

Running head: APPROACHES TO COACHING

**Copyright notice:** This article is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association (APA)  
<http://www.apa.org/journals/>

"This article may not exactly replicate the final version published in the APA journal. It is not the copy of record."

Coaching services: A look at coaches, clients, and practices

Anne M. Liljenstrand<sup>1</sup>

The Bader Group, San Diego

Delbert M. Nebeker

National University, San Diego

## Coaching services: A look at coaches, clients, and practices

## Abstract

Coaching is growing rapidly as a way to help individuals improve their professional and/or personal success. Although similar services have been offered for some time, coaching is becoming more widely available and is being offered by a more diverse set of professionals. This research was undertaken to learn more about coaches from varying academic backgrounds and how they may differ in their approach to their craft. 2,231 coaches participated in the study by completing a web-based survey examining coaching practices. A general discussion and conclusions are included.

## Keywords

Executive coaching

Coaching practices

Coaching models and processes

Leadership development

### Coaching services: A look at coaches, clients and practices

Coaching is growing rapidly as it becomes increasingly popular. Although there is little information on the size of the industry, in 1999 the International Coach Federation (ICF) estimated that there were then approximately 16,000 coaches worldwide and survey results by Manchester, Inc., (Morris, 2000) indicated that 45 percent of CEOs reported their senior-level personnel needed coaching services. Based on the data collected for the present study, the field of coaching is estimated to be a one billion dollar per year industry.<sup>2</sup> Although coaching and similar services have been offered in the past, coaching is becoming more widely offered by a more diverse set of professional coaches. Currently coaching is reported to be the fastest growing field within consulting (Eggers & Clark, 2000; Hall, Otazo & Hollenbeck, 1999). We know, however, very little about the coaches or their coaching approaches and practices. To fill this void we sought to learn more about how coaches from different backgrounds approach their craft.

#### The Supply Side of Coaching Services

Recent transformations in the field of coaching have led to decreased stigmatization and increasing demand for coaching services. As the demand has increased so has the supply of those offering coaching services. It is unclear exactly when coaching services were first offered. However, Judge and Cowell (1997) reported that human resource consulting firms began to offer such programs in 1990, even though various forms of coaching have been offered long before that time. According to the same authors, coaching interventions were initially implemented only as a last resort in order to save poorly performing managers. This is no longer the case. Coaches are hired for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is to support and increase the performance of an already successful employee (Judge & Cowell).

This shift from hiring coaches for struggling employees to focusing on the rising stars has decreased the stigmatization of receiving coaching services and has in turn increased the demand for such services. The role of the coach also appears to have changed over the past years. To a large degree coaches have changed from “experts” to “thought partners” (Eggers & Clark, 2000, p. 67). This change, suggests that coaches more and more serve as sounding boards rather than experts, “...a confidant to offer insight, perspective, and constructive feedback on ideas.” (Witherspoon & White, 1996, p. 131). This may have positively influenced client perceptions of coaching interventions, creating less resistance, and thus increasing the demand for such services.

In addition, as managed care in psychotherapy has increased, the difficulty has also increased of making a good living by providing traditional clinical psychology services. Thus interest among clinicians in providing services to business and industry, often through consulting services such as coaching has sharply increased (Maddi, 1997; Atella & Figgatt, 1998).

Today, coaching is not only offered to executives but to a variety of individuals in different positions and contexts. Coaches use a variety of titles ranging from “Executive Coach” and “Business Coach” to “Life Coach” and “Personal Coach” (Gale, Liljenstrand, Pardieu & Nebeker, 2002), revealing an expanding market beyond the boardroom all the way to the living room. Whatever the context, however, coaching is generally considered a helpful process that has the potential for continued growth and expansion.

Entry into the profession has a relatively low barrier and monetary rewards are potentially high (Brotman, Liberi & Wasylshyn, 1998; Hellkamp, Zins, Ferguson, & Hodge, 1998). In fact, the only real barrier to entering coaching is the coaches’ ability to solicit clients;

(Garman, Whiston & Zlatoper, 2000). It appears that anyone can offer their services as a coach. Although training certification programs exist for coaches, these are not mandatory.

Technology, especially the Internet, is helping spread coaching too by providing coaches with greater access to clients both domestically and internationally. Furthermore, increasing acceptance of working from a home office has (Judy & D'Amico, 1999) drastically reduced the costs of setting up an independent consulting office. Considering all of these contributing factors it seems only natural that the coaching industry is expanding rapidly.

Many view the rapid increase in both supply and demand of coaching services positively. Others will argue that this rapid growth has not given coaching enough time to develop and mature as a clearly defined and reliable service.

#### Who Provides Coaching Services?

Coaching is criticized for a lack of educational consistency and standardization because coaches come from a variety of different educational disciplines and range from high school graduates to PhDs. A vivid example was presented by Hollenbeck (2004) where a single coaching vendor offered coaching from coaches with such varying educational backgrounds as: BA in Japanese Studies, Master's of Social Work, Master's of Future Studies, PhD in Systems Engineering and PhD in Psychology. Judge and Cowell (1997) reported 90% of their sample reported their highest degree to be at the master level in either business or the social sciences. They further stated, "Psychologists, MBA's, PhDs, even drama instructors – all are pitching in to help improve the work performance of top executives." (p. 71). Data from Gale et al. (2002) showed that about 60% of their coaches reported holding degrees from business or the social sciences.

#### *Coaching Providers*

Different provider “camps” are apparent when studying coaches. A few authors have argued that one discipline is better qualified to provide coaching services than another is. For example, Brotman et al. (1998) argued that psychologists are “uniquely qualified” to provide coaching services (p.40). Tobias (1996) saw many important psychological approaches used within coaching, such as confidentiality, comprehensive psychological conceptualization, psychological assessments, and the ability to work through resistance. However, as psychologists providing consulting services are educated within different sub-fields of psychology, important differences in their approaches are also likely to exist (Glaser, 1958; Maddi, 1997). Harris (1999), for example, states that industrial-organizational (I-O) psychologists have much to offer when serving as a coach, and reports that they are probably better trained for the assessment and feedback phases of coaching, than for the planning, implementation and follow-up phases. Hollenbeck (2004) draws the parallel between coaches and experts, and states, “...becoming experts is what I-O psychologists are extremely good at.” (p. 20), urging I-O psychologists to become leaders within the field of coaching. Wasylshyn (2003) states, “Talented executive coaches must be grounded in both business and psychology” (p.97), and she encourages psychologists who lack business experience to gain knowledge through experiences, literature and training. However, she also states that if sustained behavioral change is the goal, coaches with training in clinical psychology are needed.

It is not clear which educational background is the best suited for providing coaching services, or if differences in practices between the providers from these groups actually exist. However, considering the rapid growth of the field and the insufficient empirical information on the topic, we believe clear indicators of possible differences between the main providers of coaching would be helpful to practitioners and clients alike and can serve as a starting point for

future research. Thus, the focus of this study is to explore differences between coaches with an educational background in Industrial-Organizational psychology (I-O), Clinical psychology (CPSY), Business (BUS) or Education (EDU). A more general group, (OTH), consisting of individuals trained within a number of different fields, including but not limited to the life sciences, engineering, and law, will also be examined as they participated in the study.

