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ABSTRACT

All organizations have their individual strengths and weaknesses. Keeping up with technology and finding appropriate strategic focuses are important, but a driving force to success lies with the engagement of its employees.

This study was aimed at researching the impact of team leaders using coaching skills with their team members at the DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division. The challenge for DHL Thailand is to develop its team leaders and members to meet the corporate vision and mission through the opportunity of enhanced relations with their leaders and engagement in work. The research examined how team leaders developing their coaching skills and coaching their team members affected dimensions of the team leader/team member relationship as measured through the dimensions of the Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR), a tool which measures a team member’s perceptions on dimensions of the relationship that team members create and share with their team leader. As well, the Gallup Q12 survey was given to the team members to measure changes in team member engagement before and after the intervention. While the PQCR measures the dimensions of the coaching relationship, the Gallup Q12 provides data about the change in the results of team member engagement.

The research findings indicated that the ODI had an impact on the team leader and team member relations and on employee engagement. This was supported by both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The researcher posits that team leaders coaching team members may enhance the team leader/team member relationship and the level of engagement of team members. Limitations of the study may include the ability of the researcher to draw descriptive or inferential conclusions of the sample data gathered from the
THE EFFECTS OF TEAM LEADER COACHING ON TEAM MEMBERS

research group, and the limitation of generalizing the findings of one organizational study to all organizations in the business world, even those with similar missions and goals. Recommendation’s for further study include to continue developing team leaders in their coaching skills and using these skills with their team members on a regular basis, to explore other types of interventions that could affect employee engagement, and to conduct further interviews with the participants about topics related to attitudes of employee engagement.
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CHAPTER I - THE POTENTIAL CHALLENGE FOR CHANGE

The Challenge in Perspective

Studies indicate that organizations are determined to develop and maintain high-performing and engaged workforces to ensure that their operations run uninterrupted (Lewis, 1996). A 2013 Harvard Business Review Survey reports that business leaders see the top three success factors for organizations worldwide are to achieve a high level of customer service, to have effective communications, and to achieve a high level of employee engagement. The report also notes that a highly engaged workforce can maximize an organization’s investment in human capital, improve overall productivity, and reduce costs (Harvard Business Review, 2013).

This desire for increased employee engagement creates numerous challenges and options for organizations to explore. Some of these options include changes in policies and practices to influence employee attitude and behavior, analysis and redesign of work, rewards systems, changes in compensatory policies, and skills development for increases in innovation and productivity (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008).

How team leaders lead and regard their team members can also have a significant influence on the engagement level of the teams. Leadership qualities such as setting a good example, asking for input from team members, showing empathy, stretching the abilities of team members, setting up reward systems, and developing and promoting team members from within the organization are behaviors that can help to promote employee engagement (OfficeTeam, 2013).

In addition to these strategies and initiatives, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) also suggest that team leader coaching can foster increased development of team members by helping them to plan their work, develop meaningful goals, and strengthen the relationship
between team members and team leaders acting as coaches. In turn, this relationship offers support and accountability for team members who are increasingly motivated to achieve their goals and in turn feel more engaged with their organization.

Coaching is also valued for its capacity to create higher levels of organizational engagement in teams, which according to the International Coach Federation (2013) can benefit organizations in terms of leadership development and performance as well as reduced levels of attrition and overall improvements in teamwork. Furthermore, adopting coaching as a strategy can bring many positive returns to the organization itself (Shih, Chiang, & Hsu, 2006).

In addition to the benefits coaching can provide to an organization, it can also support team leaders and members who have new responsibilities or who need to improve their performance. (Jarvis, 2005). This benefit can be demonstrated through increased productivity, including work performance, business management, time management and team effectiveness. Team leader coaching can develop more positive employees by improving self-confidence, building closer relations with other team members, enhancing communication skills, and nurturing a better work/life balance (International Coach Federation, 2016). Research on coaching programs from the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) provides further examples of benefits as it suggests that if effectively implemented, those receiving coaching will exhibit a greater level of engagement, including satisfaction with their jobs and more positive attitudes as well as creating an improved connection to the team member’s organization and team leader (Ragins & Cotton, 2000).

To better understand coaching in various perspectives, the following sections examine current challenges that organizations and teams face, including the role of team leaders
coaching as a strategic tool for increasing employee engagement. This topic is observed from global, regional (Asia), and national (Thai) perspectives, including DHL Thailand Supply Chain.

**Global Perspective.**

This section provides an overview of the importance and challenge of increasing employee engagement within organizations on a global scale and how coaching may support that increase in engagement.

As the global community becomes increasingly connected there is emphasis on the importance of employing teams that can quickly react and adapt to changes in a constantly fluctuating business environment (Bass & Bass, 2008). This realization has created a need for organizations to find ways to meet these challenges. Team leader coaching may be offered as one solution. In fact, there has been steady growth in the coaching profession worldwide, with over seventy percent of organizations utilizing coaching practices, primarily in Western Europe, North America, and Australasia (Zenger & Stinnett, 2006). Organizations in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Asia Pacific are also increasingly choosing coaching as an effective tool for team member development (International Coach Federation, 2016).

Another survey (International Coaching Federation, 2015) estimates that coaching services have generated more than 1.5 billion dollars in income and that at that time there were in excess of 30,000 full time coaches worldwide. Coaching has been shown as an effective strategy in assisting the development of team members and leaders to be better equipped to face the challenges of globalization. Team leader coaching appears to provide organizations the potential to increase organizational engagement and performance (Meggison & Clutterbuck, 2005) and to be more competitive globally. Such studies help explain why coaching is now regarded as an effective organizational development tool and
strategy as well as a successful way to develop team leaders in organizations for the challenges of communicating with team members towards the goal of increasing engagement (Kilburg, 1996). It is therefore relevant to explore how coaching helps organizations to be more globally adaptable in order to improve employee engagement.

In the global environment contemporary employees show an increased drive for greater self-fulfillment and personal development within their organizations. This motivation has lead organizations to provide expanded skills and behavior development for its teams by actively facilitating them to be more engaged, self-directed and goal oriented. Coaching could support organizations in driving the move towards meeting these needs through increased productivity, performance, and improved relations with team members (Lewis, 1996).

In fact, beyond financial incentives Bass and Bass also suggest that it is not enough for organizations to simply offer competitive wages but that there also appears a need to empower teams towards a greater sense of self-direction and engagement in work. Additionally, it is increasingly important that team leaders spend less time in directing or controlling team members as was traditionally practiced (Bass & Bass, 2008). In a globalized economy performance standards are not static but instead require continuous improvement mandating that organizations and teams be adaptable and proactive.

These fluid and ever changing global demands suggest that team members are better prepared to succeed when they are flexible in their skills development, and that teams increase their own value and worth to the organization when they are better able to understand, anticipate and be ready to accept and align their own developmental needs with organizational goals in order to maintain high performance (Muongmee, 2007).
So too, as organizations continue to face and address the growing global need for a flexible, responsive, and engaged workforce, team leaders may find it advantageous to assist their team members in defining organizational goals in ways that are authentic and positive (Ellinger & Bostrom, 1999). A 2014 Gallup poll found that less than thirty-one percent of team members are engaged in their work, fifty-one percent are not engaged, and nineteen percent are actively disengaged. Consequently, organizations are more frequently assessing team leaders on their team members' engagement levels through the use of metrics and consequently team leaders are often giving more attention to promotion of team engagement strategies than in the past. Consequentially, team leaders who focus on raising levels of employee ownership and trust leads to stronger engagement to the organization. (Adkins, 2015). This development may in turn affect how team members feel towards their team leaders, and strengthen the level of attachment to their organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Kidd and Smewing (2001) note that effective coaching is likely to impact the degree to which team members meet their need for affection and belonging in their workplace. This experience may create greater attachment to the organization and increased performance. Mottaz (1988) also found that when team members have the perception that they are receiving support from their own team leaders through coaching they are more likely to demonstrate organizational engagement. The empowerment that coaching can bring to team members from their leader has the potential to increase the level of trust, which can follow in an increase in team member engagement levels (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Beyond supporting improved relationships between team leaders and team members, coaching can also assist in meeting the technological demands of the twenty-first century. With advances in technology and increased global competitiveness, organizations are recognizing that new styles and approaches to leadership must be developed in order to aid
teams in adapting to new challenges. As a result, internal coaching programs have been one means of meeting the demands of globalization across many industries (Frisch 2001). In fact as far back as 20 years previously, Olivero (1997) noted a twenty-two percent increase in productivity after a series of managerial training modules, but after a coaching intervention there was an eighty-eight percent rise in productivity. Similarly, Jarvis (2005) found that nineteen percent of team leader coaching was very effective, and sixty-five percent was effective. The utilization of team leaders as coaches has fostered a move away from organizational ‘command and control’ culture with improvements demonstrated in managerial skills and capability. This finding has changed the behavior of coaches and increased employee engagement that has been shown to be increasingly prepared to meet the demands of the global economy.

In summary, leadership in a global context requires team leaders to have the ability to interact with diverse backgrounds and communication styles (Goldsmith & Greenberg, 2003). Because of this need for increased skill development, team leaders coaching their team members are now considered important in today’s competitive global environment. The ability to inspire and increase levels of communication and engagement of teams has a positive impact on productivity and engagement, and creates the potential to increase proactivity of team members to the organization’s success (McLead, 2003).

Asian Perspective.

As a result of globalization Asia now has the fastest growing economies in the world, and remains the most dynamic part of the global economy. However, it is also bracing for the effects from a weak global recovery, a slower global trade, and a short term impact form the growth transition of China (International Monetary Fund, 2016).
Meeting these challenges is key to ensuring steady economic growth across the Asian region. In short, how do organizations meet the essential challenges of building and retaining engaged and committed teams? Findings of a survey of twelve developed or developing Asian nations indicate that most team members are proud to work for their organizations but are reluctant to commit to their role for more than one year. The challenges facing organizations to retain talent are important to organizational success. In order to ensure long-term team retention there is a growing need to enhance leadership development and improve communication skills of team leaders (Work Taiwan, 2004-2005). Young leaders especially are the most culturally agile, so it is important to develop their skills to face the challenges that the Asian business environment presents (Bersin, 2014).

When studying the engagement of these new leaders, Adams (2013) noted that less than a quarter of the organizations in Asia feel that their leaders are prepared for the future. This deficit is partly due to rapid advances in careers compounded by leaders being placed in positions for which they are not yet prepared. Adams (2013) further suggested that leaders are often expected to simply follow the decisions of others, and accordingly feel disempowered.

Viewed from another perspective, Wylie (2004) noted that it may be advantageous for team leaders to have the ability to maintain their own level of engagement and motivation within the workplace in order to effectively maintain the level of their own team members at an effectively engaged level. According to a 2016 Aon Hewitt report on global trends in employee engagement, the improvement across Asia in this area has shown measurable improvement. Organizations in Asia require highly engaged and productive workers to further tap into the opportunities for growth. The Asian region has a five percent a year projected regional growth rate through 2020, and organizations need employees who will be
strong and committed advocates for their organization (Aon, 2016). Thus, support should ideally be in place that fosters the development of new and upcoming team leaders, providing them expanded strategic and global perspectives alongside the essential operational leadership skills (Adams, 2013). As is noted in the following discussion, coaching, among other alternatives, could be helpful in this regard.

Multiple practices to influence team member attitude and behavior have been utilized, such as analysis and design of work, rewards systems, compensation, and skills development for increases in innovation and productivity (Need, 2006). Coaching skills could help leaders be better communicators and be more supportive of their team members, which in turn could create relationships that have a positive impact on overall employee engagement (Bartlett, 2001). Thus, many organizations in Asia in recent years have been utilizing coaching as one of the strategies to address needs of teams to be more resourceful and flexible as well as more engaged and connected with their organizations (Nangalia & Nangalia, 2010).

A related research study conducted by Ratanjee in 2013 on the skills development of several Asian nations concluded that while all countries are transforming organizations at their own pace, some countries are further along in their development. Realistically this movement towards leadership development will advance according to each country’s individual business climate. Ratanjee (2013) noted that when senior leadership is venerated and norms and customs are valued over developing leaders to meet their full potential it may lead to creating team members who think like their leader, creating a work environment that relies more on groupthink than the development of actual critical thinking skills or independent thought. Instead, effective leaders recognize that they can be more effective with the support and engagement of those whom they lead. Coaching may be one of the
solutions that enables team leaders in Asia to develop the attributes of self-directed and goal oriented thinking in team members.

To conclude, coaching has been associated with raising the confidence of team members in their professional abilities by improving their skills and helping them to set and attain goals which in turn may assist in attaining an overall increase in organizational satisfaction and motivation. This enhancement could then help in developing improved interaction with colleagues, leading to improvements in performance (Greif, 2007). While coaching is not the sole means of employee and team development, it may offer the capacity to complement and expand on other developmental policies and programs.

Thai Perspective

Thailand has achieved a record pace of growth in 2017, signaling a positive outlook. This fact has hastened urbanization, wealth creation, education and mass communications, and has encouraged growth in the middle class while offering greater business autonomy. For the past two decades this growth has created some challenges to the more traditional Thai bureaucratic systems (International Monetary Fund, 2016).

Consequentially, Thailand has faced obstacles as it has moved into the twenty-first century, requiring its corporate teams to interact more skillfully in order to meet the demands of the global and regional economies that are increasingly connected and complicated (Wedel & Rondinelli, 2001). This realization is not new. The introduction of coaching in Thai organizations may offer support to the facilitation of learning while encouraging growth, development and engagement of team members (Mink, Owen, & Mink, 1993).

Shore & Bloom (1986) noted a major challenge to team member development in Thailand is in the formal education system that inhibits team members’ on-the-job critical and analytical skills. In fact, education policy reform in Thailand has increasingly
emphasized thinking and analytical skills to develop lifelong learning practices and increase self-directed learning behaviors (Pimpa & Rojanapanich, 2013). Student-centered learning has the capacity to evolve the Thai education system to focus on lifelong learning in which students work to find solutions for problems without a total dependency on an instructor (Clasen & Bowman, 1974). Students in this new environment learn to reason independently with the goal of using critical thinking as an everyday life skill. Thus, development of critical thinking skills is one of the policy goals within the Thai education system. The capacity for self-directed learners aligns with the aims of coaching - to promote a deeper connection and awareness of goal identification and achievement.

However, there are those leaders within the Thai educational system who express concern over Thailand succumbing to international educational “fads”, including the decentralization of learning, an increased focus on student centered learning, and increased promotion of the importance of technology in education (Fry & Bi, 2013). This divide in educational philosophy prevents learners from developing the skills needed to be self-sufficient in their learning or in feeling comfortable or confident in using critical thinking skills later in life. As Thais leave the university and enter the workforce they may not be equipped with those skills needed to be self-directed learners. The introduction of coaching in organizations could at least partially address this learning gap. Through the practices of positive and focused dialogue as established between a coach and coachee, there is the chance to create awareness, purpose, competence and well-being, possibly increasing engagement (Bawany, 2015). The nature of coaching in promoting self-directed thinking skills could assist in meeting this learning and development gap. However, there are still significant challenges that Thai organizations face in their attempts at having increasingly
self-directed, motivated and engaged teams. One is in facing the inherent compliance culture found within many Thai organizations.

A major challenge in traditional educational administrative practices in Thailand is the emphasis on high centralization with the individuals within the system implicitly supporting what is known as a “compliance culture.” Within the realm of the entrenched generation of team leaders it is understood and is still relevant today that the ‘orders from above are the orders we follow’ (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). Despite advances and progress made towards promotion of modern management philosophies, a compliance culture still prevails within the business, education, and governmental sectors, and consequentially Thai institutions continue to rely heavily on position power in the implementation of new programs or policies (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000).

It is still commonplace for traditional Thai business leaders to direct without question and for team members follow in deference. The cultural assumption is that even change entails the establishment of orders from positions of authority which will be followed and rarely questioned (Hallinger, Chantarapanya, Sriboonma & Kantamara, 2000). Thais also exhibit a strong ‘We’ over ‘I’ mentality. Thais seek stability through their social relationships and emphasize harmonious relationships to maintain certainty. Anything that may detract from this harmony could create resistance (Hallinger et al., 2000). Rather than seeing the need for change from an individual perspective, Thais look to their personal social groups to make sense of their role when they are faced with role change or personal criticism. Therefore, Thais are more likely to change as a group rather than as an individual (Hallinger et al., 2000).

Coaching has the capacity to transform this group-mentality perspective to one in which team members understand their roles within the organization as individuals as well as
within the group context. This perspective could allow management to better align teams and organizational goals (Bawany, 2013).

Moreover, coaching may have capacity to create a more genuine relationship between the team leader and team member, as well as positively affect communication effectiveness within this relationship by feeling more connected and comfortable with the leader (Brodie et al., 2010). In this process, the team member will also further their own professional development. This coaching relationship may have a positive impact on what are termed the “21st Century skills of self-directed learning, critical thinking, collaboration and communication (Bellanca, J. & Brandt, R. 2010). Doing so may in turn have a positive impact on the engagement of the team members.

It has been noted however that older generations of Thai management attach importance to authoritarian style management, and standards of being an excellent leader amongst this group are generally characterized by a show of respect, adherence to and development of organizational culture, and working with generational differences in a non-confrontational manner. Harmony, respect and deference to authority remain strong within the older generation of Thai leaders (Selvarajah & Meyer, 2013).

In contrast, younger Thai managers are seeking a more collaborative and harmonious working environment as opposed to merely paying deference to authority (Selvarajah & Meyer, 2013). Accordingly, newly appointed Thai managers are dissatisfied in complying with the current authoritative leadership structure. It may be possible that through the implementation of coaching practices these younger team leaders would benefit in the hands-on process as it would provide in developing relationships with their team members while helping improve performance and capabilities (Orth, Wilkinson & Benfari, 1987). In this
dissertation, utilizing coaching as a tool that advances Thai organizations towards higher levels of engagement and development will be researched.

**The Focal System**

DHL conducts business in over 220 countries and territories. Its workforce exceeds 340,000, providing solutions for a vast number of logistics needs. For example, DHL is part of the world’s leading postal and logistics company Deutsche Post DHL Group, and encompasses the business units DHL Express, DHL Parcel, DHL eCommerce, DHL Global Forwarding, DHL Freight and DHL Supply Chain.

