

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY
2009, 62, 361-404

A SURVEY OF EXECUTIVE COACHING PRACTICES

JOYCE E. BONO

Department of Human Resources and Labor Relations
University of Minnesota

RADOSTINA K. PURVANOVA

Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota

ANNETTE J. TOWLER

Department of Psychology
DePaul University

DAVID B. PETERSON

Personnel Decisions International

Despite the ubiquity of executive coaching interventions in business organizations, there is little uniformity in the practices (e.g., assessment tools, scientific or philosophical approaches, activities, goals, and outcome evaluation methods) of executive coaches. Addressing the ongoing debate about the role of psychology in executive coaching, we compare the practices of psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, as well as the practices of coaches from various psychological disciplines (e.g., counseling, clinical, and industrial/organizational). Results of surveys completed by 428 coaches (256 nonpsychologists, 172 psychologists) revealed as many differences between psychologists of differing disciplines as were found between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Moreover, differences between psychologists and nonpsychologists were generally small (average $d = .26$). Our survey also revealed some differences in the key competencies identified by psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches.

Executive coaching is a custom tailored, individual training intervention that has become increasingly popular in corporations over the past several decades (Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999; Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003). It has been estimated that there are at least 30,000 coaches worldwide (International Coaching Federation, 2007a), and membership in the International Coaching Federation (ICF) has doubled in the past 5 years—from 5,500 members in 2002 to 11,000 members in 2007 (ICF, 2007b). *The Economist* (2003) estimated the

We thank John Scott for his comments on an early draft of the survey and Abby Miller and Theresa Ascherman for their assistance with data collection.

Correspondence and requests for reprints should be addressed to Joyce E. Bono, 321 19 Avenue South, Department of Human Resource and Labor Studies, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455; jbono@umn.edu.

© 2009 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

market for executive coaching at one billion dollars worldwide and rapidly growing. Peterson and Hicks (1999) report that 93% of U.S.-based Global 1000 companies use executive coaching, as do 65% of the Global 1000 outside the United States.

Despite the widespread use of executive coaches in corporations, much of the process and practice of executive coaching remains shrouded in mystery. Lowman (2005) suggested that executive coaching has "caught on more as an area of practice than as one of theory or research" (p. 90), but a small and growing literature has emerged in three disciplines: management, psychology, and training (Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001). One common theme that can be found in this literature is an ongoing debate about who should be conducting executive coaching and what training, experience, and credentials these individuals should have. Accordingly, the primary purpose of our study is to provide a snapshot of the field of executive coaching, similar to broad surveys that have been conducted on topics such as individual assessment (Ryan & Sackett, 1987), management training (Saari, Johnson, McLaughlin, & Zimmerle, 1988), and assessment centers (Spsychalski, Quinones, Gaugler, & Pohley, 2001). Our aim is not to develop theory or to test scientific hypotheses related to executive coaching. Rather, given the debate about what executive coaching involves and who is qualified to conduct it, we asked a broad sample of coaches, from a variety of disciplines and educational backgrounds, to tell us about themselves, the people they coach, the processes and tools they use, and the outcomes they achieve.

State of the Literature

Despite the popularity of executive coaching in the business world, rigorous peer-reviewed empirical work on executive coaching is hard to find, though much has been written about the topic. There are numerous books and book chapters (e.g., Kampa & White, 2002; Peterson & Kraiger, 2004) devoted to case studies, best practices, and individual perspectives on coaching. We found over 400 publications on executive coaching listed in Business Source Premier (1984–present) and 197 in PsychInfo (1887–present). We identified only two articles on executive coaching in top-ranked management or psychology journals (Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Smither et al., 2003). We also found 48 articles on executive coaching in *Consulting Psychology Journal* and 19 articles in *Harvard Business Review*. Joo's (2005) review of the coaching literature reports that 71% of published articles on executive coaching were in practice journals, 15% in academic journals, and 14% in magazines, supporting the notion that coaching has received more attention in the practitioner community than among academics. Even within the academic

literature, empirical investigations are the minority (i.e., 18%; Grant, 2006).

Although various definitions of executive coaching have been offered, there is some agreement about what the core of executive coaching is. Kilburg (1996), for instance, defined executive coaching as a helping relationship between a managerial-level client and a consultant that follows a formally defined coaching agreement. Witherspoon and White (1996) described executive coaching as a personal learning process that focuses not only on interpersonal issues but on intrapersonal ones as well. Most definitions converge on the notion that executive coaching is a process that involves "a series of one-on-one interactions between a manager or executive and an external coach" (McCauley & Hezlett, 2002, p. 321) for the purpose of "equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (Peterson, 1996, p. 78). Sustained behavior change is the ultimate goal of most executive coaching engagements (Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn, 1998).

Although behavior change is at the heart of most executive coaching, the purpose of executive coaching varies across coaches, client organizations, and executives, and has varied over time as well. Historically, coaching focused on remediation for derailing executives, but most coaching today is focused on preparing high-potential employees for career advancement (McCauley & Hezlett, 2002). Despite a general trend toward less coaching for problem managers, Fritsch and Power's (2006) survey of *Fortune* 500 companies revealed that about one-third of companies still use executive coaching for performance problems. As suggested by the label, executive coaching tends to be reserved for those at the top of organizations; the American Management Association (2008) reported that 46% of North American companies use external coaching for executives, compared to 27% who used them for managers, 13% for supervisors, and only 5% who used coaching for all employees.

