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Abstract

Objectives: This study explores the interaction between national culture and coaching methods that executive coaches use in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The objective is to develop understanding regarding whether executive coaches varied methods or approaches depending upon a coaching recipient being an Expatriate or a UAE National citizen.

Design: The research took place in the UAE, using semi-structured interviews with four participants. The participants were executive coaches with experience and understanding of different approaches and methods used in coaching psychology practice.

Methods: A qualitative method of data collection and analysis, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), was used to examine the lived experience and making sense of rich individual narratives. The double-hermeneutic approach of IPA generated understanding via interpretation of the participant’s perceptions.

Results: Cultural Values, Business Environment and Approach & Methods were three themes that emerged from the study. National Culture is a significant feature of life in the UAE and is omnipresent in the complex, multicultural business environment and manifests itself in differences of cultural values and dimensions. Whilst national culture is important, it is only
of many layers that shape an individual. Participants prioritise and customise their coaching approach based upon the coachee as an individual and their current contextual situation. Only small differences are identifiable in the utility of certain coaching methods due to national culture, however, the approach to coaching is adjusted to address higher expectations of direction, different motivational factors, different value systems and the higher emphasis on relationships and trust amongst Emiratis.

**Keywords:** Coaching psychology, executive coaching, culture, United Arab Emirates, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA).
Introduction

The current research attempts to bridge a gap in existing literature regarding the impact of national culture on approaches and methods used in executive coaching. The aim is to leverage the multicultural business environment of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) to develop understanding of this phenomenon. The study analysed the lived experiences of executive coaches working with UAE National citizens and Expatriates, seeking to understand if coaches alter their coaching approach and methods, such as cognitive behavioural, psychodynamic, personal construct, strategic, or positive psychology depending upon the nationality of the coachee.

Culture can be framed as the collective and individual programming separating people from different groups (Hofstede, 1988), or more lucidly as how groups solve problems and reconciles dilemmas (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1997). National culture is an important influence over organisational practises and values (Hofstede, 1991), and evident in the UAE and across the Arabian Gulf where family-oriented business relations and Islamic cultural values distinctively shape the business environment (Metcalfe, 2006). This dominating influence of local culture over organisational practises and values pervades despite the dependence upon a 90% expatriate workforce (UAE Interact, 2010) represented by over 200 nationalities (Abouzeid, 2008). The omnipresent influence of UAE cultural values in the business environment, despite the high percentage of foreign employees can be somewhat attributed to the propensity for senior roles in business units, boards and committees to be staffed by UAE Nationals.

Hofstede’s socio-cultural, anthropological research provides a framework to relate national cultural values to workplace practise. Whilst observing that individuals only adhere to the culture of their nation in varying degrees, culture does set limits on normative behaviours,
thus pressuring individual conformity to societal expectations. Whilst Hofstede’s original dimensional work did not cover the UAE explicitly, the categories of; power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity form a useful reference. Such a simple framework can lead to stereotypical assumptions in coaching (Passmore, 2013), however, coaches can mitigate this by taking steps to recognise, accept, adapt, integrate and leverage cultural differences; (Rosinski, 1999). Additionally, research-based prescriptive motivational approaches to cross-cultural coaching pose that typical coaching psychology techniques can be applied, but adjusted for cultural values and motivational factors (Coultas, et al. 2011).

Whilst coaching has emerged as an important, growing leadership practise; so far it has assumed a North American and Western European worldview that doesn’t hold universally (Rosinski, 2003), and could be harmful in different cultural settings, such as more collectivistic societies (Hofstede, 1993). Many executive coaches operating in the UAE are North American and European, thus encouraging consideration of how false assumptions based upon stereotyping can distort communication (Guirdham 1999). Cultural diversity presents challenges to practice that are seldom considered in writings of coaching, however Rosinski and Abbot argue that culture is an omnipresent influence that presents opportunities to harness when coaching (Rosinski and Abbot, 2006). Rosinski’s Cultural Orientations Framework builds on the work of eminent interculturalists, developing a common language to discuss culture and a framework of categories enabling integration of culture into coaching (Rosinski, 2003). More recently the Universal Integrated Framework (UIF) was developed from a critical review of a range of coaching methods, forming a cross-cultural coaching method underpinned by psychological learning theory (Law, et al, 2007), and aligned with the British Psychological Society definition of coaching psychology (Palmer and Whybrow,
The UIF integrates various coaching psychology methods, such as cognitive behavioural, gestalt techniques, narrative and existential approaches (Law, 2013).

