



Systemic Questioning in Collegial Case Consultation: A Qualitative Exploratory Study from a Systemic Constructivistic Perspective

Shereen Safavi ^{1*}, Dr. Veronika Sweet ²

¹ Degendorf Institute of Technology, Germany

² ReflAct Institute, Germany

* Corresponding Author: **Shereen Safavi**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04

Volume: 07

Issue: 05

Received: 21-07-2026

Accepted: 19-08-2026

Published: 17-09-2026

Page No: 441-448

Abstract

Contemporary organisations operate in environments characterised by increasing complexity, uncertainty and continuous transformation. Under such conditions, approaches based on linear problem-solving and expert-driven interventions are reaching their limits. Systemic coaching offers an alternative perspective by understanding organisations, teams and individuals as interconnected systems in which realities are continuously co-constructed through communication and interaction. Within this perspective, systemic questioning represents one of the central conversational practices for enabling reflection, perspective-taking and the emergence of new possibilities.

Although collegial case consultation has become an established format for professional reflection across organisational contexts, little research has explored how systemic questioning is experienced within these collaborative settings. This study addresses this gap through an exploratory qualitative research design grounded in systemic constructivism. Data were generated through a semi-structured focus group involving experienced coaches, consultants and organisational leaders with practical expertise in collegial case consultation. Rather than seeking causal explanations, the study reconstructs participants' subjective experiences and shared interpretations regarding the use of systemic questioning during collegial consultation processes.

The findings suggest that participants experienced systemic questions as creating dialogical spaces that encouraged perspective shifts, collective reflection and collaborative meaning-making. Instead of producing direct effects, systemic questioning appeared to facilitate conversational processes through which alternative interpretations, previously unnoticed relationships and new possibilities for action could emerge. Participants also described challenges related to maintaining a systemic stance, avoiding premature solution orientation and tolerating uncertainty throughout the consultation process.

From a constructivist perspective, these findings are understood as context-dependent reconstructions rather than objective evidence of effectiveness. The study contributes to systemic coaching research by illuminating how systemic questioning supports collaborative reflection within collegial case consultation while reinforcing the importance of systemic attitudes such as curiosity, not-knowing, resource orientation and second-order observation. It further highlights the relevance of qualitative inquiry for understanding professional learning as a relational and co-constructed process in complex organisational environments

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2026.7.5.441-448>

Keywords: Systemic coaching, collegial case consultation, systemic questioning, constructivism, qualitative research, reflection, perspective-taking, organisational learning

1. Introduction

Organisations increasingly operate within environments characterised by complexity, uncertainty, digital transformation and rapidly changing social and organisational conditions. Traditional models of leadership and professional development, often grounded in prediction, control, and linear cause-and-effect assumptions, frequently prove insufficient for addressing the

dynamic realities of contemporary organisational life. As complexity increases, professional practice requires approaches that acknowledge ambiguity, interdependence and the multiplicity of perspectives rather than searching for singular explanations or universally applicable solutions (Dollinger & Hogrefe, 2013) ^[1].

Systemic coaching has emerged as one response to these developments. Rooted in systems theory, second-order cybernetics and radical constructivism, systemic coaching does not conceptualise organisations or individuals as isolated entities whose behaviour can be explained through linear causal relationships. Instead, it understands people as participants within relational systems in which meaning continuously emerges through communication, interaction and observation (von Schlippe & Schweizer, 2019) ^[2]. From this perspective, coaching is less concerned with solving predefined problems than with creating conversational spaces in which new distinctions, alternative interpretations and previously unnoticed possibilities can emerge (Patrzek, 2021; Radatz, 2008) ^[3, 4].

Central to this systemic understanding is the assumption that realities are not objectively discovered but socially and individually constructed (Mohr, 2020) ^[5]. Consequently, systemic interventions cannot directly produce change. Rather, they offer invitations for reflection that may enable systems to generate their own new understandings (Cornelissen, 2021) ^[6]. The role of the coach therefore shifts from providing expert knowledge towards facilitating processes of dialogue, curiosity and collaborative exploration. This systemic stance is reflected in principles such as resource orientation, neutrality, circularity, appreciation of multiple perspectives and the well-established notion of not-knowing (Ludwig von Bertalanffy, 1968; Radatz, 2008; Palazzoli *et al*, 1980) ^[7, 4, 8].

