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Abstract

Background: The influx of foreign talent and the globalization of organizations have caused a surge in demand for executive coaches. These consultants of change are often called upon to assist managers and leaders deal with organizational issues such as people development, organizational diagnostics, and change management to name a few. Thus when dealing with people in a cross-cultural arena the need for coaches or consultants to be culturally sensitive and culturally competent is of great importance. Aim: The study aimed to explore the multicultural coaching competency(s) of practicing executive coaches in the three domains: awareness, knowledge and skills. Method: An on-line survey included demographic questions, questions about multicultural coursework, their professional experience, and the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey, Executive Coaching Edition (MAKSS-ECE) were emailed to INSEAD CCC past and current participants, and a few ICF members. The tool assesses three domains of multicultural counselling competency: awareness, knowledge, and skills. Results: Results indicated that executive coaches perceive themselves to be aware and knowledgeable about cultural competency however they may not have the skills to undertake the tasks. Conclusion: Implications for multicultural coaching competency training in executive coaching include the need for incorporation of the multicultural counselling competencies across the executive coaching curriculum and within supervision. Further research examining content of multicultural coaching competency in executive coaching courses and designing a tool specific to the industry and profession is recommended.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Chapter overview

Culture has been at the helm of attention within many fields such as history, geography, sociology, psychology, anthropology, education, communication and counselling, and has been studied for eons. The contextual contribution of culture within these specializations has given insight to areas such as cross-cultural communication, linguistic anthropology, and multicultural counselling and education to name a few. While there has been much focus on multicultural competencies in many fields, there has been limited attention given to multicultural coaching competencies.

Literature on executive coaching defines executive coaching as a relationship-based intervention between a single identified executive coach and an individual employee (usually a manager or executive) within an organization that is undertaken to provide ongoing, work-related, personal development for that individual (Dean & Meyer, 2002; Gilmore, 2002; Kilburg, 1997; Peterson, 1996).

The executive coaching profession has grown in leaps and bounds over the past few years emerging as a service to businesses and organizations that recognize the need for developmental attention for their employees (Michelman, 2005). Moreover with the internationalization of organizations the demand for such services has consistently increased over the years.

1.2. Statement of Problem

A review of the International Coach Federation (ICF), the Association of Coaching (AC), the Association of Coaching Training Organizations (ACTO), European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC) and the International Association for Coaches (IAC) found that these
associations generally set the standards for coaches and coaching programs and they have their own list or model of competencies for coaching effectiveness. However, these competencies constitute a more universal coaching standard and do not necessarily constitute one being multiculturally competent. Additionally, there are no models, assessments, or tools available for assessing coaching competencies or multicultural coaching competencies specifically.

Furthermore, the field of executive coaching is still in its infancy and though some attention has been given to executive coaching in businesses, training, and psychology, there are few empirical studies that examine the professionals involved in executive coaching, the skills and competencies required to perform executive coaching, and the process of executive coaching when viewed through the multicultural lens. It was with this in mind that the current study was conducted.

1.3. Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions executive coaches have about multicultural competencies by way of a self-assessment tool. By working with an adequate sample size and using a range of methods, this research aims to examine the cultural competency of practicing executive coaches and to determine if there is a need for cultural specific training in coaching programs.

1.4. Research Question

The study is designed to answer the following research questions:

To what extent do practicing executive coaches perceive themselves to be competent in multicultural coaching?

1.5. Definition of Terms

1.5.1. Culture
Matsumoto (2000, as cited in Heppner, Wampold & Kivlighan, p. 369), defined culture from a psychological standpoint as “a dynamic system of rules, explicit and implicit, established by groups in order to ensure their survival, involving attitudes, values, beliefs, norms, and behaviours, shared by a group but harboured differently by each specific unit within the group, communicated across generations, relatively stable but with the potential to change across time.

1.5.2. Competency

Boyatzis (1982) defined competency as an underlying characteristic of an individual, which is causally related to effective or superior performance in a job. This definition was further articulated by Spencer, McClelland, & Spencer (1994) as “motives, self-concepts, attitudes or values, content knowledge or cognitive or behavioural skills” (p. 6).

1.5.3. Multicultural Counselling

Pedersen (1997) defined multicultural counselling as the coming together of two or more people from varied cultural backgrounds in a counselling relationship.

Vontress’s (1988) definition of multicultural counselling views multicultural counselling as “counselling in which the counsellor and the client are culturally different because of socialization acquired in distinct cultural, sub-cultural, racio-ethnic or socioeconomic environments” (p. 74).

Holcomb-McCoy & Myers (1999) viewed multicultural counselling as having the necessary skills to counsel individuals from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds.

1.5.4. Cultural Competence

“Is the belief that people should not only appreciate and recognize other cultural groups but also be able to effectively work with them” (Sue, 1998; p. 440).

1.5.5. Multicultural Counselling Competence (MCC)
Multicultural counselling competence has been defined as counsellors’ attitudes/beliefs, knowledge and skills in working with diverse cross-cultural clients (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

1.5.6. Self-Perceived Multicultural Counselling Competence (MCC)

This is typically a self-report using Likert-scale scored instruments assessing their own (counsellor or in this case executive coach) competence in the areas of attitudes/beliefs, knowledge and skills.

1.5.7. Intercultural coaching & Intercultural excellence

Rosinski (2003) in his book “Coaching across cultures” defined intercultural coaching as being able to espouse a coaching style enhanced with a global and intercultural perspective, and explained intercultural excellence as having the capability to work well across cultures through an appreciation of cultural differences augmented by an ability to leverage these differences.

1.6. Assumptions and Limitations

It is assumed that the participants will respond to the items in the questionnaires in a timely and honest manner. It is also assumed that the research instruments will measure the participants’ cultural competency accurately and determine areas of multiculturalism and multicultural coaching that coaches would need or be interested in further training and education.

Regarding the limitations of this study, it would be impossible to assess all coaching professionals practicing internationally as access to databases would be limited. Hence, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all practicing coaches (i.e. executive, business, leadership, etc.) or diversity and coaching training programs globally. The self-report nature of this study is not the most accurate measure of this construct and neither is it objective. Given that all responses to the questionnaires would be anonymous, there may be some participants who
would answer the questions in an untruthful manner to make himself/herself look more culturally competent (i.e. socially desirable).

Despite some of these immediate drawbacks, it is believed that this study will be beneficial to the growing field of coaching thus outweighing the limitations.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Chapter Overview

While the field of coaching has grown dramatically over the past decade and will continue to see growth in terms of both size and scope, there has simultaneously been growth in organizations in terms of internationalization of operations and thus diversity. As the world makes this transition to a global economy where cross-cultural interactions and diversification in the workforce becomes commonplace the need for leaders to be multiculturally competent therefore increases. In order to be successful in the global market leaders generally call upon executive coaches or diversity trainers to help them develop and enhance their cross-cultural capabilities. However, a question arises here - are executive coaches multiculturally competent? This paper intends to explore the multicultural coaching competency of executive coaches by leveraging of the multicultural counselling competency (MCC) model developed by Sue et al (1982, 1992). For the purpose of this paper, the chapter starts out by explaining executive coaching, and its usage in counselling parlance. This lays the foundation to understand how executive coaching leverages off the multicultural counselling competency (MCC) model. The review briefly covers important components of MCC, and focuses heavily on explaining the model at length. It is important to note that terms such as multicultural, cross-cultural, international, global and intercultural are used frequently in consulting and business, for the purpose of this paper the term multicultural will be used for historical reasons as well as to work with culture related issues in the broadest sense.

2.2. Executive Coaching within a Counselling Framework
Counselling as a field has been around for many years and has grown in leaps and bounds with its fundamental tenants now well established. The American Counselling Association (ACA website, 2012) defines counselling as a collaborative effort between the counselor and client. Professional counselors help clients identify goals and potential solutions to problems which cause emotional turmoil; seek to improve communication and coping skills; strengthen self-esteem; and promote behavior change and optimal mental health. The field of executive coaching has come into the counselling jargon recently and is used to describe an intervention or a set of interventions offered by an expert, the executive coach, to a manager or leader (Hart, 2002). The International Coaching Federation (ICF website, 2013) defines coaching as partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential. Executive coaching has been defined in varied ways, but in general it is a personal (one-to-one) and confidential relationship designed and directed to help the client improve performance at work and develop skillfully (Joo, 2005; Sherman & Freas, 2004).

Since executive coaching is reflective of counselling in many ways, comparisons of the discipline are constantly occurring. For example, some noteworthy similarities are (1) the relationship is contracted, personal, confidential and trust based; (2) the phases of the executive coaching process are parallel to the counselling process; (3) the coach’s role is to provide assessment expertise, interpersonal guidance, and support; and (4) the goal is for personal and professional growth and development of the client (Berglas, 2002; Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Joo, 2005).