### Contemporary Understandings of Coaching Practices

A number of theories, models, and processes guide practicing coaches. Lowman (1998) asserts that an individual, who is interested in developing his or her skills in consulting psychology, would benefit from training at many different levels and within a variety of subject fields. Kilburg (1996) argues that coaching is built on methods used in organizational development, adult education, management training, I-O psychology, consultation, as well as clinical psychology. Furthermore, Kilburg states, “As it is currently practiced, executive coaching appears to be an eclectic mix of concepts and methods that are being applied by a variety of consultants who have accepted assignments to work with individual executives.” (p. 59). As evident in the literature, coaches appear to use slightly different models and processes when approaching coaching assignments (Banning, 1997; Buzzotta, Lefton & Sherberg, 1977; Diedrich, 1996; Kiel, Rimmer, Williams & Doyle, 1996; Nowack & Wimer, 1997; Peterson, 1996; Saporito, 1996; Thach, 1998).

Based on narratives a general model can be extracted that consists of the following five stages: (a) setting the foundation by defining the context, establishing the contract and building a working alliance, (b) assessing the individual, (c) strategizing the engagement and developing a plan based on assessment feedback and goals, (d) implementing the plan, and, in some cases, (e) evaluating the intervention and reassessing the initial target areas. While a

general model sounds credible, it is safe to say that a cookie-cutter approach does not necessarily translate into effective coaching. In addition, a number of interpersonal skills and often subject matter skills, are needed to provide sound coaching. Although anecdotes serve as good sources for understanding the range of coaching approaches, they do not specifically and empirically describe the various approaches and their differences. To gain this added insight we needed a large sample of coaches where we could gather quantitative descriptions of their practices and approaches.

### Training, Education and Coaching Practices

Considering the rich educational experience of completing an academic degree, it is probable that education would manifest itself in the approaches taken by coaches. Thus, one element that may serve as an important basis for a coach's approach and a model for their practice is the type of formal training and education that the coach has received. The diversity of academic fields involved in training and educating individuals who offer coaching services, however, is a major barrier to common approaches and practices. Furthermore, the curriculum of non-academic coach training programs appears to lack consistent content and many coaches do not participate in the training programs available.

In addition, a coach's vocational interests and personality (Holland, 1985) are likely to play a significant role in the choice of educational field by a coach and her subsequent approach and activities as a coach (for more details see Liljenstrand, 2004). For these reasons academic background was chosen to serve as a primary independent variable in this research.

## Method

### *Participants*

Approximately 9,000 coaches were contacted and asked to participate in our online survey. The participating coaches were accessed through a number of international organizations, associations, and Internet list servers. These included: Academy of Management, American Psychological Association (APA) - Division 13, American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), AON Consulting, Association of Business Psychologists, Center for Creative Leadership, Coaching.com, College of Executive Coaching, European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, European Coaching Association, Executive Coaching Network, International Association of Coaches, International Coach Federation (ICF), Organizational Development Network (OD-Net), Personnel Decisions International, Professional Coaches and Mentors Association (PCMA), RHR International, The Executive Coaching Forum (TECF), and Worldwide Association of Business Coaches as well as a few coaches independent of these sources.

### *Instrument*

The “Coaching Practices Survey” developed by Gale, Liljenstrand, Pardieu, and Nebeker, (2002) was used to quantitatively describe and compare experiences, practices, and approaches of coaches. Based on a review of the literature we constructed a survey to identify seven important categories of coaching practices and approaches. The survey covered 42 topics, 11 of which contained numerous subsets, totaling 120 items. The response options used different response formats, such as frequency and extent rating scales, choices among multiple response alternatives, yes-no responses, and special open-ended alternatives such as “other”.

*Procedure*

The data were collected through a web-based survey that automatically recorded participants' responses while ensuring respondent anonymity. Coaches were invited by email to participate in the study. The email contained a link to the survey. Each assisting organization sent an email of our design to their members asking for cooperation in this research. To preserve their members' or employees' privacy our organizational partners did not give us access to their mailing lists. As a result some people may have been sent several invitations and some respondents may have come from coaches who received the email from other coaches who forwarded it to them. Therefore, we can not know precisely how many individuals were invited to participate; we can only estimate it based on how many organizational members each group had. Responses were automatically stored on a computer server and later downloaded for coding and analysis using SPSS. Each individual was assigned to one of five groups based on the academic discipline in which they reported to have earned their highest degree: Industrial-Organizational Psychology (I-O), Clinical Psychology (CPSY), Business (BUS), Education (EDU), or a group containing a variety of educational backgrounds such as Life Sciences, Law, Engineering, etc. (OTH).

The purpose of this research was to explore how a coach's academic background is related to other coaching characteristics and practices. We wanted to know how coaches from different disciplines differed in many areas. For example: Are there differences in how long the coaches in different disciplines have practiced? What training did they find useful in becoming a coach? Are there differences in the titles they use? Are they hired for different types of engagements? What differences are there in their use of assessment tools? Do they charge different fees and so forth?

For our analyses, the individual item scores and groups of item scores addressing a topic are reported and compared across academic background (I-O, CPSY, BUS, EDU, OTH). The data were analyzed using 1-way and 2-way ANOVAs for significant differences at an alpha level of .05.

### Results and Discussion

About 25% of the coaches contacted provided usable surveys. This gave us a sample of 2,231 coaches. Our findings are organized into three sections each representing major groups of conceptually related issues. The three sections are: (a) the coaches' personal attributes, (b) client acquisition methods and client attributes, and (c) service delivery practices. These results present the differences between the educational groups and group interactions with different coaching attributes and practices. Because of the large number of cases almost all main effects and interactions for differences between educational groups were statistically significant. Therefore, most of the important decisions about the significance of these results concern practical significance from their usefulness to the reader and not purely "statistical significance." To simplify the presentation of the results we have chosen to provide tables of means and standard errors of the mean. In this way it is possible for the interested reader to estimate whether any specific mean may include a specific value or mean from another group or variable by calculating the confident interval around the mean at a preferred level of probability (e.g. for a 95% confidence interval around the mean, the reader would multiply the standard error by 1.96 and then add and subtract that value from the mean). To avoid confusion and excessive repetition we have integrated the reporting of results with our discussion whenever we found it reasonable to do so. In addition, we also provide a more general discussion of the results in a general discussion and conclusion section.

[Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here.]

### *Coaches' Personal Attributes*

A number of significant differences in coaches' personal attributes were found. These results are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

*Academic background, age, gender and experience.* A summary of the personal attributes of the coaches in our sample is presented in Table 1. Of the 2,231 usable respondents who reported their academic backgrounds, 154 were in I-O, 208 in CPSY, 551 in BUS, 235 in EDU and 1,083 in OTH fields. Significant differences existed in age and gender between coaches from different educational backgrounds. Coaches generally were in their late forties to early fifties with coaches in EDU, CPSY, and I-O being older. Coaches with BUS background made up the youngest group. About 67% of coaches were female with significantly more male coaches in BUS, CPSY and I-O. The largest percent of female coaches was found in EDU.

