Kingston Business School

Exploration of the application of mindfulness and interpersonal mindfulness in leadership and management development

Emma DONALDSON-FEILDER
CPsychol, MA, MSc, AFBPsS, FAcSS
Student ID no: K 1656283

Kingston Business School
June 2019

Supervised by: Dr Rachel Lewis and Dr Joanna Yarker

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology (DOBPsych)

Acknowledgements

What a journey this Professional Doctorate has been! So many people have helped me along the way and I feel huge gratitude to all of them.

Firstly, to Joanna Yarker and Rachel Lewis, my supervisors, colleagues, research-collaborators and friends, 'thank you' is really not enough to express my enormous gratitude for all that they have provided over the last three years. Joanna and Rachel have been inspiring and supportive, knowledgeable and encouraging. I would never have started the Doctorate, let alone finished it, without their guidance and expertise. I also thank my third supervisor, Lilith Arevshatian, for her insightful comments and helpful input to this work. Thank you too to Samuel Keightley for his support on the quality assessment for my systematic literature review, and to Claire Hardy for reviewing the write-up of my empirical study.

Secondly, I offer great gratitude to all those who participated in my empirical study. The interviewees, in particular, gave extremely generously of their time and provided me with invaluable insights and information in all four phases of the research; and the wider population of people who participated in the questionnaire surveys in phases 2 and 3 also gave a huge amount to the research. The whole study felt like an extremely relational and generous process. I could not have done it without these kind people. I also want to thank the authors of the studies included in my systematic literature review, not only for doing their research, but also for responding to my various enquiries.

Next, I want to thank Gregory Kramer for his genius in creating Insight Dialogue (ID) – an amazing practice that continues to delight, teach and challenge me – and for his personal support and friendship over the years and particularly regarding the Doctorate. Thank you too to Phyllis Hicks and Florence Meleo-Mayer for developing Interpersonal Mindfulness (IM) from the basis of ID and for their enthusiasm and generosity in spreading the word.

Thank you also to my fellow Prof Doc'ers! It feels like the nine of us who have been on the Professional Doctorate journey together since September 2016 have formed personal and professional connections that will last well into the future. As well as enjoying their company, I have felt sustained and held by them through the highs and lows of the doctoral process and am proud to be part of the cohort.

Finally, I want to thank my partner, Malcolm, who has given me endless kindness, wise support and encouragement, acted as a sounding board, and always been there to help me.

May this work be of benefit and reduce suffering.

Abstract

There is a body of literature suggesting that mindfulness or meditation interventions for leaders and managers has/would have a positive impact on leaders' own wellbeing, their leadership capability, and their direct reports. However, no systematic review had previously been conducted examining the benefits of such interventions. The purpose of the first study in this thesis was therefore to systematically review research on mindfulness or meditation interventions for managers and leaders. The review identified 19 studies that met the inclusion criteria. Findings indicate some encouraging signs that mindfulness and meditation interventions may improve aspects of leaders'/managers' wellbeing and resilience, and leadership capability, but research results are very variable in quality and strength, and there was no evidence on benefits for participants' direct reports. The studies reviewed explored a diversity of interventions, but provided little insight into which mindfulness and meditation interventions for managers and leaders are most effective, in what context they are best applied, or for whom they are most suitable. While the sub-set of studies that measured mindfulness found that the interventions used did increase participants' mindfulness, there was no exploration of whether improved mindfulness was the mechanism by which other positive outcomes were achieved.

Given the interpersonal nature of leadership, an interpersonal form of mindfulness has the potential to offer leaders and managers benefits over and above those provided by intrapersonal mindfulness. The second study in this thesis therefore set out to explore the possibility of adapting a particular intervention, Interpersonal Mindfulness (IM), which is based on Insight Dialogue (Kramer 2007), for application in leadership development. As scientist-practitioners, we chose a Delphi research methodology, in order to apply a systematic academic research process to consulting and achieving consensus between expert practitioners in the field, in order to explore the potential application of IM in leadership development. Our aims were: firstly, to create a shared understanding of the necessary components of an IM programme for leadership development; and, secondly, to create guidance for those who might offer such a programme in practice. Through four phases of data gathering and feedback, we achieved consensus between 39 experts on guidance text covering: development of an IM-based leadership development programme, contextual factors that will act as facilitators or barriers, and selection and screening of participants. The intention is that this guidance will impact practice though supporting implementation of coherent, consistent IM-based leadership development, sensitive both to its origins and to the context; and that our methodology and learning support others in impacting the world outside academic research.

Table of contents

Professional practice statement

As an Occupational Psychologist, Chartered with the British Psychological Society and Registered with the Health and Care Professions Council, I am exempt from Part 1 (Professional Practice Portfolio) of this Professional Doctorate. The work in this thesis therefore satisfies the requirements for Part 2 of the doctorate (Research Thesis).

The following provides a summary of my professional practice as context to this thesis.

I completed my MSc in Organisational Psychology at City University in 2001 (graduating in January 2002). In order to work as a trainee Occupational Psychologist specialising in workplace health, wellbeing and stress management, I become self-employed. I built up a portfolio of work including running courses on how managers can manage stress and how organisations can conduct stress risk assessments. Over the following years, I achieved sufficient experience to fulfil the requirements for BPS Chartership in Occupational Psychology, so I submitted my Chartership Logbook in November 2004, and gained entry to the Register of Chartered Psychologists in 2005.

Since 2004-5, I have been working with Joanna Yarker and Rachel Lewis, in collaboration with others, to conduct a series of research projects exploring the manager behaviours that are important for preventing stress, how managers can be supported to develop these skills, and the organisational and other factors that determine the success of such management development. In addition, we have conducted research looking at resilience in the workplace, management competencies for supporting return to work, management competencies for employee engagement, Occupational Safety and Health leadership for distributed workers, cancer in the workplace and other workplace health and wellbeing topics.

Alongside this research, I have also worked on a range of consultancy and training projects, with a focus on workplace health, wellbeing and stress reduction, leadership and management development. I qualified as a coach and coach supervisor and have coached individuals on leadership skills, workplace wellbeing, and career transitions, and supervised coaches and other professionals. In 2008, having had a personal meditation practice for about 10 years, I attended a 'Mindfulness for coaches' course and started integrating mindfulness into my coaching and supervision work. In 2010, I discovered Insight Dialogue (ID), a relational form of meditation in which meditators practice meditative dialogue (as described in my empirical study below) and subsequently learnt to facilitate it. More recently, I trained as a mindfulness teacher, and then as a teacher of Interpersonal Mindfulness (IM, a secular version of ID).

By 2016, the scene was set for me to want to bring these strands of my practice together by undertaking the Professional Doctorate and researching mindfulness, and particularly IM, as a potential leadership and management development mechanism.

Publications and dissemination from this thesis

Peer-reviewed publications

Systematic Literature Review
Donaldson-Feilder, E., Lewis, R. & Yarker, J. (2018/2019). What outcomes have mindfulness and meditation interventions for managers and leaders achieved? A systematic review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 28 (1), 11-29, published online Nov 2018, doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2018.1542379.

I initially submitted this paper to the *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* in February 2018, and resubmitted it following minor amendments from the Editor to ensure anonymity in March 2018. The manuscript was almost entirely my own work: I developed the original idea, conducted the literature searches, sorted the titles, abstracts and full papers, extracted and analysed the data, and created and submitted the draft manuscript. My supervisors also sorted the titles and abstracts, and supported the sorting of the full papers; they also commented and provided suggestions at each stage of the process; I had support from Rebecca Peters in formatting the final manuscript for submission.

In April 2018, the Editor asked us to revise and resubmit the paper and provided extensive comments from two reviewers. I implemented the majority of these revisions; my supervisors provided support and advice on this process and helped with editing the paper to remove repetition; I received support from Samuel Keightley at Kingston Business School in conducting the quality assessment and following up study authors for additional information. I resubmitted the revised version in August 2018.

In October 2018, the Editor provided us with a further set of comments from the two reviewers, following review of the second version. I implemented the majority of these revisions; my supervisors provided support and advice on this process and helped with further editing. I submitted the revised version in late October 2018 and it was accepted for publication immediately. It was published online in November 2018 and in the February 2019 hard copy version of the journal.

Empirical study
Donaldson-Feilder, E., Yarker, J., Lewis, R. & Arevshatian, L. (under review). Interpersonal Mindfulness for leaders: a Delphi Study exploring the application of Interpersonal Mindfulness in leadership and management development. *Mindfulness.*

I submitted this paper to the *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* in February 2019 for the special issue on “Enhancing the Impact of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology”. The manuscript was almost entirely my own work: I developed the original idea, collected and analysed the data, and created and submitted the draft manuscript. My supervisors commented and provided suggestions at each stage of this process; I also sought comments on the final draft from Dr Claire Hardy, who has experience in publishing Delphi Studies.

Peer reviewed conference presentations

Systematic Literature Review
Donaldson-Feilder, E., Lewis, R. & Yarker, J. (2019). Mindfulness and meditation for management and leadership development: a systematic review of the evidence. At the *Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference*, Chester, January 2019.

Empirical study
Donaldson-Feilder, E., Yarker, J., Lewis, R. & Arevshatian, L. (2019). Developing leadership with interpersonal mindfulness. As part of a symposium chaired by Joanna Yarker, entitled *Becoming a pracademic: Using academic approaches to answer burning questions* at the *Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference*, Chester, January 2019.

Other presentations and impact

Initial thinking on this doctoral research was presented under the title '*From mindfulness to interpersonal mindfulness: a potential avenue for leadership development*' at the Affinity Health at Work Research Consortium master-class in December 2016.

The findings of this doctoral research were presented under the title '*Application of interpersonal mindfulness to leadership and management development*' at the Affinity Health at Work Research Consortium master-class in December 2018.

Forthcoming invitations to speak at which this research will be shared are as follows:

- *Interpersonal Mindfulness: a new relational dimension for leaders and practitioners:* a master-class for the Mindfulness in coaching practitioner group in York in May 2019
- *Management and leadership: essential factors for employee health and wellbeing:* a 'State of the Art' presentation at the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology 2019 conference in Turin in May 2019
- *Self-care as CPD:* an invited speaker session at the Henley Coaching Conference in October 2019

Systematic Literature Review

What outcomes have mindfulness and meditation interventions for managers and leaders achieved? A systematic review

(Published version)

As mentioned in the 'Publications and dissemination of this thesis' section above, this paper was published in the *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Issue 28, Volume 1, in February 2019; it was published online in November 2018: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1542379

Listed on the Kingston University Research Repository - http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/42205/

This paper has been removed due to restrictions from the publisher. The webpage for it can be accessed via the link on the previous page.

Empirical Study

Interpersonal Mindfulness for leaders: a Delphi Study exploring the application of Interpersonal Mindfulness in leadership and management development

(Submitted version)

As mentioned in the 'Publications and dissemination of this thesis' section above, this paper was submitted to the *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* in February 2019 for the special issue on "Enhancing the Impact of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology".

Article removed due to publisher restrictions - not yet available online.