That said, there are a few differences as well that distinguish the two professions such as (1) the focus of the intervention is on the client’s current job environment and thus future professional goals within the existing organizational context rather than psychological disorders;
(2) the clients organization typically pays for the service; (3) information is gathered from coworkers or peers, subordinates, and supervisors regarding how the client is perceived within the organization (e.g. 360° feedback); and (4) individuals with or without professional counselling qualifications are providing the service (Berglas, 2002; Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2001; Joo, 2005).

The executive coaching profession is quickly becoming a popular intervention for businesses and organization interested in developing their employees (Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Quick & Macik-Frey, 2004). While the provision of executive coaching by therapists, psychologists and other helping professionals has become common place as these professionals step up to meet the demand for coaching there are yet other professionals who call themselves executive coaches as they have emerged with experience in the field of business management, human resource management and industrial and organizational psychology (Judge & Cowell, 1997).

Additionally the field of coaching is not as clearly defined and regulated as counselling. While associations such as the International Coaching Federation (ICF) have defined a set of core competencies which are grouped into four clusters on their website (ICF, 2013) these competencies are only used by ICF approved training centers or courses and do not cover competencies within a cultural context. Moreover the popularity and lucrative potential of executive coaching has caught the attention of many who want to capitalize of this marketing demand, and therefore anyone can call themselves an executive coach without having any qualifications or competencies.

While the field is yet in its infancy, very few studies exist to assess the skills and competencies (multicultural coaching competencies included) of professional executive coaches.
2.3. Multicultural Competencies

As we have noted that definitions of executive coaching competencies exist however, these definitions of competencies do not include executive coaching from a multicultural perspective. There’s a need to view executive coaching from a cultural lens to deal with the internationalization of the workforce and to assist leaders in developing cross-cultural capabilities.

The growth and study of the multicultural movement in counselling originates from the multicultural movement some half a century ago. The movement stems from the historical mass migration of the Europeans “Whites” and Africans slavery (Blacks) into the US, which eventually sparked the US Civil Rights movement during the 1960s’s and 1970’s, and the Feminist movement in the sixties where minorities demanded equal opportunities (e.g. occupations, mental health services, etc) (Katz, 1985).

2.4. Understanding the Dimensions in the Multicultural Counselling Competency Model

The multicultural counselling competency model (not to be confused with the multicultural counselling competency matrix) stems from Sue et al. (1982) seminal paper identifying cross-cultural competencies being divided into three distinct dimensions. These dimensions are (a) beliefs and attitudes/awareness, (b) knowledge, and (c) skills. These dimensions have become the basis of multicultural counselling competence, and the basis for training, assessing and identifying culturally competent counsellors in the western world.

A. Multicultural Awareness

Multicultural awareness is one of the most important ingredients of counselling competence (Sue & Sue, 1990; 2003) and is highly valued in the counselling profession (Hansen, 2009). Multicultural awareness refers to the personal processes of the counsellor including
conscious and unconscious bias, values, and stereotypes. It addresses the ongoing discovery of the counsellor as a racial and cultural being. This procedure of becoming a multiculturally aware counsellor involves recognizing the impact of culture on the development of personally held values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours, acknowledging the influence of these values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours on psychological processes, identifying subconscious biases, assumptions, and stereotypes, developing openness and respect towards those from diverse cultural backgrounds, and committing to ongoing cultural understanding (Sue, Arredondo, McDavis, 1992). Multiculturally competent counsellors understand that their racial, ethnic, and cultural heritage influences the development of their values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours and further recognize that those whose cultural heritage differs from theirs will endorse values, beliefs, and attitudes consistent with a personally unique experience of socialization. In addition, the multiculturally aware counsellor acknowledges the impact of the socio-political system in which socialization occurred. That is to say, socio-political influences enhance and support personal development for some groups while creating a barrier for others (Pinderhughes, 1989).

In summary, awareness of these biases and beliefs help a counsellor determine how these influence perceptions of the client, the client’s problem(s), and the counselling relationship (Sue et al, 1992).

An interesting find is that the International Coaching Federation is consistent with only one domain of the multicultural competency “awareness” and had a statement on their website “8. Creating Awareness - ability to integrate and accurately evaluate multiple sources of information and to make interpretations that help the client to gain awareness and thereby achieve agreed-upon results” (ICF Website, 2013). However, it is tapered more to the client being made aware rather than the coach.
B. Multicultural Knowledge

While multicultural counselling awareness examines the implications of one’s own cultural conditioning, multicultural knowledge refers to understanding one’s own worldview, as well as having specific knowledge of cultural groups with whom one works, and knowledge of socio-political influences on members if these groups (Sue et al, 1992). It involves acquiring expertise about the client’s worldview and expectations for the counselling relationship (Ponterotto et al, 1994). A multiculturally educated counsellor would acquire information about inherent values, beliefs, attitudes, family structures, and communication styles of various cultures as well as the effect of socio-political conditions such as oppression, racism, forced migration, refugee status, and poverty (Smart & Smart, 1995) while at the same time recognizing intra-group differences. Interacting with persons of diverse cultural heritages in settings other than a counselling relationship can assist the counsellor by acquiring perspective and understanding of culture specific behaviours in contrast to unhealthy functioning. A counsellor who is multiculturally knowledgeable actively attempts to understand the worldview of his or her culturally different client without negative or bias judgements (Sue & Sue, 1990).

C. Multicultural Skills

Multiculturally skilled counsellors manifest a willingness to be flexible in meeting the needs of culturally diverse clients and providing culturally meaningful interventions. In other words, it implies that the counsellor is able to intervene in a manner that is culturally sensitive and relevant (Ponterotto et al, 1994). According to Sue & Sue (1990), a culturally skilled counsellor is one who is in the process of actively developing and practicing appropriate, relevant, and sensitive interventions and skills in working with his or her culturally different clients. Multicultural skills (Sue et al, 1982; Arredondo, 1999) merge awareness and knowledge
into culture specific counselling strategies and interventions thus mobilizing a cross-cultural competent counsellor.

2.4.1 Multicultural Counselling Competency Matrix

This three-pronged conceptualization of multicultural competence was further expanded upon by posting a 3 (Characteristic) x 3 (Dimension) matrix that would further organize the multicultural competencies (Sue et al, 1992; Figure 1)

Figure 1

Multicultural Counselling Competency Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Standards/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of own assumptions</td>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of client's worldview</td>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing appropriate interventions</td>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This 3 (Characteristic) x 3 (Dimension) matrix consisted of the three key characteristics of a multiculturally competent counsellor, namely (a) awareness of own assumptions, values and biases; (b) knowledge of the worldview of the culturally different client; and (c) skills to apply appropriate intervention strategies and techniques. Within each of these characteristics, the existence of the three dimensions are posited, namely (a) beliefs and attitudes, or awareness; (b) knowledge, and (c) skills. Thus, nine competency areas were developed and 31 competencies
within these areas are deemed important by the authors. In 1998, this was further expanded to 34 competencies to include individual counselling and organizational development (Sue et al, 1998). The competencies have been well received and adopted by various associations as guidelines for training, service delivery and research activities (Sue et al, 1998; Arredondo & Perez, 2006). It is also viewed as a three-phase developmental process where one moves on from awareness, to knowledge and skill building.

2.5. Review of culture in coaching

There are notably many interesting research works in the area of multicultural competency. One such area is counselling, where over the past three decades, there has been a deluge in the counselling literature assessing counselors’ multicultural counselling competence. Using self-report assessments many studies have examined the multicultural counselling competence of various professionals and trainees in the field of counselling, education, communication and training.

The field of coaching is witnessing a demand to add a cultural or multicultural context in their field of practice. Rosinski (2003) in his book “Coaching across cultures” states that coaches have relied heavily on their common sense, and communication techniques and as traditional coaches they have assumed a worldview that does not hold true universally especially since this worldview is predominantly American and then to come extent Western European. In the past the cultural dimension was overlooked or at best, given anecdotal and superficial attention. He adds that given the amazing challenges in a global and turbulent environment along with an increase in migration, culture must become part of the equation. However, his book views culture from a corporate and professional perspective and does not address the need for a coach to be multiculturally competent as much as it asks of the coach to move from a traditional
coaching methodology to a cross-cultural methodology thus challenging their beliefs and assumptions.