David Peterson of PDI notes that coaching occurs at individual level, with culture a social or group level phenomenon, arguing that despite the potency of culture as a force shaping behaviour and identity, there are many other factors to consider. As culture is an unpredictable and unreliable factor in determining individual character, the role of a coach is to understand the individual regardless of what shaped them, (Peterson, 2007).

The literature informs of the importance of remembering that an individual is not the culture, reflecting a basic psychological observation that individuals differ more within groups than groups differ from each other (Palmer & Arnold, 2013). Although national culture is likely to play a role in defining an individual’s world view, many things shape the character, values, or behaviour of any particular individual, such as; personality, experiences, political, family, social, educational and economic background. Therefore, assumptions regarding the extent of national cultures’ influence on individuals can be ill-informed. However, when working across cultures, cultural knowledge and sensitivity is required (Donnison, 2008).

This dynamic, multicultural backdrop, combined with the lack of research of cross-cultural coaching in the UAE provides a rich research opportunity at the intersection of culture and coaching psychology. In addition to growing the body of emerging theory in an important topic, an improved understanding of whether approach and/or methods are varied potentially identifies optimisation opportunities for coaching programs, such as in selection, matching coach and coachee, tailoring programs and managing issues that arise in coaching interactions.

As the research is somewhat philosophical in nature and subsequently utilises qualitative research methodology, no hypothesis or secondary research question was proposed.
Methods

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) allows for deep analysis and interpretation of personal experiences and perceptions of participants rather than objective account formation (Smith and Osborn, 2003). Therefore IPA is well suited to the small available population size and idiosyncratic subject matter. The semi-structured interview format enables engagement in conversation, probing relevant, important areas (Smith, 1996). IPA combines the theoretical orientations of phenomenology, hermeneutics and ideography in an interpretative overlay of how individual experiences appear to others. This expression of double-hermeneutics (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2012) is particularly appropriate, allowing the richness and complexity of human sense making in emergent situations (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

Participants

Due to the rich subject matter, small population of suitable participants and depth of immersive analysis required with IPA, the research gathered input from four participants. Whilst noting sample size as contextual, the research adheres to guidance of between three and six participants for IPA (Smith, et al. 2009), enhancing quality by analysing fewer participants in greater depth, rather than shallower, descriptive analysis that can result from more participants (Reid, et al. 2005).

Participants were purposively selected, fulfilling the criteria of being UAE based, expatriate executive coaches, with experience and understanding of coaching psychology methods. They were recruited through the network of the researcher and all are experienced in coaching executives within prestigious organisations in the UAE.
Interviews were recorded using a digital sound recorder, anonymised and transcribed.

Procedure

After having received approval from Heriot Watt University Ethics Committee, participants were contacted directly, the background of the research explained, example interview questions sent in advance, permission sought and consent forms signed. Data was collected from individual, semi-structured interviews of between 40 and 80 minutes in Abu Dhabi and Dubai, UAE in December 2016. The interview approach aimed to stay on target whilst remaining flexible and conversational (Ruben and Ruben, 1995). The conversation was broadly framed around the questions in Table 1.

Table 1. Interview Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Coaches:</th>
<th>Main Questions:</th>
<th>Additional Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell me about your experience of coaching in the United Arab Emirates (UAE)</td>
<td>What kind of coaching interventions have you led in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk to me about the typical coaching process that you go through?</td>
<td>Who is it typically initiated by and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective do you think coaching is in the UAE?</td>
<td>What were the main challenges you were addressing through these coaching interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that your coaching is as successful in the UAE when compared to that provided elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the topic of national culture arisen during coaching in the UAE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that national culture plays a role in coaching in the UAE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With hindsight, would you change your approach or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you wish went better?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would you do differently if repeating the coaching now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any other thoughts or insights on coaching practice in the UAE?