Reflective review of the process of undertaking the Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology at Kingston Business School – September 2016 to February 2019

Reflective review of the process of undertaking the Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology at Kingston Business School – September 2016 to February 2019

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Scoping out your research idea and settling into the Prof Doc programme	Did your initial idea change during this stage? If so, how and why? What challenges did you face and how did you overcome them?	I started out on the Prof Doc journey because I identified an area of research that I really wanted to pursue. However, the actual research idea changed considerably over the process of applying for the Prof Doc and the initial months of the Prof Doc programme. The initial idea that started me out on the Prof Doc journey focussed on 'wise leadership' – a concept essentially about applying Interpersonal Mindfulness (IM) to leadership that had emerged from conversations with other practitioners who were interested in the same field as me. When I raised this in a team meeting in in early August 2016, Jo and Rachel's response was that I should do this research as my Prof Doc – and that I needed to get my application in before the end of August! Through discussion with Rachel and Jo during the first half of August 2016, the research idea evolved from being about 'wise leadership' (which was a pretty fuzzy concept and didn't have any research basis) to being more clearly focussed on IM itself. By the time I put in my Prof Doc application form in mid-August, my intention was to explore the application of IM to leadership and leadership development. Within this period, the idea evolved from a three-step research process (involving conceptualising IM, exploring the role of IM for leadership development, and designing an IM intervention for leadership development) into an intention to conduct two studies:

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		1. Conceptualising interpersonal mindfulness – literature review and CIT interviews – aiming to explore the impact of IM practice/what outcomes IM practice generates, In order to develop a conceptual framework of IM outcomes 2. Validating the model/measure of interpersonal mindfulness and linking it to leadership (and/or employee outcomes) – survey questionnaire – aiming to conduct a quantitative exploration of how IM outcomes (from the framework developed in the interview phase) linked to leadership and management models The thinking behind the shift from the initial three-step process to the two research studies was to make it less of a leap (all the way from IM to leadership development) and create a research design that was manageable. However, when it came to scoping out the actual research, it became clear that even the two-part version was too broad. The problem with including both IM and leadership was that IM is a very new construct and currently exists only in the form of an 8-week training intervention protocol and meditation practice. There is no research on IM and only one research study on Insight Dialogue (ID), the Buddhist practice from which it has been developed (the latter is a PhD thesis looking at measures of mindfulness, self-compassion, compassion and wellbeing of participants before and after an ID retreat). As a result, there is no defined construct of IM, no measure of IM and no understanding of the mechanisms through which it might influence behaviour/ outcomes in the workplace. Initially, therefore, Jo's advice was that I would need to focus on IM on its own first, before starting to think

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		about its relationship to leadership and that it would be too much to do all of this in my Prof Doc. This presented quite a challenge for me. Having engaged in the Prof Doc because I wanted to do research on IM and leadership, I was very enthusiastic about my research topic. As well as being really interested in doing the research and seeing the results, I also saw the research as a way of integrating the somewhat disparate parts of my work/career: my thinking was that it would be a way of bringing together Rachel, Jo and my joint work on leadership and management (and the link to employee wellbeing) and my strong interest in IM. Whilst this enthusiasm was beneficial in terms of giving me the motivation and engagement to carry the Prof Doc through, the downside was that it meant that I was quite wedded to including both IM and leadership in my studies. As a result, I found it difficult to let go of the leadership element and struggled to see other options. Through a number of conversations and email exchanges with Jo and Rachel, in December 2016, this challenge was overcome as they proposed the idea of creating an IM protocol for use in the workplace. Given that IM currently exists as a training intervention and meditation practice, the process of creating an IM intervention protocol for a specific application (workplace settings) was more manageable than trying to conduct a full conceptualisation process. Although I was initially unsure about letting go of the conceptualisation process, I was pleased to be back in the domain of applying IM

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		in a practical way and, when the idea evolved through discussion into a research project to create an IM protocol for use in leadership development, the fit to what I wanted to achieve felt good. As the research idea of creating an IM protocol for use in leadership development emerged, I initially thought I would conduct a two-phase research programme, with the second phase being the piloting of the protocol developed in the first phase. When it became clear that we only needed to conduct one empirical research study (together with an SLR) for the Prof Doc, I dropped the second phase of the research plan and focussed the research design on creating an IM protocol. Over this period, I also became clear that I wanted to draw on research Rachel and I had conducted about management development (for employee wellbeing). This research had shown that achieving success in leadership and management development is not just about the intervention methodology, it is also about the context in which the development is taking place and the manager participants. As a result of thinking about this, I chose to expand the research design to capture these ‘context’ and ‘manager’ elements as well as the ‘methodology’. When I submitted an initial draft version of my research design proforma in August 2017, Rachel made a number of valuable challenges on my introduction (and simultaneously on my draft SLR paper). Not only were there quite a lot of concepts and terms that were very familiar to me, for which I needed to get really clear about definitions etc. (see

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		more below), but also the storyline about why I was looking at IM for leadership development was not clear. I had made a number of assumptions about the value of IM for leadership, which I had only mentioned in passing or not mentioned at all. It was really useful for me to get explicit about this and realise how much I was assuming because of my own background and experience (my 'view of the world').
	How did this process differ from your expectations?	This process was much harder than I expected. Despite having been involved in research projects for many years, I found that I was more personally engaged in the development of the research design for the Prof Doc and more attached to the initial ideas I had developed. As explained above, because the research idea had been what had prompted me to take on the Prof Doc, I found the process of morphing the initial ideas into something that was realistic and do-able much more challenging than if I had just been a member of a research team jointly developing a team idea. Another difference between my expectations and reality was around the time commitment and workload. During initial discussions, the suggestion had been that much of the leg-work for my literature review could happen through Affinity Health at Work as we were in the process of conducting a review of the literature on mindfulness in the workplace for our Affinity work health and wellbeing hub. The hope was that this would give me the material I needed for my literature review. However, as the frame for my research and my systematic literature review became clearer, it became obvious that the work for the hub would not be particularly helpful for my Prof Doc needs. At the same

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		time, it also became clear that the systematic review process needed to be all my own work, so getting assistance through Affinity Health at Work would not be appropriate in any case. The issue of time commitment and workload was exacerbated by the fact that, because I had decided to apply for the Prof Doc at the last minute, I had not planned time into my diary for it. For the first 6 months of the Prof Doc programme, I had numerous work and other commitments (including the final parts of a programme to gain a Certificate in the Supervision of Coaches, Mentors and Consultants), which meant that I had very little availability for Prof Doc work. So, at the point where I wanted to be dedicating time to the process of undertaking initial literature searches, reading around the subject and developing my plans, I simply had no time available to do so. I also had under-estimated dramatically the amount of time that the Prof Doc would require. As a result, I was slow getting off the ground and found it frustrating and worrying not to have the diary- or head-space to do what was needed. Once I was clear about how much time I needed to devote to the Prof Doc, the challenge became one of how to balance giving the time to the Prof Doc with earning enough money to pay the bills, whilst also allowing time for personal and family commitments and not getting into a state of overwhelm/overwork that would harm my wellbeing. This was an on-going challenge for the whole period of the Prof Doc. I have found it anxiety-provoking to turn down work, but necessary to do so in order to progress on the Prof Doc

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		and maintain my sanity. From early March 2017, I aimed to set aside about a day per week to work on the Prof Doc (rather less in the first few months, rather more over the summer as I finalised the Systematic Literature Review). As I prepared to conduct the research study, I felt I needed to devote longer periods of time to it in order to immerse myself in data gathering, analysis etc., so the from January 2018, I moved to setting aside about a week per month.
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	While it is invaluable to have a clear idea of aims and reasons for doing research, it is important not to be too attached to the exact process or methodology to be used. Being willing to explore different methodologies and ways of reaching the aim - and to flex plans accordingly - is vital if the aim is to be achieved. It is unlikely that the first proposed plan is going to be the one that works; it will almost certainly be modified through early discussions, exploration of what others have done and reading around the subject. I always think I can do more than is actually possible. It is important to keep research plans simple and not aim to cover too much ground in order to make a research project achievable. Doing a Prof Doc is a very time consuming process! It needs dedicated time and plenty of headspace as well as diary space in which to think through ideas, read the literature and get my own mind clear.

Early stages and adaptation to being on the Prof Doc		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What would you do differently if you were to go through this process again?	Be less set on my research process, but clearer on my aim, so that the discussion about how to achieve the aim has plenty of scope for flex and adaptation. Set aside plenty of time from the beginning to engage with the process, read around the topic and think things through.

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
The systematic review: Developing a protocol	What challenges did you face and how did you overcome them?	Initially, I was trying to find an existing SLR on mindfulness in the workplace in order to model my SLR on it. However, this proved extremely challenging and I spent quite a bit of time fruitlessly searching and contacting people. Ironically, Jamieson and Tuckey's SLR reviewing mindfulness interventions for employee health and wellbeing appeared in JOHP April 2017 edition, by when I had already finalised my SLR protocol and done my searches. In the end I used the Robertson et al (2015) SLR on resilience interventions as a model for my approach. My first draft SLR protocol included too many search terms and too many databases. It became clear from conversations with Jo and Rachel that I was being over-ambitious (again) and needed to trim back the number of searches and search terms and to have clearer exclusion criteria. I trimmed down the search terms further still as a result of meeting with Robert Elves, the Library services person who supported us on managing the search processes and using the database search technology.
	How did you come to a decision on the keywords, databases and inclusion/exclusion criteria to use?	Once the topic for the SLR was decided, the process of coming up with key words was fairly straightforward (though I was initially over-ambitious – see above). Choosing the databases was also fairly straightforward: essentially, I went for the databases that I had seen commonly used in other SLRs (ones that I had read about and ones for which I had been part of the project team). Inclusion and exclusion criteria needed a bit more thought and discussion – they went through several iterations of refining, clarifying and

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		expanding. At first, I came up with mainly inclusion criteria and Jo and Rachel helped me add exclusion criteria.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	Actually, this process was quite straightforward – perhaps more straightforward than I had expected. The proforma Rachel and Jo provided set out what was needed very clearly: the headings and prompts/questions led me through it step by step and really simplified it (thank you, Jo and Rachel!) In addition, the articles and examples provided in the dropbox made the content needed clear (thank you again, Jo and Rachel!)
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Keep it simple. Follow the proformas provided!
	What would you do differently if you were to go about developing a protocol again?	Limit the number of search terms and databases included.
The systematic review: Conducting searches	What challenges did you face and how did you overcome them?	The technology: I found it a real headache to find my way around the search engines and databases – just knowing which boxes to tick, buttons to click and where to go was challenging. When I first tried doing the searches, I found it almost impossible to know what to do. Sitting down with the university library staff and going through the process of doing the first search together made an enormous difference (thank you Robert Elves

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		and Chris Manning!) It also helped me refine my search terms still further to create a systematic search that was realistic and did not generate too many irrelevant references – or not as many as it might otherwise! The technology also proved problematic in terms of transferring the references to Ref Works, downloading them from Ref Works; for example, I had so many references identified in one particular database that they wouldn't transfer across in one go, so I had to do them page by page, which took ages. The process of de-duplication in RefWorks was also anything but straightforward. I again got help and advice from the library staff (thank you again, Robert Elves and Chris Manning!) I conducted the searches in two different ways: initially I did 12 separate searches using each of the three databases, separating out the search terms; then I just put all the search terms in in one go, using OR to combine them. For some reason, the full search including all the terms came up with more references than the 12 separate searches (2088 for the former vs 1777 for the later after deduplication). The initial 12 searches were probably a waste of time, but did at least help me to be familiar with the searching process. However, having two separate search results led to problems at the sifting stage as Rachel did title sifting on one list and I did title sifting on the other. This meant that it was a bigger job to compare and combine our two title lists in order to clarify discrepancies; I was also a bit nervous that there might have been titles on the list

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Rachel used that weren't on the list I used. We certainly ended up with rather different lists of titles (we had 76 titles that were on both lists, 81 that were on Rachel's but not on mine and 153 that were on mine but not Rachel's). We ended up using all 310 of these references for the abstract sift, rather than trying to weed out discrepancies at title sifting stage. In the end, we assumed that all 1777 references on the list generated by the separate searches were included in the 2088 on the list generated by the full search. The next challenge was in obtaining the full papers for the references that were retained after the abstract sift. Quite a few of the papers turned out to be PhD dissertations, which were hard to obtain, so I needed a lot of help from the interlibrary loan team at the university library. Other references turned out to be conference abstracts, so I had to contact the author to get the details. Overall, the process of getting full papers was much slower and more arduous than I expected. However, I managed to get all the papers in the end through a systematic process of recording which references I had obtained, which ones I needed to contact the author, which ones were inter-library loans, etc. and plugging away at it. Once I was reviewing the full papers, some of the decisions about which ones to keep in and leave out were straightforward, but some of them were a real challenge. Quite a few of the papers were borderline and I went through the whole process of data extraction

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		before being able to decide whether to retain them or not. As a number of these were PhD theses, this was time consuming. The inclusion of PhD theses was challenging for a number of reasons, from obtaining a copy, to reading the enormous documents, to determining the quality of the research. However, because 6 of the 16 papers eventually included in my SLR we PhDs, I would have been excluding a high proportion of the studies had I left them out. The ideal would have been to include only papers that appeared in peer-reviewed journals, but that would have left me with only seven studies (other studies were conference papers and business school reports, not peer-reviewed journal articles).
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	While the conceptual process was simple, the reality of the using the search technology was a nightmare. In the past, I have been involved as part of a team conducting an SLR (on distributed workers, cancer at work etc) but I had not had to do the nitty gritty of using the databases, obtaining the papers etc. Each step of the way took much longer and was much more complicated than I expected, mostly not because of the references/papers themselves, but because of logistical aspects, such as database technology, obtaining papers etc.