I-O and CPSY groups reported having worked as coaches significantly longer than the BUS and OTH groups. The significant difference in years of experience between the education groups may be because coaching appears more closely related to the practice of the I-O and CPSY groups and can be viewed as an extension of their previous or existing practice portfolio. Furthermore, these findings support the idea that those with a background in psychology, closely followed by those with a background in EDU, may have been the first to offer coaching services. Coaches from CPSY and I-O had significantly more education than coaches from other backgrounds. Overall, only 19% of the coaches had doctorate degrees whereas more than 50% of CPSY and I-O coaches had earned a doctorate. CPSY and I-O coaches were also significantly more likely to have master's degrees. Coaches from BUS had the least education with almost 49% holding a bachelor's degree or less.

*Preparation methods, income and titles.* Coaches compared the value of different methods of preparing to become a coach, (see Table 2). All groups reported prior career experience was the most useful (ranging between “Not at all” [4.00] to “Extremely” [5.00] with the CPSY group reporting the highest mean, 4.51, and the OTH group reporting the lowest mean, 4.24). Those trained in CPSY, closely followed by the I-O group, reported their academic backgrounds significantly more useful than the BUS, OTH, and EDU groups. On the other hand, coaches with a BUS or OTH background, closely followed by the EDU group, reported valuing coach training programs as significantly more useful than the remaining groups. These coaches, as well as those trained in EDU, also reported participating in coaching seminars/ lectures/ workshops significantly more often, almost twice a year, versus once a year or less as reported by I-O and CPSY groups. Additionally, all groups reported mentoring by others as very useful.

The large discrepancies found between the groups on the utility of different methods for preparing to be a coach, suggests that coaches from the BUS and OTH groups may attend coach training programs and seminars more often than the other groups to compensate for their lack of applicable academic preparation. Another possible explanation for the significant differences between the groups may be due to the continuing education (CE) requirement for licensed psychologists. Since coaching seminars do not always offer CE credits, such seminars may be less attractive to those attending seminars or workshops to satisfy licensing requirements. Furthermore, once psychologists have attended CE workshops, attending additional coaching seminars may be unattractive.

There are also differences by academic training in the number of coaches who report having their own personal coach; only half of the coaches in the I-O and CPSY groups themselves have coaches whereas 75% of coaches within the BUS, EDU and OTH groups do.

The groups also differed in their reported annual coaching income. I-O and CPSY reported an annual income *from coaching* of about \$63,000, the BUS group reported an average of \$58,000, the EDU group reported \$51,000, and the OTH group \$45,000.

Coaches in our sample used a variety of professional titles. Executive Coach, Personal Coach, Life Coach, and Consultant were found to be the most popular titles used. Titles, however, differed substantially in usage between the different groups of coaches. Slightly more than 31% of coaches in the I-O, CPSY and BUS groups reported using Executive Coach as their professional title, compared to a little more than 21% of the coaches in the EDU and OTH groups. The variance in using Personal Coach as a title was quite large, separating particularly the I-O group (8.3%) from the OTH group (35.7%), but also from the EDU group (28.5%) and the BUS group (25.7%). The CPSY group fell in-between with 20.4% of such coaches using the title - Personal Coach. The Consultant title was used most often by the I-O and CPSY groups (40.7% and 26.2%, respectively). Only small percentages of the EDU, BUS and OTH groups (14.5%, 12.6%, and 10.8% respectively) reported using Consultant as their title. A little more than 11% of coaches used some other title (developmental coach, mentor, etc.)

*Attitudes toward licensure/ certification and ethics.* Significant differences existed in coaches' views of coaching certification or licensure. The BUS, OTH and EDU groups reported certification or licensure more important as a means to control quality than the psychology groups. This may be related to the BUS, OTH, and EDU groups rating coach-training programs significantly more useful than did the I-O and CPSY groups as these coach training programs often are the types of programs offering coaching certifications. Perhaps licensure or certification is more helpful to coaches who come from academic backgrounds not as easily linked to coaching skills. Since coaches in these areas do not have graduate degrees that clearly

demonstrate these skills they may feel certification is a form of professional validation. A related finding indicates that those who have been providing coaching services longer also see less of a need for licensure or certification ( $r = -.18, p < .01$ ). Perhaps their experience and past success make it less important.

The results reveal that all groups believe that coaches should be required to adhere to ethical guidelines between a 4.58 and 4.70 on a 5-point scale. All groups endorse this view “to a very large extent” and no significant differences were detected between the groups. Although these findings are very encouraging, we don’t really know if the groups are referring to the same standards or guidelines to define what is ethical. It is likely that coaches with a background in either I-O or CPSY have the American Psychological Association ethical guidelines as their standards while coaches with a background in BUS refer to guidelines provided by business oriented associations, or an association such as the International Coach Federation. While all groups reported that coaches should be required to adhere to ethical guidelines, the groups differed significantly in how often they see unethical practices. Coaches with backgrounds in BUS, OTH, or EDU fields reported significantly fewer unethical practices occurring than the two psychology groups. While it is possible that unethical practices occur less frequently among coaches with backgrounds in BUS, OTH, or EDU fields than the psychology groups, it is more probable that these groups hold different standards and definitions of what is unethical.

Thus, even though the results appear to show common agreement about the importance of ethical behavior, we can’t say they are equal in their ethical behavior. Because business ethics have received considerable attention from the media following the Enron, Tyco, and WorldCom and other ethical debacles, the importance of abiding by ethical guidelines may have been inflated by social desirability.

*Client Acquisition Methods and Client Attributes*

Our second category of examined variables dealt with client differences – both in how clients were acquired and their attributes.

*Marketing methods and contracting agents.* Coaches were questioned on frequency of their means to obtain clients (advertising, website, professional referrals, word of mouth, or clients obtained by firm). Informal methods (referrals from clients and word of mouth endorsements) were heavily used by all groups to gain clients. Formal methods of gaining clients (using advertising and websites) are infrequently used. I-O coaches used these formal marketing methods the least of any group.

[Insert Table 3, about here.]

Coaches with an academic background in either I-O or CPSY reported being hired more often (56.2% and 45.5% respectively) by the client's employer (usually an organization) than coaches with backgrounds in OTH (6.9%), BUS (13.2%), or EDU (15.0%) fields. These latter groups reported being hired mainly by the individual receiving coaching. These findings are consistent with the various titles used by coaches, as the OTH, BUS and EDU groups reported using the title Personal Coach more often than the I-O and CPSY groups, and the I-O and CPSY groups reported using the title Consultant more than the other groups. Based on these findings, it appears that coaches with backgrounds in psychology focus more of their coaching on assisting individuals within the workplace in comparison to coaches from fields other than psychology who often work with individuals outside of the workplace.