Analysis

IPA involves several stages of data analysis, moving the researcher from identifying the uniqueness of participant perspectives, to what is shared across participants, making meaning in a particular context (Cooper, et al. 2015). Recordings were listened to and transcriptions read multiple times, immersing the researcher in the data, followed by textual analysis with notes made on important points from an individual participant’s perspective. These notes were transformed into emerging themes and lifted to higher levels of abstraction whilst remaining grounded in the text. Themes were coded and connections sought, before a table of themes was produced. This was followed by a detailed, interpretative examination of the data through the lenses of the themes, connections and groupings (Smith, et al. 2011). Every stage was repeated for each participant, returning to the beginning when new themes emerged from later participants and when themes were consolidated and merged into a final master table of themes (See Table 2). This intense, iterative, yet rewarding process of analysis continued into the write up of the results and discussion.

Table 2. Abstraction Leading to Final Master and Sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master and Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Coach # 001</th>
<th>Coach # 002</th>
<th>Coach # 003</th>
<th>Coach # 004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Page | 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Values</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Dimensions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Value Systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Environment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Cultural Dynamics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge of Multicultural, Transitory Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is One Layer of Many</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach and Methods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Application of Methods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customise for Individual and Context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Culture Directly / Early</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Adaptation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

The narrative analysis from the participant interviews resulted in the emergence of sub-themes, subsequently revealing three superordinate themes (See Figure 1);

- Cultural Values,
- Business Environment,
- Approach & Methods.

Figure 1. Sub and Superordinate Themes
Cultural Values

The first superordinate theme of Cultural Values consists of three sub-themes (See Figure 1):

- Cultural Dimensions,
- Different Value Systems
- Relationships

All participants talked of cultural dimensions, stating the impact on the coaching process, both explicitly and implicitly;

“power distance is much more acute in this region” (004)

Participant 001 also refers to the Hofstede dimension of power-distance;

“something that I notice oftentimes come up when I’m working with gulf nationals, is the whole notion of power distance... ...we do have to recognise that meritocracy and shared responsibilities is not a cultural norm” (001)

Describing a direct impact on the coaching dynamic resulting from high power-distance;

“I find that high power distance automatically places the coach in a role of authority, something that doesn't fit with classic global methodologies around coaching” (001)

Similarly, Participant 002 experienced expectations of playing the authority figure in the coaching relationship;

“I asked if we were to work together, what do you think we should work on. She replied to say, isn’t that your job?” (002)

The expectation of direction and of the coach to play a lead role is also described by Participant 001;
“I once worked with an Emirati CEO who said during our very first session: "I hired you to give me answers - not to ask me questions!"” (001)

Participant 004 highlights impacts related to the Hofstede dimension of uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2001);

“I do think that when it comes to confrontation, people will move away from confrontation here” (004)

Providing a direct example of the impact on coaching conversations;

“here you almost get the feeling that people want you to come off the accelerator and put on the brake and you see a visible relief when you do those sorts of things.” (004)

Participant 001 spoke passionately of differences in value systems between UAE Nationals and Expatriates. Firstly in terms of consciousness of values;

“it’s a very values driven society and I think that there is a consciousness around values here that I don’t find so much when working with people from other parts of the world” (001)

Then with examples of differences in the values;

“the value of commitment is different from what I would see when I’m working with people from western countries” (001)

All participants referred to the importance of relationships, family and trust to UAE Nationals;

“of course family matters, it’s hugely important to the Emiratis.” (002)

Participant 001 elaborates, relating individualism-collectivism to the fear of losing face;

“Relationship is very important here. The need for love and belonging, it shows up everywhere. Wanting to be part of and be accepted by my community, my family, that is such
an important piece here. So the fear of losing face is of course coming from that place.

Whereas expats, westerners, we are, we can pretty much carve our own lives to the extent
that we are individualistic, they only exist because of the collective. It’s a big difference.”