One of the most distinctive conversational practices within systemic coaching is systemic questioning. Rather than collecting information or guiding clients towards predetermined conclusions, systemic questions invite participants to observe situations differently, reconsider established interpretations and explore relationships that previously remained unnoticed (Freedman & Combs, 1996) ^[9]. Through circular, hypothetical, resource-oriented, scaling or future-oriented questions, conversations become opportunities for expanding possibilities rather than confirming existing assumptions.

These dialogical qualities become particularly relevant within collegial case consultation. Unlike traditional expert consultation, collegial case consultation is based on reciprocal learning among professionals who collaboratively reflect upon authentic cases from their own practice (Franz & Kopp, 2015; Seyfried & Marschke, 2022) ^[10, 11]. Participants alternately assume the roles of facilitator, case presenter and reflective colleagues, creating a structured yet self-organised environment for professional learning. Within such settings, systemic questioning has the potential to enrich collective reflection by encouraging multiple viewpoints, supporting collaborative sense-making and maintaining openness towards uncertainty without prematurely narrowing conversations towards solutions (Schiersmann & Hausner, 2023; Ryschka & Tietze, 2011) ^[12, 13].

Despite the growing practical relevance of collegial case consultation in organisational development, leadership education, healthcare, social work and coaching practice, relatively little research has examined how systemic

questioning is experienced within these collaborative consultation processes. Existing literature predominantly describes either systemic questioning as a coaching intervention or collegial case consultation as a methodological framework. Their intersection, however, remains comparatively underexplored, particularly from a qualitative constructivist perspective that foregrounds participants' lived experiences rather than measurable outcomes.

This paper addresses this gap through an exploratory qualitative study investigating how experienced practitioners describe the use of systemic questioning during collegial case consultation. Rather than evaluating effectiveness in linear terms, the study seeks to reconstruct how participants experience reflection, perspective-taking, collaborative dialogue and meaning-making throughout the consultation process. The research is explicitly informed by a systemic constructivist epistemology, recognising that knowledge generated through qualitative inquiry represents context-dependent reconstructions co-created by participants and researchers alike.

By focusing on subjective experience instead of causal explanation, the study contributes to current discussions within systemic coaching, organisational learning, and qualitative research methodology. It further illustrates how systemic questioning may support professional reflection not by providing answers but by creating relational spaces in which new understandings can emerge through dialogue.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1. Systemic Coaching as a Constructivist Practice

Systemic coaching has evolved as an increasingly relevant approach for supporting individuals and organisations in contexts characterised by complexity, uncertainty, and continuous change (Suling & Wildner, 2024) ^[15]. Rather than viewing organisations as predictable systems that can be managed through linear interventions, systemic coaching understands organisational life as emerging from ongoing interactions between individuals, relationships and social contexts. This perspective shifts attention from isolated individuals towards the relational processes through which realities are continuously constructed (Baecker, 2021; Berger & Luckmann, 1966) ^[16, 17].

The theoretical foundations of systemic coaching are deeply rooted in systems theory, second-order cybernetics and radical constructivism. Ludwig von Bertalanffy's General Systems Theory (1968) introduced the idea that living systems cannot be understood by analysing isolated components alone but must be viewed through the relationships between their interconnected elements. Later developments by Gregory Bateson (1972) expanded this perspective by emphasising communication patterns, circular causality and interaction as the primary units of analysis. Instead of asking why a problem exists, systemic thinking explores how relational patterns are maintained and how alternative interactions might emerge.

This systemic orientation was further developed through second-order cybernetics. Heinz von Foerster argued that observers inevitably participate in the realities they describe. Consequently, observation itself becomes part of the system under investigation. Knowledge can therefore never be regarded as an objective representation of reality but rather as a construction emerging from particular observational perspectives (Abels, 2007) ^[19]. Ernst von Glasersfeld's radical

constructivism similarly proposes that individuals actively construct their realities through experience rather than discovering an external objective truth (von Glasersfeld, 1997) ^[20].

Within coaching, these epistemological assumptions fundamentally reshape the professional role of the coach. Rather than acting as an expert who diagnoses problems and prescribes solutions, the systemic coach facilitates conversations through which clients may develop new distinctions, interpretations and possibilities for action. Change is therefore not understood as something externally produced by interventions but as an emergent process generated by the system itself. The coach contributes to this process by creating conditions that invite reflection while respecting the autonomy and self-organising capacity of the client system (von Schlippe & Schweizer, 2019) ^[2].

From this perspective, coaching becomes less about transferring knowledge and more about facilitating collaborative meaning-making. Reflection is not directed towards identifying correct answers but towards expanding the range of possible observations available to participants. Consequently, systemic coaching values uncertainty not as a deficit but as a productive condition for learning and development.