As managers and executives are working in more globalized environments, coaches are being called upon to build a cultural perspective into executive coaching as it opens up greater awareness and clarity about one’s own cultural starting points and assumptions and allows for a wider and deeper understanding of learned behaviors (Gilbert & Rosink, 2008). The Cultural Orientations Framework (COF) is designed for use by coaches and their clients individually or in a team. The tool does not assess competency but instead assists the coach in working with diverse clientele and helps the client discover their cultural orientation.

In addressing the need for culture in coaching, many studies have erupted answering this. Kersiene & Savaneviciene (2005) studied the influence of culture in organizational settings and the need for organizational multicultural competence, Connerley & Pedersen (2005), addressed the need for leaders to be multiculturally competent when dealing with a diverse workforce and leveraged off Sue et al’s (1982; 1992) model to develop awareness, knowledge and skills in leaders. Chrobot-Mason & Ferdman (2001) surveyed six I-O psychologists assessing the importance of multicultural competencies and ways to incorporate it into their relationship with executives and organizations. They received a combination of personal experience and the use of awareness, knowledge and skills to assist. Additional research explores coaching in multicultural contexts (Chapmen, Best, & van Casteren, 2003; Lowman, 2007; Moral & Warnock, 2005; Peterson, 2007; Turner, 2007) but none of these assess the multicultural competency of executive coaches by way of any self-report tool(s).

Furthermore, when discussing coaching in a multicultural context, many a times the role or the expectation of a multicultural coach or a global coach is expressed as someone who has
lived and worked in multicultural or international business environments. Competency is gauged by way of experience and exposure and less by formal tools. Gilmore (2002) suggests that an executive coach’s unique background determines the types of executive coaching situations in which he or she will aid most competently.

2.6. Limitations of previous studies

Though many studies have been conducted to investigate and explore the context of culture in multicultural counselling, coaching or consulting settings (Gilbert & Rosinski, 2008; Kersiene & Savaneviciene, 2005; Moral & Warnock, 2005; Turner, 2007) a model assessing multicultural coaching competencies is amiss.

Whilst there was been strong support for the multicultural competencies model amongst counsellors, it has not gone unchallenged. Some limitations in the acceptance of the cultural competency model are that it (a) has various meanings, (b) includes inadequate descriptors, and (c) focuses specifically on race & ethnicity (Weinrach & Thomas, 2004; Sue, Zane, Nagayama Hall, & Berger, 2009; Vontress & Jackson, 2004). Despite the controversies, it is asserted that the multicultural competencies are a way to address oppression and racism within the counselling profession (Arredondo, 1999) and simultaneously they represent ethical practice (Arredondo & Toporek, 2004). That said while the counselling profession has accepted this cultural competency model, it has yet to adopted as a mandatory professional standard. Nonetheless, there is no other cultural competency model available that has been adapted and used as extensively as the multicultural counselling competency model by Sue et al (1982; 1992).

In multicultural counselling, all interactions are considered multicultural in nature. The same can be adapted to executive coaches and coaching whose interactions are multicultural in
nature as they work with leaders from diverse backgrounds who in turn manage a diverse workforce. Connerly & Pedersen (2005) set the precedence by applying the framework set by Sue et al (1982; 1992) to leadership when considering multiple cultural perspectives in the workplace. Likewise, the intention of this paper to bridge the gap in coaching by using Sue et al’s (1982; 1992) model and have coaches develop their multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills and although the majority of the research on multicultural counselling competencies has been done in the counselling psychology field, it is as important a core competency area for executive coaches as it is for counsellors.
Chapter 3

METHODS

3.1. Chapter Overview

The methodology used in this study is described in this chapter. The chapter is organized in the following broad subsections: purpose of study, research questions, research design, methods, participants, instrumentation, validity, ethical considerations, and limitations.

3.2. Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the multicultural coaching competence of executive coaches. Being competent is fundamental to people in the helping profession, be it counsellors or coaches. Although previous studies have investigated coaching in multicultural context, there is a dearth of enquiry into assessing the multicultural coaching competence of practicing executive coaches. The study of multicultural coaching competence within the field of coaching by leveraging of the model by Sue et al is a first which is interesting as the model has recently been suggested for use in leadership (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). The knowledge obtained from this study will not only add to the current field of coaching, but would also have implications for training and development of executive coaches’ multicultural competencies within the growing field of coaching, consulting and mentoring.

3.3. Research Question

The study explores one key question in order to assess the multicultural competency of practicing executive coaches:

To what extent do practicing executive coaches perceive themselves to be competent in multicultural coaching?
3.4. Research Design

The study will consist of a non-experimental quantitative research design encompassing survey research dictating the primary findings of this study (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). In using quantitative research the researcher primarily relies on numerical data (Charles & Mertler, 2002). Leveraging on post-positivist claims for developing knowledge, such as cause and effect rational, reduction to specific variables, hypotheses and interrogations, use of measurement and observation, and the testing of theories, the researcher would isolate variables and causally relate them to determine the magnitude and frequency of relationships. Furthermore, the researcher determines which variables to examine and additionally determines the instruments that yield highly reliable and valid scores.

As part of the quantitative study, the researcher chose to use the Multicultural Counselling Awareness – Knowledge – Skills Survey: Counsellor Edition – Revised (Appendix A) and adapt it to the executive coaching context hereby entitled the Multicultural Counselling Awareness – Knowledge - Skills Survey: Executive Coaching Edition (MAKSS-ECE; unpublished, Appendix B). In addition, the researcher has also used a demographics questionnaire to ascertaining race, gender, years of experience, certification, multicultural training (if any). Participants were also requested to provide feedback on the assessment to add richness to the data.

3.5. Target Population

The initial target population choice for this study was all of INSEAD’s Consulting and Coaching for Change (CCC) current and past (alumni) participants who are in the practice of executive coaching which are approximately 330 members. To improve generalizability the database of the ICF Singapore website was used (352 members).
3.6. Participant Selection and Description

Invitations were sent to all INSEAD CCC members, and a random selection of 70 of the ICF Singapore members. In addition, to improve sample size a direct approach was made by the researcher to colleagues working as executive coaches.

3.7. Methodology

The methodology and procedure for gathering data followed in this research study was predominantly web-based. Web-based surveys via internet polls or electronic mail are noted to reach very wide audiences inexpensively and secure speedy & prompt replies (Kehoe & Pitkow, 1996 as cited in Cook, Heath & Thompson, 2000). Kittleson (1997), noted that web-based surveys yield a response rate of 25 – 30%; and follow-up reminders to participate e-surveys tend to approximately double the response rate.

Given the potential for a poor response rate, and that online data collection procedures involve minimal costs (Cobanoglu, Warde, & Moreo, 2001) as well as savings of time (Pettit, 2002), all CCC participants and practicing executive coaches were invited to participate.

3.7.1. Quantitative Analysis

The explanation to using Quantitative Analysis starts with the pre-quantitative phase of determining the MCC instrument to be used, followed by an overview of the original instrument and the explanation of the changes made in order to adapt it to the coaching context. This is followed by a review of the demographics questionnaire. It concludes with providing information on the data collection strategy and the analysis of data.

3.7.2. Brief Review of MCC Instrumentation

As the study of multicultural counselling has expanded so has the number of ways to assess multicultural counselling competency. The assessments address the competence of
counselors, trainees, teachers, supervisors, and even the training environment. The assessments take the form of practitioner self-reports, supervisor evaluations, self-administered surveys, observation reports, and trainee portfolios (Gamst, Liang & Der-Karabetian, 2011).

Of the five most commonly used assessments, namely the MAKSS, Multicultural Counselling and Training Survey (MCCTS; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999), the Multicultural Counselling Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994), and the Multicultural Counselling Awareness Scale (MCAS; Ponterotto, Sanchez & Magids, as cited in Ponterotto et al, 1994) as well as the revised Multicultural Counselling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991) and the Cross-Cultural Counselling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R; LaFramboise, Coleman & Hernandez, 1991), four were reviewed prior to determining suitability for this study. The CCCI-R was not reviewed as the investigator had to no access to it. A brief overview of three of the tools reviewed and the reasons for not using them are provided herewith. A review of the MAKSS-CE-R and its journey in this study is provided thereafter.

The Multicultural Counselling Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) contains 40 items and like the MAKSS is based on the three multicultural competency domains awareness, knowledge and skills as developed by Sue et al (1982). MCI is the most widely used tool and was the ideal choice, however whilst reviewing this survey it was found that the words ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ was used extensively. In the United States, individuals are categorized as minorities based on their ethnic/racial group identity. The usage of these terms could offend some non-American respondents. Additionally, the MCI required respondents to be working with culturally different clients, which was beyond the scope of this study. The cost for purchasing this tool was also very high.
The Multicultural Counselling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS; Ponterotto et al, 1991) is a 32 item survey and it only measures knowledge and awareness. Another tool would have needed to be used to determine skills. In addition, the words ‘majority’, ‘minority’, ‘racist’ and ‘white’ were used separately in almost 14 of the 32 items.

