2011

# The role of process consultation and appreciative inquiry in the coaching model at Los Angeles Universal Preschool

Karel Kreshek

# THE ROLE OF PROCESS CONSULTATION AND APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY IN THE COACHING MODEL AT LOS ANGELES UNIVERSAL PRESCHOOL

---

A Research Project

Presented to the Faculty of

The George L. Graziadio

School of Business and Management

Pepperdine University

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Organization Development

---

by

Karel Kreshek

August 2011

This research project, completed by

KAREL KRESHEK

under the guidance of the Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the faculty of The George L. Graziadio School of Business and Management in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Date_____

Faculty Committee

_____
Committee Chair, Ann E. Feyerherm, Ph. D.

_____
Committee Member, Terri Egan, Ph. D.

_____

Linda Livingstone, Ph. D., Dean
The George L. Graziadio School of Business and Management

## Abstract

Enabling American students to race to the top through the education reform launched by the Obama Administration begins with attention to its youngest citizens. Studies have shown that high-quality early childhood education is associated with improved school achievement in later years. However, limitations in the reach and effectiveness of federal and state preschool programs have prompted the creation of nonprofit organizations dedicated to improving access to preschool for underserved children. One such organization is Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), whose design includes coaching for childcare providers to heighten the quality of their preschool programs. This study examined the use and impact of the coaches' application of process consultation (PC) and appreciative inquiry (AI) principles with their childcare providers.

The study utilized a mixed-method design that collected data using surveys, interviews, and observations. Two survey instruments and one interview script were designed by the researcher and reviewed by an expert panel. The instruments gathered data about the coaches' perceptions of AI and PC, the coach-provider relationship, ownership and collaboration, the coaches' style, and the impact of coaching. Data collection occurred from November through December 2010. A sample of seven coaches and 49 providers completed surveys, five coaches and five providers were interviewed, and two coaches were observed. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the survey data, the interview data were subjected to thematic analysis, and the observation data were used to create a narrative description.

The LAUP coaches in this study demonstrated substantial use of PC philosophies in their work with childcare providers. The coaches also reported use of AI philosophies; however, the providers were neutral, on average, about whether the coaches used AI approaches. Coaches and providers reported that the use of PC and AI yielded benefits such as building strong coach-provider relationships, positioning the coaches as helpful resources to providers, changing providers' thinking, and co-creating implementable solutions.

Although this study suffered from limitations concerning the small sample size and measurement tools that did not gather sufficient relevant data, the findings were promising. It is advisable to continue using the LAUP coaching model. Further, this study demonstrates that AI and PC philosophies can be applied in one-on-one coaching, in nontraditional settings or industries, and even when organizational change is not the focus. Future studies should utilize a larger sample size and improved measurement tools to gather additional information about the coaches' use of AI and PC and the impact of these philosophies on providers.

Acknowledgments

Playing to win!

I would like to take this opportunity to thank some people who have traveled the road with me these past few years. These were people who I called when I had doubts, cried with when I was frustrated, and played with when I was celebrating. These are individuals who I love deeply.

The first person to thank is Dr. Gary Mangiofico. You started out as my boss, and became my mentor, professor and friend. I had never heard of Organization Development before meeting you and it was you who suggested I look into the MSOD program. I can wholeheartedly say that if you had not been a part of my life, I would not be here today. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for helping move me from my “blind” window to my “open” window.

I could not have completed this program without the support of my parents, Nina and Saul Kreshek. I know I am here today because of the hard work I have accomplished; but, I couldn’t have done it without you. I always knew you were in my corner cheering me on and believing in my ability.

A big “shout-out” goes to my sisters and friends. It has been tough at times spending weekends and weeknights hitting the books and not being able to socialize, talk on the phone, or “hang out.” You have supported me, my kids, and my studies. I am very blessed to have you all in my life.

I want to thank you, Charly, for being a part of my life and filling it with love and friendship. There is no way to measure the support you have provided.

And, of course, the biggest thank you of all goes to Samantha and Andrew! These past 2 years have been an emotional journey for us. We have had tears, laughter, and arguments over my time away from home, whether I was at school or simply in the other room studying. And yet, here we are. I hope you both understand one day and appreciate the sacrifices we all made.

Congratulations—We did it!

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

List of Tables

Table Page

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Enabling American students to race to the top through the education reform launched by the Obama Administration (U.S. Department of Education, 2009) begins with attention to its youngest citizens—those preschool-aged children who have not yet begun Kindergarten. Up to 30% of low-income children and 17% of middle-income children lack the familiarity with numbers, letters, and words they need to be ready for school (Coley, 2002; West, Denton, & Germino-Hausken 2000).

A study of the prekindergarten system in Tulsa, Oklahoma, found that children who attended preschool scored 41% higher in assessments of letter-word identification and 17% higher in spelling than children who did not attend preschool (Gormley, Gayer, Phillips, & Dawson, 2004). Other studies have found that high-quality preschool reduces grade repetition, dropping out, and special education placement (Belfield, Nores, Barnett, & Schweinhart, 2006; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2002).

Wat (2010) concluded based on a review of 50 years of research that high-quality preschool education has the potential to instill in children a love of learning and foundation of knowledge that could address many of the academic achievement challenges facing children today. Additionally, 40 states as well as the District of Columbia offer state-funded preschool programs to improve children's access to high-quality preschool education and become ready for Kindergarten. The federal Head Start program offers preschool education to the

poorest children but “serves only about half of [those who are] eligible” (Doggett & Wat, 2010, p. 9).

Head Start and the state preschool systems have helped increase access to preschool for many children; however, critics have argued that the program is burdened with bureaucracy, mismanagement, financial abuses, and sometimes theft (Winter, 2005). This has prompted the creation of additional organizations that focus on enhancing the availability and quality of preschool for all children.

One such organization is Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), a non-profit organization whose mission is to help prepare children for Kindergarten by making voluntary, high-quality preschool available to every 4-year-old in the Los Angeles County (“About LAUP,” n.d.). Since its opening in 2005, LAUP has provided access to high-quality preschool education to more than 30,000 4-year-olds in Los Angeles County each year. In particular, it focuses on 17 underserved areas, identified by zip code, in the county.

The organization is funded by the First 5 LA Commission, which was established by Proposition 10 in California in 2004. LAUP works with private, public, and charter schools (centers) in addition to home-based family childcares. The LAUP Network consists of approximately 200 childcare providers and more than 250 centers and family childcares.

LAUP built its approach and services using the California State Preschool and Head Start systems as benchmarks. The LAUP designers believed that the many regulations that occupy childcare providers’ time under these benchmark programs would deter providers from delivering high-quality education to

children. The designers also believed that childcare providers needed guidance and support rather than monitoring and regulations.

This led to LAUP's innovative design, which features two resources for childcare providers that set LAUP apart from state preschool systems and help raise the quality of the childcare programs. First, fiscal coaches are provided who offer information and support that focus on the business aspects of operating a high-quality preschool. Second, experienced early learning educators are provided who coach childcare providers regarding curriculum, enrollment, parent engagement, and health and wellness. All of the LAUP coaches collaborate with the provider to ensure that the services provided to the children are continuously reviewed and are guaranteed to be high-quality.

The LAUP coaches who support the childcare providers are specifically trained in process consultation (PC) and appreciative inquiry (AI). Both processes emphasize dialogue and active listening, helping, and focusing on the positive (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Schein, 1987). Thus, both adopt a strengths-based (rather than problem- or deficit-based) point of view. Guided by the principles of PC, LAUP coaches gather a large volume of information from their clients (childcare providers) to determine the best approach for their work together. Guided by AI, LAUP coaches focus on (a) discovering what drives the childcare providers, (b) envisioning what their dreams are for the future, (c) co-creating how they will reach their dreams, and (d) learning from the childcare providers' accomplishments.

For example, LAUP coaches work with the childcare providers to help them identify their strengths and challenges. The LAUP coaches also help the

childcare providers learn how to take a challenge and identify the best way to move forward for the most positive impact on them, their teachers, students, and entire organization. The LAUP coaches also work with the childcare providers to help them visualize their future by tapping into the strengths from their past successes. Providers in the organization's progress report shared, "The coaches have made us better teachers and better able to work with parents. And the coaches have helped us assess our programs, build on them and work to improve areas that weren't our strong suit" (Love et al., 2009, p. 10).

Beyond these anecdotal reports, no studies have been conducted to examine how AI and PC are applied by the coaches in their work with providers and what impacts are being experienced as a result of the coaching. It is important to understand these applications and impacts to assure that LAUP is achieving its mission.

### *Purpose of the Study*

This study examined the role of PC and AI in the LAUP coaching model. The research questions were:

1. In what ways do LAUP coaches apply the philosophies of AI and PC in their work with childcare providers?

2. What impacts do coaches and providers report as a result of the coaching relationship and approach?

This research utilized a case study design to examine the coaching model being used at LAUP. The study took place during the fall semester of 2010.

### *Significance of the Study*

This study provides LAUP with information on the successes (or lack thereof) of using PC and AI in LAUP coaches' relationships with childcare providers. LAUP can review the study findings and determine the role that PC and AI play in the coaches' work. In addition, the data collected provides a glimpse into how AI and PC may be applied on an ongoing basis in coaching relationships and what outcomes may result. These findings can be helpful to other organization development practitioners who are or plan to utilize these philosophies in their work.

### *Organization of the Study*

This chapter provided the background, purpose, and significance of the study. Chapter 2 examines literature pertaining directly to the theories of PC and AI. Success factors for effective coaching relationships also are discussed.

Chapter 3 describes the methods used in this study to draw participants and to collect and analyze data. Chapter 4 reports the findings from this study. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results of the study including conclusions, recommendations, limitations, and directions for additional research.

# Chapter 2

## Literature Review

This chapter reviews literature relevant to studying the role of PC and AI as the foundation in the coaching model at LAUP. First, theories and studies about PC in coaching relationships are reviewed. Second, the AI approach is examined and discussed.

### *Models of Consultation*

Schein (1987) is the key thought leader behind theories of PC. He also identified two other popular models of consultation: *doctor-patient* and *purchase of expertise*. While PC is the focus of this study, this model is best understood by comparing it to the two other consultation models. Additionally, all three models play off each other and are necessary for PC to be successful. The sections below provide an overview of each model of consultation.