*Client gender.* Overall, the percent of female clients exceeded that of males (55.7% to 44.3%), however, this percent differed by academic background (see Table 3). The psychology groups, particularly those with I-O backgrounds, reported coaching more male clients (I-O

54.6% and CPSY 50.2%) than the other groups. OTH coaches had the lowest percent of male clients (40.4%). Comparing these results to the gender of the coach, it appears that a coach's gender is related to the gender mix of his or her clients. For example, the coach's gender and the percentage of male clients correlate positively ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ). Together these results suggest that women more often receive coaching and that clients may prefer a coach of their own gender.

*Competition among coaches.* Coaches from different backgrounds differ in how competitive they find coaching to be. OTH, BUS and EDU groups find coaching significantly less competitive than the I-O and CPSY groups. We can't know for certain why this is, however, the following may help create a rational explanation. Recall that coaches with a background in either I-O or CPSY reported being hired by an employer more often than by the individual receiving their coaching. They also reported coaching more often in manufacturing and large businesses (as explained below). Organizations generally will have a greater ability to pay for coaching services than individual clients. Organizations will also often provide multiple clients for a given marketing effort or contract. For these reasons it may be more desirable to provide services to organizations. Furthermore, it is also likely that organizations seek bids from numerous coaches and then consider costs, ROI, and liability issues more often than individual clients do as organizations may be more selective in their contracting than individuals. All of these reasons may make it more difficult for I-O and CPSY coaches to compete for their business. As well known to many consultants, one has to provide convincing evidence in vetting ones qualifications to become a preferred provider to an organization.

*Client industry and client organizational position.* The next area of interest focuses on the types of different industries and positions coaches serve. Mixed model ANOVAs, containing the frequency of coaches serving different industries or the frequency of client position types as the

within-subject repeated measure and the five categories of coaching backgrounds as the between-subject factor, were used to analyze the data. Thirteen different types of industries were identified (e.g., agriculture, energy, manufacturing, healthcare, government non-profit, consulting, etc.) A significant interaction revealed that coaches from different educational backgrounds serve different industries. In comparison to other groups, the BUS group reported coaching entrepreneurs, individuals within consulting organizations, and technology firms, relatively more often than they reported coaching individuals representing the government, and healthcare industries. The I-O and CPSY groups reported focusing more on healthcare, government, energy, and utilities, than other groups, even though they also work heavily in entrepreneurial and technology industries. The EDU and OTH groups reported smaller differences in the industries they serve than the other groups.

To test whether or not coaches from different academic backgrounds coached clients from different organizational positions, nine different types of clients were identified (e.g., CEO, mid-level manager, entrepreneur, non supervisory professional, etc.) The most interesting findings are in the interaction between coaching background and client types. Based on this interaction the coach's educational background is significantly associated with the position of client the coach serves. As shown in Table 3, entrepreneurs and mid-level managers were the most frequently coached group of clients. Coaches with BUS, OTH, and EDU backgrounds coached the entrepreneurs relatively more often and the I-O group reported coaching mid-level managers and top managers relatively more often, but not entrepreneurs.

### *Service Delivery Practices*

Next we examined service delivery practices. Many variables about how coaches conduct their practices are included in this section. The results of these analyses are found in Tables 4, 5, & 6.

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

*Client goals.* Coaches were asked “how frequently are you hired for each of the following coaching engagements.” They responded to 13 different goals for their clients. A significant interaction between academic background and client goals was found indicating that coaches from different backgrounds are hired to accomplish different objectives with their clients. Based on the data in Table 4, it appears that the BUS group had different coaching patterns. They reported being hired more often than the other groups to coach individuals on task skills, such as sales, than for interpersonal relations, such as building trust, improving listening skills, and adapting to change. The I-O and CPSY groups reported being hired more often than other groups for engagements focusing on improving skills that enhance and make work relationships more effective, such as improving communication and listening skills and building trust. Often these engagements involve improving skills like listening, communication, building trust in relationships, and delegation. They also worked less on clarifying and pursuing client goals than the other groups. Even though the OTH and EDU groups reported frequencies similar to the other groups for many of the different types of engagements, they reported particularly high frequencies for balancing work and personal life, clarifying and pursuing personal goals, and managing careers and stress relatively. In the case of the OTH group, this pattern is probably related to the fact that these coaches are significantly less likely to be hired by organizations ( $r = -.33$ ). In other words, some organizations may consider career planning and improving the client’s family or personal life as inappropriate reasons to hire a coach for an

employee. Thus, coaches may be hired more often for such engagements simply because the client (hiring for themselves) uses different criteria than organizations do, and not because the coach is better trained to coach on these topics.

*Client assessment.* Coaches reported the frequency and the type of assessment tools they used when coaching. It is evident that there are significant differences between the groups in their use of different assessment tools. The groups differed in how often they used cognitive ability tests such as the Wonderlic; emotional intelligence inventories such as the EQ-I; group interpersonal assessments such as the FIRO-B; interest inventories such as Holland test of vocational interests; multisource assessment tools such as 360-degree inventories; and objective personality tests such as NEO-PI. No differences were found between the groups for projective personality tests such as the Rorschach; however, these tests were reported never to be used by any group. The findings also point out that objective personality tests and multisource assessment (360 degree assessments) are the only two assessments tools commonly used by coaches. It was also evident that the I-O and CPSY groups use these tests most often. More specifically, the I-O group reported using 360-degree tools significantly more often than any other group, although the CPSY group also used such tools significantly more often than the EDU, BUS and OTH groups. These results are not surprising considering the I-O and CPSY groups also report being hired more often than the other groups by organizations, where 360 tools are often used. Coaches with a background in either I-O or CPSY also reported using objective personality assessment tools significantly more often than the other groups. These differences suggest that coaches with a psychology degree use the tools and resources that they have been exposed to in their academic and professional training in their practices.

[Insert Table 5 about here.]

*Session format.* The next area of interest focused on how different coaches structure their coaching sessions. The coaching formats offered were found to differ depending upon the coaches' academic background. Overall, telephone and face-to-face coaching were found to be the most common formats used, while email or teleconferencing were used sparingly. Significant differences between the groups on face-to-face and telephone coaching were found. The I-O group reported coaching face-to-face significantly more often and significantly less via phone, than all the other groups. Overall, the CPSY group reported using both formats at about the same rate, but reported coaching by phone less often than the OTH, EDU and BUS groups.

[Insert Table 6 about here.]

*Time spent coaching.* I-O and CPSY coaches reported working fewer hours per week as coaches and also spending a lower percent of their work time on coaching than the other groups. These findings suggest that coaches with a background in BUS and OTH, who also report having worked fewer years (see Table 1), but more hours per week as a coach, have focused their careers on coaching and/or specialize in it to a greater extent. They may have done this by making coaching the principle service they offer. More than the other groups, coaches with a BUS or OTH background appear to have started new careers as coaches rather than simply adding coaching services to an already established practice.

*Engagement length.* Analyses reveal that the five educational groups define a short-term coaching engagement to last between 1 to 3 months ( $M = 2.50$ ) and a long-term coaching engagement to last between 9 to 12 months ( $M = 10.93$ ), with no significant differences existing between the groups. Furthermore, all groups reported between 38.90 to 44.95% of their engagements to be long-term.