The MCCTS is also a 32 item survey; however the suitability of this survey would be for trainees or students being trained in a multicultural counselling course to ascertain competence post training (or lack thereof).


The Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skill Survey was created to measure the participant’s perception of his or her “level of multicultural counselling awareness, knowledge, and skills” (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991, p. 145).

The MAKSS-CE-R (Kim, Cartwright, Assay, & Andrea, 2003) is a 33 item questionnaire with a 4-point Likert type scale from 1 (strongly disagree/very limited) to 4 (strongly agree/very good/very aware), with seven (7) items requiring reverse scoring (items 1-4, and item 6, 8 and 9), measuring awareness, knowledge and skills and taking approximately 15 minutes to complete. The MAKSS-CE-R is a multidimensional, multicultural counselling competence measure based on Sue et al.’s model (1982) that focus on multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills. Item numbers 1 to 10 measure measures multicultural counselling awareness-revised, items 11 to 23 measure multicultural counselling knowledge-revised, and items 24 to 33 measure multicultural counselling skills-revised. Higher scores on the total instrument and on the individual subscales indicate higher self-reported competency.
It is important to mention that the MAKSS-CE-R is a revised and shortened version of the 60-item MAKSS-CE (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1990; 1991). Principal factor analysis (with an oblique rotation) produced a three-factor simple structure that accounted for the 29.8% of the total variance and reduced the scale to 33 items (Gamst, Liang, & Der-Karabetian, 2010). All three subscales had reliability based on Cronbach’s alpha (Gamst, Liang, & Der-Karabetian, 2010). The authors were careful to indicate the limitations of the scale which include “the tendency of some persons to rate themselves higher on one or more of the competency areas than they actually are” and the inability of the scores to indicate a person’s “ability to work effectively with persons from a broad range of diverse backgrounds in different capacities as a mental health professional (D’Andrea & Daniels, 2005, p. 4).

That said, the scale was chosen for its brevity and increased reliability and validity over the original measure (MAKSS-CE), as well as its reputation in the counselling literature.

3.7.3. 1. Multicultural Counselling Awareness – Knowledge - Skills Survey: Executive Coaching Edition (MAKSS-ECE)

The coaching version was adapted and revised with permission from the publisher Bryan S. K. Kim (Kim, personal communication, 07 June 2011; Appendix C). The three subscales, number of questions, Likert type scale, as well as the scoring key have been maintained. Some words were changed or added to suit the executive coaching field. The following is a description of the variations in the coaching version of the assessment:

1. Where the word “counselling” is mentioned in the original, the coaching version added the word “coaching” to read as counselling/coaching (Items 1 – 4, 6 – 9, 23)
2. The following words were replaced (Items 18 – 20): “Mainstreaming” to “Cultural Sensitivity”, “Cultural Encapsulation” to “Cultural Intelligence” ; and “Contact Hypothesis” to “Sexuality”.

3. Item 24 was rephrased from “How would you rate your ability to effectively consult with another mental health professional concerning the mental health needs of a client whose cultural background is significantly different from your own” to read as “How would you rate your ability to effectively consult with another mental health or coaching professional concerning the mental health or coaching needs of a client whose cultural background is significantly different from your own”

4. Where the word “mental health needs” is mentioned in the original, the coaching version added the word “coaching” to read as mental health/coaching needs (Items 25 – 28, 30-31, 33).

5. Item 29 an example was added to view the item from the coaching lens “How would you rate your ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of psychological tests (i.e. psychometric assessments used in coaching situations) in terms of their use with persons from different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds?

3.6.4. Demographics Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire (Appendix D) was created based on similar studies (Holcomb-McCoy, 2001; D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, MAKSS Survey, 1991). The questionnaire included items designed to ascertain the socio-demographic information of race, age, and gender. Professional related information was also a focus and therefore questions regarding participant’s years of experience, qualifications, undergraduate and postgraduate field of study, multicultural training, relevant and related educational experiences, relevant and related
work experiences, relevant and related training experiences, licensure, and professional organization membership(s). Additionally, the questionnaire asked participants to identify if they were a past or present participant of the INSEAD CCC program. The questionnaire also requested participants to provide feedback on the assessment being used for this study. Finally they were asked to rate their perceived multicultural competence on a scale of one (low) to five (high).

3.8. Data Collection

Several steps were completed to ensure accurate and appropriate data collection. The survey questionnaire was sent out using Qualtrics™ (www.qualtrics.com), an on-line survey and data collection service, after receiving approval from INSEAD. The data was collected with the help of the INSEAD CCC administrative team. The survey could be accessed through the URL, which was sent to all current CCC Wave 12, 13 and 14 participants in both France and Singapore, and by way of LinkedIn to the INSEAD CCC Alumni. Contact details were confidential, and could not be shared with the researcher, thus the INSEAD administrative team assisted in forwarding the email announcement requesting for participation in the study (Appendix E).

The email message announced the study to the registered counsellors, and requested voluntary participation from the sample of approximately 330 CCC current participants and alumni. The message described the present thesis study as an investigation of executive coaches’ multicultural competence, thus including the purpose of the research, and a rationale for participation. It also indicated the importance of their input for the study and they were requested to forward the survey to their contacts in the practice of coaching. Individuals interested in participating were directed to an address on the internet where they could access the online
survey [http://insead.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2hQ6WFsJrRBdQvX](http://insead.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2hQ6WFsJrRBdQvX). A similar message went out to 70 randomly selected coaches from the ICF Singapore Website and friends of the investigator in the practice of coaching.

An informed consent form was posted on the web as an opening page of the survey (Appendix F). Participants were to click on the button below, saying “Accept” (or “Decline”), thus expressing their compliance to participate in the study and complete the survey. Those who agreed with the informed consent statement were then directed to the survey page that included a demographic information form, and the Multicultural Awareness – Knowledge – Skills Survey: Executive Coaching Edition. No identifying information was collected. Upon completion of the survey, a note of acknowledgement was added along with an option to provide feedback on the assessment. The researcher’s contact information was also provided in the email for any further questions or comments.

The first email invitation was sent in April 10. A second and final invitation went out 5 days later. A total of 23 completed surveys were received, indicating a response rate of 6%. While participants could come back to complete their incomplete survey, the surveys could only be submitted once to avoid duplication of surveys or data although it is noted that duplicate surveys can be identified by time, date, and the origin of submissions (Schmidt, 1997).

Participation in the study required approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete the two surveys.

Internet based surveys methodologies are prone to respondents intentionally providing incorrect data (Kraut et al, 2004). Furthermore, inattentive replies by participants may also result from an enormous variety in their web-survey environments, from private to public. Two strategies were used to reduce chances of incorrect collection of data. First, announcing the research through INSEAD reduced the likelihood of malicious responses. Second, the mandatory
requirement for respondents to click their agreement in the informed consent reduced the frequency of random surfing by those not interested in completing the survey.

There are several advantages to conducting internet based research. Firstly, the research can gather nationwide samples which are possibly more diverse (Mohr & Rochlen, 1999), than samples that are limited in their means of data acquisition. Internet samples are therefore more representative than traditional samples with respect to age, gender, geographic location, and socioeconomic status, and are about as representative as traditional samples with respect to race (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004). Another advantage of web-based surveys is that participants’ responses were automatically stored in a database and could easily be transformed into numeric data in Excel or SPSS formats.

3.9. Data Analysis

Scoring the MAKSS-CE-R consists of adding the participant’s rating on each item in the subscale and this followed by dividing the subscale total by the number of subscale items to obtain a subscale mean. A composite scale mean can be obtained by adding the participant’s scores on all 33 items and diving that total by 33 to obtain a composite total score mean. The MAKSS-CE-R is a Likert Scale Data, which is different to Likert-Type Data. Boone & Boone (2012), defined a Likert Scale as being “composed of a series of four or more Likert-type items that are combined into a single composite score/variable during the data analysis process. Combined, the items are used to provide a quantitative measure of a character or personality trait. Typically the researcher is only interested in the composite score that represents the character/personality trait” (p. 2).
SPSS Version 21 and MS Excel 2010 were used to analyze the survey data. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the participant’s age, race, gender, educational background, work experience and special training as an executive coach.

This was followed by assessing the awareness, knowledge and skills subscales by using mean, standard deviation, Pearson’s r, and t-test, to determine areas for improvement or development.