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Dealing with so many PhD theses was also unexpected and made the process more complicated and time consuming than I had foreseen.
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Technology is a nightmare! While understanding the process required for an SLR is straightforward, actually conducting the process is not! I have deeper respect for those who have published SLRs. Get help from the experts. The university library staff, who are dealing with these issues all the time, are well placed to help and were incredibly friendly, supportive and good at advising me. Conducting an SLR is much more time-consuming than it would appear from the write-up. It is also much more subjective than it appears: decisions about which papers to retain are not always easy, while some are obviously in or out, for others it is a matter of opinion as to whether they should be retained.
	What would you do differently if you were to go about conducting systematic searches again?	Simplify! Just do one single search (for each database), putting all the search terms in together with appropriate (), OR and AND. This would have avoided having two different lists and all the problems that created.

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
The systematic review: Assimilation and write up	How did you come to a decision on the way to cluster the data and tell the story? How did you make the choice of target journal?	A real turning point for me was when, at the March 2017 face-to-face session we reviewed a range of SLR papers to identify what worked and didn't work. This led to me choosing the Robertson et al (2015) paper as a model for my own SLR, which made things enormously easier. When it came to shaping my own SLR, I could use a very similar format, headings and approach to the one they had used. I chose the journal to target for publishing the SLR some time after I had submitted the SLR paper for the Kingston University upgrade process. At that point, I listed out all the journals in which the individual papers included in my SLR had been published and reviewed the publisher's web-pages for each. Based on the overview, scope and guidance for authors for each journal, I divided the 7 journals into three categories: most likely to be worth pursuing; worth considering but less likely; and probably not worth considering. I added a few ideas of my own to the list (the journal that had published the SLR on which mine was modelled, and another I knew of) and sent the full list to Jo and Rachel, providing web-links to each journal. They agreed with going for the first one on my list, though plans changed when we moved towards submission (see below).
	What challenges did you face and how did you overcome them?	While I had created quite an extensive spreadsheet in my initial data extraction process, when it came to actually writing up the findings from the synthesis and assimilation process, I found that there was not nearly enough information in the initial extraction database to give me what I needed to draw conclusions and do the write-up. As a result,

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		I found myself regularly having to go back to the source papers for further details. This was particularly painful for the PhD theses because the documents were so long, idiosyncratic and difficult to navigate. When I submitted an initial draft version of the SLR paper, Rachel made a number of valuable challenges on my introduction (and simultaneously on my research design proforma). There were quite a lot of concepts and terms that were very familiar to me and that I used regularly in my work/life, but had never had to define or examine scientifically. The challenges from Rachel forced me to get really clear what I meant by these concepts, how they were defined, how others used them and had researched them, all of which was extremely helpful in helping me get my head straight and uncovering my assumptions. Rachel provided further valuable challenges when it came to refining and finalising my results and discussion sections. Receiving her comments on two iterations of draft versions helped me develop a much more precise perspective and expression of what the findings and implications of the literature review were.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	There was one disappointing difference: I had intended to do a quality review of the papers but, despite two iterations/attempts at doing this, I eventually decided to drop it. Because many of the papers in my SLR were qualitative, it was not possible to do a

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		quality assessment along the lines of that used in many of the exemplar papers, so we looked for a quality review process designed for qualitative studies and found Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis and Dillon (2003). However, this proved a pretty complex and detailed approach, which was not realistic to do for the papers in my SLR. Next, I tried a simplified version, taking criteria from Briner and Denyer (2012) but that proved too subjective and difficult to make judgements. Due to lack of time before the deadline, at this point, I decided to leave out any quality assessment (though I eventually added one in at revise and resubmit stage – see below). There was one really positive difference: As well as reading the papers selected through the SLR process, I also found a number of extremely helpful conceptual papers that were not suitable for inclusion, but were relevant. I spent time over the summer reading these papers and found they really expanded my thinking around the benefits of mindfulness for leadership, and particularly in terms of ways of thinking, levels of consciousness, post-conventional leadership etc. This really helped me frame my SLR in the broader context. It gave me greater enthusiasm for the research and re-ignited my motivation and sense of purpose around doing the Prof Doc. I feel that my own level of awareness has expanded as a result of engaging and immersing in the field. While one of my aims for the Prof Doc was about bringing together disparate parts of my work/career (see above), the degree of personal/professional development that it has provided is more profound and valuable than I had expected.

Systematic literature review		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Having an example SLR (Robertson et al, 2015) that gave me a framework on which to base my approach was enormously helpful. It is definitely worth identifying a good existing SLR that has a similar aim and target and using it as a template.
	What would you do differently if you were to go about writing up again?	Extract more data at the start so don't have to keep going back to the source papers. Avoid including PhDs if possible because they are so long, idiosyncratic and of varying quality.

Bridge from SLR to research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Bridging from the SLR to the research study design	How did your SLR provide the basis for your study?	The SLR gave some encouraging evidence that mindfulness and meditation interventions for leaders and managers may improve aspects of their wellbeing and resilience, and leadership capability, possibly including their 'post-conventional' leadership capabilities. However, most mindfulness and meditation approaches are intra-personal and involve solitary practices. Given that so much of a leader/manager's role is about dealing with people and relational processes, adding an interpersonal element to the mindfulness/meditation intervention could potentially add even more value in the context of leadership and management development than intra-personal mindfulness or meditation (see more below) – hence the interest in Interpersonal Mindfulness (IM). However, the SLR also showed that research so far conducted has explored a diversity of different interventions with different intended outcomes, and provided little or no insight into the most appropriate design of mindfulness and meditation interventions for managers and leaders, in what context they are best applied, or for whom they are most suitable. Given that Rachel and my research suggests that that all three factors (intervention design/methodology, organisational context and manager participants) are vital to the success of management and leadership development (at least when the aim is to enhance employee wellbeing) there could be considerable benefit in exploring these intervention methodology/design, context and participant considerations in more depth.

Bridge from SLR to research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	How is your research unique and what will it add to the literature base?	1. There is currently no research exploring IM as an intervention or IM as a potential contributor to management and leadership development. 2. There is currently no research looking at intervention methodology/design, context and participant considerations when it comes to applying mindfulness and meditation to leadership and management development.
	From your SLR, what information regarding methods have you considered in the design of your study? What methods predominated? Were they the most appropriate? What was missing? Samples?	The papers in my SLR were all intervention studies, considering a particular mindfulness or meditation intervention for leaders/managers. They were a mixture of qualitative and quantitative designs, with a number of them using both quant and qual data to examine the effectiveness of the intervention being considered. The quality of the studies was very variable, and there was also a huge variety in the number of participants, the use of and effective measurement of control and comparison groups, the degree to which significance and effect sizes were considered. Review of these studies made it clear that it is important to have more clarity and agreement about intervention format, so that there is a shared understanding of the components of an intervention and research can compare like with like. The aim of my research was to develop shared understanding of the components of an IM intervention for leadership and management.
	What has and hasn't been explored before empirically? Why might	The number of studies of applying mindfulness and meditation to leadership/management development is small. Even within that small number of studies, there has been little or no exploration or coverage given to understanding what are the

Bridge from SLR to research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	that be? What are the limitations of the existing literature? Why are you in a position to explore these gaps?	key elements of the intervention being used or how a mindfulness/meditation intervention needs to be adapted to be run for leaders and managers. It would appear from what is written in these papers that mindfulness interventions that were originally designed for general populations have been either used as they are or adapted by the addition of informational/discursive elements that link to leadership; presumably, there was some discussion of how the intervention should be designed and implemented in each of the studies, but this is not examined in the write-ups/papers. None of the papers looked at what mediated the changes in outcome measures that were associated with participation in the intervention. In other words, even where the study included a measure of mindfulness (and less than half did) it did not look at whether an increase in mindfulness (or other equivalent variable in the case of interventions that were not mindfulness-focussed) was the mechanism by which changes in other variables (leadership capabilities or wellbeing/resilience) were achieved. There was also, as mentioned above, little or no insight given in the papers into the context in which these interventions are best applied, or for whom they are most suitable. IM is in a formative stage of development and has not yet been used in a leadership/management development context. This makes it new and fertile ground for

Bridge from SLR to research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		designing something with care and thought. I am in a position to explore these issues for IM because I have a good understanding of both IM/ID and leadership/management development.
	What alternative conclusions could you have drawn from your SLR in terms of opportunities for further research? Why didn't you conclude this?	There are numerous different routes in which research could go, based on the findings in my SLR. Probably the obvious routes would be to explore mindfulness and meditation interventions for leaders/leadership in more detail. For example: • More rigorous controlled intervention studies with better quality measures and statistical analysis that… ○ Use consistent and high quality measures of outcomes ○ Look at outcomes for those being led and managed by the intervention participants ○ Look in more depth at 'post conventional' leadership capabilities ○ Compare different types of mindfulness and meditation interventions to see if some are more effective than others ○ Explore the 'home practice' element of these interventions more explicitly and rigorously

Bridge from SLR to research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		◦ Look at mediators and mechanisms by which the intervention achieves any outcomes ◦ Look at contextual and participant characteristics as well as the intervention itself • Studies of how to adapt mindfulness and meditation interventions for leadership/management development (as compared with a general population) • Studies exploring the contextual factors and/or participant characteristics that influence the effectiveness, acceptability, attractiveness etc of these interventions My research project builds on the SLR in as much as the papers in the SLR showed some encouraging evidence that mindfulness and meditation could be useful for leadership/management development and that more research is needed to understand what kind of adaptations are needed to make mindfulness and meditation effective, acceptable, attractive etc for leadership/management development – and more research is needed to understand the contextual factors and participant characteristics that influence this. However, rather than continue the exploration of intrapersonal mindfulness and meditation, I have chosen to focus on IM, which is a new form of mindfulness/meditation intervention that has not yet received any research attention, let alone research looking at its application to leadership/management development. I am particularly interested in

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Bridge from SLR to research study design</th></tr>
<tr><th>Stage</th><th>Questions</th><th>Reflections</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>looking at IM because I believe it has greater value to add in the leadership/ management development context than intra-personal meditation/mindfulness: IM has the potential to offer both the value that mindfulness and meditation bring and additional benefits in terms of developing leaders' and managers' relationship/ interpersonal capacities and wisdom/ understanding. In particular:
• IM is involves practising in dyads and small groups, which means that it involves an opportunity for leaders and managers to practise mindfulness/ meditation in circumstances that are closer to their real-life situations – i.e. while communicating and in relationships with others – and therefore it is the potentially easier for leader participants to integrate the approach and learning from the practice into their leadership role.
• Through the mindful contemplations that IM involves, participants explore fundamental aspects of being human and being in relationship with other human beings: this combination of meditating in relationship on existential issues offers the opportunity for wisdom and insight/ understanding to arise in an experiential way, observed and shared in a mindful interpersonal situation.</td></tr>
</table>

Submitting SLR to a peer reviewed journal (EJWOP)		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Initial submission	Process and learning?	I was a bit slow off the mark in getting my head round where I should be submitting my SLR, which delayed it getting reviewed and prepared for submission. However, once I put my mind to it, it was fairly straightforward to identify relevant journals (those that had published papers within my SLR, those I would have liked to submit to… see above) Jo and Rachel reined in my aspirations to the high impact factor journals and suggested that I should go for Journal of Managerial Psychology. However, once we came to prepare the manuscript, we identified that there was a word count limit for this journal, so we had to think again and Jo and Rachel suggested *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* (EJWOP). I was happy to be guided by them on this and the fact that Kevin Daniels is the editor of EJWOP seemed a positive. The exchanges with Rebecca, who helped with preparing the manuscript for submission, were easy and reassuring. None of her suggested amends were major, so it didn't take too much time or brain-space to deal with them. The process of submitting the manuscript online was a bit of a headache, purely because it was all unfamiliar, time-consuming and slightly nerve-wracking in terms of worries about getting some silly administrative thing wrong and invalidating my submission. A couple of things were unclear too – e.g. whether to submit a version with both coversheet and contents as well as the two separately, or whether just to provide the two separately.

