

Research & Evaluation Concept Note

Proposed questions, study designs, measures, and ethical protections for independent study.

Proprietary methodology. Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is a proprietary methodology of **Maturity.Coach**.

Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is presented as a framework for inquiry. It invites independent assessment of its **conceptual coherence, feasibility, acceptability, cultural responsiveness, implementation conditions**, and the questions it raises for leadership and relational practice. This concept note orients researchers, universities, and institutions — including those considering the framework for internal coaching with their own staff, and professional bodies evaluating it against coaching competencies and ethics — to how such independent study might proceed.

Evidence status. Evidence is under development. The framework requires independent validation before efficacy claims can be made. Nothing in this note asserts outcomes.

1. Why study this approach?

Four motivations, as stated in the framework's research and evaluation agenda:

- The need to examine relational and community-centered approaches to leadership development.
- The importance of culturally responsive coaching models.
- The opportunity to explore how coaching can attend to the individual, relationships, organisational systems, and long-term leadership impact.
- The need to study both potential benefits *and* potential risks.

The framework requires independent validation before efficacy claims can be made. The questions it offers are starting points for that work — not conclusions.

2. Assessment targets

Independent assessment of Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is invited across five stated targets:

Assessment target	What it examines
Conceptual coherence	Whether the relational premise, the Living Tree Model, and the five dimensions form an internally consistent and defensible construct.
Feasibility	Whether the framework can be delivered as intended within real coaching engagements and institutional settings.
Acceptability	How clients, coaches, and stakeholders experience the approach — including its boundaries and limits.
Cultural responsiveness	Whether the framework's use of wisdom traditions as inspiration (not ownership) holds up under scrutiny, and how it performs across cultural contexts.
Implementation conditions	What conditions — supervision, consent practices, adaptation, context — the framework needs to be used responsibly.

Research questions can be formulated against each target — an acceptability study might ask how clients experience the dimensional inquiries; an implementation study might ask what fidelity and supervision conditions are needed for consistent delivery. Researchers should formulate their own questions; the framework's published question list, where it exists on the site, is the authoritative starting point.

3. Potential study designs

Options, not prescriptions — as offered by the framework's research agenda:

Foundational & conceptual

- Conceptual analysis and expert-panel review
- Participatory design research

Qualitative

- Qualitative interviews and thematic analysis
- Case-study research

Exploratory & pilot

- Feasibility and acceptability pilot studies
- Pre/post exploratory coaching studies

Comparative & mixed

- Mixed-methods studies
- Comparative process studies

Implementation

- Implementation and fidelity research

Longitudinal

- Longitudinal leadership and organisational-learning research

These designs span the maturity spectrum from concept critique to longitudinal fieldwork. Given the framework's early evidence status, feasibility, acceptability, and conceptual studies logically precede efficacy-oriented designs.

4. Suggested measures and data sources

Categories only; no proprietary instruments are named. Selection and validation would be the work of independent researchers:

- Client-reported coaching experience
- Psychological safety and perceived trust
- Relational leadership awareness
- Leadership self-efficacy
- Stakeholder or team feedback, where appropriate and consented
- Sense of belonging and connection
- Leadership stewardship behaviours
- Long-term orientation and legacy reflection
- Organisational climate or culture indicators
- Qualitative narratives, reflective journals, and interviews
- Coach fidelity and supervision notes, de-identified and ethically governed

Several categories map naturally to the framework's own constructs (relational leadership awareness, sense of belonging, stewardship behaviours, legacy reflection), while others (psychological safety, self-efficacy, climate indicators) connect it to established leadership-development literatures. Instrument selection and psychometric validation remain the responsibility of the independent research team.

5. Ethical protections

All research involving Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ would be independently governed and conducted under the following protections, as stated in the framework's research agenda:

Participant protections

- Informed consent
- Confidentiality
- Voluntary community and stakeholder participation
- Data minimisation

Research practice

- Culturally responsive research practices
- Avoidance of extractive research
- Community consultation where relevant
- Institutional review board or ethics review where applicable

Scope & governance

- Clear scope-of-practice boundaries
- Referral pathways to qualified support
- Transparent governance of intellectual property and data ownership

A full notice will describe data ownership, retention, de-identification, and participant rights, and is subject to ethics and legal review before any study begins. A formal framework for this governance appears on the Data Governance page. Community and stakeholder participation is always voluntary and consent-based.

6. For institutions considering internal coaching use

The framework is explicitly **designed to be examined** by leadership-development and organisational partners — leaders and buyers exploring executive coaching, culture, succession, and community-centered change — as well as by professional coaching organisations (standards bodies, credentialing organisations, review panels, educators, and program directors) evaluating the model against professional competencies and ethics.

Institutions considering Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ for internal coaching with their staff should note three boundaries the framework sets for itself:

- **Adaptable, not prescriptive.** Local context, client identity, culture, consent, and professional ethics shape every application, which should be adapted with cultural humility and informed consent.
- **Organisational applications are illustrative.** In the five dimensions, organisational applications are presented as illustrative possibilities — never guaranteed outcomes.
- **Community does not mean surveillance.** The framework's "community" construct never means that community members automatically attend sessions, that a coach may contact family, colleagues, or stakeholders without permission, or that a client must disclose private information. HR, sponsors, and managers hold no automatic window into coaching content.

An institution piloting the framework internally could reasonably pair a feasibility and acceptability design (Section 3) with the participant-protection measures above, establishing before launch what data — if any — the institution will see, consistent with the consent and confidentiality boundaries.

7. Partnership invitation

The framework extends a standing invitation to university labs, professional associations, doctoral researchers, and institutional partners to consider independent, transparent, ethically governed assessment of the framework.

Independent means independent: the framework's own materials state it seeks rigorous assessment, critique, refinement, and evidence development. Studies need not be favourable to be welcome.

8. Scope reminder: what the framework is — and is not

Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is	It is not
A relational, community-centered coaching framework	Therapy or trauma treatment; not psychotherapy
A structured approach to leadership reflection and development	A religious doctrine, ceremonial practice, or spiritual direction
A model for exploring identity, relationships, stewardship, and legacy	A substitute for mental-health care, clinical care, or legal advice
A methodology designed for professional inquiry and responsible adaptation	A substitute for cultural permission or lived expertise; not cultural appropriation
A framework seeking rigorous assessment, critique, and evidence development	A mandate to involve family, community, or colleagues

These boundaries matter for study design: because the framework is not therapy, studies must include referral pathways to qualified support; because it is not a cultural authority, studies must include culturally responsive practices and avoid extractive designs.

Related documentation

This concept note is a secondary orientation document. The framework's own published research and evaluation agenda is the authoritative source for proposed research questions, designs, and measures.

- Research & Evaluation agenda (authoritative source)
- Framework overview
- Five dimensions in detail
- Data Governance
- Intellectual Property & Licensing

© 2026 Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ — a proprietary methodology of Maturity.Coach. This note does not constitute research ethics approval; any study involving human participants must obtain institutional review board or equivalent ethics approval before commencement.