The theme of saving face continues with Participant 003 describing a dimension that would
necessitate judgement from the coach on approach;

“There will be some who know they need help and even though they need to save face, they
would prefer to lose face with their coach so that they can save face outside” (003)

The importance of trust was explicitly stated by all, with a temporal implication also
emerging;

“Trust is important; don’t do anything different in terms of having faith in the integrity of the
coaching methodology that I have set up front” (004)

“I terms of my ability to build... it takes longer. That is for sure.” (004)

“I think it comes down to intent vs content. If people believe that you are on their side, if they
trust you, you can pretty much say anything.” (002)

“I would say that the success of the assignment is actually very much depending upon can
you establish that relationship and can you build that level of trust with someone” (001)

Participants observe significant differences in cultural dimensions and values, particularly the
importance placed upon family and relationships. This impacts the coaching approach,
content and nature of the coaching conversations.
The second superordinate theme of Business Environment consists of four sub-themes (See Figure 1);

- Significance of Cultural Dynamics,
- Challenge of Multicultural, Transitory Environment,
- Motivational Factors,
- Culture is One Layer of Many

All participants commented on the omnipresence and major impact of culture in the UAE business environment;

“Culture is a huge part of it” (002)

“Culture, it’s something that’s got to be known and treated with great respect” (004)

Participant 002 agreed on culture’s importance, speaking passionately about it being one factor of many and potentially overplayed.

“Yes I think it is an aspect, an important aspect, but not the only aspect.” (002)

“I think in this multicultural environment that we work in, we run the risk of thinking that culture outranks everything else, and it doesn’t.” (002)

All participants referred to the UAE’s challenging, multicultural business environment.

Participant 001 describes environmental complexity and subsequent challenges for Emirati Leaders;

“I think operating in an environment where there is a lot of transition and it is constantly changing. There is all the ingredients for dysfunctional teams, dysfunctional organisations.” (001)
“we have to acknowledge the complexity of being a UAE National leading a multicultural
team. I’ve come across teams with twelve different nationalities in one team right, and
everyone is coming from different parts of the world, with different beliefs” (001)

The challenge of cultural understanding due to the significance of differences arose.

Participant 003 talks of guardedness;

“I think, it might be more guarded with Emiratis simply because the difference in the
culture.” (003)

Participant 004 talks of how the absence of a shared culture can make building trust more
challenging;

“When you are deep in that relationship, you just see sometimes how humour, metaphor,
sporting analogies, whatever it may be that you use to build trust in another culture, a shared
culture is off the table here” (004)

Whilst Participant 002 describes how differences present in a multicultural environment
make building trust harder;

“I think that the more similar you are to someone or they are to you, the more easier it is to
trust. You’ve got the same language, same skin colour, same experiences.” (002)

Different motivating factors for UAE Nationals was classified it as a key difference by
Participant 004;

“typically an Emirati executive will have gotten that job because he or she, he typically, is
capable, he’ll have gotten that job probably younger than his peer in the west, he’ll have
gotten it because he’s smart, because he’s got wasta*, because he’s connected and he’ll have
gotten the job for that. Chances are that the individual will also be independently wealthy.”

(004)

*Wasta = Arabic for connections, influence. Seen as a contributing factor in decision making (Cunningham and Sarayrah, 1993)

“Finding the burning platform with an Emirati is more difficult than with say finding a
burning platform for a guy who went to a comprehensive school in Manchester and became
the CEO of British Gas, because you’ve got carrot and stick, there’s other things inside that
persons make-up that you can leverage.” (004)

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs was referenced in some interviews (Maslow, 1970), seemingly
implying that high levels of independent wealth and job-security result in automatic
fulfilment of basic-needs.

“We can’t think about higher order of needs until we’ve paid the bills” (004)

Participant 001 reflected on the leadership potential of UAE Nationals given their higher
purpose values;

“lower level values are survival values, whereas the higher level values are at the top. I see a
lot of the higher level values centred here. This is what is really, really going to make a
difference in the organisation, because if you have leaders who can operate here, they can
pull other people up with them” (001)

All participants commented in some form that while national culture is important, it is only
one consideration of many when coaching an individual. Organisational culture was
highlighted as a key consideration;

“organisations have their own business culture so there are similarities between expats and
Emiratis within the same business cultures.” (003)
Participant 001 describes culture as a layer;

“we cannot ignore that while systems are extremely important and complex, then people add to the complexity, then you put on another layer of culture, it’s not easy to navigate” (001)

While Participant 002 sees it as a filter;