#### *Doctor-Patient*

The doctor-patient model is used when a consultant is invited into an organization to diagnose and then fix a problem (Schein, 1987). In such scenarios, the client often is unsure of what the actual problem is and, instead, simply has a sense that something is not working right. Because the consultant is tasked with coming in and identifying the problem, the client externalizes the issue and puts all hope and trust in the consultant to fix it. The benefit of this model for clients is that they give themselves permission to abdicate responsibility for the problem and its resolution. The drawback is that clients become dependent on their consultants to find the problem and recommend a way to resolve it.

While the doctor-patient model enables clients to delegate identification and resolution of the problem to the consultant, the clients must later live with and sustain the solution. This can be difficult when they have taken little or no role in identifying and solving the problem. Schein (1987) explained that if the client does not take some form of ownership for the problem, there is no guarantee that the client will comply with the “prescriptions” from the consultant, no matter how fabulous they are. In contrast, when clients are involved in the process, they have a vested interest in the success or failure of the intervention. Unless the client and consultant collaboratively discover the problem, collect the supporting data, and create the vision for the future, the implementation of the solution (e.g., an intervention or program) often is unsuccessful.

Five conditions are necessary for the doctor-patient model to be successful (Schein, 1987). First, the client must be onboard. When this occurs, the client tends to support the consultant and his or her method. The client also tends to view the process as helpful. Second, the client must have successfully identified the symptoms and the area where the problem lies. This is a necessary precondition for hiring the right kind of consultant for the problem and supports successful diagnosis and resolution. Third, the consultant needs to have the cooperation of organization members to be able to gather needed information related to the problem. Access to information is needed for the consultant to correctly diagnose the problem and to determine the remedy. Fourth, the client needs to understand and correctly interpret the diagnosis and be able to implement whatever prescription is offered. This implies that the consultant and client have continuously spoken openly about the problem and the proposed “fix.”

Fifth, for the consulting relationship to have been capacity building, the client should have learned how to diagnose and create remedies with the help of the consultant and should have the ability to do so in the future.

*Purchase of Expertise*

The foundation of the purchase of expertise model is that the client believes he or she has identified the problem, the solution, and what help is needed to fix the problem. According to this model, the client's involvement with the problem ends here. The client gives the issue to the consultant to solve and to return only when it is fixed. A common example of this approach is taking one's car to have the oil changed.

Four conditions must be met for the purchase of expertise model to work (Schein, 1988). First, the client needs to successfully identify the problem. A hired expert is not expected to correct an incorrect diagnosis. He or she is only hired to perform a particular function and that is all. Therefore, the consultant as hired expert depends on the client to relay correct information regarding the true problem. Second, the client must thoroughly screen and select a consultant who has the appropriate expertise and capability to carry out the fix. Third, the client must effectively communicate the needs of the organization to the consultant. It is imperative for both the client and consultant to understand what the client believes needs to be done to guarantee that the proper consultant has been hired. Fourth, the client must be prepared for the results of the fix, which may include receiving disappointing feedback or unanticipated side effects.

*PC*

PC is a specific approach to consulting that focuses on creating a helping relationship where the client develops the ability to own, identify, and resolve problems facing the organization (Schein, 1987). Building capacity in this way is imperative, as the ebb and flow of organizational life cannot guarantee the continued success of a particular solution. Therefore, a successful process consultant will be able to teach the client to learn how to identify a problem and create a plan to remedy. PC differs from the purchase of expertise and doctor-patient model as it is both remedial (focused on solving a problem) and preventative (focused on building capacity for the client to solve problems in the future). Schein (1999) elaborated,

> PC is the creation of a relationship with the client that permits the client to perceive, understand, and act on the process events that occur in the clients' internal and external environment in order to improve the situation as defined by the client. (p. 20)

According to this model, the process consultant's key role is to help the client develop diagnostic, design, and implementation skills, all while the client is immersed in the findings and the creation of an intervention. This kind of relationship is created through collaborative diagnosis of a problem or problems, solution design, and implementation, although ownership of the problem and solution steadfastly remain with the client. PC relies on the client owning the problem and remedy, because without such ownership, forward progress cannot be successful. Further, Schein (1987) argued the client would experience no lasting benefit of the consulting relationship if the consultant were to take on all the responsibility of identifying the problem and establishing the remedy.

At the heart of this model is the belief that the clients themselves are the only ones who can truly understand, diagnose, and solve their problems. Schein explained that only the clients intimately understand their own working environments and can predict whether a certain solution will be successful. In the case of organizations, the client knows and understands his or her company's culture and whether the proposed intervention will be well received.

Therefore, the consultant can bring process expertise related to diagnosis, design, and implementation; however, the client brings the content and context expertise. Success according to this model, then, requires a balanced relationship between the consultant and client in identifying the problem and designing the solution.

Schein (1999) encapsulated these concepts into seven guidelines that must be observed for PC to be successful:

1. The client owns the problem.

2. The client and consultant work together to determine what type of consultant is needed. It may be that the client would be better served working with a consultant who provides expertise or a consultant who works more like a doctor with a patient than a process consultant.

3. The client and process consultant work together to establish what needs to be "fixed" and how to resolve the problem.

4. The client is open and willing to learn and contribute to the process.

5. The client communicates with the consultant regarding which interventions will work and which will not.

6. The client learns to detect problems and strategically design and apply solutions.

7. The process consultant gives the client the tools necessary to move into the future more independently.

Participation, which is central to PC, has long been discussed as a critical success factor for change (Kykyri, Puutio, & Wahlstrom, 2010). For example, several studies within the field of strategic change management have produced evidence of the role of participation in the success of organizational change (Choi, 2007; Lines, 2004; Saksvik et al., 2007). However, empirical studies are lacking on the specific role and impact of PC in these successes (Lambrechts, Grieten, Bouwen, & Corthouts, 2009). As part of this research, three studies were found that examined the use of PC in consulting projects.

Boss, Dunford, Boss, and McConkie (2010) examined the impact of a 4-year organization development project in the Metro County Sheriff's Department. One of the interventions was PC, wherein the organization development consultant "regularly attended meetings and helped staff members diagnose and manage the process events that occurred during those meetings" (p. 442). The consultant did not focus on the content of the problems; rather, he or she focused on how problems were resolved. Other interventions addressed team building, training, third-party consultation, technology, organization structure and physical setting, and surveys and accountability. Results included "improved organization climate and leader effectiveness; decreased employee turnover, jail breaks, and citizen complaints; increased resources allocated to the organization; and improved organizational effectiveness, as measured by criminal justice leaders in

the community" (p. 436). While PC likely contributed to these findings, the direct effects of PC could not be isolated from the effects of the other interventions.

Appelbaum and Steed (2005) examined management consultant projects at one telecommunications firm in North America to determine the critical success factors for these projects from the employees' point of view. Based on their survey of 102 employees, the researchers concluded that process issues need to be emphasized and the client-consulting relationship has a strong impact on the project's outcome. These findings suggest that PC helps support consulting project success.

Kykyri et al. (2010) profiled a consulting project within a Finnish organization that utilized PC. The aim of the study was to examine the mechanisms involved in clients developing ownership of their problems and solutions. The PC events involved three sessions for managers and two 2-day events for all organization members (managers plus employees). A total of 4 managers and 23 employees participated in the events. The researchers examined the subtleties and nuances of the consultant's conversations with the clients to understand how conversation ignites change. The researchers provided examples of the consultant interviewing organization members and pressing them to discuss their own interests, thoughts, and ideas about the ongoing consultation. The researchers term this kind of dialogue *ownership talk* and concluded that "conversations are constant; change inevitably is an outcome of the conversations" (p. 95). They explained, "When people feel more involved in the change process and the acceptance of expressing one's views, . . . defensive reactions to change decrease" (p. 95). Thus, participation was embodied in

conversations where organization members voice their perspectives and this type of participation reduced their resistance and gave way to change. This type of participation is central to PC, as the consultation during PC takes place within the context of conversation. Therefore, it appears that PC aids organizational change.

In summary, this section reviewed three popular models for consultation: doctor-patient, purchase of expertise, and PC. While doctor-patient positions the consultant as an expert and the purchase of expertise positions the consultant as a "pair of hands," PC positions the consultant as a helper who supports the client in owning, identifying, and resolving the problems facing the organization (Schein, 1987). PC occurs within the context of conversation. Holding an ownership conversation has been credited with reducing resistance and igniting change (Kykyri et al., 2010). Continuing to examine the application and outcomes associated with PC remains a direction for additional research.

### *AI*

AI is a philosophy of learning about what works relative to the focus of inquiry (e.g., a business process, an organization), what is strong and efficient, and what can be used to sustain the system when problems do arise. AI also is a process that engages people in building the future they would value most (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005).

Understanding AI requires attention to both the terms *appreciate* and *inquire*. Appreciate means to grasp the nature, worth, quality, or significance of something; to value or admire highly; and to recognize with gratitude ("Appreciate," 2011). Inquire means to ask questions about or to seek information

from another by questioning (“Inquire,” 2011). In essence, AI is a way of seeing and being in the relationship that calls forth the best of what is in the system. “AI suggests that by focusing on that image of health and wholeness, the organization’s energy moves to make the image real” (Watkins & Mohr, 2001, p. 10). Further, AI holds that problems and solutions are not separate.

The core tenet underlying AI is that the system (e.g., an organization and its people) consciously and subconsciously dedicate their energy and, thus, move the entire system toward the questions they ask and the images they hold of the system (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). If questions are centered on the possibilities of the future and what has worked in the past, the organization and its people will move to bring that positivity into the future. If questions focus on what has not worked, then the organization or people become lost in the past, dwell on the negative, and neglect to imagine positive images of the future. Cooperrider and Whitney explained, “Human systems grow in the direction of what they persistently ask questions about, and this propensity is strongest and most sustainable when the means and ends of inquiry are positively correlated” (p. 9). Until AI, organization development practices did not focused heavily on changing how people think. This is where AI is most powerful. When people think differently, the outcomes change as well (Bushe & Kassam, 2005).

