflects where each coach's current place is on the IDC, whereas the PO reflects his or her own perceptions.

The participants were grouped into Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural groups:

- The Monocultural group included the 2 individuals (coaches 1 and 2) with DO scores below 85 (within the Denial and Polarization range).
- The Transitional group included the 13 individuals with DO scores between 85 and 115 (within the Minimization range), and
- The Intercultural group included the 6 individuals with DO scores above 115 (within the Acceptance and Adaptation range).

As the initial line-by-line coding was conducted, it quickly became apparent that an adjustment was needed in the method of grouping. The modified grouping is presented below, and the rationale is explained.

Modified grouping. The Monocultural group was further divided into two subgroups: The Low-Polarization group (DO scores of below 80) and the High-Polarization group (DO scores of 80 to 84.99). The Transitional group was divided into three subgroups: The Low-Minimization group (DO scores of 85-94.99), Mid-Minimization group (DO scores of 95-104.99), and High-Minimization group (DO scores of 105-114.99). Finally, the Intercultural group was divided into three subgroups: The Low-Acceptance group (DO scores of 115-119.99), High-Acceptance group (DO score of 120-129.99), and Low-Adaptation group (DO scores above 130). In addition to the initial

three groups, these subgroups were used in discussion where appropriate. The new groupings of participants are summarized below.

- *The Low-Polarization group (DO scores below 80).* The Low-Polarization group had one participant (Coach 1), whose DO score was 75.9.
- *The High-Polarization group (DO scores of 80-84.99).* The High-Polarization group had one participant (Coach 2), whose DO score was 83.96.
- *The Low-Minimization group (DO scores of 85-94.99).* The Low-Minimization group had five participants (coaches 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7), whose DO scores were 88.56, 88.58, 90.96, 92.22, and 92.68 respectively.
- *The Mid-Minimization group (DO scores of 95-104.99).* The Mid-Minimization group had six participants (coaches 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13), whose DO scores were 95.93, 97.39, 97.91, 98.57, 100.5, and 101.4 respectively.
- *The High-Minimization group (DO scores of 105-114.99).* The High-Minimization group had two participants (coaches 14 and 15), whose DO scores were 107.8 and 109.9 respectively.
- *The Low-Acceptance group (DO scores of 115-119.99).* The Low-Acceptance group has two participants (coaches 16 and 17), whose DO scores are 115.9 and 116.0 respectively.
- *The High-Acceptance group (DO scores of 120-129.99).* The High-Acceptance group had two participants (coaches 18 and 19), whose DO scores were 121.5 and 126.4 respectively.

- *The Low-Adaptation group (DO scores above 130).* The Low-Adaptation group had two participants (coaches 20 and 21), whose DO scores were 130.4 and 132.9 respectively.

Rationale for the modification. The rationale for this modification to take place has three bases. First, as I conducted the line-by-line coding of the interview transcripts, I realized very quickly that there were much deeper nuances among the interview data than what I could articulate in the three-way grouping of Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural groups. Simply put, there were enough meaningful comparisons and distinctions to make between the interviews within each of the original three groups. This need for further differentiation between interviews led me to regroup the participants into the total of eight groups described above, instead of only three.

Second, focusing more on each interview allowed me to explore more deeply and describe more accurately the themes that emerged from various orientations along the process of intercultural development. This approach is consistent with a qualitative analysis strategy, namely the unique case orientation approach. This approach assumes that each case under analysis is special and unique, and the first level of analysis is being true to, respecting, and capturing the details of the individual cases being studied (Patton, 2002, p. 41). The first level of analysis in this study was the line-by-line coding process. To be true to, respect, and capture the details of the interviews, the above-suggested modification to the grouping was essential. As Patton (2002) explained, “a case can be a person, an event, a program, an organization, a time period, a critical incident, or a community” (p. 55). I will proceed with the modified groups as cases—the unit of

analysis—and seek to “describe that unit in depth and detail, holistically, and in context” (p. 55).

Third, using the eight groups instead of three better revealed the nature of creative synthesis through inductive analysis. Drawing creative synthesis requires the “immersion in the details and specifics of the data to discover important patterns, themes, and interrelationships; begins by exploring, then confirming; guided by analytical principles rather than rules; ends with a creative synthesis” (Patton, 2002, p. 41). Using eight groups first allowed me to better immerse myself into each of the “unique cases.” Then, in discovering important patterns, themes, and interrelationships, my analytical principles became key. A core principle in conducting this analysis was to explore and confirm how coaches may perceive culture and intercultural competence differently or similarly in their work at various stages of intercultural competence development. Having this principle guide the analysis of eight interview groups, I should arrive at more detailed and nuanced illustrations of each group, therefore, more detailed and nuanced case descriptions of various orientations within the intercultural development process. The groupings are shown in Table 6, IDI Scores and Groupings.

Table 6

IDI Scores and Groupings

Coach	Initial Grouping	Modified Grouping	PO	DO
1	Monocultural	Low-polarization	115.9	75.90
2		High-polarization	115.9	83.96
3	Transitional	Low-minimization	118.6	88.56
4			121.2	88.58
5			120.7	90.96
6			123.7	92.22
7			122.5	92.68
8		Mid-minimization	122.9	95.93
9			123.3	97.39
10		122.5	97.91	
11		124.8	98.57	
12		124.4	100.50	
13		129.1	101.40	
14		High-minimization	129.3	107.80
15			126.4	109.90
16	Intercultural	Low-acceptance	133.2	115.90
17			129.7	116.00
18		High-acceptance	135.4	121.50
19			136.0	126.40
20		Low-adaptation	137.0	130.40
21			139.8	132.90

Interview Analysis Results

In this section, I report the results of the interview data analysis. The report is organized first by research questions and then by domains and themes within each research question. Domains A through E represent the findings for Research Question 1: How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive the role of culture in their work?

Domain A: Cultural factors. This first domain emerged through how coaches discussed what culture meant to them. Presented here are the cultural factors discussed by coaches, in describing what constituted culture in their respective perspectives, as well as some themes yielded from comparing the factors raised by coaches in various groups.

Theme 1: As coaches developed interculturally, the number of cultural factors mentioned grew. The two coaches in the Monocultural group, coaches 1 and 2, had the

least elaborate vocabulary in talking about culture. They connected culture primarily to language and international clients.

The Transitional group talked about culture with much more ease than the Monocultural group and had many more cultural factors to mention in discussing culture. Of 13 coaches in this group, two or more of them discussed the following cultural factors, presented here in the order of most to least often mentioned: *Nationality/geographical region* ($n = 8$ of 13), *organizational/workplace/profession* ($n = 6$ of 13), *family/parenting* ($n = 5$ of 13), *values/beliefs/way of thinking* ($n = 5$ of 13), *gender* ($n = 4$ of 13), *communication style/preference* ($n = 4$ of 13), and *age/generation* ($n = 2$ of 13).

The coaches in the Intercultural group discussed some of the same cultural factors mentioned by those in the Transitional group, including: *Nationality/geographical region* ($n = 5$ of 6), *family/parenting* ($n = 5$ of 6), *values/beliefs/way of thinking* ($n = 5$ of 6), *gender* ($n = 4$ of 6), *communication style/preference* ($n = 4$ of 6), *age/generation* ($n = 2$ of 6), *organizational/workplace/profession* ($n = 2$ of 6).

Coaches 20 and 21, who have the Low-Adaptation orientation, talked about culture in some additional terms. The factors that both coaches discussed additionally in relation to culture were: *Race*, *religion/theology/denomination*, *immigration status*, and *language*. Furthermore, Coach 20 also mentioned *hierarchy*, *educational background/degree*, and *physical appearance*. Coach 21 mentioned *cultural heritage*.

Theme 2: Monocultural coaches tended to talk about culture primarily as it relates to language difference and clients' nationalities. Having the Low-Polarization orientation, the insufficiency in Coach 1's ability to talk about culture was evident, even compared with Coach 2, whose orientation was in High-Polarization. During the

interview, Coach 1 often took a pause after a question to think about her response, and it became apparent to me that the pause was due to her lack of experience thinking about culture. She had a limited repertoire in vocabulary for discussing culture compared to the rest of the coaches. She was not able to give tangible examples of what culture might have meant to her other than in relation to the language difference and the fact that she had worked with international clients.

Language, in particular, was the focus of the conversation with Coach 1, and it was also the case with Coach 2, who believed “language matters, not culture.” A difference between Coach 2 and Coach 1 was that Coach 2 clearly stated that there were “many ways to define culture.” To this end, he mentioned *value difference* and *communication style/preference* as examples.

Theme 3: Mid- to High-Minimization coaches tended to discuss culture as it relates to organizational culture. One tendency that stood out with Mid- to High-Minimization groups was that the coaches in these groups talked extensively about cultures of organizations, workplaces, or professions; as Coach 8 stated, “Intercultural could also mean, to me, dealing with different divisions, business units, across the same organization.”

Coach 11 said, “I have given a lot of thoughts around this.” She argued that paying attention to organizational cultures was important, “There are people, and there are studies that say that we will notice a difference between countries, but we will not notice a difference between organizational cultures.”

Coach 12 discussed the importance of understanding the clients’ organizational culture and said, “I have to try to ascertain fairly quickly the culture of the organization

they're working in." As Coach 14 looked for an example of culture affecting coaching, she said, "That would be more to do with organizational culture rather than nationality or ethnic group or any of those."

Theme 4: Low-Acceptance coaches tended to discuss culture as it relates to cultures within a country. A noticeable tendency of the coaches in the Low-Acceptance group was that they stressed describing culture as in cultures within a country. Coach 16 said, "When we talk about intercultural competency, we are not talking *only* about people from different countries." She further explained, "When you change regions, people are really different . . . mainly regarding education, values, beliefs." She said about the U.S. context, "When you go to California, you'll see really different people than when you go to Texas or Chicago." Coach 17 also talked about how one could experience culture shocks within a country:

When you think of *Country I*, there is no one culture. So, I live in one of the southern states in *Country I*. And if you were to travel to the north, the culture is very different. And, it's very easy for an individual to travel from the south to the north and experience a culture shock. It's very easy.

Theme 5: Low-Adaptation coaches tended to jump to discussing intercultural competence without talking about culture. A tendency that stood out of the Low-Adaptation group was how ready the coaches were to talk about intercultural competence. The two coaches in this group, coaches 20 and 21, did not spend time talking about culture and immediately jumped to discussing intercultural competence as if it was a given condition that both they and I (i.e., the interviewer) should have a good

understanding of what culture meant and be ready to go straight into discussing intercultural competence and what it meant for coaching.

Domain B: Distinction between personality and culture. This domain is about the coaches' views of culture in relation to personality. In this domain, the word *personality* includes all types of individual traits or characteristics about which coaches talked.

Some coaches believed that all people were different because each individual was unique, based on their different personalities. Other coaches seemed to view the differences of people as something based on their cultural backgrounds or environments in addition to the differences due to the uniqueness of the individuals' personalities.

Are the coaches paying attention to the client's personality, culture, or both? There was a gradual progression from the Monocultural group, where a coach made no distinction between personality and culture, to the Intercultural group, where coaches clearly addressed the distinction between the two and discussed the importance of paying attention to both.

Theme 6: Low-Polarization and Low-Minimization coaches made no distinction between personality and culture. Coach 1's inability to think about personality and culture as two separate influencing factors to coaching was very clear. She talked about a client who was from a different country and stated that the cultural difference made their relationship difficult. While she saw cultural difference as something that could cause difficulty in a coaching relationship, when asked to describe it further, she was only able to define the client's behavior as "her natural way of dealing with people and

communicating.” She was not able to explore or explain the “natural way” as resulting from the client’s personality or from her culture.

Coach 6 often used a similar term, *natural tendency*. He explained his own natural tendency when meeting new people, “My natural tendency is to try and connect. And I would often go out of my way to try and have a rich connection with somebody.” He also used some terms in talking about his clients such as “the natural way of speaking” and “your natural way of being.” He also used the word “genuine.” An example is when he talked about his experience listening to other coaches coach. He said, “They all come from a point of view which is genuine to them.” Similar to Coach 1, Coach 6 also displayed no distinction between culture and personality in explaining from where his clients’ “natural ways” were coming.

Coach 2 talked about a challenging coaching relationship with a client who came from a different culture, and he described the client’s communication style to be a “very expressive angry style.” As he reflected on this coaching relationship during the interview, Coach 2 brought up a distinction between personality and culture, through wondering whether the cause of the communication difficulty he was experiencing with the client was due to the client’s personality or the culture. He seemed somewhat curious and, yet, dismissed any further exploration quickly by stating, “Whether that was just his personality or something to do with culture . . . but I don’t know because he’s the only person from *Country P* that I’ve coached.”

Theme 7: Some Low-Minimization coaches saw personality and culture separately and in relation to each other. Coach 3 talked about an example of using a personality type assessment tool with a client. This client was in the process of pursuing a

new life outside of her home culture. Coach 3 and the client discussed the client's personality type and how it was making her unique in the culture where her particular personality did not fit well. She explained:

We were able to use the Myers-Briggs and the letters to compare her to that culture and to see the really valuable differences and what makes her unique and why that culture wasn't fitting her anymore and why she was uniquely capable of breaking away from that and indulging in some real wild creativity. That was a really helpful tool in that process.

Coach 5 did not talk about clients' personalities but instead used the term *archetypes* in contrast to *culture*. To explain the contrast between the two, she said, "If the archetypes are instinctual coming up through us, through our instincts, then culture is our social conditioning that comes down on us."

Theme 8: Mid-Minimization coaches tended to see cultural difference as part of individual uniqueness. Coach 9 explained the relationship between individual uniqueness and cultural difference, "Respecting individuals' uniqueness is basically the essence of intercultural competence. Because individual uniqueness includes being culturally different." At a different point in the interview, she made a slightly different comment. She said that she would need to understand her client's culture first, and she could then better understand their individual uniqueness:

Interpersonal difference is . . . is probably easier to understand or to grasp. If I were a supervisor or a leader, it would probably be easier for me to grasp individual difference within the same cultural background because I can empathize. But, if I were leading and coaching someone from a different culture,

it could be a little bit more tricky . . . or difficult . . . because then I would have to understand first the culture of where this person is coming, came from . . . for me to have a better understanding of his individual uniqueness.

Coach 10 made a similar statement to Coach 9, “All differences are interpersonal. I would say that the intercultural differences are just one subset of interpersonal differences.” Coach 11 also talked about the uniqueness of people:

It’s not about countries. It’s about people. And the way we have to respect and really create that partnership with a client. So, partnership is being able to really connect with different people with the uniqueness of people. And that uniqueness, it comes not only from the country but from their life experience.

Theme 9: Mid-Minimization to High-Acceptance coaches hesitated to “call it cultural.” Coach 8 believed that it was important that a coach addressed “intercultural differences” when coaching clients who worked for a global organization. She explained that the coaches needed to help their clients deal with differences in preferences, styles, work habits, behaviors, backgrounds, values, beliefs, life experiences, accents, and locations. While she was quite elaborate in describing what she meant by “intercultural differences,” she then made a conflicting statement, “I wouldn’t call that cultural. I would just call that style. But I don’t know that I would call that a cultural issue.” For most of the interview, there was not a clear distinction between what was or was not cultural in the ways Coach 8 talked about difference among people. However, much later in the interview, she made a statement making a connection between culture and “styles.” She said:

Well, I think that I hadn't really put much thought about this. It's possible that different cultures have different styles. And part of it is that they, the mores of their culture, the experiences they've had that could emphasize certain styles over another. So, to me, styles could have a real connection to intercultural.

When asked for an example of culture affecting coaching, Coach 18 first wondered and responded in an inadequate manner:

Well, you know, when I think about that . . . I've realized that, as I was considering the situation before, I questioned whether it was . . . a cultural norm or whether it was a personality factor that was influencing how people were responding.

She then gave an example of some people she worked with and how she considered that their tendencies could be coming from their personality or culture:

I started to realize that certain people were very focused, very assertive, maybe even aggressive, highly competitive. And instead of saying that it was because they were from this country or that country, I started to wonder whether it was a cultural norm or whether it was more their personality. And I don't know the answer to that, but certainly, the environment in which people are raised has an impact on how they negotiate with others. I've seen this happen with, for instance, someone who tries to be in a position to ask for a raise. I don't think it's just their personality. I think that we see some of their issues that are based on where they were raised come forward in the process. A negotiating salary, asking for a raise—there are two issues that have come to light recently.

While she was observant and curious, she became hesitant to say what was personality and what was culture, “There definitely are some cultural norms, but I don’t want to generalize here. I think part of it is the person’s personality too.” Though she was open to and aware that some differences come from personality differences and others from cultural differences, she said that she tried not to say something was a cultural issue:

Just to be aware and open to the fact that sometimes the differences that we see come from cultural factors, sometimes there are gender differences, sometimes there are . . . differences in the way that people were raised that impact how they interact with other people, so there are personality differences. So, I try not to say that this is a cultural issue. It could be coming from another aspect.

Theme 10: High-Minimization to Low-Acceptance coaches struggled to articulately discuss personality and culture and the distinction between the two.

Coaches 14 spoke to individual and cultural differences, however, making a clear distinction between individual and cultural or articulating the relationship between them seemed to be a great challenge to her. For example, she struggled to verbalize why one of her clients was having challenges as a leader in the workplace:

The client I worked with on his career, he was actually . . . he wasn’t native *Country U* born, but he had been in *Country U* a long time and . . . he came for college. But I think when it came to figuring out how to take on a leadership role, his native, he was originally from *Country N* . . . and I think one of the things . . . I mean, it’s really . . . sometimes, it’s kind of hard to decipher what’s what, isn’t it? Because he was very . . . and a guy who was very analytical and less interested in kind of people skills.

When asked whether culture played any part in coaching, Coach 16 responded, “What do you mean?” So, I rephrased the question and asked, “Does culture affect your coaching in any way?” She was not able to respond to the question, and her response turned out to be disjointed and unrelated to the question:

Because for me the session, the coaching session, is a partnership. And then everything is about the coachee. And I really work myself to be . . . really present . . . and I don’t think I’m apart, but together with the coachee.

Theme 11: A Low-Adaptation coach made a clear distinction between personality and culture and talked about how to use them to tailor his own actions.

Coach 21 emphasized the importance of making the distinction between individuality and culture. Unlike other coaches, Coach 21 made clear statements when it came to the effects of culture and personality on coaching and what coaches needed to do in their coaching practice. He believed that coaches must “provide cultural questions and ask questions that help identify some things on a personal level especially with a client’s personality versus what’s the cultural influence.”

To Coach 21, understanding each client is to pay attention to personality and culture. He said, “To put it in perspective, each client, I believe, that every client is multicultural and that those influences go beyond personality. So, each coaching relationship is intercultural.” He also spoke to what the word intercultural meant to him by saying:

When we’re talking intercultural, we’re also talking about being able to shift from what is part of somebody’s personality and what is this outwardly cultural influence. Intercultural is really with everybody because of what we’ve learned of

what's beyond our genetics. Well, that might not be anybody else's definition, but that is mine.

When he shared the example of a client relationship that did not work out well, he explained how he approached the situation with the client's cultural background in mind and analyzed the outcome from both cultural and personal perspectives:

I had a manager who was from *Country T*, and he was manager at a corporation, he was not getting along with his team. It was not a successful relationship at my end. I went from doing this by phone to actually meeting in person to meet, you know, in his culture, and I was not able to read the air, so to speak, in the sense of his gestures, etcetera. So eventually what I did is, even though I have other clients from the same region as *Country T* over the years, I referred him to somebody who had great expertise in working with clients from *Country T*, and they still weren't successful, so, it turned out to be more him and not as much cultural, but he was very resistant.

Domain C: Is culture positive or negative? This domain focuses on whether each coach talked about culture in the positive light or in the negative. The tendency was that more interculturally-developed coaches talked more positively about culture while the lesser developed coaches saw culture negatively.

Theme 12: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches saw culture primarily as a problem. Culture was portrayed by Coach 1 mostly as something that created difficulty. In telling me about a client with whom she had great difficulty building a positive relationship, she stated, "I felt that the cultural differences have made that relationship difficult. For me, it was very stressful." She and the client ended up in a challenging

relationship, as she expressed, “I couldn’t control it. She [the client] drove me up the wall!” Coach 2 first stated positively about culture, “I’m happy to be in such a world where each culture has its own value.” When asked whether culture played any role in coaching, he responded by asking himself whether culture had been a “problem,” “Interesting way to look at it would be if people in your society had issues around their ethnicity vis a vis the ethnicities around them. And I’m just trying to think where that’s been a problem.” Coach 4 used the term “misleading” as an effect of cultural difference. For example, she said, “I realized that people from *Region E*, especially from *Country G*, they are more logical. They are more rational. So . . . certain instance will mislead them. They think that rational is the logical way.” She also said, “I have my own perspective. So, when I’m asking a question or do something to *Region W* people, probably it’s misleading already.” To avoid such misleading, Coach 4 believed that it was important for a coach to learn the cultural taboos:

I’m thinking if I have chance to work with, you know, *Region W* country people, and the first time I will ask them, I will talk to them. How are they going to have a . . . how’s their preference . . . for the coaching session? Yeah, I will ask them. And, of course, I have to know certain question or certain instance, I’m not supposed to use for *Region W* people.

Coach 6 shared an example of his coaching an executive adjusting to a new cultural environment. He said that the client had a “wrong natural way of speaking” and a cultural “handicap”:

I was asked to coach a *Country B* executive who had grown in the *City M* middle-class environment. And I don’t know if you’re familiar, but in *Country B*, the way

you speak classifies you on a vertical level at a certain social class according to accent and vocabulary. And also, it classifies you in terms of geographical origin within *Country B*. Obviously, the closer to *City L*, the better. And in general, most of them the better and the more normal, the less cultured you're supposed to be.

This guy from *City M* middle class, and he is heading toward a job in a *Country U*-based multinational. The words he uses, the speech patterns, the way he formulates his answers, the tone of voice, everything says he grew up fighting his way in a tough neighborhood in *City M*, which obviously is not going to be well accepted in the board room in *City C* or wherever. So, I have to tell this chap that he has the wrong natural way of speaking for his future. The reason he was sent to me first by the chap who connected us is that that chap sensed that I had the experience and the ability to detect and to explain to this man that he had a cultural handicap.

Coach 7 described what it was like for her to talk to people from other cultures:

When I talk to people from this culture, it was so . . . what can I say? Hmm . . . it's challenging, and . . . it's strange. You have to accept things that you couldn't even think about it.

