

# Implementation of Coaching Using the GROW Model Approach in CPNS Training

Edah Jubaedah<sup>1</sup>, Tetty Kurniati<sup>2</sup>

{edah.jubaedah@poltek.stialanbandung.ac.id<sup>1</sup>, tetty.kurniati@poltek.stialanbandung.ac.id<sup>2</sup>}

Politeknik STIA LAN Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia<sup>1,2</sup>

**Abstract.** This research aims to explain the implementation of the coaching model in the basic training for prospective civil servants, conducted at the Center for Training and Development of Competency for State Civil Apparatus (Puslatbang PKASN) under the National Institute of Public Administration (LAN). The research used a descriptive quantitative approach with a survey method involving students and alumni, particularly those participating in the Basic Leadership Training (Latsar) in the year 2022. The research findings revealed that coaching, employing the GROW model in Latsar CPNS, has been effectively implemented. Throughout each stage of the model, Widyaiswara, as a coach, has assisted Latsar participants in comprehending their goals, evaluating existing conditions, exploring alternative choices, and fostering commitment to achieving their desired outcomes from the actualization learning process. Despite the successful implementation of coaching in Latsar CPNS, there are still technical and non-technical challenges encountered, both by the coaches and the Latsar CPNS participants as coachees. Technical challenges in Latsar CPNS implementation are linked to the virtual coaching format, as the training utilizes a hybrid approach combining offline (outside the network) and online (virtual) patterns.

**Keywords:** Coaching, GROW Model, Pre-service Training

## 1 Introduction

Coaching is one of the methods in human resource development that is widely applied in organizations today. Since 2006 in the United States, coaching has gained popularity in the United States as a preferred approach in human resource learning within organizations [1]. Generally, coaching is defined as a method to improve skills, performance, and individual development. More specifically, coaching is a systematic process to assist individuals in exploring issues, setting goals, developing action plans, taking necessary actions, monitoring and evaluating the extent to which these actions can help individuals achieve their goals [2].

Various research findings indicate various impacts of coaching methods on both organizations and individuals. The implementation of coaching programs has indirect effects on organizations, such as increased performance, productivity, sales [3], reduced staff turnover [4], improves financial outcomes and the achievement of goals or targets [5]. Additionally, coaching programs also influence employees' perceptions of their organization, such as employees' perceptions of the effectiveness of supervisors and organizational support in improving work-family balance [6]. However, it is acknowledged that scientific evidence demonstrating the

effectiveness of coaching programs for organizations is still limited [7] and requires further empirical evidence with appropriate research methods [8].

Coaching, based on various research findings, also has an impact on individual employees themselves. Some research in the sales sector indicate that the implementation of coaching programs affects the performance of sales personnel [9]. In Malaysian companies, coaching, accompanied by recognition and acknowledgment from the organization, positively influences employee performance [10]. Literature reviews on research results related to the impact of coaching on individual employees identify various individual factors that can be influenced by coaching, including self-efficacy, anxiety, stress, depression, resilience, job satisfaction, and performance [8].

Considering the influence of coaching on organizational and individual development, academics and practitioners in the coaching field have attempted to formulate various models of the coaching process. One such model was first developed by Graham Alexander [11] and later refined by Sir John Whitmore [12], known as the GROW model, which stands for Goal (G), Reality (R), Options (O), and Will (W). The model is based on Whitmore's view of the coaching process as a mean to create learning and developmental conditions for employees within an organization. Coaching in the organizational context aims to build awareness and responsibility among employees for learning and performance improvement.

The GROW model developed by Whitmore outlines the coaching process structure to be undertaken and executed by a coach. In the first stage, coaching begins with setting goals for the coachee, including the goals of the coaching process itself. The second stage involves clarifying the situation or reality faced by the coachee in achieving the established goals. In this phase, the coach asks various self-assessment questions to the coachee regarding facts, actions taken, obstacles, and available resources [12]. The third stage involves developing various alternative actions that the coachee can take to achieve the established goals. The final stage of Whitmore's model is the development of an action plan based on the results of the discussion in the previous stage.

Several studies have been conducted to assess the effectiveness of implementing coaching with Whitmore's GROW model. A study on the implementation of coaching with the GROW model in developing teaching styles for teachers in Bangladesh concluded that this model is not easy to apply. Various factors need to be considered if the model is to be applied positively and constructively [12]. Another study indicates that the application of coaching with the GROW model is more effective because it is considered a proactive strategy to support goal initiation, completion, and behavior change improvement [13].