2.2. The Systemic Attitude

Although systemic coaching is often associated with particular methods, its defining characteristic lies less in specific techniques than in the underlying professional attitude (Wilhelm, 2015) ^[21]. Systemic interventions derive their effectiveness not primarily from the questions themselves but from the epistemological stance from which these questions are asked.

Central to this stance is the principle of not-knowing, which has become one of the defining characteristics of systemic practice. Rather than assuming privileged access to truth, systemic practitioners deliberately suspend premature interpretations and remain curious about the multiple reality's participants may construct. This position does not imply ignorance or lack of expertise. Instead, it reflects an ethical and epistemological commitment to respecting the client's own expertise regarding their lived experience (Radatz, 2008; Richter-Kaupp *et al.* 2021) ^[4, 22].

Closely connected to this attitude is the systemic assumption that every observation is context-dependent. Behaviours cannot be understood independently from the relational systems within which they occur. Consequently, systemic conversations avoid reducing complex situations to individual deficits or singular causes. Instead, they invite participants to observe interactions, relationships and contextual influences that may otherwise remain unnoticed (Herwig-Lempp, 2019; Erpenbeck, 2023) ^[23, 24].

Resource orientation constitutes another central element of the systemic mindset (Radatz, 2010) ^[25]. Rather than focusing on pathology or deficits, systemic conversations intentionally search for existing competencies, successful exceptions, previous experiences and available resources that may contribute to future development (Kollak, 2024) ^[26]. This orientation reflects the assumption that sustainable change is more likely to emerge from strengthening existing capabilities than from analysing problems in ever greater detail.

Equally important is the principle of neutrality or, more appropriately, multi-partiality (Palazzoli *et al.*, 1980) ^[8].

Systemic practitioners refrain from privileging one perspective over another. Instead, they seek to understand how different participants construct different yet equally coherent realities. This openness allows multiple interpretations to coexist without requiring immediate resolution, thereby supporting richer collective reflection (Lindemann, 2023) ^[27].

Together, curiosity, resource orientation, contextual thinking and second-order observation form the professional attitude through which systemic questioning becomes meaningful. Without this systemic stance, questioning risks becoming another technique for directing conversations rather than opening spaces for dialogue (Ludewig, 2002) ^[28].

2.3. Systemic Questioning as an Invitation

Together, curiosity, resource orientation, contextual thinking and second-order observation form the professional attitude through which systemic questioning becomes meaningful. Without this systemic stance, questioning risks becoming another technique for directing conversations rather than opening spaces for dialogue.

Solution-focused approaches, particularly those developed by Steve de Shazer and Insoo Kim Berg, have significantly influenced contemporary systemic questioning (de Shazer *et al.*, 1986) ^[29]. Their work shifted attention from analysing problems towards exploring preferred futures, existing resources and small achievable changes. Within this tradition, questions are understood as conversational invitations rather than diagnostic instruments. They support the construction of new possibilities without assuming that facilitators possess superior knowledge regarding desirable outcomes (de Shazer *et al.*, 2007) ^[30].

From a constructivist perspective, the significance of systemic questions lies less in their wording than in the conversations they generate. The same question may evoke entirely different meanings depending on participants, relationships, organisational cultures and contextual conditions. Consequently, systemic questions cannot be evaluated independently from the interactions within which they occur.

Several forms of questioning have become well established within systemic coaching, including circular questions, hypothetical questions, scaling questions, resource-oriented questions, exception questions, reframing questions and the miracle question. While these formats differ in their immediate conversational focus, they share a common epistemological function: they interrupt established patterns of observation and invite participants to construct alternative understandings (Lindemann, 2023; Reiber, 2013) ^[27, 31].

Rather than producing direct behavioural change, systemic questioning therefore creates conversational conditions under which participants may recognise previously unnoticed distinctions, relationships and opportunities for action. Change remains an emergent property of the dialogue itself rather than a predictable consequence of any individual intervention (Maturana, 2013) ^[32].

2.4. Collegial Case Consultation as Collaborative Meaning-Making

Collegial case consultation represents a structured yet self-organised format for professional reflection in which practitioners collaboratively explore authentic challenges arising from their own work (Franz & Kopp, 2015; Seyfried & Marschke, 2022) ^[10, 11]. Unlike expert consultation,

responsibility for the reflective process remains within the group itself. Participants alternately assume different roles, including case presenter, facilitator and reflective colleagues, thereby creating a reciprocal learning environment characterised by shared responsibility and mutual trust (Weiß, 2022; Tietze, 2019) ^[33, 34].