“The way I see it is that culture is a filter. It is a filter, but it is not the only filter that is out there... Education, who your parents are, how they treated you, how tall you are, your gender, the colour of your skin, where you went to school, who you hung out with, what job you have.” (002)

Elaborating with an example of how filters vary in importance and influence depending upon context;

“If I’m dealing with an eighteen year old Indian and I’m dealing with a six year old Indian, they’re different people, they’re both Indian, they both have the Indian culture but the generation is probably more important at that stage.” (002)

Participant 003 describes steps;

“You have your family, you have your extended family, you have your neighbourhood, your society, then you have your nation, your country, then you have your, the world you know. It just builds up, step by step.” (003)

Whilst Participant 004 describes the cultural ecosystem;

“Personality is primary importance, number two is national culture and number three is the person temporarily enters organisational culture.” (004).
The influence of national culture is strong and omnipresent, the multicultural, transitory environment creates challenges and differences in values and circumstances of UAE Nationals generate different motivational factors. Consistently, national culture is deemed to be only one factor of many that influences the coaching relationship.

**Approach & Methods**

The third superordinate theme of Approach & Methods consists of four sub-themes (See Figure 1);

- Consistent Application of Methods,
- Customise for Individual and Context,
- Address Culture Directly / Early,
- Cultural Understanding and Adaptation

Participants consistently state that underlying coaching methods do not change much based upon the national culture of the coachee;

“methodology; there are certain things that are off the table, but there are 80% the same as it would be anywhere” (004)

Elaborating;

“There is what and a how of coaching. I think the what is pretty steadfast, you know there’s a process that one must go through. I think there is questions that one must ask, there is a repertoire of tools that one can choose from and then use and then there is a flow and pursuit of whatever the end game is. I think where culture arises is in the how.” (004)

Participant 004 observes the preparation phase being impacted with Emiratis due to a desire to save face and high-power distance;
“what I do find is very limited here is the utility of 360’s, and also in junior executive interviews... I did an exploration, a discovery process for a CEO two weeks ago and he had zero appetite to do a 360... due to the confrontational nature of it...he wanted to save face, which is a big theme, so 360 was off the table right away.” (004)

All participants stated in a form that the individual always comes before the culture;

“I find that there is more predictive meaning to be found in knowing that a guy is an ENTJ for example, or an introverted CFO is more meaningful than knowing the guy is Swiss, or knowing that he’s Emirati.” (004)

“always try to just deal with the individual wherever they came from” (003)

The customisation or tailoring of coaching based on the individual and the context is described by all participants;

“I can’t say that I have one standard approach that I use with every single client because it really is a very customised approach that I am using.” (001)

“There are tools in the toolbox... but then again you tailor the way you go through it.” (003)

Participant 002 reiterates the individualised approach, adding views about being straight and direct;

“You have to treat individuals as individuals. Some people will try too hard to not offend and they become a bigger problem by being too vague” (002)

The participants all describe the need to address coaching directly and in the early stages of the engagement;
“when I start a coaching engagement with someone, particularly if it is a male Gulf national, I would ask him, I would basically put on the table that we come from two very different cultures so from a scale of 1-10 how direct can I be with you?” (001)

“a lot of that cultural stuff, that how honest can I be stuff should take place in that before stage, you should have done your mental and physical preparation prior.” (004)

Whilst maintaining a level of cultural adaptability;

“bringing the difference in culture to the table and also make it clear that while I tend to be very direct, that is my style, that’s what you will get if you work with me.” (001)

The importance of understanding and adapting to cultural dynamics emerged as a theme;

“the way that I do direction when I don’t know the person very well and I don’t know the culture very well, or I don’t know the filters. I ask, is this a thing that you can do, or why could you not do this thing?” (002)

However, the extent of the differences can mean that it is not fully possible to understand the others perspective;

“There are an awful lot of minefields where just a verbal faux-pas, because they’re non-confrontational they may not say, then it festers, it becomes toxic and you either get to know about it, or you don’t get to know about it, but that cultural faux-pas was the deal breaker.” (004)

Participant 001 attempts to attribute the reason for challenges in understanding;