In the Indonesian context, coaching as an HR development technique is not limited to organizational applications but is also used as a learning method in training programs. This is evident in the development by the National Institute of Public Administration (LAN), a government institution authorized to oversee the development of civil servant competencies. Since 2015, the term coaching has been mentioned in regulations governing the guidelines for conducting both leadership training and basic training for civil service candidates. In basic training, the coaching concept is specifically used as a learning method in the actualization stage of basic civil servant values. The implementation involves guidance by instructors or assigned personnel acting as coaches during the actualization learning stage..

Since the coaching method has been implemented in leadership training programs and basic training for civil servant candidates (CPNS), numerous studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of this method. Research on basic training for Civil Servant Candidates (CPNS) at the Human Resources Development Agency (BPSDM) Aceh has shown that mentors acting as coaches are highly relevant in enhancing participants' competence in designing and

actualizing the fundamental values of civil servants [14]. Other studies have identified various factors that can determine the effectiveness and success of implementing coaching as a learning method in basic training programs. These factors include participants' abilities, adequate time allocation for the coaching process [15], the coach-to-participant ratio in training, differences in knowledge, and the coach's perception of the actualization learning agenda [16]. Additionally, instructors assigned as coaches are required to have competencies in conducting the coaching process, especially in listening skills, commitment, and other soft skills [17].

However, research on the application of the coaching method in basic training programs has not yet focused its analysis on the coaching process model used by instructors as coaches. Therefore, this study aims to describe and analyze the implementation of the coaching process using the GROW model approach by Whitmore. This research examines coaching implementation based on the coach's behavior during the coaching process with coachees, focusing on the four behavioral dimensions: goal setting, reality checking, developing alternative solutions, and action plan development. The study aims to determine whether instructors (*widyaiswara*), acting as coaches during the coaching process, apply these four behaviors and identify inhibiting factors in implementing the coaching process using the GROW model. Indicators for each coaching stage are formulated as outlined in the following table:

**Table 1.** Dimensions and Indicators of the GROW Coaching Model Stages

| Goal   | Reality   | Options   | Will   |
|--|---|---|--|
| 1. What do you currently want to achieve?                                    | 1. Related to the goals you want to achieve,              | 1. What can you do?   | 1. What concrete steps will be taken to achieve this?                        |
| 2. What indicates that your goals have been successfully achieved?           | what is your current position?                            | 2. What needs to be done but hasn't been done yet?                | 2. When will you initiate these steps?                                       |
| 3. What motivates you to desire these goals?                                 | 2. What results have been achieved so far?                | 3. What strategies or steps have been taken for a similar matter? | 3. What will you do after that?  |
| 4. What do you expect from the coaching sessions?                            | 3. Are there any obstacles that you are currently facing? | 4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of these steps?      | 4. Are there any obstacles you face in implementing these steps?             |
| 5. What is most important thing for you in the coaching sessions?            | 4. Why is it considered an obstacle?                      | 5. Are there other suitable solutions for the current situation?  | 5. How will you address these obstacles?                                     |
| 6. Does the coaching session help you clarify the goals you want to achieve? | 5. What has been done so far?                             |   | 6. Will these actions lead you to the achievement of the actualization goal? |
|  | 6. What went wrong?                                       |   |  |
|  | 7. What has been successful?                              |   |  |
|  | 8. What needs to be done to move forward?                 |   |  |

## 2 Methods

The research methodology employed in this study is quantitative, utilizing a non-experimental descriptive approach. The descriptive method is chosen because the research aims to describe and interpret the implementation of the coaching model in the Civil Servant

Candidate (CPNS) Basic Training program, in accordance with the current conditions of individuals, regulations, circumstances, or events. The survey method is employed as the descriptive method in this research. The population and sample in this study consist of participants in the Basic Training organized by the Training and Competency Development Center of the National Institute of Public Administration (LAN) in 2022. The population of Basic Training participants in 2022 is 287 individuals. However, the participants who participated in filling out the questionnaire for this research were only 34 individuals, representing 12% of the total. The data collection technique involved distributing a questionnaire to respondents containing 25 questions related to the coach's behavior during the coaching process. Univariate analysis is used for data analysis since the study focuses on a single variable, which is the implementation of coaching using the GROW model (goal, reality, options, and will). Respondent responses are analyzed based on frequency distribution, mode, median, and mean.