AI is a strengths-based process that engages organization members in sharing positive values, stories, and experiences and, thus, moves the organization toward a positive future (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Taking this focus additionally helps to reduce stress, anxiety, and fear because people are invited to focus on positive accomplishments rather than on problems, negativity,

and fault-finding. These strengths-based questions allow the client to reflect on the positive results the organization has reached and what has been going "right." Based on this knowledge and infused with this positive energy, the organization is then equipped to move toward a positive future. For example, rather than focusing on employee turnover, organization members would discuss longevity and what keeps employees at the organization. Rather than examining low staff morale, the focus would be on what motivates the staff. Thus, AI moves the client from solving problems to designing a positive future.

This strengths-based approach has been built into various participative approaches to facilitating change on individual, team, and organizational levels. Care is taken during these interventions to assure that the first question asked is one of positive inquiry, as the opening question strongly determines the way the conversation is going to flow. According to Whitney (2006), AI recognizes the diversity among people and invites everyone to share their experience and provides opportunities for people to converse with one another and create a shared future. "People inquire into, learn about and then build upon the strengths, best practices, most cherished values, beliefs, and hopes and dreams of one another" (p. 48). AI can be used as a foundation for conversation for a large-scale intervention in an organization or a simple one-on-one dialogue with a colleague. While most AI interventions utilize a large-scale format, it is quite successful one-on-one.

One example of AI's effectiveness was noted by Arcoleo (2001), who found that one-on-one appreciative interviews created

> connection, relationship and common ground where none (or little) existed beforehand. When aggregated across an organization, these impacts strengthen the social and interpersonal fabric of the system, building trust, hope for the future, energizing optimism, and a determination to take action to make images real. (p. 5)

Arcoleo concluded that the organization was able to collectively move forward with the dreams for the future created during the appreciative process.

Orem (2009) also witnessed the effectiveness of the one-on-one appreciative interview during her workshop on appreciative coaching and asset-based thinking. She concluded based on her workshop results that people can increase their chances of being successful and satisfied by noticing one's personal strengths, what is most valuable about others, and what is already working well.

AI as a change intervention also has been considered to be transformational, as it brings new ideas to the forefront and gives people the opportunity to choose from this new perception and set of ideas (Bushe, 2007). AI has been applied to a range of topics, from leadership and strategic planning to organization design and teambuilding.

One AI model for change is called the 4-D cycle (Watkins & Mohr, 2001). The cycle includes four phases: discovery, dream, design, and destiny. The discovery phase focuses on collecting stories about what has worked in the past related to the topic of inquiry. In a large-group format, data collection is conducted by the intervention participants themselves through appreciative interviews. These interviews engage participants in sharing stories and listening to each other. The stories focus on times the participant or the organization was at its best. The participants then record the stories along with key ideas and

themes that are reflected in and across the stories. In a one-on-one setting, the consultant conducts the interview, listens to the client, and identifies the recurring positive themes from the various stories collected. The consultant also uses probing questions to further focus the client on his or her strengths. Soon, both the consultant and client are able to see the strengths that are the keys to the success of the organization. It is important to note that having the consultant conduct interviews is a variation of AI that might be better termed *appreciative interviewing*. Typically, the interviews are conducted by participants within the system, heightening their ownership of the data and the process.

The next phase, dream, is to envision “what might be” for the organization. In a large-group setting, the participants would construct a common, compelling, and positive vision for the organization (Watkins & Mohr, 2001). In a one-on-one setting, conversations with the consultant would give the client room to dialogue about the possibilities available to him or her and the organization. The consultant would pose questions to help the client articulate the future and envision what he or she would like the organization to look like.

The third phase, design, articulates the ideal organization, aligned with both its positive past and the vision articulated by participants (Watkins & Mohr, 2001). This stage also involves designing how the future vision will be achieved. At this stage in a one-on-one format, the client hones in on his or her own desires for the future and one’s positive values are given the power to become more active.

The fourth phase of the 4-D cycle is destiny. This phase focuses on empowering the participants to connect and cooperate in order to co-create the

steps needed to realize the dream (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). At this phase, the client will take ownership of his or her dream and create a game plan to bring it to life. This is the phase when the client creates what is imagined.

AI has been widely applied across industries. Ai Consulting, a global consulting firm, is a consortium of nearly 100 practitioners who lead change using AI (“Ai Consulting,” n.d.). As of 2005, Cap Gemini Ernst Young, had declared that AI was the core of their human systems consulting practice (as cited in Bushe & Kassam, 2005). However, the current role of AI in its practices could not be confirmed. Ludema, Whitney, Mohr, and Griffen (2003) listed more than 75 businesses, nonprofit organizations, governments, and communities that have engaged in significant AIs. The United States Navy also created a center for positive change that is leading multiple AI events (as cited in Bushe & Kassam, 2005).

Several additional researchers have provided anecdotal evidence that the AI process can enhance creativity (Barrett, 1998), encourage team and professional development (Goldberg, 2001), create and execute strategy (Johnson & Leavitt, 2001), and heighten stakeholder engagement (Whitney & Cooperrider, 1998). However, empirical data have been lacking to validate these claims.

Bushe and Kassam (2005) examined 20 cases published before 2003 where AI was used to change social systems. Their aim was to determine whether transformational change occurred. In their study, transformation referred to changes in the identity of a system and qualitative changes in the state of being of that system. All 20 cases utilized the 4-D model, collected positive

stories, and observed the five principles of AI outlined by Cooperrider and Whitney. Only seven (35%) showed transformational outcomes. The researchers concluded that AI's power to incite transformative change lies in its focus on (a) changing how people think (rather than changing what they do) and (b) supporting change that flows from new ideas and is self-organizing.

Sekerka, Brumbaugh, Rosa, and Cooperrider (2006) used AI in a study of "individual-level processes and perceived outcomes of organizational development and change, including emotions and workers' perceptions of their organization and themselves" (p. 450). The researchers concluded that AI reduces the negative consequences associated with change initiatives because of its focus on positivity and strength. They elaborated that positivity helps facilitate the desired change because the positive feelings extend to the system and the individual. When people feel positive about themselves, change is more readily implemented.

In summary, AI adopts a positive approach to change that engages people in building the future they would value most (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). AI can be used at the individual, group, or organizational level. A popular model for leading AI interventions is the 4-D cycle, which consists of four phases: discovery, dream, design, and destiny (Watkins & Mohr, 2001). AI has been widely applied across industries and some evidence exists that it has had transformational impacts in certain cases (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). The power of AI seems to lie in its ability to change how people think and its basis in participants generating new ideas and self-organizing the change effort.

### *Success Factors for an Effective Coaching Relationship*

Combining the philosophies of PC and AI and applying them to the context of coaching, the coach's first responsibility to the client becomes building a strong relationship. This relationship is the foundation for trust and, subsequently, productive work together. Trust must be present for both the coach and client to be open with one another. Openness, in turn, supports effective dialogue for planning goals and strategies as well as for taking ownership of problems, solutions, and results (Egan, 1981).

Egan (1981) used the term *helping relationship* to describe this type of coaching relationship. He noted that helping relationships develop in three stages. Stage 1 includes problem exploration and clarification. During this stage, the coach must be an active listener. Stage 2 includes developing a new perspective and setting goals. During this stage, coaches are tasked with challenging both themselves and their clients. Egan explained that coaches must not be afraid to help their clients, even if it means challenging them. Stage 3 consists of developing and implementing goals, as well as evaluating the results of those actions. Coaches also must be able to demonstrate the need for the client to implement their plans, because talking about a problem and owning it are just the beginning.

Egan (1981) added that ideal helpers (coaches) are committed to their own personal development and listen attentively to their clients:

> [Coaches] respect their clients and express this respect by being available to them, working with them, not judging them, trusting the constructive forces found in them, and ultimately placing the expectation on them that they do whatever is necessary to handle their problems. (p. 27)

A helper is successful if the clients they are working with are able to identify their problems properly, take ownership of them, and eventually co-create the solution to fixing the problem based on the strengths of the client.

### *Summary*

This chapter reviewed literature on PC, AI, and effective coaching relationships. PC occurs within the context of conversation is distinguished by its focus on supporting the client in owning, identifying, and resolving the problems facing the organization (Schein, 1987). PC is believed to be highly effective in reducing clients' resistance for and igniting change (Kykyri et al., 2010).

AI features a positive approach and focuses on discovering the client's strengths and then envisioning, designing, and delivering on a positive future rooted in those strengths (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). AI's power lies in its ability to change how people think, its focus on clients generating new ideas, and its efforts to help clients self-organize change (Bushe & Kassam, 2005).

When PC and AI are built into a coaching relationship, coaches engage in problem identification and solution generation with their clients. Importantly, they also focus on the client's strengths.

This study examined how the philosophies of AI and PC were built into LAUP coaches' work with network childcare providers and what outcomes were produced as a result. The next chapter discusses the design and methods of the case study.

# Chapter 3

## Methods

This study examined the role of PC and AI in the LAUP coaching model. The research questions were:

1. In what ways do LAUP coaches apply the philosophies of AI and PC in their work with childcare providers?

2. What impacts do coaches and providers report as a result of the coaching relationship and approach?

This chapter describes the research design and pilot study, the research sample for both the LAUP coaches and LAUP childcare providers, the data collection procedures, protection of human subjects, instrumentation, and an overview of the data analysis procedures.

### *Research Design*

This mixed-method study utilized a case study design to examine the use of PC and AI at LAUP. Case study relies on the collection of multiple forms of data (Creswell, 2003). This study gathered data through surveys, interviews, and observation. LAUP coaches, LAUP childcare providers, and the researcher herself, who is an LAUP employee, provided data. The data were then triangulated to achieve a more complete and robust understanding of the phenomena being studied. Gathering multiple forms of data was one means for controlling researcher bias.

Gathering both qualitative and quantitative data and helped to increase the breadth and depth of insights gained through this study. Qualitative approaches allow for a more emergent design, meaning that as the researcher

interacts with the participants, she adjusts the questions in response to their unfolding stories. Quantitative approaches enable the researcher to gather standardized data that provide a measurement of the defined study variables.

### *Sample*

LAUP employs approximately 24 coaches and operates a network of nearly 200 childcare providers. The sample size of coaches and childcare providers for this study was determined by a couple of factors. Kvale (1996) recommended that the sample size for interviews range from 5 to 25 people depending upon the nature of the inquiry. The second factor influencing the sample size was simply based on the number of LAUP coaches and childcare providers who volunteered to participate.