From a systemic perspective, collegial case consultation provides considerably more than a structured problem-solving technique. It constitutes a social space in which professional knowledge is continuously negotiated through interaction. Participants do not simply exchange advice; rather, they collectively construct new understandings by contributing different observations, experiences and interpretations. Professional learning therefore emerges as a relational process rather than an individual cognitive activity (Schiersmann & Hausner, 2023; Ryschka & Tietze, 2011) ^[12, 13].

The structured phases commonly associated with collegial case consultation—including case presentation, clarification, hypothesis generation, reflection and transfer—provide sufficient stability to support open dialogue while preserving flexibility for emergent conversations. This balance between structure and openness closely aligns with systemic principles of self-organisation, circularity and contextual responsiveness (Franz & Kopp, 2015; von Bertalanffy, 1968) ^[10, 7].

Within these collaborative settings, systemic questioning appears particularly relevant. Because multiple practitioners contribute diverse professional perspectives, questions can stimulate observations that would likely remain inaccessible in individual reflection alone. Circular questions invite participants to explore relational dynamics, hypothetical questions encourage future-oriented thinking, while resource-oriented questions redirect attention towards existing competencies and successful experiences (Simon & Rech-Simon, 2023; Radatz, 2008) ^[14, 4].

Importantly, the value of systemic questioning within collegial case consultation does not lie in producing consensus. Instead, it resides in maintaining productive differences between perspectives. These differences become valuable resources for collective reflection, enabling participants to observe the same situation through multiple lenses without requiring agreement regarding a single correct interpretation.

Accordingly, collegial case consultation can be understood as a constructivist learning environment in which systemic questioning supports collaborative meaning-making rather than expert problem-solving. It is precisely this interaction between systemic dialogue and collective reflection that forms the focus of the present study.

2.5. Transition to Methodology

The theoretical considerations presented above position systemic questioning not as a collection of isolated techniques but as an expression of a broader systemic and constructivist understanding of professional dialogue. From this perspective, the relevance of systemic questions cannot be assessed through linear notions of effectiveness. Rather, their significance lies in how participants experience them within concrete conversational contexts and how they contribute to the co-construction of reflection, meaning and new possibilities (Ludewig, 2002; Mohr, 2020) ^[28, 5].

Consequently, the present study adopts an exploratory qualitative research design that seeks to reconstruct

participants' lived experiences of systemic questioning during collegial case consultation. The following section outlines the methodological approach underpinning this investigation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts an exploratory qualitative research design grounded in a systemic constructivist epistemology. Rather than seeking objective explanations or causal relationships, the research aims to reconstruct how experienced practitioners describe and make sense of systemic questioning within collegial case consultation. From this perspective, knowledge is understood as relational and context-dependent, emerging through interaction rather than existing independently of those who observe and describe it (Hussy *et al.*, 2013) ^[35].

The methodological approach therefore aligns with the epistemological assumptions underlying systemic coaching itself. Both systemic coaching and qualitative inquiry reject the notion of an objective reality that can simply be discovered. Instead, they assume that realities are continuously constructed through communication, interpretation and observation (Mey & Mruck, 2020) ^[36].

Consequently, the purpose of this study is not to determine whether systemic questioning "works" in a universal sense, but to explore how participants experience its role within collaborative reflection.

The study follows an inductive logic in which empirical material serves as the basis for developing context-sensitive interpretations rather than testing predetermined hypotheses. This exploratory orientation was considered particularly appropriate because the intersection of systemic questioning and collegial case consultation has received comparatively little empirical attention in existing literature (Patzek & Scholer, 2018) ^[37].

3.2. Participants and Context

Participants were recruited through purposive sampling to ensure substantial professional experience with collegial case consultation and systemic practice. The focus group consisted of five experienced practitioners representing leadership, organisational consulting and systemic coaching. Participants were affiliated with different organisational contexts, including Boeing Digital Aviation Solutions and the UCN Community, allowing diverse professional perspectives while maintaining a shared familiarity with collegial consultation formats (Mey & Mruck, 2010).

The intention was not statistical representativeness but information-rich dialogue. Diversity of organisational background, coaching experience and professional roles was expected to enrich the interaction by introducing multiple observations and interpretations into the conversation (Krueger & Casey, 2014; Grønkjær *et al.*, 2011) ^[38, 39].

From a systemic perspective, this diversity was not regarded as methodological noise but as an important resource for generating different constructions of meaning.