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Explanation of Research Respondents

The respondents in this research are participants or alumni of the Civil Servant Candidate (CPNS) Basic Training organized by the Training and Competency Development Center of the National Institute of Public Administration (LAN) in 2022, totaling 34 individuals. The respondents come from various government agencies that send their prospective civil servants to participate in the CPNS Basic Training at the Training and Competency Development Center of the National Institute of Public Administration. The respondents in this study are from the Bandung City Government, Banjarnegara District, and the National Agency of Drug and Food Control (BPOM). These respondents have different educational levels, ranging from diploma, bachelor's, master's, to professional education. The majority of respondents have a background of Bachelor's degree education (52.94%) and Diploma III education (35.29%).

Examining the profile of the research respondents based on their positions or occupations indicates alignment with the origins of their respective institutions. For instance, some respondents occupy roles as doctors or nurses, aligning with their institutional backgrounds in hospitals and Primary Health Care Centers (Puskesmas).

**Table 2.** Job Profile of Research Respondents (N=34)

| No | Position/Job             | Quantity | No | Position/Job                  | Quantity |
|----|--------------------------|----------|----|-------------------------------|----------|
| 1  | First Specialist Doctor  | 3        | 7  | Supervisor of Pharmacy & Food | 3        |
| 2  | Analyst                  | 6        | 8  | Website Manager               | 1        |
| 3  | Pharmacy Assistant       | 2        | 9  | Financial Report Compiler     | 6        |
| 4  | Midwife                  | 5        | 10 | Nurse                         | 2        |
| 5  | Nutritionist             | 1        | 11 | Dental and Oral Therapist     | 1        |
| 6  | First Auditor Specialist | 1        | 12 | Others                        | 3        |

## **3.2 Implementation of with the GROW Approach**

### **3.2.1 The Goal Setting Stage**

The coaching process in the GROW model begins with goal setting. In this research, goal setting is focused on the objectives that participants in the Basic Training aim to achieve through the actualization of basic values learning activities. Respondents were asked for their feedback on the coach's behaviour during the coaching process, particularly regarding questions that assist Basic Training participants in understanding the goals, targets, and objectives they aim to achieve in the implementation and preparation of actualization.

The responses from Basic Training participants indicate that the majority chose the alternative answer "Frequently" (48.53%). This suggests that, according to the respondents, the instructors acting as coaches in the Basic Training, using the GROW model, frequently ask questions that help participants understand the goals they want to achieve in actualization learning, especially related to the actualization design that participants will create. Some respondents even selected the answer "Always," with an average percentage of 19.61%. Notably, none of the respondents chose the alternative response "Never."

The research score for the goal-setting dimension in coaching with the GROW model is 744. When compared with the ideal score, the research score percentage is 72.94%. This percentage falls within the "Good" criteria. This implies that, based on the respondents' perspectives, coaches effectively employ coaching with the GROW model. The coaches are effective in asking questions that encourage Basic Training participants to understand the goals and expectations they aim to achieve through their actualization learning activities.

### **3.2.2 The Reality Stage**

In the reality stage, Basic Training participants were asked for their feedback on whether the instructors, acting as coaches, ask questions that help them understand the conditions and obstacles they face in achieving the goals of actualization learning. The research outcomes reveal that a considerable number of respondents favored the response "Frequently" (47.79%). From these findings, it can be inferred that, in the context of the GROW model, instructors frequently pose questions assisting participants in comprehending their position, achievements, obstacles faced, what has been attained and not yet achieved, and the necessary steps to accomplish the goals of actualization learning. Additionally, a significant number of respondents from Basic Training participants selected the answer "Always" (18.01%). At this stage, no participants chose the alternative response "Never."

The research score for the reality stage indicator in coaching with the GROW model is 975, with a percentage score of 71.69%. This percentage score is obtained after comparing it with the ideal score of 1,360. Based on this percentage score, the reality stage dimension falls into the "Good" category. Therefore, based on the assessment of Basic Training participants, the instructors are effective in conducting the coaching process in a stage that helps participants understand the reality they have or aspire to achieve in reaching their goals.