*Session frequency and length.* The I-O and CPSY groups reported offering their sessions on a significantly less frequent basis (2.52 and 2.69 times per month respectively) than coaches with a background in BUS, EDU, or OTH (3.10, 3.25, and 3.27 times per month respectively). The length of client sessions was also investigated. On average, the I-O group offered longer sessions than all the other groups ( $M_{I-O} = 82.26$  vs.  $M_{Rest} = 59.91$ ;  $F=20.08$ ;  $df = 4/2140$ ;  $p < .01$ ). The I-O coaches appear to have a different pattern of coaching sessions than other coaches with longer yet less frequent sessions. The net effect appears to be that I-O coaches spend about 20 minutes more a month with their clients.

*Session fees.* Coaches were asked to estimate their typical fee per session. Some coaches may not charge their clients on a per session basis but they can estimate this value. While there may be errors in their estimates it is probably unlikely that coaches from different backgrounds differed systematically in how they make these estimates or the errors they make. We found that coaches from the different disciplines reported charging different session fees for their services. Coaches with a background in I-O reported charging the highest fee per session, almost \$200. The CPSY group reported charging \$170, the BUS group \$156, the EDU group \$148 and the OTH group \$140. Nevertheless, when the fee per session was converted to an hourly rate, the fees averaged \$165 per hour and differed only slightly between groups. The BUS group was significantly higher than all the other groups combined ( $M_{BUS} = \$177$  vs.  $M_{Rest} = \$161$ ;  $t = 2.91$ ;  $df = 2,078$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

*Concurrent clients.* There is also a significant difference in the number of clients that coaches reported working with at any one time. Overall, the BUS, OTH, and EDU groups reported coaching 8.86, 8.40, and 8.01 individuals at the same time respectively in comparison to

6.10 reported by the I-O group. The CPSY group falls in-between with their mean number of concurrent clients at 7.63 .

*Client referrals.* Referring a coaching client to another coach or resource if the client no longer benefits from their services was reportedly done less than sometimes by all five groups of coaches ( $M= 2.83$ ). This may seem surprising, particularly when in traditional clinical psychology, referral practices function very similarly to the medical model where client centered ethics require referrals when a professional cannot assist the client. We don't have any comparable data for clinical psychologists so we don't know how often they refer patients but we assume that they would usually do so when they can not help a client. There may be several possible reasons why coaches do not refer clients to other professionals. (a) Considering that coaching often focuses on an individual in their work environment and is not considered therapy, coaches may not feel the same ethical obligation to the client. (b) It is possible that coaches do not perceive alternative resources to be potentially beneficial to their clients. (c) Finally, the notion of referring business to other professionals could be viewed as giving away business to a competitor and thus harmful to their own practice.

Wasylyshyn (2001) pointed out that coaches who are not trained within psychology are less likely to successfully handle referrals when the client suffers from psychological based problems. There is also the possibility that coaches who are not trained as psychologists discount psychological problems as they fail to understand it, as reported by Berglas (2002), which in turn would lead to less referrals being made. More importantly, as Berglas points out, when such problems are ignored; coaching services can in fact make the situation worse.

*Evaluation methods and client follow-up.* Beside the differences in the use of objective assessment tools when initially assessing a client, the coaches were also questioned about their

methods to evaluate the effectiveness of their coaching. These included feedback from the client, feedback from the client's supervisor, return on investment, post-360 degree feedback, or "other" data. Overall, feedback from the coaching client was by far reported to be most frequently used by all groups ( $M= 4.60$  on a 5-point never to always scale), without significant differences between the groups. Differences were found, however, in how often coaches used feedback from the coaching client's supervisor. The I-O group ( $M= 3.39$ ) reported using feedback from the client's supervisor significantly more often than the others groups, and was most closely followed by the CPSY group ( $M= 2.93$ ). Significant differences were also found for the use of post 360 degree assessments. I-O psychologists reported using post 360 degree results as an evaluation tool significantly more often than the other groups ( $M= 2.50$ ), followed closely by the CPSY group ( $M= 2.13$ ). The collective average of all the groups was 1.85. Considering that the psychology groups often are hired by organizations, where 360 tools are used, these results are not surprising. The lack of more objective outcome based evaluation criteria highlight the need for more work in this area. Despite the lack of objective measures used, all groups reported similar times to follow-up with their coaching clients. No significant differences between groups were found with all coaches following-up about one to three months following the completion of an engagement.

### General Discussion and Conclusions

As expected, differences exist between coaches from different academic backgrounds. Coaches from different groups report approaching coaching differently and offering their services to different target markets. The results point toward the existence of at least two, and possibly more, markets with different engagements, clients, settings, approaches and perceived levels of competitiveness. Based on these findings coaches educated within the field of OTH,

BUS, or EDU fields appear mainly to be hired by the individuals receiving coaching services and seem to be more involved in the personal coaching market. Coaches with a background in psychology tend to be hired by organizations, use titles such as Executive Coach and Consultant, and also find the field of coaching more competitive. This group also tends to rely more on their academic training when coaching, attend coaching specific seminars or workshops less frequently, and appears to be less interested in coaching-specific certifications or licensure. Considering the differences in actual time spent coaching, perhaps those with a psychology background view coaching services as a mere extension to their regular services, such as providing organizational development, human resources and individual therapy initiatives.

### *Implications of Findings*

Considering that research on coaching is in its early stages, we believe there are a number of areas where our research and data are valuable. These are described in some detail below. Furthermore, we hope this attempt to create a description of coaching practices can serve as a springboard for future studies evaluating coaching services.

*Empirically derived benchmarks from practicing coaches.* Practicing coaches, as well as individuals considering adding coaching to their professional toolbox, may find it useful to benchmark their services and fees to stay competitive. Our results provide information that can be used to benchmark coaching approaches in the form of means and ranges, for coaches with different academic credentials. This is in contrast to Gale et al. (2002), who focus on general information about coaching practices.

*Consumer assistance.* Considering the increased demand for coaching services, the high costs involved, and the typical coaching client's organizational role, access to good information is important to consumers of coaching services. Making informed and competent

decisions when hiring a coach are critical to coaching success. We believe the results from our research can serve as an indication of the range of differences in practices and approaches of coaches. To the extent that potential clients are exposed to these data, they may make more educated decisions about what to expect from a coach while at the same time better understand the characteristics of coaches with different backgrounds. Once aware of the typical services offered by different coaches they should be in a better position to find an appropriate coach based on their coaching objective.

*Added credibility through quantitative indicators.* The coaching business can be seen as a mixed bag of individuals who are eager to serve as coaches, sometimes without obvious education or experience related to the service. Our quantitative overview of key descriptors and indicators of how coaches approach their work can provide a more detailed picture of coaching practices as well as some areas of caution. Furthermore, descriptive statistics can enable the general public and potential customers to form a more educated impression of this service as a whole.

*Curriculum for coach training programs.* Coach training programs are becoming more and more common. These programs often provide set courses for the incoming “students,” independent of the person’s prior expertise and competence level. By highlighting existing differences in practices among various providers, training programs can be tailored to the incoming students, making it possible for coaching schools and institutes to offer more attractive and efficient programs.