DHL Supply Chain is also the global market leader in contract logistics (DHL, 2014). It provides warehousing, managed transport and value-added services and offers solutions for corporate information and communications management. This research project focused on DHL Supply Chain Thailand.

Ms. Natcha Satienpoch, The Senior Manager for Talent Management/Acquisition and L&D for DHL Supply Chain Thailand, cares deeply for her staff, understands coaching, and would like to develop the potential of the employees. She is also trained in coaching skills and has herself been a coachee. She clearly sees the power of coaching and how it can positively affect team leaders and team members. She has also expressed enthusiasm and support for overseeing a coaching intervention research within her organization (source: researcher).

The researcher thus facilitated a SOAR analysis to better understand the organization’s challenges and the opportunity for coaching to be beneficial. SOAR is an appreciative focused analysis whereby subjects are led through a series of questions formed by what they feel their organization’s *Strengths* are, how these organizational strengths lead to *Opportunities*, how these opportunities then align with the *Aspirations* (goals, vision
mission) of the organization. From these Aspirations, it is then derived what Results can be delivered in measurable and specific ways to the organization (Stavros et al, 2003).

The researcher met with Ms. Natcha Satienpoch and two of her department's members for the focus group meeting. The focus group members were chosen by the Ms. Satienpoch, as they had a keen understanding of training and development issues and in turn saw the challenges to enhancing the engagement levels of teams. The members of the focus group were bright, optimistic, and had enthusiasm to see their organization flourish. The focus group activity lasted approximately 90 minutes.

The researcher guided the SOAR process to gather the strengths, perspectives and aspirations of the focus group. The focus was on discovering conditions that have created success for the organization. While threats, weaknesses or problems were not ignored, they were reframed when possible to focus on what the organization wanted, rather than what it did not want. The strengths were summarized and opportunities were identified.

Overall, the SOAR focus-group discussion revealed that while the organization strives to be open and positive in its relations with all team members, there is still room for increased engagement, in particular from the ‘Millennial’ employees who typically showed less loyalty to the organization and consequently demonstrated little care for long term goals or job security. There had been many challenges in understanding, let alone meeting, the needs of this generation of team members. A 2012 survey of over 11,000 respondents in the ‘millennial generation’ seemed to parallel the challenges faced by DHL. The study revealed the top 5 concerns of the millennials were to (1) have opportunities for advancement, (2) have good people to work with, (3) have good people to report to, (4) have opportunity to develop skills, and (5) have a good life/work balance (Ng, Schweitzer & Lyons, 2012).
DHL up until then had had some success in training and development initiatives to engage or commit the millennial generation team members to connect to the organization to build longer term engagement. However, it was a concern that the needs of this group of team members were not being fully met.

While DHL provides leaders with skills training to assist them in their development there still remained challenges in encouraging a move from a ‘command and control’ paradigm of tactics towards the enablement and empowerment of team members. Moreover, the level of proficiency in performance management skills that team leaders currently possessed appeared to be in need of upgrading or improvement. Team members had expressed a desire to receive more meaningful development in feedback skills, and they also expressed the need for increased support from their leaders to develop their own growth potential.

Leaders had indicated they lack the skills to help their team members in the areas of supporting them with feedback and to support their team members’ development. While they had received management training through courses offered by DHL, some respondents felt they lacked the ability to fully support their team members sufficiently. These respondents expressed the need to better balance and manage the performance of their teams, but often times felt overwhelmed by the pressures of their responsibilities in meeting deadlines and targets. Having the opportunity to enable team members to take on increased ownership of their responsibilities and to be more confident in their abilities to set goals and problem solve would establish a working environment that was more proactive, strategic, and empowered.

Therefore, those in the focus group were adamant that an intervention of equipping team leaders with coaching skills and having team leaders coach their team members could support the team members to be more self-directed and proactive in their work. Furthermore,
management enthusiastically supported a coaching intervention and the research as a useful way to gauge whether coaching could be an integrated development tool for both team leaders as well as team members. Finally, the focus group members expressed a hope that a coaching initiative would positively affect the performance of employees and build their skills through coaching and being coached in order to achieve a greater level of customer satisfaction and to meet the organization’s goals. Table 1 presents a summary of the findings from the SOAR analysis.

Table 1

A summary of the DHL Supply Chain SOAR session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior leadership is accessible to all members of the organization.</td>
<td>1. Innovation can be valued and nurtured more, in order to grow the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team members feel free to express their opinions.</td>
<td>2. The millennial generation employees should be studied to be more engaged and committed to the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team leaders develop positive relationships with their team members.</td>
<td>3. Some members of management may benefit by being nurtured to be more caring and engaged with their team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team leaders with charisma have more devoted and engaged team members than those leaders without as much charisma.</td>
<td>4. Increase team building activities to create more engagement which may benefit from utilizing coaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership seeks less resistance to change through the development of learning activities that make team members feel more engaged.</td>
<td>1. Better handling of complaints that are filed with the HR by streamlining the HR system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The organization accommodates the goal formation of its team members.</td>
<td>2. The HR department needs to be more strategic and emphasize more soft skills development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership encourages team members to feel they have a place within the company and can grow on a long-term basis.</td>
<td>3. The company needs to focus on retention of its staff throughout the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team members learn how to balance being compliant to organization norms while encouraging innovative thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Organizational Structure of DHL Thailand.

Figure 1 highlights the areas of the DHL Thailand Supply Chain where the participants had been chosen for this research. These were team leaders of a distribution center for Makro, which is managed by DHL Thailand Supply Chain. These team leaders perform various functions within the organization, and report to the Heads of Operations of either Makro Fresh (distribution for fresh produce for Makro) or Makro Dry (distribution for dry goods for Makro). For each team leader involved, three of their team members were to receive coaching. This formula created a total of 16 team leader coaches and 48 team member coachees, respectively. The team leader positions are noted in the chart as the offshoots of the Makro Account Head, Makro Fresh Head and the Makro Dry Head.

![Organizational Chart - DHL Supply Chain - Makro Client](image)

*Figure 1. Organizational Chart – DHL Supply Chain – Makro Client. This figure outlines the organizational structure of the research participants.*
To gain a deeper understanding of the organizational structure of the research subject than was presented in the last section, the researcher conducted a McKinsey 7-S analysis. This analysis aided to bring into focus the management challenges of DHL in working towards its stated values of creating more self-directed and proactive teams.

**Analysis of Organization Using the McKinsey 7-S.**

An analysis of the DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division was conducted using the McKinsey 7-S model. This model can be used to assess the competitive and strategic positioning of an organization. The model proposes that there are seven key components to be aligned: strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style, and shared values. Having a clear understanding of an organization’s competitive position is essential for its growth and performance. The McKinsey 7-S framework represented in Figure 2 has been widely used for this purpose, acting as a model that needs to be aligned so an organization can effectively manage the competitive forces that may affect its performance (Mindtools, 2014).

![Figure 2. The McKinsey 7-S Framework (Tracey & Blood, 2012).](image)

Strategy, Structure and Systems are considered to be ‘hard Ss’. “Strategy” reflects the planned activities of the organization to meet its competition (external environment).
"Structure" defines divisions of task and labor, and the overall hierarchy of the organization. "Systems" describes the way in which the organization manages its processes and procedures. The other four elements, called the soft S's, are "Staff", "Skills", "Style" and "Shared" values. Staff refers to those who are employed in the organization, including their backgrounds and experience. Skills refers to what the organization does well, and includes the competencies that are leveraged to manage the organizational system, its technology and its customers. Style represents the collectively held beliefs, values and behaviors of the organization. The Shared Values element, at the center of the model, represents the overarching goals of the organization, those things which give team members meaning and a sense of purpose (Tracey & Blood, 2012).

Data was collected and analyzed for the McKinsey 7-S Framework analysis of the DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division from both first person interviews as well as research of secondary sources, primarily web based and print based information.

**Company Profile.**

DHL began its operations as the first international door to door delivery service in 1969, and 'invented' air express delivery. By 1973 DHL had over 3,000 clients and 314 staff in worldwide to handle over 500,000 shipments per year. The organization continued its rapid growth worldwide becoming a leading innovator in shipment technologies. In 1990 DHL became partners with several other major transport organizations, including Lufthansa Cargo, Japan Airlines, Nissho Iwai and Western Union, thus becoming one of the first in its industry to expand into the Eastern European markets. It continues to diversify its services and expand its offices and distribution centers worldwide to this day (DHL, 2014).

DHL Thailand includes express services, eCommerce, freight transportation, and supply chain solutions. The focus of this profile is on the supply chain division of DHL
Thailand. The supply chain division at DHL Thailand has various functions. It plans the logistics of the supply chain, sources and warehouses materials, manufactures products, stores and customizes goods, delivers said products through multiple means of transport, and returns unneeded goods. These tasks require innovative processes and solutions (DHL Thailand, 2016).

**Strategy.**

In April 2014, Deutsche Post DHL Group announced its 2020 strategy, to position itself as “The Postal Service for Germany and The Logistics Provider for the World”. The three pillars of its strategy are to “Focus, Connect and Grow.” DHL focuses on logistics as its core business with a target for it to account for 85% of its revenue in 2020. It will continue to exploit the world’s growth markets to reach this target. The “Focus” pillar refers to its 2015 strategy to be a “Provider, Employer and Investment of Choice”, including increased investment in its corporate social responsibility programs worldwide. The “Connect” pillar looks to meet the potential of the organization through a thorough exchange of its expertise and experience. This development will require increased collaboration of its talent to ensure top quality and excellence. This goal includes inter-organization certifications and training, ensuring that the skills and knowledge for any job are being met. The pillar “Grow” refers to the strategy of growth and development, in particular that of e-commerce. The organization also plans to export and market its expertise and knowledge to other regions and emerging markets. Its 2020 strategy will help expand the organization’s global footprint with a planned 30% of its revenues stemming from emerging markets (DHL, 2015).
Staff, Skills, Style, and Shared Values.

DHL Supply Chain has a policy to hire and develop leaders who understand the “big picture” of the organization and their role within it. They seek leaders who can focus on their current work while also being able to contemplate future strategy. DHL supply chain focuses on hiring the best talent they can in logistics management.

In an informal interview with Ms. Natcha Satienpoch, the Senior Manager of Learning and Development at DHL Supply Chain Thailand, it was noted that that DHL has developed a series of effective processes for tracking projects, and that the organization strives to foster a culture that seeks continuous improvement. The company values efficiency, the best service possible, and encourages all team members to share new ideas to improve any and all systems. This strategy is noted in the company profile published in 2015 ((DHL, 2015).

Ms. Satienpoch also emphasizes that DHL highly values its team members, considering them the most valuable resource, and that if they are encouraged and supported they will also be more engaged to their organization. The organization is intent on increasing the capacity and potential of its team members, to be more self-directed and utilizing their strengths to build on their skills.

Ms. Satienpoch noted as well that there is a need for more team leaders who have the ability to develop their team members. Leadership at the junior level should help team members use more critical thinking skills, be more self-confident, and learn to set goals. Thus, it would appear that many of the soft skills are in place and that the organization has promoted their development, but that some leaders may lack certain skills in order to help their team members meet their full potential.
**Systems and Structure.**

Many of the systems that DHL Supply Chain have in place support their strategy to maintain coordinated work systems. The team leaders spend a substantial amount of time with their teams to check on details of their work. The company is quite detailed ensuring efficient running of the organization. Ms. Satienpoch sees coaching and teamwork as key to this efficiency. She commented that she would actually like team leaders to be able to ‘let go’ more in order to help the teams build trust and be more engaged by being part of the decision making process. A core element of this strategy would give discretion while empowering team members without micro-management. The notion of empowering team members requires the need to provide high standards by ensuring procedures are carried out successfully and on time.

DHL Thailand Supply Chain’s structure parallels its overall corporate structure. It is fairly top-down management requiring strict processes that need to be followed, though the company’s strategy nevertheless values a more collaborative organizational approach. To achieve these twin goals there should be increased communication and ongoing professional development, especially with team leaders. This dual strategy would help to promote more focus on allowing all team members to feel their ideas are important and consequently that they are more engaged in their work. Moreover, due to the complexity of the business and the need to respond quickly to competitive changes, the ability to be proactive and solutions-focused should be a concern and goal of everyone who works in the organization.

In conclusion, DHL Thailand faces challenges. The analysis utilizing the McKinsey 7-S Framework was a useful way to view its organizational needs. DHL Thailand Supply Chain appeared to have a strong set of shared values and a strategy that was inclusive and sought to maximize the potential of its teams. However, for the organization to be successful,
close attention to detail was required. Due to the nature of its services, there was pressure on the team leaders to manage their teams to meet these demands. The aim of the organization towards more collaborative, proactive and creative approaches provides an opportunity for the organization’s leaders to have the skills to promote more open and collaborative ways of thinking. Training the team leaders to use coaching skills and offering them the support to use these skills with their team members could be a positive step towards meeting the shared values and strategy of DHL to its Thailand Supply Chain division.

The Need for Action Research at DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division

As Ms. Satienpoch, the Senior Manager of Learning and Development noted, there is an opportunity for DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division to develop team leaders with coaching skills to use with their team members. DHL would like to see teams capable of developing goals that are in line with the organization’s expectations. This action research project aimed to meet management’s view of an opportunity to introduce coaching and coaching sessions for team leaders that would include employees from various departments within DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division. The project would evaluate the effects that the development of team leader coaching skills for team leaders had on both the team leaders and team members. Evaluation would be measured through two pre and post ODI surveys and post ODI interviews of both team leaders and team members.

Statement of the Problem

DHL Thailand has a corporate structure with an aim to develop its team leaders and members to meet the corporate vision and mission through the opportunity of enhanced relations with their leaders and engagement in work connected to the organization and have a clearer self-development pathway. From the SOAR assessment it was found that the DHL team leaders manage their teams a majority of the time in a top down manner. Therefore the
opportunity is there to develop the relationship of the team leaders and members so that the
Team members feel more connected to their leader, their function’s responsibility, and to feel
more engaged to the organization itself. Therefore, the development of the team leaders in
coaching skills and their subsequent use of these coaching skills with their teams is
recommended to improve the current situation.

**Research Objectives**

The objectives of this study are the following:

1. To assess the current relationship of team leaders and team members as measured
   through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship Survey.
2. To assess the current level of team member engagement as measured through the
   Gallup Q12 Engagement Survey.
3. To provide development of coaching skills for the team leaders.
4. To have the team leaders utilize coaching skills with their team members.
5. To measure the effect of team leader coaching on team members post ODI,
   qualitatively through interviews and quantitatively through the Perceived Quality of
   Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Survey and the Gallup Q12 Survey.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study were formulated based on the research objectives.

The research questions are:

1. What is the current relationship of team leaders and team members as measured
   through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship Survey?
2. What is the current level of team member engagement as measured through the
   Gallup Q12 Engagement Survey?
3. What is the appropriate ODI for developing coaching skills for the team leaders?
4. What is the appropriate ODI for having the team leaders utilize coaching skills with their team members?

5. In what ways will the ODI of team leader coaching on team members affect the team members, as measured qualitatively through interviews and quantitatively through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Survey and the Gallup Q12 Survey?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses for this study were formulated based on the research questions.

The research hypotheses are:

**Hypothesis 1**

$H_{10}$ There is no significant mean difference in the Gallup Q12 team member engagement scores for team leaders between pre-ODI and post-ODI;

$H_{1a}$ There is a significant mean difference in the Gallup Q12 team member engagement scores for team leaders between pre-ODI and post-ODI.

**Hypothesis 2**

$H_{20}$ There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on creating a genuine relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

$H_{2a}$ There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on creating a genuine relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

**Hypothesis 3**

$H_{30}$ There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on level of effective communication between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

$H_{3a}$ There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on level of effective communication between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.
Hypothesis 4

H4\textsubscript{0} There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the comfort level of the relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

H4\textsubscript{a} There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the comfort level of the relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

Hypothesis 5

H5\textsubscript{0} There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the development and learning of the team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

H5\textsubscript{a} There is a significant mean difference in the scores on the development and learning of the team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The limitations of a study are the characteristics of design and methodology that set the parameters on the application or the interpretation of the study’s results. This study measured the extent to which coach training and individual coaching affected the participants’ engagement levels within the Supply Chain Division of DHL Thailand. An examination of the engagement levels before and after the ODI was measured in accordance with the intervention. One possible limitation of this study was the ability of the researcher to draw any descriptive or inferential conclusions of the sample data gathered from the research group. In this case it was the research on team leaders and team members in a specific business environment. As well, the analysis of the pre and post ODI results would be the basis to how and establish the difference before and after the study to draw conclusions based on the impact of the intervention. The researcher was also aware of the limitation of generalizing the findings of one organizational study to all organizations in the business world, even those with similar missions and goals.
DHL Supply Chain Thailand was chosen because of concerns regarding the state of leadership within the division and because the organization was keen to develop a coaching program in response to the development of their junior team leaders to help them in developing their team members through the use of coaching skills. Therefore, the study focused on team members who received the team leader coaching intervention.

It was possible that respondents may have been tempted to complete surveys with answers they perceived as being favorable to themselves or the company. To minimize this tendency, participants were assured that it was important to answer the survey truthfully and that answers given on the survey would be kept strictly confidential.

This study was conducted in a large logistics company; the survey subjects were located in The Kingdom of Thailand. The participants were team leaders and their team members within the organization. Furthermore, the intervention was short term rather than long-term. All team leaders involved in the coach training received follow-up support and feedback to ensure that the best possible results could be achieved.

**Significance of the Study**

This research was intended to benefit the focal company as a whole. The research was designed and implemented with the collaboration of top management, based on the results of a SOAR analysis and Mckinsey 7S analysis. By developing DHL’s team leaders with new skills in coaching that could support team members, the research focused on how these skills may have resulted in increased team member engagement with the company and its clients as well as in the development of their own capabilities to meet the company’s mission and vision.

The intention of this intervention was to develop team leaders in specific coaching skills and processes and to use these new skills with team members in order to:
• Create a measurable positive difference in the dimensions of the team leader/team member relationship as measured through the PQCR survey and subsequent follow-up interviews.

• Create a positive difference in the engagement level of the team members towards organizational goals as measured by the Gallup Q12 survey and subsequent follow-up interviews.