Theme 13: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches expressed simple positivity toward culture without substantive examples, only after they were prompted.

When Coach 1 described culture as something negative, I asked if there had been any positive experiences with culture. Then she said, "Many. Many because that's also what makes me very happy and excited and I learned so much new things. Because I have a lot of international clients here because we're a global company, so a lot!" She also reflected

on her work with international clients, “I find it enriching. I find it . . . amusing. I learn a lot . . . and most of the time it’s very positive.”

In terms of the grouping of the coaches, Coach 8 was part of the Mid-Minimization group. However, I included her example in this theme because she was merely three points above the Low-Minimization group in her DO score. She talked about cultural diversity in the global business setting, “I think more generally that, when you say intercultural, people are going to think that we’re talking about people from other countries, other cultures, with different types of beliefs and values.” She described such a global work environment as “wonderful,” “It’s very global, and what’s wonderful is that at least here in *Country U* they have one of the most diverse cultures and people within their workplace. They are wonderful.”

Theme 14: Mid-Minimization to Low-Acceptance coaches saw the mix of positive and negative of culture. While Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches had rather simple statements about culture, positive or negative, and had to be prompted by questions to offer further insight, the coaches in Mid-Minimization to Low-Acceptance groups had more complex thoughts to share about positivity or negativity of culture.

For example, Coach 9 saw cultural diversity as both value added and a barrier. She believed “diversity itself, by working with a team from different cultural backgrounds, would be very value added to the client,” and she argued that it was important to feel positive about one’s own cultural differences.

After making these positive statements about culture, she then stated, “It only becomes a barrier if you allow it to be.” She offered an example of the glass ceiling that she observed in her work:

I saw firsthand how supervisors, considering the glass ceiling for leadership, where supervisors and up are white. And people on the shop floor or at the entry level would be immigrants. And I've seen how the supervisors struggle to understand people that they are leading because they just don't understand the culture!

A similar view was shared by Coach 10, who talked about paying attention to the cultural differences that "might get in the way" of effective coaching or effective presentations.

Coach 13 mentioned the positive effect of cultural diversity by connecting diversity to creative-thinking and said, "I'm always telling people that on a team you need some people who are different because they're the ones that help you think out of the box."

Coaches 16 and 17 stood out for their attitude toward discussing the cultural challenges they experienced. Even though they were talking about challenges, they talked with amusement and joked about their own experiences. When Coach 17 described how language affected her work, there was a part of the interview conversation where her tone of voice changed. Her voice became more light-hearted. She pointed to the fact that I, the interviewer, was Japanese and had the following exchange with me about her experience working among speakers of Japanese, *Language C*, and *Language K*. Coach 17 first said, "It was very frustrating because . . . [laugh] you know, the reason for it is, it's so bizarre. I'm sorry, but are you, are you Japanese?" Responding, I said, "I am Japanese, Yes." Coach 17 then said in an amused tone of voice:

Yeah. Okay. All right. Okay. You know, why I thought then it was very frustrating is quite a bizarre reason. So . . . "My name is [Coach 17]. And I come

from *Country I*,” and they’re just two short sentences that I would say in English. But, if it is translated into either *Language C* or Japanese, the length of the sentence, for whatever reason, I think, quadruples! And it would take that much more time to convey exactly that information or that content. And, I would think initially, “Why are they taking such a long time to read this short of information?”

After discussing her frustration and amusement with the language translation, she laughed and said, “I think *Language C*, Japanese, and *Language K* are languages that I would never attempt unless I have an IQ over three digits [laugh] but . . . Yeah! I think I survived!” [laugh]

There was a time when Coach 16 mentioned how she, from *Country B*, and her friends, from *Country A*, made jokes with each other about cultural differences between them. When asked whether she found it more challenging to coach someone from *Country A* than someone from *Country B*, she responded, “No, no, no, no, because I have many friends in *Country A*. And we make jokes about our way of being. They do the same with us [laugh] because they have an overdose of proudness.” Coache 16 discussed stereotypes. She described an example of people’s common stereotypes affecting work relationships. The example was of her observation of a woman from *Country A* working among colleagues of *Country B*:

For example, I don’t know if you are aware, but people of *Country B*, they stereotype. They have a stereotype regarding people from *Country A*. And I have one woman professional executive from a big technology company. I started observing her regarding her proud . . . when she talked about the nation or local habits, local behavior. The people of *Country A* are strong expressing themselves.

They are emotional. Well, people of *Country I*, also they are emotional, but the people of *Country A*, they appear to be . . . how can I say in English? Umm . . . that's not positive, that's not proud of themselves, but when this is negative, they are selfish. I can't find a word here. But when I started paying attention, I observed that she is not, she is really nice. And she likes, she's part of the English culture and a very refined person, educated. Nothing against herself but in favor of herself, business, and everything she does. She's secure. She knows what she wants. But for some people of *Country B*, this can appear threatening.

Theme 15: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches had positive and constructive views of culture. Coaches 18, 19, 20, and 21 only made positive and constructive comments about culture. For example, Coach 18 said, "I've worked with people from other countries mostly my entire adult life. I had fun. Let's just say, I just enjoyed every minute of it." Coach 19 shared his belief on making mistakes:

I was a TA [teaching assistant] in a third-grade classroom, and the lead teacher was a Muslim woman. And, you can tell from my personality, I'm like, "Hey! How you doing? I'm [Coach 19]," right? And I stuck out my hand, and she looked at me like, "What is that for?" So, I had to pick my face up off the floor, and I'm embarrassed but, see, that's what I try to teach my students. It's okay to make mistakes.

He believed that what was important was that one learns from mistakes:

There was no harm, no foul. Oh, she doesn't shake hands with men who are not a part of her family. Okay! Learning moment. And that's what I share with my

students. “Hey, I’ve made plenty of mistakes. I think that’s what qualifies me to teach this course because I’ve improved. I haven’t stayed in those mistakes.”

Coaches 20 and 21 also maintained positive attitudes toward culture throughout the interviews. The essence of this positive attitude toward culture was well captured in this comment by Coach 20:

Coaching is supposed to be a non-judgmental space. And of course, we make judgments, but underneath and within there, I think, are the values of being non-judgmental and being safe and comfortable with other people and being respectful and compassionate. You just meet a whole range of different people with different experiences. And it’s different rather than more or less difficult.

To Coach 21, knowing each other was important between a coach and the client. To achieve that, they would need to ask each other and tell each other. Coach 21 talked about “creating a way.” He spoke of himself and his client creating a way and helping the client in creating a way with others around him or her. In describing an example of his relationship building process with a client, he said, “We had to find our way . . . so being able to find the style and language, and finding a way to clarify understanding that works for the client and then works in that relationship.”

Domain D: Attention to and curiosity for culture. This domain addresses the degree of attention the coaches might pay to culture. Is culture important to pay attention to? Are they curious to learn more about culture? The tendency was that more interculturally developed coaches paid closer attention and were more curious about culture while the lesser developed coaches did not pay much attention.

Theme 16: Polarization coaches had not considered culture much before and dismissed cultural influence in coaching. For Coach 1, culture was simplified, dismissed quickly, and played a limited part in coaching. She stated, “No matter whether green, black, blue or whatever the origin or age or sex, it doesn’t matter.” She believed, “coaching is about skills.”

Throughout the interviews, Polarization coaches showed limited curiosity in culture. There were two moments during the interview where Coach 1 showed curiosity. Both incidents were very brief. First, when she was explaining about a client she had difficulty relating to, she talked about how the experience raised her own self-awareness, even though she did not make a connection to culture. She said that she learned from the experience:

Why is it upsetting me? Why is she triggering some points that are just really upsetting me . . . so much? And that is something that you learn with experience, you learn with maybe also feeling good about who you are and what you’re able to do and what you’re not able to do.

Another moment when Coach 1 showed excitement was when she talked about living in a country where multiple languages were spoken. Because she lived and worked in a country where three languages are widely spoken, I asked whether culture mattered at all when she coached individuals within the same country but from regions where different languages were spoken. It was at this point, with my prompting to think about culture, that she took the time to reflect and made a connection to culture. She said:

There are slight differences. That goes as far as maybe slightly different behavior or expressing themselves. So, it . . . so, yes! . . . because it’s almost like there are

three cultures within the country! . . . by the mere fact of having the language separation.

Coach 2 had not thought about culture very much before. When asked a question, “When you feel some kind of cultural challenge, then that’s usually language?” He responded, “I guess!” When prompted if a cultural challenge could be coming from anything other than language, his response was “I hadn’t thought about it much.”

While acknowledging the effect of culture on people, Coach 2 believed his clients’ health-related issues were more important than issues related to culture:

I’m trying to think if there’s any other ways that one can look at culture . . .
umm . . . my clients come from various backgrounds—Jewish, various Christians,
umm . . . many people that are not religious at all. I think what I have found is that
it’s not nearly as important as the issues that they face with the health-related
impairment, which is quite often disabling.

He further stated, “So, it doesn’t matter where they came from. Where they are now is in trouble.” Coach 2 stated of a client, “He needed to talk to someone who wouldn’t judge him, who would just listen. And so . . . it wouldn’t matter what his culture would have been. He was under duress psychologically.”

When asked about the role of culture in coaching, the examples offered by Coach 1 revolved around two factors, language and international clients. From her perspective, culture mattered in two types of situations, when a client came from another country and when a client spoke another language. When asked if there were any coaching situations within a country where culture mattered, she was very clear that culture did not matter much. She responded, “Certainly not as much.”

One of Coach 2's clients from *Country T*, who was not a native English speaker, was studying in *Country S*, where he had to write a thesis in English. Coach 2 talked about supporting this client with the English language and with the cultural transition back from *Country S* to *Country T*. While Coach 2 discussed cultural challenges that his client was experiencing, he also noted that there were no cultural issues between him and the client:

His big challenge was the language. I proofread his thesis and so on as part of my work. And I was helping him to understand the nuances of English. And so . . . but his being a *Country T* person living in a laid back *Country S* culture presented challenges for him. He was a soft-hearted fellow who didn't like the anger and the passion and the dust of *Country T*. He rather liked the laidback, gentle environment of *Country S*. And so, I helped him transition back to home. Now he's doing his Ph.D. in *Country T*, but there wasn't any issue about him and I and our cultures, you know, issues like that.

Coach 2 also talked about cultural differences not affecting his coaching:

One of my folks in *Country S*, we were talking about salary, and he said, "Well, of course, here we don't do salary. One simply gives the present of work to get a gift of pay." You know, that's a cultural difference. But it didn't make any difference in the way we coach. Apparently, it's gross to just talk about raw pay. You have to kind of talk around it.

Theme 17: Some Minimization coaches acknowledged cultural influence in coaching. Minimization coaches made mixed comments on the importance and relevance of culture in coaching. There were comments that strongly supported the effects of

culture as well as ones that were more dismissive or unsure. For example, when asked if culture affected coaching in any way, Coach 6, after a pause, responded that culture affected coaching “all the time”:

I’m inclined to answer . . . all the time. All the time because culture can derive, from a different social group. Or, not only from the language, but from, you know, if you grew up in a bourgeois environment, and you were told that this is the way you set the table, this is the way you use a knife, a fork, or a spoon, and there are people who tell you if you are . . . taking the soup from the soup plates with a spoon, you have to tilt the plate towards you, and some people will tell you not, you tilt it towards the center of the table. So, this is two different . . . cultures, in a way.

He also talked about how different professions could create different cultures, and he said that culture was “always present,” “So, the culture element is always present because I’m dealing with people who are lawyers, dentists, or they have a stutter or whatever. And their universe is not familiar with mine.” Coach 7, who specifically talked about the importance of being curious as a coach, said, “I push myself to see if there is a different culture out there, and you have to be more curious to learn more about that, more . . . to change my question or to change the way I put my question.” When asked whether culture affected coaching, Coach 9 immediately responded, “Oh, for sure! Definitely. Yeah, definitely.” Coach 10 said, “I’ve come to realize that cultural differences are everywhere.” Coach 12 echoed that culture was important, and he made a distinction between “understanding a culture” and “understanding that there is a culture,” “I think culture’s extremely important, and understanding that there is a culture. You don’t have

to understand a culture. You just have to understand that there is that culture there, so how do you deal with it?" When asked whether culture affected coaching, Coach 15 readily responded, "Oh, absolutely. Absolutely." He continued:

I think culture does play out quite often. I think as society does become more multicultural, I do encounter people here who have different heritages, you know, whether they're European. I have done much indigenous coaching of indigenous people. I've done a little bit, but you have to be aware that it's the way *they* process the information. It's the way, or not they, it's the way *we* process the information differently.

Theme 18: Some Minimization coaches were unsure or acknowledged cultural influence in coaching in limited or inconsistent ways. In contrast to Theme 17, some other Minimization coaches were more unsure about culture affecting coaching. Some coaches showed little interest in talking about culture or stated that the issue was about something else, not culture.

While Coach 5 acknowledged cultural differences, particularly those created by racial and gender differences, she believed that her coaching was not affected by culture:

I really think that color doesn't come into it at the professional level that I'm at. And who I'm coaching, they both happen to be lawyers with different specialties—one's commercial, and one's in private practice. I really don't think it comes down to color or male or female. They're coming to a professional for coaching.

She immediately continued with a statement that seemed to contradict the previous comment, "If I'm thinking about . . . I definitely do have some credibility as a white

woman. Because the culture is that you can trust white women in *Country S*.” Coach 8 made recurring comments that what she was observing was not cultural. She made comments using the term *style* instead of *cultural*, “I wouldn’t call that cultural. I would just call that style. But I don’t know that I would call that a cultural issue.” She gave an example:

I can think of one instance, and she was not, it was not a cultural issue. It was a . . . it felt like there was a gender issue. It was a woman who was born in *Country U*; I don’t know what nation—, she was properly homogenized. She was someone who would come across as the proverbial B word, and she was having a real problem, she came on so strong and so hard that people did not want to work with or for her. Before we started the coaching, she interviewed me. She interviewed one or two other potential coaches. She did not choose me. I was not surprised. And then the person she chose was a man, and in that case, that might have been a better fit for her. So, with that, that was more of a gender issue than a cultural issue. But I haven’t had any real issues.

She also said that culture was not a “real issue” for people who were living in the same country as she was:

I certainly coach people that have come from different countries that are now living in *Country U*. For people that have been in different cultures here and that are living in *Country U*, it really hasn’t been a real issue.

When asked about any effect of culture on coaching, Coach 8 said, “I haven’t had any real issues.” When asked if it would be easier to coach when the clients come from the

same country as the coach, Coach 11 responded, “It’s not about the culture. It’s about availability.” Coach 12 also said that it was not about culture:

I don’t care what your culture is. You have to give people two things—hope and control. Hope that tomorrow is going to be maybe a little bit better than today and so, I’m going to stick with this. The other thing you have to give them is control. They have to have control over their life, and believe that, and over what they’re working at.” And if you, and if they have that, I don’t care what culture you’re in, people will work harder.

When asked whether culture affected coaching, Coach 14 took a pause and hesitantly said “Uh huh.” And she mentioned her volunteer experience helping refugees, “I’m trying to think of an example that would make sense. [short pause] I think in the work I did in *City P*, culture had a huge impact, but that wasn’t necessarily coaching work.” Coach 14 believed that culture was relevant for some clients but not all:

I don’t think culture is always there, and I think I’m always aware of it. Or I try to be [laugh] always aware of it, but it’s not something that I would lead with in a coaching session . . . unless a client specifically brought it up, and most of the clients I worked with don’t necessarily do that.

Theme 19: Intercultural coaches paid stronger and more consistent attention to cultural influence on coaching. The coaches in the Intercultural group all saw culture as an important part of coaching. They talked more in detail and in depth about how they saw culture affecting coaching and gave examples readily.

When asked whether she thought about cultural difference as she coached clients from different countries, Coach 16 said that she was “more careful with a person from a

different culture” and would pay more attention than usual, especially at the beginning, “At least at the beginning, two or three sessions, the first sessions, I really pay attention and their reactions, way of thinking and feeling things.” She explained what she would pay attention to, “I think about their values, beliefs, history. I observe their emotions, expression because, well, emotions are universal, but the way that you express them is different.”

When asked whether culture affected coaching, Coach 17’s immediate reply was, “Oh, absolutely!” She stated that culture affected coaching in various ways. An example was when she coached a team of individuals from multiple countries and noticed the clients had different expectations of her as a coach.

In an effort to understand the team members she was coaching, Coach 17 decided to utilize a cultural mentor:

One of the things that I did essentially was, my boss in *Country C* was from *Country J*. And he was posted in *Country C*, and he worked in *City N* [*in Region W*] for a very long time. So, he had the perfect blend of the cultural understanding [of *countries C, J, and K*’s region] plus a very *Region W* outlook. And, he spoke English fluently. And, he had worked with people from *Country C* for a very long time, and of course, he was from *Country J*, so he knew the *Language J* too. So, what I did essentially was, I asked him to coach me.

She later also talked about this boss who played the role of a cultural coach for her, “I think, he was my anchor. He was my go-to person if the cultural bits were not falling into place for me.” Coach 17 described the process of her attempt to understand what was happening around her, “I think, actually, I played maybe Sherlock Holmes [laugh] a

little.” She gave an example of her experience working with translators. She thought that her translator was translating her brief statement into an unreasonably long one:

I, for some reason, thought maybe he’s struggling with the language, and therefore, he’s kind of explaining a lot more than what is required. I just wanted him to translate when I speak. So, I said, “Okay, let me see if three people take the same amount of time in translating three sentences.” You know, statistically speaking, it would be off by 10 to 12 seconds. It cannot be more than that, give or take, unless I’m reciting poetry. Well, I wasn’t reciting poetry at all. So, the same sentences, I got three or four people to translate. And I realized that there is a factor that’s emerging. So, it’s not just one person.

After playing “Sherlock Holmes” with multiple translators to understand why they were taking such a long time to translate short statements, she began to reflect on her own perception:

Everyone seems to be taking pretty much, that much of time to translate it, which means that . . . it was in my head. It’s not that the universe is conspiring [laugh] against me! You know? And, I think that the minute that fell into place, I realized, “Okay, maybe I’m just making a mountain out of a molehill. That’s how it works.” And, over a period of time, you begin to figure it out.

When asked whether culture affected coaching, Coach 19 also immediately said, “Culture always matters.” He then gave an analogy:

One easy analogy that perhaps you’ve heard is how culture is to humans as water is to fish. But we don’t necessarily know that we’re swimming in it because it’s

just our normalcy and we're in it all the time. So, culture, behavior, customs, traditions, belief systems, values, and culture is transmitted from person to person. Coach 19 also said, "Most people are multicultural and don't know it." Coaches 20 and 21 also recognized the presence of culture in every situation, as Coach 20 said, "You run into different cultures all the time." Coach 21 spoke of the importance of understanding the effects of culture and said, "Every coaching relationship is intercultural." They also believed that culture was part of identity. Coach 21, in particular, repeatedly talked about the concepts such as people's "multiculturality" and "multicultural identity" and stated, "We all have a cultural biography."

In talking with High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches, coaches 18, 19, 20, and 21, during the interview, one thing appeared very clear. These coaches' curiosity for culture readily came out, and there was never a time when I needed to prompt the coaches to talk about culture. They were ready to discuss culture from the start of the interview with no hesitation, were able to offer examples, and were clearly very curious about how culture affected their coaching.

Domain E: Talking with clients about culture. There was a wide range of readiness level among the coaches for talking about culture. Some coaches had much to say about culture, even without me offering any prompts. They had endless examples to give, which clearly showed that they had given much thought to culture in their coaching practice and in their life experience in general. Alternatively, there were other coaches who were not as ready to talk about culture. They were not able to describe what the term culture meant to them or think of examples of seeing the influence of culture in their lives.

A trend was observed that more interculturally developed coaches were able to talk about culture more readily and offer examples more easily compared to those who were less interculturally developed. This domain reported whether the coaches talked readily about culture with their clients.

Theme 20: Polarization coaches had limited experience of and interest in talking about culture with their clients. It was a recurring comment that Coach 1 did not like to talk about culture with her clients. When asked if culture affected coaching, she said that she struggled with different perceptions her clients had and exclaimed, “In coaching, you don’t want things to become personal, but they do!” After discussing a few examples of her struggles, I asked if she talked about those struggles or about culture with the clients. Her response was, “That didn’t actually surface and that was another comment I wanted to make. You know, sometimes the culture doesn’t matter at all. Most of the time it doesn’t matter.” She continued to say, “I would pretend that the culture is not the center of attention.”

Coach 1 also talked about her experience coaching in different languages. She spoke three languages, with varying degrees of comfort. She was aware that sometimes her client might be being coached in a non-native language as well, and she said, “It’s not the person’s native language. And that can lead to misinterpretation or misunderstanding.” While she noticed this possible effect of language used in coaching, she said that she never discussed with her clients about her own or the clients’ comfort levels with the language used in coaching sessions.

When asked whether he talked about culture in his coaching, Coach 2 responded, “No, no. I don’t. I don’t unless there’s an example that comes to mind of my own experience.”

Theme 21: Minimization coaches reluctantly talked with clients about culture because it had to be brought up. Minimization coaches were interested in knowing some cultural specifics to aid in behaving properly or to ask appropriate questions. The trend was that they focused on finding out cultural information to avoid cultural mistakes.

Coach 4 was concerned with cultural taboos. She stated that she would try to “do homework” to know what the taboos might be. She also said that she would invite her clients to help her understand their cultures. When I asked how she would invite the clients, she imagined a situation where she would coach a client from another region and said:

I’m thinking if I have a chance to work with *Region W* people, and the first time I will ask them, I will talk to them. How are they going to have a . . . how, how’s their preference . . . for the coaching session? Yeah, I will ask them. And, of course, I have to know a certain question or certain instance, I’m not supposed to use for *Region W* people. Yeah.

Coach 6 talked about asking questions about cultural practice, such as certain table manners. He stated that he noticed how people were using utensils in certain ways and wanted to know if his observations were correct.

Coach 7 mentioned an example of how she approached a client from another culture and the client had a “negative reaction.” She said that she would always be careful about what questions to ask. She said, “I am careful about what I’m going to ask the next

time. A lot of times, I ask the question, ‘Is this proper to ask?’” Coach 8 was aware that she had her own way of seeing things that might be different from her clients, and she said, “Because I have been brought up in *Country U*, and I’m probably pretty homogenized. This is the way that I see things. How do they see things?” When asked what she would do if she was going to coach someone from a different culture, she said:

Ahhhhhh . . . well, first of all, I probably would do a little bit of research about . . . to deal with the cultural differences from that particular area to understand, to get a better understanding of what is more norm for that culture.