3.10. Ethical Issues

Ethical considerations regarding participant’s welfare and confidentiality of data are addressed. It important to note that the results of this study would not be representative of all coaches practicing in their respective fields or any specific race at large.

3.10.1. Research Permission

In compliance with the general regulations in conducting a research study, a thesis proposal was presented to the Associate Director, Research, INSEAD Executive Degree Programmes at INSEAD. The proposal included information about the project title and type, number and type of subjects. In addition, the proposal contained a basic description of the project and its significance, methods and procedures, participants and research status.

3.10.2. Participant’s Welfare

Participants were provided with an informative email and consent form prior to completing the questionnaires. Contact details of the investigator were also provided should the participants have any queries. Potential participants were informed of the nature of the study, the survey method and the anticipated amount of time required for participation. It was also made clear that participation is strictly voluntary and all information is kept confidential and identities (if any) are kept anonymous. Participants were also encouraged to discuss any concerns about
the objectives of the study prior to commencing participation. All respondents were given the freedom to leave the study should they have to do so at any point in time.

3.10.3. Informed Consent

One of the most significant ethical guidelines governing research on humans is that participants must give their informed consent before participating in a study. Therefore an Informed Consent form was designed for participation in the web-based survey(s). The form states that the participants are guaranteed certain rights, consent to be involved in the study, and acknowledge their rights are protected. The informed consent for the web-based survey was affixed to the web survey and reflected compliance by participation.

One of the advantages of using signed consent forms is that they increase the likelihood that respondents understand what participation will comprise and what their rights or privileges are in relation to participation and issues of confidentiality and anonymity. Additionally, signed consent forms are seen to protect the investigator from later accusations from study participants (Coomber, 2002).

3.10.4. Anonymity and Confidentiality

Due to the nature of this study, the anonymity of participants has been protected by numerically coding each completed survey and keeping the responses confidential. In the web survey, participants can only be identified by an IP address as no personal information is collected in the demographic form. There is no indication of participant’s name throughout the survey or at the feedback stage. The code used for analysis is R1 to R23 to represent Respondent 1 to Respondent 23.

3.10.5. Data Retention and Storage
All raw data from this study, including the survey electronic files, interview tapes, and transcripts, will be kept in locked file cabinets in the researcher’s office where necessary and/or will be held in the personal computers and thumb drives of the investigator. The data will be accessible only by the investigator at any given time. Any/All data that is stored on the computer/thumb drive will be de-identified. The data will finally be burnt and retained onto a CD. All data will be destroyed after upon clarification from the school. Participants, who withdraw from the study, will have their data destroyed immediately. There is no way the data or responses can be traced back to any respondents.

3.11. Limitations and disadvantages

Firstly, the research only used a single methodology – quantitative thus relying heavily on numerical data (Charles & Mertler, 2002). Whereas a qualitative approach (i.e. semi-structure interviews) is “an inquiry process of understanding” wherein the researcher develops a “complex, holistic picture, analyses words, reports detailed view of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting” (Creswell, 1998, p. 15). The data collection would have been more wholesome by “mixing” both quantitative and qualitative within a single study to understand a research problem more completely (Creswell, 2002) as neither method are sufficient on their own to capture the trends and details of the situation.

Secondly, due to the low number of respondents it may not be possible to do a Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and analysis of variance (ANOVA) due to the small cell sizes. The low participation rate in this study could possibly be attributed to the lack of incentives.

Thirdly, whilst the giving of incentives was considered, at the point of disseminating the survey the researcher decided not to provide any incentives. While there are some researchers
(and research organisations) who offer financial or material ‘rewards’ to study participants who participate in their studies (see e.g., Wright, Waters & Nicholls, 2004; Tarleton et al, 2004) and where this occurs such information is generally included in the information provided to study participants. Some researchers view it as important that all people should be paid for their time and effort while others consider that this might encourage potentially vulnerable people to participate for the wrong reasons (Wright et al, 2004; Ensign, 2003). Smyth (2004), further added that incentives aren't necessarily restricted to money or gifts and some research projects may provide other incentives, rewards or compensations for time and effort, such as food.

Finally, a counselling instrument was used to assess coaching competencies. The instrument and the items in the instrument have been successfully adopted across disciplines and were able to be easily modified for executive coaches.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Chapter Overview

This chapter provides the results of the statistical analyses performed to examine the research question in Chapter One and Three: To what extent do practicing executive coaches perceive themselves to be competent in multicultural counselling?

4.2. Participants

Approximately 400 executive coaches were emailed from the INSEAD CCC Program, ICF and other professional associations. Of those solicited, 35 participated (9%) but only 23 (6%) completed the survey and these respondents serve as the sample for this study. There was a drop-out rate of 3%.

4.3. Descriptive Characteristics

Demographic information (age, gender, education, work experience, and coaching experience and training) was gathered as part of the survey to provide information about the participants (Appendix G). Demographic data related to age, gender, and ethnicities are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Male</td>
<td>65.20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Female</td>
<td>34.80%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; 20-29</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, demographic information related to the educational backgrounds of executive coaches was gathered for this study. Education was measured by degree level and degree focus for those with graduate degrees. Results degree type were gathered and categorized as
undergraduate, post-graduate (i.e. post-graduate diploma, master’s, JD) and doctoral (i.e. Ph.D, Ed.D, Psy.D, MD). Results for both undergraduate and post-graduate degree specialization/focus were gathered and categorized as “business (i.e. business administration, organizational development, etc.) finance (i.e. financial services, auditing, etc.), marketing (i.e. market research, brand management, etc.), pure sciences (i.e. chemistry, biology, physics, etc.), social sciences (i.e. psychology, sociology, counselling, etc.), arts & literature (communication, arts, education, etc.) and other”. The questionnaire also checked if cross-cultural training was a part of their training or coursework, and also checked for their membership with professional associations as well as their participation in the INSEAD CCC program (if any). The results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

**Additional Demographics from the Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education (as terminal degrees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Undergraduate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Post-Graduate (incl. Masters and JD)</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Doctoral (incl. PhD, EdD, PsyD, MD)</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Field of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Business</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Finance</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Marketing</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Pure Sciences</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Social Sciences</td>
<td>39.10%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Arts &amp; literature</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt; Other</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-Cultural Training (i.e. Coursework or Training Component)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Membership

|     | 
|-----|--------|
| <>  |        |
| ICF | 43.50% |
| ISCP| 4.30%  |
| AC  | 0.00%  |
| ACTO| 0.00%  |
| EMCC| 0.00%  |
| IAC | 0.00%  |
| Others | 52.20% |

INSEAD CCC Program

|     | 
|-----|--------|
| <>  |        |
| Current Participant (Wave 12-14) | 39.10% |
| Alumni | 34.80% |
| Neither | 26.10% |

Demographic information related to the executive coaches’ work experiences, languages spoken, licensure, and their personal perceptions of their multicultural coaching competency were also gathered. Many of these were fill-in-the-blank questions. A summary is provided herewith:

Languages: All participants were conversant in the English language, and many were multilingual, speaking at least 3 - 4 languages. Only 1 participant was proficient in English only.

Work Experience: Majority of the respondents had experience of 5 years or less (N = 10); there were some with less than 10 years of experience (N = 8), and the rest had more than 10 years of experience (N = 5), thus suggesting that executive coaching is a fairly new career field.
Self-perceived multicultural coaching competence: Participants were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high, majority (N = 9) of the participants rated themselves a 3, thus indicating that one-third of the participants chose to present themselves as neutral. 10 participants rated themselves as 4 or 5, and only a handful of the executive coaches rated themselves 1 or 2 (N = 4).

4.4. Measuring Multicultural Counselling Competency

In this study the recommendation of D’ Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (n.d.) to calculate the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and the Pearson r was followed for the three subscales of the MAKSS-CE-R. Cronbach’s alpha measures the internal consistency of the items on the subscales. According to Kline (2002), to be considered a reliable test the Cronbach’s alpha should be .7 of greater. Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale in this study is shown in Table 3. The Cronbach’s alpha is less than .7 which may indicate the subscale is not as reliable in measuring Awareness of coaches as it is for counsellors. This may be the result of the coaches being less able to assess their own ability (see demographics results). To test the discriminant validity of each subscale correlation coefficients between the scales were measured using Pearson r. The lower the correlation between subscales the more likely they are distinct measures. Validity scores for this study are shown in Table 4.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MAKSS-ECE</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Validity testing for MAKSS-ECE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness Score</th>
<th>Knowledge Score</th>
<th>Skills Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Score</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Score</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above results, the MAKSS-ECE was determined to be a reliable and valid test to measure multicultural coaching awareness, knowledge and skills for executive coaches to enable the data to be further analyzed.