The survey sample size for this study was 7 coaches and 49 providers. The interview sample size for this study was six coaches and five providers. This satisfied the minimum recommended sample size recommended by Kvale for each group. Although coaches and providers are paired and work together in practice, coach-provider pairs were not surveyed or interviewed as part of this study.

A demographic profile of the coach sample is provided in Table 1. Demographics for the total coach population at LAUP were unavailable. All coaches in the sample were female and more than half (57%) were aged 30 to 39. Nearly three quarters (71%) held a master's in early childhood education. All participants had been with the organization 3 more years. Additionally, 43% had been in the field for 13–19 years and 43% had been in the field 20 or more years. A total of 71% had completed 3 or more training sessions in AI and PC.

Table 1

*Coach Sample Demographics*

| | % |
|---|---|
| Gender distribution | |
| Male | 0% |
| Female | 100% |
| Age distribution | |
| 20–29 | 0% |
| 30–39 | 57% |
| 40–49 | 29% |
| 50–59 | 14% |
| 60 or over | 0% |
| Educational attainment | |
| Bachelor's | 14% |
| Master's (Early childhood education) | 71% |
| Master's (Other field) | 14% |
| Doctorate | 0% |
| Tenure in field | |
| 0–5 years | |
| 6–12 years | 14% |
| 13–19 years | 43% |
| 20 or more years | 43% |
| Tenure in organization | |
| 0-0.99 years | 0% |
| 1–1.99 year | 0% |
| 2–2.99 years | 0% |
| 3 or more years | 100% |
| Training in appreciative inquiry or process consultation | |
| None | 0% |
| 1–2 sessions | 29% |
| 3 or more sessions | 71% |

*N* = 7

Table 2 presents the demographics for the provider sample. Demographics for the total provider population at LAUP were unavailable. All provider participants were female and were more or less equally split across the following age groups: 30–39, 40–49, and 50–59. A total of 27% held an associate's degree, while 23% had a bachelor's in another field and 21% held a master's in early childhood education. More than half (57%) had 20 or more

years of experience in the field and 80% had been in the network 3 or more years. All participants had attended LAUP training. The childcare centers varied in the number of workers who held bachelor's degrees.

Table 2

*Provider Sample Demographics*

| | % |
|---|---|
| Gender distribution | |
| Male | 0% |
| Female | 100% |
| Age distribution | |
| 20–29 | 0% |
| 30–39 | 29% |
| 40–49 | 25% |
| 50–59 | 27% |
| 60 or over | 19% |
| Educational attainment | |
| High school diploma | 2% |
| Associate's | 27% |
| Bachelor's | |
| Bachelor's (Early childhood education) | 8% |
| Bachelor's (Other field) | 23% |
| Master's (Early childhood education) | 21% |
| Master's (Other field) | 19% |
| Doctorate | 0% |
| Tenure in field | |
| 0–5 years | 10% |
| 6–12 years | 18% |
| 13–19 years | 14% |
| 20 or more years | 57% |
| Tenure in network | |
| 0-0.99 years | 5% |
| 1–1.99 year | 7% |
| 2–2.99 years | 9% |
| 3 or more years | 80% |
| Attended LAUP training | 100% |
| Number of teachers at facility with Bachelor's degrees | |
| None | 24% |
| 1 | 20% |
| 2 | 24% |
| 3 or more | 30% |

*N* = 49; LAUP = Los Angeles Universal Preschool

### *Protection for Human Subjects*

Permission to conduct this study at LAUP was granted by the chief executive officer in June 2010. Oversight for this study was provided by the Pepperdine University Institutional Review Board. The board granted approval to conduct the study in July 2010. All human protection measures were observed. The researcher completed the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams course sponsored by the National Institute of Health in October 2009.

An emailed consent letter (see Appendix) informed participants of the purpose of the study and nature of participation. They were assured that their involvement was voluntary and they could decline a question or withdraw from the study at any time. Participants were informed that they would face no apparent risks or costs to participate in the study and would receive no financial incentives to participate. The only inconvenience participants faced was the time they allotted to complete the survey and one-on-one interview. Participants provided implied consent to participate in both phases of the study by completing the online survey. Several LAUP coaches also signed a hard copy of the consent letter.

Hard copies of all completed surveys, emails, and interview notes along with any audio-recordings of the interviews will remain in a locked cabinet accessible only to the researcher for 5 years, after which time they will be destroyed. If any identifying information is attached to an electronic survey, it will be removed and filed in a folder on the researcher's personal desktop, which also is accessible only to the researcher.

All participant responses were kept confidential. To ensure the confidentiality of the participants, letter identifiers were applied to each participant on their survey results and notes from the one-on-one interviews. Data are reported only in aggregate in this study and in any future publications. Participants also were made aware that they could request and receive a summary report of the study.

## *Instrumentation*

The researcher developed the surveys used in this study, as no validated PC- and AI-based surveys were available. The questions created for the surveys were more grounded in PC and gathered data on how the LAUP coaches and childcare providers co-create goals, work together, and own problems and solutions. The questions written for the surveys and interviews for the childcare providers and coaches were all based on the frameworks of PC and AI. Each question was phrased in a positive tone.

### *Survey*

The survey gathered coaches' demographic information (e.g., their history, education) along with their coaching approach and impacts on the provider. Ten questions were asked to gauge their use of PC principles and seven questions were used to assess their use of AI principles (see Table 3). The survey examined five areas related to the coaching relationship:

1. Perceptions of AI and PC. Coaches were asked six questions about the value and impact they perceived that AI and PC had in their work. For example, Question 1 on the Coach Survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement with, "I am more helpful to the provider due to my understanding of AI." Items 19

and 20 invited them to elaborate on their understanding of PC and AI using open-ended questions. Providers were not asked these questions.

2. Relationship. Coaches and providers were asked to evaluate the degree of trust in their relationship. One question on each survey investigated this area. For example, Question 16 on the Coach Survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement with, “I feel trusted by the provider.”

3. Ownership and collaboration. Coaches and providers were asked to identify who took ownership of the providers’ issues and whether collaboration occurred. Six questions (three on each survey) investigated this area. For example, Question 6 on the Provider Survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement with, “While I take responsibility for my problems, my LAUP coach and I work together to co-create a solution.”

4. Style. Respondents were asked 15 questions (seven items on the Coach Survey, eight items on the Provider Survey) about the nature and focus of their coaching work together. For example, Question 5 on the Coach Survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement with, “I focus on what the provider is doing more than on how the provider is getting something done.”

5. Impact. Participants were asked nine questions (three items on the Coach Survey, six items on the Provider Survey) about the impact of the coaching relationship. For example, Question 7 on the Provider Survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement with, “I find myself more proactive in thinking about my problems due to the work with my LAUP coach.”

Table 3

*Survey Questions*

| Topic | Coach Survey Item | Provider Survey Item |
|---|---|---|
| Perceptions of AI and PC | 1. I am more helpful to the provider due to my understanding of PC.<br>2. I am more helpful to the provider due to my understanding of AI.<br>17. I am able to learn what goals the provider wants to achieve due to my training in AI.<br>18. I am able to learn what goals the provider wants to achieve due to my training in PC.<br>19. Elaborate on your understanding of AI.<br>20. Elaborate on your understanding of PC. | |
| Relationship | 16. I feel trusted by the provider. | 17. I feel trusted by the LAUP coach. |
| Ownership and Collaboration | 7. I find myself taking an ownership role in the provider's challenges and solutions.<br>11. I often find myself fixing the "problem" without collaborating with the provider.<br>13. The provider and I successfully work together on creating solutions. | 6. While I take responsibility for my problems, my LAUP coach and I work together to co-create a solution.<br>11. I often find myself fixing the "problem" without the collaboration of the LAUP coach.<br>13. The LAUP coach and I successfully work together on creating solutions. |
| Style | 3. I focus on the provider's area of need by asking powerful questions.<br>4. I focus on the provider's area of need by asking positive-experience based questions.<br>5. I focus on what the provider is doing more than on how the provider is getting something done.<br>6. I am open and flexible when working with the provider.<br>10. I share my doubts and concerns with the provider.<br>12. The environment at the preschool is not essential to supporting or hindering the goals set by the provider.<br>15. The provider and I discuss his or her values and are able to create an internal and external environment where those values are supported. | 2. The LAUP coach asks me powerful questions.<br>3. The LAUP coach asks me questions about my positive experiences.<br>4. I feel the LAUP coach is more interested in how I accomplish my work rather than what the work is.<br>5. I feel my LAUP coach is very open and honest with me.<br>9. I feel the LAUP coach is able to focus more on my strengths than on my weaknesses.<br>10. I share my doubts and concerns with the LAUP coach.<br>12. The environment of the Center or Family Childcare Center is supported by the goals set by the LAUP coach and me.<br>15. The LAUP coach and I discuss my values and are able to create an internal and external environment where those values are supported. |

Table 3 (Continued)

| Topic | Coach Survey Item | Provider Survey Item |
|---|---|---|
| Impact | 8. I am aware that everything I do and say is a form of intervention for the provider.<br>9. I make mistakes and learn from them when working with the provider.<br>14. I am a useful resource for the provider. | 1. The LAUP coach provides me with helpful ideas.<br>7. I find myself more proactive in thinking about my problems due to the work with my LAUP coach.<br>8. I make mistakes and learn from them when working with the LAUP coach.<br>14. The LAUP coach is resourceful with herself or himself and the tools suggested for me to provide a high-quality program.<br>16. My personal values are more present in my Center or family childcare center due to the work I do with the LAUP coach.<br>18. After working with my LAUP coach, I am ready to implement the solutions we created to achieve my goals. |

*Note.* AI = appreciative inquiry, PC = process consultation, LAUP = Los Angeles Universal Preschool

In addition, the surveys included items about the coach and childcare providers' demographic data regarding years in the early childhood education field, education level, and gender. The format consisted predominately of multiple-choice questions with a couple of open-ended questions.

*Interview Script*

The interview questions were designed based on the 4-D cycle of AI. These questions gathered data about the nature of the coach-provider work relationship, their individual strengths, and the impact of the coaching relationship. Six questions were asked:

1. Tell me a story about the best experience you had with your coach (or provider) during your working relationship over the summer.

2. Go back into that experience of the story you just told me and tell me if you can identify one or two lessons you learned.