Furthermore, courses on the topic of coaching are also becoming increasingly popular within academia, as degree programs are adding courses on executive coaching, or coaching degrees in general, to their curricula. Recall that the BUS, OTH and EDU groups saw their

academic backgrounds as less useful than the I-O and CPSY groups did. If large numbers of graduates from these programs continue to become coaches, it seems plausible that these programs could offer some academic based education or training that would be useful to graduates interested in coaching. Academic institutions with MBA programs and other master's degrees could differentiate their programs and degree offerings by adding a coaching emphasis, and thus new opportunities for specialization. By integrating coaching into academically accredited graduate level programs the role of higher education in preparing coaches would be reinforced and could potentially enhance services provided.

### *Limitations*

First, although this study seeks to provide quantitative information on a number of variables, we are limited in the inferences we can make from these distinct group comparisons. In some areas we have no data. For example, Wasylyshyn's (2003) research on client perspectives on coaching highlighted executives' preferences for coaches with graduate training in psychology *and* experience in/ or understanding of business. She also emphasizes the importance of adjusting ones language, from psychology based terminology to more business based terms when working as a coach. Even though we could not include these elements in our survey we agree that diverse expertise/ and experience is very important for a coach. For example, without business experience and know-how, which clinical psychologists at times lack, a psychologist's knowledge may neither be heard nor accepted by executives. In other words, perhaps it is only when psychologists are able to gain business experience and shift their communication style to fit organizations that they seem well positioned for the challenges of working with executives. Because our research design focused on differences in practices associated with the academic discipline in which the coach reported earning their

highest degree, it is difficult to make inferences regarding coaches with diverse competencies even though that may be what clients prefer.

Second, it is very difficult to capture all the aspects of a coaching engagement through a survey. Despite our confidence in the validity of survey responses, other dynamics between coach and client are not measurable through surveys and are very likely to be part of coaching engagements. Whether or not these dynamics vary significantly between the groups compared in this study is impossible to know.

Third, even though the participating parties were ensured anonymity when invited to complete the online survey, social desirability may have played a role in some responses, which in turn could have either inflated or deflated the means. However, compared to other collection methods, such as interviews or observations where the coach is aware of being observed, anonymous surveys are probably less likely to generate socially desirable responses.

Last, for some coaches, (e.g., those who practice under the title consultant) coaching is an intervention that can serve as the main organizational development intervention, as part of a broader organizational development project, or as a follow on to other consulting efforts. Since some coaches have added coaching to their existing service portfolio, there is a risk some respondents had difficulty keeping the two activities separate. Thus, their responses about coaching may have been unduly influenced by their other consulting services.

#### *New Directions*

Since this is one of the first studies to quantitatively explore differences in practices and approaches to coaching, additional research is needed to confirm or amend our results. This research can be approached from a number of angles.

A number of coaches reportedly used titles such as Executive Coach, Consultant and Personal Coach. However, we did not explore the reasons they use different titles. For example, is the use of a title specific to a particular clientele? Also, it is unclear if coaches tend to use the same title all the time, or if they use different titles depending on the coaching context, perhaps to attract different types of clients. Also, do coaches who use different titles provide different services, or, are different titles simply used to attract diverse customers requesting fairly similar services? We have not chosen to consider these questions in this paper but they are potentially useful questions to answer. Furthermore, services targeting a client's personal rather than professional life may be more likely to address therapeutic and clinical issues. If these situations are not addressed correctly, coaches who have not been trained in clinical or counseling psychology could potentially harm their clients. Thus, exploring different types of coaching practices in more detail is recommended.

From this research it may be possible for coaches to better understand coaching markets and their role in them. Perhaps some coaches may be better able to successfully position themselves in these markets. We hope it can serve the needs of coaches as well as clients. As we see it, one of the goals of this research has been to provide coaches and potential consumers with specific information about the diversity found in coaching and improve the possibility of both coach and client finding an effective match. Considering the rapid growth of this practice area, particularly as it is expanding beyond working with executives, there appears to be a demand for different types of coaching as well as different types of coaches.

## References

- Atella, M. D., & Figgatt, J. E. (1998). Practicums in consulting psychology: Working with doctoral clinical programs. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50, 218-227.
- Banning, K. L. (1997). Now, coach? *Across the Board*, 34, 28-32.
- Berglas, S. (2002). The very real dangers of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(6), 87-92.
- Brotman, L. E., Liberi, W. P., & Wasylyshyn, K. M. (1998). Executive coaching: The need for standards of competence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50, 40-46.
- Buzzotta, V. R., Lefton, R. E., & Sherberg, M. (1977). Coaching and counseling: How you can improve the way it's done. *Training and Development Journal*, 31(11), 50-60.
- Diedrich, R. C. (1996). An iterative approach to executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 61-66
- Eggers, J. H., & Clark, D. (2000). Executive coaching that wins. *Ivey Business Journal*, 65, 66-70.
- Gale, J., Liljenstrand, A., Pardieu, J., & Nebeker, D. M. (2002). Coaching: who, what, where, when and how. *Coaching World – International Coach Federation*, 93. Retrieved January 27, 2003, from <http://www.coachfederation.org/pressroom/exec-summary-2002.pdf>
- Garman, A. N., Whiston, D. L., & Zlatoper, K. W. (2000). Media perceptions of executive coaching and the formal preparation of coaches. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 52, 201-205.

- Glaser, E. M. (1958). Psychological consultation with executives: A clinical Approach. *The American Psychologist*, 13, 486-489.
- Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27(3), 39-53.
- Harris, M. (1999). Practice network: Look, it's an I-O psychologist... No, it's a trainer... No, it's an executive coach! *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 36(3), 38-42.
- Hellkamp, D. T., Zins, J. E., Ferguson, K., & Hodge, M. (1998). Training practices in consultation: A national survey of clinical, counseling, industrial/organizational, and school psychology faculty. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50, 228-236.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hollenbeck, G. P. (2004). This ain't your momma's doublewide! or executive coaching at the crossroads. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 42(1), 16-23.
- International Coach Federation. (1999). FAQ's about the ICF professional and master certified coach (PCC & MCC) credentialing program. Retrieved January 7, 2003 from <http://www.coachfederation.org/credentialing/en/credential-faq1.pdf>
- Judge, W. Q., & Cowell, J. (1997). The brave world of executive coaching. *Business Horizons*, 40(4), 71-77.
- Judy, R. W., & D'Amico, C. (1999). *Workforce 2020: Work and workers in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute, Inc.
- Kiel, R., Rimmer, E., Williams, K., & Doyle, M. (1996). Coaching at the top. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 67-77.