“The fear of failing and the fear of losing face when you are holding a responsibility that you may have been given at a very early age, or stage in your career. The fear of not being able to do that and do it well is a significant amount of pressure to put on someone. We cannot
possibly understand what that is like, because we are here for a while and we know that we will leave and go on somewhere else, but for the UAE National it is there, this is their home, this is where their reputation is everything” (001)

Participant 004 conveys acceptance that there are things an expatriate will never fully know or understand;

“you don’t understand the culture as deeply as maybe you could, and you don’t understand the boardroom practices once the door closes and all of the expats leave the room” (004)

Participants strongly stated that national culture affects coaching methods either not at all, or very little with the only examples being the impact of power distance and uncertainty avoidance on the use of 360 feedback. However, the impact on approach and content is evident. More time is taken to build trust, motivation needs to be worked upon differently, certain topics are off the table and while cultural understanding is necessary, gaining a full understanding is challenging if indeed possible at all.
Discussion

This discussion integrates the theories identified in the literature review with the themes contained within the results, highlights the limitations of the study and proposes how the results may inform practice.

Cultural Values

Although Hofstede’s original and Trompenaars’ subsequent cultural dimension work did not cover the UAE specifically (Trompenaars, 1997), Hofstede’s work covering the Arab World is a relevant proxy, demonstrating high levels of collectivism and power-distance in the UAE (Hofstede, 1980). (See Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Hofstede Cultural Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Power-Distance</th>
<th>Uncertainty Avoidance</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab World*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Countries included: Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates (Hofstede, 1980)

** Data sourced from Hofstede, 1980

Significant differences in power-distance and individualism were evident in the research, with practical examples of both dimensions appearing in the interviews. These differences
indicate that Executive Coaches need to be mindful that high power-distance can change relationship dynamics, reducing openness, increasing expectations on the coach to take the position of power in the relationship and to provide more advice and direction. The low levels of individualism are reflected by the participants discussing the importance of relationships and family. The research indicates the importance of coaches understanding that high relative levels of collectivism is a key differentiator, leading to fundamentally different vantage points for decision making, surfacing in a fear of failure and need to save face that differs from an expatriate from a more individualistic society (Hofstede, 1980).

A relationship of trust and understanding was identified as essential to success, aligning with theory that trust is one of the most crucial elements of coaching across cultures (Hicks and Peterson, 1999). Every individual client has their own expectations on how trust is built, a challenge that is accentuated across cultures, therefore an understanding of cultural differences and an appreciation that trust may take longer to develop across cultures will help a coach to anticipate issues and navigate smoothly (Hicks & Peterson, 1997).

Once trust is established, the higher level values referred to by participant 001 can be worked upon, offering great potential for UAE Nationals to develop excellence in leadership, becoming strong role models (Scott-Jackson, 2008).

Organisations in the UAE tend to be hierarchical with higher levels of power distance than is common in ‘western’ business practise (Weir, 2003; Weir and Hutchings, 2005). The UAE is a collectivist culture, with a business culture that is well encapsulated as ‘hard on issues, soft on people’ (Al Omari, 2008). This impact of this is seen in the research, with coachees less likely to provide open, direct feedback to seniors or to directly address employee performance issues.
The multicultural, transitory business environment in the UAE was referred to by most participants as presenting challenges to the coachee, such as managing extremely diverse teams. The significant cultural differences resulting from diversity present challenges to relationship and trust building between coach and coachee as certain tools and common connections to build rapport are less plausible. Indeed, all participants spoke of challenges in developing cultural understanding, consistently asserting that differences are so large that it is impossible to fully understand.

