If the hat fits: A review of Task Technology Fit Theory (TTF) through users experience of engaging with an AI coaching agent

Jonathan Passmore, Jane Daly & David Tee

Citation: Passmore, J. & Daly, J. & Tee, D. (2026). If the hat fits: A review of Task Technology Fit Theory through users experience of engaging with an AI coaching agent. *Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching, In advance of publication,* Doi: 10.1007/s11613-025-00981-8

Keywords AI Coaching, Task Technology Fit Theory, Symbiarchic Leadership

Abstract

This study examines how managers experience and evaluate AI coaching agents through the lens of Task Technology Fit theory. Against the backdrop of rapid advances in generative AI and ongoing debates about whether AI can coach, we ask how well Task Technology Fit explains user attitudes and how designers should develop AI coaching tools to meet expectations. Using an exploratory, qualitative design, we conducted semi structured interviews with twelve managers from diverse sectors who had recently used one or more AI coaching agents. Our findings suggest Task Technology Fit is most salient when aligned not only with tasks but also with user perceptions, ethical expectations and organisational conditions. The study indicates that AI coaching currently serves best as a scalable, low friction complement to human coaching rather than a direct substitute.

1 Introduction

The field of artificial intelligence (AI) has undergone significant evolution since its formal inception through the work of pioneers like McCarthy and Minsky (Russell and Norvig 2021). Initial optimism in the 1960s and 1970s, exemplified by early symbolic AI systems such as ELIZA and MYCIN, demonstrated that machines could mimic human problem-solving within narrow domains, but these initial efforts declined during the 1970s and 1980's (ibid.). The emergence of transformer architectures in 2017 and the proliferation of generative large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-3.5, launched in November 2022, have created a boom in AI and signalled a potential revolutionization of the nature of work. One challenge, as with the launch of many technologies from the Sinclair C5 to the Segway, is user adoption.

1.1 Task Technology Fit Theory (TTF)

Task–Technology Fit (TTF) theory, first introduced by Goodhue and Thompson (1995), to explain technology adoption and performance. TTF is defined as "the degree to which a technology assists an individual in performing their portfolio of tasks" (ibid., p. 216). The authors argued that a technology will positively impact individual performance only if it fits the user's task requirements; even a highly capable system is unlikely to be used (or yield benefits) if its functionality does not match the needs of the task. This idea was formalized in a "technology-to-performance chain" model, in which task characteristics, technology characteristics, and individual abilities jointly determine the perceived task–technology fit, which in turn influences technology utilisation and ultimately the user's performance outcomes. In essence, when a technology product's capabilities closely correspond to the demands of a user's work, the user is more likely to adopt the product and achieve better results.

Over the past decade, TTF has been widely applied in human–computer interaction research, with substantial empirical support for its core propositions (Jeyaraj 2022). TTF

has also been more recently extended to AI applications. For example, a 2024 user study on *generative AI* adoption found that most TTF dimensions (e.g. the fit between ChatGPT's capabilities and users' task needs) significantly predicted individuals' decisions to continue using the AI tool (Huy et al. 2024).

Despite its strengths, the TTF framework has attracted criticism. One concern is the complexity of the original model: which makes it difficult to test empirically. Secondly, critics argue it offers weak predictive power as well as lacking an acknowledgement of situational and personal factors. Given this, there are very few studies which tested all dimensions of task-tech technology fit (Eybers et al. 2019).

In response, extensions of TTF have incorporated factors such as user trust to improve its predictive power (Teo and Men 2008). Jeyaraj (2022) suggests that TTF is best evaluated based on users' perceptions (e.g. perceived usefulness) than on researchers attempts to measure usage behaviour.