### **3.2.3 The Options Stage**

In the "Options" stage of coaching, the alternative answer most frequently chosen by Basic Training participants was "Frequently," with an average percentage of 49.41%. Some participants even chose the alternative answer "Always," with a percentage of 19.41%. This indicates that, according to the respondents, instructors acting as coaches frequently and consistently ask questions that help participants comprehend alternative solutions they can undertake in actualization learning, especially solutions related to the planned actualization design. In this dimension, a few participants answered "Never," especially regarding questions about the advantages and disadvantages of the steps participants will take based on the planned actualization design. However, the percentage is very small, specifically 1.18% or 2 individuals out of the total respondents.

Based on the distribution of responses from participants like these, the research score for the "Options" stage dimension is 633. When compared with the ideal score of 850, the research score percentage is 74.47%, falling within the "Good" criteria. Consequently, it can be interpreted that the implementation of coaching with the GROW model in the "Options" stage is well-executed by instructors according to the perspective of Basic Training participants.

### **3.2.4 The Will Stage**

In the final stage of the coaching process with the GROW model, known as the "Will" stage, as previously explained, the instructors acting as coaches guide and assist Basic Training participants in finding and making a commitment to concrete steps or plans to realize the choices they have made in the preparation of actualization. Basic Training participants were also asked the same set of questions as those posed to the instructor respondents, totaling 6 questions. For this stage, participants frequently selected the alternative answer "Frequently," with a percentage of 55.89%. Moreover, 20.59% of Basic Training participants opted the answer "Always." This indicates that, according to the respondents, the instructors acting as coaches frequently and consistently ask them about efforts to help participants take concrete steps to achieve the goals of actualization learning, set a target time to start the steps toward achieving those goals. This includes helping participants understand obstacles and actions to be taken by participants in the steps toward achieving the goals of their actualization design. In this stage, no participants chose the alternative answer "Never."

The research score analysis for the "Will" stage dimension reached a score of 779. When compared with the ideal score of 1,020, the research score percentage is 76.37%. This percentage falls within the "Good" criteria. Therefore, it can be said that the instructors acting as coaches in the "Will" stage indicator in the coaching process with the GROW model have implemented it effectively.

### **3.2.5 Barriers in Coaching Implementation**

The research findings reveal that the implementation of coaching using the GROW approach still encounters various inhibiting factors. Out of 34 respondents from Basic Training participants who completed the questionnaire, 27 individuals (79.41%) stated that they encountered obstacles in the coaching process. Conversely, 7 individuals (20.59%) claimed that

they did not confront any obstacles. The obstacles faced by participants include hindrances arising from the participants themselves, the coach, the coaching process, and the organization of the Basic Training itself. The most frequently mentioned hindrance is related to the limited time and tight schedule for coaching sessions.

Technical obstacles related to virtual/online coaching involve issues related to inadequate internet connectivity. Respondents also highlighted obstacles from the perspective of instructors serving as coaches, particularly concerning differences in perception among coaches when providing input to Basic Training participants as coachees.

### **3.3 Discussion**

The outcomes of the research reveal that coaching, as a learning method in training programs utilizing the GROW model, can be effectively implemented by trainers assigned as coaches. Although the coaching process conducted by trainers in the Basic Training Program was not explicitly identified as the GROW model in practice, the research confirms that the GROW model is indeed utilized by the trainers. Coaching, as a learning method in training programs, requires a well-defined process structure to achieve the desired learning outcomes.

Therefore, coaching techniques are suitable for use as a learning method in this basic training. This is because the learning outcomes of the Actualization training module emphasize not only knowledge but also the participants' ability to create an actualization plan, implement it in the workplace, and ultimately present it in the form of a report before examiners. The experiential learning nature of this learning method undoubtedly requires guidance from trainers by applying coaching concepts.

The coaching process structure considered fitting for this basic training is the GROW model. In this process, the trainer, acting as a coach, plays a significant role in uncovering the potential of participants. This involves setting goals, assessing the reality participants face, and subsequently developing various alternative solutions, as well as creating an action plan to achieve the set goals in actualization learning. However, in practice, the implementation of the GROW model in the coaching process of the Basic Training for Civil Servants (CPNS) faces various inhibiting factors, both from the participants' side and the trainers' side. This is due to the hybrid learning method employed in Basic Training, which combines both online and offline learning, demanding a good quality internet connection.

## **4 Conclusion**

The implementation of coaching using the GROW model has been carried out by trainers assigned as coaches in the actualization learning of the Basic Training for prospective Civil Servants (CPNS). The trainers assigned as coaches in CPNS Basic Training have been effective in applying coaching with the GROW model. Throughout each stage of the model, the coaches have assisted CPNS participants in understanding goals, conditions, alternative options, and commitments to achieving the learning outcomes of actualization.