3.3. Data Collection

Empirical material was collected through a semi-structured focus group conducted in a digital environment. Focus groups are particularly suitable for systemic inquiry because meaning emerges not only through individual responses but through interaction between participants. Rather than treating participants as isolated informants, the focus group allowed

observations, agreements, differences and collective reflections to become visible within the dialogue itself (Littig & Wallace, 1997) ^[40].

The interview guide was informed by systemic theory while remaining sufficiently open to allow unexpected themes to emerge. Questions were formulated as invitations for reflection rather than requests for factual information (Krueger & Casey, 2014; Schorn, 2000) ^[38, 41]. Initial prompts encouraged participants to describe their experiences with systemic questioning during collegial case consultation, while follow-up questions explored themes such as perspective-taking, reflection, collaborative dialogue and perceived challenges (Kruse, 2014) ^[42].

The moderator intentionally adopted a systemic stance characterised by curiosity, restraint and not-knowing. Instead of directing the discussion towards predefined conclusions, moderation sought to maintain dialogue and support participants in jointly exploring their own experiences (Friebs & Gabriele, 2021; Schreier *et al.*, 2023) ^[43, 44].

All participants provided informed consent. The discussion was audio- and video-recorded, transcribed verbatim, anonymised and processed in accordance with ethical standards for qualitative research (Mey & Mruck, 2020; Niederberger & Zwick, 2023; Cassell & Symon, 2004) ^[36, 45, 46].

3.4. Researcher's Position

Within systemic constructivism, researchers cannot be understood as neutral observers positioned outside the research process. Observation itself contributes to the realities that become visible. Consequently, reflexivity formed an integral component of the methodological design. The researcher approached the study as a second-order observer, recognising that interpretations developed throughout the analysis were themselves constructions rather than objective representations of participants' experiences. Rather than attempting to eliminate subjectivity, reflexivity was understood as a resource for making the interpretive process transparent (Hoffjann & Sandhu, 2024) ^[47].

This position corresponds closely to the systemic principle of observing observations, acknowledging that empirical findings emerge through the interaction between participants, researcher, theoretical framework and context.

4. Findings

Analysis of the focus group revealed four interrelated themes describing how participants constructed the role of systemic questioning within collegial case consultation. Rather than describing direct causal effects, participants consistently portrayed systemic questions as invitations that opened conversational spaces in which reflection, perspective-taking and collaborative meaning-making became possible.

4.1. Creating Spaces for Perspective Shifts

Participants repeatedly described systemic questions as interrupting habitual interpretations of professional situations. Rather than immediately searching for solutions, questions encouraged participants to reconsider assumptions, observe relationships and explore previously unnoticed viewpoints.

Circular questions were frequently experienced as particularly valuable because they invited participants to temporarily adopt alternative perspectives. Considering how colleagues, clients or organisational actors might perceive the

same situation expanded the range of possible interpretations without requiring agreement regarding a single explanation. Perspective shifts were therefore not experienced as replacing one interpretation with another but as increasing the number of observations available to participants.

4.2. Reflection as a Collaborative Process

Reflection emerged not as an individual cognitive activity but as a relational process developing through dialogue. Participants described collegial case consultation as a conversational space in which meaning gradually evolved through interaction between multiple professional perspectives.

Systemic questions appeared to support this collaborative reflection by slowing conversations, creating pauses for consideration and encouraging participants to remain curious rather than prematurely concluding discussions.

Several participants emphasised that valuable insights often emerged unexpectedly during the dialogue itself rather than through carefully planned interventions.

Reflection was therefore experienced as an emergent property of interaction rather than the result of particular questioning techniques.

4.3. Resource Orientation and New Possibilities

Participants consistently distinguished systemic questioning from conversations centred primarily on problems or deficits. Resource-oriented questions redirected attention towards existing competencies, previous successes, supportive relationships and future possibilities.

Rather than denying the existence of professional challenges, these questions enabled participants to describe situations from perspectives that highlighted available resources and alternative courses of action.

Importantly, participants did not experience these conversations as prescribing solutions. Instead, they described systemic questions as expanding possibilities while leaving responsibility for future decisions with the case presenter.

4.4. Challenges of Maintaining a Systemic Stance

Although participants generally valued systemic questioning, they also described challenges associated with maintaining a systemic attitude during collegial consultation.

Several participants reported a strong tendency to provide immediate advice, particularly when discussing emotionally demanding cases. Remaining within a position of curiosity instead of expert judgement required conscious self-reflection.