1.2 AI in coaching

While early developments focused on script based coaching bots, the emergence of generative AI has created an existential threat in the coach community (Diller et al. 2024). In response some have argued from a philosophical perspective AI tools cannot coach, as coaching is purely a human endeavour (Bachkirova and Kemp 2024). Other have chosen to focus on an empirical approach, evaluating the efficacy of such tools, often with positive results (Mai et al. 2021; Terblanche et al. 2023). However, a systemic literature review of the published literature has raised a need for caution in generalizing from these studies, given the focus of published studies has been skewed towards student populations and health and wellbeing outcomes (Passmore, Olaffson, and Tee 2025a). More significantly the scalability, consistency and lower cost of AI compared to human-led coaching means that organisational interest is growing, which has seen global digital coaching providers, such as EZRA, BetterUp and CoachHub, now leverage Generative AI to deliver services including role-play, feedback, performance tracking, and coach-matching (Financial Times 2025). The growing capabilities of Gen AI combined with significant investment suggest there is belief this market is likely to grow over the coming decade. One challenge is user acceptance. Will users engage with it? Evidence from the Sinclair C5, Segway to Google Glass all suggest, that great ideas can be thwarted by limited user acceptance.

1.3 TTF Theory and AI coaching

Applied to AI, TTF predicts that coaching technology will be effective when its functions (e.g., personalised interventions and real-time adaptation) map closely to coaching tasks such as goal setting and reflective dialogue. However, as noted above, a critical component is user perceptions of the technology, as opposed to its technical capabilities. Thus, TTF offers a useful framework for evaluating when AI coaching is perceived as adding value to the development and decision making of workplace managers.

1.4 Research question

In this study we sought to use Task Technology Fit (TTF) Theory as a framework to explore user experiences (UX) of engaging with AI coaching agents. Specially our research question was: How well does TTF explain user attitudes when considering AI technology and how should designers develop AI coaching tools to best meet user expectations? The research questions guiding the inquiry were explicitly formulated as: “How do managers perceive AI tools following their personal use of an AI coaching agents?” and “How do they see such agents supporting their learning, development and work role?”

2 Method

2.1 Procedure

This study employed an exploratory, cross-sectional design, adopting a qualitative, inductive methodology informed by Creswell and Creswell (2017). Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, analysed using thematic analysis in accordance with established qualitative research protocols (Braun and Clarke 2012; Terry et al. 2017). The study was guided by a relativist ontology, acknowledging that individual experiences of phenomena vary based upon contextual and experiential differences. Additionally, the research embraced a social constructionist epistemology, recognising that understanding emerges through social interactions and shared meanings (Easterby-Smith et al. 2021).

Participants were purposefully selected to ensure richness and relevance of data. The study specifically targeted managers with direct experiences of using one of more AI coaching agents as part of their work role. The participant selection strategy was aligned with recommendations from Flick (2022), with inclusion criteria established prior to data collection.

In assessing user experience (UX) within this qualitative study, we drew upon Norman and Draper (1986). They argued UX was central to system effectiveness and emphasised the cognitive compatibility, user control, and the alignment of technology with user tasks. By incorporating these concepts into the analysis allowed for a deeper understanding of how users’ expectations, behaviours, and experiences influence the perceived fit between the task and the technology, enriching the interpretation of qualitative data within a TTF framework.

Ten interview questions were used to explore the UX and TTF theory constructs.

2.2 Participants

Fourteen managers were invited to participate in the study and twelve participated in the research study. Two individuals withdrew as they were not able to make the interviews due to changing work commitments. The participants were drawn from different sectors

and roles including health care, government and IT. Participant roles and responsibilities ranged from higher managerial to intermediate managerial, administrative or professional. In gender 60% were female and 40% were male, while 75% were white and 25% were BIPOC. All participants were aged 18-65. Participant details are summarised in Tab. 1. Participants exposure varied, with users access 1-3 bots during the preceding 3 months to the study.