One area of diversity among coaches is in the processes and tools they use. For example, though most coaches acknowledge the need for individual assessment, they disagree widely on what should be assessed and how assessment should be conducted (e.g., Diedrich, 1996; Kiel, Rimmer, Williams, & Doyle, 1996; Levinson, 1996; Saporito, 1996; Tobias, 1996). They also vary in whether they use the results of assessment to develop insight (e.g., Diedrich, 1996; Tobias, 1996) or to facilitate goal setting or action-oriented planning (e.g., Kiel et al., 1996; Peterson, 1996).

One thing about which there is considerable agreement is that individuals who participate in executive coaching find it useful. A survey conducted by the International Coaching Federation (1998) revealed that 98.5% of respondents said their investment in a coach was valuable or

very valuable. McGovern et al. (2001) examined the impact of coaching on 100 executives and found that 86% of participants and 74% of other stakeholders (e.g., human resource directors and immediate supervisors) were very or extremely satisfied with the coaching process.

Given the popularity of executive coaching in business organizations, surprisingly little can be found in the existing literature about who provides executive coaching. About 10 years ago, Judge and Cowell (1997) surveyed 60 coaches about their qualifications and backgrounds. Some of the findings were that (a) coaches held a variety of degrees, from drama to psychology; (b) 90% had master's degrees in business and the social sciences, and 45% had doctoral degrees; (c) most coaching was conducted in the client's (52%) or coach's (25%) office, with only 15% of coaching conducted by phone or electronic means; (d) some, but not all, coaches were licensed to practice psychology; (e) most worked for smaller companies or independently; and (f) approaches to coaching ranged from behavioral to psychoanalytic in nature. One reasonable conclusion based on the current executive coaching literature is that everyone is doing it, and everyone is doing it differently. In the absence of formalized standards or licensure for executive coaches, services are being provided by MBAs, attorneys, sports coaches, teachers, nurses, and health and beauty consultants (Brotman et al., 1998; Peterson, 2002).

The Role of Psychology in Coaching

One longstanding debate in the coaching literature has been on the role of psychology in executive coaching. An issue that has been at the center of the debate has been the distinction between psychotherapy and coaching. Many articles have been devoted to this topic (e.g., Brunning, 2006; Hart, Blattner, & Leipsic, 2007; Kilburg, 2004a; Levinson, 1996), and most make distinctions between the two. For example, The International Coaching Federation (2007c) Web site distinguishes between coaching and therapy, in part, by contrasting time orientation (past vs. future) and focus (person vs. work). Because there are no clear lines to separate coaching from therapy, Grant (2001) suggests that one way to think about the potential overlap between coaching and therapy is to think about a distribution, in which one end represents a clinical population in need of therapy and the other end represents a population of executives who need business coaching, with some degree of overlap in the middle of the distribution.

Because executive coaching blurs the line between traditional concepts of mentoring, consulting, and psychotherapy (Dean & Meyer, 2002), much journal space has been devoted to discussions of whether or not executive coaches should have psychological training. On one side of the debate are

those who believe that psychological training is essential for executive coaches (e.g., Berglas, 2002; Dean & Meyer, 2002). Taking the extreme position, Berglas (2002) states, "I believe that in an alarming number of situations, executive coaches who lack rigorous psychological training do more harm than good" (p. 87). Dean and Meyer (2002) suggest that psychological training "will assure that the coach has the basic knowledge and clinical skills needed to accomplish the objectives and goals" (p. 12) of coaching, which typically include some type of sustained behavior change (Brotman et al., 1998). If sustained behavior change is the core product of executive coaching, then psychologists, with their training in human development, learning and behavior, understanding of psychological measurement, skill in handling relationship boundaries, and understanding of client confidentiality (Wasylyshyn, 2003), are likely to be effective coaches. Although psychological training is not the only place where such skills can be acquired, graduate training in psychology or human development is a natural place to develop them.

In addition to their qualifications to conduct coaching, psychologists may also contribute to the coaching process in a number of other ways. Berglas (2002) suggests that executives should undergo psychological evaluation before coaching to screen out "employees not psychologically prepared or predisposed to benefit from the process." Psychologists may also be well positioned to advise organizations in the selection of executive coaches (Brotman et al., 1998) and in the evaluation of coaching outcomes (Berglas, 2002).

On the other side of the debate are those who speak out against psychological background for executive coaches (e.g., Filipczak, 1998). In their review of the coaching literature, Garman, Whiton, and Zlatoper (2000) reported that only 31% of the articles they reviewed mentioned psychological training at all. In articles that did address psychological training, it was viewed as positive in 45% of the cases; in 36% it was seen as having the potential to be positive or negative. In 18% of the articles reviewed, psychological training was seen as "potentially harmful" (p. 203) for executive coaching. Filipczak (1998) notes that therapists, who lack business experience, are jumping into executive coaching because of the paucity of job opportunities in mental health. He goes on to suggest that therapists may be unable to adapt to the role of executive coach because "they see corporate America as another dysfunctional family that needs to be fixed" (Filipczak, 1998, p. 34).

The more common position among those who do not see psychological training as essential to executive coaching is that psychological training can be valuable, but only in some situations. Kilburg (2004b) outlines a list of situations in which psychological interventions are relevant for executive coaching, including situations when "executives continue to

underperform despite conscious stated intention and desire to improve and do well," when "knowledge, ability or skill may be insufficient to master a challenge or solve a problem," and when "relationship disturbances are imperiling an executives' career, and ability to do the job" (p. 252). Kilburg (2004b) also notes limitations to psychological approaches including situations in which there is a conflict of interest between an executive's need for long-term self-development and the organization's need for rapid improvement in performance.