It was thus intended that the research would provide a beneficial model for future coach training initiatives conducted at DHL Thailand Supply Chain as well as for other organizations within Thailand.

Definition of Terms

**Organization Development** - Organization development is both a professional field of social action and an area of scientific inquiry. The practice of OD covers a wide spectrum of activities to improve an organization’s problem-solving capabilities and its ability to cope with the changes in its external environment with the help of an external or internal behavioral-scientist consultants. Organization development is a planned process of change in an organization’s culture through the utilization of behavioral science methodology, research, and theory (Burke, 1982).

**Action Research** - a cyclical process of diagnostic change– research– diagnosis – research. The results of diagnosis produce ideas for changes. The changes are introduced into the same system the number of cycles maybe infinite (Cummings & Worley, 2014).

**Engagement of Team Members** - According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), engagement of team members may include team members (1) Taking initiative and having direction in their lives, (2) Generating their own positive feedback and ‘rewards’ in the form of recognition, success, administration or appreciation through their attitudes and activities,
(3) Showing engagement in their lives outside of their work environment, (4) Not being ‘workaholics’, but instead experiencing pleasure in their work as opposed to being stressed and compulsive.

**Team Leader** - Scouller (2011) defined the purpose of a leader (including a team leader) as follows: "The purpose of a leader is to make sure there is leadership to ensure that all four dimensions of leadership are [being addressed]." The four dimensions being: (1) a shared, motivating team purpose or vision or goal (2) action, progress and results (3) collective unity or team spirit (4) attention to individuals. Leaders also contribute by leading through example.

**Team Members** - A group of people with a full set of complementary skills required to complete a task, job, or project. Team members (1) operate with a high degree of interdependence, (2) share authority and responsibility for self-management, (3) are accountable for the collective performance, and (4) work toward a common goal and shared rewards(s). A team becomes more than just a collection of people when a strong sense of mutual commitment creates synergy, thus generating performance greater than the sum of the performance of its individual members (Lombardo, 2018).

**Relationship between Team Leader and Team Member** - A working partnership that addresses developmental needs and performance of the team member within the dimensions of (1) Genuineness of the relationship, (2) Effective communication, (3) Comfort with the relationship, and (4) Facilitating development (Brodie, 2010).

**Team Leader Coaching** - A developmental activity in which team members work one-on-one with their direct team leaders to improve job performance to enhance the capacity for future roles and challenges. The relationship should be based on the use of objective information, such as feedback, performance data, or assessments. The team leader / team
member coaching relationship is a working partnership that addresses developmental needs and performance of the team member (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship Survey (PQCR)* - The PQCR survey focuses on the team leader/team member relationship, referring to as “a working partnership that addresses developmental needs and performance of the team member”. This partnership is defined as a specific type of coaching outside of other previously defined coaching contexts. Coaching is defined as “a developmental activity in which team members work one-on-one with their direct team leader to improve current job performance to enhance the capacity for future roles and challenges” (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Genuineness of the Team Leader/Team Member Relationship* - The extent in which the team member feels how genuine the relationship is with the team leader. For example, Gegner (1997) notes that a coaching relationship should be one where the coach genuinely cares for the coachee and has a passion to help to improve and facilitate a state of continuous learning for the coachee (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Effective Communication between the Team Leader/Team Member* - The extent to how well the team leader communicates with the team member in a coaching context. This openness should include an approach and attitude from the coach that is encouraging, focused on growth and learning, and strives to create an agreeable chemistry between the coach and coachee (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Comfort in the Relationship between the Team Leader/Team Member* - The extent to which the team member feels comfortable in working with the team leader on goals. Graham et al. (1994) discuss that comfort in the coaching relationship requires the coach to display a genuine attitude of care towards the coachee and that this also requires one with effective
interpersonal skills. These skills include showing respect, being empathetic, showing respect, and being authentic (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Team Member Learning and Development.* This is what Hunt and Weintraub (2016) notes as an interaction between the coach and coachee that is aimed at facilitating self-directed learning and development. It is a concerted effort on the part of the coach to assist the coachee in learning from the work experience while identifying areas of development that benefit career enhancement. It is the presence of these dimensions of team leader coaching that may be measured when observing the team leader/team member coaching relationship (Brodie & Levy, 2010).

*Gallup Q12 Employee Engagement Survey* - The Gallup Q12 Survey is a brief 12-question survey developed out of research on the factors that are noted to affect employee engagement. It is most commonly used by organization leaders wishing to identify levels of engagement in their employees with a goal of developing a strategy to increase employee engagement. The Gallup Q12 has three categories in which it sorts those surveyed: (1) Engaged - These are employees who have passion and connection to their work, (2) Not-Engaged - These employees are usually noted as being “checked out”, and have a general apathy towards their own work duties as well as to the organization, (3) Actively Disengaged - These employees are beyond being unhappy within their organization. They are also generally responsible for undermining their team members into diminishing their own productivity and passion.
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW AND FRAMEWORKS

Introduction

The literature review provides an overview of coaching and its uses within an organizational context. In particular, a definition and of coaching and how it is used within organizations is provided, as well as the effects of team leader coaching on employee engagement. Following the exploration of coaching the literature review continues by focusing on employee engagement, including some historical perspective and a summary of some theory of the topic. Following this exploration and review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks are established. The action research framework is then established with an overview of the pre ODI assessment as well as the post ODI evaluation of outcomes. A summary of the ODI activities is also presented.

Review of the Literature and Related Studies

Providing coaching to team members can lead to increased confidence, self-directed thinking, and positive solutions-based attitudes (Pickerden, 2014). By addressing the possibilities for team members to reach their true potential, coaching may be a key towards teams building on their own personal capacity and contribution to the organization (Greif, 2007).

As well, with the demands of the modern business environment, many organizations are working to improve their productivity and maintain competitive advantage by increasing employee engagement (Saks, 2006). Employee engagement aims to involve employees and team members more fully in their work. Organizations which can improve conditions so that team members are happier may find that productivity improves which also may lead to an increase in profits. When employees feel satisfied, find their work more enjoyable and
rewarding, and feel that they are appreciated and are being developed they are more likely to care for and contribute more to the organization (Schaufeli, 2013).

Through what was learned as a result of conducting a SOAR analysis and completing a Mckinsey 7S study DHL pf the Thailand Supply Chain Division, the researcher subsequently explored the influences of coaching on dimensions of the team leader-team member relationship, and on the employee engagement of team members. The literature review begins this exploration of the research with a history and definition of coaching.

**Definition and Process of Coaching**

Multiple modern definitions of organizational coaching appear within the literature. Since its inception in 1995 the International Coach Federation (ICF) has been a leading organization in defining and developing ethical standards and protocols of organizational coaches. The ICF defines coaching as “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential”, insisting that coaches honor their clients as the experts in their own lives, and holding the belief that all clients are creative, resourceful and whole (International Coaching Federation, 2016).

The ICF further defines the role of the coach as one who supports the coachee in discovering, clarifying, and aligning what the coachee wants to achieve, and who further encourages the coachee in a journey of self-discovery so that they may generate their own solutions and strategies towards goal completion. The coach is also one who holds the coachee accountable for goal completion and continuous learning, unlocking potential for self-development (International Coaching Federation, 2016).

Kilburg (1996), unlike the ICF definition, did not include the term “partnership” in the definition. Instead he described coaching as a relationship which helped to "achieve a
mutually identified set of goals.” Kilburg also indicated that the client and coach in the coaching relationship was an “affiliation based on reciprocity rather than one formed for the sole purpose of seeking or giving advice.” (Kilburg, 1996).

Through a review of the academic literature focusing on coaching there appear to be some commonalities found in the coaching process. First, coaches are expected to reserve specific time for their coaching. They should collaborate with their coachees to set challenging goals that stretch the coachees’ abilities (Kinlaw, 1999). Moreover, coaches should hold their coachees to a level of accountability in their expectations for achieving the goals that the coachee has established. Coaches also aid in the coachees’ progress by offering resources or by clearing any environmental challenges or barriers that may impede their success. Coaches should also provide consistent feedback in a helpful and objective manner that serves the agenda of the coachee (Crane, 2007).

Belf (1996) described the coaching process as one that is “organized and ongoing, placing an emphasis on action, improvement in performance, and personal learning and growth”. Another definition by Frisch (2001) defines the coaching process as “a one-on-one intervention designed to support professional growth from within the organization, as opposed to other roles of an advisory nature that consultants or human resource professionals may provide, as coaching is focused at the individual level”. Tobias (1996) as well laid an emphasis on the individualization of the coaching process, noting that it is ongoing, unlike what one would receive in professional development programs or workshops which are short term and usually single trainings. Williams and Davis (2002) as well agreed with Tobias (1996) in the long-term aspect that a coaching relationship typically entails.

Additionally, coaching is typically not described as a process or intervention that focuses on the client’s past but instead as an intervention designed that is future and solutions
focused (Williams & Davis, 2002). Through the process of enabling the client to learn and understand themselves through a holistic approach, coaches have been referred to as ‘change agents’ within the corporate culture. (Diedrich, 2001; Katz & Miller, 1996).

Additional definitions of the coaching relationship reveal that it consists of an ongoing, face-to-face process with the intention of influencing behavior through an established methodology and skills learned and practiced by the coach (Allenbaugh, 1983). It is considered a hands on process of helping team members to recognize opportunities for insight and growth (Orth, 1987), with a focus on setting goals and learning through a personal self-directed reflective process (Mink, Owen, & Mink, 1993).

In regards to its relationship with employee engagement, coaching may be seen by organizations as a means to stimulate individual performance and personal growth in order to achieve both personal and organizational success. Dickel (2010) notes that coaching can reduce turnover since it works well as a retention tool by helping team members to be more personally engaged and accountable in their own work. Coaching can also be a useful tool when a team member is assigned to a new role or takes on new duties within the organization. To be able to survive in a dynamic knowledge-based economy, an organization will likely strive to foster innovation in its team members so that they are increasingly proactive.

Furthermore, coaching aims to equip coachees with the tools, knowledge and opportunities that they need in order to become more effective in both their personal and professional lives (Veale and Wachtel, 1996). These goals are created by the coachee but facilitated by the coach through specific processes throughout the coaching relationship. These coaching processes are specific and important to the success of the coaching relationship.
In conclusion, what appears common to the many definitions of coaching is that it is a partnership that the coach and coachee share and a focused interest in the development and process of achievement in the coachee's goals. The structure of the process emphasizes the creation of clearly defined goals and some means of measurement that is identified and agreed upon by both coach and client. The coach is seen as a 'facilitator' of the coaching process, and not a director or one in control of the process. It is an action-oriented process that promotes personal and professional development. Team leaders may thus act as coaches in guiding their team members' performance and improvement, reinforcing their strengths and helping them through a specific process of facilitation to find their own path towards achieving the goals that they have set.

Organizations must also decide whether to train leaders to be internal coaches with their team members or to outsource and use external coaches within the organization. The advantages and disadvantages of both options are explored in the following section.

**Internal Versus External Coaching**

Organizational coaching practices have been utilized as a means of developing team members to set personal and developmental goals and to provide accountability in meeting those goals (Mclead, 2003). The question is if it is better to train internal coaches or to hire external coaches to work within the organization. This question will be explored in this section.

While external coaches (private coaches from outside the organization sponsored by the organization) are commonly used, more organizations are beginning to train team leaders internally in coaching skills in order to better assist their team members to be goal oriented and accountable to succeeding in their goals. This move towards internal coaching and
developing the relationship between the team leader and team member has been shown to potentially influence the relationship of the team leader and team member (Hudson, 1999).

There are advantages and disadvantages to using either internal or external coaches. An internal coach can provide advantages such as limited direct costs, and may hold a benefit in that the team leader has an established relationship with the coachee, possibly resulting in more impactful change than would be found when using external coaching services. Internal coaches will likely better understand the organizational culture than external coaches and be able to develop a higher level of trust and intimacy with the coachee because of their day to day interactions with them (Johanson, 2016). Some disadvantages to utilizing internal coaching may include that the coach finds it a challenge to differentiate between the roles of coach and leader, or to keep the distinction between the two roles clear with the coachee. The internal coach and coachee may also be hesitant to explore certain ‘hot spot’ issues within the relationship or organization, thus avoiding issues that should be explored for the growth of the team member (Johanson, 2016).

The advantages to using an external coach include that they bring a specialist skill to the role that an internal coach may not possess. An external coach will also be less likely influenced by an organization’s internal culture or politics, and the relationship with the coachee would be without the potential interference that the team leader and team member may have in their relationship. The disadvantages of using an external coach include a higher and possibly prohibitive cost, and a potential ignorance on the part of the external coach in the coachee and the organization’s culture (Johanson, 2016).

While both internal and external coaching have advantages and disadvantages, the focus on training the team leader in coaching skills will be explored, as this is in line with the
intentions of DHL in the ODI. Therefore, the following section explores the dimensions of team leaders coaching their team members.

**The Definition and Dimensions of Team Leader Coaching**

The shift to team leaders coaching their team members required an updated definition which Heslin (2006) termed ‘team leader coaching’. This concept was defined as “team leaders providing one-on-one feedback and insights aimed at guiding and inspiring improvements in team members’ work performance”.

Brodie and Levy (2010) further established a concise definition of team leader coaching drawing from many researchers, and a valid and reliable survey which encompasses the elements of this definition. They defined coaching as “a developmental activity in which team members work one-on-one with their direct team leaders to improve job performance to enhance the capacity for future roles and challenges”. The research studies determined that the relationship should be based on the use of objective information, such as feedback, performance data, or assessments.

Brodie and Levy (2010) also focused on the team leader / team member coaching relationship, referring to it as “a working partnership that addresses developmental needs and performance of the team member”. This relationship is defined as a specific type of coaching outside of other previously defined coaching contexts.

The subsequent model created by Brodie and Levy (2010) was created based on common dimensions of a coaching relationship as derived from a summation of the literature on employee coaching. The first dimension is the *genuineness of the relationship*, pertaining to the extent in which the team member feels how genuine the relationship is with the team leader. For example, Gegner (1997) notes that a coaching relationship should be one where the coach genuinely cares for the coachee and has a passion to help to improve and facilitate
a state of continuous learning for the coachee. Kilburg (2001) also noted the aspects of mutual respect, empathy, authenticity and genuineness as being important for creating an effective relationship. Establishing and maintaining this level of trust is critical to the success of the coaching relationship as when trust is present clients are more likely to share sensitive information find the coach more influential (Lowman, 2005).

The second dimension focuses on effective communication, or the extent to how well the team leader communicates with the team member in a coaching context. This openness should include an approach and attitude from the coach that is encouraging, focused on growth and learning, and strives to create an agreeable chemistry between the coach and coachee (Hunt & Weintraub, 2016). Orth, Wilkinson, & Benfari (1987) also noted the importance of collaboration and commitment to the relationship in order for it to be more effective.

The third dimension encompasses the comfort in the relationship, or the extent to which the team member feels comfortable in working with the team leader on goals. Graham et al. (1994) discuss that comfort in the coaching relationship requires the coach to display a genuine attitude of care towards the coachee and that this also requires one with effective interpersonal skills. These skills include showing respect, being empathetic, showing respect, and being authentic. Ting and Riddle (2006) also add that a coach should be able to build rapport, be committed to the coaching relationship, and focus on collaboration in order to be effective. Finally, (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal (1990) identified the elements of coordination, mutual attentiveness, and positivity experienced between individuals important in reducing the differences of the coach and client and on building the similarities.
The fourth dimension of the model pertains to the extent that the team leader facilitates the development of the learning and development of the team member. This development is what Hunt and Weintraub (2016) notes as an interaction between the coach and coachee that is aimed at facilitating self-directed learning and development. It is a concerted effort on the part of the coach to assist the coachee in learning from the work experience while identifying areas of development that benefit career enhancement. It is the presence of these dimensions of team leader coaching that may be measured when observing the team leader/team member coaching relationship. The following section will explore how this relationship may create effects that beneficially impact the development of the team members.

**The Effects of Team Leader Coaching on Team Member Development**

Now that the dimensions of the coaching relationship have been explored, the effects of team leader coaching on team members will be examined.

Researchers began observing ways in which coaching affects the relationship between the team member and the team leader, in particular looking at the elements of trust and mutual respect between the two (Whitmore, 1998), and the impact that this relationship has on the team members’ levels of engagement to the organization (Wright, Gardner & Moynihan, 2003).

It was noted that many organizations began implementing coaching programs for the specific purpose of increasing team member morale and productivity (Hahn, 2008). To this end, Garvey (2004) noted that coaching could also have a positive effect on an organization by supporting team members with a communication network that enables them to fulfill their social needs at work. Another study found coaching as a means to teach team members to unlock personal potential and to be increasingly self-directed learners (Whitmore, 2004).
Additionally, coaching empowers team members by encouraging the development of new skills, enhancing performance and preparing team members for change as well as promotion (Witherspoon & White, 1996). But how may coaching affect the engagement of team members? To examine this issue the next section first explores definitions and the history of research on employee engagement and follows with team leader coaching and its possible effects on the engagement of team members.

**Employee Engagement**

As was explored in Chapter I, organizations ideally recruit team members who can adapt and react to an ever-changing and demanding global market. As far back as 1996 Lewis suggests that team members be flexible and continuously develop their professional skills in order to maintain their value within their organization (Lewis, 1996). More recently Bass and Bass found that organizations seek engaged team members in times where stiff competition demands a resilient workforce (Bass and Bass, 2008). Truss (2014) also discussed the value of organizational development noting that the way a workforce feels regarding their organization will affect the overall performance of the organization. This sentiment is a particularly relevant issue when team members interact with customers. These findings place a premium on defining and promoting employee engagement, and are discussed within this chapter.

**Definition of Employee Engagement**

The challenge of defining employee engagement is compounded by the fact that there is no universal definition. This section will explore the development of the definition of employee engagement within the academic literature.

Kahn (1990) defined engagement as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically,
cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. The cognitive aspect regards the beliefs that team members hold about their organization, leaders and conditions at work. The emotional aspect concerns the team members’ positive or negative attitudes towards the leaders and organization. The physical aspect concerns the level of physical energy that is used in order to accomplish the role. Thus, Kahn (1990) defined engagement in both a psychological as well as physical sense when a team member engages in and performs their roles within the organization.