Others emphasised that systemic questioning occasionally created uncertainty because conversations remained open longer than participants initially expected. Rather than experiencing this uncertainty as problematic, many participants eventually recognised it as a productive aspect of systemic dialogue.

The findings therefore suggest that the effectiveness of systemic questioning depends less upon mastering particular techniques than upon sustaining an underlying systemic attitude throughout the consultation process.

5. Discussion

This study explored how experienced practitioners construct the role of systemic questioning within collegial case consultation. Rather than identifying linear effects,

participants described systemic questioning as creating relational conditions through which reflection, collaborative dialogue and new observations could emerge.

These findings resonate with constructivist understandings of coaching that conceptualise change as an emergent property of communication rather than the consequence of externally applied interventions. Participants' descriptions consistently emphasised conversations as processes of collaborative meaning-making in which multiple perspectives remained available simultaneously. Such observations closely align with Bateson's understanding of communication as relational difference, von Foerster's notion of second-order observation and von Glasersfeld's constructivist epistemology (Luhmann, 2012; von Glasersfeld, 1997) ^[49, 20].

The findings further reinforce the distinction between systemic methods and systemic attitudes. Although participants referred to different forms of questioning—including circular, hypothetical and resource-oriented questions—they repeatedly emphasised that the quality of dialogue depended less upon the wording of questions than upon the facilitator's ability to remain curious, avoid premature interpretations and tolerate uncertainty.

This observation supports contemporary systemic coaching literature arguing that techniques cannot be separated from the epistemological assumptions informing their use. Questions become systemic not because of their linguistic structure alone but because they emerge from a relational stance characterised by not-knowing, appreciation of multiple realities and confidence in participants' capacity for self-organisation (Maturana, 2013; Cornelissen, 2021) ^[32, 6].

The findings additionally contribute to research on collegial case consultation by highlighting its function as a constructivist learning environment rather than merely a structured consultation method. Participants described professional learning as emerging collectively through interaction, suggesting that collegial consultation may be understood as a dialogical process in which professional knowledge is continuously negotiated rather than transferred. Rather than interpreting these findings as objective evidence of effectiveness, they should be understood as context-dependent reconstructions of participants' lived experiences within one particular professional setting.

6. Practical Implications

The study offers several implications for coaching, leadership development and organisational learning.

First, organisations implementing collegial case consultation may benefit from emphasising systemic attitudes alongside questioning techniques. Training programmes frequently focus on learning question formats, while comparatively little attention is devoted to cultivating curiosity, second-order observation and tolerance of uncertainty. The present findings suggest that these underlying attitudes may be equally important.

Second, facilitators should consider systemic questioning less as a mechanism for directing conversations than as an invitation to collaborative exploration. Maintaining conversational openness may support richer professional reflection than immediate solution orientation.

Third, leadership development programmes may integrate systemic questioning into peer-learning formats to strengthen collective reflection, interdisciplinary dialogue and organisational learning. Particularly within complex organisational environments, creating spaces in which

multiple perspectives can coexist may contribute to more adaptive forms of professional decision-making.

Finally, the findings highlight the value of qualitative inquiry for understanding coaching practice. Rather than reducing professional conversations to measurable variables, qualitative approaches provide opportunities to explore how participants themselves experience reflection, learning and change within organisational contexts.

7. Conclusion

Contemporary organisations increasingly require forms of professional learning capable of engaging with complexity without reducing it to linear explanations. Systemic coaching offers one such perspective by understanding reflection as a relational process through which new possibilities emerge collaboratively.

The present study explored how experienced practitioners described systemic questioning within collegial case consultation from a constructivist perspective. Participants consistently portrayed systemic questions not as techniques for producing predefined outcomes but as conversational invitations that enabled perspective shifts, collaborative reflection and the co-construction of meaning.

Rather than demonstrating universal effectiveness, the findings illustrate how systemic questioning may contribute to creating dialogical spaces in which participants observe situations differently and generate alternative understandings together. These processes appear to depend less upon individual questioning techniques than upon a systemic attitude characterised by curiosity, resource orientation and respect for the autonomy of participants.

By integrating systemic theory, constructivist epistemology and qualitative inquiry, this study contributes to the growing discourse on coaching and organisational learning in complex environments. It suggests that professional development may be strengthened not through greater certainty or increasingly sophisticated interventions but through conversations that invite multiple observations, embrace uncertainty and support collaborative meaning-making.

Ultimately, systemic questioning may be understood less as a method for changing people than as a practice of creating conditions in which new understandings become possible.