Even among those who advocate psychological training for executive coaches, there is recognition that executive coaching "is not the place for psychologists with no particular interest in business" (Foxhall, 2002, p. 53). Nancy Tippins, PhD, president of a consulting firm that does executive coaching, points out that it is important for coaches to communicate with businesses about the types of problems they are qualified to address, such as skill development, organizational strategy, or managing and motivating employees (Foxhall, 2002). According to Sandra Shullman, PhD, chair of APA's Executive Coaching Work Group, "No one specialty in psychology may fully prepare someone to do executive coaching" (Foxhall, 2002). According to these psychologists (i.e., Shullman and Tippins), coaches with education and experience in industrial-organizational psychology may not be qualified to counsel executives on psychological problems, and clinical or counseling psychologists may not be able to offer advice on how to design a more efficient organization. Furthermore, a coach without psychological training may not be qualified to administer and interpret psychological assessments or to help an executive sustain behavior change over the long run.

Despite the popularity of executive coaching in the business and training worlds, there are many unanswered questions about how coaches' educational background and training might impact their coaching practices. In part, lack of clarity around executive coaching is understandable as coaching can be used to address a variety of issues from derailment (e.g., an executive's inability to get along with others), to career and retirement planning, to employee development (e.g., preparing a high-potential employee for promotion and new responsibilities). Furthermore, over time, having an executive coach has been seen both as a signal that a manager is in trouble and as a status symbol (Johnson, 2007). Nonetheless, the lack of standardization or clarity about coaching practices, training, and outcomes has caused frustration in organizations, as they struggle with how to select a competent coach. "Talk with anyone who has implemented a coaching process and they'll have at least one bad story to tell—generally about matching an executive with the wrong coach," says Liz Thatch (Thatch & Heinselman, 1999).

Given the ubiquity of executive coaching in large organizations and the ongoing debate about the role of psychology, there is practical value in understanding differences, if any, between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Accordingly, we have three central goals in this research. (a) Identify the background and training of executive coaches. (b) Link coach background and training to coaching practices, including type of client, topics addressed, scientific or philosophical approach to coaching, use of assessment tools, and methods of assessing success. Specifically, we compare both the practices of psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches and the practices of psychologists from differing disciplinary backgrounds (e.g., industrial and organizational psychology, counseling psychology, and clinical psychology). (c) Identify the key competencies of executive coaches, as perceived by coaches from psychological and nonpsychological backgrounds. We focused on a comparison between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches because there has been active debate surrounding the issues of whether psychologists are better equipped to provide quality coaching services than are nonpsychologists. Implicit in this debate is the notion that organizations should consider a coach's education and training in making selection and assignment decisions because coaches' training will be linked to their practices. Our research makes an important contribution by empirically examining the validity of this assumption.

Method

Participants and Procedures

We identified executive coaches through a survey of the membership of three large organizations with which executive coaches tend to be affiliated: International Coaching Federation, Society of Consulting Psychology, and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. We also included in our survey some international (e.g., coach-to-coach), regional (e.g., Minnesota Professionals for Psychology Applied to Work), and national (e.g., Professional Coaches Association) groups with which coaches tend to be affiliated. We sent an initial screening e-mail to 6,961 members of these organizations, asking recipients to identify themselves as either (a) an executive or business coach, (b) a personal or life coach, (c) a human resource (HR) professional or manager who hired an executive coach for an employee, (e) an individual who has used the services of an executive or life coach, or (f) an individual who has had no involvement with executive or life coaching. We also contacted representatives of coaching organizations in the United Kingdom, Hong Kong, Australia, France, and Germany, asking these individuals to distribute our screening survey to the coaches on their list-serves.

Two thousand forty-eight (29%) individuals responded to the screening survey. Sixty-two percent of respondents ($N = 1,260$) identified themselves as executive coaches. In addition, 867 respondents were personal/life coaches, 202 were HR professionals who had obtained a coach for a third party, 858 had used the services of a coach, and 814 had no involvement in coaching. Responses to our screening survey questions were not mutually exclusive as some individuals reported conducting both executive and personal coaching, as well as using the services of a coach themselves.

As our focus was on the practices of executive coaches, we e-mailed an invitation to participate in our study to only the 1,260 individuals who identified themselves as executive coaches. The e-mail invited coaches to complete an extensive Web-based survey including questions about their background, their clients, and their practices. Of the 1,260 invitation e-mails we sent, 35 were undeliverable, thus 1,225 business and executive coaches were invited to participate in our research. Four hundred eighty coaches (39%) completed a survey, however, 52 surveys were deleted from subsequent analysis due to a substantial amount of missing data (final $N = 428$).

Measures

In the development of our survey, we consulted the existing literature, as well as several practicing coaches, in an effort to include all the major elements of a coaching practice (e.g., activity, philosophy, methodology) and to be certain that our survey items were written in a way that would make sense to executive coaches. The final version of our survey contained four major sections: coaching practices (Section I), coaching outcomes (Section II), coach background (Section III), and a section with an open-ended question about coach competencies (Section IV).

Section I, coaching practices, consisted of 46 questions in the following categories: assessment tools utilized by the coach (e.g., interviews, cognitive inventories, performance appraisal), reasons for referral to the coach (e.g., promotion, job performance, retirement), approaches to coaching (e.g., behavioral modification, goal setting, neurolinguistic programming), methods of communication with client (e.g., telephone, face-to-face), nature of the coaching engagement (e.g., number of sessions), and hierarchical level of individuals being coached (e.g., CEOs, midlevel managers). Most items were framed in terms of the frequency with which a coach engaged in each practice, using a 5-point scale: 1 = *rarely/never*, 2 = *occasionally*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *always*.