Table 1 Participants

Research Participant Code	Gender identity	Age	Racial identity	Industry
P1	F	40-65	White	Healthcare (Public Sector)
P2	F	18-39	White	Professional Services/Consulting
P3	F	40-65	BIPOC	Professional Services/Consulting
P4	M	18-39	BIPOC	Professional Services/Consulting
P5	M	40-65	White	Technology/IT
P6	F	40-65	White	Technology/IT
P7	F	40-65	White	Professional Services/Consulting
P8	F	40-65	White	Government (Public Sector)
P9	M	40-65	BIPOC	Technology/IT
P10	M	40-65	White	Technology/IT
P11	M	40-65	White	Government (Public Sector)
P12	F	40-65	White	Government (Public Sector)

2.3 Ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained for the research from Henley Business School, University of Reading (Reference: SREC-HBS-20241219-JOPA8826). All participants signed a Consent form prior to the interview and were advised the data would be transcribed, anonymised and would be used for research purposes. Individuals were able to withdraw at any time.

2.4 Analysis

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect data. The interviews were structured around the ten questions and lasted between 25-45 minutes. Each interview was recorded and transcribed via Microsoft Teams. The transcripts were analysed using

a thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2012; Terry et al. 2017). A review process was used to identify the key themes, which were then compared with the existing literature.

2.5 Themes

The researchers generated a series of themes from their analysis, which are reported in the next section. In total, six themes were identified. The themes are summarised in Tab. 2.

Table 2: Themes

Theme	Explanation
Theme 1: Accessible Simplicity	How well the AI tool supports real work tasks, particularly efficiency and usability.
Theme 2: Relational empathy	Concerns or insights about emotional resonance, empathy, and human connection in AI tools.
*Theme 3: M*ore or less	What users found valuable or limiting in their engagement with the AI tool.
Theme 4: Ethics, Bias and Trust concerns	Reflections on data privacy, fairness, accuracy, or over-reliance on AI.
Theme 5: Adoption as a systemic issue	Individual, social or organisational factors influencing uptake.
Theme 6: Hybrid Human-AI Future	A vision or preference for how AI and human roles might co-exist in coaching or learning.

3 Findings

3.1 Theme 1: Accessible Simplicity

The theme of functional fit emerged as a prime factor influencing how participants evaluated the AI coaching tools. Ten participants highlighted how the tool aligned with or enhanced their existing workflows, particularly in areas such as reflection, task planning, and performance review. The primary strength noted was its capacity to structure thought processes efficiently, supporting everyday work tasks without requiring extensive onboarding or technical skills.

Participant 6 remarked: “It’s instantaneous… I’m not waiting for a monthly meeting… and ultimately, it’s free as well,” suggesting that the value of the tool lay in its accessibility and integration into the workday.
Participant 10 added: “*It helped with writing and brainstorming… I used it for work and personal use – it fits everywhere*,” illustrating the perceived versatility and relevance to diverse roles.

3.2 Theme 2: Relational empathy

The second theme captures participant concerns around the emotional and relational limitations of AI coaching tools. Eight participants expressed the view that while the tool mimicked a conversational tone, it failed to replicate the deep empathy, emotional nuance, and psychological safety offered by human coaches.

Participant 4 commented: "*There are foundational elements that define coaching… the relationality and the human-to-human connect. That's what's missing."* This statement reflects the perceived boundary between a transactional interaction and a meaningful human connection. The implication is that AI coaches can appear to the user as helpful but emotionally hollow. They provide surface engagement but not subtly or depth.

Participant 3 added: "*We respond to anything that mimics empathy… but it's not real*…". This and other comments highlighted a potentially deceptive experience when engaging with systems that appear emotionally intelligent but are not. While all the systems used were text driven coaching bots, we wonder whether this feeling of deception would diminish or grow when more anthropomorphic coaching tools are used, such as voice to voice, with human instead of animal images or using moving human images, human names and photorealistic human avatars.

This limitation connects with behavioural science findings that highlight the role of co-regulation and empathy, in supporting behavioural change (Rogers 1961). While AI tools can deliver open questions, summarise client responses and follow a structured process (Passmore, Tee, and Rutschman 2025b), users felt the tools lacked the capacity for emotional presence, deep listening, and adaptive empathy compared with human coaches (Passmore et al. 2025c).