May et al (2004) studied Kahn’s (1990) model, finding that the elements of meaningfulness, safety and availability were significantly related to engagement. They found the factor of job enrichment and role were positive predictors of meaningfulness, and a rewarding coworker and supportive supervisor relationship was a positive predictor of safety, while having adequate resources to complete their job were a predictor of psychological availability. Meaningfulness, over other elements, was found to have the strongest relation to employee outcomes when viewed in terms of employee engagement.

Another model of engagement comes from what is referenced as the ‘burnout’ literature. This model describes job engagement as a positive antithesis of burnout, which is described as the erosion of engagement employees may have with their job (Maslach et al 2001). Maslach et al, noted six areas of work-life that can either lead to burnout or to engagement. These are (1) workload, (2) control, (3) rewards and recognition, (4) community and social support, (5) perceived fairness and (6) values. Job engagement, it was argued, is associated with having a sustainable workload, with feelings of choice and control, with feeling there is an appropriate level of recognition and reward, with having a supportive work community, with there being agreeable level of fairness and justice, and with meaningful and valued work. Engagement would be the mediating link between these work-
life factors and with work outcomes. It can be noted that May et al’s (2004) findings tend to support Maslach et al’s (2001), in particular with the notion of meaningful and valued work being associated with engagement.

Holbeche and Springett (2003) defined employee’s perceptions of meaning in the workplace as linked to levels of engagement and, thus, performance. Their argument was that employees are active seekers of meaning within their work and that organizations need to provide for them a sense of meaning or employees are likely to quit. They found as well that many people experience a greater search for meaning at work (70 per cent) than they do in other parts of their life. The reason for this may be that because people usually spend more time at work than they do in other parts of their lives. Holbeche and Springett (2003) also argue that engagement is more likely achievable when there are shared senses of ‘destiny’ and ‘purpose’ that connect people on an emotional level and raise aspirations for reaching their potential and capability.

While Kahn’s (1990) and Maslach et al’s (2001) models note the psychological conditions that may induce engagement, they do not address why employees respond to these at different degrees of engagement. Saks (2006) explained that employee engagement can be shown in the Social Exchange Theory (SET). SET posits that employees are increasingly obligated through the generation of interactions where both parties have ‘reciprocal interdependence’. SET claims that these types of relationships develop over time, building trust, loyalty, and mutual commitment, and creating a two-way relationship between the employer and employee.

Saks (2006) argues that individuals repay their organization through their level of engagement in response to the resources they receive from their organization. They show this through engaging more in their work roles and devoting themselves cognitively, emotionally,
and physically. SET helps explain why employees may be more engaged in their work and to their organization.

Schaufeli (2007) later noted that while a job may be fulfilling, the team member may not be engaged because of personal problems, for instance. Or, an employee may feel engaged but not show initiative in work because of job constraints. As the two examples above illustrate, the actual experience of work engagement is neither intrinsically linked to the factor of challenging work nor to performance and may need to be treated as a separate entity.

**Historical Review of Employee Engagement**

One of the first academic studies of employee engagement was conducted in 1988, when Gallup created the Q12, an employee engagement measurement tool consisting of 12 questions. Gallup's surveys categorized actively engaged, non-engaged, and actively disengaged team members. After nearly a decade of collecting results, Buckingham and Coffman summarized their findings in their book *First, Break all the Rules*. This study was the beginning of what Schaufeli (2013) termed as the “psychologization” of the workplace. Schaufeli asserts that there was an increase in demands on team members at this time to be more diverse, open to organization change, and adaptable to increasingly boundary-less working roles. This modification required team members to bring their whole selves to address the needs of their work in order to be engaged.

David Ulrich (1997) similarly summarized that the organization increasingly demands more output while hiring fewer team members, and consequently that team members must be willing to psychologically invest in their jobs. This finding also coincides with the Positive Psychology Movement of the early 2000s, headed by Martin Seligman. Positive psychology studies humans at the highest level of functioning and attempts to identify those factors that
allow it to thrive. The positive psychology movement appeared to be a driver for academia to invest more resources into the study of team member workplace engagement. Positive psychology emphasizes the shift away from negative aspects such as work violence, stress, burnout, and job insecurity, and supports the goal of a working environment that promotes the positive affect of team members, while encouraging helpful behaviors, team building exercises, job resources, job security and work support (Martin, 2005). And so how does this development of employee engagement benefit an organization? This development is explored in the following section.

Benefits and Results of Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is an important factor in team member turnover, loyalty, safety, and customer satisfaction (Phale, 2008). According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), such positive characteristics of engaged team members may include team members:

- Taking initiative and having direction in their lives.
- Generating their own positive feedback and ‘rewards’ in the form of recognition, success, administration or appreciation through their attitudes and activities.
- Showing engagement in their lives outside of their work environment.
- Not being ‘workaholics’, but instead experiencing pleasure in their work as opposed to being stressed and compulsive.

Gallup (2008) and The Hay Group (2001) also cite the benefits for high workforce engagement. Successful organizations understand the importance of employee engagement in order to positively affect and create success for the organization, and when team members are engaged they exhibit higher levels of creativity, innovation, productivity and are more customer focused, and remain with their organization longer. The studies also recommend
that developing engaged team members be incorporated into the organization’s overall team development strategy (Gallup, 2011).

Yet in spite of the understanding that employee engagement carries a high degree of importance, this finding has apparently not received adequate attention or priority at the executive level (Macey, Schneider, Barbera & Young, 2009). In performance reviews or balanced scorecards, measurements of employee engagement are often still absent. In many organizations, leaders are often not held responsible for the level of engagement of their department or team members, and while engagement may be “met” through targeted engagement scores, the actual level of engagement as measured by behaviors of team members is still absent. (Macey et al., 2009).

So, too, it has been the experience of the researcher within many organizations in Thailand that while there is much discussion amongst upper management of the need to increase the morale and engagement of team members, these ‘soft goals’ are often sublimated by concerns over the bottom line. Selvarajah and Meyer (2013) noted that companies which focus on keeping generations of team leaders in place rely on the traditionally hierarchical leadership and focus on unquestioning allegiance and loyalty over increasing employee engagement levels to improve performance.

Observing the current state of the organizational system at the DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division, one can recognize the opportunity to improve its engagement through the proposed team member coaching intervention. According to DHL values, there is a mandate to encourage self-directed thinking and develop proactive employees in order to increase competitiveness and creativity. From information gathered in chapter one through the SOAR analysis and McKinsey 7S, there appears a need for team leaders who are skilled in providing feedback with their team members; moreover, DHL encourages that goals be set so that team
members feel they are being cared for and developed. These aspects of employee engagement could possibly be met through enhancement of the team leaders’ coaching skills with their teams, which is explored in the following section.

**Influences of Team Leaders on Employee Engagement**

This section will explore ways a team leader may be able to influence team members to be more engaged.

Beyond enhancing team-member motivation and engagement, team leaders are tasked with preventing unwanted and inefficient workplace issues. Baumruk (2006) notes that team leaders can affect many aspects of team members’ working experience, including relationships, rewards, opportunities, and the nature of actual work itself. Accordingly, team leaders should coach and support team members by clarifying job expectations, consequences and advancement opportunities. Furthermore, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) postulate that effective team leaders both recognize the achievements of team members holding them accountable. This support is shown to be an important resource in optimizing employee engagement.

Additionally, Arakawa and Greenburg (2007) recommend that team leaders be optimistic and involved in their team members’ work. Their research involving 103 team members reveals that positive leadership produced a significant correlation with the performance, engagement and optimism. Understanding these two powerful influences of work engagement – the job resources available to the team member along with the team leader’s support - may reveal how team-member coaching may provide a positive influence and facilitate in the development of work engagement.

In summary, the results from research have demonstrated a link between engagement and team member performance and enhanced organizational business outcomes. While there
are other key elements of engagement, including effective communication, development opportunities for team members, and leaders who can connect with team members and help to create engagement, it is still a process that requires different specific needs for each organization. There is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ model (Kular, 2008). Accordingly, the next section addresses whether coaching can bring team members closer to the expectations and goals of the organization by developing their engagement, while also helping with the team members’ development. It is therefore possible that team leader coaching has the capability to affect team-member development, learning, feedback, and the general communicative relationship between the team member and team leader. This combination of behaviors aims to advance the level of mutual respect and trust that enables a focus on performance objectives (Graham, Wedman, & Garvin-Kester, 1994).

Effects of Team Leader Coaching on Employee Engagement

This section examines the possible impact that team leader coaching would have on engagement of the team members. The studies which have shown that coaching has improved individual and organization performance are noted.

A study by Hagen (2012) extensively reviewed the literature on coaching by managers, and cited positive outcomes in the areas of job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, task performance, less intention to quit, and morale. Additionally, Ellinger et al. (2013) utilized a case study approach to the research on the impact of line managers who had coached their teams. Overall the study found that there was increased job commitment and better performance. This study identified a relationship between the supervisors and employees and the positive impact it had on both performance and job satisfaction. In this study the managers perceived they were engaging in coaching behaviors at a higher level than that which was perceived by the employees.
Additionally, Elmadag et al. (2008) found that managerial coaching had an influence on employee commitment, particularly in the quality of service. This study also examined whether coaching impacted outcomes such as commitment to the organization and satisfaction, as well as job performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. They reported a positive relationship to these measured outcomes of coaching. Finally, Park, Yang & McLean (2008) conducted a survey on 178 people in one organization and found a positive relationship in the areas of employee learning, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. This study showed a significant relationship between managerial coaching and outcomes that are relevant to employee engagement, such as retention (Park et al., 2008b).

Summary of Literature Review Findings

As organizations face the challenges of innovation and the need to quickly react to the market, they could benefit from team members who are committed, responsible, and flexible. While coaching has received increased attention as one possible solution to these needs, there still remain questions as to the levels of its effectiveness as a measure to increase the engagement of team members to meet these goals. This review of the literature subsequently explored how coaching may affect the levels of engagement. In turn, it may also be useful to determine how coaching can lead to effective organizational outcomes when it is used to develop team members’ work engagement. The training of team leaders in coaching skills and the means whereby coaching can benefit the work engagement level of team members is explored further in this research.

Theoretical Rationale of Coaching’s Impact on Engagement

This section discusses the theoretical rationale of employee engagement. Theories on the manager - team member relationship, team leader coaching, and employee engagement
are used to frame and examine the outcomes of team leaders coaching their team members to improve the levels of engagement.

Gregory and Levy (2015) define coaching as a “developmental activity in which team members work one-on-one with their direct team leader to improve current job performance to enhance the capacity for future roles and “challenges.” One output of the culmination of the research by Brodie (2010) was the Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR) survey.

The PQCR survey focuses on the team leader/team member relationship, referring to it as a “working partnership that addresses developmental needs and performance of the team member.” This partnership is defined as a “specific type of coaching outside of other previously defined coaching contexts.”

Table 2 below lists the qualities for each dimension, which makes up the content for the final version of the PQCR.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Qualities of Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness of the relationship</td>
<td>1. My supervisor and I have mutual respect for one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I believe that my supervisor truly cares about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I believe my supervisor feels a sense of commitment to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>4. My supervisor is a good listener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. My supervisor is easy to talk to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. My supervisor is effective at communicating with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with the relationship</td>
<td>7. I feel at ease talking with my supervisor about my job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I am content to discuss my concerns or troubles with my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I feel safe being open and honest with my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating development</td>
<td>10. My supervisor helps me to identify and build upon my strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. My supervisor enables me to develop as an employee of our organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. My supervisor engages in activities that help me to unlock my potential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DHL SOAR assessment found that the DHL team leaders manage their teams a majority of the time in a top down manner. An opportunity is there to develop the
relationship of the team leaders and members so that the team members feel more connected to their leader, their function’s responsibility, and to feel more engaged to the organization itself. By examining dimensions of employee engagement from the theories explored in this chapter, the researcher theorizes that the team leader’s development of coaching skills use of these coaching skills may have two impacts. The first of these impacts would be changes in the dimensions of the team leader and team member’s relationship, as measured through the levels of the (1) genuineness of the relationship, (2) the level of effective communication, (3) the comfort of the relationship, and (4) the facilitation of the team member’s development as is measured through the PQCR survey (Brodie, 2010). The second impact of team leader coaching could be explored in the engagement level of the team members as measured through the Gallup Q12 survey. Figure 3 lays out a summary showing the relationship between team leader coaching, the change in the dimensions of the team leader and team member as a result of coaching, and team member engagement with notable research theories drawn from the literature review.

Figure 3. Theoretical Framework
Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework may support a theory of a research study. It is a network of concepts which are interlinked and, when seen together, provide a deeper understanding of phenomena. The concepts within the conceptual framework support one another and establish a specific ‘philosophy’ within the framework (Jabareen, 2009). The conceptual framework below illustrates how team leader coaching with team members may affect their relationship and shift the level of organizational engagement of team members. The development of the professional relationship between the team members and the team leaders potentially enhances the level of communication and openness between the team members and team leaders as well as the possible development of engagement of team members following the coaching intervention. Hypothetically, the intervention will determine whether the team leader coaching intervention has a positive effect, no effect, or a negative effect on the dependent variables. It is a way to describe the link to the hypotheses and the research questions of the study. Figure 4 displays the conceptual framework as described above.

Figure 4. Conceptual Framework
Action Research Framework

The Action Research framework follows from discussion of the conceptual framework to show the linear progression of the research project itself. The action research framework outlines the team leader coaching initiative and its effects on the team leader and team member relationship as well as the level of team member engagement. Figure 5 illustrates the action research framework.

Pre-ODI
Before Team Leader Coaching of Team Members

Findings from:
- SOAR Study
- McKinsey 7-S Analysis
- Pre PQCR Survey.
  Low level of:
  - Genuineness of the relationship
  - Effective communication
  - Comfort with the relationship
  - Facilitating development
- Pre Gallup Q12 Survey.
  Low level of:
  - Employee Engagement

Post-ODI
After Team Leader Coaching of Team Members

Findings from:
- Post PQCR Survey.
  Higher level of:
  - Genuineness of the relationship
  - Effective communication
  - Comfort with the relationship
  - Facilitating development
- Post Gallup Q12 Survey.
  Higher level of:
  - Employee Engagement
  - Post Intervention Interviews of Team Leaders and Team Members

Figure 5. Action Research Framework

The pre-ODI explored the opportunity for DHL to train select team members in coaching skills to use with their team members. This was a result of a SOAR analysis and McKinsey 7S analysis of DHL, using the PQCR and the Gallup Q12 as a means of measurement. The ODI consisted of team leaders being trained in specific coach training skills and using these skills with selected team members. The post-ODI applied the PQCR and Gallup Q12 surveys to test changes in the team leader/team member relationship and change in the engagement level of the team members. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to provide more in-depth information from team leaders and team members on their experience of coaching/being coached. The semi-structured interviews were based off the PQCR and Gallup Q12 surveys.
Chapter III – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design Introduction

Chapters 1 and 2 included an overview of the research study and a review of the relevant academic literature. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology and the benefits and appropriateness of the proposed design. Chapter 3 also presents the research methodology, research design, research participants, research instruments, and data collection and analysis procedures.

Diagnosis and Problem Formulation

The researcher conducted an initial analysis of the organization through conversation with selected leadership team members to gather a general sense of their needs and expectations, as well as discovering opportunities regarding the intervention. Upon completion of chapters 1-3 of the research thesis, the researcher refined the intervention in preparation for the ODI.

Design and Development of ODI Interventions

The purpose of this study was to establish a measurement of the effectiveness of coaching on employee engagement. While coaching is still relatively new to many organizations, it has potential as a development strategy (Brock, 2008). The ability to measure the extent to which coaching can affect engagement of team members is useful information to businesses throughout Thailand who are also looking to advance their own levels of organizational engagement. Within the context of the DHL Supply Chain’s needs revealed through the SOAR analysis and McKinsey 7S analysis, it was revealed that team leader coaching may reveal an opportunity for DHL to build on the potential of its team members, particularly in developing their abilities to set goals, increase critical thinking skills, and boost team members’ confidence levels.
The Timeline of ODI at DHL Thailand

During the nine-month process of the OD intervention of DHL Thailand, the ODI activities involved 64 people (16 team leaders and 48 team members). The process took nine months, starting with the researcher getting approval from DHL, collecting pre-ODI data, implementing the ODI coaching workshop, gathering post-ODI data, and compiling the conclusions of the research.

Table 2 summarizes the key activities during this project and explains the sequences of the research activities.

Table 2: Timeline of ODI Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ODI</th>
<th>Pre ODI</th>
<th>Pre ODI</th>
<th>Pre ODI</th>
<th>Pre ODI</th>
<th>ODI</th>
<th>ODI</th>
<th>ODI</th>
<th>Post ODI</th>
<th>Post ODI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Organizational Assessment</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>Result Reported to Organizational Leaders, decision made on what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. | Data Gathering:  
• Pre ODI - questionnaires: PQRC and Gallup Q12 Analysis of Data from Pre ODI Assessment |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 4. | Analysis of Data from Pre ODI Assessment |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 5. | OD Intervention Training of Team Leaders  
• Training of 16 team leaders in coaching skills (2 days, and 3 follow-up webinars on coaching skills development) |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 6. | OD Intervention Team Leaders coaching members  
• The 16 team leaders assigned three team members to coach three times each. |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 7. | Data Gathering  
• Post ODI - questionnaires: PQRC and Gallup Q12  
• In depth interviews of selected team leader and team members |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 8. | Data analysis and report |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
| 9. | Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations made |          |         |         |         |     |     |     |          |          |
Research Design

This section discusses the application of the research methodology and the utilization of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. The methodology of this study utilizes an action research based approach.

Action research involves a continuous process of research, planning, theorizing, learning and development, which identifies and works with questions and issues that arise from the participants in their local environments. The data that emerges helps to build theories which are continuously tested and reviewed through multiple experimental interventions (Burton & Steane, 2004). Measuring productivity levels of team members before and after providing specific training is an example of action research.

Empirical data procured by this research was hoped to provide insight into the area of coaching and its effect on employee engagement. Findings that potentially revealed a correlation between team leader coaching affecting the team leader/team member relationship as well as shifts in team member engagement could be useful for developing future team leader coaching programs throughout the organization.