4.4.1. Statistical Analyses

For all the respondents the Awareness subscale mean was 23.09 with a standard deviation of 3.38. For the Knowledge subscale the mean and the standard deviation for all respondents was 38.83 and 4.87, respectively. The Skills subscale for all respondents generated a mean of 28.22 and a standard deviation of 4.33. Table 5 shows the mean and standard deviations for all 23 participants.

Table 5

MAKSS-ECE mean and standard deviations of subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall respondents scored lower on the Awareness scale than either the Knowledge or Skills subscales. Respondents tended to score higher on the Skills subscale than on the Knowledge subscale. Accounting for reverse scored items in the instrument, scores ranged from
1 to 4, with 1 signifying a self-reported low level of awareness, knowledge or skills, and 4
signifying a self-reported high level of awareness, knowledge, or skills. Therefore, on each of the
subscales the lowest score would be 10 for Awareness and Skills (10 questions each), and 13 for
Knowledge (13 questions). The highest score for each subscale would be 40 for Awareness and
Skills, and 52 for Knowledge.

Table 6

\textit{t-Test: Paired two sample for means}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>-5.733</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.986</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>-3.787</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired t-Tests were conducted to assess for any differences between the skill’s subscales.

There was no significant difference in the scores for awareness (M = 2.3, SD = 0.3) and
knowledge (M = 2.9, SD = 0.37), conditions; t(22) = -5.73, p = 9.11.

There was a significant difference (at the 0.10 level) in the scores for the knowledge (M =
2.9; SD = 0.37), and skills (M = 2.8, SD = 0.43), conditions; t(22) = 1.85, p = 0.077.

There was a significant difference (at the 0.05 level) in the scores for the awareness (M =
2.3, SD = 0.33) and skills (M = 2.8, SD = 0.43), conditions; t(22) = -3.78, p = 0.001.

4.5. Discussion

The field of executive coaching has come into view as a profession dedicated to helping
individuals become more effective in their careers and occupational settings. This study was
designed to address the issue of multicultural coaching competency amongst practicing executive
teachers. Executive coaches were surveyed for their experience and qualifications in the practice
of executive coaching. The survey included a modified version of the MAKSS-CE-R; entitled
MAKSS-ECE which measures an individual’s perceived multicultural competence along three domains, awareness, knowledge and skills. The literature has so far indicated that the study of culture within the coaching field is contextual. While there are studies and books that exist discussing the role of culture in coaching, they do not address or view it as a mandatory requirement to be competent.

Leading theorists in multicultural counselling competencies agree that the three dimensions of cultural competency are awareness, knowledge and skills (Arredondo, 2003; Sue, Arredondo & McDavis, 1992; Monk, Winslade & Sinclair, 2008; Pederson, 2000).

Reliability results (Table 3) indicated that the Awareness scale (0.58) was not as reliable or lacked internal consistency as compared to the Knowledge (0.85) and Skills (0.80) Scale, indicating that participants were either guessing, answering in a socially desirable manner, or the need for another cultural competency dimension could be required for executive coaching. Overall the MAKSS-ECE proved to be a reliable tool (0.72).

Results from the t-Test suggested (a) there was no significant difference between awareness and knowledge, indicating that once coaches are able to assess their knowledge levels, they are able to assess their awareness. Considering this is a tool has been designed to work progressively, it seems that for executive coaches it works in reverse when it comes to knowledge and awareness. This could be another factor for the low reliability for the awareness subscales. Further research needs to be conducted to understand the how executive coaches perceive and conceptualization of ‘self-awareness’, in addition to its relationship with knowledge.

A comparison between knowledge and skills indicated that skills are significantly different. By being knowledgeable about cultural issues does not ensure the coaches have
sufficient skills to undertake the task. Similarly there is a significant difference between awareness and skills such that having awareness does not ensure the coaches have the skills. These results indicate that while coaches may be aware of and are knowledgeable about cultural competency they may not have the skills to undertake the task appropriately. This would indicate a need for training of coaches to provide them with the skills they need to undertake the task.

4.6. Reflections on Feedback of Assessment

At the end of the survey participants were asked to provide feedback on the assessment. Of the 23 who completed the assessment, 13 provided some brief feedback. As a researcher, practicing counsellor and a coach in training it seemed to me that participants do not view coaching as an evolving process “...coaching philosophy assumes each client is complete and whole..” (R22) or culture as important “...cultural is not a factor to consider” (R22). As I reflect on this I wonder if coaches feel that their experience in diverse situations constitutes them multiculturally competent. Rosinki (2003) states that coaches have thus far been rather traditional in their coaching, depending on common sense, communication techniques, and psychological perspectives. He adds that given the changing demographics coaches should be more open and aware of these changing cultural dynamics and incorporate it into their coaching sessions. One comment that stood out as it appeared a few times was that many would have preferred if they were given the option to explain their choices factor (i.e. open-ended questions) rather than forced choices. Did the coaches have a story to tell? Future research could consider using story telling as a tool to engage executive coaches in sharing their cross-cultural experiences whilst simultaneously incorporating the Sue et al (1982; 1992) multicultural competency model. Furthermore, they wanted would have preferred the survey to be more detailed orientated and less complex “...bit more details and less tech terminology” (R6),
...questions to complex..” (R2; R3). As I reflect on these comments, I would be keen to explore how coaches view and define culture and competency. That said, there are some very interesting points made and these can be used when developing a tool specifically to the coaching industry. For example “...add question related to language proficiency when coaching/counselling..” (R4), this is interesting as majority of the respondents when asked their language proficiency indicated they were proficient in at least two to five languages. Additional areas to research within executive coaching would be the country of origin, influence of living aboard (i.e. on being a 3rd culture kid).

As I reflect further on the feedback and the results generated I wonder if executive coaches consider themselves highly competent beings generally as their role of executive coach puts them in a position of control and their selling point is their experience and expertise, thus clouding their ability to consciously assess their own capabilities. I wonder if this is ego or a sense of superiority due to the role they play in the client’s ‘life’?

4.7. Limitations

The current study was not without limitations. The low response rate was rather discouraging. Considering the large number of practicing executive coaches in the industry and those who identified working for many years within the field of coaching, the question is raised as to whether coaches generally feel multiculturally competent because of their experience and if this was a topic of interest for practicing executive coaches. It is unknown why coaches refrained from attempting this test after reading the informed consent (i.e. 3% drop-out rate). Additionally, while the researcher could have run t-Tests (i.e. correlating gender, age, experience, etc to the awareness, knowledge and skills subscales) the results would have to be interpreted with caution as the cell sizes are very small. A second limitation was the assessment
was not pilot tested. Soliciting feedback on items, format, clarity of language used and content from practitioners and multicultural experts would have helped the tool be more coaching specific (i.e. not using counselling/coaching could have cause confusion as many coaches do not ‘counsel’ clients). A final limitation was the majority of participants were current and past participants of INSEAD’s CCC Program and thus the results may not be indicative of executive coaches in general.

4.8. Future Research

This research attempted to add an additional layer to the knowledge on training multiculturally competent helping professionals in a particular field, executive coaching. Before this study there was knowledge about the importance of the multicultural counsellor (what governing associations require), there were guidelines on creating curriculum (implementations at the institutional level), and there were scales to measure competence (what trainees gain). However, there had not been a study to see how those connect and intersect within the executive coaching field. While there are studies discussing cross-cultural coaching and the importance, there is no model, framework or operationalization within the institutional or association level unlike the model put forth by Sue et al (1982; 1992). Furthermore these are viewed from a corporate or professional lens largely, as well as from ways to communicate. A next level of research would look at the interplay of the multicultural competencies across the coaching curriculum set by bodies such as ICF, or institutes such as University of Sydney (i.e. Masters of Science in Coaching Psychology), or INSEAD (i.e. Executive Masters in Consulting and Coaching for Change). The study can go a step further by comparing professionals (i.e. practicing) coaches and current students within the program taking a course in cross-cultural coaching.
An additional area of research would be to (a) add the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Reynolds, 1982) to the quantitative study and (b) to add a qualitative component. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) was designed to measure and evaluate socially desirable responses. Adding a measure of social desirability when measuring multicultural counselling competence has shown to be important and advantageous (Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Granello & Wheaton, 1998; Sodowsky, et al., 1998). The scale evaluates these responses in terms of culturally acceptable and approved behaviours, but simultaneously most unlikely to occur. Cartwright, Daniels, and Zhang (2008) likewise suggest that ratings on self-report assessments are not sufficient. They suggest a self-report instrument such as the MAKSS-CE-R should be combined with an independent observer rating strategy by which an individual observes the counselor or trainee in an culturally diverse setting and rates “various aspects of the counselor’s or student’s multicultural competence” (p. 320). The same can be applied to a practicing executive coach or one in training. Additionally, open-ended questions that come to mind as part of interviewing executive coaches are: Are executive coaches prepared to be multiculturally competent executive coaches; How does an executive coach define (a) culture; and (b) multicultural competency; and What are the multicultural competency requirements within the executive coaching field and should they be integrated into executive coaching curricula?