3.3 Theme 3: More or less

The theme of perceived value versus limitation captured a broad spectrum of participant experiences. Eight participants described the AI tool as useful for initiating thought, capturing reflections, or prompting progress. At the same time, individuals also highlighted its limitations, particularly regarding depth, personalisation, and interactivity.

Participant 5 commented: "*It was like three standard questions… there was no nuance, no depth*". While the tool offered a useful starting point, users felt it did not support complex, layered development goals. Others echoed this perspective, using words like 'formulaic' and 'one-size-fits-all' to describe their AI experience when compare to a human coach.

Despite these concerns, many participants acknowledged the AI's value for short-form journaling, feedback logging, or clarifying immediate priorities. Participant 10 noted: "*I used it for thinking things through—it's good for helping you not procrastinate.*" The trade-off appears to be between structure and substance: the AI can aid performance-focused

or time-bound tasks but is limited when it comes to exploratory, emotional, or nuanced coaching.

3.4 Theme 4: Ethics, Bias and Trust concerns

Ethics, bias, and trust formed a powerful theme within the participant narratives. Concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the authenticity of AI-driven interactions were raised by six participants. These concerns significantly influenced how comfortable users felt sharing sensitive reflections with the AI.

Participant 2 remarked: "*It makes me nervous… It's the data thing*," citing workplace pressures and client policies as sources of anxiety. Participant 9 was more direct: "*All the guidance is issued by white middle-aged men… there's danger in groupthink*," highlighting perceived limitations in diversity and fairness in the system's training data.

Participant 3 offered a powerful insight: "*We respond to empathy, even if it's not real. That makes it dangerous.*" This underscores ethical concerns around simulated empathy, AI that mimics emotional connection may mislead users in emotionally vulnerable situations and lead to possible overreliance on AI reassurance.

3.5 Theme 5: Adoption as a systemic issue

Barriers and enablers to adoption emerged clearly across interviews, with ten participants offering insights into factors influencing AI coaching tool usage. Many described uncertainty about the tool's role, digital confidence, and organisational culture as key determinants of engagement.

Participant 8 said: "*It felt like a friend… a clean relationship, no judgment*," showing how emotional comfort and perceived neutrality can support early adoption. In contrast, Participant 2 noted: "*The provider is all over us for data security… it makes me nervous*," highlighting how external compliance pressures can inhibit usage. Participant 10 emphasised the learning curve: "*It felt natural… but only once you know how to use it*," pointing to effort expectancy as a gatekeeper to effective use.

3.6 Theme 6: Emerging Symbiarchic Leadership

A recurring theme was the emergence of a hybrid future, where AI tools are integrated into the workplace, contributing to what we have labelled the rise of 'Symbiarchic Leadership', where leaders are required to identify, appoint, train, deploy, and manage both human and AI resources in their teams. Ten participants articulated a vision where AI augments their roles and their learning undertaking some tasks completely, partnering on others and with humans focusing on tasks which they are best equipped to deliver, such as tasks which require emotional depth, ethical framing, and adaption. In learning this leads to an integration of AI and human resources to support learning in a hybrid model.

Participant 9 envisioned this clearly: "*We'll reach a point where AI complements the coach… creating deeper insights*." Participant 7 highlighted scalability: "*It (the AI coach) provides timely guidance… something I can't do at scale*." These comments reflect growing acceptance of AI as a performance support tool, but not as a relational replacement.

Participant 4 added nuance: "*Don't call it coaching… it's not relational. But it helps."* This underscores the need for accurate framing—AI as a supplement, not a substitute. Participants emphasised expectations must be managed to preserve the unique value of human coaching.

4 Discussion

The six emergent themes from this study provide a rich understanding of the evolving landscape of AI-supported coaching and leadership development in professional contexts, which is enhanced by TTF theory. Collectively, the themes reflect a cautious optimism among participants, acknowledging the functional and logistical benefits of AI tools, while simultaneously grappling with their limitations.