She also stated that it would be important to ask cultural questions early, “So, I would probably bring this right up because it has to be done. It has to be brought up immediately.” She continued by saying:

And, to be honest, I probably would think before the coaching got started. I’d want to have a discussion on some of these things to make sure that this would be appropriate for, that I would be the appropriate coach for that particular person.

During the interview, Coach 9 laughed and said, “This is a very interesting conversation.” She explained, “I never get to discuss these things with people. Because most of the people I interact with . . . we don’t normally talk about culture.” Though she seemed to be enjoying talking about culture during the interview, when asked if she would talk about culture with her clients, she responded with “No!” immediately and clearly. She added, “No, I generally do not. To be honest, it would probably come out in the first session or, first one or two sessions anyway.” When asked if he talked about culture with his clients, Coach 10 responded, “Yes, definitely. I talk about it pretty regularly with my clients to ask them, so that we can have a conversation about what might be our cultural

differences that would get in the way of effective coaching.” Coach 14 said, “I don’t think we explicitly talked about it.” She stated:

So, if culture came up, obviously, we would discuss it, but it wouldn’t be something that I would go in asking directly about. I mean if there was a situation and I thought it was having an impact, then, of course, I would ask. But it wouldn’t be like an assessment I do straight away or anything like that.

The reason why she usually did not talk about culture was “because I try to be led by the client and what kind of outcomes they want.” She also said:

Because the coaching I do, people don’t come to me saying, “I’m having this....” You know, someone might come saying, “I’m having this communication issue.” But they don’t come saying, “Well, you know, I want some help to be more culturally competent.”

Coach 14 stated that although always aware of culture, culture was not always relevant:

I don’t think culture is always there, and I think I’m always aware of it. Or I try to be [laugh] always aware of it, but it’s not something that I would lead with in a coaching session . . . unless a client specifically brought it up, and most of the clients I worked with don’t necessarily do that.

Some Minimization coaches stated that they might talk about culture but would do so indirectly. For example, Coach 11 explained:

No, not directly. No. Sometimes . . . no. With a coachee, I don’t. We work around culture aspects, but not . . . in that way if it’s acceptable in their frame of reference or not. But not directly.

Coach 12 also talked about culture with his clients without using the word culture, “Yes. We may not say the word culture, but it may be that I ask a question and I give them an example.”

Theme 22: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches asked clients cultural questions. All coaches in the Intercultural group were more comfortable and ready to talk about culture. In particular, High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches were very articulate and elaborate in explaining how they talked about culture with their clients.

Coach 18 said that she “explores” with her clients:

Sometimes, I say, “There may be some cultural differences here.” And then I say, “Let’s explore,” because I want them to feel comfortable talking with me and asking questions. So, I’m very open in the way that I say it, but I want them to feel comfortable bringing matters to my attention. The coaching partnership is based on trust, and so I try to establish, very early on, that I’m a good listener and that, if there’s something that needs to be addressed, together we’ll explore it and we’ll talk about it.

When asked whether he talked about culture with his clients, Coach 21 responded without hesitation that he did. He would talk with clients about what was a personality difference and what was a cultural difference. When further asked if he had ever coached a client who believed that culture did not matter, he said:

In having the conversation and asking again questions, around things like . . . it could be something as clear as, “What else do you want me to know about you, and if you want to know about me, to make our coaching partnership safe?” That’s successful as a starter. In identifying values, especially, as they were

growing up and how those values apply to them today, and then various relationships. There are times that people thought the culture didn't matter, and it turned out they did because, hey, I'm about just putting my head down and getting my work done, and going to get recognized on the work that I did. It depends on the workplace that you're at.

Coaches 20 and 21 both talked at length about the importance of asking questions. Coach 20 believed that it was particularly key to ask questions to understand each client's context.

Coach 21 also talked about asking questions to understand both personality and culture of the client. He said that a coach must "provide cultural questions and ask questions that help identify some things on a personal level especially with a client's personality versus what's the cultural influence."

Coach 21 also shared some of the ways that he used questions to understand his clients' "cultural biography." "We all have a cultural biography. Yeah, we, the coaches ask questions about somebody's background. It could be in a questionnaire. A discovery session, some way in our continuing conversation." In addition to asking cultural questions, for Coach 21, asking for permission from clients was an important part of coaching. He said that a coach needed to "be fearless and ask permission to coach." As he asked his client cultural questions, he first asked for permission to ask those questions. Coach 21 also believed that asking for permission to make mistakes was important:

Ask permission to make mistakes. I think that much of your client's cultural bio, which you will continue to become richer as you're coaching the client. That's

when you will know how to adapt your questions. So, I think that's a missing step.

Domains A through E reported the total of 22 themes, responding to Research Question 1 regarding coaches' perceptions of culture. Below, I present domains F through M and 25 themes, which summarize the findings in response to Research Question 2, regarding the coaches' perceptions of intercultural competence: How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural) perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to their work?

Domain F: Readiness to talk about intercultural competence. Coaches' readiness to talk about intercultural competence ranged from verbally stating that they had not thought much about intercultural competence, to struggling to imagine what intercultural competence might mean to them, and to having so much to say about intercultural competence that they talked at length about it.

Theme 23: Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches were unfamiliar with intercultural competence. When asked questions regarding culture or intercultural competence, each time, Coach 1 posed a long pause, giving the impression that she had not given much thought to these topics. The term intercultural competence was not a familiar term for Coach 2 either. He said:

Well, I have never used the term myself. Umm . . . so I don't know if it has a particular set of meanings attached to it or not. I have no perceived, I have no preconceived notions about what that term means.

When further asked whether the term sounded like something that was relevant for coaches to think about, he said, “I guess it is because we’re all becoming citizens of a global enterprise.” When he talked about how he believed that coaches should “focus on generalized issues as opposed to culturally specific issues,” he gave a hypothetical example:

If somebody called me and they said, “I have arranged for my son to marry someone from a slightly lower caste, and I need your help in finishing the deal.” I would say, “okay.” And I would listen to what they had to say, and I wouldn’t say, “Well, I don’t believe in castes.” You know?

In response to this comment, I asked him whether this way of responding to the client was part of his intercultural competence, and he said, “I don’t know what intercultural competence is. [laugh] It might be.” When asked whether she had any experience where intercultural competence of her or her client affected coaching, Coach 7 replied, “Affect . . . I cannot . . . really give much the question. Can you give me an example?”

Theme 24: Mid-Minimization coaches explored intercultural competence and related terminologies as they talked. The two coaches with the lowest DO scores within the Mid-Minimization group, coaches 8 and 9, initially did not show familiarity with the term intercultural competence. However, unlike Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches, these two coaches continued their reflection and exploration of the term. While they were not necessarily concise or articulate in their comments, they developed their ideas of what intercultural competence might mean as they continued talking.

Coach 8 did not find the term intercultural competence familiar at first. When asked what she thought it might mean, she said, “Because you say inter . . . Let me think.

Hmm, that's an interesting question because to me, that's almost too broad for me." She continued struggling to respond to the question, "If someone says, 'Tell me what you think about,' as you just did, 'inter, intercultural . . . competence,' did you say?" After trying for a while to speak to what intercultural competence might mean for her, she said:

Well, I think that I hadn't really put much thought about this. It's possible that different cultures have different styles. I mean, and part of it is that they, the mores of their culture, the experiences they've had that could emphasize certain styles over another. So, to me, styles could have a real connection to intercultural.

As Coach 8 tried to describe intercultural competence in her own terms, she said:

To me, that means one of at least two things. It, to me, talks about being able to deal with people on site that come from different cultures, and you're dealing with them directly. It can also mean dealing with people from other country. You are in the same company, but you are a global company, and so you're dealing with people again from other cultures, but they're in their other country.

She tried to speak more specifically:

They're from, let's say, *Country F* or *Country G* or *Country C* or whatever, that is working in *Country U*. That's one type of intercultural. The other is that you are dealing with people from other countries in their own country. So, I think there's different sets of expectations.

As she talked about intercultural competence, she became more easily able to give examples of what she would call intercultural competence, "But intercultural could also mean, to me, dealing with different divisions, business units, across the same organization." She continued to expand her explanation, "You're dealing with

differences. You're dealing with being able to deal with people that have had a different set of life or work experiences, have maybe a different language, at least a different primary language, their first language." She then talked much about differences in the workplace:

Inter means that you are dealing with people with different backgrounds, potentially different values, different sense of beliefs, different life experiences, different accents, and it can be people that you're working with face-to-face. It could be people that you are dealing with because they are still in the same company, but they may be in a different location.

There can be differences in the way different business units within an organization work. To me, intercultural is a very broad term. Because it's inter, it makes me think that you're talking within the same company. But it could also mean outside the company. So, let me start internal first:

It could be different types of customers. So, you could be working here in *Country U* and really have customers that are in *Region E* or *Region A* or *Region S*, or whatever.

It could also mean, and I've seen this so frequently, that a company might have, let's say, three or four different divisions. And there could be a separate, overall culture from that particular business unit that could be different as well.

After exploring the differences, she summarized, "So, you're dealing with differences in looking at and how to deal with all these differences as equal, but different."

Coach 9 also developed his explanation of intercultural competence as he tried to speak to the topic:

It sounds to me like you're trying to build the capacity . . . of your client to work with people from different cultures, which doesn't necessarily mean . . . I don't know. I don't limit the term culture to people coming from different countries but . . . culturally diversity may come from say gender or . . . coming from a different educational background or whatnot. It could come from different . . . ethnic . . . ethnicity . . . within the same country because countries have various ethnicities too within it. So, not limiting culture to people coming from different countries, I would say that intercultural coaching is you're building competence in the area of being able to work with people from varying cultures. That's my understanding. Is that correct?

Coach 11 started discussing what intercultural competence meant for her by examining some similar terminologies:

I realize that . . . for me, when I addressed this topic, I call it cross-cultural competency. But I realize that for *Country A people*, cross-culture means necessarily the interaction between different countries. So, if I would have a definition to cross-cultural, intercultural, or cultural competencies, for me, it's all the same.

Theme 25: High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches more readily discussed intercultural competence and related terminologies. These interculturally developed coaches engaged more smoothly in talking about intercultural competence and how it might affect coaching.

For example, when asked whether intercultural competence affected their coaching, Coach 18 and 19 were able to talk about it even though they seemed careful or

even somewhat hesitant in how to begin to respond. Coach 18 responded, “Hmm . . . [long pause] So, intercultural competence, how did it affect my coaching? Well, I try to have cultural sensitivity. Is that what you mean?” Coach 19 said, “Intercultural competence. I use that same phrase. Uh huh. Intercultural effectiveness, intercultural competence. Yes.” Coach 21 was immediately ready to discuss the topic and shared his belief that guided him in determining what actions or behaviors were culturally appropriate or “correct.” He said:

You’re going to get your cultural ability by not necessarily being politically correct all the time in the sense of being, “Oh, I can’t ask a question . . . that’s not politically correct.” It is politically correct if it’s culturally correct . . . you know? So, that’s the difference between political correctness and cultural correctness.

Domain G: Intercultural competence is about awareness. Some words were used by multiple coaches, multiple times in discussing intercultural competence, including *accepting*, *openness*, *respect*, *sensitivity*, and *trust*. One that was used the most number of times by the largest number of coaches was *awareness*. Counting both *awareness* and *being aware*, 17 of 21 coaches, spanning all Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural groups, talked about the concept of awareness, and the number of times the concept was mentioned was 117 times throughout the 21 interviews.

Theme 26: To Polarization to Mid-Minimization coaches, intercultural competence was about being aware of and understanding different cultures. To Coach 1, Intercultural competence was about “awareness of the other people’s different cultures and understanding there may be differences in values and norms and expectations and communication.”

Coach 3 stated, “What it sounds like to me is an awareness of different cultures and an openness to different cultures.” She said:

What I think of is, I started with the openness, you know. It’s being aware of their different cultures and being willing to work with different cultures. And I think it’s another step beyond that. I feel like it would include learning about other cultures so that we are in a position to be helpful to a wide array of people.

Coach 10 talked about becoming “more aware of the role that culture plays in coaching and just in our dealings with one another.” While Coach 10 made a clear statement about culture playing a role in coaching, Coach 12 added a little more expanded comment about how culture might affect coaching:

I understand that cultures are different in a lot of different places. So, that has to come into it. I have to be aware of that, and so that helps me in my coaching because I can hear things that might not necessarily apply for one place as it would in another. And I have to be aware of that.

Theme 27: Intercultural coaches talked elaborately about awareness and about other things beyond awareness. Coaches in the Intercultural group spoke to awareness in more elaborate ways. Coach 17 defined coaches’ intercultural competence not only as being aware of and understanding cultural differences but also working with those differences to facilitate good coaching conversations:

So being aware of the differences, understanding the differences as a next step . . . and trying to work with these differences to facilitate a good coaching conversation would be intercultural competence. That would be my understanding.

Coaches 20 and 21 were the most elaborate in discussing their views of intercultural competence, as it related to other concepts. To them, intercultural competence was about awareness and many other things. In explaining what intercultural competence meant to them, they brought up many factors and concepts that they believed were related to intercultural competence. Those commonly mentioned by both coaches were *openness*, *safety*, *respect*, and *awareness*.

Coach 20 believed that part of intercultural competence was to have “openness to others” and to be “totally open to whatever’s going on in the exchange” in the conversations with clients. Coach 21 talked about being open to the clients, and he called attention to the disclosure on the coach’s part. He believed that coach’s appropriate disclosure about himself or his cultural background could be used to build trust.

To both coaches 20 and 21, coaching to take place in a safe space was important. Coach 20 said, “Coaching actually unpacks their world at the very time you accept their world. So, it’s a safe place.” According to Coach 20, when a coach coaches with intercultural competence, “It builds enhanced safety for the client.” Coach 21 also said that one of the first things a coach would do in a coaching relationship would be to “create safe spaces,” where clients were comfortable communicating.

It was apparent that Coach 20 had thought at length about respect in coaching relationships. He had reflected on a few factors about himself that helped bring respect in his coaching relationships:

People who come, I’ve not ever advertised for coaching clients. People come to me by referral mostly. Probably my interest is in education and training more than trying to build a client base. And here’s a couple of things I’ve learned about it.

And, they're just generic, but they work. They psychologically and relationally work. One, I turn 67 next month. And I heard somebody say a few years ago, "Gray hair counts for something." People show a little respect to the aged, as they should. That's just a normal given. Yeah? Secondly, a doctorate counts for something. It's no big deal. It's just hard work, as you know. But, it counts for something. It says . . . well, whatever else this person is or is not, they've worked hard for it. So, there's already some external factors that determine the relationship of respect. Thirdly, I think if people come for coaching and they seek out a coach, they're going to say, "Who do I want to coach with? Is it someone I can respect?" So, I have people treat me good generally. I usually go away from a coaching session saying, "That was great. That was fun! That was good! I'm really happy." And I think mostly they are too because they keep coming back and they keep paying me so . . . it's a good thing!

Coach 20 talked about how he asked his clients to tell him about their world:

Sensitivity is about just respecting people and accepting who they are and how their world looks. They even want the coaching piece. Ask some questions. Tell me how your world works. Tell me why you think it works that way. Tell me where it works well for you, and tell me where it doesn't work well.

He also talked about going beyond his assumptions and learning about the "real person" in each client:

So, the respectfulness has to go beyond that [assumptions] first; the cultural competence has to go beyond that first thought/observation. And it has to go, "Where's the real person in this? And how do I serve them best?" So, for me, it is

that respect. It's that recognition of another human being, whatever the gender. It's that seeking their best and seeking to serve them, I think, are the keys to cultural competence, in that sense.

When asked whether he thought that a coach would be prepared to coach with intercultural competence after being trained as a coach through an ICF accredited coach training school, his response was:

My answer is yes. And the reason I say yes to that is because people can say, this is a question I would ask somebody, and it's all about respect. So, if respect means something and trust means something different to you and the client, that's the first thing you have to identify.

By coaches 20 and 21, awareness was discussed in two related and yet distinct ways. First, it was discussed by both of them in terms of the importance of first developing strong self-awareness to help clients become aware. Coach 20 talked about coaches' self-awareness building as part of their coach training:

Are you aware of what you're like? What is it that you're bringing into the coaching space? What are your hot buttons? And, we do all that as part of the training. So, not to fix people but to help them to be aware what goes on in the coaching space.

I asked Coach 20, "How does coaches' self-awareness relate to their intercultural competence?" He replied:

It does at a number of levels. Firstly, I think . . . self-awareness is, in the first place, a recognition of my own strengths, my own fears, my own insecurities, and . . . what that does is, as you become aware of and how to self-manage that

well, it doesn't become an obstacle to finding the other person. It isn't something that gets in the way and stops you from being effective in the coaching space. So, I think that's a fairly vital and a critical piece. Secondly . . . we do particularly touch on people's hot buttons, their vulnerabilities, their histories and so on. And we do a fair bit of that in the coaching space in order to say, "How would you like to be dealt with in this space? Let's talk about your history." And what that does, it builds compassion. It builds an openness to others. It builds a greater capacity to listen. It builds enhanced safety for the client. "I'm not here to judge you. I have no right to judge, you know?" And as we do that and that comes out of the space of self-awareness. I don't even have the right, so in my case and in so many other coaches we've trained, to pull out my doctorate for the sake of the argument or my 40 years of ministry experience or educational experience. It's not about that. It's not . . . that I'm a guru. It is that I'm a servant. So, unless we enhance that in the place of helping coaches develop a strong sense of self-awareness, which also then translate into other awareness, we're going to get in the way of the coaching.

The second way that awareness was talked about was by Coach 21. It was about intercultural competence being beyond awareness. Coach 21 stated:

And with the growing demographics, it's beyond the growing demographics. It's beyond awareness. It's having the knowledge, having strategies to allow your flexibility just like we've learned how to pose different coaching questions. And, then, that big link in that it's the capacity to act on those strategies.

Coach 20 made similar statements about intercultural competence that it was about being respectful of the person beyond first impressions:

The respectfulness has to go beyond that first . . . the cultural competence has to go beyond that first thought or observation. And it has to go, “Where’s the real person in this? And how do I serve them best?” So, for me, it is that respect. It’s that recognition of another human being, whatever the gender. It’s that seeking their best and seeking to serve them, I think, are the keys to cultural competence, in that sense.

Both coaches 20 and 21 talked about intercultural competence being about more than awareness. It was about action. Coaches 20 and 21 both offered examples of their intercultural competence applied in their actions.

Coach 21 stated that asking questions differently depending on who the client was could be an example of an action prompted by the coach’s intercultural competence. In addition, he described his act of switching the mode of coaching from coaching by phone to coaching in person as an example of his intercultural competence. He explained that the reason for the decision was precisely because he assessed the client’s culture to value face-to-face conversations more than virtual in building relationships.

Coach 20 talked about his coaching relationship with a client who came from a very contrasting culture to his own. While he identified his culture to be very informal, he assessed the client’s culture to be very formal. They had some exchange regarding what the client should call his coach. The client initially called Coach 20 “Dr.,” and he told the client that he could call him by his first name. It seemed that the client didn’t feel comfortable calling his coach by the first name. Coach 20 went on to explain the process of how he approached his relationship building with this client:

In a sensitive way, I guess, first of all, is seek to understand before trying to be understood. So, I spend a couple of days just mucking around with them and getting to know them and . . . eat with them and talk with them one-on-one, and there definitely is a difference, a level of respect. And it was only when he asked about why don't you like me calling you sir or doctor or whatever, that I actually responded. I said, "Well, I'm glad you asked. Here are the reasons." I was actually quite okay about it. I'd made my point. I said, "Just call me *Tom*." And I thought I don't have to go on and on about it. I don't have to make an issue because it isn't an issue. But, it would be easier if you told him, but I chose not to. That was okay. So, when he asked, I thought, "okay, he's genuinely asking, and I feel very comfortable in telling him why."

Coach 20 continued to explain how the discussion on what to call a coach concluded:

So, we had this really fascinating discussion. And because it's *Culture A* and *people from Country A* do like doctor and sir and all that, and it's the Country P thing, he said, "okay, that's really good, *Tom*. Thank you so much, sir, *Tom*."

[laugh] And I thought okay. Doesn't matter. I've made my point. It's not going..., so you run into different cultures all the time.

In addition, Coach 20 believed that intercultural competence was about "seeing the real person" in clients, or "another human being created by God." It was about having *compassion* and *genuine love* for other people and seeking to serve the clients best. He talked about the need for greater capacity to listen, with *genuine interest* and *curiosity*, hearing clients' heart, how they work, and what goes on for them.

Coach 21 stated that intercultural competence was about being “able to shift from personality to cultural influence,” identifying *cultural nuances* (versus personality). It is about “being culturally correct, not politically correct.” A coach needs to establish not only agreement but *trust*, and, in doing so, capture one’s own and client’s cultural bio. Intercultural competence is about having *flexibility, adaptability, knowledge, strategies,* and *capacity to act*—take note of what they learned and put it into action.

Domain H: Nature or nurture. Some coaches talked about intercultural competence as something that people are born with or naturally have (nature) while others saw it as something that they develop over time (nurture). This domain summarizes whether the coaches viewed intercultural competence as nature or nurture.

Theme 28: Monocultural to Low-Minimization coaches were unclear on whether people are born with intercultural competence or can be taught. A term that Coach 2 used multiple times to talk about intercultural competence was being a “grown up.” The first time he mentioned it was when I asked a clarifying question:

You talked about some of the things that I see as being part of intercultural competence. For example, you’re trying to be open and accepting of different people. Or you said you try to listen to what these people have to say and understand why things are the way they are, without injecting what you think the things should be like. Right? In my own idea of intercultural competence, all these things are part of it. So, if you are to say, okay, let’s say these types of qualities are part of intercultural competence, do you still think intercultural competence is important for all coaches? Or just some coaches? Or just particular types of coaches? Or what do you think?

His response to this question was:

Well . . . as you are characterizing intercultural competence, I have a different expression that I would use for that. It's grown up. Yeah. A grown up person *is* accepting of diversity, *is* accepting of difference, *will* listen attentively and respectfully to young children, to different people, to different cultures. To me, that is just simply a way of being.