Research Methodology

An approach utilizing both qualitative and quantitative analysis was used in gathering data for this research. Using a mixed-methods approach may strengthen the results as the integration of both the quantitative and qualitative data, and, therefore, can provide a more informed framework in making sense of the data (Creswell, Fetters, & Ivankova, 2004). Johnson and Christensen (2007) further noted that the mixed-method approach allows researchers to use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, wherein the quantitative analysis is reinforced by the strength of the focus on the participants by the qualitative analysis.
By combining quantitative and qualitative research and data, the researcher was hoping to gain a wider and deeper understanding of the corroboration within the research. The combination also offset potential limitations attendant with using only one approach. Another advantage of conducting mixed methods research was in the aspect of triangulation, which is the use of several means (methods, data sources and researchers) that study the same phenomenon. Triangulation can identify aspects of phenomena in a more accurate manner through approaching the research from various perspectives through the use of different methods and techniques. Triangulation requires a careful analysis of what types of information are provided by each method, including the possible strengths and weaknesses of each (Food Risc Resource Center, 2015).

**Subjects of Study and Sources of Data**

The subjects of this study were selected team leaders and team members from DHL Thailand Supply Chain Division. The subjects were members of the Makro Distribution Center of DHL, both from the Dry Goods and Wet Goods divisions. The leaders were either from general management of these divisions, or were line managers. The team members being coached were at the level of assistant manager or supervisor. A total of 16 team leaders and 48 team members were invited to participate in the study. While the team leaders were chosen through a process of discussion between the department heads, the leaders’ team members that were to be coached by the leaders would be chosen through random sampling techniques. This methodology aimed to limit bias within the team leader / team member coaching relationship. The researcher collected data of all participants involved in this research. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. This included two surveys, the ‘Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship’ and the ‘Gallup Q12’ survey. The qualitative data consisted of interviews of team members and team leaders. Five team leaders
and eight team members were interviewed with survey-based questions. This is displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Research Instruments, Tools and Data-Gathering Techniques and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data – Gathering Techniques</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quantitative Data          | 1. Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) survey (Pre and Post ODI)  
                            | 2. The Gallup Q12 Employee Engagement Survey |
| Qualitative Data           | 1. Digital recordings and notes taken of post ODI interviews based on questions derived from the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Survey and the Gallup Q12 Survey.  
                            | 2. Content analysis of post ODI interviews. |

Instrumentation

The research project included post ODI interviews and two questionnaires distributed both pre-ODI and post-ODI. These are detailed in this section.

Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Survey – Reliability and Validity

Dr. Jane Brodie (2010) developed The PQCR in an attempt to focus on the importance of the supervisor-subordinate coaching relationship as a foundation for effective team member coaching. In her study, Brodie created a new definition of the team member coaching relationship based on four dimensions determined critical for a team member coaching relationship.

Development of the PQCR scale involved several steps. This procedure included item refinement from a Subject Matter Expert (SME) review, then piloting of the refined items with working adults, and lastly an evaluation of the factor structure and internal consistency of the items. This process is detailed below.
Twenty-five graduate students were recruited as SMEs for a preliminary review of the items for each dimension. The graduates received descriptions of the five dimensions and 29 items to match to the dimensions. The purpose of this task was to examine content validity of the items to their dimensions. SMEs correctly sorted twenty-two of the items (76%) into their intended categories and the remaining 24% (seven items) were dropped from the list. One item was re-categorized to another dimension after 95% of the SMEs placed it there. Some items were reworded as a result of comments from the SMEs (Brodie, 2010).

Following the revision process, the remaining items were given to working adults in an online survey. The survey participants were asked to rate whether they agreed or disagreed with the items and their relation to the corresponding dimension. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

As certain a priori expectations were made about the items mapped to particular dimensions, the data were analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis. At this point, there were five items per dimension with the goal being to reduce the survey to three items per dimension. After the elimination of the weakest of the items, a pool of twelve items was ultimately retained (three per dimension).

The internal consistency reliability for the PQCR scale for the twelve items was strong, with a coefficient alpha of $\alpha = .95$. Although the scale was intended to be used together in its entirety, Dr. Brodie further examined each of the four individual dimensions for exploratory purposes. These coefficients also measured high, ranging from $\alpha = .85$ to .91. Specifically, the coefficients for the four dimensions are as follows: 1) genuineness of the relationship: $\alpha = .88$, 2) effective communication: $\alpha = .85$, 3) comfort with the relationship: $\alpha = .91$, and 4) facilitating development: $\alpha = .87$ (Brodie, 2010).
The PQCR was used as a dependent variable in the DHL study. The dependent variable is what you seek to measure in an experiment and what is affected during an experiment. The dependent variable responds to the independent variable. It is dependent because it "depends" on the independent variable (Labwrite, 2017). In the case of this experiment, the dependent variables are changes in employee engagement and the dimensions of the PQCR. The independent variable is the coaching intervention.

The PQCR was created by Brodie (2010) through a process of item refinement and data collection and analysis. The final model for the PQCR demonstrated strong factor structure and the scale exhibited high internal consistency reliability. The dimensions were largely based on contemporary literature focused on employee coaching. The 12-item PQCR scale can be found in the Appendix. Dr. Brodie gave the researcher written permission to use the PQCR. Moreover, Dr. Brodie offered the researcher any assistance or clarification on utilizing the survey for the research. Please see permission found in Appendix G.

**The Gallup Q12 Survey - Reliability and Validity**

The Gallup Q12 Survey is a brief 12-question survey that is easy for organizations to administer. The survey was developed out of research on the factors that are noted to affect employee engagement. Through the examination of thousands of employee surveys, the Gallup survey reduced questions they collected to a final 12 that had the strongest correlation to employee engagement. Of particular focus were questions that reflected engagement that could lead to increased retention, profitability, and revenue growth (Harter et al, 2006).

The Gallup Q12 was developed over a 30-year period, involving quantitative and qualitative research. Both its reliability and validity have been subjected to extensive study over the years. It is most commonly used by organization leaders wishing to identify levels of
engagement in their employees with a goal of developing a strategy to increase employee engagement.

As of 2005 over 87,000 work units and over 1.5 million employees have taken the Gallup Q12 (Harter et al, 2006).

The Gallup Q12 has three categories in which it sorts those surveyed:

1. Engaged: These are employees who have passion and connection to their work. They are key drivers of innovation and build positively to the development of their organizations.

2. Not-Engaged: These employees are usually noted as being “checked out”, and have a general apathy towards their own work duties as well as to the organization. They feel they are merely ‘sleepwalking’ while at work, and simply put the time in but exert minimum effort and have little to no passion for what they are doing.

3. Actively Disengaged: These employees are beyond being unhappy within their organization. They are also generally responsible for undermining their team members into diminishing their own productivity and passion.

The Gallup Q12 measures actionable issues for management which reflect the extent to which employees are engaged at work. The Gallup Q12 has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 at the business-unit level. The meta-analytic convergent validity of the equally weighted mean (or sum) of items 01-12 (Grand Mean) to the equally weighted mean (or sum) of additional items in longer surveys (measuring all known facets of job satisfaction and engagement) is 0.91. This shows that the Q12 can capture the general factor that is found in lengthier employee surveys. Individual items correlate to their broader dimension true-score values, on average, at 0.69 (Harter et al, 2006).

Semi-Structured Interviews

In order to gather additional information, interview questions for both the pre and post ODI were based on both the PQCR and the Gallup Q12 surveys. This dimensional approach enabled a deeper range of understanding of the participants than what the two surveys alone
could provide. A random sample of five team leaders and eight team members were interviewed for approximately 25 minutes each.

**Statistical Tools**

The qualitative data was collected from the interviews and focus groups with proper documentation throughout the process, including note-taking and full recording of all conversations. Interviews were summarized, analyzed and categorized into common groups and themes. The data collected through the interviews was used to support the findings from the surveys.

**Data Gathering Techniques and Procedures**

At all times the researcher adhered to the highest standards of research protocol in the best interest of the participants of the research and the organization itself. All documents were kept strictly confidential and were not and will not be distributed to any third party without the express permission of DHL Thailand, the participants, and the researcher. The researcher organized the coaching interventions for selected team leaders and team members.

**Data Collection/Documentation of the Change Processes**

All pre-ODI and post-ODI survey data was collected through online surveys utilizing the Google Forms service. Data collected from the online surveys was then transferred to an offline spreadsheet. All interviews were recorded, transcribed for key content, and categorized.

**Data Analysis**

In this section the tools for quantitative and qualitative data analysis are identified, described and organized.
Quantitative Analysis

The PQCR and Gallup Q12 are both twelve question surveys with a five point Likert scale. This five-point bipolar scale ranges from a group of categories from least to most and asks survey participants to indicate to which degree they agree or disagree. (Statistical Services Centre, 2001).

The responses of all surveys were collated into tables and summarized to the mean, standard deviation, answer distribution, and percent distribution. This initial data summary was used for descriptive purposes.

It was determined that an appropriate statistical tool for the survey data being collected was the paired t-test. A paired t-test is used to determine whether the mean of the differences between two paired samples differs from 0 (or a target value). A paired t-test is used to compare two population means where you have two samples in which observations in one sample can be paired with observations in the other sample. (Statistical Services Center, 2001). As the pre and post survey data being observed could be matched and compared, the paired t-test was utilized.

Further, in order to measure the ‘size of difference’ found in the pre and post intervention, the survey results were also treated with the Cohen’s d statistical tool. This tool measures the “size of effect” that the intervention had on the participants (Cohen’s d = .2 small, .5 moderate, .8 large). The Cohen’s d is generally considered a complementary tool to use along with a paired t-test (Rice & Harris, 2005) when measuring significance. In order to determine statistical significance in answering the hypotheses, an analysis of pre and post data from the PQCR and Gallup Q12 surveys was conducted as well as more specific analysis of subsets of questions to test individual significance in the various dimensions of the PQCR.
Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative data to be analyzed was derived from semi-structured interviews based on elements of the PQCR and Gallup Q12. The researcher used a five-step method for the qualitative analysis, designed by Piercy (2015) to analyze the data:

1. In the first stage the researcher listened to and created extensive summaries from the recordings. The notations consisted of main ideas and topics that came up in the interviews. The focus was on separating important or useful information from unimportant information. As the ideas of the interviewees emerged, the researcher made notes and tentative connections between the ideas.

2. In the second stage, the collected observations were developed into preliminary categories (descriptive and interpretive).

3. The third stage of the analytic framework consisted of an examination to identify connections between the ideas that were listed in the categories.

4. The fourth stage of the analysis involved a determination of the basic themes discovered through examining the observations. This thematic approach is what Ely (1991) defined as “a statement of meaning that runs through all or most of the pertinent data, or one in the minority that carries heavy emotional or factual impact”.

5. The fifth stage was to examine the themes from all of the interviews. The predominant themes were then used to supplement the data collected from the PQCR and Gallup Q12 to further explore the research questions and check on significance of the hypotheses.

Summary of ODI Activities

Pre ODI

The researcher conducted the Pre ODI by utilizing the following assessment tools:

1. The researcher conducted an orientation to all participants of the Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR) survey and the Gallup Q12.

2. The survey was distributed and completed directly after the orientation to the participants.

For the ODI activities, the researcher received support from his Thai coaching and training staff in order to conduct the training sessions in Thai language.
ODI

The ODI was conducted in four stages:

*Orientation to ODI - all participants.*

The orientation to the ODI was conducted in one large group. This session detailed the steps to be taken throughout the intervention, gave a brief introduction to coaching, and explained what it means to those involved in the research. The research involved 16 team leaders and 48 team members (each team leader coached three of their team members after the coach training was finished).

*Team Leader Coaching Training*

The two-day training program accredited by the International Coach Federation (ICF) was delivered to the team leaders. The trainer for the program was a certified ICF coach at the Professional Coach Certification (PCC) level. All team leader participants of the program were individually assessed by the trainer in their comprehension and competency in their capacity to use the coaching skills and processes that were taught during the course. All participants were subsequently granted a certification accredited by the ICF that they completed the course which confirmed the ability of the team leaders to begin using their new coaching skills with their team members.

The coach training course included basic coach communication skills, training in a goal-setting model, techniques in raising awareness of the coachees, and processes for following up and holding accountability for the team members on their developed goals. Team leaders involved in the project had on-call support to a professional external coach. Additionally, there was a 1.5 hour coaching skills review webinar in week two of the intervention. The trainer also offered phone support to team leaders throughout the intervention phase after the initial training program.
**Team Leaders Coaching their Staff**

After receiving the training, the team leaders were asked to apply their coaching skills on a day-to-day basis with their members. Team leaders were also assigned three team members to formally coach three times each between 45 minutes to one hour over a six-week period, once in week one, once in week four, and once in week six.

The coaching sessions followed a specific process, as was taught to the team leaders in their coach training program. The initial coaching session included:

1. A short time to build rapport.
2. A discussion with the team member on how coaching works (roles and processes).
3. An exploration of possible goals for the team member to set.
4. A creation of two-three specific goals (at least two professional goals, and one personal goal).
5. The establishment of strategies and actions for goal achievement.
6. The closing of the session with a learning reflection.

The second and third sessions included:

1. A review and reflection of what actions were completed towards the goal.
2. The creation of new actions as were necessary towards goal completion.
3. The closing of the session with a learning reflection.

**Post ODI**

After the six-week period had concluded and each team leader had formally coached their three assigned team members a total of three times each, a randomized sample of the participants (five team leaders and eight team members) were interviewed. The interviews
were approximately 25 minutes each. A Thai speaker/translator was present to conduct the interviews in Thai, with the researcher present as well.

The researcher conducted the Post ODI by utilizing the following assessment tools:

1. Resending the PQCR survey to all participants

2. Interviewing selected participants. Questions were based on the dimensions of the Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR) and based off questions found in the Gallup Q12 survey.

The collected data supported in guiding, shaping, and deterring the researcher’s conclusions.
Chapter IV: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the pre and post ODI results of the Likert-style questionnaires and summarizes and utilizes the open ended interviews conducted post ODI. These results will aid the researcher in sharing an analysis and interpretation of the research.

As was discussed in chapter 3, the research was completed in three parts. The organizational assessment was conducted in November and December 2016. Results of this assessment were reported to organizational leaders and decisions on the ODI were finalized in January 2017. Pre ODI survey data was gathered and analyzed in February 2017. The training of the team leaders was conducted in March 2017 and the monitoring and use of said coaching skills and providing support in the process to the team leaders was conducted from April through mid-May of 2017. The post ODI questionnaires and individual interviews were conducted in early June, and the analysis and report was completed in June and July 2017. The total ODI process lasted nine months (November 2016 – July 2017).

The following sections discuss the findings of this research. The respondent demographics are presented, followed by the pre-ODI findings. The ODI is then recounted and is followed by the post-ODI findings. Chapter 4 concludes with a general comparison of the pre and post ODI findings and a test of the hypotheses.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographics are characteristics of a population. When designing a survey, the research needs to assess who to survey and how to breakdown overall survey response data into meaningful groups of respondents (Defranzo, 2012).
The total population of the focal system is 335 employees. The respondent sample represents 19% of the total population of the focal system. Team leaders and team members included in the study were chosen through a process of random selection.

The demographic data of the 64 participants are presented below. The demographic information provided includes gender, organizational working positions, years of service with the organization, ages of the participants and the levels of education of the participants.

**Gender of Participants**

Gender demographics displayed in Table 5 reveal an unequal distribution of male and female participants. There were 41 males and 23 females in the study.

*Table 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Research Participants</th>
<th>Number of Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working Positions of Participants**

The 64 participants held positions within the organization as follows: 1 managing director, 15 line managers, 48 team members (see Table 6).

*Table 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Positions of Participants</th>
<th>Number of Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Manager</td>
<td>15 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Members</td>
<td>48 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of Service of Participants**

The years of service with DHL for the 64 participants ranged from three to 16 years.
Table 7

Years of Service at DHL of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Number of Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>18 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>26 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-16 years</td>
<td>20 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age of Participants**

The age of the participants ranged from 27 to 54 years (see Table 8).

Table 8

Age of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-35</td>
<td>33 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>21 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Education of Participants**

The levels of education of the 64 participants represented technical diplomas, bachelor’s degrees, and master’s degrees (see Table 9).

Table 9

Level of Education of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Number of Participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Diplomas</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degrees</td>
<td>43 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-ODI Findings**

Before the ODI two questionnaires were distributed to the participants. The Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) was given to both the team leaders as well as team members while the Gallup Q12 Engagement Survey was given to the team members only.
These questionnaires were also given as a part of the post ODI. Qualitative interviews were not conducted as part of the pre-ODI.

**Summary of the PQCR Survey - Pre ODI Results**

The PQCR consists of 12 questions which explored the relationship the team member has with the team leader. The questionnaire was given to the team members to evaluate aspects of how they feel about their relationship with their team leader and a slightly altered version of the survey was given to the team leader to measure how they feel they are as a leader in relation to their team members in those same areas.

This survey utilizes a 5 point Likert scale. The scale was converted to numerical format (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5). Table 10 displays the pre ODI results for the team members for all 12 questions of the PQCR.

Table 10 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the pre-ODI PQCR results for the team members. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, less than 1% disagreed with the statements, 12% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 49% agreed with the statements, and 38% strongly agreed with the statements.

**Table 10**

*Pre ODI PQCR Results for Team Members - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My team leader and I have mutual respect for one another.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>57.86%</td>
<td>39.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that my team leader truly cares about me.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>15.78%</td>
<td>55.23%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. I believe my team leader feels a sense of commitment to me. 3.97 .63 (0) (0) (8) (23) (7) 0% 0% 21.04% 60.49% 18.41%

4. My team leader is a good listener. 4.34 .62 (0) (0) (3) (16) (19) 0% 0% 7.89% 42.08% 49.97%

5. My team leader is easy to talk to. 4.13 .70 (0) (0) (7) (19) (12) 0% 0% 18.41% 49.97% 31.56%

6. My team leader is effective at communicating with me. 4.31 .70 (0) (0) (5) (16) (17) 0% 0% 13.15% 42.08% 44.71%

7. I feel at ease talking with my team leader about my job performance. 4.26 .72 (0) (1) (3) (19) (15) 0% 0% 2.63% 7.89% 49.97% 39.45%

8. I am content to discuss concerns or troubles with my team leader. 4.36 .58 (0) (0) (2) (16) (20) 0% 0% 5.26% 42.08% 52.6%

9. I feel safe being open and honest with my team leader. 4.15 .82 (0) (2) (4) (18) (14) 0% 0% 5.26% 10.52% 47.34% 36.82%

10. My team leader helps me to identify and build upon my strengths. 4.10 .72 (0) (0) (8) (18) (12) 0% 0% 21.04% 47.34% 31.56%

11. My team leader enables me to develop as an employee of our organization. 4.28 .73 (0) (0) (6) (15) (17) 0% 0% 15.78% 39.45% 44.71%

12. My team leader engages in activities that help me to unlock my potential. 4.34 .62 (0) (0) (3) (19) (16) 0% 0% 7.89% 49.97% 42.08%

Table 11 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the pre-ODI PQCR results for the team leaders. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, less than 2% disagreed with the statements, 12% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 68% agreed with the statements, and 18% strongly agreed with the statements.