4.1 Accessible simplicity as a foundation for adoption

Accessible simplicity emerged as a clear determinant of initial engagement. Participants identified task alignment, speed, and ease of use as central strengths. In line with TTF theory (Zigurs and Buckland 1998), the AI coaching tool was positively received when it effectively supported workflow-related tasks such as reflection, planning, and feedback processing. Notably, these features met the immediate, procedural demands of users without requiring a steep learning curve. This echoes Schmidt et al. (2024), who argue that in fast-paced environments, tools that reduce cognitive friction and accelerate capability development are more likely to be adopted. However, functional fit alone did not guarantee ongoing engagement, especially when emotional or contextual depth was required.

However, in the same interviews participants also highlighted their experiences of the systems limitations. Some users found that some tools interface problematic or raised other factors which reduced the frequency of their use.

Overall, these findings suggest that for AI coaching to be effective in professional settings, it does not need to match human coaching, but instead it must align closely with user task demands, workflows and time constraints. Functional fit does not require perfection, but instead must be perceived as creating value in providing a support for performance or a saving in time to complete everyday role tasks.

4.2 Relational Empathy

Relationality and empathy emerged as a critical fault line in participants' evaluations. While the AI tools demonstrated conversational fluency, they failed to replicate the emotional intelligence and psychological safety which participants felt would be present when engaging with a human coach.

Rogers (1961) emphasises the importance of co-regulation and attunement as foundations of effective client work, and these ideas have bene central in the development of coach education and practice (Passmore and v. Bartheld 2024).

The Participants' discomfort with the AI's emotional limitations suggests a misfit in emotionally rich or identity-sensitive contexts, consistent with TTF theory's concept of task mismatch. More recently writers (Phillipson et al. 2025; Hu et al. 2024) have reinforced the view that emotional resonance is non-negotiable in developmental contexts requiring trust and vulnerability. Thus, while AI can assist in structured tasks, these text-based tools were unable to replicate the human capacity for relational coaching, while users held expectations that the experience would be similar to engaging with a human coach.

These concerns also map onto Task-Technology Fit (TTF) theory's concept of emotional-task misfit (Zigurs and Buckland 1998), whereby a tool may function well for procedural tasks but underperform in affectively rich settings. AI's inability to adapt to subtle relational cues may create a ceiling for its coaching potential, or encourage designers to more clearly set expectations about the potential of the tool.

4.3 More or less

The third theme highlights the tension between perceived value and system limitations. Participants valued the AI tools for immediate tasks such as reflectional conversations, journaling or ideation but criticised its lack of depth, adaptability, and personalisation. This reflects a moderate fit within the TTF framework: the tools were adequate for linear tasks but insufficient for dynamic or emergent learning needs.

Nissim and Simon (2021), have previously cautioned against overstating AI's usefulness in human-centred fields where nuance and narrative matter. As with many tools, the perceived value was heavily dependent on the framing of the tool's capabilities and the accuracy of user expectations. When misalignment occurred, user disappointment follows, which risks contributing to lower levels of engagement and adoption.

4.4 Trust, Ethics, and the Need for Transparency

Ethical concerns surfaced strongly in participants' reflections, particularly regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the importance of transparency. This theme reveals a socio-technical misfit: the technology may function well but fails to meet the broader

psychological and ethical expectations of users, especially experiences of using the AI coaching tools over time.

This finding mirrors Binns (2018), who highlights the risks of hidden algorithmic processes that reduce user trust. Van der Gun and Guest (2023) expand this notion further by exploring non-intentional dehumanisation through anthropomorphic AI design. In emotionally sensitive environments, AI's simulated empathy may lead users to over-trust a tool that cannot reciprocate care and could lead to psychological overreliance on AI. As TTF theory emphasises, user perceptions of trust and transparency are key contextual variables affecting sustained engagement.

As AI permeate coaching and learning, transparent design, ethical audits, and diverse development teams are essential to build trust (Passmore, Olaffson and Tee 2025a). Without these safeguards, AI risks being perceived not just as limited, but as unsafe or manipulative.