- Kilburg, R. R. (1996). Executive coaching as an emerging competency in the practice of consultation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 59-60.
- Liljenstrand, A. M. (2004). A comparison of practices and approaches to coaching based on academic background. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 64(10B), 5261. (UMI No. 3108277)
- Lowman, R. L. (1998). Consulting to organizations as if the individual mattered. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50, 17-24.
- Maddi, S. (1997). Strengths and weaknesses of organizational consulting from a clinical psychology background. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 49, 207-219.
- Morris, T. W. (2000). Coaching: Rebirth of an age-old remedy. *Afp Exchange*, 20(3), 34-36.
- Nowack, K. M., & Wimer, S. (1997). Coaching for human performance. *Training and Development Journal*, 51(10), 28-32.
- Peterson, D. B. (1996). Executive coaching at work: The art of one-on-one change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 78-86.
- Saporito, T. J. (1996). Business-linked executive development: Coaching senior executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 96-103.
- Thach, L. (1998). 14 ways to groom executives. *Training*, 35(8), 52-55.
- Tobias, L. L. (1996). Coaching executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 87-95.
- Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2001, April). *Executive Coaching: Clinical and Business Perspective*. In V. V. Vandaveer (Chair), Executive coaching: Confluence of clinical, I-O, counseling, and

OD psychology?, Symposium conducted at the 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive Coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 55, 94-106.

Witherspoon, R. G., & White, G. P. (1996) Executive coaching: A continuum of roles. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 124-133.

### Author Note

Data for this work was collected as part of a dissertation conducted at the California School of Organizational Studies, Alliant International University, San Diego, CA.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anne M. Liljenstrand, 2351 Opalo Way, San Diego, 92111. Email: [anne@badergroup.com](mailto:anne@badergroup.com)

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> We thank Jonathan Gale and Joyce Pardieu for their help in the design of the instrument and data collection.

<sup>2</sup> Calculated based on responses from 2,218 coaches. We estimated the total number of coaches in 2004 to be 22,000 worldwide based on the previous estimates that there were 16,000 coaches in 1999 and assuming a modest 6.6% annual growth rate in coaches. The mean reported annual income x number of coaches ( $\$51,774 \times 22,000 = \$1,139,028,000$ ), and the average number of clients at any one time x number of sessions per year x average price per session x estimated total number of coaches ( $8 \times 34.5 \times \$151 \times 22,000 = \$916,872,000$ ) gave us our range.

Table 1. Means and standard errors for coaches' personal attributes by education groups.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2231)	I-O (N=154)	CPSY (N=208)	BUS (N=551)	EDU (N=235)	OTH (N=1083)
Age	48.1 (0.2)	48.7 (0.82)	49.9 (0.68)	46.5 (0.41)	51.0 (0.52)	47.9 (0.29)
Percent male coaches	32.8 (1.0)	38.8 (4.0)	39.8 (3.4)	40.1 (2.1)	19.9 (2.63)	29.8 (1.4)
Experience (yrs.)	5.33 (0.12)	8.22 (0.56)	7.11 (0.47)	4.81 (0.21)	5.95 (0.38)	4.70 (0.15)
Education (yrs.)	17.43 (0.04)	18.81 (0.11)	19.06 (0.08)	16.77 (0.07)	17.69 (0.1)	17.20 (0.05)
Percent doctorate	18.8 (0.8)	51.6 (4.1)	57.7 (3.4)	3.5 (0.8)	17.5 (3.0)	14.6 (1.1)
Percent master's or higher	63.2 (1.0)	89.5 (2.5)	96.2 (1.3)	51.9 (2.1)	72.8 (3.0)	56.7 (1.5)

*Note.* I-O = industrial-organizational psychology. CPSY = clinical psychology. BUS = business. EDU = education. OTH = individuals trained within a number of fields. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard error.

Table 2. Means and standard errors for coaches' rated usefulness of different sources of training, professional experiences, income, and the importance of ethics.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2225)	I-O (N=153)	CPSY (N=207)	BUS (N=550)	EDU (N=234)	OTH (N=1081)
In becoming a coach, how useful were the following <sup>a</sup> ?						
a) Academic background	3.50 (0.03)	3.95 (0.09)	4.21 (0.07)	3.25 (0.05)	3.76 (0.07)	3.38 (0.04)
b) Being mentored by others	3.96 (0.02)	3.79 (0.10)	3.90 (0.09)	3.94 (0.05)	4.00 (0.08)	4.00 (0.03)
c) Coach training program	3.74 (0.03)	2.89 (0.13)	3.12 (0.11)	3.95 (0.06)	3.67 (0.10)	3.88 (0.04)
d) Prior career experience	4.29 (0.02)	4.27 (0.08)	4.51 (0.06)	4.29 (0.04)	4.39 (0.06)	4.24 (0.03)
e) Training seminars	3.36 (0.03)	2.93 (0.11)	3.16 (0.09)	3.41 (0.05)	3.47 (0.08)	3.41 (0.04)
f) Other activities	1.88 (0.03)	1.78 (0.12)	1.56 (0.09)	1.82 (0.07)	1.83 (0.10)	2.00 (0.05)
Seminars/workshops attended yearly <sup>b</sup>	2.65 (0.03)	1.79 (0.11)	2.06 (0.10)	2.75 (0.06)	2.87 (0.09)	2.79 (0.04)
Percent with own coach	70.3 (1.0)	47.7 (4.1)	49.3 (3.5)	75.6 (1.8)	74.5 (2.9)	74.1 (1.3)
Income from coaching (\$000)	52.02 (1.10)	63.89 (4.71)	63.03 (3.99)	58.24 (2.34)	50.69 (3.53)	45.40 (1.40)
Importance of certification/licensure for quality control	3.41 (0.03)	3.11 (0.10)	3.13 (0.09)	3.47 (0.05)	3.40 (0.08)	3.47 (0.04)
Importance of ethics <sup>c</sup>	4.62 (0.02)	4.67 (0.05)	4.62 (0.05)	4.58 (0.03)	4.70 (0.04)	4.61 (0.02)
Occurrence of unethical practices <sup>d</sup>	2.53 (0.02)	2.79 (0.06)	2.79 (0.04)	2.43 (0.03)	2.53 (0.05)	2.48 (0.02)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Not at all and 5 = Extremely Useful.

<sup>b</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = More than 3 times a year.

<sup>c</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Not at all and 5 = To a very large extent