3. How do you and your coach (or provider) work together to create a plan or goal?

4. What did you gain from your experience with the coach (or provider) that you had not anticipated? Was there any surprise or unexpected occurrence?

5. How will your experience influence your behavior in the future?

6. If you or your program were at its best, what would it look like?

*Instrument Validation*

The interview script and surveys were subjected to expert review in August 2010 to assure their face validity. The expert reviewers included (a) two coaches; (b) Gary Mangiofico, Ph.D., chief executive officer of LAUP from 2006 to 2010, associate dean of the fully employed and executive programs at Pepperdine University's Graziadio School of Business and Management, and expert in PC; and (c) Terri Egan, Ph.D., professor of organization development at Pepperdine University's Graziadio School of Business and Management and expert in AI.

The reviewers examined the surveys and the interview script, offered feedback, and made suggestions for improvement. The researcher made the suggested changes to both the surveys and the interview script. The revised instruments were approved by the Pepperdine University Institutional Review Board.

## *Data Collection Procedures*

The researcher is an LAUP employee and had access in person, by email, and by telephone to both populations included in this study. She presented the study and invited all 24 coaches to participate in the study during a meeting held

in September 2010. She presented the coaches with the vision of the study and distributed the consent letter. Those who volunteered to participate were asked to return a signed consent form to the researcher by the end of the week. They also were asked to provide their personal email address to enable further correspondence.

When the researcher received the signed consent form, she sent an email with a link to complete the survey. Participants were given 2 weeks to complete the survey and they were invited to communicate with the researcher by email with any questions. Seven coaches completed the survey, yielding a 29% response rate.

Once the surveys were completed, the researcher sent an email to schedule the one-on-one interviews for November and December 2010. Six coaches volunteered to participate. The researcher contacted these six to schedule a one-on-one interview. Interviews were conducted by telephone or in person, depending upon the preferences of the participant. The researcher recorded handwritten notes during the interviews and then transcribed them onto an Excel spreadsheet.

At the close of the interview, the researcher requested a site visit with each coach to directly observe their work with the childcare providers. Two coaches provided verbal consent to be observed and the researcher sent a letter to confirm the observation date and plans. The researcher recorded handwritten notes of her observations regarding the nature of the coach-provider relationship, the coach’s style, and the verbal and nonverbal communication that was shared. These data were transcribed them onto an Excel spreadsheet.

In October 2010, the researcher sent the 200 childcare providers in the LAUP network an email that informed them of the study, the nature of participation, and a link to the survey. The participants were given 2 weeks to complete the survey and they were invited to communicate with the researcher by email with any questions. A total of 49 providers completed the survey, yielding a 25% response rate. Once the surveys were completed, the researcher sent the respondents an email to schedule one-on-one interviews for November and December 2010.

### *Data Analysis Procedures*

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the survey results. Data from the interviews were examined and common themes were identified. The themes were subjected to review by a second rater who validated the analysis. The observation data were reviewed to identify common themes. These themes were used to create a narrative profile of the coaching work that reflected both cases that were observed. The study data were reported for each topic area and sample group (coaches and childcare providers) to facilitate comparisons. Importantly, comparisons were performed only in aggregate. It was not possible to link results from coach-provider pairs.

### *Summary*

This study utilized a mixed-method design that collected data using surveys, interviews, and observations. Two survey instruments and one interview script were designed by the researcher and reviewed by an expert panel. The instruments gathered data about the coaches' perceptions of AI and PC, the coach-provider relationship, ownership and collaboration, the coaches' style, and

the impact of coaching. Data collection occurred from November through December 2010. A sample of 7 coaches and 49 providers completed surveys, five coaches and five providers were interviewed, and two coaches were observed. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the survey data, the interview data was subjected to thematic analysis, and the observation data was used to create a narrative description. The next chapter reports the findings of the study.

# Chapter 4

# Results

This study examined the role of PC and AI in the LAUP coaching model. The research questions were:

1. In what ways do LAUP coaches apply the philosophies of AI and PC in their work with childcare providers?

2. What impacts do coaches and providers report as a result of the coaching relationship and approach?

This chapter reports the results of the study. Survey results are presented first, followed by interview findings, and the narrative produced based on the observation data. While data are reported and compared across the coach and provider samples, it is important to note that comparisons were performed only in aggregate. It was not possible to link results from coach-provider pairs.

## *Survey Findings*

Survey findings were drawn concerning participants' perceptions of AI and PC, the coach-provider relationship, ownership and collaboration of their work together, the coaching style, and impact of the coach-provider relationship. These findings are reported in the sections below.

### *Perceptions of AI and PC*

Only the coaches were asked about their perceptions of AI and PC. Survey data suggested that the coaches believed their understanding of PC and AI enabled them to help the providers (see Table 4). Additionally, the coaches agreed that their training in PC and AI helped them be able to uncover the providers' goals.

Table 4

*Coach Perceptions of Appreciative Inquiry and Process Consultation*

| Survey Question | *N* | Range | Mean (*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am more helpful to the Provider due to my understanding of PC | 7 | 4–5 | 4.43 (0.53) |
| I am more helpful to the Provider due to my understanding of AI | 6 | 4–5 | 4.50 (0.55) |
| I am able to learn what goals the Provider wants to achieve due to my training in AI | 7 | | 4.00 (0.00) |
| I am able to learn what goals the Provider wants to achieve due to my training in PC | 7 | | 4.00 (0.00) |

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree

Coaches were invited to elaborate on and describe their understanding of AI. Five of the seven respondents answered this question. One theme, cited by three participants, concerned the importance of one's strengths and building upon them. One coach explained, "As a coach, I can help a provider by taking them from where they are and building on their strengths to work on goals to help improve their program." The second theme, cited by two respondents, was that they believed they deeply understood AI and regularly used powerful questioning as an important tool.

LAUP coaches also were invited to elaborate on and describe their understanding of PC. Four of the seven participants answered this question. Examination of the responses pointed to two themes. One theme was that building a relationship with the provider was important and that trust plays a large role in that relationship. For example, one coach stated, "Providers need to trust who you are and what your role is prior to building a successful collaboration." The second theme was that co-creating a relationship, goal, or vision was necessary for successfully helping the provider. One coach explained, "PC is an

approach that is used to support a client in taking ownership of the direction they would like to go in. Helping them to have a vision and develop strategies that will accomplish that goal." Both building relationships and co-creating within those relationships are key characteristics of PC.

*Relationship*

The coaches agreed or strongly agreed that their providers trusted them (mean = 4.57, *SD* = 0.53). In contrast, the providers varied in their perceptions of their coaches' trust in them (see Table 5). On average, the provider group was neutral (mean = 3.88, *SD* = 1.05).

Table 5

*Coach and Provider Perceptions of Coach-Provider Relationship*

| Survey Questions | *N* | Range | Mean (*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| I feel trusted by the provider | 7 | 4–5 | 4.57 (0.53) |
| I feel trusted by the LAUP coach | 49 | 1–5 | 3.88 (1.05) |

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree

*Ownership and Collaboration*

Survey respondents were asked about who took ownership of the providers' issues and to what degree collaboration occurred in the relationship. Coaches, on average, indicated that they did not take ownership of the provider's challenges (mean = 2.57, *SD* = 0.79) and indicated that they tended to work collaboratively (see Table 6). While providers agreed that they collaborated with their coaches (mean = 4.08, *SD* = 0.84), there was some indication that the providers took more independent action.

Table 6

*Coach-Provider Collaboration and Ownership of Issues*

| Survey Question | *N* | Range | Mean (*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coach Questions | | | |
| I find myself taking an ownership role in the provider's challenges and solutions | 7 | 2–4 | 2.57 (0.79) |
| I often find myself fixing the "problem" without collaborating with the provider | 7 | 1–3 | 1.86 (0.69) |
| The provider and I successfully work together on creating solutions | 7 | 4–5 | 4.43 (0.53) |
| Provider Questions | | | |
| While I take responsibility for my problems, my LAUP coach and I work together to co-create a solution | 47 | 1–5 | 3.98 (0.90) |
| I often find myself fixing the "problem" without the collaboration of the LAUP coach | 49 | 1–5 | 3.35 (1.11) |
| The LAUP coach and I successfully work together on creating solutions | 49 | 2–5 | 4.08 (0.84) |

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree

*Style*

Table 7 presents the results regarding the coaches' style as perceived by coaches and providers. The coaches generally agreed that they utilize questions that are powerful (mean = 4.43, *SD* = 0.53) and based in positive experiences (mean = 4.14, *SD* = 0.69). The providers also agreed that questions were powerful (mean = 3.84, *SD* = 0.87) and based in positive experiences (mean = 3.98, *SD* = 0.78). Coaches agreed or strongly agreed that they were open and flexible (mean = 4.71, *SD* = 0.49), and the providers agreed as well (mean = 4.45, *SD* = 0.80).

The coaches varied in their focus on the content versus the process of providers' work (range: 1–5, mean = 3.43, *SD* = 1.27). The providers' responses roughly aligned with the coaches' self-evaluations (range: 1–5, mean = 3.03, *SD* = 1.16). Coaches also varied in the degree to which they share their doubts and

Table 7

*Coach and Provider Perceptions of the Coaches' Style*

| Survey Questions | *N* | Range | Mean (*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coach Survey | | | |
| I focus on the provider's area of need by asking powerful questions | 7 | 4–5 | 4.43 (0.53) |
| I focus on the provider's area of need by asking positive-experience based questions | 7 | 3–5 | 4.14 (0.69) |
| I am open and flexible when working with the provider | 7 | 4–5 | 4.71 (0.49) |
| I focus on what the provider is doing more than on how the Provider is getting something done | 7 | 1–5 | 3.43 (1.27) |
| I share my doubts and concerns with the provider | 7 | 2–4 | 3.43 (0.79) |
| The environment at the preschool is not essential to supporting or hindering the goals set by the provider | 7 | 1–3 | 1.71 (0.76) |
| The provider and I discuss his or her values and are able to create an internal and external environment where those values are supported | 7 | 4–5 | 4.29 (0.49) |
| Provider Survey | | | |
| The LAUP coach asks me powerful questions | 49 | 2–5 | 3.84 (0.87) |
| The LAUP coach asks me questions about my positive experiences | 49 | 1–5 | 3.98 (0.78) |
| I feel the LAUP coach is able to focus more on my strengths than on my weaknesses | 49 | 1–5 | 3.84 (1.11) |
| I feel my LAUP coach is very open and honest with me | 47 | 1–5 | 4.45 (0.80) |
| I feel the LAUP coach is more interested in how I accomplish my work rather than what the work is | 49 | 1–5 | 3.02 (1.16) |
| I share my doubts and concerns with the LAUP coach | 48 | 1–5 | 4.15 (1.07) |
| The environment of the center or family childcare center is supported by the goals set by the LAUP coach and me | 48 | 2–5 | 4.00 (0.83) |
| The LAUP coach and I discuss my values and are able to create an internal and external environment where those values are supported | 49 | 2–5 | 4.10 (0.87) |

concerns with providers (mean = 3.43, *SD* = 0.79), whereas providers tended to share their doubts and concerns with their coaches (mean = 4.15, *SD* = 1.07). The coaches and providers believed that the preschool environment is relevant to the providers' goals and work with providers to create values-supportive environments.