To understand his concept of being a grown up, I asked whether it was something coaches learn as part of their coach training. He said:

No, it's more of a question of accepting responsibility for what you say and accepting the consequences of what you do and not blaming the world and not blaming the weather. And sort of waking up cheerfully accepting what the day brings and hopefully bringing good to it and bringing energy to it. And when things go wrong, they go wrong. Some people, something bad happens, and they blame everyone. That's childish! Things happen. You have to accept them and then move on. Bad things happen. Okay. What can we do?

I asked the follow-up question to the comment above: "So, if the training programs are not necessarily training coaches to be grown up coaches, then are these coaches born with that quality?" He responded:

I think the attitude you bring to coaching is very important. And if you are very timid or if you are selfish or if, and I know this has happened too, some people come to coaching because they don't know what else to do. They just say, "Oh! I can make money at that. That's easy. I can just talk." Yeah, that may work, but it may not work. You know, the coaches that I get along best with are actually

interested in those conversations that help people. They're passionate! They love it! The coaches that I talk to just love doing it.

Coach 3 asserted, "one of the parts of being human is that we have a naturally limited perspective," therefore, the learning is important. "Coaches need to be learning machines, in a way . . . because we have to be growing. We have to be doing the work in order to be valuable to our clients." After stressing about the importance of learning, Coach 3 asserted another perspective:

I think that for the most part, that that is an innate skill. It's something we're born with. And then we discover that we have that, and we learn how to develop it. I think that's true for most coaches. And so, whatever that is, and I can't fully explain it, but whatever that is, I think, puts people at ease if they're going to be at ease.

When asked whether it would be possible to develop intercultural competence if a coach never had previous international experiences, Coach 4 said, "It's possible. Of course, probably, it takes a longer time, more effort." Regarding her own intercultural competence development, she said, "But for myself, I think it's quite natural. Yeah. I mean, of course, I still need to learn a lot." Coach 5 believed that intercultural competence needed to be taught but did not know how it could be taught, "Intercultural competence has got to be taught. I'm not sure how you teach it. I'm saying I try a mishmash of my own experience."

Theme 29: Low-Acceptance coaches connected own intercultural competence with their experience. Coach 16 posed a question of whether intercultural competence is something people are born with, or people learn and said, "This can be learned, or

sometimes it is innate, innate they say when we're born with it. Sometimes natural and, but you can learn, you also can learn." She referred to her personal experience and background as something that helped her work with clients from different cultures. She talked about having some friends who were of different cultural backgrounds and said, "I love it. Love it. Also, because I really like intercultural. And my husband is from *Country A*. He has been living here for 46 years. He's from *City C*." She then said about her own work experience, "I worked for *Region E* companies. I worked for *Country G*, for *Country B*, *Country F*, and for *Country A*. So, the intercultural for me is really, really fascinating." Coach 17 also made a connection between her own intercultural competence and her experience. She had extensive experience traveling around the world, and she believed that such experience made intercultural competence her "second nature":

I'm not too sure if it is about competence at all, but I have traveled a lot. I am extremely well-traveled. I've done a lot of *Region S*. I've done a lot of *Region A*, *Region G*, *Region E*, and quite a bit of *Country U*. So, when we travel a lot, I think we just become very sensitive to the differences, and it becomes your second nature, you know, after some time. So, I've spent, I think, over the last 23 years, perhaps about ten years just traveling the world.

Coach 17 argued that her traveling experience allowed her to be sensitive to difference and to respect the difference even when she didn't understand or agree with it. She believed that this second nature could be acquired by anyone who traveled:

So, I think it has just now come to me with ease of being sensitive to the differences. While I might not understand the difference, I'm sensitive to the fact that there is a difference. And that difference needs to be respected irrespective

whether I agree with it or not. And it's as simple as that. So, I really don't consider that as a competence at all, but I think it's just that . . . it's there, a second nature. And I think it happens to anyone who travels a lot.

Domain I: Relationship to difference. Coaches described what intercultural competence meant in terms of how people related to difference or people from different cultures.

Theme 30: To a Low-Polarization coach, intercultural competence was about being able to deal with different people. In Coach 1's words, intercultural competence meant, "to be able to deal and communicate appropriately with people of other cultures."

Theme 31: To a High-Polarization coach, intercultural competence was about not being prejudice toward difference. Coach 2 believed that coaches "probably should be more accepting of the various diversities they find and certainly not prejudice about them." To Coach 2, intercultural competence meant to be a "grown up," and he explained, "A grown up person *is* accepting of diversity, *is* accepting of difference, *will* listen attentively and respectfully to young children, to different people, to different cultures." When Coach 2 mentioned his experience with a society where a caste system was present, I asked him whether he felt differently about being accepting and open to people who lived in his own neighborhood and being accepting and open to somebody who lived in a caste system. I asked him if he could comfortably accept and be open to someone who came from a societal system with which he did not agree. He responded:

Yes, I can. I think it's important. And I did live in *City M* for a month, and I observed how untouchables were treated. And I observed how garbage was handled on the streets. And I didn't make any judgments about this. I just

watched, and I learned because there were reasons for the way things had evolved. And it wasn't my place to be superior about my particular culture, but rather to listen and learn and watch. And try to understand how things came to be as they were.

I asked whether there had been any situation where he had difficulty accepting cultural difference. He responded, "Yes, I have trouble accepting cultures that brutalize women. That doesn't sit well with me." I asked a follow-up question, "What do you do if somebody from that culture comes?" He said:

If I were coaching somebody who said, "How do I beat my wife better?" I'd say, "I'm sorry. I can't help you." I wouldn't do it. If it was a culture of "How do I select my fifteenth wife?" I'd say, "That's fine. That's fine." I have no problem with people marrying in different ways. But hurting people, I have a problem with.

As Coach 2 imagined what it meant to be interculturally competent, he then also imagined what it meant to be interculturally *in*competent, "In a way, intercultural competence, is that not the way everyone should be in any case? Who should be . . . interculturally *in*competent? What is that?" He further discussed the term "intercultural incompetence":

What is intercultural incompetence? Is that . . . burying your head in the sand and saying, "Well, I'm right and everybody else is wrong?" Or that, "My culture is great. Your culture is nothing." What is that? I don't know. Seems to me that grownups who are civilized with one another are respectful and will listen to one

another, and will appreciate differences and not focus on the differences but maybe focus on what they share.

Theme 32: Mid-Minimization coaches discussed commonality and difference.

As was just mentioned, Coach 2, a High-Polarization coach, said that coaches should “appreciate differences and not focus on the differences but maybe focus on what they share,” suggesting that coaches should focus more on commonality rather than on difference. Mid-Minimization coaches also talked about commonality and difference in coaching, and some did so giving importance to both commonality and difference and others with more weight on commonality. Coach 8 said:

I think that you need to look at it as a coach. You need to look at how you handle that. How do you find commonality? And how do you appreciate the differences, work with those differences so that you can increase performance of everyone across the board.

Coach 9 reflected on some client examples and discussed an assumption she observed, “It seems to me that there is this assumption that people are the same. [laugh] They’re coming from the assumption.” She offered an example of a client talking about being “normal”:

Here’s another thing. We were doing the payroll, and here’s what the payroll supervisor said. Because their names are five, seven syllables. And so, she was struggling to pronounce their names. And I’m not. And she said, “How could you remember all these names?” I said, “I just can remember.” And she said, “Why can’t they just have normal names?” And I was struck by that because what is normal to you? Because there is assumption . . . that normal means being like me.

And that everyone should be like me so that there is the ethnocentric way of leadership, which is not appropriate . . . having to lead such a diverse group of people.

Coach 12 discussed how people are different in some ways and the same in other ways:

As much as people are from different cultures, we're all the same to a degree, in certain aspects. So, having that, I love diversity. I love it when I'm in a different country. It's fun. It's exciting. I learn. But I also know we're all just people. And we want sort of the same things. How we get there may be different. Our values may be different. But that doesn't mean another value's wrong and my value's right. It just means they're different. Does that make sense?

He said, "Intercultural competence, to me, is simply the ability to work with people from different backgrounds to produce the results that are desired." To Coach 12, a key was to "treat everybody right":

I want people of different backgrounds because they bring different ideas. So, if you allow that team to work together with all those ideas, and then you honor the team, then you'll have success. That's one. Two, I think you just treat everybody with respect and being fair. I mean, that's just . . . you treat everybody right!

He also talked about a general principle:

A general principle is something, to me, that applies wherever you are. Like learning to work with your peers is very important. Learning as you go up the ladder, the higher you get, the more you need to learn to ignore the things that aren't as important as others. Prioritize and don't worry about the little things that don't impact the big picture.

Theme 33: High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches discussed difference in more complex and nuanced ways. Coach 13 asserted the importance of having diverse people on a team, “I’m always telling people that on a team, you need some people who are different because they’re the ones that help you think out of the box.”

In addition to recognizing the benefits of the differences of people on a team, Coach 13 talked about cultural difference and ethical dilemma:

Intercultural competency is really understanding that people are different and embracing those differences or respecting those differences. You know, one of the most horrific things is how young women are tortured in *Region A* cultures. okay, and I have friends that send around petitions. I don’t like to see that happen either, but it’s centuries culture. And so, we’re looking at it from a *Country A* standpoint that it’s wrong. And it’s interesting because sometimes within the culture, I talked to someone who’s *from Region A*, and she said, “We, well, I don’t abide that,” she said, “that’s a tradition, and both men and women accept that it is, even though it doesn’t look healthy and it isn’t healthy.” I guess my point to that is, “Do you understand the origins of practices that people have? Some of them are outdated and should be eliminated.”

I think the competency is being able to understand, number one, that other cultures are different; number two, that difference isn’t always bad because it’s not like *Country A*. It may not be good, but it doesn’t mean it’s bad because it’s not like us.

Coach 15 said that it was about paying attention to people and their differences, nuanced or profound:

Cultural competency is about understanding people and that we are all different. And that people have nuances, from nuances to profound differences, in the way they like to interact with other people. So, the importance of cultural competency is understanding those small things because those small things matter.

Coach 16 described having intercultural competence as not being black and white, “When you have intercultural competency, you think differently. You are more open-minded, and you are not black and white.” She stated that she was “careful to deal with different people from different cultures” because “they perceive many things in different ways and they express their perceptions, feelings, and thoughts sometimes differently.” She also talked about being open to understanding, accepting, and adapting:

Intercultural competence for me is one person that is open to understand, a different history, a different mindset, habits . . . food, religion, but is openness to understand and acceptance. And also, adaptability to deal with a different person.

Coach 17 stressed the importance of doing homework:

So, for example, I’m a person that’s been born and brought up in a city in the west of *Country I*. I live in a city which is in the south of *Country I*, but I have a coachee who comes from the northeast. *Very* different. They are *so* different in terms of language, in terms of the food that is eaten, the education, the curriculum that they have in the northeast of *Country I*. *Everything* is *so* very different. The work culture is very different there. And therefore, it becomes very important for me to do my homework.

She talked about gathering information through doing homework about her clients:

I think there is a *lot* of homework that I do about my coachee. There is a lot of information that I ask about my coachee. My first conversation with a coachee is just to try and understand him or her from his own perspective about where does he come from, where does she come from . . . what are his likes, dislikes, what are some of the challenges that they faced, how did they deal with it, where all have they lived in *Country I*, and so on. And there is a lot that essentially tells me about the individual. And there is a background, that I'll be able to draw and essentially, again, tell me some of the do's and don'ts with regard to questions. So, that helped me a lot in my coachee conversations. If I don't do that kind of homework, then the probability of conversation not going very well is quite high in *Country I*.

When asked if there were times when she could not address difference well, Coach 17 talked about cultural differences in *Region A*, using the metaphor of shades of green:

Sometimes, yes. I think that has primarily happened only when I've traveled in *Region A*. Because the differences are, sometimes . . . how do I put this? [short pause], for example, if you were to have two shades of green next to each other, it might be a little difficult to decipher the difference, right? Does that mean . . . are they still green? Sometimes it takes a little bit longer. But for example, if it was *Region A* versus *Region E*, it's more obvious. I think that's what. And, if the green is very tired, I guess also . . . you don't see the difference instantly. It takes that much more time. I think it's also a state of mindset that guides the individual's ability to decipher the difference, and to even understand the difference.

Coach 17 talked about intercultural competence in terms of sensitivity to and awareness of difference:

To my understanding, intercultural competence would essentially mean in terms of one individual sensitive to the differences and the diversity of thoughts, actions, and communication, both verbal and nonverbal, that an individual brings to the table.

Coach 17 described intercultural competence also as empathy and relatedness:

In my head, the word *empathy* means the same thing. I think the word, *relatedness* means exactly the same thing. Right? If I'm able to empathize with you, it is because I have attempted to understand your challenge from your perspective. What else is it but intercultural sensitivity? I'm just using a street word like *empathy* or a whole word like *relatedness*, but at the end of the day, I think it still means that.

Coach 19 talked about appreciating who he was as well as appreciating others' cultures:

A core piece of intercultural effectiveness is there's an approach of humility, of . . . I'm glad to be who I am, I'm glad the way I was made, the way God made me, but I have appreciation for somebody else's culture too.

Coach 19 also said:

I'm not ethnocentric. I can go to a German-American fair over in *City P*. I can go to Lumberjack Days in *City S*. I can go to Cinco de Mayo, and me and my wife and my son, we just walk around eating and talking to people, having a good time. We may be the only black folks out there in some of those places, but we don't care! And I hope that our white brothers and sisters and our Asian brothers and

sisters and Latin brothers and sisters can go to Juneteenth and Rondo Days and hang out too. To me, that's intercultural effectiveness. I think those are adequate examples.

Coach 19 asserted, "Somebody would say, 'Well, why should I have to change or make adjustments? I'm just being myself.' That would be the wrong attitude." Coach 20 talked specifically about asking questions about how his clients saw the world:

Sensitivity is about just respecting people and accepting who they are and how their world looks. Ask some questions. Tell me how your world works. Tell me why you think it works that way. Tell me where it works well for you, and tell me where it doesn't work well.

Domain J: Importance of intercultural competence in coaching. This domain reports how coaches perceived the role and importance of intercultural competence in coaching.

Theme 34: To Monocultural coaches, intercultural competence had limited importance in coaching and would not alter coaching conversations. When asked whether intercultural competence mattered in coaching, Coach 1 emphasized the importance of awareness, "For me personally, it's important. But I think also as a coach, if you want to gain trust and credibility with someone who's from another culture, the least you could do is be aware of the differences." I asked Coach 1 to give examples of situations where intercultural competence mattered:

I think every time you're dealing with someone who's not natively your own culture, it becomes an important factor just because coaching is about being

considerate and being aware of the other person coming from different background and keep that in mind.

While she believed that being aware and considerate of different backgrounds was important, she did not believe that it should affect coaching conversations and said, “It’s not going to necessarily alter the coaching conversation, but the awareness is important.”

In addition to being open to new experiences and new challenges, being open to learning about other cultures was important to Coach 2. However, he implied that he would not necessarily “make it a point” to consider his clients’ cultures:

I’m quite open to learning about other cultures. But if someone were to call me from, you know, *City M*, I wouldn’t rush to the dictionary or encyclopedia and look up about *City M*, although I know the place, so I don’t have to. But, you know what I mean? I wouldn’t make it a point to figure out how I talk to that person that’s specific to that culture.

Coach 2 believed that coaches should not have prejudice. In explaining further, he asserted that his client being in a different country should have no impact on coaching:

I think coaches shouldn’t have prejudices about settings. I think that if somebody calls me, and I do have a client that’s going to call me in an hour, from *Country C* . . . I don’t think his being in *Country C* should have any impact on the general competencies and overall goals that he would have and that I would help him with.

He also said, “Coaches, I guess, need to be citizens of the world for sure.” And he explained:

I don't think it's necessary for coaches to learn how to be, you know, how should I say? Competent in cultures. They rather go beyond that. They probably should be more accepting of the various diversities they find and certainly not prejudice about them.

Theme 35: Low-Minimization coaches believed that intercultural competence was important in coaching. Low-Minimization coaches were quite certain that intercultural competence played a role in coaching. When asked whether intercultural competence was important in coaching, Coach 4 said:

Because for coaching, you need to, in the first place, to respect this person to accept whatever . . . what he is. I mean . . . whatever he is . . . you respect him as he is. Right? But then, you just try to help him or her to find out their own way to get things done. So, if I, a person is quite narrow-minded, it's easy for me to judge. But I've been meeting different people. And knowing people from different family, different country, different culture will have a different way of thinking or ideas or a way of doing things or way of solving problems. So, I think it's quite important to have this so-called intercultural competence for a coach, I think.

Coach 5 said, "Being aware makes you sensitive to other people's culture," and, when asked whether someone could be a good coach without being interculturally competent, she responded:

I've got to say no because culture is an unconscious social conditioning. Most of us are not aware of our social conditioning. If you were interculturally numb, it would cause a lot of discord. And so much of this is unconscious signaling. So, it

would be in how I moved my body; it would be in how I listened. It would cause a disconnect.

When asked whether intercultural competence mattered in coaching, Coach 7 also asserted that intercultural competence was “for all.”

Theme 36: Mid- to High-Minimization coaches saw intercultural competence more relevant in some coaching situations than others while they felt their own intercultural competence to be adequate. Some of the Mid- to High-Minimization coaches showed a trend where they acknowledged the importance of intercultural competence in coaching, even though in a limited way. As soon as they were asked about their own coaching, they expressed that they felt equipped to coach different clients.

Some coaches said that intercultural competence mattered in coaching, but “it depends.” For example, Coach 8 initially stated that intercultural competence could affect coaching but, depending on the type of coaching, “It absolutely can! I guess it depends. I think it depends on the type of coaching that they are doing.” She gave an example of coaching in global companies as a type of coaching where intercultural competence played a role:

If they are working particularly for a global organization, I think that helping whoever you’re coaching deal with not only their intercultural differences that they may have but dealing with other people’s intercultural preferences or styles, the work habits and behaviors; I think it becomes really important.

But when I’m dealing with companies that are global or that they have a customer base that can be global, and, I’m saying global, but it could be that you’re a *Country U* company and you have customers or your workforce is

mostly Hispanic or Asian or Eastern European or whatever it is, and they can still be all *Country U* citizens. But you're still dealing with the people of organizations that may have a different value system or believe that they have different priorities or whatever.

While she was able to talk about examples of global companies, when asked about her own coaching, she became unsure of whether intercultural competence mattered in her coaching. She responded imprecisely:

I'm trying to think about that. I have not found that . . . it may be, there may be, I might have gotten some pushback occasionally from someone I was coaching on the way, but maybe as they looked at how to solve something that I might not have taken something into consideration. I'm not even sure if I can even think of an example of that.

Then she said that she generally felt equipped in her coaching, "I have not had anything that has been an outright pushback. I have generally felt that . . . I felt pretty equipped . . . I mean, being able to handle that." I asked her to confirm, "So you normally don't feel uncomfortable with the differences that exist between you and your clients?" She replied, "No. I really don't." So, I asked the follow-up question, "Why do you think that is?" She responded:

I'm trying to think. Maybe it's because of the companies that I have worked with. Maybe that's the answer. I'm trying to think, if there's an, if . . . [sigh] I think basically the people I have coached are all in *Country U*, then they come from different cultures, but they're living in *Country U*, and so they're under . . . they are under pressure . . . or they have been highly influenced by *Country U* mores.

So maybe if I were coaching somebody from, that was living in . . . *Region S* or *Region A* or *Region M* or something of that sort, maybe that would be the difference.

Coach 8 further reflected on why it was that she felt comfortable with differences between her and her clients. She attributed the reason to her work experience and style:

Well, think about, I'm 60-some years old. [laugh] I have a lot of work experience. And I've worked with people in different cultures. In a way, it's probably somewhat my coaching behavior. I'm, in real life, the person that has lots of opinions and can have judgments, etcetera. What I find when I coach is that I am able to put judgment aside. And I don't claim to have all the right answers or any right answers, but I think I have a skill in being able to listen and ask hopefully thought-provoking questions. And that style would—maybe I'm being naïve—but I think that style has enabled me to deal with a wide variety of people.

Coach 9 also expressed a level of comfort with intercultural competence in her coaching. She thought that a coach who had learned to coach to clients' individual uniqueness should be able to coach to cultural difference as well. So, I asked the question, "Do you feel that, as coaches, throughout our coach training, we acquire a capacity to see the difference or uniqueness in individuals and also acquire intercultural competence?" She responded:

Yeah. Yeah, because inherently, as coaches . . . we need to; we're just facilitating. We're not putting in any content. So, the content is provided *for* by the client. So, whatever content the client brings in is brought upon by his cultural background. Then we learn from that. We learn from the content that the client is bringing into

the conversation, and then we listen to that, and then we learn, and then we just do our work around that content that the client has presented.

When asked if intercultural competence was important in coaching, Coach 14 responded, “I think it’s extremely important,” and added that “it depends”:

But I guess . . . I mean, it depends a lot too on your client group, but even if you don’t have a very diverse client group and you’re working with people who are quite similar to you, I think to have an understanding, an appreciation of organizational culture is essential because it plays such a big role in people’s experience at work for my clients anyway, people’s experience at work. And, well, it depends where you live, I guess [laugh]—but we live in a very diverse population, particularly in *Country U*, and I think if you don’t understand some of the differences that people have, the different experiences they have and the different perspectives and frames of mind, it’s very hard to communicate effectively . . . let alone coach. [laugh]

When examining how her coaching was going with clients, she did not necessarily see it in a cultural way, “I think in coaching there are always times when the communication isn’t quite gelling as well as I might hope. But I don’t necessarily . . . frame it in a cultural way, I guess.” An interesting comment was that, even though she said that she did not necessarily see culture affecting communication, she gave an example of her coaching *Country U* clients, which seemed to be framed in a cultural way:

I think one of the things that I have to be aware of is that my communication style is probably not as direct as people who’ve grown up in *Country U*, at least white *Country U*. That’s one of the things I have to be aware of when I’m coaching.

Coach 15 said that understanding clients' nuances, which was "more than just their exterior," was important for coaches because it was those nuances that got in the way of coaching:

That worrying comes from their heritage, their upbringing, the way they were brought up. It's all those parts. And I think cultural competency, for me, is really important because it's about the nuance. Because the nuance is the thing that's getting in the way of a successful outcome if you aren't aware of it.

When asked if intercultural competence affected his own coaching, Coach 15 said not in his coaching, "Not within coaching because I think my coaching . . . the people I'm coaching are pretty homogeneous, and they all tend to be corporate of a similar culture."