<sup>d</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Always

Table 3. Means and standard errors for coaches' contracting agents, perceived competition, and the frequency of coaching clients in different organizational positions by education group.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2231)	I-O (N=154)	CPSY (N=208)	BUS (N=551)	EDU (N=235)	OTH (N=1083)
Percent hired by employer	16.4 (0.8)	56.2 (4.3)	45.5 (3.6)	13.2 (1.5)	15.0 (2.5)	6.9 (0.8)
Percent male clients	44.3 (0.57)	54.6 (2.01)	50.2 (1.85)	47.3 (1.14)	43.5 (1.78)	40.4 (0.81)
Extent of competition <sup>a</sup>	2.95 (0.02)	3.41 (0.08)	3.29 (0.06)	2.88 (0.04)	3.00 (0.07)	2.84 (0.03)
How often do you coach individuals in the following positions <sup>b</sup> ?						
a) CEO or equivalent	2.41 (0.03)	2.37 (0.10)	2.44 (0.09)	2.58 (0.06)	2.44 (0.08)	2.32 (0.04)
b) President or equivalent	2.46 (0.03)	2.52 (0.10)	2.49 (0.09)	2.60 (0.06)	2.44 (0.08)	2.38 (0.04)
c) Vice President or equivalent	2.68 (0.03)	3.10 (0.10)	2.79 (0.09)	2.87 (0.06)	2.62 (0.09)	2.52 (0.04)
d) Mid-level Manager or equivalent	3.09 (0.02)	3.37 (0.08)	3.08 (0.08)	3.17 (0.05)	3.11 (0.07)	3.01 (0.04)
e) 1 <sup>st</sup> Line Supervisor or equivalent	2.30 (0.03)	2.31 (0.10)	2.22 (0.08)	2.33 (0.05)	2.44 (0.08)	2.26 (0.04)
f) Line Worker or equivalent	1.74 (0.02)	1.57 (0.07)	1.62 (0.07)	1.68 (0.04)	1.87 (0.07)	1.78 (0.03)
g) Non supervisory Professional or equivalent	2.42 (0.03)	2.15 (0.10)	2.33 (0.10)	2.31 (0.06)	2.34 (0.08)	2.55 (0.04)
h) Entrepreneur or equivalent	3.34 (0.03)	2.80 (0.11)	3.02 (0.09)	3.45 (0.05)	3.22 (0.08)	3.45 (0.03)
i) Other	1.30 (0.02)	1.18 (0.06)	1.23 (0.06)	1.17 (0.03)	1.37 (0.07)	1.38 (0.03)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Not at all and 5 = Extremely Competitive.

<sup>b</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Always.

Table 4. Means and standard errors for coaches' frequency of goals for clients by education group.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2217)	I-O (N=153)	CPSY (N=205)	BUS (N=547)	EDU (N=233)	OTH (N=1079)
How frequently are you hired for each of the following coaching engagements <sup>a</sup> ?						
a) Adapting better to change	3.13 (0.02)	3.11 (0.09)	3.20 (0.07)	2.97 (0.05)	3.19 (0.08)	3.19 (0.03)
b) Balancing work and personal life	3.37 (0.02)	2.75 (0.09)	3.03 (0.08)	3.34 (0.05)	3.42 (0.07)	3.52 (0.03)
c) Building trust in relationships	2.82 (0.03)	2.97 (0.09)	2.86 (0.08)	2.66 (0.05)	2.91 (0.08)	2.85 (0.04)
d) Clarifying and pursuing goals	3.95 (0.02)	3.56 (0.09)	3.83 (0.06)	3.92 (0.04)	4.00 (0.06)	4.02 (0.03)
e) Improving communication	3.52 (0.02)	3.67 (0.08)	3.66 (0.07)	3.41 (0.05)	3.53 (0.07)	3.53 (0.03)
f) Improving delegation skills	2.71 (0.02)	2.86 (0.09)	2.92 (0.08)	2.71 (0.05)	2.66 (0.08)	2.66 (0.03)
g) Improving listening skills	2.96 (0.03)	3.16 (0.10)	3.14 (0.08)	2.83 (0.05)	3.09 (0.08)	2.94 (0.04)
h) Improving strategic planning skills	2.92 (0.03)	2.90 (0.10)	3.00 (0.08)	3.03 (0.05)	2.90 (0.08)	2.85 (0.04)
i) Improving technical skills	1.65 (0.02)	1.63 (0.07)	1.56 (0.06)	1.70 (0.04)	1.69 (0.06)	1.64 (0.03)
j) Increasing sales	2.27 (0.03)	1.73 (0.08)	2.11 (0.08)	2.59 (0.06)	2.10 (0.08)	2.25 (0.04)
k) Managing career	3.39 (0.02)	3.00 (0.1)	3.25 (0.08)	3.47 (0.05)	3.42 (0.08)	3.42 (0.04)
l) Managing stress	3.22 (0.03)	2.82 (0.09)	3.26 (0.08)	3.09 (0.05)	3.28 (0.08)	3.32 (0.04)
m) Other	1.72 (0.03)	1.69 (0.11)	1.63 (0.09)	1.68 (0.06)	1.73 (0.09)	1.77 (0.04)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Always.

Table 5. Means and standard errors for coaches' frequency of using different formats in providing services by education groups.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2231)	I-O (N=154)	CPSY (N=208)	BUS (N=551)	EDU (N=235)	OTH (N=1083)
How often do you use the following to conduct a coaching session <sup>a</sup> ?						
a) Telephone	3.79 (0.02)	3.18 (0.08)	3.56 (0.08)	3.80 (0.05)	3.85 (0.07)	3.91 (0.03)
b) Face to face	3.30 (0.02)	3.86 (0.08)	3.45 (0.07)	3.27 (0.05)	3.35 (0.07)	3.19 (0.03)
c) Email	2.26 (0.02)	2.17 (0.08)	2.29 (0.08)	2.20 (0.05)	2.38 (0.08)	2.27 (0.04)
d) Teleconferencing	1.62 (0.02)	1.49 (0.07)	1.70 (0.07)	1.62 (0.04)	1.64 (0.06)	1.61 (0.03)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Always.

Table 6. Means and standard errors for coaches' frequency of practices by education group.

Variable	Coaching Group					
	Total (N=2231)	I-O (N=154)	CPSY (N=208)	BUS (N=551)	EDU (N=235)	OTH (N=1083)
Weekly hours spent coaching	15.51 (0.27)	11.43 (0.83)	12.86 (0.87)	17.85 (0.54)	14.75 (0.83)	15.56 (0.38)
Percent work time coaching	45.6 (0.64)	31.8 (2.06)	36.1 (1.98)	50.2 (1.30)	43.1 (1.96)	47.6 (0.93)
Definition of short term engagement (months)	2.50 (0.03)	2.48 (0.11)	2.74 (0.10)	2.49 (0.06)	2.50 (0.09)	2.46 (0.04)
Definition of long term engagement (months)	10.93 (0.06)	11.08 (0.25)	11.51 (0.18)	10.79 (0.12)	11.17 (0.18)	10.81 (0.09)
Percent of long term coaching engagements	42.32 (0.62)	38.90 (2.33)	42.27 (1.93)	43.25 (1.20)	44.95 (2.01)	41.77 (0.90)
Monthly coaching sessions per client	3.12 (0.03)	2.52 (0.12)	2.69 (0.09)	3.10 (0.05)	3.25 (0.08)	3.27 (0.04)
Length of typical coaching session (minutes)	59.91 (0.69)	82.26 (3.46)	66.15 (2.30)	58.93 (1.37)	59.26 (2.07)	55.98 (0.88)
Typical fee per session (\$)	151.85 (1.93)	199.67 (7.74)	170.32 (7.06)	156.13 (3.76)	147.99 (5.97)	140.15 (2.62)
Number of concurrent coaching clients	8.24 (0.12)	6.10 (0.38)	7.63 (0.37)	8.86 (0.25)	8.01 (0.39)	8.40 (0.18)
Frequency clients are referred to other coaches if no longer benefiting from services <sup>a</sup>	2.83 (0.02)	2.67 (0.09)	2.89 (0.06)	2.76 (0.04)	2.87 (0.07)	2.87 (0.03)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents answered on a 5-point scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Always.