Submitting SLR to a peer reviewed journal (EJWOP)		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Kevin came back pretty quickly having identified a couple of points where the manuscript gave away or might have given away the identity of the authors, plus a strong suggestion to include reference to a previous EJWOP SLR on mindfulness interventions. These were fairly easily remedied, and the resubmission was fairly straightforward once I had figured out that I needed to submit it from scratch. It was a bit annoying to have to retype in all the information in the form that I had been so painstaking about the first time round. What I would do differently next time: - Check with Megan Reitz the name of the journal to which she and Michael have submitted their study as I remembered too late that she said it was doing a special issue, which might have been relevant - Keep a PDF of all the pages of my submission, so that is would have been easy to copy across the entries to the form when I had to restart the submission from scratch
Revise and resubmit	Process and learning?	The paper came back with a revise and resubmit, which initially seemed positive. However, my first attempt at implementing the revisions was deeply dispiriting because there were so many and they were so complex. Just drawing up the table to list out all the revisions and our responses took ages.

Submitting SLR to a peer reviewed journal (EJWOP)		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Once I had a little more time and got on with the revisions, I managed to get a lot done and could see the positive intent of the reviewers more clearly, which made it feel more affirmative and more achievable. However, by the time I had spent four full days on revising the paper and could see I still had a long way to go, I started to get downhearted again and wondered whether it was worth the grief. In the end, with support from Jo and Rachel, plus Sam helping with the quality review (a strong recommendation from Kevin, as editor, so we had another go at it…) and a lot more days of work from me (the process took about 12 days of my time in total), I managed to resubmit a substantially improved version of the paper. What I would do differently next time: • Brace myself emotionally for the ups and downs of the revise and resubmit process – knowing that it is a grind and likely to be soul-destroying would have made it rather easier to handle. • Take a more interpretive approach to my results write up from the start – put more of the results into a table and leave the text part to focus on overviews, comparisons between studies etc. • Do a quality assessment and create evidence statements with grading for each statement from the start.

Submitting SLR to a peer reviewed journal (EJWOP)		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Further revisions and resubmission	Process and learning?	It was a great relief to hear that the reviewers recognised that the paper had improved and that the further revisions were not too substantial. It still took quite some hours to work through them all. However, the acceptance email from EJWOP made it all seem worthwhile!

Research proposal and development of final research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Design	How did you come to a decision on the study/studies you were going to undertake? Why have you chosen this study design? Why did you decide to use the particular methodology/ analytical process?	As described above, the first few months of the Prof Doc involved quite a struggle to come up with a research design that fitted my intention for the Prof Doc, while at the same time being a feasible piece of research. Through a process of discussion and exploration with Jo and Rachel, we eventually grounded a plan to create an IM protocol for use in leadership development, while also exploring the context in which the development is taking place and the manager participants. The addition of the context and participant factors was based on our own research that showed that these two were important, as well as methodology, and on a presentation by Ray Randall that also suggested the importance of these three levels of exploration in process evaluation. In my initial research proposal in early August 2017, I had proposed that the whole research design be based on interviews, but Rachel pointed out that there needed to be some checking back with interview participants to ensure that the outputs that emerged from the research were based on a consensus between participants rather than just a process of me being the arbitrator of the content. This led me to shift my design/methodology to a Delphi study approach. Delphi studies are designed to bring together the views of 'experts' in the field to create a consensus on a particular output. At my research proposal stage, I was proposing to interview four different participant groups (IM/ID teachers and practitioners; mindfulness in the workplace teachers, particularly those teaching Mindful Leadership; leadership development professionals; and

Research proposal and development of final research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		managers/leaders). However, when I conducted a review of Delphi study papers to see what methodologies, participant numbers etc. had been used, I found that all the Delphi studies I read had fairly homogeneous participant groups of experts. Given the nature of my research content, Rachel and I came to the conclusion that all my research participants needed to be expert in IM/ID and also needed to have an understanding of organisations and/or leadership and management development. In order to review appropriate Delphi studies, I searched for papers in which the content/output of the research was aligned to what my research was looking at – i.e. interventions and/or guidance. For the 5 that most closely matched what I was hoping to do, I listed out the details of how many phases they used, how many participants, how the data was gathered and whether it was qualitative or quantitative data for each. This helped me compare and contrast the different approaches taken and which would be most appropriate for me to adopt. One of the papers that most closely mirrored my research aims was by Skirton et al (2013), who conducted a Delphi study to determine the European core curriculum for Master programmes in genetic counselling. The similarities were that it was about designing content for an intervention (Master programmes) in quite a specialist area in which there would be a limited number of experts. I have therefore chosen to model my methodology on the Skirton et al (2013) paper.

Research proposal and development of final research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Skirton et al (2013) used a four-phase research design in which the initial and 4th/final phases were workshops with a small expert group, and the 2nd and 3rd phases used a survey sent out to a wider group. This combination of small and large expert groups worked well for my context; however, I chose to do interviews for the first phase because my expert group were so geographically dispersed that it would not be possible to get them all together in one place and gathering their views separately seemed acceptable in this first phase stage as there is not a need for agreement/consensus until later in the process. For the final phase, where consensus is important, it was be more important to bring people together, though this needed to be through online technology as it was still not be possible to get them into a single physical location. The great value of the Skirton et al (2013) approach is that it allows an initial gathering of diverse views through the first two phases (interviews with small group, then qualitative survey with larger group), followed by a coming to consensus through the second two phases (quantitative survey with larger group, then workshop with small group).
	What other design could you have chosen to answer your question and why was yours more appropriate? Please consider at least two	I could have gone straight into testing out a pilot intervention, perhaps, or compared a number of different interventions. However, because IM is such a new approach to meditation/mindfulness and has never been used in leadership/management development, there would be no evidence on which to base the intervention design, so it would be a shot in the dark and unlikely to yield a good intervention.

Research proposal and development of final research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	alternatives and describe why you haven’t progressed with these.	Another possibility would have been, as initially proposed, to do a straight qualitative study with different participants – or even with a homogeneous group of experts. However, this would not allow a consensus-reaching process and would result in me being the final arbiter of what content should be included in the final outputs, whereas the Delphi study allows me to produce outputs on which a group of experts have reached consensus.
	What challenges did you face in the design process and how did you overcome them?	I found it challenging to let go of my initial idea of interviewing four different categories of participant (IM/ID teachers and practitioners, mindfulness in the workplace teachers, particularly those teaching Mindful Leadership, leadership development professionals, and managers/leaders). I had been keen to hear all the different views. However, doing a Delphi study meant that the research participants needed to be expert in the topic, and it was clear that the last three categories of participant were not sufficiently expert in IM/ID to be able to comment on it as an intervention.
	What are the limitations of your study design?	Not getting other views – for example, leadership development experts and potential leader/manager participants.
	How did you choose your recruitment strategy and why? What are the	Given that my participants needed to have an understanding both of IM/ID and of organisations and/or leadership development, there was a very small group of people who could be involved. Many of these people I know personally already, having been on

Research proposal and development of final research study design		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	limitations of this approach?	teacher trainings, retreats etc with them, others I know of and were recommended by those I do know. The limitation is that it is a pretty homogeneous group of people, who may not provide the diversity of perspectives that would be ideal to design the outputs I want to produce.
	How did you choose the number and type of participants and why is that appropriate?	Essentially, I worked from the Skirton et al (2013) paper, and other previous Delphi studies, to evaluate how many participants I needed. I also took a pragmatic view of the number of people I knew who had both an understanding of ID/IM and of organisations and/or leadership. Given that the Skirton et al (2013) paper was also about designing the content for an intervention in a specialised area, this seems like a suitable approach and the other Delphi studies supported the population sizes I chose.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	I didn't realise that the design would change so much – not just in the early stages of scoping as described in the first section, but also continuing to evolve even after I had completed the research proposal proforma
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Find a paper on which to model your design!

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Gathering data	How did you go about gathering data and accessing participants? Why did you choose this route?	This phase was interviews with a small group (aiming for 6-8 people) who have particularly strong expertise in the relevant fields – i.e. IM/ID and organisations and/or leadership. I chose 9 people who I felt had the requisite expertise and discussed the list with one of these experts to check that my perspective on who to choose was the valid one. I then contacted all 9 of them; one person said it was not the right time for him, but the other 8 were willing to schedule interviews. I used the online meeting platform Zoom to conduct the interviews, which allows easy audio and video recording. This route allowed me to access appropriate participants who were most likely to be willing to be involved in the research as I knew them personally.
	What challenges did you face when gathering data/accessing participants and how did you overcome them?	The interviews were longer than I expected: I had estimated that they would take 30-60 minutes, but it turned out that almost all of them were longer than 60mins. This meant that I had to check in with interviewees around the 60mins mark to be sure that they could give the additional time. One of my interviewees mentioned that there are other forms of IM that are not based on ID. This threw me initially as I was not aware of these. It meant that that interview was slightly awkward at the beginning, but I managed to get it back on track and it helped me clarify that I am looking at IM as based on ID, not other forms of IM. I have subsequently asked her for details of these other IM theories/approaches/interventions.

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	The main thing that was different is that it became very clear as I conducted the interviews that the data would not provide details of exactly what the intervention should look like. Participants all seemed to have different ideas about how many sessions there should be, how long they should be, at what frequency etc. and many participants said that the format would depend on the context, organisation and participants. So I needed to drop the intention that the outcome will be a protocol for a pilot IM/ID leadership development programme. This was a bit of a disappointment as it means I will not progress the field as far as I would like. However, the data allows me to produce a set of guidelines for developing IM/ID to a leadership development setting, including an important early step of doing that organisational data-gathering, and it is clear that that response to the context is vital in order to ensure that the intervention is appropriate to the context in which it is offered (as well as being sensitive to the origins of IM/ID).
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	How different people's perspectives can be depending on their background and approach. Even their understanding of the questions was different, let alone how they responded – some asked me lots of questions to understand the terms/concepts I used, while others just dived in based on their own understanding. How easy it is to record interviews on Zoom!