Table 11

Pre ODI PQCR Results for Team Leaders - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My team members and I have mutual respect for one another.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63.12%</td>
<td>36.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My team members believe that I care about them.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.52%</td>
<td>73.64%</td>
<td>15.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the GALLUP Q12 Survey - Pre ODI Results

Besides the PQCR survey, the Gallup Q12 engagement survey was given to the team members only. The Gallup Q12 consists of 12 questions which explore aspects of engagement within an organization. The questionnaire was given to the team members to measure their engagement level pre and post ODI. This survey utilizes a 5 point Likert scale. The scale was converted to numerical format (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5).

Table 12 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the pre-ODI PQCR results for the team members. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, none of the respondents disagreed with the statements, 9% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 56% agreed with the statements, and 35% strongly agreed with the statements.
Table 12

Pre ODI Gallup Q12 Results for Team Members - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Neither/Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have the materials and equipment to do my work right.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the last seven days I have received recognition and praise for doing good work.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor or someone at work seems to care about me as a person.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is someone at work who encourages my development.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At work my opinion seems to count.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mission and purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have a best friend at work.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In the last year, I have had opportunities to learn and grow.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization Development Intervention (ODI)

Implementation of ODI

The organization development intervention took place from March 27 through June 3, 2017. Throughout this timespan several activities were conducted by the researcher, a Thai coach trainer, and a research assistant to help with translations, interviews, and transcriptions.
Two personnel at DHL helped to coordinate training and other activities, interviews, and survey distribution and collection. Recounted below are steps taken from the beginning of the ODI until the finish.

**Distribution of Team Leader and Team Member Surveys**

The questionnaires were given to the team members and team leaders. The research coordinator at DHL working with the researcher was able to attain 100% compliance with participants in completing the questionnaires. These surveys were distributed and collected using the Google Forms online cloud service. Participants were assigned a number to keep track of pre and post ODI scores. Otherwise, the surveys were anonymous, and results were kept confidential with only the researcher having access to the primary data that was collected.

**Two-Day Coaching Skills Training for Team Leaders**

The coaching skills training for the team leaders (named “Manager as Coach”) was held April 3 and 4 at a hotel a short distance from the DHL distribution center where the research participants work.

The course was slightly modified from a coaching skills training program designed by the Thailand Coaching Institute. This two-day program facilitates the learning and use of coaching competencies aligned with those prescribed by the International Coach Federation. The course was also granted 12 hours of Continuing Coach Education Units (CCEUs) by the ICF.

The overall objectives of this course were to:

- Prepare managers to be effective coaches
- Improve a manager's ability to inspire those around them
- Improve a manager's ability to collaborate with and influence others
• Give managers the skills to help others develop insights
• Improve the quality of everyday feedback

Participants of this course learn how to apply coaching skills in everyday workplace scenarios. These situations include problem solving, decision making, giving everyday feedback, conducting strengths-based skills training, conducting team coaching sessions that are cooperative and collaborative, and leading performance reviews that are positive and solution-focused. The practical nature of this program ensures that all theories and ideas are implemented so the participants can begin using the skills in the workplace.

The course is highly interactive and it was imperative that the participants take part in all activities. Theories or skills that are delivered to the participants are also practiced under the supervision of the trainer and course assistants. Many live and authentic coaching demonstrations are conducted throughout the two day training as a means for the participants to observe and reflect on their newly learned coaching skills. An overview of the course is presented in Table 13.

**Table 13**

"Manager as Coach" Training Program Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Instructional Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.5   | Day 1 9:00-10:30   | • Introductions and Expectations  
• Defining coaching  
• The Iceberg Model  
• The ‘Tell-Ask-Problem-Solution’ (TAPS) Model  
• The International Coach Federation (ICF)  
• Coaching demo and reflection |
|       | Day 1 10:30-10:45  | **Coffee Break** |
| 1.5   | Day 1 10:45-12:15  | • Understanding coaching and the role of the coach  
• Building good rapport  
• Listening like a coach  
• Speaking like a coach  
• Giving acknowledgement  
• Communication checklist |
|       | Day 1 12:15-1:00   | **Lunch** |
| 1.5 | Day 1                                      | 1:00-2:30 | • Conversations that drive insight  
|     |                                           |           | • Identifying and stating the dilemma  
|     |                                           |           | • The 'Permission-Alignment-Inquiry-Refinement (PAIR) model of communication  
|     |                                           |           | • Using powerful questions  
|     | Day 1                                    | 2:30-2:45 | Coffee Break  
|     |                                           |           | • Moving from dilemma to insight  
|     |                                           |           | • The Goal-Reality-Options-Way Forward (GROW) Model  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching demo  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching practice  
|     |                                           |           | • Reflection on the day  
|     | Day 2                                    | 9:00-10:30| • Reflection from day one  
|     |                                           |           | • Review of the GROW model  
|     |                                           |           | • Creating powerful actions  
|     |                                           |           | • Having a complete coaching conversation  
|     |                                           |           | • Observer comments and checklist  
|     |                                           |           | • Pair coaching practice session 1  
|     |                                           |           | • Pair coaching practice session 1 debrief  
|     | Day 2                                    | 10:30-10:45| Coffee Break  
|     |                                           |           | • Review on goal completion – the 'Facts-Opinion-Learning-Linkage-Outlook-Way Forward’ (FOLLOW) model  
|     |                                           |           | • FOLLOW model demo and practice  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching around habits  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching around new skills acquisition  
|     |                                           |           | Lunch  
|     | Day 2                                    | 12:15-1:00| • Coaching around performance reviews  
|     |                                           |           | • Managing a performance review  
|     |                                           |           | • Focusing on learning and growth  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching Teams  
|     |                                           |           | • Principles and method of coaching teams  
|     |                                           |           | • Coaching teams demo and practice  
|     |                                           |           | 2:30-2:45 Coffee Break  
|     | Day 2                                    | 2:45-4:15 | • Review on role of the manager as a coach  
|     |                                           |           | • Final coaching conversation – creating a personal coaching development plan  
|     |                                           |           | • Pair coaching practice session 2  
|     |                                           |           | • Pair coaching practice session 2 debrief  
|     |                                           |           | • Workshop reflection activity  
|     |                                           |           | • Final questions and closing  

Sixteen team leaders attended the two day training. Fifteen of the leaders were able to attend the full two days, while two of the team leaders left early on day one. These two leaders were able to receive a review of the material they missed from a subsequent webinar that was facilitated by the trainer especially for them.

The training was conducted by Dr. Terdtoon Thaisriwichai, a Professional Certified Coach (PCC) of the ICF and a co-owner of the Thailand Coaching Institute. Dr. Thaisriwichai has conducted similar trainings for dozens of local and multinational organizations and corporations such as Microsoft Thailand, Chevron, Siam Commercial Group, And CP ALL, amongst many others. Dr. Thaisriwichai conducts over 100 workshops a year in Thailand and the region. He is a sought after accomplished trainer and is well known for his facilitating style which is highly interactive and enthusiastic.

The researcher greeted the participants on the first morning and gave a brief introduction to the training and his hope that the training would enable the leaders to build their coaching skills. By all accounts the DHL coordinator, the participants, and the coordinator were enjoying the training and eager to begin using their new skills the following week. Below are some photographs of the training sessions.
Figure 7. Photographs from the ‘DHL Manager as Coach’ Training (source: researcher)
**Team Leaders Coaching Their Team Members**

The week after the training, starting April 10 and completed by the end of May, the team leaders began coaching selected team members. In order to check on the quality of the coaching sessions, the trainer checked in with them periodically to ensure the quality of their coaching matched to how they were trained in the coaching process and mindset. This was completed through phone calls, during the webinars, and within a ‘Line’ chat group discussed below. Coaches also completed a self-assessment after their coaching sessions which they would use to reflect on the efficacy of their coaching.

According to the DHL coordinator, by the end of May 15 the team leaders had completed their nine coaching sessions (three for each team member). The researcher interviewed the DHL research coordinator about the coaching-session details. The team leaders met participants in conference rooms or their offices for coaching. The coaching sessions lasted between 45 and 60 minutes.

The training coordinator observed that the coaching sessions were well received by the team members. The team leaders were trained to explain coaching, the role of the coach, and the role of the coachee. These explanations are important aspects of coaching, ensuring that the team members understand coaching and its agendas. The team leaders were taught that in optimal coaching sessions the team member will develop one goal that is work related and another goal that is more personal. In the three sessions for a coaching engagement, most team members progressed in developing professional and personal goals.

In order to ensure the confidentiality of the coaching sessions, the researcher did not require the team leaders or team members to submit any details about their goals or what transpired in the conversations during the coaching sessions. However, the post interviews
were prepared to ask general questions about their experience during the coaching relationship with their leader.

**Trainer Support for Team Leaders**

As a means of support, the trainer created a group chat within the “Line” mobile device application, which is the most used and popular messaging application in Thailand. Nearly all of the team members joined this group voluntarily and received occasional tips or reminders to work on their coaching with their team members. The trainer would also send occasional short articles or website links which gave additional advice on different coaching topics. The Line group proved effective for having discussions about different concerns or for getting suggestions on how to work with different team members, especially if they were having some difficulties in connecting with or coaching them effectively.

Two weeks into the intervention the trainer offered a one-and-a-half-hour webinar using the “GoToMeeting” webinar platform. This webinar application allows the trainer to use video for all of the team leaders, to show presentations, have a virtual whiteboard, and for everyone to communicate with one another as well. Team leaders shared their experiences about coaching successes and goals. The trainer helped to coach the team leaders one by one in ways to enhance their own coaching skills. Other team leaders shared their experiences about coaching challenges and successes. During this period, the trainer offered a brief review of the coaching models and skills that they had learned during the training and solicited questions about specific topics related to the training.
Post ODI Findings

Post ODI Surveys and Interviews

The questionnaires were re-distributed to team leaders and team members on June 1. they were given until June 9 to complete the questionnaires. Ultimately there was a hundred-percent response rates with survey returns.

On June 10, the post intervention interviews were conducted. All team leaders and team members who had been chosen to take part in the interview met at the distribution center. The DHL research coordinator arranged for those chosen team leaders and team members to have the interviews by webinar. The research assistant had translated the interview questions into Thai and conducted the interviews. While many of the team leaders and team members speak English, in order to ensure that the highest level of communication all interviews were delivered in Thai. At all times during the interviews, the interviewee and I could all see one another through video windows in the webinar chatroom. Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and facial and voice expressions indicated the interviewees were relaxed and open throughout the sessions.

The researcher recorded individual interviews and uploaded all of the recordings to an online cloud database, and provided the research assistant access to these recordings. The researcher ensured that all interview recordings were kept strictly confidential between the researcher and research assistant. Within two weeks the research assistant completed English-language written summaries of all interviews, providing extended summaries of each question asked during the interview. The researcher then carefully studied the summaries and reviewed any questions about the data with the research assistant to ensure that there was full understanding of the interviewees’ answers. When the post ODI questionnaire surveys had
been completed, the researcher organized the findings into tables in the same format as the pre-intervention data had been organized.

Summary of the PQCR Survey - Post ODI Findings

Table 14 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the pre-ODI PQCR results for the team members. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, none of the respondents disagreed with the statements, 3% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 39% agreed with the statements, and 58% strongly agreed with the statements.

Table 14
Post ODI PQCR Results for Team Members - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My team leader and I have mutual respect for one another.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26.31%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that my team leader truly cares about me.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>36.83%</td>
<td>60.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe my team leader feels a sense of commitment to me.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>57.88%</td>
<td>39.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My team leader is a good listener.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>28.94%</td>
<td>65.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My team leader is easy to talk to.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td>65.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My team leader is effective at communicating with me.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39.46%</td>
<td>60.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel at ease talking with my team leader about my job performance.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>47.35%</td>
<td>44.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am content to discuss concerns or troubles with my team leader.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>39.46%</td>
<td>55.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel safe being open and honest with my team leader.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>44.72%</td>
<td>49.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My team leader helps me to identify and build upon my strengths.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.83%</td>
<td>63.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Gallup Q12 Survey - Post ODI Findings

Table 15 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the pre-ODI PQCR results for the team members. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, none of the respondents disagreed with the statements, 3% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 52% agreed with the statements, and 45% strongly agreed with the statements.

Table 15
Post ODI PQCR Results for Team Leaders - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My team members and I have mutual respect for one another.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My team members believe that I care about them.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My team members believe that I feel a sense of commitment to them.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am a good listener.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am easy to talk to.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am effective at communicating with my team members.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My team members feel at ease talking with me about their job performance.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My team members are content to discuss their concerns or troubles with me.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 presents a detailed summary of the mean, standard deviation, and answer and percent distribution of the Gallup Q12 survey post-ODI results for the team members. When calculating a rounded up average of all responses as a whole for the survey’s 12 statements, findings indicate that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements, none of the respondents disagreed with the statements, 8% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements, 46% agreed with the statements, and 46% strongly agreed with the statements.

Table 16
Post ODI Gallup Q12 results for team members - Summary of Mean, Standard Deviation, Answer Distribution, and Percent Distribution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Likert Score</th>
<th>Parentheses</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At work my opinion seems to count.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>42.09%</td>
<td>49.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The mission and purpose of my company makes my job important.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>36.83%</td>
<td>42.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
<td>39.46%</td>
<td>44.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have a best friend at work.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>39.46%</td>
<td>57.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>47.35%</td>
<td>47.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In the last year, I have had opportunities to learn and grow.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>63.14%</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post ODI Qualitative Data Summary of Interviews**

The qualitative data collected came from semi-structured interviews which were based off of the PQCR and Gallup Q12 questionnaires. The researcher followed a five-step method for the qualitative analysis of the interviews, taken from Piercy (2015), to analyze the data:

1. In-depth summaries of the interview recordings were created. Main ideas and topics from the interviews were then presented in a bullet format. Relevant information related to the research questions was the focus for this part of the data analysis.
2. Further interpretive and descriptive categories of statements were created from the transcripts.
3. Connections between the statements were made and statements were sorted into groups based on these connections.
4. Basic themes were determined through the examination of the statements. This thematic approach is what Ely (1991) defined as “a statement of meaning that runs through all or most of the pertinent data, or one in the minority that carries heavy emotional or factual impact”.
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5. The fifth stage was explored in the examination of the themes and predominant themes then supplemented in the data to explore answers to the research questions and hypotheses later in chapter four and in the findings section of chapter five.

Table 17 below provides three samples of the data summary for each of the main categories based on the interviews of the team members and team leaders. The full table of summaries created from the interview transcriptions can be found in Appendix G. These statements were utilized throughout this chapter to supplement the findings from the data collected through the PQCR and Gallup Q12 surveys, and later in chapter five to support the researcher’s findings and recommendations.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TM1. Describe one or two examples of how you feel cared for by your team leader.</strong></td>
<td><strong>TL1. Describe one or two examples of how you care for your team members.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader offers consistent follow up and feedback on performance and progress.</td>
<td>• I remain responsive and proactive with my team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader offers support in achievement of my goals.</td>
<td>• I trust my team members in what they are doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader works alongside me, encouraging teamwork.</td>
<td>• I provide clear steps and follow up in my instructions or directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TM2. What kind of strategy or style does your team leader use when discussing job performance issues with you?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TL2. What is your strategy or style of discussing job performance issues with your team members?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader is straightforward and honest with me.</td>
<td>• I ask my team about their issues or problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader is not always very serious.</td>
<td>• I encourage my team to think without giving them solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The team leader speaks carefully and thinks about what he or she is saying.</td>
<td>• I assign team members homework to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TM3. How do you feel when your team leader is discussing job performance issues with you?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TL3. What is your perception of how team members feel when talking to them about their job performance?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My team leader communicates clearly with me.</td>
<td>• My team members and I give one another our hearts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My team leader coaches me on my job performance.</td>
<td>• I gain trust with my team members through talking openly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My team leader listens to and advises me.

I talk with my team members about their personal lives, not just work issues.

**TM4. Describe one or two examples of how your team leader recently helped or guided you in your professional development?**

- My team leader explains to me carefully how to do my work.
- My team leader tells me my strengths and weaknesses.
- My team leader discusses my career path with me.

**TL4. Describe one or two examples of how you recently helped your team members in their professional development?**

- I support my team to be more proactive.
- I take time to emphasize the importance of teamwork.
- I create positive thinking and feelings.

**TM5. Do you feel engaged in your work? Can you give some examples?**

- The manager and team are always willing to help one another.
- The relationship with the team leader is like that of a family member.
- We share the same goals for the company’s growth.

**TL5. Do you feel engaged in your work? Can you give some examples?**

- I feel engaged with my team members.
- Coaching is a great tool and has helped me to feel more trust with my team.
- I have a “service mind”.

Comparison of the Pre and Post ODI Results

Table 18 shows a comparison of the mean averages of the pre and post Gallup Q12 ODI survey results for the team members and indicates that in all questions there was a positive shift in all of the responses. The positive shift in the mean average ranged from a .03 to .23 increase in the results.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gallup Q12 Survey Question for Team Members</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pre Survey Mean</strong></th>
<th><strong>Post Survey Mean</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mean Difference</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>+ .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have the materials and equipment to do my work right.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>+ .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>+ .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the last seven days I have received recognition and praise for doing good work.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>+ .15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the Pre and Post ODI Results
Hypothesis Testing

Testing Hypothesis 1 – Team Member Engagement

H\textsubscript{1}\textsubscript{0} There is no significant mean difference in the Gallup Q12 team member engagement scores for team leaders between pre-ODI and post-ODI;

H\textsubscript{1}\textsubscript{a} There is a significant mean difference in the Gallup Q12 team member engagement scores for team leaders between pre-ODI and post-ODI.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the Gallup Q12 survey scores of the team members before the coach training and the survey scores after the training. There was a significant difference in the scores before the coach training (M=51.2, SD=4.22) and after the coach training (M=53.12, SD=3.64) conditions; t(37)=-5.87, p = .001. Table 19 indicates the significance level is less than 0.05. The effect size based on Cohen’s conventions (d = .48) exceeded a small effect (d = .2). Therefore, H\textsubscript{02} is rejected. These results suggest that the coach training had a positive effect on the team members in terms of their engagement.
Table 19

Overall Differences Between Gallup Q12 Pre-Test and Post-Test for Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .05.