Motivation theory is an important factor in Executive Coaching and is impacted by contextual differences facing UAE Nationals. Several participants referred explicitly or implicitly to the hierarchy of needs theory developed by Maslow which remains one of the most popular motivational theories (Pinder, 1984). Maslow asserts that humans are self-actualising subjects that can transcend national culture (Maslow, 1970). However, the theory has been subject to controversy regarding whether it is transferable across cultures (Adler, 1986; Steers and Porter, 1987). An adapted theory developed for Chinese culture that placed the need for belonging before physiological needs due to the high relative levels of collectivism (Nevis, 1983), could be more applicable to the UAE and would be interesting for further research. It could be argued that the challenge to the hierarchy of needs theory is accentuated by the unusually large levels of individual wealth, financial independence and job security amongst UAE Nationals for whom safety and physiological needs are met comfortably. This changes the approach and levers available to the coach to work on motivation with coaches and offers an interesting opportunity for further research.
Triandis (1996) argued that self-actualisation is a primarily western, individualistic construct and accordingly may be fundamentally flawed. Later providing a bridge in theory from cultural values to motivation, summarising different value sets into two broad categories; East; including group achievement, harmony, long term relationships, and West; including personal achievement, advancement, dominance, autonomy, self-reliance (Triandis, 2004). It could be argued that in a more collectivist culture, self-actualisation is realised in terms of meeting societal needs and expectations, rather than by more intrinsic or extrinsic individual attainment. This is reflected in the research results with participants describing the abundance of higher consciousness values, such as sustainability and concern for future generations amongst Emiratis.

Many participants observed that, whilst national culture is a significant factor, it remains one dimension of many that influences an individual and the coaching process, aligning with Peterson’s assertion that an individual is shaped by many things other than culture, such as personality, life experiences, education, profession and social status (Peterson, 2007).

Organisations have their own cultures and preferred leadership styles (Schein, 1992), with stronger corporate cultures more likely to significantly influence the behaviour of employees, particularly as they reach more senior levels (Peterson, 2007). Most participants view that organisation and/or sector is a key factor, demonstrated by the culture of certain industries having a stronger influence than national culture, for example in Investment Banking, or Law firms.

**Approach & Methods**

The participants use a wide range of coaching and coaching psychology methods, including psychoanalytic, personal construct, NLP, transactional analysis, psychometrics and psychosocial theory, yet consistently asserted that national culture does not have much or any
impact on the coaching psychology methods that they use. The only example given was the lower utility in 360 degree feedback due to high power-distance and potential loss of face. This is consistent with the view of Hoppe, who sees 360 as well suited to North America’s low context, explicit, individual focus, and less suited to collectivist, high context cultures where family and relationships have greater importance (Hoppe, 1998).

The highest level of consistency, passion and conviction from the participants was in their assertions that the individual comes first when designing coaching interventions. This aligns well with Peterson’s assertion that the coach’s challenge is to know the individual regardless of the culture, as whilst culture can be a strong influence on identity and behaviour, it remains an unpredictable factor in determining an individual’s values, character or behaviour (Peterson, 2007).

Hofstede’s dimensions have been criticised for placing too much emphasis on culture as a source of difference. However, similar to the participants, Hofstede does place personality before national culture and human nature. Therefore, perhaps it is the overuse and universal acceptance of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions that is problematic, not the framework itself (Hofstede, 1991).

Whilst asserting that the selection of coaching approach and methods is always based upon the individual first, generalisations of cultural dynamics are present and seem to serve as a useful guide with it described by Participant 002 as a form of shorthand to understanding differences. Accordingly, cultural norms can help a coach generate hypothesis about the coachee, such as; is this coachee more likely be more motivated by a collective goal than an individual one, or might this coachee prefer authoritative, clear direction rather than an open free conversation. Testing these hypotheses can avoid pitfalls Hicks and Peterson (1997).
Many participants stated that they would alter their coaching approach to include direct inquiry early in the process to address how cultural differences may impact the coaching relationship. Placed alongside an expectation of more explicit guidance and direction than would be expected in a western business setting this suggests that directness is more accepted than would be expected from a culture with such high levels of power distance. This would indicate that a different ratio should be considered when coaching UAE Nationals compared with UK nationals, where a survey of coaching psychologists showed 67.9% describing their approach as facilitational, and 17.4% as instructional (Palmer and Whybrow, 2006).

Participants referred in varying degrees to the importance of cultural understanding and awareness, and the requirement to maintain adaptability. The interview responses indicate that all participants avoid the ethno-centric pitfalls and operate with an ethno-relative approach in a range between recognising, accepting and integrating differences. This places them in the higher ranges of Rosinski’s (1999) model of dealing with cultural differences, adapted from the work of Milton Bennet (1993), however there would seem to be space for the coaches to grow into operating at the highest level of the model and leverage differences, looking to make the most of cultural differences (Rosinski, 1999).