Theme 37: Intercultural coaches considered intercultural competence as a critical key to coaching. Coach 16 believed that coaching with intercultural competence brought confidence and credibility to her coaching. She explained, "People feel more confident. It's easier to develop credibility. You are included in different groups. You feel your knowledge bigger. It's rich. It's really, really rich." Coach 17 believed that coaches must first accept and understand how people's differences impact coaching, "My competence to recognize these sensitivities and (a) accept it and (b) try to understand where, what, and you know, how it's going to impact the conversation, a coaching conversation. To me, that would be intercultural competence." She defined that coaches' intercultural competence was about working with difference and facilitating good coaching conversations. She also said, "I don't think . . . a coach, a good coach who believes that coaching is about facilitating a process, can run away from accepting the

fact that intercultural sensitivity is key to a conversation.” She also stated that a lack of intercultural competence would have an adverse effect on coaching conversations:

If the person is not aware of intercultural sensitivity, then I think it is going to have a huge impact on the coaching conversation itself. And it is going to have an adverse effect on the coaching conversation. Technically speaking. Nonetheless, I think I’m going to push my point by saying that . . . I’m working under the assumption that this individual we’re talking about is a coach, is at least an average coach, an average to a good coach, and believes that he or she needs to facilitate a coaching conversation. The coach might not call it, refer to it or understand it as intercultural competence or sensitivity. They might call it something else . . . which is fine, which is perfectly okay.

Coach 18 said that intercultural competence was “absolutely important” to her. As she worked mainly with international clients, I asked whether intercultural competence was important for other coaches whose clients were not international. She first responded hesitantly:

I don’t know if they even think about it. And I don’t know very many coaches who work with international clients. And maybe that’s just because I’m not in touch with them, but . . . I don’t know, really. I don’t know if it’s important to them or not.

She then continued to reflect and said:

I think it matters whether you work with clients from other countries or not. Because if, maybe your clients are working with people from other countries. And maybe there’s a way that you can impart some knowledge on them. If you’re

working with *Country U* citizens, it's very likely that these people are in workplaces or in families or in churches or synagogues or organizations where they encounter people from other countries. We're becoming increasingly more diverse in our cities and our towns. And whether you have a role where you are working with people directly or not, I think that culture impacts very many aspects of your life.

Coach 20 described how intercultural competence fit in the coaching framework:

“How do the Japanese have toast? What do you like doing on Sunday afternoons? What's different about you?” So, the cultural competence fits the coaching framework so prolifically. I am genuinely interested in you. Everybody's got a story to tell, and I'm insatiably curious. But before we get to hear all this, a needs assessment and say, “Tell me about yourself. Tell me what you're good at. Tell me about your family.” And that becomes our first session usually, and usually, that's free. And out of that, I will be able to draw out, “Okay, this is what I'm hearing you say. How does that sound? I'll put a coaching proposal together.” But the cultural competence about that is, let's build a relationship. Let me hear your heart. Let me hear how you work. Let me hear what goes on for you.

Domain K: Interculturally competent coaching. This domain presents various statements by the coaches that seemed to describe interculturally competent coaching. Less interculturally developed coaches were less articulate in describing, and more developed coaches were more confident in their ideas of what interculturally competent coaching should look like and were able to speak with examples.

Theme 38: Low- to Mid-Minimization coaches struggled to describe what interculturally competent coaching might look like. Coach 7 shared an example of her female client who was looking for a job. This client came from a culture where being a woman assumed having certain types of jobs. Women were also expected to make their decisions based heavily on the opinions of their male family members. Because these cultural values were different from Coach 7's cultural values, she struggled to coach this client. When the client was not pursuing the type of job she seemed to want, Coach 7 said:

I couldn't understand why, why, why not? Because I wasn't certain how can I take this reaction. I had to ask, how can I ask...? And . . . they, the most important question was: Is it something important for you to be in such a job? Certainly. Certainly. Can you please explain it to me? What can I ask? It was for me; it was very, her reaction was so . . . amazing.

As the client explained why she had limited ability to pursue her career due to family expectations, Coach 7 responded:

This situation's so difficult to deal with, and they need much time. But there, I put myself back, and I asked what she wanted. It's not what I want. What I think is proper, it's the best for her.

So, if she's not ready to be there, we cannot push her to be there even if they can't both understand, the men can't understand and feel strong and do it. She wasn't yet ready to deal with it because she has to be more economically independent. She got to have some friends to help, and that's tough for her. And there to continue discussion of her goal.

Through this coaching process, Coach 7 worked to remain focused on the client's agenda rather than her own, which coaches are trained to do. During this time, she said, she had to "keep her feelings." She said, "I was confused because my feelings tell me, come on, this is so great, so . . . why?"

She shared some of the tactics she would use when trying to 'keep her feelings':

I have to find a way to keep myself calm and not to show so . . . so openly my reactions. I took breaths, take breaths, and talk more slowly when I talk with . . . generally with my clients in coaching.

Coach 11 also had a tactic for her coaching practice that allowed her to focus on each client, "I normally don't schedule coaching sessions back to back. I need some time to re-center myself to be with a client. But, when I'm with a client, I'm with that client, with their culture." She continued to describe what interculturally competent coaching would look like. Here, her comments became increasingly unclear about how she viewed the role of culture was in coaching. She seemed to contradict her own statements repeatedly. She first asserted that cultural competencies should be required of coaches:

I believe, in my perspective, every coach should be able to interact with every culture, no matter the culture. it's my belief—it's a belief, okay? If it's my belief that cultural competencies should be added to a requirement for a coach. And that means being able to overcome any misperception or . . . because I'm coaching based on their own frame of reference. I'm not coaching with my frame of reference. Okay? So, for me, it's harder if I'm not completely aligned with that type of frame of reference.

Then, immediately, she seemed to discount culture:

But, for me, it's not a matter of culture. Even with my students, I never found a difference in that place. I'm working with the Coaching Training School I, and I observe a lot of coaching. We have classes where they practice coaching. And I observe people from completely different countries coaching each other. And I really don't see any . . . I don't see an issue with cultural differences.

In her above comments, she stated that cultural competencies are important for coaches, coaches and clients have a different frame of reference, and it could become difficult for her when her frame of reference was not aligned with her clients'. Then she said, "But for me, it's not a matter of culture." To clarify this chain of thoughts, I asked if she meant that frame of reference each person has is not necessarily coming from culture. Her response was:

It will always come from culture. It's not necessarily connected with countries. Coach 13 believed, "to develop that competency, you have to be curious, which is a coaching concept." She shared that it did not mean easy to do, "You need to be curious. You need to be respectful. And I think, you know, sometimes it's hard to be respectful because it's so anticlimatical to what you believe in."

Theme 39: High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches had seemingly endless examples of how they did or could alter how they coach. Coach 15 gave an example of how coaching might be done differently with a cultural group, "For example, with people of *cultural group A*, we would not have a conversation like this. We would not be face-to-face. We would sit by side, side by side." He talked about an example of a friend of his:

For example, if you are working with a person from *cultural group A*, you're better off sitting side by side. And a friend of mine, who has coached a number of people from *cultural group A*, does more of her coaching in a car. Because that environment gives them, you're sitting side by side, and you've got the opportunity to have a conversation in a car. So, she will say, when she does a coaching session with a leader from that culture "Let's go for a drive!"

Coach 15 also discussed coaching clients with a different cultural background from his own and said:

I think that what I've observed other people doing and the stories they tell me, based on my own experience of working with people, not of my culture, I became more aware of being aware, I think, and watched for the clues and watched their body language if you did something, to see whether they moved in or moved out or what their facial expression was. And then, be vulnerable enough to say, you know, "Would you prefer it if I interacted in another way?"

He explained that to have a conversation with someone from another culture, we would need to understand the "environment and the preference they have for having the conversation." We would need to know what "would distract from the conversation."

One of his examples was, "If you're having a conversation with a *Culture H* person from *Country I*, don't have your legs crossed with your foot pointing at them." He said that these things were subtle, "It's knowing those subtleties because they become blockers to the conversation. So, I think cultural competence is that understanding that if you're going to work with somebody of a certain culture or ethnicity, you need to know these things." He stressed the importance of knowing these potential "blockers" even though

they might seem small, “I think in my experience, in terms of cultural competency, it’s understanding that the small things are important.”

Coach 16 tried to observe and learn more when working with clients from different cultures. She thought that her “perception was more activated.” I posed a follow-up question to ask whether she exercised her intercultural competence with those clients from the same cultural background as herself as well as her clients from other countries or other cultures. Her response was that the intensity of the way she used her intercultural competence was different. It would be more intense when working with the clients from different cultures:

If I receive a person, for example, I never worked with a person from *Country I*.

But if I have a client from there, my initial perception process . . . being careful with the questions, with the feedback, will be more intense . . . will be intensified.

Then she said that the sessions would eventually become more “natural,” “Not that . . . it will last, this intensity will last just sessions then I learned and we, as soon as I see the connection, things go all natural, more natural.” She noticed how culture affected her clients’ expectations of her. An example was when she coached team members while working in *Country C*. Her team members consisted of individuals from multiple countries, “The teams would expect me to tell them what to do. But that wouldn’t happen so much in *Country J* or in *Country K*.” Coach 17 continued to describe the cultural differences between *Countries C, J, and K*. She said that the rapport building with clients was done differently among these three cultures:

In *Country J*, it required a lot more of conversation that I would need to have with the group, with the individuals, especially if it was a team coaching then I would

need to spend about the first half an hour, 40 minutes, talking about totally unrelated things so that I would build a rapport then slowly move into the space of the work-related stuff. Something similar even in *Country K*, but in *Country C*, they just wanted me to get to the point and to be, you tell me what I'm supposed to do.

Because of this effect of culture on rapport building, Coach 17 said that she initially could “not make sense of why the coaching conversations are not making any sense.” She explained her process of rapport building:

I had to spend a fair amount of time to understand the psyche of the groups in each of the countries that I was working with, the people that I was working with. And, I think it took me about four months to figure this out because I didn't know why the conversations were not making sense to anybody even to me and not the person. So, it took me about three to four months to get this thing right and work myself through to connect, to build a rapport with my team members and over a period of time, coach them.

Coach 20 described his coaching work in the language of his Christian context:

To me, the whole coaching paradigm of seeking to serve the other runs entirely parallel to the Christian gospel, the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many. And he does that by finding out, “What do you need to have if I help you do it?”

He further explained what it meant to serve his clients:

Guess what, “the coaching's not about you.” It's about them. Totally. So, you pack all your little problems, just pop them out of there if you've got them. And if

they really upset you, fine, take it. Pop it up on a shelf. You can; we can come back to it later. But when you're in the coaching space, it's about them. You serve them. You die to self—a very good Christian virtue, as you probably know—and you live for them, at this point. What you do with it after, if you need to debrief, that's fine. But right now, in this coaching space, it's totally about the other person. It's totally about how you can bring out their best, find their heart, move towards their solutions for their well-being and not yours." So, is it for all coaches? Sure. Ideally, absolutely.

Coach 20, who coached largely within the Christian community context, explained his making cultural adjustment to clients, by citing a section of the Bible:

The Apostle Paul writes in Corinthians 9:19-23, "To the Jew I became a Jew, and to those under the law I became as one. Or to the Greek, I became a Greek so that by all means I save some." In other words, he's a highly accomplished Roman citizen, very competent in the Hebrew language, in Latin language, and in Greek. And he does the cultural adjustment to whatever audience he's working with for a particular purpose. And that particular purpose is to lead them to Christ so that they can become closer to God.

He explained his idea of a coach coming to his or her client, "God doesn't stand up in Heaven and say, 'Hey, you! [whistle] Hey! Over here!' He doesn't do that. He comes to us in our humanity." In the coaching field, it is an often-used phrase, "Coaching is like dancing in the moment with your client." Coach 21 argued that knowing the type of dance being danced was a key, "As coaches, we dance in the moment. But what happens when we prefer our moments to be a ballet or a waltz and our clients prefer a salsa or a

cha-cha, and we don't even recognize the steps?" Coach 21 said that having intercultural competence would help coaches know what type of dance was the preference of the client:

If coaches can be prepared to at least have a certain level of intercultural competence at a level enough to know where to find out, where to find the best kinds of questions you might ask . . . that will allow you to dance in that moment.

He argued for the importance of meeting the clients where they were, by bringing himself toward the clients. He gave an example of physically coming to the client's location to meet instead of coaching by phone. He did so when he was coaching a client whom he came to believe that meeting in person was meaningful in this particular client's culture.

Coach 21 stated that paying attention not only to the type(s) of culture but also the degree of cultural influence was important. He stated that the degree to which a client was culturally influenced was as important to pay attention to as from which cultural background he or she came. He gave an example of working with female clients with an Islamic background:

With each culture, with each client, take the Islamic woman. How steeped is she in her culture? Is that going to impact her? So, I've worked with Islamic women who are very steeped in their culture . . . so that wasn't going to work at all. And I've worked with some who've acculturated enough that they could work with a male coach. And then how do you, as a male, ask those questions, versus as a female with somebody of that background?

Coach 21 stated that identifying different meanings behind concepts was important. He said, "People can say it's all about respect. So, if respect means something and trust

means something different to you and the client, that's the first thing you have to identify." Coach 21 talked about framing questions to meet different cultures. He said:

How do you know how to frame questions? I might ask a question, but how do I frame the question in the relationship? And I have a lot of flexibility and adaptability with most of my clients, but now I have a client who is an African-American male or an Islamic female. Are you going to ask a question the same way? And in many cases, you might not.

He defined every coaching relationship to be intercultural, "I believe that every client is multicultural . . . and that those influences go beyond personality. So, each coaching relationship is intercultural." Based on this belief, he would adjust his coaching to each client. He would ask himself, "How do I frame the question in the relationship?"

Coach 20 also talked about asking his clients various questions at the beginning of the coaching relationship and said, "Cultural competence about that is, let's build a relationship . . . Before I enter into a coaching relationship with, say, Akiko, I want to know a whole bunch of stuff." Coach 21 argued that even when a coach does not know what the right questions were in some cultural contexts, they would need to have "intercultural competence at a level enough to know where to find out, where to find the best kinds of questions you might ask." When asked a follow-up question, "When it comes to coaching in an interculturally competent way, how do we know which version of the questions to choose for each client?" Coach 21 responded:

I think there's a multilevel answer to that because it's part of the building, you know, establishing, not only the agreement, establishing trust in the relationship, and in doing that, that's where you can capture your client's cultural bio. I think

the first thing you have to do, even before that, is capture your own cultural bio and how it impacts the lenses that you coach, your world views.

Another aspect of interculturally competent coaching, to Coach 21, was about asking for permission:

We need to be able to capture our clients' cultural bios. And if we can get through our fear of making a mistake and ask permission to ask these questions, but ask permission to make mistakes, I think that much of your client's cultural bio, which you will continue to become richer as you're coaching the client. That's when you will know how to adapt your questions. So, I think that's a missing step.

Domain L: Coaching for clients' intercultural competence. This domain reports how some of the coaches talked about helping their clients develop intercultural competence. It was noticeable that the more interculturally developed the coach, the more in detail he or she was able to explain to me how he or she coached for the clients' intercultural competence.

Theme 40: Mid-Minimization coaches wanted their clients to develop intercultural competence. Coach 9 talked about intercultural competence in coaching as trying to “build the capacity of your client to work with people from different cultures.”

Coach 13 talked about various workplace issues that her clients had and considered them “cultural” issues. She then said, “I would want people to be curious. What I want them to be curious about is the origins of that practice, whether it's a business practice or whatever.” She also talked about her hopes for her clients:

I think, intercultural competency, it's not just knowing what a country is and the demographics of what you read in a CultureGrams. It's understanding "How do I interact with you? How can I honor you? How can I respect you? And if I have something that really bothers me, do I avoid it? Do I confront it?" And I also would hope, in their intercultural competency, that they seek counsel of people who know.

She then said, "Encourage people to develop intercultural competency, even if they're not intercultural now . . . because that's the way the world is going."

Theme 41: Low-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches talked about specific coaching situations where they were able to help develop their clients' intercultural competence. These coaches shared their own examples of coaching their clients through developing intercultural competence. Noticeable was how comprehensively they shared. They explained the situation, described what they did as a coach, and finally reported how the client changed.

Coach 16 talked about asking "some questions that help a person to reflect about the differences." She shared an example of an approach she took, which was to have her client "search some information between *Country B* and *Country A* cultural differences." She described the result of this activity:

Her work helped her to see those differences more, reduce the bad impression.

She started understanding better people from *Country B* and started . . . changing a little bit some behaviors like the way she does the follow-up, the way she delegates, the way she correct errors, mistakes. So, she started doing different.

Coach 16 further described the change she saw in the way the client related to her staff:

Things are starting . . . changing now because she was perceived as a commanding person. A colonel or whatever. And now, she changed. Instead of telling, she asks questions and first validates what people do right and then, more softly, she talks about the mistakes, offering support for them to learn. So, she's less straightforward.

Coach 21 talked about his Latina client:

The elders gave her permission within her culture because she was involved in the employee resources group for a Latino employee resource group in her company . . . So, they are the ones who helped her speak up by giving her permission. When we identified that, she was able to identify what she could speak with her supervisor about . . . And so she was able to bring up the fact that these were her cultural influences. She is doing her job. She does have a lot to say, and they created a way for her to provide information for him, and he, being Anglo, white male supervisor, was also able to find ways for her to contribute to the group and express that. Not only did her performance evaluations go up, but she's been promoted, so really creating an intercultural environment in the workplace and with her team and her supervisor that allowed her to grow, to expand her comfort style, and still feel authentic to her culture. So, it was a process! It didn't happen overnight!

Through asking his client cultural questions, Coach 21 was able to help her see the challenge she was facing from a cultural perspective. He explained, "We were able to work through identifying what was going on from her cultural level . . . she was then able to identify what values of hers were influenced or rooted in her culture."

Domain M: Intercultural competence in coach training. This domain presents the view of the coaches on the current coach training opportunities.

Theme 42: High-Polarization to Low-Minimization coaches thought that current coach training programs were not sufficiently teaching intercultural competence. Coach 2 expressed his general frustration with some of the existing coach training programs. When asked whether coaches were trained for intercultural competence in coach training schools, Coach 2 responded:

I think it must vary a lot from what I've seen. I know there's one group that comes to *City T* every so often, and they teach coaches and give them a certificate after 48 hours. I cannot see how you could teach a year of study in 48 hours but . . . When I say 48 hours, I mean actually just two days . . . day and a half. Friday night and Saturday and Sunday morning. And you start, I can't remember the name of the program, but to become a certified coach in a weekend seems to me . . . you know, probably not very realistic.

I further asked whether intercultural competence could be taught in coach training schools, and he responded:

I'm not sure. I'm not sure because . . . I have observed this, what can be taught is to pay lip service to the style of coaching. One can learn the techniques. But it's very hard to convey empathy to your client if you do not feel it. There are coaches who know you're supposed to do that, so they'll practice techniques for showing that they're empathetic. But some of the clients don't *quite* buy it. You do have to care about the outcomes, to some extent. So, you have to feel as though your client's needs and wants matter. You know, if you start by having a genuine

interest in people improving their life, then there's an optimism and a hope around the whole conversation. And it's hard to fake that . . . but some people do.

Using the term "being a grownup," which Coach 2 had used in describing what intercultural competence meant to him, I asked what he would do to train coach training students to become a grownup. His response was:

What I would do is ensure that the soft skill type mindfulness programs, appreciative inquiry programs, especially nonverbal communication programs were explored. But particularly that kind of thing in NLP [neuro-linguistic programming], so there'd be work in personal transformation. There'd be work in identifying and uncovering the synthetic veneers that you have.

He stressed that coaching was not only techniques:

As best we could to be honest with another, be honest with our feelings. Yeah, I can't get inside people's minds and hearts, but I would make sure that the conversations were as . . . open and as comprehensive as they could be in that regard. So, I would not just simply say, "This is a good coaching technique." Some of it would be personal growth in both.

Coach 4 shared her thoughts on how different regions or countries might need different competencies for coaching:

I really think it's necessary because for me, in *Region W* world, they don't focus on that. But for *Region A* market . . . especially for *Country C* people to hear. And, yeah, if some of the competencies in *Region W* world probably doesn't really apply to people here and we need to create something new. Yeah! I think

it's good having you or people who really like to contribute something to ICF coaches in the world. Very good.

Coach 5 explained what coaches need to work on to become interculturally sensitive:

Work on our own projections, our own assumptions, our own wins, and do deep-based therapy because you can read lots of books. That's knowledge. It's not wisdom. This needs to be embodied. So, you can teach it and, and maybe there's a formula but, honestly Akiko, it has to be embodied. And people have a bush barometer. They will pick it up if you are not interculturally sensitive. They *know* it. They might not put their finger on it, but they *know* it.

She asserted what is important is the personal work, which makes coaches more sensitive as human beings:

Intercultural competence is about being a human being and humane being. It's just what comes to mind while we're talking. And so, then I go back to doing personal work, doing continued personal work is what makes us more sensitive as human beings. And it's really clearing out the toxic patterns from childhood, from family, from schooling, from culture, from society, so that we can be individuals who are whole and able to laugh and, really be truly compassionate first for ourselves, and then for others.

She then spoke of her frustration with current coach training:

I don't believe that we're offering intermediate and advanced coach training. I think the way that the ICF model is geared towards accreditation, we land up ticking boxes to get hours instead of ticking that this is developmental. And I've done it! I've got four different coaching models. Honestly, I know we got to start

training coaches somewhere, but talking about the art of coaching. Intercultural competence has got to be taught. I'm not sure how you teach it. I'm saying I try a mishmash of my own experience.

Theme 43: A Mid-Minimization coach believed that intercultural competence should naturally develop as part of being trained as a coach. Coach 9 stated that intercultural competence is important as a basic leadership competency, "Knowing the demographics of people here, not only here, but probably across *Region N*, for that matter, all leaders must build intercultural competence as part of their basic leadership competencies." Because she asserted that a coach who had learned to coach to clients' individual uniqueness should be able to coach to cultural difference as well, I asked the question, "Do you feel that, throughout our coach training as a coach, we acquire a capacity to see the difference or uniqueness in individuals and also acquire intercultural competence?" She responded:

Yeah. Yeah, because inherently, as coaches . . . we need to, we're just facilitating. We're not putting in any content. So, the content is provided for by the client. So, whatever content the client brings in is brought upon by his cultural background. Then we learn from that. We learn from the content that the client is bringing into the conversation, and then we listen to that, and then we learn, and then we just do our work around that content that the client has presented.