Thirdly, the creation of a tool similar to the MAKSS-CE-R that incorporates the coaches’ awareness of the role of culture, knowledge about cross-cultural issues and skills for successful integration of the appropriate cultural modalities will be important to fully assess the multicultural coaching competency of executive coaches. The new research should aim at
attracting a larger response set overall (i.e. the various coaching associations, and participants of coaching degree programs).
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

This study provided a critical first step in identifying the importance of multicultural competency in practicing executive coaches. Up to this point, the practice of executive coaching has been largely inferred and generally described within the executive coaching literature and the study or need for a cultural perspective has been contextual and tapered towards the client. By identifying the need for incorporating a multicultural competency model within the coaching curriculum as well as within the coach-client relationship there is increased sensitivity towards coaching diverse populations.

Arrendondo & Toporek (2004), referenced several studies (e.g. Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986; Gim, Atkinson, & Kim, 1991) that supported the notion that professionals who show an interest in clients’ cultures or who behave in a culturally sensitive way are perceived as more credible, trustworthy, and competent by clients or research participants of colour.

The executive coaching field has made great strides towards becoming a recognized option for executives, managers, and organizations. It is recommended that when teaching coaching, a multicultural competency course be added and institutes should visit Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) three by three matrix of multicultural counselling competencies. By adding a layer to the matrix to include characteristics of a culturally competent executive coach, depth and relevance are added (Table 7). Cultural competence is first and foremost a commitment to take the next step, and the next and the next toward offering accessible and appropriate services for the diverse clients, communities and organizations being served.
Table 7

Multicultural Coaching Competencies Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a culturally competent executive coach</th>
<th>Dimensions of cultural competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awareness of own assumptions, values, biases and <strong>personal relationship with diversity and coaching</strong></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding the <strong>role of culture</strong> in the worldview of the culturally different client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing culturally appropriate <strong>coaching</strong> intervention strategies and techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subsequent stride forward would be to deepen the multicultural counselling competencies to address coaching as an integral component. Hopefully this research will help to fuel the momentum for coaching associations, institutions and faculty to make a concerted effort to integrate the multicultural counselling/coaching competencies across all areas of coaching practice and curriculum.
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Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – REVISED
(MAKSS-CE-R)

This survey is designed to obtain information on the educational needs of counselor trainees. It is not a test. No grade will be given as a result of completing this survey.

Please complete the demographic items listed below.

Following the demographic section, you will find a list of statements and/or questions related to a variety of issues related to the field of multicultural counseling. Please read each statement/question carefully. From the available choices, circle the one that best fits your reaction to each statement/question. Thank you for your participation.

1. Gender: _____ MALE _____ FEMALE

2. Age ______

3. Race ______

4. Ethnic/Cultural Background ________________

5. State of residence: ______________________

6. Highest educational degree earned: ____________

   In the specialty area of (check one)
   - College Student Personnel Counseling
   - Community Counseling
   - Counselor Education
   - Counseling Psychology
   - Rehabilitation Counseling
   - School Counseling
   - School Psychology
   Other: ________________________________

7. If a current student, educational degree sought: ______________

   In the specialty area of (check one)
   - College Student Personnel Counseling
   - Community Counseling
   - Counselor Education
   - Counseling Psychology
   - Rehabilitation Counseling
   - School Counseling
   - School Psychology
   Other: ________________________________
8. Are you currently enrolled in a course on multicultural counseling? ___YES ___NO

9. Number of completed courses on multicultural counseling: _____

10. Years of experience working with clients who were racially/ethically different from you:
    ____ Less than 1 year
    ____ 1-2 years
    ____ 3-4 years
    ____ 5 years or more

11. Number of past and current clients who were racially/ethically different than you: _____

12. Current occupation (if not a full-time student) ____________

13. Annual Family Income (Check one):
    ____ $7,000 or less
    ____ $7,001 - 15,000
    ____ $15,001 - 25,000
    ____ $25,001 - 35,000
    ____ $35,001 - 50,000
    ____ $50,001 or more

1. Promoting a client’s sense of psychological independence is usually a core goal in most counseling situations.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

2. Even in multicultural counseling situations, basic implicit concepts such as “fairness” and “health,” are not difficult to understand.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

3. How would you react to the following statement? In general, counseling services should be directed toward assisting clients to adjust to stressful environmental situations.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

4. While a person’s natural support system (e.g., family, friends, etc.) plays an important role during a period of personal crisis, formal counseling services tend to result in more constructive outcomes.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

5. The human service professions, especially counseling and clinical psychology, have failed to meet the mental health needs of ethnic minorities.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

6. The effectiveness and legitimacy of the counseling profession would be enhanced if counselors consciously supported universal definitions of normality.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

7. Racial and ethnic persons are under-represented in clinical and counseling psychology.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

8. In counseling, clients from different cultural backgrounds should be given the same treatment that White male clients receive.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

9. The criteria of self-awareness, self-fulfillment, and self-discovery are important measures in most counseling sessions.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
10. The difficulty with the concept of “integration” is its implicit bias in favor of the dominant culture.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

At the present time, how would you rate your understanding of the following terms:

11. “Ethnolinguistic”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

12. “Culture”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

13. “Multicultural”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

14. “Patriarchal”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

15. “Racial”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

16. “Transcultural”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

17. “Pluralism”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

18. “Noninstitutional”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

19. “Cultural Encapsulation”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

20. “Contact Hypothesis”

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

21. At this point in your life, how would you rate your understanding of the impact of the way you think and act when interacting with persons of different cultural backgrounds?

Very Limited Limited Fairly Aware Very Aware

22. At this point in your life, how would you rate yourself in terms of understanding how your cultural background has influenced the way you think and act?

Very Limited Limited Fairly Aware Very Aware

23. How well do you think you could distinguish “intentional” from “accidental” communication signals in a multicultural counseling situation?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

24. How would you rate your ability to effectively consult with a mental health professional concerning the mental health needs of a client whose cultural background is significantly different from your own?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

25. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of lesbian women?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

26. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of older adults?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

27. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of gay men?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

28. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

29. How would you rate your ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of psychological tests in terms of their use with persons from different cultural racial background?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

30. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of men?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

31. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of individuals with disabilities?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

32. How would you rate your ability to effectively secure information and resources to better serve culturally different clients?

Very Limited Limited Good Very Good

33. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of women?
SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

For the Awareness Scale: Reverse score items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9. Then, sum the scores from these items plus the scores from items 5, 7, and 10.

For the Knowledge Scale: Sum the scores for items 11 to 23.

For the Skills Scale: Sum the scores for items 24 to 33.

For the Total Scale: Sum all of the reverse scored items and the rest of the items.
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1. Promoting a client's sense of psychological independence is usually a safe goal to strive for in most counseling/coaching situations.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

2. Even in multicultural counseling/coaching situations, basic implicit concepts such as "fairness" and "health", are not difficult to understand.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

3. How would you react to the following statement? In general, counseling/coaching services should be directed toward assisting clients to adjust to stressful environmental situations.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

4. While a person's natural support system (i.e., family, friends, etc.) plays an important role during a period of personal crisis, formal counseling/coaching services tend to result in more constructive outcomes.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

5. The human service professions, especially counseling and clinical psychology, have failed to meet the mental health needs of ethnic minorities.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

6. The effectiveness and legitimacy of the counseling/coaching profession would be enhanced if counselors consciously supported universal definitions of normality.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

7. Racial and ethnic persons are under-represented in clinical/counseling/coaching psychology.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

8. In counseling/coaching, clients from different ethnic/cultural backgrounds should be given the same treatment that White mainstream clients receive.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

9. The criteria of self-awareness, self-fulfillment, and self-discovery are important measures in most counseling/coaching sessions.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

10. The difficulty with the concept of "integration" is its implicit bias in favor of the dominant culture.

**Strongly Disagree**  **Disagree**  **Agree**  **Strongly Agree**

At the present time, how would you rate your understanding of the following terms:

11. "Ethnicity"

**Very Limited**  **Limited**  **Good**  **Very Good**

12. "Culture"

**Very Limited**  **Limited**  **Good**  **Very Good**

13. "Multicultural"
14. "Prejudice"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