Interview Data Supporting Hypothesis 1

Findings from the team member interviews indicate they were quite unanimous in their opinion regarding feeling engaged in their work, and they described clearly what they felt engagement meant to them. They note that they feel that their manager is always willing to help and encourages the team members to help one another whenever possible. A prevalent theme within the interviews is to describe the relationships that they have at work similar to that of those they have with family members. These relationships create a level of communication that allows everyone the ability to share their thoughts and ideas with one another. Several of the team members also note that having the chance to set goals and work on them as a means to enhance the company’s growth was an exciting prospect, and that having their team leader as a coach strengthens the goal-setting process. The team members also note that they feel like they are being listened to and are being appreciated for their work. This in turn made them feel more engaged and open to learning new things. Several team members noted that they felt more like they wanted to improve themselves as a result of the coaching experience.

Team leaders described coaching as a tool that helped them to feel like they had a deeper level of trust with their team. A few of the team leaders described this increased feeling of being engaged as a result of having developed a "service mind", and they were proud of the company supporting them to learn these new techniques so that they could
develop themselves and help the team members in a deeper way with their new coaching tools. DHL encourages all employees to look for new strategies to improve themselves and the job that they do.

**Testing Hypothesis 2 – Creating a Genuine Relationship Between the Team Leader and Team Member**

H2a There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on creating a genuine relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;  
H2b There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on creating a genuine relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

To determine the change that team leader coaching had on creating a genuine relationship between the team leader and team member, the following PQCR pre and post survey question results were analyzed:

1. My team leader and I have mutual respect for one another.  
2. I believe that my team leader truly cares about me.  
3. I believe my team leader feels a sense of commitment to me.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare questions 1-3 of the PQCR survey scores of the team members before the coach training and the survey scores after the training. There was a significant difference in the scores before the coach training (M=12.35, SD=1.41) and after the coach training (M=13.70, SD=1.12) conditions; t(37)=-5.02, p = 0.001. Table 20 indicates the significance level is less than 0.05. The effect size based on Cohen’s conventions (d = 1.06) exceeded a large effect (d = .8). Therefore, H03 is rejected. These results suggest that the coach training had a positive effect on the team members in terms of creating a genuine relationship between the team leader and team member.
Table 20

Differences Between Team Members Pre and Post Test for PQCR Questions 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.02*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .05.

Interview Data Summary Supporting Hypothesis 2

Team members note the variety of ways in which they feel appreciated by their team leader. These include having consistent follow-up and feedback on their performance and progress, and feeling that the team leader is working alongside them and encouraging them to succeed. Several team members noted that team leaders work hard to help them to develop a positive mindset and a solution-focused attitude. They also feel encouraged when their team leaders help to coach them in finding new opportunities for their development or when they share their knowledge and experience in a way that helps them to build on their own potential. Many team members noted that they have always had a good working relationship with their team leaders and feel cared by them.

The research indicates that the team leaders care deeply about being responsive and proactive with their team. Several of the team leaders noted that they now use coaching skills whenever possible and this development has helped to create more positive working experiences. They also note that they are allowing more time for team members to find their own solutions to problems, and use self-directed thinking, rather than waiting for directions. The team leaders also found that they were checking their team members’ progress more frequently. Several team leaders also noted that they now spend more time talking to their team members about non-work related issues as trust levels have deepened through the coaching process.
Testing Hypothesis 3 – Level of Communication

H3₀ There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on level of effective communication between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

H3ₐ There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on level of effective communication between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

To determine the change that team leader coaching had on the level of effective communication between the team leader and team member, the following PQCR pre and post survey question results were analyzed:

4. My team leader is a good listener.
5. My team leader is easy to talk to.
6. My team leader is effective at communicating with me.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare questions 4-6 of the PQCR survey scores of the team members before the coach training and the survey scores after the training. There was a significant difference in the scores before the coach training (M=12.75, SD=1.68) and after the coach training (M=13.86, SD=1.24) conditions; t(37)=-3.49, p = 0.001. Table 21 indicates the significance level is less than 0.05. The effect size based on Cohen’s conventions (d = .75) exceeded a moderate effect (d = .5). Therefore, H0₄ is rejected. These results suggest that the coach training had a positive effect on the level of effective communication between the team leaders and team members.

Table 21

Differences Between Team Members Pre and Post Test for PQCR Questions 4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .05.
Interview Data Analysis for Hypothesis 3

Team members unanimously felt that their team leaders were clear in their communications, listened to them carefully, and shared open trust with them. They also noted that their team leaders coached them on their job performance and encouraged them in goal creation and in achieving the goals that they created.

The team leaders are similar in the remarks. One team leader most eloquently said “My team members and I give one another our hearts”. They consistently report that gaining the trust with their team members was important for them to have open conversations about performance or other issues concerning their overall performance improvement or goal setting. Their coach training helped their team members to elicit solutions, and they encouraged them to speak up and to develop their own ideas.

Testing Hypothesis 4 – Comfort Level of the Relationship Between the Team Leader and Team Member

H4\textsubscript{0} There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the comfort level of the relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

H4\textsubscript{a} There is a significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the comfort level of the relationship between team leaders and team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

To determine the change that team leader coaching had on the level of effective communication between the team leader and team member, the following PQCR pre and post survey question results were analyzed:

7. I feel at ease talking with my team leader about my job performance.

8. I am content to discuss my concerns or troubles with my team leader.

9. I feel safe being open and honest with my team leader.
A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare questions 7-9 of the PQCR survey scores of the team members before the coach training and the survey scores after the training. There was a significant difference in the scores before the coach training (M=12.78, SD=1.90) and after the coach training (M=13.29, SD=1.37) conditions; t(37)=-1.35, p = 0.001. Table 22 indicates the significance level is less than 0.05. The effect size based on Cohen’s conventions (d = .3) exceeded a small effect (d = .2). Therefore, H05 is rejected. These results suggest that the coach training had a positive effect on the comfort level of the relationship between the team leaders and team members.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.35*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .05.

Interview Data Analysis for Hypothesis 4

Team members feel that their leaders are generally straightforward and honest. They do not want their team leaders to always be serious but to treat them more like family. The team members feel encouraged when their team leaders note the accomplishment of the goals and acknowledge them for good work performance. The team members also want to have space to grow and think of solutions on their own. Especially important for most team members was the ability to have meaningful, challenging work. Most team members feel that their team leader provides useful feedback and gives examples that help them to understand their job and how to perform better. When the team leaders coach them, team members feel more trusted and empowered to create their own goals.
Team leaders want to discover the issues and problems that their team members have by asking them first to describe these concerns in detail. They encourage their team members to express themselves and want them to find their own solutions to work-related problems. Through the coaching program, the team leaders developed improved feedback techniques which they found very useful to use with their team members by encouraging them as they were designing and working on their goals.

**Testing Hypothesis 5 – Increase of Development and Learning of Team Members**

**H5₀** There is no significant mean difference in the PQCR scores on the development and learning of the team members pre-ODI and post-ODI;

**H5ₐ** There is a significant mean difference in the scores on the development and learning of the team members pre-ODI and post-ODI.

To determine the change that team leader coaching had on the level of development and learning of the team members, the following PQCR pre and post survey question results were analyzed:

10. My team leader helps me to identify and build upon my strengths.

11. My team leader enables me to develop as an employee of our organization.

12. My team leader engages in activities that help me to unlock my potential.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare questions 10-12 of the PQCR survey scores of the team members before the coach training and the survey scores after the training. There was a significant difference in the scores before the coach training (M=12.67, SD=1.82) and after the coach training (M=13.83, SD=1.30) conditions; t(37)=-3.22, p = 0.001. Table 23 indicates the significance level is less than 0.05. The effect size based on Cohen’s conventions (d = .73) exceeded a moderate effect (d = .5). Therefore, H06 is
rejected. These results suggest that the coach training had a positive effect on the level of development and learning of the team members.

Table 23

Differences Between Team Members Pre and Post Test for PQCR Questions 10-12 (source: the researcher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t < .05.

Interview Data Analysis for Hypothesis 5

Team members described several ways in which their team leader helped in their professional development. Their team leader will carefully explain to them how to perform the work and helped them identify their strengths and challenges in the assigned work. The team leaders also acknowledged their accomplishments and helped them to develop goals aligned with their career paths. The team leader assigned meaningful work and provided the space and resources needed to learn on their own. Team members were also encouraged to work on their mindset and attitude towards that of reaching their fullest potential.

In general, team leaders support their teams to be more proactive, and emphasize the importance of teamwork. Team leaders also realize that it is important to connect with the team members to improve professional growth and opportunities to serve as role models through their own and managerial development.

Synthesis of the Findings

This study was designed to determine the effects of a team leader coaching intervention on team members on the members’ levels of engagement, and as well the effect on four distinct dimensions of the relationship between the team leader and team member. The study utilized two surveys (the PQCR and the Gallup Q12) as well as semi structured
surveys post ODI of both team leaders and team members as a means to test the level of significant change pre and post ODI.

Results from the quantitative data in all areas of both surveys showed a statistically significant increase. This indicates that there was a positive statistical increase in employee engagement as defined by the Gallup Q12 survey, and in the areas of the team leader–team member relationship as defined within the PQCR. These areas of improvement support the post ODI interview data of team members and team leaders which was discussed within the hypotheses testing section of this study. These results appear to indicate that with the intervention of coaching there was a positive impact on both the team members as well as team leaders.

The qualitative data notes the relationship between the team leader and their team members within the dimensions of the PQCR after the coaching intervention, as noted below.

When asked about feeling cared for by their team leader, multiple positive responses were made. “The team leader supports me to have a positive mindset and a good attitude about work”, one team member noted, while another said “The team leader encourages me to join training and to increase my skills development” and “I am encouraged to seek new opportunities in my own development”. These comments indicate the level of care that the team members felt from their leaders. The team leaders themselves also reacted positively when asked how they care for their team members. One team leader answered that “I frequently check up on my team members and their work progress, as a result of the coach training”. Another team leader noted that “I talk to my team members about personal, non-work related issues and topics” and “I encourage my team members to share their thoughts and feelings with me”.
Within the area of job performance, one team member noted that "the team leader allows me to find my own solutions" and "the team leader speaks carefully and thinks about what he or she is saying to me". Both of these comments indicate a developing coaching relationship. A team leader also commented that "I encourage my team to think without giving them solutions", and "I try to be as clear as possible in my communications and work hard to build our teamwork". Emphasis on the process of goal setting is also indicative of a coaching relationship.

When asked to reflect on their level of engagement, team members responded positively. One team member noted "The manager and team are always willing to help one another" and "the relationship with the team leader is like that of a family member". Others commented that "I feel listened to and appreciated at work", and "I am engaged in my work and want to learn new things". Another commented that "I feel like I want to prove myself". Team members also noted similarly, with comments such as "I feel engaged with my team members" and "coaching is a great tool and has helped me to feel more trust with my team". They also noted that "I am encouraged to fulfill my full potential" and that "there could be stress in the job but our close family style helps with that". Comments such as these may indicate that the team leader coaching relationship had a positive influence on the engagement of the teams themselves.
CHAPTER V – SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five includes the summary of the research findings, the conclusions drawn from the findings, and the recommendations based on the findings, as well as recommendations for any further OD follow-through based on the conclusions. Chapter five concludes with an epilogue, including the researcher’s reflections on the experience of being an OD practitioner.

Summary of Findings.

The aim of this research project was to determine the impact of a coach training initiative with team leaders and to study the attendant effects this training had on the relationship with their team members and on the team members’ employee engagement.

Research findings derived from the Gallup Q12 and PQCR surveys indicate that the ODI significantly changed the levels of engagement of the team members of DHL studied in the research. The findings confirmed that there has been significant change in the team member – team leader relationship in the areas of creating a genuine relationship. Coaching appears to create a genuine relationship, improve the level of effective communication, increase the comfort level of the relationship, and expand the development and learning of the team members. These findings are described in more detail below.

Team Member Engagement

In order to measure team member engagement, all team members were given the Gallup Q12 survey before and after the ODI. In the pre ODI survey, the team members’ collective scores were actually quite high, and in the post ODI survey, though there was a consistent albeit slight rise in the results (from a rise in the average mean of +.03 - +.21, a total mean average raise of +.16, in some questions it did not significantly change in the results. Data collected from Gallup Q12 showed a much lower amount of change when
compared to the PQCR. However, a paired-samples t-test comparing pre and post ODI survey answers for the Gallup Q12 showed a statistically significant increase in the scores.

David Ulrich (1997) stated that as an organization demands more output while hiring fewer team members, team members must be willing to psychologically invest in their jobs. Coaching could have been shown to meet this ‘psychological investment’. Interview data provided a deeper level of expression in regards to the team members’ opinions in their engagement level after the ODI. In particular, team members recognized that their manager encouraged and supported their work and goals. During the intervention, team members also felt that when the creation of goals aligned with their own professional development, they felt more connected and engaged with the company mission. As a result of the coaching relationship, the team members felt more “listened to” by their team leaders, and this experience led many team members to want to prove themselves and strive to achieve the goals they set as coachees.

Bakker and Demerouti (2007) postulate that effective team leaders recognize the achievements of team members holding them accountable. This support is shown to be an important resource in optimizing employee engagement. Indeed, as a result of the intervention the team leaders learned how to listen more empathetically and value their team members’ full potential. DHL values strategic thinking and self-directed thought and action of all of its employees. The skills that the team leaders gained through the training allowed them not only to become more open in there thinking but to also have the tools to create a deeper level of self-directed awareness and thinking in their team members.

**Genuine Relationship Between Team Members and Team Leaders**

Questions 1-3 of the PQCR were meant to measure the degree to how genuine the team members and team leaders feel their relationship is. These questions asked to what
level they had (1) respect, (2) care and (3) commitment to one another. The mean average of these 3 questions combined for the team members went from a pre ODI score of 4.12 to 4.57. The average change in score was + .44. A paired-samples t-test comparing pre and post scores for questions 1-3 showed a statistically significant increase in the score.

Gegner (1997) noted that a coaching relationship should be one where the coach genuinely cares for the coachee and has a passion to help to improve and facilitate a state of continuous learning for the coachee. In fact, team members in the intervention noticed a consistent follow-up and feedback on their progress, and also found their team leaders working closer with them and encouraging them to achieve their goals. Some team members found that the team leaders devoted coaching time to encourage them to think about their current mindset and how to change it to be a more positive and constructive. They also felt encouraged to develop themselves in their positions and to find new opportunities to build their skills and work with others team members in order to advance. They felt that the team leader as their coach helped them to see their own position and professional career path in a clearer and more structured way.

As a result of the coach training, the team leaders note that they are working to be more responsive and connected with their team and used their newly found coaching skills whenever possible. They provided more time for all team members to find their own solutions in a self-directed manner; moreover, team leaders tended to spend more time checking up on the progress of the team members that they were coaching.

**Effective Communication Between Team Members and Team Leaders**

Questions 4-6 of the PQCR were meant to measure the effectiveness of communication between team leaders and team members. These questions asked to what level team leaders were (4) good listeners, (5) easy to talk to and (3) effective at
communicating. The mean average of questions 4-6 combined for the team members went from a pre ODI score of 4.26 to 4.61. The average change in score was + .36. A paired-samples t-test comparing pre and post scores for questions 4-6 showed a statistically significant increase in the score.

Hunt & Weintraub (2016) were interested in the extent to how well the team leader communicated with the team member in a coaching context. They noted it may create an approach and attitude from the coach that is encouraging, focused on growth and learning, and strives to create an agreeable chemistry between the coach and coachee. A summary of the interviews shows that team members recognize their leaders as having increased intention to be open in their communications, including listening more carefully and openly sharing information. The findings reflect team leaders leading team members through a process of goal development and followed through with them as they addressed work challenges. Several team members note that they felt the relationship to be more trusting and open with their team leader.

The ICF’s definition of coaching is “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential” (International Coaching Federation, 2016). This definition reflects in the relationship that was developed between team leaders and team members in the intervention. Team leaders indicated how the relationship with the team members that they were coaching had been open and interesting. The nature of coaching also made the team leaders feel closer and expressed more empathy to their team members. Several team leaders noted that they felt increased responsibility for their team members’ goal creation and achievement. They also felt closer to their team members on a personal as well as professional level.
Change in the Comfort Level Between Team Members and Team Leaders

Questions 7-9 of the PQCR were meant to measure the degree of improvement in the comfort level between the team members and team leaders. These questions asked to what level team members were (7) at ease in talking about performance issues, (5) content to talk about problems, and (3) felt safe being open and honest with their team leader. The mean average of questions 7-9 combined for the team members went from a pre ODI score of 4.25 to 4.43. The average change in score was +.17. A paired-samples t-test comparing pre and post scores for questions 7-9 showed a statistically significant increase in the score.

Graham et al. (1994) noted that comfort in the coaching relationship requires the coach to display a genuine attitude of care towards the coachee and that this also requires one with effective interpersonal skills. These skills include showing respect, being empathetic, showing respect, and being authentic. A summary of the interviews of the team members shows that they feel a greater degree of honesty and closeness with their team leaders. While team members still maintain their professional relationship, they also developed a deeper personal relationship and regarded their team leaders to the extent of being “family”. They appreciated their leaders encouraging them and cheering them on through their goal development. They felt that in the relationship with their team leaders they had a chance to grow and explore their development as a result of being allowed to explore their own interests. This development helped team members feel valued and engaged at work.