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	I would like to have understood what other IM approaches there are out there, both so as not to have been thrown by that in the interview and also to give me a better sense of grounding in the field. I gained this by further literature reviews at write-up stage. Perhaps I could have gone in with some options for format (number, duration, and frequency of sessions) and taken a poll on that, but I think the 'it depends' finding is an important one – accessibility/acceptability in the particular context is all-important for success of these kinds of interventions.
Research Study: Analysing data	How did you go about analysing your data? Why did you choose this route?	I got all my interview audio files transcribed, uploaded them into NVivo and undertook a thematic analysis, in which I: • Created codes/themes from first transcript • Applied the codes/themes from the first transcript to those in the second transcript and continued to add new codes/themes from the second transcript • Applied the codes/themes from the first two transcripts to the third transcript and continued to add new codes/themes – and so on until I had coded all the transcripts • As I worked through the transcripts, I moved the codes/themes around into hierarchies and groups – every so often, I stopped coding to review these and made alterations informed by the data so far

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		• The only frame I imposed on the data was the one of dividing it into 3 buckets in line with my intended outcomes and frame of thinking: 1. Programme; 2. Context; 3 Participants. At one point, I thought that the data suggested a 4th bucket, that of Programme facilitator; however, when I reviewed the data after it was all coded, it was clear that there was not a huge amount of data in this 4th theme, so I included it as a sub-theme under 'Programme'. I also created a bucket for 'useful quotes' with an eye to using these in the final version of the outputs. All the other themes within these 3 buckets were created inductively from the data. • Once all the data had been coded, I reviewed the theme structure and the amount of data in each and moved the themes around – merging themes where there was only limited data and creating a structure that made sense. • Once I was happy with the emerging thematic structure, I started to write it up in the form of the 3 outputs (guidance on programme design; checklist for context; guidance on participants). As I did this, it became clear that some of the themes could be merged and some needed moving around. I made these changes in the Word document and in the NVivo file I chose thematic analysis rather than content analysis as there was no pre-existing theory on which to base a code book – the codes needed to be deduced from the data. I chose thematic analysis rather than IPA or any of the more intensive qualitative analysis approaches because I needed to come up with outputs that reflected the data while also

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		being applicable in other situations. As this is the first stage of a Delphi study, the cross-checking of the themes and accuracy of the outputs will be reviewed an tested in subsequent rounds of the research, so I did not conduct inter-rater reliability tests or bring in an outside reviewer of the coding I used.
	What challenges did you face when analysing your data and how did you overcome them?	There was a huge amount of data, which generated a lot of coded material, which proved problematic in terms of generating a manageable survey for phase 2 of the Delphi study – see more below. There was considerable overlap between themes – particularly within the programme design bucket, so the thematic hierarchies and groupings needed quite a bit of moving and re-ordering as further data was coded, then when I reviewed the themes, and again when I drew up the draft outputs. Creating the draft outputs was extremely helpful in terms of getting practical and reviewing all the data in the light of its purpose for steering others (and myself) who might want to use it to create a real-world programme. Initially, I found getting to grips with NVivo a little challenging – never having used it before and because Kingston Uni did not provide a Mac version of the software (only Windows) so it appeared that I would need to use it through the Kingston mydesktopanywhere online interface. But luckily we had a face-to-face Prof Doc session at just the right moment at which Rachel suggested looking for a free trial option. Once I

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		had downloaded a trial of the Mac version, it became much easier as I was more familiar with the interface and fairly quickly familiarised myself with the programme itself. In addition, I struggled a bit with understanding the analysis approach (thematic vs content analysis) and feeling that I didn't have enough time to do all the reading I needed to do in order to have that clear. However, I read a few key references and gave me enough to go on. I would have loved to have had more time to immerse myself in the relevant literature, but had to make do with the key points. Finally, as mentioned, it became clear from the interview data that it would not be possible to develop an actual intervention protocol from the data that emerged. Instead, the data would allow the development of guidance on how to develop an intervention/programme. The actual programme itself would depend enormously on the context in which it was to be applied, so it would not be appropriate to define a programme for all contexts, so this flexibility is important – and a useful finding from the research.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	In many ways, it was less that the process differed from my expectations and more that my expectations were very fuzzy and unclear, so the process emerged as I went along.

Research study – phase 1		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Lots of learning about how to use NVivo and about thematic analysis. Also, Lilith (my 3rd Supervisor) provided me with a useful reference about combining Delphi and Participative Action Research, which was food for thought around the degree to which Delphi leads to a reductionist perspective on the data. I am aware that, while I wanted to keep in all the richness of the data, I also needed to reduce it sufficiently to create a reasonably sized survey questionnaire for phase 2.
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Start with NVivo for Mac. Read up more about thematic analysis. Possibly look for some theoretical basis to create a code book and do content analysis, though the newness of IM makes it difficult to think where that might have come from.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Gathering data	How did you go about gathering data and accessing participants? Why did you choose this route?	Data gathering: was through a survey questionnaire in Qualtrics. This was still the expansive stage of my Delphi study, in which I was looking to bring in views from a wider group of participants. So, I used a combined quantitative and qualitative survey with a wider group of experts. I created a survey in Qualtrics based on the draft outputs drawn up in phase 1. Participants: as for the interviews, the pool of experts in this field is pretty small and I know many of them personally. I drew up an initial list of participants, based on people I knew, people who had attended the two IM teacher training retreats and people from recent ID retreats. I then sought the advice of my interviewees on people they would recommend for the survey phase and put a call out on the IM teachers social media platform. In the end, I identified 46 participants, including the 8 interviewees. I chose this route in keeping with the Delphi method and in light of the need for experts.
	What challenges did you face when gathering data/accessing participants and how did you overcome them?	The key challenge was that the outputs from phase 1 were much longer than the content in my model paper (Skirton et al, 2013). The latter came up with only 109 statements of what should go into a curriculum, where as my initial data analysis produced one nine-page and two three-page documents, made up of hundreds of statements about the programme, context and participants for an IM-based leadership development programme.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Initially, I created a Qualtrics survey that proposed participants download the sections of the document and asked two quantitative questions (agreement/disagreement and usefulness) and one qualitative question (comments/additions/amendments) about each section. However, it was clear to me and fed back to my by my Supervisors that this was not appropriate as there would be too much content relating to each question, so it would not be possible to know which bits respondents agreed/disagreed with and what they found useful. As a result, I conducted a further analysis, this time working with the coding from the first analysis and the frequencies to conduct a light-touch content analysis and reduce the volume down to a manageable number of themes with which to create a survey. I then put these themes into Qualtrics and used a Likert scale for agreement/disagreement. However, as Rachel pointed out, even this would not have generated useful data as it would be likely that respondents would just agree with everything. So, with some useful comments on the reduced themes from Rachel, plus some further thinking about what would be really useful in terms of data, I reshaped the survey into a more varied and interesting questionnaire. The tight deadlines for the study also presented a challenge, particularly in terms of getting support and input from others. For example, I piloted this with a couple of people

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		before sending it out to all participants, and I found that I was under quite a bit of pressure and risked putting these kind people under pressure too in order to keep to the timescales I had set for the overall process. This is partly because a Delphi study has multiple stages and, with each being dependent on the results of the last, there is some pressure not to get delayed in one phase, as that will have knock-on implications for delays in subsequent phases. Responses came in very slowly initially and, even after an initial chasing email, I was nervous that I wouldn't get enough responses. However, about 10 days after I had sent out the initial invitation, I decided (on a wise person's suggestion) to send each participant a separate email asking them personally to complete the survey. This worked like a dream and in the end, of the 46 people invited to participate in the survey, 33 actually responded (72%). One of the interviewees dropped out of the study at this point for personal reasons. Two further people responded to say that they didn't feel they were suited to respond. This brought the number of people actually available to participate (and to be invited to the second survey/phase 3) down to 43. Of the 10 others who did not respond to the survey, 3 were in email contact explaining their reasons for not taking part and for a further person her out-of-office message showed that she was not available during the period for which the survey was open, so there were only 6 people from whom I received no communication at all.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	I hadn't expected to get so many themes out of the interview data and for it to be so difficult to create a meaningful survey questionnaire. It was all a lot more time-consuming and more of a struggle than I had imagined it would be. Rachel's comments and suggestions were invaluable. When I received them, I realised that I had had a niggle in the back of my mind about the agree/disagree questions not really being useful, but I hadn't even admitted it to myself, let alone thought about what to do instead until she pointed it out! The process of getting enough responses was initially more difficult than I expected. I hadn't thought that I would need to email everyone individually. However, I was very pleasantly surprised by how successful individual emails were in getting people to respond. I was also pleasantly surprised by the number of people who emailed me and the amount of positive contact the process generated. It meant that the process felt very relational/interpersonal, which seems highly appropriate!
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Insights into the challenges of converting qualitative data into a quantitative questionnaire – that the process of reducing the volume of data to a limited number of themes needs to be rigorous and fairly ruthless. Insights into the importance of considering what is going to make for useful data from a survey questionnaire – and to pay attention to the niggles in the back of my mind.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		The value of emailing participants individually, by name, with tailored content to show that I was thinking of each of them personally. Plus the fact that this is not only valuable in terms of increasing the response rate, but also that it generates a sense of contact and relationship with each participant that feels intrinsically valuable and hopefully generates long-term relationships and shared interest in my endeavours.
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Perhaps start with a clearer picture of what questions I wanted to ask in the questionnaire, but it would have been hard to do that until I had analysed the data. Maybe I just needed to have more time between the rounds of the Delphi study to step back and consider the results of the last phase/round and the implications for the next one. Overall, allowing more time for the research project, and each of the phases within it, would have reduced the pressure of trying to fit the phases of the Delphi study into the timetable I had set. Perhaps start with individual emails and personal communication. In particular, the interviewee who dropped out of the study at this stage might have stayed involved for the surveys if I had emailed her personally rather than in a group email to all interviewees.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Analysing data	How did you go about analysing your data? Why did you choose this route?	I downloaded all the data from Qualtrics into Excel and split it according to the sections of the questionnaire – one spreadsheet for each of the three guidance documents/outputs, and within those, one worksheet per section, so that I had manageable amount of data on each worksheet. I had a separate spreadsheet for the demographic data. Quantitative data: I calculated frequencies (agreement, essential, ranking etc) and used those to determine ranking of items within sections and whether they should be retained or not. Qualitative data: I moved the comments data from each section to a new worksheet in order to be able to manipulate it easily. There I conducted a thematic analysis, grouping comments of a similar nature into themes and then giving each theme a heading. Some comments were relevant to more than one theme, in which case I included them in both and made a note on the worksheet that I had done so. Once I had the data analysis, I wrote this up in a tabular format, showing the quantitative data with the items in the first column, then providing a brief summary of that and a summary of the qualitative data in the second column, plus (in red) my thoughts on how the items (i.e. draft text for the guidance documents) should be amended in light of the results. See phase 3 for what happened next!

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What challenges did you face when analysing your data and how did you overcome them?	Initially, I didn't really know where to start in terms of data analysis. It all felt very unfamiliar and challenging. As with the interview analysis, it seemed like there was an initial state of confusion and overwhelm, which made it hard to see a way through. But, staying calm and sticking with the process, gradually the way forward became clearer and creating the table into which I transferred the results gave me a sense of how to take an overview of the data. The table also allowed me to get into a rhythm of using the data results from the spreadsheet to create a meaningful expression of the findings and their implications for the draft text/guidance. Starting to put the implications for amending the items in red in the 3rd column of the table was another key step in making sense of it all
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	Yet again, it was more challenging than I expected to generate meaningful results from the data – and more time-consuming. Just downloading and manipulating the data into the spreasheets proved time-consuming.
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	That there will probably always be a sense of confusion at the start of the analysis phase and I should not get panicked by this, but instead see it as part of a creative process in which there is initial blankness, then light gradually starts to shine!
	What would you do differently if you were	Allow plenty of time for this data-analysis process.

Research study – phase 2		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	going to begin this stage again, and why?	

Research study – phase 3		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Gathering data	How did you go about gathering data and accessing participants? Why did you choose this route?	Data gathering: was again through a survey questionnaire in Qualtrics. From the results of phase 2, I created a new survey questionnaire. Initially, I created a table showing the items that were used in the phase 2/ first survey (also called the first draft of the guidance documents) in the first column, the proposed revised version (also called the second draft of the guidance documents) in the second column, and the changes made/remaining questions in the third column. I then transferred the text of the revised version/second draft into Qualtrics, with the amended/new text marked up in red and created question items asking participants their level of agreement with each of the sections of amended/new text (on a 7-point Likert scale, plus a box for (optional) comments after each section). Participants: In keeping with Delphi study methodology, I invited the same people to participant in this second survey as I had invited for the first survey, minus the 3 who had explicitly removed themselves during the first survey. This meant I had 43 invitees.
	What challenges did you face when gathering data/accessing participants and how did you overcome them?	The process of creating the second survey from the results of phase 2 was challenging as I wasn't quite sure how to make the survey short and manageable. Initially, I included both the first draft and the second draft of the guidance document text in the Qualtrics version. This made the survey incredibly wordy and long, so I sought advice from one of my experts, who reviewed the survey and give suggestions. He felt there was no need to include both drafts of the text, so I removed the first draft. This meant that the survey

Research study – phase 3		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		just included the second draft with new/amended text marked in red. I was still concerned that it was quite long, but reassured when Jo said that it seemed OK to her and that the cognitive load was not too high. I was further reassured when Lilith agreed that it was ready to go out. The piloting process again threw up challenges. The main one of these was that the expert who completed it first (i.e. as a pilot but also to gather his data) identified that the response scale varied – sometimes being disagree>agree, other times being agree>disagree. I changed the survey so that they were all disagree>agree, but found that that meant his data was altered, so I had to go through a process with him to capture the correct data for the questions where I had made the changes. This felt like trespassing on his time and kindness.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	I had expected to need to make many more amendments to the survey before finalising it. When I sent the draft through to Jo and Rachel, I thought I might need to totally rethink it as I had had to do with the first survey, so I was pleasantly surprised that I did not need to do that (perhaps largely because I had got an expert to advise me).
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	That the process of creating a survey from the previous results is not straightforward.