Finally, the emergent theory can be summarised by explaining that whilst methods are broadly unchanged, the approach is significantly impacted;

“The what stays much the same, the how changes significantly” (004)

Limitations of the Study

Research of this nature could be criticised for having less prominence on external validity and scientific controls due to its business setting, qualitative and philosophical nature. However, IPA is concerned with the interpretation of an experiential account of a small
number of participants, allowing an under-researched topic to be explored. Accordingly, the
small number of participants results in limited data, and therefore the emergent model is
limited in its generalisation and would need to be tested further.

Another consideration is the broad, generalised definition of expatriate that has been used. In
such a multicultural business environment, there are also many cultural differences within the
expatriate community.

Implications for Practise and Future Research

The community of UAE-based Executive Coaches can reference the proposed model to
inform their understanding of the factors that can influence an individual coachee, to consider
appropriate adjustments to coaching approach and the minor impact of culture on coaching
approaches and methods. For the UAE business community, this study can provide a
additional information to consider in internal executive coaching programs and coach
selection.

Further research could consider both qualitative and quantitative methods with a broader
range of participants. There is also scope to explore the effectiveness and utility of different
approaches in coaching psychology in the UAE.
Conclusions

This qualitative study explored the intersection of coaching psychology practice and some aspects of national culture in UAE to further our understanding how coaching approaches and methods are used by Executive Coaches with UAE National or Expatriate coachees.

This understanding can represent first steps to building a model of Executive Coaching in the UAE with three emerging themes: Cultural Values, Business Environment and Approach & Methods.

The results show that the issues of culture are addressed directly, with coaches demonstrating understanding, awareness and adaptation to cultural differences, and supplying higher levels of instruction and direction to UAE Nationals.
Figure 2. The ABC model of coaching in the United Arab Emirates
Adjustments to approach and methods (A) are driven by the external factors of the UAE’s multicultural business environment (B). National culture plays a large role, creating different challenges to address and different motivational considerations for UAE Nationals. Large differences exist in cultural values (C), between UAE Nationals and Expatriates on Hofstede’s dimensions, and there are differences in the importance of relationships, trust and family.

Whilst there is notable impact to the approach, the coaching psychology methods are reported as being largely unchanged. Culture does not seem a major influence on methods, despite the large cultural differences in the UAE. However, all participants describe significant differences in approach and content based upon the national culture of the coachee. Maintaining focus on the individual, whilst being culturally aware and adaptable seems a recipe for successfully coaching across cultures in the UAE. National culture is clearly an important factor in Executive Coaching, however it is only one of many dimensions to be considered and incorporated in effective coaching process.
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### Table 1. Interview Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Coaches:</th>
<th>Main Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell me about your experience of coaching in the United Arab Emirates (UAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of coaching interventions have you led in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is it typically initiated by and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the main challenges you were addressing through these coaching interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk to me about the typical coaching process that you go through?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your style of interaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What (if any) coaching psychology methods do you use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What frameworks and tools do you typically use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why do you select these approaches?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are these approaches different to what you would employ in other countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you consciously use different methods depending upon whether the coachee is Emirati or expatriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective do you think coaching is in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that you achieve the stated aims?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that your coaching is as successful in the UAE when compared to that provided elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the topic of national culture arisen during coaching in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that national culture plays a role in coaching in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, what role and how does it play out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your culture or theirs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not, tell me more about that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was it a factor in your choice of methods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With hindsight, would you change your approach or methods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you wish went better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would you do differently if repeating the coaching now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any other thoughts or insights on coaching practise in the UAE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Abstraction Leading to Final Master and Sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master and Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Coach # 001</th>
<th>Coach # 002</th>
<th>Coach # 003</th>
<th>Coach # 004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Dimensions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Value Systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Cultural Dynamics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge of Multicultural, Transitory Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is One Layer of Many</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach and Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Application of Methods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customise for Individual and Context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Culture Directly / Early</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Adaptation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Comparison of Hofstede Cultural Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Power-Distance</th>
<th>Uncertainty Avoidance</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab World*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Countries included: Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates (Hofstede, 1980)

** Data sourced from Hofstede, 1980)
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