A study of the team leader interview data for these questions showed that after coach training many leaders asked team members to design their own goals and to find the solutions through the facilitation of their newly learned coaching skills. In order for this to happen, notes Ting and Riddle (2006), the coach should be able to build rapport, be committed to the coaching relationship, and focus on collaboration in order to be effective. Several team
leaders involved in the intervention mentioned that the development of feedback skills as a particular useful skill, in that it helped them to refine their listening skills and helping the team members to refine their goals and awareness of challenges. The team leaders also recognized the importance of developing rapport with the team members as a part of building more intimacy and trust, so that the team member felt more comfortable in sharing with them at a deep level. This also helped the team leader to understand their team members’ personalities at a deeper level which gave them more empathy to them in seeing that they can accomplish the goals that they set out to accomplish.

**Change in the Level of Development and Learning of Team Members**

Questions 10-12 of the PQCR were meant to measure the change in the level of learning and development of the team members. These questions asked to what level team members felt their team leader (10) helped them to identify and build upon their strengths, (11) develop as an employee of the organization, and (3) were helped to unlock their potential. The mean average of questions 10-12 combined for the team members went from a pre ODI score of 4.24 to 4.62. The average change in score was +.38. A paired-samples t-test comparing pre and post scores for questions 10-12 showed a statistically significant increase in the score.

From the interview data the team members described their team leaders helping and challenging them in their own professional development. This development is what Hunt and Weintraub (2016) noted as a coach/coachee interaction that is aimed at facilitating self-directed learning and development. It is a concerted effort on the part of the coach to assist the coachee in learning from the work experience while identifying areas of development that benefit career enhancement. In the case of the intervention, the team members were allowed to develop their own goals and the team leader would then help to facilitate and advise them.
on ways to reach them. Team members also appreciated that their team leaders spent time to acknowledge and encourage them consistently as they made progress in their goal achievement journey. Several team members were happy with the way that the coaching sessions helped them to develop goals that were consistent with their own strengths so that they felt more engaged while completing them. As well, certain team members mentioned that their team leader was helping them to see their potential and this motivation encouraged them to remain committed to their goals.

Team leaders felt through the process that they were enabling their team members to be more proactive and connected to their goals. So, too, certain team leaders also noted that the development of teamwork is important to many of the team members for their own professional growth. These team leaders consequentially were motivated to be more connected to other team members professionally as well as personally. Similarly, team leaders attempted to also provide additional opportunities to team members so that they could meet the goals they set. Some team leaders experienced an increased concern to support the achievement of their team members. Many of these team leaders realized that by developing their own skills team members would value the effort. The researcher assumes the coaching experience helped all participants appreciate the need for self-development.

Conclusions Based on Findings

The research has fulfilled its objectives to:

1. Assess the current relationship of team leaders and team members as measured through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship Survey.

2. Assess the current level of team member engagement as measured through the Gallup Q12 Engagement Survey.

3. Provide development of coaching skills for the team leaders.
4. Have the team leaders utilize coaching skills with their team members.

5. Measure the effect of team leader coaching on team members post ODI, qualitatively through interviews and quantitatively through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Survey and the Gallup Q12 Survey.

The objectives of the research at DHL were to provide development of coaching skills to team leaders of DHL and for the team leaders to utilize the learned coaching skills and processes with their team members. An assessment was made of the relationship of the team leaders and team members pre and post ODI, measured through the Perceived Quality of Coaching Relationship Survey, in addition to semi structured interviews of the team leaders and team members. Additionally, an assessment of employee engagement was conducted through the use of the Gallup Q12 survey. The conclusions below address these objectives.

From the findings it can be concluded that the coach training and use of coaching by the team leader resulted in an increase of engagement by the team members. This notion is supported by the paired-samples t-tests conducted to check the hypotheses and the Cohen’s d test on the effect size, as well as the interview data of the team members and team leaders. Throughout, it appears that coaching led team members to feel more connected to their goals and more supported in their work by their leader. In addition, team members also felt more connected to their team members through increased communication. Team leaders indicated a greater sense of support and empathy for their team members as they worked to achieve personal and professional goals.

Schaufeli (2013) noted that when employees feel satisfied, they may find their work more enjoyable and rewarding, and feel they are appreciated and are being developed, so that they may be more likely to care for and contribute more to the organization. It was noted that throughout the team leader coaching intervention the team members felt a greater inclination
to encourage one another, including sharing ideas while creating deeper levels of communication on both professional and personal levels. As a result of the coaching relationship the team members felt more ‘listened to’ by their team leaders and this encouraged certain team members to want to prove themselves and strive to achieve the goals they set as a coachee.

The increase in team leader engagement was similar to that of the team members. As a result of their training the team leaders learned how to listen empathetically, and see their team members’ full potential. This enhancement along with specific coaching skills helped the team leaders connect and increase the development of their team members. DHL values strategic thinking and self-directed thought and action of all employees. The skills that the team leaders gained through the training allowed not only them to become more open in their thinking but to also have the tools to create a deeper level of self-directed awareness and thinking in their team members.

Thus, the results of the research indicated that when team leaders are provided coach training and use coaching with their team members, there will be a positive impact that creates a more genuine relationship, an increase in effective communication, and an improvement in the comfort level and learning level of team members. The results appear to meet the needs of DHL in creating a supportive environment where team leaders are encouraging their team members to think in a more goal oriented, self-directed and strategic manner.

**Recommendations Based on Conclusions**

The intention of this intervention was to develop team leaders in specific coaching skills and processes and to use these new skills with team members in order to:
• Create a measurable positive difference in the dimensions of the team leader/team member relationship as measured through the PQCR survey and subsequent follow-up interviews;

• Create a positive difference in the engagement level of the team members towards organizational goals as measured by the Gallup Q12 survey and subsequent follow-up interviews.

The researcher conducted this intervention to determine whether it would create a measurable positive difference in the dimensions of the team leader/team member relationship as measured through the PQCR survey and subsequent follow-up interviews. The researcher was also curious to explore whether the intervention would create a positive difference in the engagement level of the team members towards organizational goals as measured by the Gallup Q12 survey and subsequent follow-up interviews. The hope of the researcher was that the research would provide a beneficial model for future coach training initiatives conducted at DHL Thailand Supply Chain, or for other organizations within Thailand.

The recommendations from this research project is presented in two sections. The first section are the recommendations made post OD, based on the findings. The recommendations include possible OD follow-up actions based on the residual problems in the action research. The second section includes recommendations for further research, including other related areas for research, other perspectives to be explored for further illumination of the research questions, possible follow-up research, and how organizations and professionals may benefit from the study’s findings.
**Post ODI Recommendations**

The researcher proposes that through the collected survey and interview data it reveals evidence that a program instilling a leader's coaching skills positively influences the relationship between team leaders and team members. The relationship appears more trusting, communicative, supportive and inclined to enhance team members' effective goal creation and accountability towards goal completion. This improvement in team-leader – team-member relationship appears quite clear. What is less obvious from the research project is the level to which the team member's engagement has been affected.

The researcher recommends that DHL continue developing its team leaders in their coaching skills and using these skills with their team members on a regular basis. A longer term, expanded team leader coaching initiative could indicate the level of significance on the team members' relationship with their team leaders as well as the potential for development of the team members own personal efficacy. By continuing with subsequent coach training and team leader – team member coaching programs further study and measurement of the program could be conducted to establish the level of change into the future.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

It is important to first note that the validity of results from this study is restricted to the particular context of DHL. Future research should be conducted on other organizations within Thailand to strengthen the validity of findings in this study.

It would be interesting to explore other types of interventions that could affect employee engagement. Results of this research indicate that coaching can positively affect the team member/team leader relationship, which has some ancillary effect on the level of employee engagement. Accordingly, the research indicates that it would be useful to explore non-coaching interventions that could be used in combination with coaching or alone to
measure their effectiveness. Looking at areas such as team and individual development initiatives, ways to improve job security, leadership development, compensation practices, or other interventions would help to explore areas which may also affect employee engagement.

In regards to the completed coaching study, it could be useful to conduct further interviews with the participants about topics related to attitudes of employee engagement. More specifically, follow-up queries might explore how the act of being coached has affected their own engagement to the organization. Also, conducting pre and post interviews in regards to the support the team members feel from their leaders and the engagement they feel to their organization could provide more perspective to the effects that the intervention had on the participants. Further refinement of the survey tools and the interview questions could also help obtain specific information from the participants.
EPILOGUE

Being a doctoral student and working through the ODI process has given me many new experiences and has expanded my perspectives. I came to the OD doctoral program at ABAC to learn more about organizations and what they need to do to not only survive but to thrive.

Through my coursework and research, I have concluded that organizations can only change if we address the motivation and garner the energy of the organization’s members. Change happens not from the outside in, but from the inside out. This is true with people as well as organizations. In a way, it was serendipitous that I discovered coaching during my journey as a doctoral student. Coaching is a powerful tool that can support positive change and growth in individuals and in organizations. To be able to use coaching within my action research project as a main driver for change was very motivating and powerful. I have been able to experience the flow of transformation that coaching can provide and was able to record it within a controlled intervention.

The entire process of action research within the context of a business environment provided me with an invaluable experience of blending high-level academic processes within the business world to create tangible changes that are measurable and substantial. Through the entire process of developing and conducting my action research project, I have seen how the academic world and the business world can be combined to produce positive and beneficial results. Through the use of systematic research and applying it to the real world in a business context this project has convinced me of the ability to synergize academics within a business context to discover significant findings and produce tangible results.

Finally, being a part of the OD program at Assumption University has at times been a challenge, but one for which I will always be grateful. It has taught me perseverance and
careful organization to achieve my goals. The coursework, building of my thesis, and working with my advisor to complete my project has resulted in a journey which has shifted my own perspectives on what I am capable of doing in my life. The knowledge and experience attained from this program has helped me grow as a business owner, trainer, consultant, and coach. For this I express my gratitude to be a part of the Assumption University doctoral family.
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Appendix A

SOAR Analysis Focus Group Questionnaire

Strengths
What would you say are the main strengths of your organization?
What is going well in terms of employee engagement?
What is going well in terms of employee/manager communication?

Opportunities
Where do you feel there are opportunities to improve engagement?
Where do you feel there are opportunities to improve communication?

Aspirations
What would it look like if the areas of engagement and communication really matched the organization’s vision and mission?
How would this affect the overall performance and environment of the organization?

Results
How can the vision be put into measurable terms?
What can managers and employees do to make tangible steps towards success in this area?
Appendix B

Individual Participant Semi-Structured Interview Questions - Team Member

1. Describe one or two examples of how you feel cared for by your team leader.

2. How well do you feel your team leader communicates with you?

3. What kind of strategy or style does your team leader use when discussing job performance issues you?

4. How do you feel when your team leader is discussing job performance issues with you?

5. Describe one or two examples of how your team leader recently helped or guided you in your professional development.
Appendix C

Individual Participant Semi-Structured Interview Questions - Team Leader

1. Describe one or two examples of how you care for your team members.

2. How well do you feel you communicate with your team members?

3. What is your strategy or style of discussing job performance issues with your team members?

4. What is your perception of how team members feel when talking to them about their job performance?

5. Describe one or two examples of how you recently helped your team members in their professional development.
Appendix D

Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Scale – Team Member

Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree Nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree

1. My team leader and I have mutual respect for one another.

2. I believe that my team leader truly cares about me.

3. I believe my team leader feels a sense of commitment to me.

4. My team leader is a good listener.

5. My team leader is easy to talk to.

6. My team leader is effective at communicating with me.

7. I feel at ease talking with my team leader about my job performance.

8. I am content to discuss my concerns or troubles with my team leader.

9. I feel safe being open and honest with my team leader.

10. My team leader helps me to identify and build upon my strengths.

11. My team leader enables me to develop as an employee of our organization.

12. My team leader engages in activities that help me to unlock my potential.
Appendix E

Perceived Quality of the Coaching Relationship (PQCR) Scale – Team Leader

Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree Nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree

1. My team members and I have mutual respect for one another.

2. My team members believe that I care about them.

3. My team members believe that I feel a sense of commitment to them.

4. I am a good listener.

5. I am easy to talk to.

6. I am effective at communicating with my team members.

7. My team members feel at ease talking with me about their job performance.

8. My team members are content to discuss their concerns or troubles with me.

9. My team members feel safe being open and honest with me.

10. I help my team members to identify and build upon their strengths.

11. I enable my team members to develop as employees of our organization.

12. I engage in activities that help my team members to unlock their potential.
Appendix F

The Gallup Q12 Employee Engagement Survey

Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree Nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree

1. Do you know what is expected of you at work?
2. Do you have the materials and equipment to do your work right?
3. At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day?
4. In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work?
5. Does your supervisor, or someone at work, seem to care about you as a person?
6. Is there someone at work who encourages your development?
7. At work, do your opinions seem to count?
8. Does the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important?
9. Are your associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work?
10. Do you have a best friend at work?
11. In the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress?
12. In the last year, have you had opportunities to learn and grow?
Appendix G

Summary of Post ODI Team Member and Team Leader Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>TMI. Describe one or two examples of how you feel cared for by your team leader.</em></td>
<td><em>TL1. Describe one or two examples of how you care for your team members.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader offers consistent follow up and feedback on performance and progress.</em></td>
<td><em>• I remain responsive and proactive with my team members.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader offers support in achievement of my goals.</em></td>
<td><em>• I trust my team members in what they are doing.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader works alongside me, encouraging teamwork.</em></td>
<td><em>• I provide a clear steps and follow up in my instructions or directions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader supports me to have a positive mindset and a good attitude about work.</em></td>
<td><em>• I use coaching skills whenever possible with my team members for a more positive working experience and environment.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader encourages me to join training and to increase my skills development. I am encouraged to seek new opportunities in my own development.</em></td>
<td><em>• I encourage my team members to come up with solutions on their own, through their own thinking.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader displays and supports good habits and virtues.</em></td>
<td><em>• I frequently check up on my team members and their work progress.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader is open and shares knowledge and experience with me.</em></td>
<td><em>• I talk to my team members about personal, non-work related issues and topics.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader supports me in developing my own potential for leadership.</em></td>
<td><em>• I encourage my team members to share their thoughts and feelings with me.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>• The team leader trusts and believes in me.</em></td>
<td><em>• I work to create a more open relationship with my team members.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The team leader helps me to be more open with others and to create positive relationships in the workplace.

**TM2. What kind of strategy or style does your team leader use when discussing job performance issues you?**

- The team leader is straightforward and honest with me.
- The team leader is not always very serious.
- The team leader speaks carefully and thinks about what he or she is saying to me.
- The team leader allows me to find my own solutions.
- The team leader uses feedback and provides examples for me.
- The team leader shows kindness when we are talking.
- The team leader asks me for my opinion on how to improve.
- The team leader tells me stories of his or her own learning and experience.
- The team leader works together with me on goals.

**TL2. What is your strategy or style of discussing job performance issues with your team members?**

- I ask my team about their issues or problems.
- I encourage my team to think without giving them solutions.
- I assign team members homework to think about.
- I provide my staff feedback and let them create goals.
- I build rapport with my staff before we discuss performance.
- I try to inspire and motivate my team members.
- I try to be as clear as possible in my communications.
- I work hard to build our teamwork.
- I try to communicate like and be a coach.
- I try to understand my team members' personalities.
**TM3. How do you feel when your team leader is discussing job performance issues with you?**

- My team leader communicates clearly with me.
- My team leader coaches me on my job performance.
- My team that are listens to and advises me.
- My team leader openly trust me and shares with me.
- My team leader encourages me.

**TL3. What is your perception of how team members feel when talking to them about their job performance?**

- My team members and I give one another our hearts.
- I gain trust with my team members through talking openly.
- I talk with my team members about their personal lives, not just work issues.
- I elicit solutions from my team members.
- I encourage all of my team members, especially the ones who are reluctant to speak.

**TM4. Describe one or two examples of how your team leader recently helped or guided you in your professional development?**

- My team leader explains to me carefully how to do my work.
- My team leader tells me my strengths and weaknesses.
- My team leader discusses my career path with me.
- My team leader cheers me on in accomplishing my goals.
- Team leader acknowledges and complements me when I do a good job.

**TL4. Describe one or two examples of how you recently helped your team members in their professional development?**

- I support my team to be more proactive.
- I take time to emphasize the importance of teamwork.
- I create positive thinking and feelings.
- I encourage my team to be more assertive and to speak up.
- I provide opportunities for my team to grow.
- I try to be a good role model for my team.
| My team leader gives me space to learn things on my own. | I work to build good relations with my team. |
| My team leader assigns meaningful work to me. | I develop myself before developing others. |
| My team leader supports me to have the right mindset. | I help to develop my team beyond their own specific duties. |
| I hope my team members create goals and then break them down. | |

**TM5. Do you feel engaged in your work?**

*Can you give some examples??*

- The manager and team are always willing to help one another.
- The relationship with the team leader is like that of a family member.
- We share the same goals for the company’s growth.
- The communication level is great in the organization.
- I often share my thoughts and ideas with others.
- I feel listened to and appreciated at work.
- I am engaged in my work and want to learn new things.
- I feel like I want to prove myself.

**TL5. Do you feel engaged in your work?**

*Can you give some examples??*

- I feel engaged with my team members.
- Coaching is a great tool and has helped me to feel more trust with my team.
- I have a “service mind”.
- I am proud of that my company supports its employees to develop themselves.
- I am encouraged to fulfill my full potential.
- We are always looking for new strategies to improve in our work.
- There are always new tasks that are challenging and help me to learn new things.
- There could be stress in the job but our close family style helps with that.
Appendix H

Communication with Dr. Jane Brodie – Permission to use PQCR Survey

---

Brodie Riordan
Manager - Partner L&D at McKinsey & Company

Oct 11

Hi, I would like to ask if I can use the PQCR for my research. I need a short survey to go along with my other measurement tools. Would greatly appreciate it. If you would like more info on my dissertation please reply to me. Thanks again for your time.

-Thomas Yates

5:16 AM

Hi Thomas - yes absolutely - please feel free to use the measure!

5:16 AM

Brodie Riordan is now a connection.

Oh great, thank you very much! You presented it with a 5 point likert, correct? This is great...hard to get researchers to answer me! :) Thanks again, also I really like the work you have presented and written.

5:28 AM

Yes 5 points! I'm happy to answer any questions - feel free to email me directly, too, at brodie.gregory@gmail.com.

5:49 AM

---
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