Section II, coaching outcomes, consisted of 23 questions grouped into the following categories: outcomes typically achieved (e.g., improved

self-understanding, improved performance), methods of assessing success (e.g., satisfaction with outcomes, attainment of goals), and source of success information (e.g., coaching participant, participant's boss, coach). The same frequency-based response scale in Section I was used in Section II.

Section III, the coach, consisted of 21 questions grouped into the following categories: level and area of education, age and ethnicity, number of individuals coached, percentage of income derived from coaching, fees, preferred title, employment status, formal training and credentials, and affiliation with professional organizations. Finally, in Section IV, we asked coaches to list the three competencies they considered most essential to be an effective coach.

Results

Comparing Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

In Tables 1-4, we report the means and standard deviations for psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches on aspects of their practices, clients, methods, assessment tools, activities, and methods of evaluating effectiveness. We also report correlations along with *p* values for the associations between type of coach (1 = *nonpsychologist* and 2 = *psychologist*) and practices. A positive correlation indicates that psychologists have a higher mean on the variable of interest than do nonpsychologists. Table 1 presents descriptive information about the coach's background and clients. Results indicate that compared to nonpsychologists, psychologist coaches were more highly educated (40% of nonpsychologists have a bachelor's degree or less, as compared with 7% for psychologists, and 83% of psychologists have a PhD, as compared to 13% of nonpsychologists), and had been conducting executive coaching longer (mean 11.6 and 7.5 years for psychologists and nonpsychologists, respectively). Psychologists also tended to charge more, were more likely to be licensed and less likely to be certified, more likely to carry liability insurance, and derived a smaller portion of their overall income from executive coaching (55% of nonpsychologists and 29% of psychologists earn 50% or more of their income from coaching). Psychologist coaches reported being more likely than nonpsychologists to get coaching referrals from organizational sources (managers and HR departments), and nonpsychologist coaches were more likely to initiate direct contact with a coaching participant. Most coaching was done at the level of vice president, director, and middle manager, with nonpsychologists coaches providing slightly more coaching at the mid-manager level.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Information Comparing Psychologist and Nonpsychologist Coaches

Variable	Psychologists		Nonpsychologists		<i>r</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
<i>Coach demographics</i>					
Age	47.92	10.47	48.94	8.96	-.05
Education	4.63	.69	3.61	.90	.52***
Race	.91	.28	.86	.34	.08
Gender	1.52	.50	1.60	.49	-.08
Management experience	1.93	.25	1.95	.21	-.04
Years coached	11.62	8.52	7.46	6.31	.27***
<i>Coach practice information</i>					
Hourly fees	\$259	\$218	\$214	\$124	.13*
Percentage of income from coaching	1.99	1.10	2.62	1.15	-.26***
Liability insurance	1.56	.50	1.38	.49	.18***
Licensed psychologist	.44	.50	.04	.19	.50***
Certified coach	.15	.36	.56	.50	-.40***
Percent coaching practice in U.S.	77%	37%	58%	46%	.21***
<i>Participant's job roles^a</i>					
CEO/president	3.37	1.41	3.34	1.40	.01
VP/director	4.31	1.22	4.18	1.20	.05
Midlevel manager	4.19	1.07	4.43	.94	-.12*
Entry-level or supervisor	3.07	1.40	3.29	1.33	-.08
Entrepreneur	3.04	1.45	3.87	1.24	-.29***
<i>Source of participant referral^b</i>					
Direct contact from participant	3.22	1.17	3.71	.93	-.23***
Participant referred by manager	3.08	1.11	2.71	1.31	.16**
Participant referred by HR	3.12	1.17	2.65	1.24	.19***
Coach contacted Participant	1.90	1.10	2.56	1.23	-.27***

Note. *N* = 428 for all except demographic variables, where *N*s range from 391 (hourly fees) to 424 (gender); *N* = 172 psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists. Psychologist coded 1 = nonpsychologist, 2 = psychologist. *r* = correlation coefficient, where a positive value indicates a higher mean for psychologists than nonpsychologists. Education coded: 1 = high school, 2 = associate degree, 3 = bachelor's degree, 4 = master's degree, 5 = doctorate. Gender coded: 1 = male, 2 = female. Race coded: 1 = not Caucasian, 2 = Caucasian. Percentage of income from coaching coded: 1 = 0–25%, 2 = 25–50%, 3 = 50–75%, 4 = 75–100%. Management experience, liability insurance, licensed psychologist, certified coach coded: 1 = No, 2 = Yes.

^a1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = sometimes, 5 = often, 6 = always.

^b1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

In Table 2, we compare coaching methods for psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Results indicate that psychologists were more likely than nonpsychologists to conduct coaching in a face-to-face setting, and less likely to coach by phone. Generally psychologists reported fewer coaching sessions with the average coaching participant than did nonpsychologists (e.g., 38% of nonpsychologist coaches reported "often"

TABLE 2
Coaching Methods for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	Psychologists		Nonpsychologists		<i>r</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
<i>Medium</i>					
Telephone	3.37	1.13	3.70	1.17	-.14**
Face to Face	4.15	1.01	3.70	1.21	.19***
E-mail	3.01	1.25	2.96	1.18	.02
Web site/Chat	1.16	.53	1.28	.70	-.09
Videoconference	1.22	.60	1.17	.49	.05
Traditional mail	1.31	.67	1.31	.60	.00
<i>Typical number of sessions</i>					
5 or fewer	3.25	1.53	2.66	1.34	.20***
6-10	3.63	1.36	3.62	1.36	.01
11-20	3.44	1.50	3.88	1.35	-.15**
21-30	2.68	1.63	3.48	1.64	-.24***
<i>Scientific or philosophical approach</i>					
Behavior modification	2.95	1.43	3.39	1.42	-.15**
Cognitive behavioral	3.83	1.13	3.64	1.24	.08
Process/facilitation oriented	3.99	.94	4.00	1.02	.00
Goal setting	4.40	.74	4.42	.83	-.02
Neurolinguistic programming	2.22	1.87	3.06	1.97	-.21**
Psychoanalytic/psychodynamic	2.39	1.83	2.84	2.14	-.11*
Skill training	3.31	1.25	3.34	1.26	-.01