When asked whether she thought some coaches were more interculturally competent than others, she responded, "Oh, yeah! For sure! For sure! Although I think that basically, coaches that I see, they naturally develop it as a matter of developing their coaching expertise."

Theme 44: A Mid-Minimization coach asserted that most coaches lacked the awareness of importance of intercultural competence. When discussing whether

intercultural competence should be part of coach training, Coach 10 said:

The question didn't come up in terms of 'should cultural competency be a new twelfth competency?' Or should it be blended into all the 11 competencies or some of them that we have? And my feeling on that issue is . . . [short pause] you know, I'm not sure of my feeling on that issue, of which would be better. I think either is acceptable so long as cultural competency means we have something that we are aware of as coaches we need to address, we need to become aware of and comfortable with.

However, he said that he was afraid, "most coaches are not aware of the importance." He continued:

For example, a year ago we had a conference here down in Washington on, for ICF, the intercultural summit. And we had a hundred and 30 people show up. And, you know, we were thinking, "Oh, my God, several hundreds of people will want to come." And when we run workshops and things on cultural competency, it's just always the same small group of people that tend to show up for them. I mean, wasn't that a wonderful conference for those two days we spent together?

Knowing that I was also at this conference, he continued to share some of his experience as one of the ICF leaders, including an example of another fellow ICF leader asserting that she would not need intercultural competence training because she traveled globally. He said that he came to realize "there's only a small group of us who really understand, so far, the importance of cultural competency." He continued to comment:

And it's almost become a joke, you know, that if you travel around the world, then you're culturally competent. I know it isn't true. So, we have to keep plugging away at it and show people how important it is.

Theme 45: Low-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches talked about partial learning opportunities for developing intercultural competence, currently available in or outside coach training programs. When asked whether intercultural competence was important, Coach 16 immediately replied, "Ah, for sure it is." While she believed that intercultural competence was important for coaches to develop, she stated, "I would like to add one thing. That is, of 10 coaches, you can find one with intercultural competency, in general." According to Coach 16, outside of formal coach training programs, gaining experience with and knowledge of different people and cultures was important. She said that it was necessary first for the person to be self-confident, and they could start gaining experience and knowledge:

And if you like, you need to start traveling or greeting or watching movies or even . . . taking the first opportunity to talk with a different person from another place, even when they are here in *Country B*, but you need to be in touch. So, it's really necessary interest to be willing and look for knowledge. Develop knowledge.

She stressed the importance, "If you don't read, if you don't talk to different persons, if you don't have any approximation with different people, how can you deal with them? It's difficult." When asked whether intercultural competence was important, Coach 17 also replied definitively, "I would think absolutely. The answer is yes." I asked how

advanced or not advanced she felt her own intercultural competence was, and Coach 17 said:

I don't know what the operational definition for advanced is, but I think . . . I do have the ability to be sensitive to the fact that if a conversation is not going well, I get the vibes very quickly. So, and if that is competence, then well, yes.

She shared that a part of her coach training experience that related to intercultural competence was learning to do "homework," "One is, yes, so when I went through the entire coaching program itself, we are taught to do a lot of homework." Coach 18 said that her training for intercultural competence was her work experience, "Because I had always worked with people from other countries, I was exposed to it throughout my entire career, so I didn't have any specific training in this area." When asked if intercultural competence was important for all coaches or some types of coaches, Coach 20 talked about the coach training program that he and others had developed:

I guess one of the things when we're doing the training is . . . we have ten units of competency. The ICF one has 11, but we've developed ten units of competency which has certain skills and certain knowledge. A core part of that is self-awareness. We have two units on self-awareness. And we hammer self-awareness.

He further explained how their coach training program taught self-awareness:

We do particularly touch on people's hot buttons, their vulnerabilities, their histories and so on. And we do a fair bit of that in the coaching space in order to say, "How would you like to be dealt with in this space? Let's talk about your history." "What have you really stuffed up? Let's talk about that." And what that

does, it builds compassion. It builds an openness to others. It builds a greater capacity to listen. It builds enhanced safety for the client. “I’m not here to judge you. I mean, I have no right to judge, you know?” And as we do that and that comes out of the space of self-awareness.

Coach 21 believed that intercultural competence was a critical competency in coaching, “Every client is a unique mix of multicultural identity. So, when you talk about intercultural competency, that is absolutely critical to the coach’s ability to have a deeper mastery in coaching.” I asked Coach 21 whether being trained as a coach, through an ICF accredited coach training school, would prepare the coach to coach with intercultural competence. He responded:

My answer is yes. And the reason I say yes to that is because people can say, this is a question I would ask somebody, and it’s all about respect. So, if respect means something and trust means something different to you and the client, that’s the first thing you have to identify. And, how do you know how to frame questions? I might ask a question, but how do I frame the question in the relationship? And I have a lot of flexibility and adaptability with most of my clients, but now I have a client who is an African-American male or an Islamic female. Are you going to ask a question the same way? And in many cases, you might not.

Even though he believed that a coach should be trained in intercultural competence after being trained in an ICF accredited coach training program, he also asserted that it was not yet embedded in the programs. He suggested the need for including the intercultural competence in the coaching training programs as a core competency, “Since it is not

embedded in the coaching schools, it's not yet embedded into the core competencies. We need our cultural intelligence to be able to deepen that relationship with our client.”

Theme 46: A Low-Adaptation coach talked about a need for deselecting to be a coach. Coach 20 talked about deselecting for becoming a coach as a part of the coach training process:

One of the guys said, “Make sure that when you do this that the process actually deselects people that you don't want in the coaching space.” In other words, people are dysfunctional. Do enough on self-awareness so, say this is not for me. I'm outta here. You know? So, and we're fairly clear about that.

Summary

The findings addressing the two research questions below were presented in this chapter:

1. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive the role of culture in their work?
2. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to their work?

The analysis of the two phases of the data collection, the IDI and individual qualitative interviews, yielded 46 themes under 13 domains. These findings are discussed further in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Discussions

Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings reported in Chapter Four. The current study investigated two research questions regarding how professional coaches perceived the role of culture and intercultural competence in coaching. The research questions investigated were:

1. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive the role of culture in their work?
2. How do coaches, at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural), perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to their work?

The data collection involved a two-phase process, first administering the IDI to 48 coaches and second, interviewing 21 of them individually, following the completion of the IDI. The interviews generated 1,137 minutes (18 hours, 57 minutes) of audio-recorded conversations. The interviews were then transcribed and yielded 815 pages of transcripts. The analysis of the data yielded a total of 13 domains and 47 themes.

Researcher Bias

Before discussing the findings, I will disclose two types of researcher bias that I came to notice during the process of analyzing data. One is regarding an expectation I had while conducting the research. The other is regarding a challenge I had as I analyzed the data.

Researcher's expectation. As reported in the previous chapter, I made a change to the grouping of the participants during the process of data analysis. The rationales for this change were already presented. However, I will also disclose and discuss my own bias as a researcher, which became increasingly undeniable as I analyzed the interview results.

When I was designing this research study and determining the data analysis methods, I believed that dividing the participant group into three groups would be sufficient. My reasoning behind this decision was that there are already three groups of orientations in the IDI framework: Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural. Applying these three orientations was most practical. In addition, due to the limited number of participants, dividing them into more groups would result in a small number of individuals in each group, which seemed to me at the time to be less meaningful.

Now, after collecting the data and analyzing it, I realized that I had a bias of my own to justify this grouping method. My bias was based on the following assumption. My interview participants are coaches. The coach training they go through—which is rigorous—must have trained them to be a competent coach with any client in any context, and they all should be reasonably developed interculturally. Their general awareness of self, others, life, and society is so developed that their intercultural competence must be equally developed. I may have created this bias in my mind because I am a coach myself and, thus, hoped for this assumption to be true. I imagined that there would be, or should be, a very small variation in the IDI results among the participants as well as in the comments they would make in the interviews. In the end, I was hoping to be able to report a finding because I did not see much variation in my data. This means that these

coaches all paid attention to culture at a sophisticated level of intercultural competence and were able to discuss the relevance of intercultural competence in coaching eloquently. After data collection and analysis, I admit to having had this bias all along this research study process. That being said, I was able to come to accept this bias and tailor the analysis method to having eight groups instead of only three. Therefore, I believe that I was able to clearly and adequately reveal the vast variation within the participants and report more detailed and nuanced analysis of my data.

Challenges in handling data. One of my greatest challenges in the data analysis process was making a clear distinction between describing the data and interpreting it. As a researcher, the foremost task for me was to report the data from my study and describe what the data said (i.e., let the data speak). I struggled to maintain this attitude during the process. The reason for the struggle was because my knowledge for and habits of interpreting the data from the perspective of a long-term IDI Qualified Administrator kicked in easily.

As I stated previously, in addition to being a student researcher in the doctoral program, I work as a consultant, and my professional expertise revolves around the use of the IDI and intercultural competence development. As an IDI specialist, my instinct is to analyze the data, specifically the interview data, through the lens of the interviewee's PO as well as Developmental Orientation (DO). I noticed myself asking, "Is this interviewee making this statement out of their PO or DO?" To allow the data to speak, I had to remain very mindful of how I was relating to the data. I had to make a conscious effort to hear the interview comments without assigning meanings to them during the coding and

sorting process, and when I was ready to analyze the coded and themed data, I interpreted the data using the knowledge of the IDI and the theoretical framework behind it.

Discussion of Research Question 1

This section presents discussions responding to Research Question 1: How do coaches at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural) perceive the role of culture in their work? The discussion is drawn from domains A through E, with a focus on the implications of the findings in each domain on coaching.

Domain A: Cultural factors. The more developed coaches were in their intercultural development, the more the number of cultural factors they mentioned during the interviews increased. Monocultural coaches were extremely limited in their ability to discuss culture and tended to talk about culture primarily as it related to language difference and clients' nationalities. As in the case of Coach 1, when a coach has little intentional reflection on what culture might generally mean, it is challenging, if not impossible, for the coach to examine what culture might mean in the context of coaching. This inability to substantively discuss culture is aligned with the characteristic of the Denial orientation, displaying the "low level of capability for understanding cultural differences and adapting to these differences" (Hammer, 2009).

Another finding, Mid- and High-Minimization coaches' tendency to talk about organizational culture, was consistent with one of the reflective learning exercises suggested in the Intercultural Development Plan (IDP), a document provided by IDI, LLC for the individuals whose Developmental Orientation is in Minimization: Do you believe that organizational or institutional culture is stronger or more important than

nationality, ethnicity, or class? If you do, challenge yourself to look more deeply into how you may be using the “organizational culture” template as a framework that can divert deeper attention to and recognition of national, ethnic, class or other group-based differences.

The reason behind asking the above question comes from the tendency that many individuals in Minimization overemphasize organizational cultures when talking about culture (Hammer, 2012). This tendency can hinder recognition of some important cultural factors that need to be paid attention to in coaching conversations, which can lead to the coach misunderstanding or insufficiently understanding the client and, in return, the client feeling unheard or not fully understood by the coach.

A similar tendency can be stated about the Low-Acceptance coaches who tend to discuss culture as it relates to cultures within a country. This may be simply indicating that at the Low-Acceptance level of intercultural competence, coaches may not yet be fully ready to engage in complex and potentially sensitive cultural conversations.

The last piece of discussion in this domain has to do with Low-Adaptation coaches’ tendency to jump to talking about intercultural competence. I noticed this tendency very quickly during the interviews with coaches 20 and 21, and this was an interesting finding. Even when I asked these coaches questions specifically about culture, they responded by sharing their thoughts on intercultural competence. In the interview conversations with these coaches, we never came to discussing culture, in its own sense. Instead, we jumped to discussing intercultural competence from the beginning of the interviews.

The reason for this tendency of jumping to the discussion of intercultural competence felt clear to me. As interculturally developed as these coaches are, they are craving a conversation—an intercultural conversation. Because those in the Adaptation orientation represent approximately 2.4% of the population (Hammer, 2012), it is easy to imagine how such highly interculturally developed coaches are most likely surrounded day-to-day by less developed coaches and non-coaches alike. This research interview presented a perfect opportunity for them to fully express and share their much-suppressed thoughts on culture and intercultural competence in coaching. These coaches' excitement for discussing culture during the interviews, on how they cared about the importance of intercultural competence in coaching, suggested the lack of space for them to talk about intercultural competence in their daily work environment.

Domain B: Distinction between personality and culture. Hofstede and McCrae (2004) presented an extensive review of the history of research on personality and culture since the early 20th century. Following many decades of research by both psychological and anthropological traditions, Hofstede and McCrae suggested the need for continued research on the “assessments of personality traits and their associations with features of culture” (p. 78). Considering the complex relationship between personality and culture, the finding was meaningful that coaches had varying ability to see these two factors independently and interdependently.

The findings of Domain B revealed that there was a wide range of perception among coaches when they talked about culture in relation to personality. It took the coaches reaching the Intercultural orientations to be able to pay close attention to personality and culture as two independent factors. The progression was rather stunning

from Coach 1, who was not able to distinguish personality and culture at all, to Coach 21, who was outstandingly articulate in distinguishing the two and was adapting his actions based on the understanding of both personality and culture as influencers in coaching.

This finding is alarming for the same reason that Geert Hofstede, a Dutch social psychologist, warned social science scholars in 1995:

Different social science disciplines analyse such data each at their own level of aggregation: the individual, the group, the organization, the tribe, the country.

This division of labor has developed into overspecialization: students of one discipline largely ignore developments in neighboring disciplines.

When Polarization and some of the Low-Minimization coaches make little to no distinction between personality and culture, a critical implication for coaching is the coach's inability to see the client at multiple levels of analysis, for example, as an individual, in an organization, and in a country. This is a limitation for the coach to fully understand his or her clients.

Building rapport between the coach and client is one of the most critical tasks in the coaching engagement. When a coach builds a relationship, especially when he or she experiences difficulty developing a trusting relationship, it is important to explore and ideally identify what the reason behind it might be.

Polarization coaches both described a challenging experience where they encountered a client from a different culture, however, were unable to examine the situation from the perspectives of personality difference and cultural difference. This is consistent with a challenge described by Bennett (2011) of the Denial orientation: Failure to differentiate "culture" as a category, thus, an inability to perceive or construe data from

differing cultural contexts. For example, while Coach 1 saw cultural difference as something that could cause difficulty in her coaching relationships when asked to describe further, she was only able to define a client's behavior as "her natural way of dealing with people and communicating." She was unable to "use culture as a category."

With this limitation to see personality and culture as separate factors, even when culture is at play, the coach would not be able to sufficiently guide his or her clients to explore what influencing factors were at play on any given coaching topic. For example, is the situation influenced by the client's cultural context or is the issue due to the client's preference based on his or her personality?

By not being able to separate the clients' personality and culture, the coach is not able to see the intersectionality of the two either. Even when two people have similar personalities, they can be living in very different cultural contexts, resulting in having very different life and work experiences. If the coach is unable to distinguish the two factors, personality and culture, he or she is unable to help the client unpack and sort out these factors.

Unlike those few coaches of the Polarization to Low-Minimization orientations who were unable to distinguish between personality and culture, the majority of the coaches interviewed displayed some degree of ability to make the distinction and, yet, with vastly varying degrees of ability to articulately discuss it. Some coaches showed the ability to distinguish the two factors with some limitation. An example of the limitation was when they placed much heavier weight on the clients' personality and minimized cultural influences. This presents a case of the Minimization orientation surfacing in coaching, defined by Hammer (2009) as "an orientation which is able to recognize some

patterns of cultural difference but emphasizes dealing with these identified differences through a commonality lens that can mask underlying differences.” In other words, this commonality lens of Minimization allows these coaches to discount the distinctions of personality and culture.

Only at the Low-Adaptation orientation, was a coach able to clearly distinguish personality and culture as two separate and, yet, intersecting influencing factors and give examples of utilizing this ability to reflect on his or her own decisions and actions in coaching. An example from Coach 21 showed how he used his comprehension of culture and personality to understand the coaching relationship, what was happening in that relationship, and to explore how he could improve it. In this example, after realizing that his relationship with this client was not going well, he explored what he could do to improve it and realized a potential cultural preference that the client might have had in how he wanted to be coached, which was to value coaching sessions conducted face-to-face instead of by phone. He tailored his coaching method to adapt to the cultural need of the client and switched from coaching by phone to coaching in person. After trying to make this cultural adjustment in his own coaching, he assessed that it was still not improving the relationship. At this time, he came to believe that there was something other than cultural influence at play and referred the client to another coach with greater expertise in this client’s culture. This shows that his priority was to determine the best for the client. In the end, this client was not able to work well with the new coach either, and at this time, Coach 21 finally came to believe that the challenging coach-client relationship had been due to the client’s personality or personal attitude, not his cultural background. What is apparent in this example is that, by taking both personality and

culture into consideration, Coach 21 was equipped to employ other coaching approaches to explore the best for the client, as Hofstede (1995) said, “Jumping to a different level can shed an entirely new light on existing issues” (p. 207).

Why is it important for a coach to be able to pay attention to both culture and personality? An answer drawn from this domain suggests that, unless a coach’s intercultural competence is developed into Acceptance or higher, he or she is unable to adequately identify the influence of clients’ personality and culture. Furthermore, unless the coach is at the Low-Adaptation or higher orientation, he or she is unable to use the influence of the client’s personality and culture for exploring and tailoring actions to create the best coaching engagements for the client.

This importance of paying attention to both culture and personality in coaching mirrors Hofstede’s analogy of levels of analysis using flowers, bouquets, and gardens. The analogy he uses is that of a gardener as compared to a social scientist, and I would argue to extend it to a coach, “Like flowers, bouquets and gardens represent different levels of attention of the gardener, so individuals, groups, organizations, tribes, and countries represent different levels of attention of the social scientist” (Hofstede, 1995, p. 207).

Domain C: Is culture positive or negative? For coaches to see culture as a problem or something that negatively affects coaching would have a significant implication for coaching. The coach’s negative view of culture can hinder his or her own ability to examine the role of culture in coaching and, therefore, the client’s ability to explore any role of culture in life and work.

Coaches in the Polarization to Low-Minimization groups saw culture primarily as something negative. According to some of these coaches, culture makes relationships “difficult” and “stressful” (Coach 1), creates a “problem” (Coach 2), can be “misleading” (Coach 4), makes individuals have a “wrong natural way of speaking” and becomes a “handicap” (Coach 6), makes it “challenging” and “strange” to talk to people from other cultures (Coach 7), and can become a “barrier” (Coach 9).

For example, even when Coach 2 stated culture to be something of value, when he was asked about its role in coaching, he immediately talked about culture as a problem. This was particularly striking to me, as my question was asking if culture had a “role” in coaching and, yet, he reframed the question to ask himself whether culture was a “problem” in coaching. This is consistent with the tendency of the Defense orientation, a type of Polarization, that those in this orientation are “more openly threatened by cultural differences” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 424) therefore, consider culture to be problematic.

Mid-Minimization to Low-Acceptance coaches showed somewhat more complex views of culture, but they still saw a mix of positivity and negativity in culture. It was only High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches who talked about culture in a positive light. Even when they saw a challenging aspect of culture, they displayed constructive views of culture. The individuals in the Adaptation orientation can engage in empathy with culturally different others, according to Hammer et al. (2003). This empathy and ability to see and discuss culture in constructive ways can allow coaches to explore the role of culture in their clients’ situations effectively.

Domain D: Attention to and curiosity about culture. The degree to which the coaches paid attention to and had curiosity about culture showed a tendency to grow as

their intercultural competence developed, from the Monocultural coaches who had never paid much attention to culture to the Intercultural coaches who paid stronger and more consistent attention to cultural influence in coaching, with the Minimization coaches who landed somewhere in between.

In society, where many of us lead a globally mobile and virtually connected life and work, I wonder whether any coach can claim to have a Monocultural clientele. No coach has two clients with the same cultural identities or backgrounds. Monocultural coaches' lack of experience thinking about culture and their dismissal of cultural influence in coaching is simply limiting to their capacity to understand their clients and guide them through coaching.

It was only the Intercultural coaches who showed strong and consistent attention to and curiosity about cultural influence on coaching. These coaches were extremely eager to engage in the interview and discuss intercultural competence, which made it clear to me that they had spent a significant amount of time and energy thinking about culture and maintained a high level of curiosity toward culture.

An implication of these coaches' high attention and curiosity about culture is, for any client who is aware that his or her life and work is influenced by culture, the client can bring forth a coaching topic directly or indirectly related to culture, and the coach can be ready to listen and take cultural factors into coaching consideration. At the same time, even when a client is unaware of the possible influence of culture on his or her life and work, the coach has the option of asking cultural questions and potentially bring those factors to the surface of the coaching conversation. As Rosinski and Abbott (2006) asserted, "culture is always there as an influence; it is more a matter of how much

attention we choose to give it (p. 209).” The key is that by having the high attention to and curiosity about culture, the coach has the ability to determine the level of focus he or she should give to culture in any given coaching engagement, whether or not the client is paying attention to culture.

Domain E: Talking with clients about culture. The readiness for, interest in, and the degree of talking about culture with clients was undoubtedly high for the High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches. These coaches engaged their clients in talking about culture through asking cultural questions. They saw talking about culture as a natural part of coaching, rather than something they would do when they needed to.

The attitude toward talking about culture was quite different for those with less developed intercultural competence. Compared with the Intercultural coaches, the most contrasting was of the Polarization coaches having limited experience of and interest in talking about culture with their clients. Minimization coaches talked reluctantly about culture when it came up in the coaching conversation, tried to talk indirectly about it, or wanted mainly to know the clients’ cultural specifics to avoid culture getting in their way.

These coaches at the Polarization to Minimization orientations seemed largely passive about talking about culture while the Intercultural coaches were more curious to learn about culture and asked their clients cultural questions. Rosinski and Abbott (2006) wrote:

Cultural influences are often subtle and operate beneath the surface, and people may have little awareness of the characteristics of various group cultures to which they are connected. They can, therefore, be oblivious of the influence culture may be having on their thoughts, behaviours, and emotions. In

organizations, often it is the outsider (such as the consultant, the coach, or the new employee) who can see the patterns and forces of culture at work (p. 210).