However, considering the existence of hindering factors during the coaching process using the GROW model, various improvements are needed from LAN as the Competency Development Supervisor, training organizers, trainers, and the participants themselves. These

improvements are crucial to ensuring the effectiveness of the coaching process as a learning method in the training program.

## References

- [1] J. L. Bennett, "Coaching in organizations," 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292798665>
- [2] Michael. Cavanagh, A. (Anthony M. ) Grant, and Travis. Kemp, *Evidence-based coaching. Volume 1, Theory, research and practice from the behavioural sciences*. Australian Academic Press, 2005.
- [3] P. N. C. Utrilla, F. A. Grande, and D. Lorenzo, "The effects of coaching in employees and organizational performance: The Spanish Case," *Intangible Capital*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 166–189, 2015, doi: 10.3926/ic.586.
- [4] S. Szabó, A. Slavić, and N. Berber, "Coaching and its effects on individual and organizational performances in Central and Eastern Europe," *Anali Ekonomskog fakulteta u Subotici*, no. 41, pp. 67–80, 2019, doi: 10.5937/aneksub1941067s.
- [5] R. J. Jones, S. A. Woods, and Y. R. F. Guillaume, "The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching," *J Occup Organ Psychol*, vol. 89, no. 2, pp. 249–277, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1111/joop.12119.
- [6] J. F. Rocereto, S. F. Gupta, and S. L. Rosenberg, "The Influence Of Coaching On Employee Perceptions Of Supervisor Effectiveness And Organizational Policies," 2011.
- [7] N. Bueno and J. Borges-Andrade, "Coaching in organizations: what is the scientific evidence about its effectiveness?," *Praxis Psy*, vol. 22, no. 35, pp. 27–46, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.32995/praxispsy.v22i35.157.
- [8] S. Grover and A. Furnham, "Coaching as a developmental intervention in organisations: A systematic review of its effectiveness and the mechanisms underlying It," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 7. Public Library of Science, Jul. 01, 2016. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0159137.
- [9] C. Pousa and A. Mathieu, "The influence of coaching on employee performance: Results from two international quantitative studies," *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 75–92, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1002/piq.21175.
- [10] G. K. Sidhu and I. Nizam, "Coaching and Employee Performance: The Mediating Effect of Rewards & Recognition in Malaysian Corporate Context," *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 41–72, 2020, [Online]. Available: [www.ijmae.com](http://www.ijmae.com)
- [11] M. Anisur Rahman, "Professional Development in an institution through GROW Model," *Assyfa Learning Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.61650/alj.v1i2.187.
- [12] J. Whitmore, "Coaching for Performance Fourth Edition."
- [13] S. Panchal and P. Riddell, "The GROWS Model: Extending the GROW Coaching Model to Support Behavioural Change."
- [14] N. Nurlia, "Kajian Empiris Peran Pembimbing Sebagai Coach, Mentor Dan Konselor Untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi Peserta dalam Menyusun dan Melaksanakan Aktualisasi (Studi Kasus Pada Pelatihan Dasar CPNS Di BPSDM Aceh)," *Jurnal*

- Wacana Kinerja: Kajian Praktis-Akademis Kinerja dan Administrasi Pelayanan Publik*, vol. 24, no. 2, p. 38, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.31845/jwk.v24i2.699.
- [15] B. Aulia, A. Hudalil, A. K. Banuwa, and A. Wijanarko, "Gambaran Proses Coaching Pelatihan Dasar Calon Pegawai Negeri Sipil (Latsar CPNS) pada Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Daerah Provinsi Lampung," *Jurnal Ilmiah Widya Swara*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 55–66, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.35912/jiw.v1i2.834.
- [16] A. Fatkhur Rohmah, I. Made Sudana, and T. Prihatin, "The Implementation of Coaching and Mentoring on Basic Training For Civil Servant Candidates (CPNS) in Religious Education and Training Center Semarang," *Educational Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 101–109, 2020, [Online]. Available: <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eduman>
- [17] N. M. Amin, "Penerapan Soft Skill Coaching Pada Penyusunan Aktualisasi (Studi Kasus Pada Pelatihan Dasar CPNS Kabupaten Pulau Morotai)," *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 233–247, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.52316/jap.v17i2.78.