References

1. Dollinger M, Hogrefe C. Business-Coach: wirkungsvolle Coaching Interventionen – vom Erstgespräch bis zum erfolgreichen Coaching-Abschluss. 2013.
2. Von Schlippe A, Schweitzer J. Gewusst wie, gewusst warum: Die Logik systemischer Interventionen. 4th ed. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 2019. p. 15. doi:10.13109/9783666459047.
3. Patzek A. Systemisches Fragen: Professionelle Fragekompetenz für Führungskräfte, Berater und Coaches. 3rd ed. Springer Gabler; 2021. p. 1-10. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-33148-1.
4. Radatz S. Einführung in das systemische Coaching. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer Verlag; 2008. p. 30. Available from: <https://www.carl-auer.de/media/carl-auer/sample/LP/978-3-89670-519-8.pdf>
5. Mohr G. Einführung in die systemische Transaktionsanalyse von Individuum und Organisation. Carl-Auer Verlag; 2020.
6. Cornelissen L. Systemtheorie. N.E.W. Institut; 2021.

- Available from: <https://new-institut.com/glossar/systemtheorie/> [cited 2025 Jun 1⁰¹].
7. Von Bertalanffy L. General system theory: essays on its foundation and development. Rev ed. New York: George Braziller; 1968. Available from: https://monoskop.org/File:Von_Bertalanffy_Ludwig_General_System_Theory_1968.pdf
 8. Palazzoli MS, Boscolo L, Cecchin G, Prata G. Hypothesizing—circularity—neutrality: three guidelines for the conductor of the session. *Fam Process*. 1980;19(1):1-7. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.1980.00003.x.
 9. Freedman J, Combs G. Narrative therapy: the social construction of preferred realities. 1996. Available from: http://academic.evergreen.edu/curricular/hhd2005/SpringDownloads/NarrativeTherapy/NarrativeTherapy3_5.pdf
 10. Franz HW, Kopp R. Kollegiale Fallberatung: State of the art and organisationale Praxis. EHP - Verlag Andreas Kohlhaage; 2015. p. 143.
 11. Seyfried C, Marschke B. Kollegiale Fallberatung für Pädagogen und Pädagoginnen. *Pädagogik*; 2022. p. 21. doi:10.14361/9783839457719.
 12. Schiersmann C, Hausner MB. Kollegiale Beratung: komplexe Situationen gemeinsam meistern. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 2023.
 13. Ryschka J, Tietze KO. Praxishandbuch Personalentwicklung: Instrumente, Konzepte, Beispiele. 3rd ed. Wiesbaden: Gabler; 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-8349-6384-0-4.
 14. Simon FB, Rech-Simon C. Zirkuläres Fragen: Systemische Therapie in Fallbeispielen: Ein Lernbuch. 15th ed. Carl-Auer Verlag; 2023.
 15. Suling L, Wildner J. Führung in der Transformation: Megatrends und Management als Motor des Wandels. 2024. p. 4. Available from: <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/289619> [cited 2025 May 1¹].
 16. Baecker D. Schlüsselwerke der Systemtheorie. 4th ed. Springer VS; 2021.
 17. Berger PL, Luckmann T. The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Anchor; 1966.
 18. Bateson G. Steps to an ecology of mind: collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology. Jason Aronson; 1972.
 19. Abels H. Interaktion, Identität, Präsentation: Kleine Einführung in interpretative Theorien der Soziologie. Springer Science & Business Media; 2007. p. 80.
 20. Von Glasersfeld E. Radikaler Konstruktivismus: Ideen, Ergebnisse, Probleme. Suhrkamp; 1997.
 21. Wilhelm JL. Evaluation komplexer Systeme: Systemische Evaluationsansätze in der deutschen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Universitätsverlag Potsdam; 2015. p. 36.
 22. Richter-Kaupp S, Braun G, Kalmbacher V. Business coaching: Wie man Menschen wirksam unterstützt und sich als Coach erfolgreich am Markt etabliert. BoD – Books on Demand; 2021. p. 51-ff.
 23. Herwig-Lempp J. Systemisch als Haltung. In: Becker R, Schmitt S, editors. Frankfurt am Main: Wochenschau Verlag; 2019. p. 1-4. Available from: <https://www.herwig-lempp.de/daten/181117-Herwig-Lempp-Systemisch-als-Haltung.pdf>
 24. Erpenbeck M. Wirksam werden im Kontakt: Die systemische Haltung im Coaching. 5th ed. Carl-Auer Verlag; 2023. p. 7-9, 27-ff.
 25. Radatz S. Einführung in das systemische Coaching. 4th ed. Carl Auer Compact; 2010. p. 18, 30.
 26. Kollak I. Ganzheitliches Training für die Augen. Springer eBooks; 2024. p. 40. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-68434-4.