*Impact*

Coaches exhibited awareness that everything they did and said with providers was a form of intervention (mean = 4.14, *SD* = 0.90). The coaches believed they were a useful resource to the providers (mean = 4.43, *SD* = 0.53) and the providers agreed (mean = 4.22, *SD* = 0.80). Providers also reported that the coaches gave them helpful ideas (mean = 4.24, *SD* = 0.83) and that their work together equipped them to achieve their goals (mean = 4.16, *SD* = 0.83). The providers reported varying impacts of the relationship on their ability to learn from their mistakes in the relationship (mean = 3.59, *SD* = 1.04), their thinking (mean = 3.51, *SD* = 1.26), and the embodiment of their values in their daycare business (mean = 3.18, *SD* = 1.11). These results are reported in Table 8.

## *Interview Results*

Interview results were drawn for providers' views of their best experiences, lessons learned, manner of working together, and unanticipated realizations. They also were asked about the impact of the coaching relationship and their description of being their best.

*Best Experience*

The first question asked the coach or provider to focus on a best experience they had with one of the many childcare providers they work with. As

Table 8

*Impact of the Coaching Relationship*

| Survey Question | *N* | Range | Mean (*SD*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coach Survey | | | |
| I am aware that everything I do and say is a form of intervention for the provider | 7 | 3–5 | 4.14 (0.90) |
| I am a useful resource for the provider | 7 | 4–5 | 4.43 (0.53) |
| I make mistakes and learn from them when working with the provider | 7 | 3–5 | 3.86 (0.69) |
| Provider Survey | | | |
| The LAUP coach is resourceful with herself or himself and the tools suggested for me to provide a high-quality program | 49 | 1–5 | 4.22 (0.80) |
| The LAUP coach provides me with helpful ideas | 49 | 1–5 | 4.24 (0.83) |
| After working with my LAUP coach, I am ready to implement the solutions we created to achieve my goals | 49 | 2–5 | 4.16 (0.83) |
| I make mistakes and learn from them when working with the LAUP coach | 49 | 1–5 | 3.59 (1.04) |
| I find myself more proactive in thinking about my problems due to the work with my LAUP coach | 49 | 1–5 | 3.51 (1.26) |
| My personal values are more present in my center or family childcare center due to the work I do with the LAUP coach | 49 | 1–5 | 3.18 (1.11) |

LAUP = Los Angeles Universal Preschool

all of the LAUP coaches who participated in the interview had been working at LAUP for more than 3 years, all the participants commented that this was a challenging task. One coach stated, “this is my 4th year at LAUP and to sift through is pretty hard because I've had so many great experiences.”

A variety of responses were voiced for this question, as each individual has a unique way of working with their childcare providers and has different perceptions on what a best experience is. However, all the coaches stated that the best experiences with their provider could be identified as when they were

being an active listener. The coaches who expressed this information all had stories that related directly back to the fact that they all listened to their provider's needs, desires, or fears, and then acted on them in a way that was helpful to them.

All five providers expressed that their best experiences were characterized by receiving help. Whether the LAUP coach came in to speak with parents about a decision the provider made, or came in on a weekend to make changes within the classroom environment, or worked with the provider to bolster their strengths, providers emphasized that the LAUP coaches were helpful. It is important to note that these data were not drawn from coach-provider pairs; therefore, the responses could not be directly compared.

*Lessons Learned*

The second question asked coaches and providers to identify the lessons learned from their best experience. A theme voiced by five of the six coaches was the coach's confirmation and realization that building a relationship with the provider is essential to getting the work accomplished. Four coaches also learned that it was important to be flexible and patient because building a relationship takes time. One coach mentioned how important it is for her to allow the conversation to flow and to be flexible. Two coaches expressed that the providers must own the identified problem for change to be successful. One coach said, "It is more meaningful for the provider to want the change; when they own it, it is more meaningful and the work gets done." Another emphasized, "The only way the goals will be reached is if the provider owns the plan or goal that

has been set. The provider needs to be passionate about the work they are about to entail."

Providers voiced a variety of lessons learned. Two providers emphasized the importance of adopting a fresh or different perspective of their challenges. One provider elaborated, "The approach makes a total difference in the outcome. . . . I learned to look at positive side of things and not the negative. I now have a new perspective." Two providers learned that their coach was a dependable source of help. The final provider shared her learning that the center's physical environment was important.

*Manner of Working Together*

The third question asked how the coaches and providers work together to create a plan or goal. While all the coaches expressed that they work with their childcare providers to set goals and create plans to accomplish the goals, how each coach got there was different, as each person has a different way of working. Provider goals often are identified in one of two ways. One way is when the goal is defined by LAUP. In this case, the coach discusses the goal with the provider and helps the provider understand LAUP's desired outcome. The two then work out any challenges they foresee with the goal. The second way is having the provider define his or her own goals. In this case, the provider and coach discuss the goal, work on any issues related to the goal, and determine how to attain the goal successfully.

The common element is that all defined goals are considered important, regardless of who creates them. Goals often are related to the provider's results from their Environment Rating System for Centers or Family Child Care Centers

reviews, LAUP's scope of work, the childcare provider's own desires, or LAUP training sessions.

Additionally, in some variation or another, the coaches have conversations with the provider and actively listen as the provider shares with them. One coach elaborated, "While I am in conversation with them, I am learning what they want; by being a good listener, by actively listening I am able to learn what their goals are." Following these dialogues, the coaches then discern the providers' most desired and important goals. The whole idea behind the goals is that the coach and provider are able to work on them together so that the LAUP classroom will be as high-quality as possible.

One provider could not answer the question, as she was new to the network and had yet to meet with her coach to create her goals. Despite her inability to answer this question, she was included in the sample because she participated in the survey.

Another provider shared that her coaches give her information and approaches to implement, suggesting a doctor-patient approach. The remaining three childcare providers shared that their goals were established through dialogue with their coaches. Several providers additionally described their coaches as demonstrating behaviors such as listening, providing feedback, offering supportive resources, and assuring that the provider's goals were reasonable and attainable.

*Unanticipated Realizations*

The fourth question asked coaches what unanticipated experiences or benefits they gained from their work with providers. Three coaches did not

anticipate how large a role relationship building would play in their work with providers. They explained that the quality of the relationships meant higher levels of trust, sharing, openness, and ultimately, better results. Two coaches additionally had not expected how powerful the providers' perceptions would be and how they would influence the nature and outcomes of the coaching relationship. One coach explained,

> I'm either the most knowledgeable and revered person or I'm an agent of bureaucracy. I never get anything in between. I mostly get the first. It's all about perception. I didn't know I would spend so much time working on the perception. That's very powerful.

Another coach explained that these positive perceptions were highly validating:

> I've gained validation. I was a teacher in the classroom for 16 years always concerned with how I was being portrayed, if I was on top of my game enough, looking at the latest research to be sure I was bringing my best to the classroom. I was doing more than enough. The biggest thing I've gotten from being a coach is the validation that I do bring a great experience and support to my providers.

Four providers shared that they developed an unexpectedly rewarding, supportive, and trusting relationship with their coaches. They explained that these relationships stemmed from the coaches being available, offering resources, and becoming a friend.

*Impact of the Coaching Relationship*

The fifth question inquired into how the coaches' experiences with providers would influence their behavior in the future. One coach believed she would change, but could not identify why or how. Four participants believed their experiences would strongly affect their future because they had become more

aware of how different people are and how different perceptions are necessary to fully understand and even motivate others. One coach stated

> I've gained a new experience in working with different people, childcare providers. I have a new perspective. Each provider is different than the other and one way of working with one provider may not be the best for working with another. It is about respecting and honoring. Everyone has their own needs, you have to move with them on the path they're on, you can't force them.

Another coach stated, “I have to remember that the way I communicate and behave in different situations can impact everyone differently. I have to get to know the people before I go in and ‘do.’”

Three coaches explained that their own reflective practices through this work have enabled them to learn about themselves. They hoped to carry the reflective behavior into the future. One coach elaborated, “It's been a great learning experience. From our trainings, it’s also made me more aware of my skills and talents. I've been able to learn more about myself; my strengths and weaknesses.”

Four providers acknowledged that as a result of coaching, they will be more willing to ask for help in the future. Two learned that their behaviors strongly influence the quality of their work and their relationships. As a result, they have shifted how they operate in their work with children and parents. One provider explained, “It will help me to know when to switch hats. Sometimes, it is the administrative hat, but [I need to] be sure to have ability to switch to a more nurturing hat. Approach is the key.”

*Description of Being Their Best*

The sixth and final interview question asked coaches to describe themselves if they were at their best. Only five of the six coaches answered this question. Four expressed that their best would include some variation of the term, “more time”. This could include having more time to work with and meet the childcare providers in the field, more time to avoid falling behind with the childcare providers, or more time to better prepare themselves. Two coaches desired to be more flexible and better at multi-tasking. Another two coaches stated that their best would have them looking relaxed or being able to be relaxed, comfortable, and confident.

All the providers described being their best as having an optimal physical environment at the preschool. They emphasized that upgrades and changes needed to be made to the facility for their programs to be at their best. They also identified the need for education, in terms of sending teachers to attend staff development programs and college courses, to guaranteeing their graduates enter elementary school “miles ahead of everyone else entering Kindergarten.” Table 9 summarizes the themes identified during the interviews.