Research study – phase 3		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Check all the response scales before piloting the questionnaire.
Research Study: Analysing data	How did you go about analysing your data? Why did you choose this route?	As for phase 2, I downloaded all the data from Qualtrics into Excel and split it according to the sections of the questionnaire – one spreadsheet for each of the three guidance documents/outputs, and within those, one worksheet per section, so that I had manageable amount of data on each worksheet. I had a separate spreadsheet for the demographic data. As there were some people who completed the second survey but had not completed the first one (and also some who completed the first but not the second), I needed to combine data from the two surveys to create a single demographics spreadsheet. Quantitative data: I calculated frequencies (all agreement this time) and used those to determine whether the changes were agreed or not. Qualitative data: I moved the comments data from each section to a new worksheet in order to be able to manipulate it easily. There I conducted a thematic analysis, grouping comments of a similar nature into themes and giving each theme a heading.

Research study – phase 3		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Also as for phase 2, once I had the data analysis, I wrote this up in a tabular format, showing the quantitative data with the items in the first column, then providing a brief summary of that and a summary of the qualitative data in the second column, plus (in red) my thoughts on what further changes should be made in light of the results and what questions were outstanding for the workshop to answer. See phase 4 for what happened next!
	What challenges did you face when analysing your data and how did you overcome them?	It was much more straightforward to analyse the data this time round, both because I was familiar with the process, having done it in phase 2 and because it was just agree-disagree this time. There was rather less qualitative data too.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	It was actually easier and less stressful than I expected.
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Familiarity makes doing these things so much easier.
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Not much.

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Gathering data	How did you go about gathering data and accessing participants? Why did you choose this route?	This was a final qualitative data-gathering phase, using a focus group/workshop with the participants from the interviews. In keeping with Delphi methodology, this stage is about resolving any contentious areas and creating a final consensus on the results. It would not be possible to reach consensus through interviews. Using doodle to poll the interviewees' availability, I fixed the date for the workshop several months ahead of time as I knew they were all busy people. I also sent various reminders and information updates in order to ensure that they kept it in their diaries. Based on the results of phase 3, I made a few non-contentious changes to the text and created a near-final version of the three documents plus a set of questions for the workshop. I sent this, plus the results of both surveys, to the workshop participants 3 weeks before the workshop. The workshop took place on the online platform, Zoom, with participants dialing in from the US, UK and continental Europe. I took the group through the questions, making it clear that their role was one of 'final arbiters' of the wording where the survey results did not provide a clear consensus (over 70%) or where the qualitative comments pointed to a need to make some change to the text.

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What challenges did you face when gathering data/accessing participants and how did you overcome them?	One of the interviewees had dropped out of the study at phase 2 and another interviewee was not available in June, so the focus group ended up being 6 people instead of the full 8 who had participated in the interviews. This meant that I was nervous that others would drop out and I would not have sufficient participants on the day, but thankfully all 6 were able to attend. The person who was not available in June was an important person in the ID community. This created a dilemma about whether to get his views as part of the data gathering process. In the end, I decided that it would be better to follow the Delphi protocol and create the final outputs, then give him a say in the subsequent development and dissemination of the materials after the completion of the research. One big challenge was how to corral the views of 6 people who had strong opinions about IM/ID and reach clear agreements on revisions to the text within the two hours available for the workshop – while also embodying the values and principles of IM/ID. To overcome this, I spent a lot of time preparing for the workshop, including running through the schedule with one of the participants to help ensure that my introduction and facilitation were clear, concise, appropriate, mindful and respectful. I also spent time preparing alternative suggestions for contentious parts of the text, so as to provide participants with stimulus for their ideas. Immediately before the workshop, I prepared myself in terms of bringing myself into a mindful/present and caring state. I built mindful pauses into the

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		workshop schedule and, in my introduction, made clear that I would need to manage time fairly strictly to get us through all the questions, so that I had permission to cut short long contributions, those that were off topic etc. During the workshop itself, I was careful to pause and to manage my emotions as well as managing time, so that I stayed neutral while also steering the discussion towards agreement on specific text.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	In the end, the discussion went well and the participants reached agreement on all the questions – though this took some firm and careful facilitation on my part – so my anxieties both about not everyone attending and not having enough time to reach consensus were unfounded. There was one question that I had hoped to discuss in the workshop for which there wasn't time. However, on review of that question, I realised that the level of agreement in the survey (80% or more for all areas) was high enough not to need arbitration from the workshop and that, although there were quite a few qualitative comments, these did not provide any clear direction. So, although it would have potentially been useful to get the workshop participants' views, it was not actually necessary and might just have confused things further.

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Running this kind of workshop needs a lot of careful preparation and sensitive facilitation. Running through the plan and content for the workshop with one of the participants ahead of time was incredibly useful and definitely helped make it a success. Taking a mindful and careful approach to facilitation was also essential.
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Perhaps consult with the participant who helped me prepare the workshop a bit sooner as this run-though led me to amend the document for participants slightly (making some of the text bold, so that it was clear what to look for, adding page numbers), which meant that I sent out a second version. Although having two versions only caused one minor confusion during the workshop, this could have been avoided if I had made those changes before sending the document out in the first place.
Research Study: Analysing data	How did you go about analysing your data? Why did you choose this route?	With the near-final version of the text in front of me, I listened to/watched the recording of the workshop. In parallel, I reviewed the 'chat box' text, in which participants and I had written suggestions. After each section of discussion, I paused the recording and made the change to the text that had been agreed by the participants. In some cases, I needed to listen to parts of the discussion and review the 'chat box' comments several times in order to be sure that the text revision was exactly what participants had agreed.

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		Although I had expected to get the workshop recording transcribed, in the end, there did not seem much value in doing so. The workshop led to clear agreements about the text, so there was no need to conduct a thematic or content analysis of the workshop data.
	What challenges did you face when analysing your data and how did you overcome them?	There was one question/chunk of text where the workshop participants did not reach a final conclusion on the new version of the text to be used. They had discussed the question in some depth, provided a range of views and reached consensus on what it should include, but had not come up with a precise agreed text by the time the workshop needed to conclude, so they left me to do the 'word-smithing' of the final text. In order to ensure that what I produced was representative of the participant discussions, I listened to/watched that part of the recording and reviewed the 'chat box' comments several times. Based on this review, I generated an alternative text, which I sent round to the workshop participants by email to check that they were in agreement with what I had produced, which they were.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	As mentioned, I had expected to need to get the workshop recording transcribed. However, using the recording itself proved more valuable than a transcription would have been.

Research study – phase 4		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		I hadn't realised how valuable the 'chat box' suggestions would be. They made the analysis process much simpler than if I had had to rely purely on the spoken word in the workshop
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	'Chat box' suggestions can be invaluable in clarifying text during the course of a workshop and as part of the analysis process.
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Given the importance of the chat box, I might build in more use of it if I were starting again. For example, having my own suggestions more readily available for cutting and pasting into the chat, and allowing more time for people to write in and read chat box content. Perhaps I would enter the agreed text into the chat box at the end of each section of the discussion as a mechanism for getting definitive agreement from participants on each amendment.

Research study – write-up of all 4 phases		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Research Study: Writing up	What challenges did you face when writing up your study and how did you overcome them?	The big initial challenge was to find time to do the write up because the SLR revise and resubmit for EJWOP was taking so much of my time.
	How did this process differ from your expectations/plan?	Once I got down to it, I actually found the write up process much easier and more enjoyable than I expected. The methodology and results were relatively straightforward and I could pretty much write them off the top of my head with some reference back to the data and the proforma/questionnaire for each stage. The introduction was more of a challenge; however, prior to starting that, I had written a conference submission for the DOP conference, which included a short introduction, so I was able to work from that and expand it. Because of the timing of Lilith's maternity leave, I needed to submit a draft to her at a point when I had only written the methodology and results, plus an initial attempt at the introduction. Her feedback was surprisingly positive and extremely helpful. I was delighted to hear that her view was that the methodology was pretty much there and the introduction not far off. I found her feedback that the results were a bit too 'factual', and not interpretive enough, really useful. It is interesting that my SLR was criticised for the same thing – it seems that I am inclined just to report what I have found, not to explain, interpret or give my views on that, which is useful self-awareness. Reflecting on this and

Research study – write-up of all 4 phases		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		working further on the results has helped me explore how I might develop this way of thinking. Another pleasant surprise was how much energy, interest and enjoyment I got from doing some reading around in order to a) feed into the introduction and b) understand the expectations of papers submitted to *Mindfulness* (see more on this in the next section). I found that there had been a number of papers published in the last 12months that were relevant to interpersonal mindfulness, but left a clear gap that my work (and hopefully my future research) can fill. It was exciting and rewarding to see that mindfulness with a relational focus is an emerging interest in the field. It was reassuring to hear from Jo that she liked the draft and helpful to have her comments. Following her suggestions and comments, I made some amendments to the paper and sent it to Claire Hardy, who has published a Delphi Study for comments. Claire gave me a few comments, most of which I implemented (though some were not possible – e.g. more information on the expert participants). Rachel then had a look at it and gave me a few suggestions for amendments.
	What were your key learnings from this stage?	Writing up is perhaps not as bad as it is made out to be if done in a staged way and when one is really familiar with the research. Starting with the methodology, then the results, then the introduction and finally the conclusions works really well.

Research study – write-up of all 4 phases		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What would you do differently if you were going to begin this stage again, and why?	Possibly monitor the research literature on a more on-going basis, so that I am familiar with it and clear where my work fits in.

Submitting research study to a peer reviewed journal		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Initial submission	Process and learning?	I decided early on the process of writing up my study that I wanted to submit it to *Mindfulness*. In fact, that decision really helped me to shape the introduction to my write-up, as mentioned above, because I did various searches of *Mindfulness* articles and found a number that were about research on interpersonal mindfulness – though none of them looked at interpersonal mindfulness in a workplace or leadership/management context. This early identification of my target journal meant that I did not have to rejig the write-up to prepare for submission. Other than a horrendously slow IT system (partly due to my own computer being very slow) the initial submission (in November 2018) was relatively straightforward.
Revise and resubmit	Process and learning?	It was very disappointing to hear from *Mindfulness* in February 2019 with a rejection and particularly to read the reviewers' comments. While reviewer 2 was actually very positive and seemed to have only a small number of easily addressed concerns, reviewers 1 and 3 were not so positive. Reviewer 1's comments were frustrating in that they said that they thought the paper was "outside the scope of the journal", which I would have thought was the editor's decision and the fact that the paper was sent out to review suggested that the editor felt that it was within scope. However, it was reviewer 3's comments that caused me the most discomfort: this reviewer supplied a series of comments that seemed not to be about any problem with the methodology of the research, but mostly to be about their own views on what a mindfulness programme

Submitting research study to a peer reviewed journal		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		should be like (e.g. “the 8-week structure is very important”) and their aversion to IM being offered in an organisational setting (e.g. “How will be possible to favour a “real” personal experience of Interpersonal Mindfulness, which needs time, repetition and reharse of exercises/practices, in an organizational setting that is aimed at “quick fix”? [grammatical and spelling errors original]” and “How this aims and features of Interpersonal Mindfulness/Insight Dialogue can fit with an organizational setting where business objectives have always primacy?”) The tone of the review was also rather patronising and suggested that the reviewer believed that they knew more about IM than the authors (e.g. “…there is a lack of real understanding from the author about what is at stake in Interpersonal Mindfulness and Insight Dialogue”), which I find a bit odd given how closely I involved the originators of ID and IM in the research and the fact that I offer both ID and IM myself. So, it was a matter of picking myself up from the knock-back of rejection and looking at where else I could submit. As part of this, I re-contacted the editor of EJWOP, Kevin Daniels, with the abstract to this empirical paper to ask if there was any interest in publishing it in EJWOP as a follow-on from the SLR. Kevin replied to say that it wasn’t appropriate for EJWOP in the usual course of things (as the paper does not include an evaluation), but that “it might fit the special issue being edited by John Arnold, which is more focused on practice relevant work than a typical issue”. An email exchange with John Arnold ended with him encouraging me to submit the paper straight away as the

Submitting research study to a peer reviewed journal		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		deadline for submissions to the special issue had already passed. As a result, I made a few minor tweaks to the paper to make it more targeted at impact and at the scientist-practitioner model, and submitted it the next day. I was disappointed not to have more time to rework the paper because I would have liked a) to have added more focus on researcher-practitioner collaboration and on giving support to readers to be able to use Delphi studies for themselves, and b) to have added some clarifications and made some amendments based on the *Mindfulness* reviewers' comments. However, the ethos of the special issue was so aligned with the nature of my paper, and with my own attitude to research and practice, that it seemed too good an opportunity to miss. Hopefully, the paper will get to revise and resubmit with this EJWOP special issue and I can make those changes to it at that point. This process has provided further learning about the difficulties of academic publishing and how demoralising that process is. It has also helped to clarify for me the importance of researcher-practitioner collaboration in general and of being a scientist-practitioner myself.