As an outsider in the client's context, a coach can play a key role in addressing culture in coaching conversations. As also discussed in the previous domain, Domain D, when lacking curiosity for and experience in talking about culture with clients, the coach is not able to talk about culture sufficiently.

Summary discussion of Research Question 1. The discussions on domains A through E illustrated how coaches at various stages of intercultural competence development perceived culture. There was a general trend in each domain and throughout domains A through E that the coaches with more interculturally developed orientations viewed and talked about culture with more interest and rigor. In summarizing the discussion on Research Question 1, I will note on this general trend.

As an illustration of how Intercultural coaches perceive culture, a synthesized description based on themes A through E is presented below. Intercultural coaches can:

1. see culture through many cultural factors,
2. pay attention to personality *and* culture,
3. see culture in positive and constructive ways,
4. pay close attention to and have high curiosity for culture, and
5. talk with clients about culture and ask cultural questions.

Discussion of Research Question 2

This section presents discussions responding to Research Question 2: How do coaches at various stages of intercultural competence development (i.e., Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural) perceive intercultural competence and its relevance to

their work? The discussion will be drawn from domains F through M, with a focus on the implications for coaching.

Domain F: Readiness to talk about intercultural competence. Only the coaches with High-Acceptance or higher orientations readily discussed intercultural competence and related terminologies in the interviews. The coach with the most developed intercultural competence, Coach 21, was exemplary. When I asked him about intercultural competence, he had no hesitation in responding or need to clarify what the term meant. He went effortlessly into the discussion, shared his own philosophy of intercultural competence, and provided examples from his own experiences. An advantage of this readiness is clear. Should intercultural competence need to be addressed in coaching, the coaches need to be equipped with a type of framework for, and a grasp of science and practice of, addressing intercultural competence, with which they can coach the clients.

The opposite can be said about the coaches with Low-Acceptance or lower orientations who are unfamiliar with intercultural competence or are not able to sufficiently use it as a lens in a conversation. When intercultural competence is not in the coach's coaching tool box, the coach will not be able to identify clients' stories or situation where intercultural competence could be a helpful lens. Therefore, the coach can be missing something that is potentially important to address in his or her coaching conversation.

Domain G: Intercultural competence is about awareness. The term *awareness* or *being aware* was used by most coaches when talking about intercultural competence. In particular, Monocultural and Transitional coaches talked about intercultural

competence largely in terms of awareness of other cultures. A question became: Is awareness enough?

In their review of the concept of intercultural awareness, Chen and Starosta (1998) gave insight by stating:

Intercultural sensitivity is the affective aspect of intercultural competence and refers to the development of a readiness to understand and appreciate cultural differences in intercultural communication. Intercultural awareness is the cognitive aspect of intercultural communication competence that refers to the understanding of cultural conventions that affect how we think and behave.

Intercultural adroitness is the behavioral aspect of intercultural communication competence that stresses these skills needed for us to act effectively in intercultural interactions. (p. 28)

The ways in which Monocultural and Transitional coaches talked about intercultural competence were, in fact, most aligned with Chen and Starosta's definition of intercultural awareness, (cognitive understanding).

Coaches with Intercultural orientations discussed intercultural competence using much more elaborate terms as well as real life examples from their own experiences. One way these coaches, particularly Low-Adaptation coaches, talked about intercultural competence was as being something beyond awareness. The statements using the word "beyond" stood out as the two Low-Adaptation coaches repeatedly used it. To these coaches, intercultural competence was something that went beyond assumptions, beyond first thoughts and observations, and beyond awareness. This notion of going beyond awareness is consistent with a characteristic of Adaptation described by Hammer et al.

(2003), “this shift is not merely cognitive; it is a change in the organization of lived experience, which necessarily includes affect and behavior” (p. 425). To use Chen and Starosta’s terms, intercultural competence, to these Low-Adaptation coaches, went beyond intercultural awareness (the cognitive) and included intercultural sensitivity (the affective) and intercultural adroitness (the behavioral).

Viewing intercultural competence not only as awareness but also as something beyond that has an implication for how the coach might coach. It is the difference between paying attention to the coaches’ and their clients’ cognitive understanding and considering all three aspects of intercultural competence: affective, cognitive, and behavioral.

Domain H: Nature or nurture. Monocultural and Transitional coaches did not make clear statements about whether intercultural competence is something people are born with (nature) or develop through their life (nurture). Some of these coaches stated that intercultural competence was important for coaches to learn, but they did not know how it could be taught and learned.

This inability or insufficiency in discussing whether intercultural competence is nature or nurture is meaningful to consider. In this study, intercultural competence was defined as something developmental. The developmental view of intercultural competence was described by Hammer (2015):

The Developmental paradigm views gains in intercultural competence as a function of the extent and quality of the individual’s engagement with cultural difference. As such, the Developmental paradigm is grounded more in the

dynamic interaction that arises between individuals rather than more static, personal characteristics (p. 12).

Within this framework, discussing whether a person is born with intercultural competence is irrelevant and, yet, in many of the interview conversations Polarization to Minimization coaches came to discuss it in that manner. This is a good indication that the coaches at the Polarization to Minimization orientations did not see intercultural competence as developmental.

Intercultural competence was talked about differently by Low-Acceptance coaches. They connected their intercultural competence to their experience with different cultures. Essentially, their claim was that because they have had many interactions with individuals from different cultures or traveled extensively, those experiences should have led to acquiring intercultural competence. Contrary to their assumptions, unfortunately, the experience of interactions itself does not result in improved intercultural competence. One of the research areas that contributes to this understanding is the long tradition of intergroup relations research, as Pettigrew and Tropp (2013) explained:

A popular refrain among advocates of integration is “if only we could get people from different groups to come together,” then we would be able to achieve improved relations between groups. Unfortunately, achieving positive effects of intergroup contact is not always so simple.

Another area of research that can offer insight is study abroad. In their recent study of a short-term instructor-led study abroad program, Anderson, Lorenz, and White (2016) reported:

A key finding of our research is that frequent and spontaneous facilitation by instructors has a strong impact on achieving intercultural gains in students. The most effective instructors are those who create a safe place to debrief, where students can explore cultural challenges. (p. 17)

Their research findings show that having instructors to facilitate learners' reflection is a key factor in turning study abroad experience into intercultural learning, and simply sending students abroad does not always result in intercultural competence development.

Cultural experience such as going abroad and intentional, reflective activities such as mentoring must interact with each other to create significant gains in intercultural competence development (Hammer, 2012), and "being immersed in a foreign culture does not necessarily demonstrate that they are learning how to shift cultural perspective or adapt behavior" (Hammer, 2012, p. 126). I found it very telling that, while Low-Acceptance coaches were interculturally aware enough to claim that they have the experience necessary to develop their intercultural competence but lacked a further insight that experience alone was not sufficient, those at the higher, High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation, orientations did not make such presumed connections. I could not help but wonder if more highly interculturally competent coaches, High-Acceptance to Low-Adaptation coaches, knew that their experience in itself was not sufficient to develop their intercultural competence beyond a certain point in the process of development, thus, did not claim their experience to have already developed their intercultural competence.

Domain I: Relationship to difference. The ways in which the coaches talked about difference during the interviews illustrated the developmental process of intercultural competence. To the Low-Polarization coach, difference was something "to

deal with,” and she was concerned with being appropriate. Overall, she talked about difference as something that must to be dealt with and is unfavorable. This is consistent with the tendency of the individuals in Polarization to believe difference to be “divisive and threatening” (Hammer, 2009, p. 207) as well as “uncomfortable” (Hammer, 2012, p. 121) and to see cultural difference “as an obstacle to be overcome” (Hammer, 2009, p. 207).

Coaches of High-Polarization to Mid-Minimization spoke to both the commonality and difference of people. This was a development in intercultural competence from Low-Polarization where the coach only spoke briefly to the differences of people. These coaches, to varying degrees, saw both commonality and difference.

High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches spent more time discussing difference. However, this time, the way these coaches talked about difference was very dissimilar to the way the Low-Polarization coach talked about difference. Unlike the Polarization coach’s view of difference, these more interculturally developed coaches discussed the differences of people in more complex and nuanced ways and did so with seemingly endless examples they could provide.

The implication for coaching is clear. As a coach, is one able to pay attention to difference, and difference only, as in the Low-Polarization orientation or, is one able to pay attention to both difference and commonality, but with a skewed weight on one or the other, as in the High-Polarization to Mid-Minimization? Alternatively, as those coaches with more developed intercultural competence did, is one able to focus attention on both difference and commonality in more complex and sophisticated ways?

At the Acceptance orientation, an individual becomes “able to experience others as different from themselves, but equally human” (Bennett, 2012, p. 108). Paying attention to and interacting with others through both difference and commonality can be a critical ability in coaching because it applies to the relationship building between coach and client as well as the relationships the client has between self and the people around him or her. Without being able to pay attention to both difference and commonality, the coach is most likely missing some influencing factors of these relationships.

Domain J: Importance of intercultural competence in coaching. The trend in how the coaches saw the importance of intercultural competence in coaching was reflective of their intercultural competence development. It varied from Polarization coaches seeing limited importance to Minimization coaches seeing the importance but with more relevance in some coaching situations than others to Intercultural coaches considering intercultural competence to be a critical key in coaching.

The Low-Polarization coach’s comments represented the limitation in her view of intercultural competence. She stated that it was important to be aware and considerate when a client came from a different cultural background. However, the importance she recognized was limited. She believed that a coach needed to “keep that in mind” but “it’s not going to alter the coaching conversation necessarily.”

In her essay, Barosa-Pereira (2014) asked, “What role does cultural awareness play in coaching?” The findings in this domain call for a clarification of the question itself. Is it the awareness that we want to know about? If I am to take the Low-Polarization coach’s word for it, she believes that awareness is important. Yet, she did not believe the awareness applied in her coaching practice. This case presents evidence

that awareness by itself did not encourage the coaches to alter coaching practice; there is more to intercultural competence than awareness that one needs to be asking about.

Minimization coaches varied in how important they believed intercultural competence was for them in coaching. Some of these coaches stated that it was important as well as they felt well equipped with it already. This was reflective of the overestimation of their own intercultural competence. The individual's cognitive awareness (their PO) does not always mirror their current ability (the DO). Due to this overestimation, Minimization coaches can feel adequately equipped with intercultural competence even though they are at the orientation where their capacity to view difference is still limited.

Polarization to Minimization coaches may find it relevant for them to further develop intercultural competence. Now we know that intercultural competence development is a multilevel process beyond awareness. For a coach to learn and develop intercultural competence further, he or she must see intercultural competence as something beyond awareness.

Domain K: Interculturally competent coaching. There was a noticeable jump in the coaches' ability to talk about what interculturally competent coaching might look like between Low- to Mid-Minimization coaches and High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches. Low- to Mid-Minimization coaches struggled to describe what interculturally competent coaching would look like while High-Minimization to Intercultural coaches had many examples of how they did or could alter how they coached as they saw the differing needs of their clients.

I became curious as to why this jump happened at High-Minimization, which led me to take another look at the IDI data. A possibility that surfaced was that the ability of the High-Minimization or higher orientations to envision what interculturally competent coaching might look like might be supported by their PO scores. The PO scores of the coaches of the Mid-Minimization or lower orientations were below 125, with one exception. The PO scores of those of the High-Minimization or higher orientations were close to 130 or higher. A possibility is that coaches begin to develop an ability to imagine what interculturally competent coaching might look like around when their PO develops close to 130.

An implication can be in the field of coach training. To envision and design coach training programs for interculturally competent coaching, individuals who can articulate such coaching need to be sought out. This means that coach training programs for interculturally competent coaching need to be created by individuals at the High-Minimization or higher orientations, who have the PO score that is close to Adaptation. Furthermore, because of the PO, fully integrating the intercultural competence perspective into coach training design most likely requires the individuals whose DO score is at Adaptation.

Domain L: Coaching for clients' intercultural competence. Some of the Mid-Minimization to Low-Adaptation coaches talked about the development of their clients' intercultural competence. As clients come to their coaches with various issues or goals in mind to address through coaching, it may be on clients' minds to develop intercultural competence. This means that not all clients see the development of their intercultural competence to be on their coaching agenda. However, one thing is clear. When and if a

client comes to a coach with a challenge that relates to the lack of intercultural competence or a specific goal of developing intercultural competence, only the coaches who pay attention to intercultural competence and are equipped to help others develop it can coach such a client.

Rosinski and Abbott (2015) using Milton Bennett's DMIS, an original theoretical framework on which the IDC is based, to discuss the usefulness of coaches' having the knowledge of developmental stages of this model, "Coaches who operate with an awareness of these stages can assist their clients to follow their own journeys in productively exploring cultural diversity" (p. 213). Is this true? Can a coach effectively guide a client to explore cultural diversity only if he or she knows the stages? As discussed in earlier domains, knowing the framework may raise awareness, but the actual ability to effectively navigate cultural difference and commonality can very likely be limited unless the coach has a DO at the Adaptation orientation.

Rosinski and Abbott (2015) stated:

Intercultural coaching can assist coachees move through these stages, though the shifts are uneven and not easily measured. The coach encourages coachees to operate with ethno relative approaches. The coach supports coachees as they step outside their cultural comfort zones and accept alternate cultural views as valid. (p. 213)

For this statement to be true, coaches who purport to assist and work with clients' intercultural competence development must themselves develop their own intercultural competence to be effective.

Domain M: Intercultural competence in coach training. A consensus of most coaches was that there are limited learning opportunities currently available for coaches to develop intercultural competence. Personally, I was disappointed and pleased to find this trend. The disappointment is that it confirmed my assumption that there were not sufficient learning opportunities, and the positive was that many coaches, in fact, thought that they lacked such opportunities, instead of assuming that they already had sufficient intercultural competence. As one of the Mid-Minimization coaches said, there probably are coaches in the larger coaching community who believe intercultural competence should naturally develop as part of being trained as a coach. Also, as a Mid-Minimization coach pointed out, there probably are many coaches who do not see intercultural competence as a key component of being a coach.

In discussing intercultural coaching, Glen Sebera (2015) wrote:

Coaching as a discipline contains its own specific competencies for its professional process. In all coaching initiatives (not only those leading to the goal of intercultural competency), the coach must be able to assess the coachee's immediate level of awareness and capacity for each outcome that is important for the coachee. The coach then develops, in advance or during the coaching meeting, action items for the coachee to engage in prior to the next meeting. In coaching for intercultural competency, the coach must constantly assess each component while working with the highly individual and specific needs for success within the coachee's context. The coach does this by learning the following competencies required to assist others in their development of intercultural competence (p. 4).

According to Sebera, the core coaching competencies required of coaches are, (a) asking questions, (b) listening, (c) assessing and designing a coaching program, and (d) maintaining an ongoing relationship (pp. 4-6). A piece missing from this list of competencies is intercultural competence. To assess the clients' intercultural competence and assist him or her to develop it further, the coach himself or herself must possess intercultural competence that is developed highly enough to carry out those tasks.

One thing that became clear through the findings of this study is that intercultural competence plays a role in coaching. It influences the ways coaches see culture and intercultural competence in coaching. Barosa-Pereira (2014) asserted that the individuals at the Denial orientation "can't be a coach" (p. 108). However, in this study, there was a coach whose DO score was 75.9, which is only 5.9 points above Denial. The reality could be that there are individuals whose primary orientation is in Denial and work as a coach.

If the coaching community is to take this into consideration, it must utilize the coaches who are aware of the impact of intercultural competence on coaching, raise awareness of the importance throughout the coaching community, and include sufficient learning opportunities within coach training. I discuss some suggestions for coach training in Chapter Six.

Summary discussion of Research Question 2. The discussions on domains F through M illustrated how coaches at various stages of intercultural competence development perceived intercultural competence. As was with their perceptions of culture, there was a trend in each domain and throughout domains F through M that more interculturally developed coaches considered intercultural competence to play an important role in coaching and discussed it with more complexity. In summarizing the

discussion on Research Question 2, I note this general trend of the coaches' growing understanding of and curiosity toward intercultural competence as they develop their own intercultural competence.

As an illustration of how Intercultural coaches perceive intercultural competence, I present below a synthesized description based on themes F through M. Intercultural coaches can:

- talk readily about intercultural competence,
- see intercultural competence not only as awareness but also as many other things beyond awareness,
- not assume that intercultural competence develops naturally or simply by having global experiences,
- talk about difference and commonality in complex ways and easily offer examples,
- see intercultural competence as a critical key to coaching,
- envision what interculturally competent coaching might look like, and
- coach for clients' intercultural competence development.

Summary of Major Findings: Illustrations of Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural Coaches

For the findings in Chapter Four and discussion in Chapter Five, I organized the study results by 13 domains and 46 themes. By doing so, I was able to report the themes that emerged from the interviews and discuss how the coaches at various stages of intercultural development talked about each theme. As I was writing the findings and discussions, I realized that I was beginning to see the general image of the coaches at

different stages. These illustrations respond to the critique by Leung, Ang, and Tan (2014) of the existing intercultural competence literature, which was discussed in Chapter Two. They argued that the past literature identified personal characteristics of intercultural competence but lacked research on how interculturally competent individuals actually behave in specific job contexts. They suggested, “a crucial future research direction is to identify context-specific intercultural competencies for specific job roles in well-defined intercultural contexts, as this type of research will be most useful to inform practitioners about effective behaviors in a given intercultural context” (Leung, Ang, & Tan, 2014, pp. 510-511).

One disclaimer to be noted is that this is a sample illustration. Because my study participant size was small ($n = 21$), I was not able to illustrate in the way that one illustration would fit all coaches at any given stage of intercultural development. That being said, I believe that it would be meaningful to present an illustration of how coaches in each of the Monocultural, Transitional, and Intercultural orientations might perceive and talk about culture and intercultural competence. Each orientation’s illustration is based on the themes that were associated with that particular orientation.

Illustration of Monocultural coaches. The coaches whose primary orientation is in Polarization talked about culture mostly as it relates to language difference and clients’ nationalities. These coaches had not considered culture much before and had limited experience of and interest in talking about culture with their clients, and they saw culture primarily as a problem. They easily dismissed cultural influence in coaching.

The coaches were unfamiliar with intercultural competence. To them, intercultural competence was about being aware of and understanding different cultures

and not being prejudiced toward difference or simply about being able to deal with different people. To them, intercultural competence had limited importance in coaching and would not alter coaching conversations. They believed that current coach training programs were not sufficiently teaching intercultural competence.

Illustration of Transitional coaches. The coaches whose primary orientation is in Minimization saw cultural difference as part of individual uniqueness. Some acknowledged cultural influence in coaching. The coaches recognized both commonality and difference of culture, but they would only reluctantly talk with clients about culture when it had to be brought up. When they talked about culture, they tended to discuss it as it related to organizational culture.

To these coaches, intercultural competence was about being aware of and understanding different cultures. They saw intercultural competence more relevant in some coaching situations than others. While they thought their own intercultural competence to be adequate, they asserted that most coaches lacked the awareness of the importance of intercultural competence. The coaches believed that intercultural competence should naturally develop as part of being trained as a coach.

Illustration of Intercultural coaches. The coaches whose primary orientation was in Acceptance or Adaptation had positive and constructive views of culture and paid strong and consistent attention to cultural influence in coaching. They made clear distinctions between personality and culture and talked about how to use them to tailor their own actions. In coaching, they asked their clients questions related to culture.

These coaches considered intercultural competence as a critical key in coaching and readily discussed intercultural competence and related terminologies. They talked

about specific coaching situations where they were able to help develop their clients' intercultural competence. The coaches talked about some learning opportunities for developing intercultural competence currently available in or outside coach training programs.

Interviews as Unintended Intervention

The last topic of discussion in this chapter came organically out of the interviews during the data collection. As I was interviewing the coaches, many (especially those in the Monocultural and Minimization orientations) increasingly became more eloquent in talking about culture and intercultural competence as we progressed in the interview. It was as if the interview itself was providing the opportunity, an intervention of sorts, to give thought to the topics. For example, Coach 1 lived and worked in a country where three languages are spoken. When I asked whether culture mattered when she coached individuals from regions where different languages were spoken, it was then, with my prompting to think about culture, that she took the time to reflect and made a connection to culture:

There are slight differences—that goes as far as maybe slightly different behavior or expressing themselves. So, it . . . so, yes! . . . because it's almost like there are three cultures within the country! . . . by the mere fact of having the language separation.

Coach 2, when asked about culture, other than in the form of language, playing a role in coaching, his first response was that he had not thought about it. He then paused to reflect further and realized that he, in fact, had an example of a cultural difference that was not about language:

Although, let me think, that rings a bell. I wonder . . . no. Well, well, you know, one of my folks in *Country S*, we were talking about salary, and he said, “Well, of course, here we don’t do salary. One simply gives the present of work to get a gift of pay.” You know, that’s a cultural difference. But it didn’t make any difference in the way we coach.

During the interview, Coach 9 laughed and said, “This is a very interesting conversation.” She explained, “I never get to discuss these things with people because most of the people I interact with . . . we don’t normally talk about culture.” These examples show that the coaches may not have thought much about culture before but could be easily encouraged to explore simply by having the opportunity to reflect as well as having someone to ask them appropriate questions about culture. Participating in the research interview functioned as an intervention for reflection on culture and experience of verbally sharing their thoughts, which possibly contributed to their own intercultural development.

Chapter Six: Recommendations and Conclusion

In this last chapter, I first discuss study strengths and limitations. Second, I present recommendations for future coaching research, coaching practice, and coach training. Last, I conclude the current study by sharing some personal reflections on the process of this research project.

Study Strengths and Limitations

Strengths. There are two key strengths in this study. The first is that I, the primary investigator, had expertise in both coaching and intercultural competence development. The coaches who participated in the study were very open and willing to discuss their perspectives on culture, intercultural competence, and coaching, and all interview conversations were very informative. To fully understand the interviewees and analyze the data, I believed that the high level of expertise in not only one but both fields of coaching and intercultural competence was absolutely necessary.

Second, another key contribution is that this study utilized the combination of qualitative and quantitative tools, individual interviews, and the IDI respectively. This is a contribution that responds to Barosa-Pereira's (2014) advocacy in her essay:

So far, the empirical research around cross-cultural coaching has been focused on dimensions to take into consideration while coaching. A more concrete approach is still missing where we could identify specific attitudes at the level of the heartset dimension to observe when considering what should be the competencies for a coach to be called a global coach. (p. 109)

There are two shortcomings addressed in Barosa-Pereira's statement:

- lack of cross-cultural coaching research taking a developmental approach, instead of only focusing on cultural dimensions and
- lack of cross-cultural coaching research taking a concrete approach to identifying specific attitudes at the level of the heartset, or affective, dimension.