*Site Observations*

The researcher observed two coaches at work with childcare providers at two LAUP sites. The two sites that were observed were both preschool centers (operated from a commercial building) and not family child care facilities (operated from the provider’s home). One site was located within the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), while the other was not. Both sites had multiple classrooms for children to attend preschool, although the LAUSD site

Table 9

*Themes from Coach Interviews*

| | Coach Themes<br>*N* = 6 | Provider Themes<br>*N* = 5 |
|---|---|---|
| Best experience | • Being an active listener (6) | • Receiving help (5) |
| Lessons learned | • Relationship building is essential (5)<br>• Flexibility and patience is essential (4)<br>• Providers must have ownership of their problems (2) | • Adopting a fresh or different perspective is necessary (2)<br>• The coach is a dependable source of help (2)<br>• The center's physical environment is important (1) |
| Manner of working | • Co-create goals and plans (6)<br>• Practice active listening (6) | • Collaborative dialogue (3)<br>• Doctor-patient model (1)<br>• No answer (1) |
| Unanticipated realizations | • Power of relationships (3)<br>• Power of provider perceptions (2) | • Gaining a valued relationship with the coach (4)<br>• None (1) |
| Impact of coaching relationship | • Appreciating diversity in individuals (4)<br>• Adopting personal reflective practices (3)<br>• Unspecified change (1) | • Being more willing to request help (4)<br>• Shifting professional behaviors (2) |
| Descriptions of their "best" | • Having more time (4)<br>• Being more flexible and able to multi-task (2)<br>• Being more relaxed (2) | • Creating an optimal physical environment (5)<br>• Increasing teacher education (5)<br>• Assuring academic excellence of students (5) |

had one LAUP classroom and the other site had three LAUP classrooms. Both sites had one lead teacher and two additional supporting teachers.

The researcher found similarities at both sites regarding the use of the LAUP coaching model and the training coaches receive on PC and AI. At each site, the researcher witnessed a genuine sense of warmth and openness between the provider and the coach. Both sites displayed environments that reflected the childcare providers' personal values. Additionally, the researcher found the coaches offered positive and constructive feedback to each provider. All of the coaches and the childcare providers listened to each other and paraphrased what they heard to confirm their understanding. Questions from the

coaches were open-ended and powerful. At both sites, there was a sense of trust between the provider and the coach that was demonstrated by their dialogue and non-verbal communication. This non-verbal communication consisted of smiling and steady eye contact.

### *Summary*

This chapter presented the results of the case study. Survey findings were presented in the first section, followed by interview results and observations. All of the coaches who participated in this process demonstrated that they have the understanding that PC was, in some form or another, centered on building a relationship and AI is focused on positive questioning. The next chapter provides a discussion of these results, including key conclusions, recommendations, limitations, and directions for additional research.

# Chapter 5

## Discussion

This study examined the role of PC and AI in the LAUP coaching model. The research questions were:

1. In what ways do LAUP coaches apply the philosophies of AI and PC in their work with childcare providers?

2. What impacts do coaches and providers report as a result of the coaching relationship and approach?

This chapter describes the conclusions and implications drawn from the study. Limitations affecting the study and suggestions for future research also are discussed.

### *Conclusions*

Conclusions were drawn for each of the research questions. These conclusions are described in detail below.

#### *Use of AI and PC Philosophies by LAUP Coaches*

The LAUP coaches in this study demonstrated substantial use of PC philosophies in their work with childcare providers. The coaches reported refraining from taking ownership of the providers' challenges or solutions and refraining from fixing the perceived problems. They also described the importance of trust, active listening, building relationships, and co-creating solutions within those relationships. These conditions and activities are key characteristics of PC. Similarly, the providers described taking ownership of their own problems and collaboratively diagnosing issues and designing solutions with the coaches. Both the coaches and the providers were neutral, on average,

about whether coaches focused on the “how” versus the “what” of the provider’s work. Focusing on the “how” would indicate a PC orientation.

The coaches also reported use of AI philosophies; however, the providers were neutral, on average, about whether the coaches used AI approaches. Coaches reported asking powerful, positive experience-based questions and described themselves as open and flexible. The providers offered neutral scores, on average, regarding these same items. These results are somewhat inconclusive about the degree to which AI is applied in the coaching conversation. It is important to acknowledge that these findings are tentative, as data are reported in aggregate for the provider and the coach samples rather than being drawn from coach-provider pairs.

Both the coaches and the providers reported addressing the preschools’ internal and external environments. Coaches were neutral about whether they shared their doubts and concerns with the providers. In contrast, the providers reported sharing their doubts and concerns with their coaches and also believed the coaches were open and honest with them.

These descriptions and evaluations are consistent with the descriptions of AI and PC in the literature. Schein (1987) described PC as focusing on building relationships, co-creating, and helping. AI is an approach to change and relationships that is based on building on positivity, one’s strengths, and one’s best experiences. Watkins and Mohr (2001) explained that it “looks for what is going right and moves toward it, understanding that in the forward movement toward the ideal the greatest value comes from embracing what works” (p. 11).

The implications of LAUP coaches using PC is the generation of ownership talk and heightened project success (Boss et al., 2010; Kykyri et al., 2010). The implications of LAUP coaches using AI include (a) changing how people think (rather than changing what they do) and (b) supporting change that flows from new ideas and is self-organizing (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). However, the reason for the discrepancies in coaches' versus providers' reports regarding the use of AI needs to be further explored. For example, the coaches might be aware that they are expected to use AI principles; however, they might not be applying these principles effectively, thus, leading to lower evaluations by providers. For example, they may aspire to those principles but not be able to consistently behave in alignment with their aspirations.

While this study has generated promising findings regarding LAUP coaches' use of AI and PC, it is important remember that this study used a small sample and the findings generated may not be representative of the entire population. More research would be needed to determine the extent to which AI and PC are used across the entire network. Additionally, more research is needed to examine how much and how effectively AI is being used by the coaches.

*Impact of Coaches' Use of AI and PC*

The coaches reported that their training in and understanding of PC and AI enabled them to be more helpful to their childcare providers. They believed they deeply understood AI and regularly used powerful questioning as an important tool. They also were aware that every question is an intervention and that it was important to know and build upon one's strengths.

Both the coaches and providers believed the coaches were a useful resource who provided helpful tools and ideas. Benefits the providers named as emerging from coaching included adopting a fresh or different perspective, building a valued relationship with the coach, receiving help and being more willing to ask for help, and being ready to implement the solutions they co-created with the coach. Nevertheless, providers were neutral about whether they were more proactive in thinking about their problems due to the coaching.

These findings are somewhat consistent with other reports of the impacts of PC and AI. Just as providers described being ready to implement their co-created solutions, other studies of PC have suggested that this approach tends to produce a sense of ownership and heightened project success (Boss et al., 2010; Kykyri et al., 2010). Studies of AI have suggested that it leads to self-organizing change (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). Additionally, the providers mentioned adopting a fresh or different perspective, which is similar to AI's effects of changing how people think and generating new ideas (Bushe & Kassam, 2005).

The coaches generally believed they made mistakes and learned from them when working with providers. In contrast, providers had varying opinions about this. It is possible that the double-barreled wording of this question and self-report biases affected the results. That is, this question asked (a) whether they made mistakes while working together and (b) whether they learned from those mistakes. It is possible that the participant had two different answers to that question, thus, making it impossible to provide an accurate answer. Additionally, participants can be tempted during self-reports to make themselves look good

and they might not have wanted to admit they made any mistakes. These issues need to be further explored to examine whether the PC concepts in question are being practiced.

Some differences emerged in the responses by coaches versus providers. For example, the coaches reported they felt trusted by their providers; however, the providers were neutral, on average, about whether they felt trusted by their coaches. It is possible that the selection procedures resulted in a set of coaches who have a positive bias (and, therefore, overestimate the trust their providers have in them). While the coaches believed they addressed the providers' values, the providers again were neutral about whether their personal values were more present in their preschool due to their work with the coaches. These issues should be further explored to examine the reasons for the discrepant answers (e.g., coaches' intentions versus their effectiveness) and to better understand the impact of the coaching relationship.

While limitations concerning measurement procedures and sample size have affected this conclusion, the initial findings suggest that the coaches' use of AI and PC principles have had promising and expected effects. Based on this, it is advisable to continue using the LAUP coaching model. Additionally, it would be helpful conduct further researcher to more deeply understand the effects of the coaching relationships.

### *Implications*

This study's findings, although exploratory, suggested that AI and PC were applied by coaches in a manner that led to benefits for the clients. These findings have important implications. First, these findings suggest that AI and PC

can be applied in a one-on-one setting. This is an important addition to Arcoleo's (2001) and Orem's (2009) work, which also documented the success of AI in one-on-one settings. Second, in this study, PC and AI were used in the context of supporting an ongoing childcare business. Thus, this study supported other studies that AI and PC philosophies can have positive effects, even when the focus of the conversations is not organizational change. Additionally, no prior studies were found that examined the use of these philosophies in early childhood education.

Given these implications, organization development practitioners may apply these philosophies with confidence in one-on-one coaching settings—even in nontraditional settings or industries and even when organizational change is not the focus. Clancy, Binkert, and Orem's (2007) appreciative coaching model may be helpful in this regard. It appears that strong relationships between consultant and client, client ownership of problems and solutions, and improved thinking by the client can result when appreciative coaching and PC philosophies are utilized.

### *Limitations*

This study was limited in its validity due to a shortage of rich data that were collected. The lack of data richness was due to several reasons. First, few LAUP coaches and childcare providers volunteered to participate in the case study, thus, resulting in a small sample size. Additionally, no family childcare providers took part in the survey or interviews, thus, limiting the data to the perspective of center providers. Third, data were not tracked by coach-provider pairs, thus, limiting the depth of analysis. Survey data were drawn from small

groups in disparate numbers, making quantitative comparisons difficult. Finally, the researcher did not probe participants' answers deeply, resulting in a failure to fully illuminate the survey findings. Future studies should promote participation of family childcare providers—for example, through small monetary incentives or by collecting data at days and times convenient to the providers.

Although a system was in place in the research design to secure the participants' confidentiality, the researcher herself was an employee of the LAUP at the time the study took place. While the researcher used an outside auditor to review and validate the data, the mere fact that the researcher was an employee of LAUP could have played a role in the validity of the information received. Future studies could utilize an outside researcher to conduct the surveys and interviews to enhance participants' sense of confidentiality and safety and, thus, enhance the quality of the data.