Overall reflections		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
Overall Doctoral Process	Reflecting on your doctorate, how do you feel you have developed (e.g. technical expertise, theoretical knowledge)?	Broader awareness of how mindfulness, and particularly IM, might help leaders develop greater awareness, wisdom and relational capability. More awareness about what I feel leaders need to do in terms of their relational approach (greater kindness) and how this may actually conflict with the values of the real world. This points to the delicate balance that needs to be achieved between acceptability/accessibility in organisational contexts and sensitivity to the origins and aims of mindfulness interventions. Greater clarity about and ability to articulate the concepts of mindfulness, awareness, meditation, wisdom etc. and why I believe they are important. Alongside this, a recognition of how easy it is to assume that others understand concepts that are extremely familiar to me, when actually they are not familiar to those others at all; so an understanding of the need to know that my view is just one view of the world, that others will have totally different views and that I will need to explain my perspective – and maybe even define my terms – in order to transmit messages and share understanding. There was a key moment during phase 1 of my research (February 2018) when I realised that if I am to facilitate an IM-based leadership development programme, I need to be able to embody the qualities that it is designed to enhance. So, I really need to look at and develop my own resilience, spaciousness, mindfulness, kindness, authenticity, strength in speaking the truth (to power), use of power, fully listening to others, broadening my perspective, and wisdom, and welcome paradigm shifts in my own life.

Overall reflections		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
		There was a further moment during phase 2 of my research (March 2018), in speaking with a Professor in Australia where I realised that my personal journey might be of interest to others – something to perhaps publish/share. I then kicked myself for not having recorded the process over the previous 18 months as it will have to be a retrospective record for all of that period. I started keeping a systematic journal in April and hope to use that to track how I develop and how I might support others to do the same. Recognition of the value of SLRs – how important it is to review and synthesise the research that is out there in order to draw evidence-based conclusions. While I have long been an advocate of evidence-based practice – indeed it has been a driving theme/value in my work/career – and had previously been involved in a number of SLRs, this was the first time I had been fully responsible for conducting one. As a result, the mechanics of conducting an SLR are now much clearer in my mind and the enormous value SLRs provide is more evident.
	Can you see any changes in your practices and/or professional plan as a result of undertaking this	In my role as a member of the HSE's Workplace Health Expert Committee, my experience of conducting an SLR and, indeed, the whole research project, has enhanced my ability to produce committee papers and review the papers of my fellow committee members.

Overall reflections		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	doctorate and associated learnings?	Yes, my career post Prof Doc is going to be much more about mindfulness/awareness, relational qualities/kindness/compassion, and wisdom/understanding/insight. I am very conscious now that the important element for me moving forward is how I embody these and support others with them. I want my future work to be more about meaning, purpose, leadership and presence – and I therefore need to spend time getting clearer about these aspects of my own life. My thinking is that I would like to get some experience in running Interpersonal Mindfulness for leaders, and then in the long-run that I would like to move into training trainers and coaches to offer this kind of leadership development. I am particularly interested in how we embody the capacities we are aiming to support in others in order to transmit/transfer these at a range of levels, not just through transfer of knowledge.
	What has been the most useful element of the process for you?	Reading round the topic to understand vertical development and levels of consciousness, leadership and mindful leadership, interpersonal mindfulness, and embodiment. Considering my personal/professional development – who I am being – alongside the research process. This is made the Prof Doc a very rich and holistic process, particularly relevant to my stage of life (moving into my 50s, losing my father and my mother being incapacitated), rather than just a chance to gain knowledge/a qualification.

Overall reflections		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What has been the most rewarding element of the process for you?	The research study was a very relational process: because the community of experts is quite small, I knew most of the people who participated in the research personally and found that I had a lot of warm and friendly contact with people through the process of inviting them to participate, reminding them, thanking them etc. This was particularly rewarding and supportive given the context and content of the research.
	What has been the most challenging element of the process for you?	Some of the early friction about my research topic and design was very difficult – I struggled to balance what was needed for the Prof Doc with staying connected to my purpose for doing it (IM and leadership). It was also challenging to come up with the surveys in phases 2 and 3 of my research – the results of the previous phase in each case seemed a long way from leading directly to survey questions. Doing the revisions on my SLR paper for the revise and resubmit was also extremely challenging. Although the reviewers were positive and their suggestions were all about improving the paper, the number and size of the revisions was overwhelming and the process led me to question my own ability and interest in dealing with the world of academic publishing.

Overall reflections		
Stage	**Questions**	**Reflections**
	What has been the most frustrating element of the process for you?	I would very much have liked to have more time to read around my subject: due to time constraints, my reading around had to be very targeted. There are lots of books and articles I obtained that are a little more peripheral to my topic, which I would really like to have read, but are still awaiting reading.
	What would you tell someone beginning this process? What are the key things they should know/avoid/prepare for?	Don’t expect an easy ride! Be clear about what you want to research and why, but also be willing to flex your research approach as you learn what is and is not achievable. Having a passion for the topic helps to maintain momentum and enjoyment of the research. Treat this as a journey and a chance to learn about yourself and who you are, as well as an opportunity to gain knowledge, understanding of your chosen topic and research skills.

Appendices

1. Signed ethics form

2. Consent form for interviews

3. Interview questions

4. Audit-trail of interview analysis steps and process

Appendix 1. Signed ethics form

PLEASE REFER TO THE RE4 GUIDANCE NOTES AND SUPPLEMENTARY FORMS WHEN COMPLETING THIS APPLICATION

APPLICATION FORM FOR ETHICAL REVIEW RE4
FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

SECTION A

Is this an application for a 'block release agreement':	Yes		No	X

If *yes*, please specify the name of the group/cohort and note who will be responsible for ethical oversight of projects in this area (the block release holder); this will usually be the module leader, supervisor or head of subject. This RE4 form should present a project *typical* to this group/cohort.

Dissertation Supervisor - Joanna Yarker and Rachel Lewis

Project title:

Exploration of how interpersonal mindfulness could be applied in leadership and management development, including the context, intervention mechanisms, and participants' mental models

Name of the lead applicant:

Name (Title / first name / surname):	Ms Emma Donaldson-Feilder
Position held:	Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology Student
Department/School/Faculty:	Faculty of Business and Law
Telephone:	
Email address:	

Name of co-applicants:

Name (Title / first name / surname):	n/a
Position held:	
Department/School/Faculty:	
Telephone:	
Email address:	

Name (Title / first name / surname):	
Position held:	
Department/School/Faculty:	
Telephone:	
Email address:	

Name (Title / first name / surname):	
Position held:	
Department/School/Faculty:	
Telephone:	
Email address:	

Is the project:					
	Student research	Yes	X	No	
	KU Staff research	Yes		No	X
	Research on KU premises	Yes		No	X

If it is STUDENT research:

Course title	Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology
Supervisor/DoS	Joanna Yarker and Rachel Lewis

SECTION B ***(Complete this section if another ethics committee has already granted approval for the project. Otherwise, proceed to Section C)***

Committee that granted approval	
Date of approval	

Please attach evidence that the project has been fully approved (usually an approval letter). The original application should be retained on file in the Faculty for inspection where necessary. The Faculty Research Ethics Committee (FREC) may require further information or clarification from you and you should not embark on the project until you receive notification from the FREC that recognition of the approval has been granted. You should proceed directly to Section D of this form and submit this as a fast-track application.

SECTION C

Provide a brief project description (max. 150 words). This should be written for a lay audience

This project will explore how an interpersonal mindfulness (IM)-based intervention could be used as a methodology to support leaders and managers to be more effective in their leadership roles. The intention is to develop three practical outputs that will support the implementation of an IM-based leadership development intervention:

- Checklist for organisations intending to run IM as part of their leadership development setting out the contextual factors they need in place
- Pilot IM-based intervention protocol/curriculum
- Guidance on selecting and preparing managers for an IM-based leadership development intervention

Since IM is a relatively new intervention and has not yet been applied in workplace settings, let alone as part of leadership or management development, the research will take an exploratory approach. It will engage a range of relevant experts and stakeholders, using interviews to gather initial views and then two cycles of feedback to create a consensus on the outcomes (Delphi study approach).

Estimate duration of the project (months)	9 months
State the source of funding	N/A

Is it collaborative research?

Yes		No	X

If YES, name of the collaborator institutions:

1.	n/a
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

Briefly describe the procedures to be used which involve human participants

A Delphi consensus methodology will be applied (Adler and Zigleo, 1996) in order to engage a wide group of experts and stakeholders in creating a consensus on the outcomes and findings.

For the *first phase of the Delphi study*, semi-structured interviews will be used to gather qualitative data. Interviewees will include people from four categories:

- IM/ID teachers and practitioners
- Mindfulness in the workplace teachers, particularly those teaching Mindful Leadership
- Leadership development professionals – in-house and external
- Managers/leaders – with and without a mindfulness practice

Interview questions will include:
About the organisational context:

- What contextual/organisational factors will help to ensure that an IM-based leadership development intervention has the best possible chance of success?
- What might get in the way?
- What would attract leaders to undertake an IM-based leadership development intervention and organisations to offer it? (What would the need be that this kind of intervention would meet?)

About the IM intervention mechanisms:

- What are the 'active ingredients' of an IM intervention that need to be included in any new intervention? What must any new intervention contain to remain faithful to IM (methods, attitudes, approaches)?
- How does the existing IM protocol need adapting to fit in a leadership development context? How can we make IM accessible and desirable in organisational and business settings?
- What might the intervention look like?

About manager and leader participants (mental models):

- For whom is an IM-based intervention likely to be successful (Readiness for change? Perceptions of mindfulness and IM? Mental models?)
- What are the potential 'contra-indications' that suggest a particular individual should not participate in an IM-based leadership development intervention (i.e. factors that might indicate that a particular person might not benefit from, or might even be harmed by, participating in an IM-based intervention)?
- How should managers be selected and prepared for this intervention? (How to explain it to managers? How to get manager buy-in? How to sell the intervention to managers?)
- Could it be made mandatory or is that setting it up to fail?

Data gathered in the interviews will be analysed using thematic analysis to extract key themes in each of the three aspects of the Context-Intervention-Mental models framework. To ensure the practical applicability of the research, the results of the analysis will be used to develop the outputs mentioned above.

For the *second phase of the Delphi process*, the findings from the thematic analysis will be fed back to the interviewees, in the form of draft outputs. Participants will be asked to give feedback on these drafts.

Participant feedback will be used to develop a second draft of the outputs.

The *final phase of the Delphi process* will involve a checking process in which participants will be asked to review the second draft of the outputs and to give any final amendments, with the aim of reaching a consensus on the final version of the outputs.

Summarise the data sources to be used in the project

Data sources will be: - Interview data gathered through interviews with experts and key stakeholders, the interviews will be recorded and transcribed, then the transcripts analysed using thematic analysis. - Written feedback data from interview participants on the draft outputs.