 27. Lindemann H. Systemisch-lösungsorientierte Gesprächsführung in Beratung, Coaching, Supervision und Therapie: Ein Lehr-, Lern- und Arbeitsbuch für Ausbildung und Praxis. 3rd ed. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 2023.
 28. Ludewig K. Leit motive systemischer Therapie. Klett-Cotta; 2002. p. 7, 16-18, 22-25, 37.
 29. De Shazer S, Berg IK, Lipchik E, Nunnally E, Molnar A, Gingerich W, et al. Brief therapy: focused solution development. *Fam Process*. 1986;25. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.1986.00207.x.
 30. De Shazer S, Dolan YM, Korman H, Trepper T, McCollum E, Berg IK. More than miracles: the state of the art of solution-focused brief therapy. 2007. Available from: <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-04820-000>
 31. Reiber W. Vom Fachexperten zum Wissensunternehmer: Wissenspotenziale stärker nutzen, die persönliche Wirksamkeit erhöhen. Springer Gabler; 2013. p. 157.
 32. Maturana HR. Erkennen: die Organisation und Verkörperung von Wirklichkeit: Ausgewählte Arbeiten zur biologischen Epistemologie. Springer-Verlag; 2013.
 33. Weiß S. Kollegiale (Fall-)Beratung. In: Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. 2022. Available from: <https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/kollegiale-fallberatung> [cited 2025 Jul 3¹¹].
 34. Tietze KO. Peer group supervision—simple from afar, complex from close up. *Organisationsberatung Supervision Coaching*. 2019;26(4):444. doi:10.1007/s11613-019-00622-x.
 35. Hussy W, Schreier M, Echterhoff G. Forschungsmethoden in Psychologie und Sozialwissenschaften für Bachelor. Springer-Verlag; 2013. p. 109, 187, 188-190, 229, 233, 246-248, 285.
 36. Mey G, Mruck K. Handbuch qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie. Vol. 2, Designs und Verfahren. Springer-Verlag; 2020. p. 63, 401-402.
 37. Patrzek A, Scholer S. Systemisches Fragen in der kollegialen Beratung. 2018. p. 9, 12.
 38. Krueger RA, Casey MA. Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research. SAGE Publications; 2014.
 39. Grønkjær M, Curtis T, De Crespigny C, Delmar C. Analysing group interaction in focus group research: impact on content and the role of the moderator. *Qual Stud*. 2011;2(1). doi:10.7146/qs.v2i1.4273.
 40. Littig B, Wallace C. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen von Fokus Gruppendiskussionen für die sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung. Vienna, Austria: Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS); 1997. (Reihe Soziologie / Institut für Höhere Studien, Abt. Soziologie; 21). Available from: <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-222022>
 41. Schorn A. The “Theme-centered Interview”: a method to decode manifest and latent aspects of subjective realities. *Forum Qual Soc Res*. 2000;1(2):3. doi:10.17169/fqs-1.2.1092.
 42. Kruse J. Qualitative Interviewforschung: Ein integrativer Ansatz. Beltz Juventa; 2014.

43. Friehs B, Gabriele M. Methoden und Techniken in der systemisch lösungsorientierten Beratung. Springer; 2021.
44. Schreier M, Echterhoff G, Bauer JF, Weydmann N, Hussy W. Forschungsmethoden in Psychologie und Sozialwissenschaften für Bachelor. Springer eBooks; 2023. p. 54, 208, 232, 249, 254-257, 262, 265, 283, 285, 294, 298. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-66673-9.
45. Niederberger M, Zwick MM. Online-Fokusgruppen – Chancen und Herausforderungen aus der Sicht der Forschungspraxis. Forum Qual Soc Res. 2023. Available from: <https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/90600>
46. Cassell C, Symon G. Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research. SAGE; 2004. p. 23, 25-28.
47. Hoffjann O, Sandhu S. Schlüsselwerke für die strategische Kommunikationsforschung. Springer eBooks. Springer Nature; 2024. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-45292-6.
48. Mayring P. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. 2022.
49. Luhmann N. Introduction to systems theory. Polity; 2012.

How to Cite This Article

Safavi S, Sweet V. Systemic questioning in collegial case consultation: a qualitative exploratory study from a systemic constructivistic perspective. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. 2026;7(5):441-448. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2026.7.5.441-448.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.