Note. *N* = 428; 172 psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists. Nonpsychologist is coded 1 and psychologist is coded 2. *r* = correlation coefficient; positive values indicate a higher mean level for psychologists than nonpsychologists. Responses were coded using the following scale: 1 = *rarely*, 2 = *occasionally*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, 5 = *always*.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

holding 21-30 sessions with a client as compared to 19% of psychologists). In comparing the scientific or philosophical approaches of psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, we found that nonpsychologists were *more* likely than psychologists to use behavior modification, neurolinguistic programming, and psychoanalytic or psychodynamic techniques. There were no differences between the two types of coaches in their use of cognitive-behavioral or goal-setting approaches.

Table 3 presents results comparing the assessment tools and activities used by psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, along with the topics they address in coaching. Results indicate that nonpsychologists were significantly less likely to interview the client (or his or her supervisor or peers) than were psychologist coaches. Psychologists were also more likely to use aptitude or ability tests and multisource ratings than nonpsychologists, and less likely to use interest inventories. Psychologists were also more likely to have access to performance data on the individual being coached than were nonpsychologists. We found no

TABLE 3
Assessment Tools, Activities, and Topics for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	Psychologists		Nonpsychologists		<i>r</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
<i>Assessment tools</i>					
Interview with client	4.80	.60	4.64	.89	.10*
Interview with supervisor	3.61	1.32	3.17	1.35	.16**
Interview with peers	3.19	1.21	2.75	1.27	.17**
Interview with family	1.54	.91	1.46	.80	.05
Ability or aptitude test	2.34	1.38	1.96	1.18	.15**
Interest inventory	2.26	1.19	2.71	1.35	-.17***
Personality inventory	3.12	1.39	3.23	1.29	-.04
Multisource ratings (management or leadership behavior)	3.48	1.17	2.84	1.20	.26***
Role plays	2.73	1.18	2.67	1.28	.02
Access to performance data	3.07	1.21	2.55	1.29	.20***
<i>Activities</i>					
Building rapport	4.65	.78	4.41	.97	.13**
Increasing motivation	3.55	1.21	3.76	1.11	-.09
Developing insight	4.47	.83	4.46	.75	.00
Teaching a new skill	3.60	1.11	3.54	1.05	.03
Assisting with application of skill	4.35	.83	4.16	.95	.10*
Holding participant accountable	4.26	1.00	4.21	1.06	.03
Setting goals for behavior change	4.34	.85	4.15	.83	.11*
<i>Topic addressed in coaching</i>					
Interpersonal skills	3.91	.72	3.78	.83	.08
Stress management	2.73	1.14	3.20	.98	-.21***
Strategic thinking	3.08	1.01	3.10	.99	-.01
Time management	2.69	1.02	3.22	1.00	-.25***
Conflict management	3.32	.83	3.28	.88	.02
Staffing	2.18	1.00	2.20	1.00	-.01
Management style	3.83	.89	3.59	.84	.14**
Leadership	3.92	.88	3.86	.75	.04
Communication	3.74	.90	4.03	.73	-.17***
Adaptability/versatility	2.97	1.12	3.21	1.00	-.11*
Motivation	2.36	1.21	2.86	1.19	-.20***
Delegation	2.85	1.05	2.86	.98	-.00
Planning	2.75	.99	2.98	1.07	-.11*
Sales or financial performance	2.02	1.04	2.34	1.11	-.15**
Mentoring	2.41	1.10	2.71	1.10	-.13**

Note. *N* = 428; 172 psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists. Nonpsychologist is coded 1 and psychologist is coded 2. *r* = correlation coefficient; positive values indicate a higher mean level for psychologists than nonpsychologists. Responses were coded using the following scale: 1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

TABLE 4
Methods to Evaluate Effectiveness Used by Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	Psychologists		Nonpsychologists		<i>r</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Client reports</i>					
Satisfaction with process	4.16	.98	4.44	.72	-.17**
Satisfaction with outcomes	4.24	.84	4.40	.70	-.10*
Attainment of coaching goals	4.16	.90	4.27	.77	-.06
Increased confidence	3.60	1.21	4.12	.84	-.25***
Increased self-understanding	3.84	1.25	4.33	.80	-.23***
<i>Boss reports</i>					
Satisfaction with process	3.17	1.24	3.15	1.40	.01
Satisfaction with outcomes	3.53	1.27	3.35	1.37	.07
Attainment of written goals	3.25	1.32	3.12	1.41	.05
Attainment of implicit goals	3.11	1.29	3.09	1.32	.01
Behavior change	3.44	1.21	3.24	1.28	.08
Learning or skill development	3.08	1.25	3.05	1.31	.01
<i>Others reports (peer, HR)</i>					
Behavior change	2.87	1.26	2.60	1.31	.10*
Learning or skill development	2.63	1.21	2.40	1.25	.09
<i>Objective reports</i>					
Business outcomes (financial, sales)	2.33	1.26	2.44	1.24	-.04
Promotion	2.45	1.14	2.45	1.15	-.00
Reduced complaints	1.97	1.10	1.91	1.05	.03
ROI based on utility analysis	1.77	1.19	1.81	1.08	-.02
<i>Organizational surveys</i>					
Attitude change	2.21	1.11	2.03	1.21	.08
<i>Coaches assessment</i>					
Efficacy of coaching process	4.17	1.02	4.35	.89	-.09
Efficacy of coaching outcomes	4.20	.99	4.31	.90	-.06
Attainment of written goals	3.97	1.10	4.06	1.03	-.05
Attainment of implicit goals	3.97	1.08	4.11	.96	-.07
Increased self-understanding	4.09	1.12	4.41	.80	-.17***