Wendy Wilson (2013) responded to the first need for research taking a developmental approach concerning “the concept of global mindedness from the perspective of the coaching profession” (p. 34). She investigated the *global mindset* of coaches and conducted her analysis utilizing Robert Kegan’s constructive developmental theory. She concluded that “it is their [coaches] own level of development that defines the cross-cultural coaches’ perspective on the global mindedness concept” (p. 46). As mentioned earlier, while Wilson employed a developmental approach, she did not meet the second need for taking a concrete approach to identifying specific attitudes. By employing the grounded theory method of generating results based on interviews, Wilson reported the themes that described coaches’ perceptions on global mindedness. While the findings contribute to the coaching research body, a shortcoming is that there was no objective measure of the interviewees’ stages of development. In other words, the data analysis must take everyone’s word for what it is, regardless of where interviewees land in the stages of intercultural development.

The current study advanced Barosa-Pereira’s and Wilson’s contributions by responding to both of the research needs above. One is to take a developmental approach to intercultural competence of coaches instead of “focusing on cultural dimensions.” The other is to apply a “more concrete approach” to the investigation by using the IDI, a psychometric instrument. By doing so, I was able to capture coaches’ voices through

interviews and, at the time of analysis and report, was able to organize their statements in groups reflective of coaches' stages of intercultural development.

Limitations

One limitation of this study, as was discussed in Chapter Three, is the sample size. Because the current study had an exploratory nature, the data collection relied on individual qualitative interviews to capture the voices of the coaches. Therefore, I had a limited number of interviewees I was able to realistically interview. To quantitatively show the evidence of how differently or similarly the coaches at different stages of intercultural development perceived culture and intercultural competence, it would need to wait for another future study including a larger number of participants.

Another limitation I experienced in this study was the constraints in fully describing the interview results. Due to the anonymity of the coaches who I wanted to ensure protecting, I decided to give them aliases such as "Coach 1." I also changed country names, region names, and city names (e.g., *Country A*) that were mentioned in the interviews, with the purpose of ensuring that no coach could be identified. Because of this, some of the contextual information was lost in the reporting of the data analysis; thus, it may have compromised the richness of the qualitative nuances.

Coaching Research Recommendations

As I discussed in the previous section, the current study is one of the beginning pieces of interculturally competent coaching research. Below, I propose research topics that deserve attention in the coming years.

Conceptual shift from intercultural awareness to intercultural competence.

Awareness, for awareness sake, is not enough. The findings showed that less

interculturally developed coaches relied on the idea of being aware and, in some cases, believed that there was no need to alter their coaching due to cultural difference while more interculturally developed coaches talked elaborately about many factors related to intercultural competence beyond awareness.

An area of future research needed is a conceptual one. In addition to the coaches in the current study using the term awareness to explain intercultural competence, I noticed that many of the existing research studies have resorted to doing the same. Is discussing intercultural awareness the same as intercultural competence? As a result of this study, I believe that awareness speaks well to one's cognitive understanding or knowing. Therefore, when exploring interculturally competent coaching, we must study awareness and what is beyond it. We need to define better what intercultural awareness and intercultural competence is.

Empirical research on coach-client engagement. The current study focused on the perceptions of coaches on culture and intercultural competence. To take this a step further, we need to examine the effects of culture and intercultural competence on the coach-client relationship and interactions. In doing so, it will be most informative to have coach-client pairs of various intercultural competence levels. For example, how does the coaching engagement look between an Adaptation coach and Polarization client? How about a Minimization coach and Adaptation client?

Coaching Practice Recommendations

After uncovering how much and in what ways coaches' intercultural competence influence their perceptions, I have a few recommendations for practicing coaches and coaches in training.

Using the IDI for own intercultural learning and development. I recommend that coaches utilize the IDI or other equivalent instruments, for their own intercultural learning. In his article exploring interculturally-sensitive coaching, Van Nieuwerburgh (2016) stated:

As we have suggested in this chapter, interculturally-sensitive coaching is complex. While it has been possible to propose some best practice suggestions for consideration, there are some challenges that require further reflection. Each coach will need to find a way of navigating the challenges (p. 449).

As van Nieuwerburgh said, even when we recognize the need for training for intercultural competence, or in his term *intercultural sensitivity*, it is not easy to know how to train for it. Using the IDI for intercultural learning will be a meaningful option for coaches to consider as the IDI Guided Development has shown to increase intercultural capacity (Hammer, 2012).

Intercultural coach supervision. As much as clients are on their journey of developing intercultural competence, coaches are on theirs as well. Accepting the reality that many coaches, in fact, most coaches, have not developed into the Adaptation orientation, van Nieuwerburgh's (2016) recommendation becomes appropriate that "coaching supervision be sought from an interculturally-sensitive coach supervisor" (p. 449). For example, a coach at the Minimization orientation can be supervised by an intercultural coach supervisor whose orientation (DO) is in Adaptation, to ensure that the coach is not missing important differences due to a focus on commonality. Through such supervision, the coach can be guided and develop his or her own intercultural competence.

Using the IDI to assess the effectiveness of intercultural coaching. When a coach claims to coach for developing clients' intercultural competence, how can he or she assess the effectiveness of his or her coaching? One way is to utilize the IDI as pre- and posttests. A client can take the IDI to assess the state of intercultural competence at the start of the coaching engagement and again at the end to examine the growth.

Coach Training Recommendations

Cultural factors. I suggest that coach training programs teach a greater variety of cultural factors, such as those by Geert Hofstede (1984), including *individualism versus collectivism, large versus small power distance, strong versus weak uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity*, and encourage the coaches to consider the diversity of diversity. Instead of seeing cultural diversity only through a few factors such as nationality and language, the coaches can know that there are many more factors to comprise the diversity of people. By including this information in coach training programs, coaches can simply increase their knowledge of what cultural factors contribute to the diversity of people.

Personality and culture. I suggest that coach training programs provide a more comprehensive survey of the disciplines that relate to coaching. The reality of most coaches having non- to limited ability to distinguish personality and culture is alarming. This can stem from the lack of variety in disciplinary perspectives. Minimally, coach training programs should include the foundation of psychology to address what personality means as well as the foundation of intercultural studies to address what culture means.

When offering a coach training program, the coach educators and the coach training school understandably promote their own coaching methodology. However, the coaches in training must be aware that there are multiple disciplines, such as management studies, psychology, training and development, as well as intercultural studies, as mentioned in chapters 1 and 2, that have supported and are continuing to strengthen the field of coaching.

Intercultural competence development. From the current study, it is clear that a coach's intercultural competence influences his or her perceptions of culture and intercultural competence in coaching. Consequently, coach training programs should include the aspect of intercultural competence development, if they intend to train coaches to be able to coach individuals of diverse backgrounds, which essentially mean any clients. The ICCD framework, proposed in Chapter Two, would be a guiding model for designing coach training. By using the framework, we can address specific types of challenges and strengths an individual might have, depending on where he or she lands on the intercultural development process. As a result, coach training programs can more effectively train and assess the coaches in training.

Conclusion

The ICF's coaching core competencies tell coaches to "dance in the moment" with their clients. Through the lens of interculturally competent coaching, I would pose some questions to accompany this "core competency."

Whose dance are you dancing? If you are dancing in Minimization or below, without knowing, could you be forcing your clients to dance the type of dance you like to dance? If so, is it still effective? Is that what clients want?

Do you know *how to dance* in different ways, so you can dance the dance your client chooses to dance? Do your clients even know how to dance the dance they want to dance?

If you or your client does not dance well enough, do you know *how to practice* or where you can seek help for practice?

Do you know *how to evaluate* your ability to dance, so you can pursue appropriate continuing education? How do you measure your growth as a dancer?

Last, *why do you dance*? Do you know why your client wants to dance? Does your client know why he or she wants to dance? Why would your client want to dance with you?

I would argue “dancing in the moment” is a very complex competency. By developing our intercultural competence as coaches, I believe that we will have a more multi-faceted view of the “dance” of coaching.

For this study, data collection began in February 2014 and continued until March 2015. As I finally come to the end of writing this dissertation, I have learned of more recent research studies and theoretical articles. I would like to conclude this research by expressing my excitement at this particular point in time in the field of coaching as it relates to culture and intercultural competence. I am excited to be contributing this current piece of research and looking forward to continuing working on improving the field of coaching and intercultural competence development.

References

- Abbott, G. N., Stening, B. W., Atkins, P. W., & Grant, A. M. (2006). Coaching expatriate managers for success: Adding value beyond training and mentoring. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 44*(3), 295-317.
- Anderson, C. L., Lorenz, K., & White, M. (2016). Instructor influence on student intercultural gains and learning during instructor-led, short-term study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 28*, 1-23.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 100-123.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organization Review, 3*, 335-371.
- Baron, L., & Morin, L. (2009). The coach-coachee relationship in executive coaching: A field study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20*(1), 85-106.
- Barosa-Pereira, A. (2014). Building cultural competencies in coaching: Essay for the first steps. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture, 5*(2), 98-112.
- Bennett, M. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*(2), 179-196.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A development model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (1993). Yarmouth, MN: Intercultural Press.

- Bennett, M. J. (1998). Intercultural communication: A current perspective. *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings*, 1-34.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education*, 2, 62-78. Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Bennett, M. J. (2011). *A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity*. Retrieved from http://www.idrinstitute.org/allegati/IDRI_t_Pubblicazioni/47/FILE_Documento_Bennett_DMIS_12pp_quotes_rev_2011.pdf
- Bennett, M. J. (2012). Paradigmatic assumptions and a developmental approach to intercultural learning. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*, 90-114.
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2001). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. Retrieved from <http://www.diversitycollegium.org/>
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. *Handbook of intercultural training*, 147-165.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1978). *The restructuring of social and political theory*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bhawuk, D., Landis, D., & Munusamy, V. (2008). *Understanding the basics of culture. Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations*, 7-31. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Bluckert, P. (2005). Critical factors in executive coaching—the coaching relationship. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 37*(7), 336-340.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Constructivist and objectivist grounded theory. *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2*, 509-535.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. (1998). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. Kingston, RI: University of Rhode Island Digital Commons.
- Curry, C. D. (2015). Coaching global teams and global team leaders. In *Leading Global Teams* (pp. 141-168). New York, NY: Springer.
- Daouk-Öyry, L., & Rosinski, P. (2010). Coaching across cultures. In S. Palmer & S. McDowall (Eds.) *The coaching relationship: Putting people first*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. A. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Endicott, L., Bock, T., & Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral reasoning, intercultural development, and multicultural experiences: Relations and cognitive underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(4), 403-419.
- Goh, M. (2005). Cultural competence and master therapists: An inextricable relationship. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(1), 71-81.
- Grant, A. M. (2009). *Workplace, executive and life coaching: An annotated bibliography from the behavioural science literature*. Sydney, Australia: Coaching Psychology Unit, University of Sydney.
- Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. New York, NY: Anchor.

- Hall, E. T. (1984). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. New York, NY: Anchor.
- Hammer, M. R. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(4), 474-487.
- Hammer, M. R. (2009). The intercultural development inventory. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence*, 203-217. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammer, M. H. (2005). The intercultural conflict style inventory: A conceptual framework and measure of intercultural conflict resolution approaches. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 675-695.
- Hammer, M. (2012). The intercultural development inventory: A new frontier in assessment and development of intercultural competence. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad* (pp. 115-136). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Hammer, M. R. (2015). The developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 12-13.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International journal of intercultural relations*, 27(4), 421-443.
- Handin, K., & Steinwedel, J. S. (2006). Developing global leaders: Executive coaching targets cross-cultural competencies. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 26(1), 18-28.

- Hanley, J. H. (1999). Beyond the tip of the iceberg. *Reaching today's youth. The Community Circle of Caring Journal*, 3(2), 9-12.
- Hofstede, G. (1981). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 10(4), 15-41.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, 1(2), 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (1995). Multilevel research of human systems: Flowers, bouquets and gardens. *Human Systems Management*, 14(3), 207-217.
- Hofstede, G. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software for the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-cultural research*, 38(1), 52-88.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative, and the interview method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- International Coach Federation. (2012a). *2012 ICF global coaching study*. Lexington, KY: International Coach Federation.
- International Coach Federation. (2012b). *Background information and membership facts: April 2012*. Lexington, KY: International Coach Federation.
- Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53(4), 205.
- Leung, K., Ang, S., & Tan, M. L. (2014). Intercultural competence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 489-519.

- Lindsey, D. B., Martinez, R. S., & Lindsey, R. B. (Eds.). (2006). *Culturally proficient coaching: Supporting educators to create equitable schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence a review of available tests. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(6), 849-873.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Revised and expanded from "case study research in education."* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miser, A. (2010). *Cross-cultural coaching: Ensuring success over the life cycle of an expatriate assignment*. [Unpublished paper].
- Moral, M., & Warnock, P. (2005). Coaching and culture—Towards the global coach. *Coaching for leadership: The practice of leadership coaching from the world's greatest coaches* (2nd ed.). Pfeiffer, New York: Goldsmith & Lyons Edts.
- O'Broin, A., & Palmer, S. (2010). Exploring key aspects in the formation of coaching relationships: Initial indicators from the perspective of the coachee and the coach. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 3(2), 124-143.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2007). *Maximizing study abroad* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.
- Passmore, J., & Law, H. (2009). Cross-cultural and diversity coaching. In J. Passmore & H. Law (Eds.), *Diversity in coaching: Working with gender, culture, race, and age* (p. 4). London, UK: Kogan Page.

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Strategic themes in qualitative inquiry. In M. Q. Patton (Ed.), *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*, (p. 37-73). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peterson, D. B. (2007). Executive coaching in a cross-cultural context. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 59(4), 261.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2013). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. Abingdon, UK: Psychology Press.
- Rosinski, P. (2003). *Coaching across cultures: New tools for leveraging, national, corporate, and professional differences*. Yarmouth, ME: Nicholas Brealey.
- Rosinski, P., & Abbott, G. (2006). Intercultural coaching. In Passmore, J. (Ed.), *Excellence in coaching: The industry guide* (pp. 153-169). London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Rosinski, P., & Abbott, G. (2015). Intercultural coaching. In Passmore, J. (Ed.), *Excellence in coaching: The industry guide* (pp. 209-225). London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sebera, G. (2015). Coaching for intercultural competence. In Bennett, J. M. (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Smither, J. W. (2011). Can psychotherapy research serve as a guide for research about executive coaching? An agenda for the next decade. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(2), 135-145.
- Sperry, L. (2010). *Highly effective therapy: Developing essential clinical competencies in counseling and psychotherapy*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The Free Dictionary. (n.d.). Interculturalism. In online. Retrieved from http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Interculturalism#cite_note-1
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American journal of evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246.
- Van Der Zee, K. I., & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2000). The multicultural personality questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality, 14*(4), 291-309.
- Van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2016). Interculturally-sensitive coaching. In T. Bachkirova, G. Spence, and D. Drake (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of coaching*, (p. 439-452).
- Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for performance: GROWing human potential and purpose—the principles and practice of coaching and leadership (people skills for professionals)*. London, UK: Nicholas Brealey.
- Wilson, W. (2013). Coaching with a global mindset. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring, 11*(2).

Zapata-Barrero, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Interculturalism in cities: Concept, policy, and implementation*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Appendix A

Guiding Interview Questions

1. Would you please tell me about the type of coaching you do?

Potential probing questions.

- How did you get into that particular type of coaching?
 - What makes you a good _____ coach?
2. Please take a few minutes to recall an experience when you think culture affected your coaching. What was the experience like?

Potential probing questions.

- What did you do or say? What happened?
 - In what coaching situations do you tend to pay attention to culture?
 - Do you talk about culture as part of your coaching conversations? If so, in what situations?
3. What does the term “intercultural competence” mean to you in your work as a coach?
 4. Please take a few minutes to recall an experience when you think intercultural competence affected your coaching. What was the experience like?

Potential probing questions.

- What did you do or say? What happened?
- In what coaching situations do you think intercultural competence (your own and your client’s) affects your coaching?
- In what coaching situations do you tend to pay attention to intercultural competence?

- Do you talk about intercultural competence as part of your coaching conversations? If so, in what situations?
5. How important do you feel intercultural competence is for coaches or coaching? And why?
 6. Do you have anything else you would like to share with me regarding culture and intercultural competence in coaching?

Potential probing questions.

- Of all the things we have talked about today, what else would you like to elaborate on?
- Is there anything you would like to tell me about?

Appendix B

Initial Invitation to the Study

Hello dear fellow professional coaches,

My name is Akiko Maeker. I am an ICF member coach and also a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Minnesota, USA, conducting research.

I am looking to find practicing, experienced coaches who have valuable insight into how culture affects coaching. More specifically, I plan to research how professional coaches perceive the roles of culture and intercultural competence in coaching. The purpose of this study is to generate new knowledge from the input of professional coaches regarding how culture may or may not affect coaching.

The ICF (International Coach Federation) approved their research assistance for my study. So, there is a post on the ICF's Linked In group page with the same information (<http://lnkd.in/bGXzhGD>).

I am wondering if you would be willing to help spread the word by sending the information out to your coach connections, and more importantly, participate in the study yourself.

I would be very grateful if you find it meaningful to participate in this research and offer your insight. If so, please simply send an email to me at sasa0010@umn.edu , with "Send me the survey!" in the title. I will then email you with further information and a link to the survey.

Thank you in advance,

Akiko Maeker

Appendix C

Invitation to the IDI

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study on intercultural coaching! I am so glad that you are willing to take part and provide invaluable information and insight! Below are the directions for completing an online inventory/questionnaire. The inventory is called the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI).

Your results will be confidential and used only for the purposes of my research. If, at any point in the process of completing the inventory, you choose to withdraw from the participation, you can do so without any questions asked or any other negative consequences. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Also, there is consent information attached to this email. Please review the information, and you can express your consent simply by clicking on the web link to the IDI (provided below). If you decide not to participate in the survey, you can simply not click on the link and disregard this invitation.

Here are the directions for completing the IDI:

IDI directions were provided here.

If you have problems logging in, please let me know.

Thank you very much in advance, Laurent, for your participation.

Regards,

Akiko Maeker

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is: Akiko Maeker, Department of Organizational Leadership Policy and Development, University of Minnesota, and the study is supervised by her academic advisor, Dr. Michael Goh. If you have questions, please do

not hesitate to contact Akiko at +1-612-986-7943 (mobile phone) or sasa0010@umn.edu (email) or Dr. Goh at +1-612-624-2590 (office phone) or gohxx001@umn.edu (email).

Appendix D

Invitation to Potential Interviewees

Hello again! It has been a few months since you completed the survey for my research study. I am very grateful for your participation. Now I am beginning the second phase of data collection for the study. Would you please consider being interviewed by me?

Your input will be only used for the purposes of my research. When reporting the information, I will remove the identifiers for who you are, such as your name and company/organization name, and describe it in a way that others will not be able to identify who the interviewee is. That being said, if you have any other concerns or questions, please do not hesitate to ask me or other contacts at the bottom of this email. Also, if, at any point in the process of your interview, you choose to withdraw from the participation, you can do so without any questions asked or any other negative consequences.

If you are available and willing, below are the potential interview dates/times. Please let me know which timeslots will work for you. An interview should take approximately 30-90 minutes, depending on how our conversation goes and how much time you are able to give me. We can talk by phone or via virtual programs such as Skype or Google Hangouts. If you are in town (Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota, USA), we can meet in person as well.

To schedule your interview, please reply to this email with the information below.

1. Please indicate 1st and 2nd date/time preferences. If these dates/times do not work for you, please let me know. I will be happy to suggest more options for the future dates.

Dates were listed here.

2. Please choose your preferred mode of communication.
- a. Skype (Please indicate your Skype ID. I will send you a request for connecting.)
 - b. Google Hangouts
 - c. Phone (Please let me know the number I can call.)
 - d. In person (Please let me know where you would like to meet.)

Thank you, and I will look forward to your reply!

Best regards,

Akiko

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is: Akiko Maeker, Department of Organizational Leadership Policy and Development, University of Minnesota, and the study is supervised by her academic advisor, Dr. Michael Goh. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact Akiko at +1-612-986-7943 (mobile phone) or sasa0010@umn.edu (email) or Dr. Goh at +1-612-624-2590 (office phone) or gohxx001@umn.edu (email).

Appendix E

Consent Information

CONSENT INFORMATION FORM

Professional Coaches' Perceptions of Culture in Coaching

You are invited to be in a research study of professional coaches' perceptions of culture in the coaching context. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a member of the International Coach Federation (ICF) and expressed interest and willingness to take part in this study. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Akiko Maeker, Department of Organizational Leadership Policy and Development, University of Minnesota

Background Information

The purpose of this study is: to generate new knowledge from the insights of professional coaches regarding how culture may or may affect coaching.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things: The first step of your involvement will be to respond to an online survey. This will most likely take approximately 20 minutes to complete. If you are selected to participate in the second step, you will receive an invitation email to be interviewed by the researcher. If you are not selected to participate in the second step, your contribution to the study is complete at this point. For those who will be involved in the second step, you will be asked, in the invitation email, your time availability in order to schedule an interview time. Depending upon where you are located, the interview may be conducted in person or by virtual tools such as Skype or Google Hangouts. During the interview, you will be asked a series of questions for you to talk about your views, thoughts, ideas, and/or opinions on how culture may or may not have any effect in the coaching context. The interview should last for 45-90 minutes, depending on how much you have to share. At the beginning of the interview, you will be asked whether or not you give permission to audio record the conversation.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

There are no known risks or direct benefits of being in this study.

Compensation

You will not receive payment from participation in this study.

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential. In any sort of report, I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify who you are. Research records will be stored securely in a locked file cabinet in a secure

home office, and only the researcher will have access to the records. Study data will be encrypted according to current University policy for protection of confidentiality. The audio recordings also will be kept private with access only by the researcher in the same locked file cabinet in a home office and will be erased or destroyed after the completion of the analysis.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions

The researcher conducting this study is: Akiko Maeker, and the study is supervised by her academic advisor, Dr. Michael Goh. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact Akiko at +1-612-986-7943 (mobile phone) or sasa0010@umn.edu (email) or Dr. Goh at +1-612-624-2590 (office phone) or gohxx001@umn.edu (email).

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650 or irb@umn.edu.