4.5 Adoption as a Systemic Issue

The fifth theme reframes AI adoption as not just a matter of functionality, but of system readiness. Factors such as organisational culture, digital confidence, and perceived effort expectancy played pivotal roles in shaping user behaviour.

This theme aligns with Venkatesh et al.'s (2003) Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), especially the constructs of performance expectancy, effort expectancy, and facilitating conditions. It also resonates with behavioural insights that highlight the importance of friction reduction, clear purpose, and social proof (Kahneman, 011). It further connects with Norman's concept of the 'Paradox of Technology' (Norman 1988. where added functionality can increase complexity and user frustration unless the design bridges cognitive gaps effectively. Norman advocates for user-centred design, simplifying interfaces and ensuring intuitive mappings, to reduce effort and build user confidence.

Organisational context also proved critical. Technology adoption is best achieved when it is integrated into a wider digital transformation. Implementation studies in education echo this, showing that digital tools are best adopted when they are culturally embedded, supported by training, and endorsed by leadership and offering customisation opportunities for organisations (Department for Education and Department for Business, Innovation & Skills 2021; Gulzar et al. 2025).

From a TTF standpoint, tool–task alignment alone isn't sufficient. Adoption depends on a broader fit, spanning organisational culture, digital maturity, and behavioural norms. Key enablers included tailored training, peer endorsement, psychological safety, and formal integration into cultures, development cycles and workflows.

4.6 Symbiarchic Leadership: The Hybrid Future

Finally, participants repeatedly expressed support for a hybrid model—where AI augments but does not replace humans. This configuration was seen as the most ethical and scalable way to combine the strengths of both human and machine. Empirical studies support this: with hybrid coaching approaches providing positive evidence of impact (Passmore et al. 2026). From a TTF standpoint, this hybrid model represents a high-fit scenario: AI is suited to structured, repetitive tasks, while humans excel in interpretive, emotional, and adaptive domains. Success depends on clarity of task allocation to human or AI, user training, and ethical oversight or discernment when choosing to apply AI generated outputs.

4.7 Limitations of the study

While this study offers valuable insights into the perceived alignment between AI coaching bots and users' professional tasks, it is not without its limitations. The qualitative design, while well-suited for exploratory inquiry, necessarily limits generalisability. The purposive sampling of twelve participants, though diverse across sectors, represents a relatively small and self-selecting group. This may have led to the over-representation of early adopters and under-representation of more sceptical or digitally hesitant users. Furthermore, participants' prior exposure to AI coaching tools may have influenced their evaluations, limiting insight into first-time user experiences or resistance factors. The cross-sectional design also constrains our understanding of how perceptions might evolve over time, particularly as users' familiarity increases or as AI coachbot functionality continues to develop. Additionally, while Task-Technology Fit theory provided a useful analytical framework, its original focus on functional alignment may not fully accommodate the emotional, ethical, and relational dynamics which are critical features of coaching engagements and thus AI coachbots. These limitations suggest that while the findings provide a rich and timely snapshot, caution must be exercised in making broader inferences, and further research is warranted to deepen and extend these initial insights as AI tools develop.

4.8 Implications for Practice

The findings from this study have several implications for those developing and implementing AI coaching tools in organisational contexts. The concept of "accessible simplicity" highlights the importance of designing tools that are intuitive, time-efficient, and which can be readily integrated into existing workflows. Rather than pursuing maximal technological sophistication, designers should prioritise functional clarity and ease of use. At the same time, the study reveals that users approach AI coaching with expectations shaped by human coaching paradigms, particularly in relation to emotional connection, empathy, and psychological safety. Designers should as a result help to manage user expectations by greater transparency and framing AI not as a substitute for human coaching, but as a complementary support tool for structured reflection and task-oriented development. Ethical considerations are equally critical. Concerns about privacy, algorithmic bias, and the simulation of empathy suggest that transparency and user trust

must be central to the design and implementation process, enabling users to understand how data is used and provide clear consent. Organisations introducing such tools will also need to invest in training future users to deeper user understanding and digital capability and simultaneously supporting broader cultural realignment to foster confidence and psychological safety among users. When embedded within a broader ecosystem of human development, this study suggests that AI coaching can serve as a valuable adjunct to human-led approaches, offering scalable, low-friction support for performance and learning.