Note. *N* = 428; 172 psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists. Nonpsychologist is coded 1 and psychologist is coded 2. *r* = correlation coefficient; positive values indicate a higher mean level for psychologists than nonpsychologists. Responses were coded using the following scale: 1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

significant differences between the two types of coaches in most of their activities (e.g., increasing motivation, developing insight, teaching a new skill or holding the coaching participant accountable for results), but we did find that psychologist coaches were more likely to focus on building rapport with the person being coached, more likely to assist clients with applying new skills at work, and more likely to set goals for behavior change with their client. With respect to the topics of coaching, there was considerable overlap between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches.

The top three topics addressed by psychologist coaches were leadership, interpersonal skills, and management style, and the top three topics addressed by nonpsychologist coaches were communication, leadership, and interpersonal skills. There were a number of areas (e.g., stress management, time management, sales or financial performance, mentoring, and planning) that were more likely to be engaged in by nonpsychologist coaches.

Table 4 compares methods of evaluating effectiveness for psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches; few differences were found. Generally, psychologists were less likely than nonpsychologists to depend on the reports of the individuals they coached (e.g., satisfaction with process, increased self-understanding) to evaluate coaching effectiveness. They were also more likely to use others' reports (e.g., HR or peers) of behavior change to evaluate the coaching effectiveness.

Comparing Psychologists by Discipline

Our next set of analyses examines consistency (or inconsistency) among psychologists, comparing coach practices and methods across sub-disciplines of psychology. Tables 5–8 replicate the analyses presented in Tables 1–4 but use data only from psychologists, reporting overall *F* tests from ANOVAS to compare types of psychologists. There were enough coaches in our sample to do a comparison across four psychological disciplines: industrial-organizational psychologists ($N = 83$), counseling psychologists ($N = 39$), clinical psychologists ($N = 30$), and personality/social psychologists ($N = 20$). Table 5 results reveal statistically significant differences in age (counseling and personality/social psychologists tended to be older), education (counseling and personality/social psychologists were less likely to have a doctorate: 50% counseling, 65% personality/social, 81% industrial-organizational, and 83% clinical), and gender (70% female for counseling, 68% personality/social, 49% industrial-organizational, and 30% clinical). There were also differences between types of psychologists on all the elements of coaching practices examined in Table 5, including licensure, certification, percent income obtained from coaching, and whether they carried liability insurance. Psychologists also varied in the extent to which they tended to coach CEOs and entrepreneurs and in how they obtained client referrals.

Table 6 presents results comparing coaching methods; few significant differences were found. There were also only a few significant differences between types of psychologists in their use of assessment tools and topics addressed in coaching (see Table 7), but some statistically significant differences were found for activities (i.e., teaching a new skill, assisting with skill application, and holding a coaching participant accountable). Table 8

TABLE 5
Descriptive Information Comparing Disciplines Within Psychology

Variable	Clinical		Counseling		Industrial & organizational		Personality & social		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Coach demographics</i>									
Age	51.97	10.13	47.32	8.54	45.54	10.74	52.89	10.63	4.52**
Education	4.80	.48	4.31	.83	4.80	.44	4.30	1.13	7.20***
Race	.90	.31	.87	.34	.95	.21	.85	.37	1.15
Sex	1.30	.47	1.66	.48	1.49	.50	1.70	.47	4.07**
Management experience	1.93	.25	1.97	.16	1.93	.26	1.89	.32	.56
Years coached	14.40	7.79	10.78	6.94	10.48	8.85	13.65	10.25	2.09
<i>Coach practice information</i>									
Hourly fees	\$250	83.00	\$243	97.05	\$285	299.46	\$199	171.56	.82
% income from coaching	2.43	1.10	2.38	1.33	1.61	.81	2.10	1.12	7.45***
Liability insurance	1.83	.38	1.51	.51	1.52	.50	1.39	.50	4.21**
Licensed psychologist	.70	.47	.54	.51	.34	.48	.28	.46	5.31**
Certified coach	.23	.43	.21	.41	.07	.26	.28	.46	2.90*
% coaching in U.S.	83.07	33.28	75.89	39.37	80.13	33.77	55.50	46.54	2.78*
<i>Participant's job roles^a</i>									
CEO/president	4.27	.94	3.41	1.39	2.95	1.38	3.65	1.50	7.58***
VP/director	4.77	.82	4.21	1.22	4.19	1.31	4.30	1.22	1.79
Mid-level manager	4.43	.57	4.03	1.04	4.14	1.24	4.30	.87	.95
Entry-level or supervisor	2.70	1.18	3.03	1.39	3.24	1.50	3.00	1.26	1.14
Entrepreneur	3.93	.96	3.35	1.42	2.51	1.38	3.42	1.50	9.81***

continued

TABLE 5 (continued)

Variable	Clinical		Counseling		Industrial & organizational		Personality & social		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Source of participant referral^a</i>									
Direct contact from participant	2.97	1.07	3.36	1.18	3.10	1.18	3.85	1.09	3.00*
Referred by manager	3.57	.63	2.92	1.04	3.00	1.20	3.00	1.26	2.44*
Referred by HR	3.47	.86	2.90	1.27	3.27	1.17	2.45	1.10	4.17**
Coach contacted participant	2.27	1.02	2.15	1.18	1.67	1.00	1.80	1.24	3.16*

Note. $N = 172$ for all psychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 30$ Clinical, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social Psychologist.