15. "Racism"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

16. "Transcultural"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

17. "Pluralism"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

18. "Cultural Sensitivity"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

19. "Cultural Intelligence"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

20. "Sexuality"  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

21. At this point in your life, how would you rate your understanding of the impact of the way you think and act when interacting with persons of different cultural backgrounds?  
Very Limited  Limited  Fairly Aware  Very Aware

22. At this time in your life, how would you rate yourself in terms of understanding how your cultural background has influenced the way you think and act?  
Very Limited  Limited  Fairly Aware  Very Aware

23. How well do you think you could distinguish "intentional" from "accidental" communication signals in a multicultural counseling/coaching situation?  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

24. How would you rate your ability to effectively consult with another mental health or coaching professional concerning the mental health or coaching needs of a client whose cultural background is significantly different from your own?  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

25. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of lesbian women?  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

26. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of older adults?  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

27. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of gay men?  
Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good
28. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

29. How would you rate your ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of psychological tests (i.e. psychometric assessments used in coaching situations) in terms of their use with persons from different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

30. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of men?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

31. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of individuals with disabilities?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

32. How would you rate your ability to effectively secure information and resources to better serve culturally different clients?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good

33. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health/coaching needs of women?
   Very Limited  Limited  Good  Very Good
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Personal Communication with Bryan S. K. Kim (PhD):
Seeking permission to use MAKSS-CE-R
to me

Dear Reema:

Thank you for your interest in the MAKSS-CE-R. Attached is the scale and its scoring instructions. You have my permission to use the scale for your research. However, please do not make any changes, as doing so could change its psychometric properties.

Best wishes,
Bryan Kim
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Demographic Questionnaire (as seen on Qualtrics)
**DQ**

**DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please take a moment to answer some demographic questions. Information provided herewith will not be used to track or analyze you individually. It will be used in an aggregate manner to collect and analyze data.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>What is your current age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>To what ethnic group do you primarily identify yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Options: African American/Black; Afrikaans; American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian (Chinese, Indonesian, Malaysian, etc); Pacific Islander; Caucasian/White; Indian (origins of Indian Subcontinent); Latin; Latina/Hispanic; Middle Easterner; Australian/New Zealander; Other (please specify).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>What languages are you proficient in (including English)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>What was your undergraduate field of study or academic major?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Do you currently have a graduate degree or degrees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D7  If having a graduate degree, please identify the degree level (you may choose more than one if applicable)

- Postgraduate diploma
- Masters
- Ph.D.
- Ed.D.
- Psy.D
- MD
- JD
- Other Doctoral-Level Professional (please specify)

D8  (If applicable) What was your postgraduate field of study or academic major?

- Business
- Finance
- Marketing
- Pure Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Arts and Literature
- Other

D9  Was cross-cultural training a component of your coursework or training?

- Yes (Please provide details)
- No

D10  Please describe any other educational experiences that you would consider relevant to your current practice as an executive coach.

D11  Have you had any work experience within or related to the following job categories?

( Business Administration, Business Consulting, Sales and Marketing, Human Resources, Medicine, Technical Fields (please specify), Psychology (please specify), Counseling, Academia (university-related), Teaching, Ministry, Other (please specify)

How long? (Describe in years)
D12 Please describe any other work-related history that you would consider relevant to your current practice as an executive coach.

D13 Are you a licensed clinician?

- Yes
- No

D14 If you are a licensed clinician, what is your license type?

- Licensed Professional Counselor
- Licensed Psychologist
- Licensed Clinical Social Worker
- Other

D15 Please select if you are a professional member of any of the following associations.

- International Coaching Federation (ICF)
- International Society of Coaching Psychology (ISCP)
- Association for Coaching (AC)
- Association of Coaching Training Organizations (ACTO)
- European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC)
- International Association for Coaches
- Others

D16 Please describe any professional training that you would consider relevant to your current practice as an executive coach and the approximate number of hours engaged in such training.

D17 How long have you been engaged in the practice of executive coaching? (Describe in years)
D18

On a scale of 1 to 5 (1=Low and 5=High), please rate your multicultural coaching competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Coaching Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D19

Are you a current participant or alumni of INSEAD's Consulting and Coaching for Change (CCC) Program?

- Current Participant
- Alumni
- Neither
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Email Message Sent to ICF & INSEAD CCC Participants (Current & Alumni) via Susan Tang & Elizabeth Florent-Treacy
Dear CCC Participants,

I am Reema Mirchandani, a participant of CCC - Wave 12 (Singapore) and I am in the midst of collecting data for my Thesis - a road many of you have already traveled and some of you eventually will.

For my thesis I am assessing the self-perceived multicultural coaching competency of practicing executive coaches. In the counseling or coaching world, all interactions with clients are considered multicultural in nature. Thus the need for counselors/coaches to be multiculturally competent in dealing with diversity. Cultural competency covers areas such as awareness, knowledge and skills. The survey attached helps in determining ones competency level.

Your participation and time invested in this study is greatly appreciated.

Please note that no Identifying information will be retained in the analysis of data. **ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ANONYMOUS.** Please attempt to complete all questions in order to retain the validity of the study.

**Explanatory Statement:**

- The survey consists of (a) Informed Consent Form; (b) Demographics Questionnaire; & (c) MCC Survey. The assessment ends with 2 short feedback questions.
- You are given 48 hours to complete the survey (i.e. you can save it and come back to it within 48 hours), however you are requested to do this in one-sitting.
- The total estimated time to complete the assessment is about 10-15 mins.
- The survey is available from Wed, 10 April 2013 - Fri, 19 April 2013
- The word "practicing" has been used rather loosely for this study to include coaches with 1 - 50+ years of experience. (I noted that some of my classmates started coaching into the 2nd CCC Module and continue to do so.)

I've invited you to read the PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM, and subsequently fill out the survey on Multicultural Coaching Competency. Please access this link: [http://insead.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2hQ6WFsJrRBdQvX](http://insead.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2hQ6WFsJrRBdQvX).

I thank you in advance and encourage you to share this survey within your coaching network (ICF or otherwise).

Yours sincerely,

Reema Mirchandani  
CCC Participant-Wave 12, INSEAD  
E: reema.mirchandani@insead.edu  
M: (614) 67802966; (65) 97857442
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Participant Consent Form
Consent Form – Online Surveys & Questionnaire

Title: Self-Perceived Multicultural Coaching Competence of Practicing Executive Coaches.

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the INSEAD researcher for their records

I agree to take part in the INSEAD research project specified above. I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that:

I agree to complete surveys & questionnaire asking me about multicultural coaching competence.

I understand that my participation is voluntary; that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw only before submitting the online questionnaire. After that point it will not be possible to identify which response is yours as they are anonymous.

I understand that any data that the researcher extracts from the questionnaires for use in reports or published findings will not, under any circumstances, contain names or identifying characteristics.

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that could lead to the identification of any individual will be disclosed in any reports on the project, or to any other party.

I understand that data from the surveys & questionnaire will be kept in a secure storage and accessible to the researcher and Supervisor only. I also understand that the data will be destroyed after a 5 year period.

☐ Accept  ☐ Decline
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MCC - Demographic Data Collected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reema Mirchandani</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>CCC-101</td>
<td>Digital Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC-102</td>
<td>Social Media Strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC-103</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC-104</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC-105</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC-106</td>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Details**

- **CCC-101**: Digital Marketing
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
- **CCC-102**: Social Media Strategies
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
- **CCC-103**: Project Management
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
- **CCC-104**: Data Analysis
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
- **CCC-105**: Entrepreneurship
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
- **CCC-106**: Business Ethics
  - Credits: 3
  - Grade: A
  - Notes: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Description of the study design</td>
<td>3x15 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Description of the intervention</td>
<td>3x15 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Description of the outcomes</td>
<td>3x15 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Description of the data analysis</td>
<td>3x15 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Description of the follow-up</td>
<td>3x15 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MCC - Survey Data Collected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Ops</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Ops</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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$t$-Test Results: Paired Two Sample For Means

t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means
### t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.308695652</td>
<td>2.986622074</td>
<td>2.82173913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.114466403</td>
<td>0.14021096</td>
<td>0.187233202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.263996891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-5.733380234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>4.55437E-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.717144374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>9.10874E-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.073873068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.986622074</td>
<td>2.82173913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.14021096</td>
<td>0.187233202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.45074064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>1.856705914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.038397242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.717144374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.076794484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.073873068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.308695652</td>
<td>2.82173913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.114466403</td>
<td>0.187233202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.411196048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-3.787154794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.000506072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.717144374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.001012144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.073873068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>