4.9 Implications for research

Research in AI coaching has accelerated rapidly since 2020. This study opens several avenues for further investigation into the integration of AI in coaching and professional development. It highlights the need to evolve Task-Technology Fit theory to better account for emotionally complex, ethically charged, and relationally rich contexts. Traditional TTF dimensions—such as functional alignment and task efficiency—may be necessary but insufficient to explain user engagement with AI in developmental settings. Future research could build on this foundation by incorporating constructs such as perceived empathy, trustworthiness, and psychological safety into the theoretical framework. Secondly, longitudinal studies are particularly needed to assess how user attitudes change with sustained use, especially as AI tools become more contextually adaptive or emotionally expressive. Thirdly comparative studies exploring user experiences across different demographic groups, specifically age and neurodiversity, as well as cultural settings, such as Japan and Middle East, would also help to illuminate both cultural differences in approaches to technology and questions over inclusion. Finally, participatory and user-centred design methodologies present promising directions for ensuring that future AI coaching tools are not only technically robust but also socially and ethically attuned.

5 Conclusion

These six themes collectively underscore the nuanced relationship between users, AI coaching tools, and the socio-technical systems within which they operate. Task-Technology Fit theory provides a helpful lens for understanding these dynamics, revealing that optimal use occurs when tools align not only with tasks, but also with user values, organisational context, and psychological expectations. The findings suggest that AI coaching tools can offer meaningful value when their use is framed correctly, integrated into a valuable ecosystem of development models, and implemented within cultures that support experimentation, reflection, and ethical engagement. Rather than replacing human coaches, AI at present may be better positioned as a complementary capability—amplifying its capabilities for coaching at scale, with convenient instant access around the clock, and with a focus on short, task focused, transactional conversations. In contrast, humans coaching can continue to provide the empathy, cultural and ethically nuances conversations which require reflection and judgment essential for deep and transformational growth.

References

Bachkirova, T., & Kemp, R. (2024). 'AI coaching': Democratising coaching service or offering an ersatz? *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 18*(1), 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2024.2368598

Binns, R. (2018). *Fairness in Machine Learning: Lessons from Political Philosophy*. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81:149–159. Verified publication with open-access PDF: https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/binns18a.html

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper et al. (eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57–71). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Department for Education and Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (2021). *Implementation of education technology in schools and colleges*. UK Government report: evidence-based guidance on embedding digital tools, including user training and organisational readiness. assets.publishing.service.gov.uk+1educa. Retrieved on 3rd June 2025.

Diller, S. J., Stenzel, L-C., & Passmore, J. (2024). The Coach Bots Are Coming: Exploring Coaches' Attitudes and Responses to the Threat of AI Coaching*, Human Resource Development International. 27*(4), 597-621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2024.2375934

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. & Jackson, P.R. (2021). Management and business research. 7th edn. London: Sage Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351154631_Management_and_business_research_7th_edition

Eybers, S., et al. (2019). Matching technology with enterprise architecture and enterprise architecture management tasks using task technology fit. In *Enterprise, Business-Process and Information Systems Modeling: 20th International Conference, BPMDS 2019, 24th International Conference, EMMSAD 2019, Held at CAiSE 2019, Rome, Italy, June 3–4, 2019, Proceedings 20* (pp. 245-260). Basel: Springer International Publishing.

Financial Times (2025). The AI chatbots offering workplace counsel. *Financial Times*, 17 March 2025.

Flick, U. (2022). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (7th ed.). London: Sage.

Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance. *MIS Quarterly, 19,* 213-236. https://doi.org/10.2307/249689

Gulzar, M., Naqvi, B., & Smolander, K. (2025). Technology Change Adoption in Organizations: Drivers, Challenges, and Success Enablers. In Papatheocharous, E., et al. (eds.), *Software Business. ICSOB 2024. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing*, vol 539. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-85849-9_32

Hu, S., et al. (2024). Coaching to develop leadership of healthcare managers: a mixed-methods systematic review. *BMC Medical Education, 24,* 1083. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06081-y

Huy, L., et al. (2024). Generative AI, Why, How, and Outcomes: A User Adoption Study. *AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction, 16*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.17705/1thci.00198

Jeyaraj, A. (2022). A Meta-Regression of Task-Technology Fit in Information Systems Research. *International Journal of Information Management, 65*, 13. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102493

Kahneman, D. (2021). *Thinking Fast and low*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux

Mai, V., et al. (2021). Accompanying reflection processes by an AI- based Studi CoachBot: a study on rapport building in human-machine coaching using self-disclosure. In C. Stephanidis et al. (eds.), *HCI International 2021 - Late Breaking Papers: Cognition, Inclusion, Learning, and Culture.* Basel: Springer International Publishing (13096, pp. 439-457). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-90328-2_29.

Nissim, G., & Simon, T. (2021). The future of labour unions in the age of automation and at the dawn of AI. *Technology in Society, 67*, Article 101732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101732

Norman, D.A., & Draper, S.W. (1986)**.** *User Centered System Design: New Perspectives on Human-Computer Interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Norman, D. A. (1988). *The Psychology of Everyday Things*. New York: Basic Books.

Passmore, J., & Bartheld, J. v. (2024). *Becoming an accredited ICF Coach*. London; Libri.

Passmore, J., Olaffson, B., & Tee, D. (2025a). A systematic literature review of artificial intelligence (AI) in coaching: Insights for future research and product development. *Journal of Work – Applied Management*. In advance of Publication. Doi:10.1108/JWAM-11-2024-0164

Passmore, J., Tee, D., & Rutschman, R. (2025b). Getting better all the time: Using professional coach competencies to evaluate the quality of AI Coach bot performance. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Practice & Research,* In advance of Publication, https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2025.2510643

Passmore, J., Palermo, G., Tee, D., & Rutschmann, R. (2025c). Human coaches & AI Coaching Agents: An exploratory quasi experimental design study of workplace client attitudes performance. *Journal of Work – Applied Management.* In advance of Publication. http://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-02-2025-0032

Passmore, J., Gething Lewis, E., Rodgers, J., & Malakoudis, P. (2026). Using Hybrid Coaching to enhance technology adoption: A Thematic Analysis of user experiences of Microsoft Copilot adoption. *European Journal of Training & Development*, In advance of Publication.

Phillipson, J., et al. (2025). *Leadership Training in Healthcare: A Systematic Umbrella Review*. BMJ Leader, In Advance of publication.

Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Schmidt, J., et al. (2024). Mapping the regulatory landscape for artificial intelligence in health within the European Union. *NPJ Digit Med*. *7*(1), 229. doi: 10.1038/s41746-024-01221-6

Teo, T. S., & Men, B. (2008). Knowledge portals in Chinese consulting firms: a task–technology fit perspective. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *17*(6), 557-574.

Terblanche, N., et al. (2023). Performance matters: students' perceptions of Artificial Intelligence Coach adoption factors. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 16*(1), 100-114, doi: 10.1080/17521882.2022.2094278.

Terry, G., et al. (2017). Thematic Analysis. In C. Willig & C. Rogers (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (2nd ed, pp. 17-37). London: Sage.

Venkatesh, V., et al. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(3), 425-478. https://doi.org/10.5172/impp.2012.14.2.231

Zigurs, I., & Buckland, B. K. (1998). A Theory of Task/Technology Fit and Group Support Systems Effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly*, *22*(3), 313–334. https://doi.org/10.2307/249668