Education coded: 1 = high school, 2 = associate degree, 3 = bachelors degree, 4 = masters degree, 5 = doctorate. Sex coded: 1 = male, 2 = female. Race coded: 1 = not Caucasian, 2 = Caucasian. Percentage of income from coaching coded: 1 = 0-25%, 2 = 25-50%, 3 = 50-75%, 4 = 75-100%.

Management experience, liability insurance, licensed psychologist, certified coach coded: 1 = No, 2 = Yes. Degrees of freedom for F tests (3, 168).

*1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = sometimes, 5 = often, 6 = always.

^a1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 6
Comparison of Coaching Methods Across Disciplines of Psychology

Variable	Clinical		Counseling		Industrial & organizational		Personality & social		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Medium</i>									
Telephone	3.27	1.17	3.59	1.16	3.30	1.09	3.40	1.19	.68
Face to face	4.40	.89	3.87	1.26	4.19	.85	4.15	1.18	1.67
E-mail	3.37	1.25	3.00	1.38	2.89	1.16	2.95	1.32	1.08
Web site/chat	1.30	.70	1.13	.57	1.11	.38	1.25	.64	1.22
Videokonference	1.23	.50	1.28	.86	1.19	.51	1.20	.52	.21
Traditional mail	1.37	.89	1.21	.57	1.34	.65	1.35	.59	.45
<i>Typical number of sessions</i>									
5 or fewer	3.00	1.15	3.21	1.47	3.34	1.63	3.35	1.79	.39
6-10	3.97	1.03	3.51	1.47	3.70	1.40	3.10	1.37	1.81
11-20	4.23	1.14	3.59	1.43	3.17	1.48	3.05	1.82	4.52**
21-30	3.27	1.57	2.95	1.79	2.35	1.49	2.65	1.69	2.89*
<i>Scientific/philosophical approach</i>									
Behavior modification	2.50	1.20	3.31	1.45	3.00	1.42	2.75	1.65	1.99
Cognitive behavioral	3.80	1.00	3.92	1.18	3.89	1.15	3.40	1.14	1.14
Process/facilitation oriented	4.20	.66	3.95	1.12	3.90	.93	4.10	.97	.84
Goal setting	4.50	.68	4.54	.72	4.27	.73	4.50	.83	1.71
Neurolinguistic prog.	2.33	1.90	2.15	1.63	2.34	2.08	1.65	1.18	.78
Psychoanalytic/dynamic	2.50	1.82	2.13	1.36	2.47	2.04	2.40	1.85	.35
Skill training	3.50	1.17	3.62	1.23	3.18	1.22	2.95	1.47	1.87

Note. N = 172 for all psychologists; N = 39 Counseling, N = 83 Industrial-organizational (I-O), and N = 20 Personality and social. Responses were coded using the following scale: 1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always. Degrees of freedom for F tests (3, 168).

*p < .05; **p < .01.

TABLE 7
Comparison of Assessment Tools and Outcome Assessment Across Disciplines of Psychology

Variable	Clinical		Counseling		Industrial & organizational		Personality & social		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Assessment tools</i>									
Interview with client	4.87	.35	4.87	.52	4.70	.75	5.00	.00	1.87
Interview with supervisor	4.00	1.08	3.51	1.39	3.64	1.33	3.10	1.33	1.99
Interview with peers	3.63	.89	3.10	1.23	3.17	1.26	2.75	1.29	2.34
Interview with family	1.63	.81	1.69	1.03	1.45	.86	1.50	1.05	.77
Ability or aptitude test	2.37	1.25	2.08	1.29	2.54	1.46	1.95	1.36	1.62
Interest inventory	2.27	1.29	2.38	1.16	2.16	1.17	2.40	1.23	.44
Personality inventory	3.40	1.28	2.62	1.46	3.29	1.30	3.00	1.56	2.67*
Multisource ratings	3.53	.97	3.26	1.31	3.61	1.09	3.25	1.41	1.13
Role plays	2.80	1.03	2.67	1.24	2.73	1.19	2.75	1.29	.07
Access to performance data	3.40	1.00	3.00	1.36	3.08	1.22	2.65	1.09	1.61
<i>Activities</i>									
Build rapport	4.87	.57	4.79	.57	4.58	.83	4.35	1.04	2.53
Increase motivation	3.73	1.08	3.85	1.27	3.39	1.16	3.35	1.39	1.74
Develop insight	4.47	1.01	4.67	.48	4.40	.84	4.35	1.04	1.07
Teach a new skill	4.13	.86	3.85	1.11	3.45	1.03	2.95	1.36	6.28***
Assist with skill application	4.77	.43	4.38	.94	4.25	.79	4.05	1.05	3.94**
Hold participant accountable	4.50	.90	4.54	.89	4.04	1.06	4.30	.92	3.09*
Set goals for behavior change	4.63	.49	4.44	.82	4.25	.88	4.05	1.10	2.47