A final limitation was the measurement procedures, which did not always align with AI philosophies and did not generate enough data to answer the research questions. For example, some questions asked coaches and providers about who "fixed the problem." The negative tone of this wording is antithetical to AI philosophy and this could have resulted in some biasing of the data. In future studies, it would be important to remove any double-barreled and negatively worded questions and ensure that all the interview and survey questions supported the research questions.

### *Suggestions for Future Research*

To get a better sense of the use and impact of PC and AI in the LAUP coaching model, future studies should draw a larger sample of both coaches and

childcare providers (including center and family childcare providers). This would enable the researcher to gain a larger perspective and, thus, a better understanding of how the coaches understand and use the two processes in their fieldwork. This study would be beneficial to provide more insights about the use and impacts of the model that distinguishes LAUP from other similar organizations.

Another research recommendation is to improve the measurement tools by addressing the limitations discussed in the previous section. This type of research is needed to assure that the study findings are credible and that an effective assessment of the LAUP model could be conducted.

### *Summary*

Enabling American students to race to the top through the education reform launched by the Obama Administration (U.S. Department of Education, 2009) begins with attention to its youngest citizens. Studies have shown that high-quality early childhood education is associated with improved school achievement in later years (Belfield et al., 2006; Gormley et al., Reynolds et al., 2002; Wat, 2010). However, limitations in the reach and effectiveness of federal and state preschool programs have prompted the creation of nonprofit organizations dedicated to improving access to preschool for underserved children. One such organization is LAUP, whose design includes coaching for childcare providers to heighten the quality of their preschool programs. This study examined the use and impact of coaches' application of PC and AI principles with their childcare providers.

The study utilized a mixed-method design that collected data using surveys, interviews, and observations. Two survey instruments and one interview script were designed by the researcher and reviewed by an expert panel. The instruments gathered data about the coaches' perceptions of AI and PC, the coach-provider relationship, ownership and collaboration, the coaches' style, and the impact of coaching. Data collection occurred from November through December 2010. A sample of 7 coaches and 49 providers completed surveys. Five coaches and five providers were interviewed. Two coaches were observed. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the survey data, the interview data was subjected to thematic analysis, and the observation data was used to create a narrative description.

The LAUP coaches in this study demonstrated substantial use of PC philosophies in their work with childcare providers. The coaches also reported use of AI philosophies; however, the providers were neutral, on average, about whether the coaches used AI approaches. Coaches and providers reported that the use of PC and AI yielded benefits such as building strong coach-provider relationships, positioning the coaches as helpful resources to providers, changing providers' thinking, and co-creating implementable solutions.

Although this study suffered from limitations concerning the small sample size, the findings were promising. It is advisable to continue using the LAUP coaching model. Further, this study demonstrates that AI and PC philosophies can be applied in one-on-one coaching, in nontraditional settings or industries, and even when organizational change is not the focus. Future studies should utilize a larger sample size and improved measurement tools to gather additional

information about the coaches' use of AI and PC and the impact of these philosophies on providers.

# References

# References

About LAUP. (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from http://www.laup.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=52&Itemid=2

Ai consulting. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.aiconsulting.org/ourstory.htm

Appelbaum, S. H., & Steed, A. J. (2005). The critical success factors in the client-consulting relationship. *The Journal of Management Development, 24*(1/2), 68–93.

Appreciate. (2011). In *Merriam-Webster's dictionary.* Retrieved May 1, 2011, from http://www.merriam–webster.com/dictionary/appreciate

Arcoleo, D. P. (2001). *Underneath appreciative inquiry: The power of positive conversation.* (Master's thesis, Fielding Institute). Retrieved June 1, 2011, from http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/ai/uploads/DARCOLEO%20-%20Final%20AI%20Thesis.doc

Barrett, F. J. (1998). Creativity and improvisation in jazz and organizations: Implications for organizational learning. *Organization Science, 9*(5), 605–622.

Belfield, C. R., Nores, M., Barnett, S., & Schweinhart, L. (2006). The High/Scope Perry Preschool Program: Cost–benefit analysis using data from the age-40 followup. *Journal of Human Resources 41*(1), 162–190.

Boss, R. W., Dunford, B. B., Boss, A. D., & McConkie, M. L. (2010). Sustainable change in the public sector: The longitudinal benefits of organization development. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *46*, 436–472.

Bushe, G. R. (2007). Appreciative Inquiry is not (just) about the positive. *OD Practitioner, 39*(4), 30–35.

Bushe, G. R., & Kassam, A. F. (2005). When is appreciative inquiry transformational? A meta-case analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*(2), 161–181.

Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: Effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 467–484.

Coley, R. J. (2002). *An uneven start: Indicators of inequality in school readiness. ETS policy information report.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Clancy, A. L., Binkert, J., & Orem, S. (2007, June 3). *Appreciative coaching: A positive model for change.* Presentation at the ASTD 2007 Conference, Session SU318, Atlanta, GA.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Doggett, L., & Wat, A. (2010, November 1). Why pre-k for all? *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(3), 8–11.

Egan, G. (1981). *The skilled helper: Model, skills and methods for effective helping* (2nd ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Goldberg, R. A. (2001). Implementing a professional development system through appreciative inquiry. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 22*, 56–61.

Gormley, W., Jr., Gayer, T., Phillips, D., & Dawson, B. (2004). *The effects of Oklahoma's universal pre-k program on school readiness: An executive summary.* Washington, DC: Center for Research on Children in the United States, Georgetown University.

Inquire. (2011). In *Merriam-Webster's dictionary.* Retrieved May 1, 2011, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/inquire

Johnson, G., & Leavitt, W. (2001). Building on success: Transforming organizations through an appreciative inquiry. *Public Personnel Management, 30*(1), 129–137.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kykyri, V., Puutio, R., & Wahlström, J. (2010). Inviting participation in organizational change through ownership talk. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 46*, 92–118.

Lambrechts, F., Grieten, S., Bouwen, R., & Corthouts, F. (2009). Process consultation revisited: Taking a relational practice perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45,* 39–58.

Lines, R. (2004). Influence of participation in strategic change: Resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement. *Journal of Change Management, 4*(3), 193–215.

Love, J. M., Atkins-Burnett, S., Vogel, C., Aikens, N., Xue, Y., Mabutas, M., et al. (2009). *Los Angeles Universal Preschool Programs, children served, and children's progress in the preschool year: Final report of the First 5 LA Universal Preschool Child outcomes study.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematics Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved May 1, 2011, from http://www.first5la.org/files/UPCOS-Final-Report.pdf

Ludema, J. D., Whitney, D., Mohr, B. J., & Griffen, T. J. (2003). *The appreciative inquiry summit.* San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Orem, S., & the Cramer Institute. (2009). *Introduction to appreciative coaching and asset-based thinking: Using asset-based thinking and appreciative coaching to coach, manage, and live more effectively.* Presented January 23-24, San Francisco.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2002). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title I Chicago child-parent centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(4), 267–303.

Saksvik, P., Tvedt, S., Nytro, K., Andersen, G., Andersen, T., Buvik, M., et al. (2007). Developing criteria for healthy organizational change. *Work and Stress, 21*(3), 243–263.

Schein, E. H. (1987). *Process consultation: Lessons for managers and consultants* (Vol. II). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. H. (1988). *Process consultation: Its role in organization development* (Vol. I, Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Sekerka, L., Brumbaugh, A., Rosa, J., & Cooperrider, D. (2006). Comparing appreciative inquiry to a diagnostic technique in organizational change: The moderating effects of gender. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 9*, 449–489.

U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the top program: Executive summary.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

Wat, A. (2010). *The case for pre-k in education reform: A summary of program evaluation findings.* Pew Center on the States Research Series. Washington, DC: Pew Center on the States.

Watkins, J. M., & Mohr, B. J. (2001). *Appreciative inquiry: Change at the speed of imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

West, J., Denton, K., & Germino–Hausken, E. (2000). *America's Kindergartners: Early childhood longitudinal study, Kindergarten class of 1998-99, Fall 1998. Statistical analysis report NCES 2000–070.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/2000070.pdf

Whitney, D. (2006). Appreciative inquiry: Creating cultures of positive participation. *OD practitioner, 38*(4), 46–51.

Whitney, D., & Cooperrider, D. L. (1998). The appreciative inquiry summit: Overview and applications. *Employment Relations Today, 25*(2), 17–28.

Winter, G. (2005, March 18). Government is criticized on oversight of head start. *The New York Times*, p. A15.

# Appendix

## Study Invitation and Consent Letter

June 1, 2010

Dear {LAUP Coach or Provider}:

I am an employee at Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) conducting research in my graduate studies at the Graziadio School of Business & Management at Pepperdine University. The study is titled ***The Role of Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry and Servant Leadership in the Coaching Model of LAUP***. The purpose of the study is to document the unique use of the LAUP coaching model in a time-bounded situation and to explore how the LAUP coaching model is executed. The primary goal of this study is to observe the consulation processes of the LAUP coaches and to validate the roles that Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry and Servant Leadership play in the LAUP Coaching Model.

Your participation is voluntary and anonymous. It will require that you complete both a one-on-one interview and survey anonymously. It may also require that I accompany several of the LAUP Coaches when they meet with some of the Providers over the summer. The questionaire and survey will not be time consuming and please note your participation is voluntary; you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and your participation will not be detrimental to you in any way with the Coach nor LAUP. All responses will be kept confidential; only aggregate data will be reported in my thesis. As well, I will provide you with a completed copy of the thesis upon completion for your review.

It is assumed your participation will result in improved understanding how the LAUP Coaching Model works. The data received will be synthesized and included in the thesis which can be made available to you.

Your signature below will confirm your acceptance of participation and that you are aware and understand what will be required. Again, your participation is anonymous and please note that any and all recordings gathered for this study will be kept in a locked file cabinet that I am the only one with access to.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at [omitted] or email me at [omitted]. As well, if you have any questions about the study please feel free to contact my advisor directly by email at [omitted] or contact Doug Leigh, the chair of the Institutional Review Board for questions about participant's rights at [omitted].

Thank you very much,

Karel Kreshek
Pepperdine University
MSOD Student

_____
LAUP Coach or Provider / Date