Storage, access and disposal of data

Describe what research data will be stored, where, for what period of time, the measures that will be put in place to ensure security of the data, who will have access to the data, and the method and timing of disposal of the data.

Interview recordings and transcripts, and participant feedback on draft outputs, will only be accessible to the research team (lead applicant and supervisors). They will be held in digital format on a secure server, and destroyed after 12 months. (A secure archive may be retained if it seems possible that the data is needed for further research, in which case it will be password protected and only accessible to the lead applicant and will be destroyed after 10 years.) Participants' names will be kept in a separate place to the interview recordings and transcripts, which will be identified only by a participant number, to ensure that participant data is treated with complete anonymity.

Risk Assessment Questionnaire: Does the proposed research involve any of the following?

		YES	NO
0.	The use of human biological material?		X
1.	Children or young people under 18 years of age?		X
1.a	If YES, have you complied with the requirements of the DBS?		
2.	People with an intellectual or mental impairment, temporary or permanent?		X
3.	People highly dependent on medical care, e.g., emergency care, intensive care, neonatal intensive care, terminally ill, or unconscious?		X
4.	Prisoners, illegal immigrants or financially destitute?		X
5.	Women who are known to be pregnant?		X
6.	Will people from a specific ethnic, cultural or indigenous group be targeted in the proposed research, or is there potential that they may be targeted?		X
7.	Assisted reproductive technology?		X
8.	Human genetic research?		X
9.	Epidemiology research?		X
10.	Stem cell research?		X
11.	Use of environmentally toxic chemicals?		X
12.	Use of ionizing radiation?		X

13.	Ingestion of potentially harmful or harmful dose of foods, fluids or drugs?		X
14.	Contravention of social/cultural boundaries?		X
15.	Involves use of data without prior consent?		X
16.	Involves bodily contact?		X
17.	Compromising professional boundaries between participants and researchers?		X
18.	Deception of participants, concealment or covert observation?		X
19.	Will this research significantly affect the health* outcomes or health services of subjects or communities?		x
20.	Is there a significant risk of enduring physical and/or psychological harm/distress to participants?		X
21.	Does your research raise any issues of personal safety for you or other researchers involved? (especially if taking place outside working hours or off KU premises)		X
22.	Will the research be conducted without written informed consent being obtained from the participants except where tacit consent is given by completing a questionnaire?		X
23.	Will financial/in kind payments (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants? (Indicate in the proposal how much and on what basis)		X
24.	Is there a potential danger to participants in case of accidental unauthorised access to data?		X

[**Note** *health is defined as not just the physical well-being of the individual but also the social, emotional and cultural well-being of the whole community].

SECTION D ***(To be signed by all applicants)***

Declaration to be signed by the applicant(s) and the supervisor (in the case of a student):

- I confirm that the research will be undertaken in accordance with the Kingston University *Guidance and procedures for undertaking research involving human participants.*

- I will undertake to report formally to the relevant Faculty Research Ethics Committee for continuing review approval where required.

- I shall ensure that any changes in approved research protocols or membership of the research team are reported promptly for approval by the relevant Faculty Research Ethics Committee.

- I shall ensure that the research study complies with the law and University policy on Health and Safety.

- I confirm that the research study is compliant with the requirements of the Disclosure and Barring Service where applicable.

- I am satisfied that the research study is compliant with the Data Protection Act 1998, and that necessary arrangements have been, or will be made with regard to the storage and processing of participants' personal information and generally, to ensure confidentiality of such data supplied and generated in the course of the research. *(Further advice may be sought from the Data Protection Officer, University Secretary's Office)*

- I shall ensure that the research is undertaken in accordance with the University's Single Equality Scheme.

- I will ensure that all adverse or unforeseen problems arising from the research project are reported immediately to the Chair of the relevant Faculty Research Ethics Committee.

- I will undertake to provide notification when the study is complete and if it fails to start or is abandoned;

- (For supervisors, *if the applicant is a student)* I have met and advised the student on the ethical aspects of the study design, and am satisfied that it complies with the current professional (*where relevant),* departmental and University guidelines. I accept responsibility for the conduct of this research and the maintenance of any consent documents as required by this Committee.

- I understand that failure to provide accurate information can invalidate ethical approval.

Is this an application for fast-track ethical approval? (Fast track is **only** available for projects either pre-approved by another ethics committee, or where you have accurately indicated 'No' to every question on the Risk Assessment Questionnaire – Pg4)	**Yes**	X	**No**	

Please sign and date	*Signature*	*Date*
Lead applicant		24th October 2017
Co-applicant		
Co-applicant		
Co-applicant		
Supervisor		

NOTE

If this is a block release application and/or you have answered YES to any of the questions in the Risk Assessment, you must complete a full application for ethical approval and provide the information outlined in the checklist below. Your project proposal should show that there are adequate controls in place to address the issues raised in your Risk Assessment.

If you have answered NO to all of the questions in the Risk Assessment you may submit the form to your Faculty Ethics Administrator as a fast-track application. You must append your participant information sheet. The Faculty Research Ethics Committee (FREC) may require further information or clarification from you and you should not embark on the project until you receive notification from your Faculty that recognition of the approval has been granted.

CHECKLIST ***(Where a full application for ethical approval is required)***

Please complete the checklist and attach it to your full application for ethical approval:

Before submitting this application, please check that you have done the following: *(N/A = not applicable)*	**Applicant**			*Committee use only*		
	Yes	**No**	**N/A**	**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
All questions have been answered	**X**					
All applicants have signed the application form	**X**					
The research proposal is attached	**X**					
Informed Consent Form is attached	**X**					
Participant Information Sheets are attached	**X**					
All letters, advertisements, posters or other recruitment material to be used are attached			**X**			
All surveys, questionnaires, interview/focus group schedules, data sheets, etc, to be used in collecting data are attached	**X**					
Reference list attached, where applicable	**X**					

Appendix 2. Consent form for interviews

Research to explore how Interpersonal Mindfulness could be applied in leadership and management development

Consent form

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my Professional Doctorate research looking at how Interpersonal Mindfulness could be applied in leadership and management development. Your views will be really valuable. In accordance with university ethics procedures, please complete the form below to confirm your consent to your participation.

	Please put initials in the box to confirm
1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for this research and have had the opportunity to ask questions	
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason	
2. I understand that all information collected during the research will be given complete anonymity: I will not be identified on the interview notes or transcripts and the views included in any of the final outputs will not be attributed	
3. I agree to take part in the research	
4. I agree to my interview being audio recorded	
5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications	
6. I agree that data gathered in this research, after it has been anonymised, will be stored safely for the purposes of this research and within the limits of the law, accessed only by members of the research team, and disposed of securely	

____________________________ ________________ _______________________

Your name | Date | Signature (electronic signature is fine)

Researcher: Emma Donaldson-Feilder, Student on the Professional Doctorate in Occupational and Business Psychology at Kingston University
Contact email:

Appendix 3. Interview questions

Semi-structured interview schedule – questions adapted as appropriate in each interview

About the IM intervention mechanisms:

- What are the 'active ingredients' of an IM programme that need to be included in any new intervention?
    - What must any new intervention contain to remain faithful to IM (methods, attitudes, approaches)?
- How does the existing IM protocol/curriculum need adapting to fit in a leadership development context?
    - What might an IM-based leadership development programme/module look like?
        - Open courses and/or in-house programmes
        - Possibility of offering it in a coaching approach
        - Possibility of offering other interventions beyond L&D - e.g. for team development, facilitating meetings, processes – going beyond the person of the leader to leadership in organisations more broadly (distributed leadership, followership…)
    - How can we make IM accessible in organisational and business settings?
    - How do we overcome issues relating to the unfamiliarity of mindful conversations? And the intimacy that potentially arises in IM?

About the organisational context:

- What contextual/organisational factors will help to ensure that an IM-based leadership development programme/module has the best possible chance of success?
    - What might get in the way?
- What would attract leaders to undertake an IM-based leadership development programme/module? And attract organisations to offer it?
    - What would the need be that this kind of intervention would meet?

About manager and leader participants (mental models):

- For whom is an IM-based leadership development programme/module likely to be successful (Readiness for change? Perceptions of mindfulness and IM? Mental models?)
    - What might get in the way?
    - What are the potential 'contra-indications' that suggest a particular individual should not participate (i.e. factors that might indicate that a particular person might not benefit from, or might even be harmed by, participating in an IM-based leadership development programme/module)?
- How should managers be selected and prepared for an IM-based leadership development programme/module?
    - How to explain it to managers? How to get manager buy-in/sell the intervention to managers?
    - Could it be made mandatory or is that setting it up to fail?
    - What if participants know one another (in which case they will, inevitably, hold assumptions about each other)? What if they work together? What about having participants of different levels of seniority?

Next steps

Run through the next steps in the research process… Then:

- Can you think of anyone that I could include in the questionnaire survey?

Thank you very much indeed for your time today!

Appendix 4. Audit-trail of interview analysis steps and process

The Delphi study phase 1 interviews were first analysed using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Subsequently, in order to create the basis for a survey questionnaire for phase 2, content analysis (Miles, Huberman and Saldana, 2014) was used to refine down the guidance. The steps taken are described here in detail:

Step 1: Interviews conducted and recorded
I conducted all interviews on Zoom video-conferencing and used the in-built recording function in the service. After each interview, I made some notes of key messages in a Word document.

Step 2: Interview recordings transcribed verbatim
I shared each of the audio recordings with the person who helped me with transcription, ensuring confidentiality of the data. She transcribed each one into a Word document and shared the transcript with me, again assuring confidentiality of the data. Where she was unsure of a word or phrase, she indicated the time within the recording where this was said so that I could check my understanding against the audio and add to/correct the transcript.

Step 3: Familiarisation with the data – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 1
Before starting the data analysis, I listened to each of the audio recordings at least once and reviewed the transcript documents to ensure that I was familiar with the contents and starting to think about potential codes/themes.

Step 4: Interview transcripts uploaded into NVivo
Having downloaded a trial version of NVivo for Mac onto my computer, I uploaded the Word transcript documents into the NVivo system.

Step 5: First interview coded – initial codes generated – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 2
Using a largely inductive, data-driven approach, I started generating codes by coding the first interview transcripts. The only structure I took into the coding process was an overarching one of the three types of information, based on the three sections of the interviews, about the: intervention mechanisms; organisational context; and manager and leader participants. Otherwise, I used the content of the data to drive the coding.

Step 6: Other seven interviews coded – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 2 continued
Using the codes generated from the first transcript and adding further codes as needed, I then worked my way through the remaining interview transcripts to code all the data.

Step 7: Initial themes established – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 3
As I was coding the transcript, I started to group codes into nodes/themes, in an iterative and dynamic process. Once all the transcripts were coded, I reviewed all the codes and the initial nodes/themes I had created to see how they could be structured and created a 'first pass' of a thematic structure.

Step 8: Themes reviewed and refined – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 4
I downloaded the 'first pass' of my thematic structure from NVivo in order to review and refine it. I also downloaded all the 'references', or data extracts, for each node in order to draw on the data as I reviewed and refined the structure. Through a process

of moving themes around to better fit the data, I came up with a 'second pass' and then a final structure.

Step 9: Themes defined, named and written up – Braun and Clarke (2006) phase 5

Once I had the final structure, I reviewed the themes, structure and 'references'/data extracts to decide on names/definitions for the themes. I then used all this information to create a write-up of the themes in a Word document.

Step 10: Themes converted into initial guidance documents

Based on the write-up of the themes, I created three separate guidance documents: guidance on developing the programme; checklist for organisations; and guidance on participants. These documents ran to 9, 3 and 3 pages respectively.

Step 11: Guidance documents edited down using content analysis - Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014)

As I attempted to create a survey out of the guidance documents, it became clear that the initial versions were way too long to form the basis of a manageable survey. Having discussed this with my supervisors, I followed their advice to conduct a quick content analysis in order to edit down the guidance documents. By determining which themes were mentioned by the largest number of interviewees, I could group themes and edit the guidance down to a more manageable size (3, 1 and 1 pages respectively). This then enabled me to create a manageable survey for phase 2 of the study.