<i>Topic addressed in coaching</i>	4.00	.59	3.87	.89	3.92	.67	3.85	.75	.24
Interpersonal skills	2.93	1.17	2.87	1.11	2.54	1.12	2.95	1.19	1.54
Stress management	2.80	1.00	3.21	.89	3.13	1.08	3.05	.95	1.05
Strategic thinking	2.57	.94	2.82	1.10	2.61	1.00	2.90	1.07	.79
Time management	3.37	.72	3.36	.84	3.23	.85	3.55	.89	.91
Conflict management	2.30	.99	2.36	.96	1.98	1.01	2.50	.95	2.45
Staffing	3.93	.58	3.95	.86	3.76	1.01	3.75	.79	.60
Management style	4.07	.69	4.13	.66	3.80	1.01	3.85	.88	1.63
Leadership	3.97	.77	3.87	.92	3.60	.92	3.75	.91	1.57
Communication	3.13	1.01	3.18	1.21	2.87	1.11	2.75	1.12	1.16
Adaptability/versatility	2.17	.87	2.69	1.30	2.25	1.24	2.45	1.28	1.51
Motivation	3.00	.91	3.18	1.14	2.75	1.03	2.45	1.00	2.79*
Delegation	2.70	.70	3.08	.98	2.63	1.03	2.70	1.08	1.94
Planning	2.20	.96	2.23	1.14	1.90	1.04	1.80	.89	1.49
Sales/financial performance	2.33	.96	2.72	1.12	2.22	1.08	2.75	1.16	2.65
Mentoring									

Note. $N = 172$ for all psychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 30$ Clinical, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social. Responses were coded using the following scale: 1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always. Degrees of freedom for F tests (3, 168).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 8
Comparison of Methods Used to Evaluate Effectiveness Across Disciplines of Psychology

Variable	Clinical		Counseling		Industrial & organizational		Personality & social		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<i>Client reports</i>									
Satisfaction with process	4.30	.75	4.26	.94	3.99	1.05	4.45	.95	1.81
Satisfaction with outcomes	4.30	.60	4.31	.77	4.12	.99	4.55	.51	1.61
Attainment of coaching goals	4.37	.62	4.28	1.00	3.96	.96	4.45	.69	2.84*
Increased confidence	3.97	1.03	3.87	1.20	3.24	1.24	4.00	1.03	5.05**
Increased self-understanding	4.20	1.06	4.08	1.13	3.54	1.33	4.05	1.15	3.18*
<i>Boss reports</i>									
Satisfaction with process	3.80	.76	3.23	1.29	2.95	1.28	3.05	1.36	3.67*
Satisfaction with outcomes	3.97	.67	3.51	1.43	3.43	1.35	3.30	1.26	1.57
Attainment of written goals	3.63	.72	3.26	1.46	3.16	1.42	3.05	1.23	1.14
Attainment of implicit goals	3.53	.82	3.15	1.41	3.01	1.34	2.80	1.32	1.67
Behavior change	3.87	.68	3.49	1.30	3.34	1.32	3.15	1.04	1.88
Learning or skill development	3.47	.86	3.18	1.37	2.92	1.30	3.00	1.26	1.55
<i>Others reports (peer, HR)</i>									
Behavior change	3.23	1.07	2.90	1.31	2.77	1.33	2.65	1.04	1.22
Learning or skill development	2.93	1.08	2.87	1.26	2.46	1.24	2.40	1.05	1.98

presents cross-discipline comparisons for psychologists on evaluation. Once again, few statistically significant differences were found.

Considering Tables 1–4 as a set (comparing psychologists vs. nonpsychologists) with Tables 5–8 as a set (comparing disciplines within psychology), one might reach the conclusion that considerably more differences can be found between psychologists and nonpsychologists than between the various disciplines in psychology. This would not be a valid conclusion. Because we focused on statistically significant differences across groups, such a comparison would be misleading, as the overall number of coaches in the two sets of analysis vary greatly ($N = 428$ in Tables 1–4, and $N = 174$ for Tables 5–8). For this reason, a comparison of the magnitude of differences (not just significance tests) between psychologist coaches of various disciplines with the magnitude of differences between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches is needed. Examining d values for all the comparisons in Tables 1–8 results in computation of 803 values. We present the full comparison data in the Appendices, but for reader convenience, we also computed *average* d values for each general topic of comparison (e.g., assessment tools, evaluation, and practice information), using means and standard deviations presented in Tables 1–8. We then averaged the absolute d values from all the within-psychology comparisons to form an overall d value representing average differences between psychological disciplines, which can be compared to the d value representing average differences between psychologists and nonpsychologists.

Results in Table 9 indicate that the magnitude of differences between psychologists and nonpsychologists is roughly equal to the magnitude of differences between psychologists of differing disciplines. The overall absolute mean d value, across all topics, tools, outcomes evaluation, and practices is $d = .26$ for the psychologists versus nonpsychologists comparison and $d = .29$ for the comparison of psychological disciplines (with the largest differences occurring when we compare clinical to other types of psychologists; average $d = .34$). Although many of the differences we examined were statistically significant, as noted in Tables 1–8, examination of the d values reveals that, in general, these effects were small to moderate in magnitude.

Our final analysis was a comparison of the competencies considered to be essential for effective coaching. Because the data for this analysis is qualitative, we restricted our comparison to psychologists versus nonpsychologists. In the first step of our analysis, three of the authors read all the competencies (blind to whether they were provided by psychologists or nonpsychologists) and developed a list of competencies found in the data. Through discussion, we developed a final set of competencies (see Table 10). In the next step, two authors counted the number of times each competency was mentioned by psychologists and nonpsychologists.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Overall, Average Effect Sizes for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	Coun vs. I-O	Clin vs. I-O	P/Soc vs. IO	Coun vs. Clin	Clin vs. P/Soc	Coun vs. P/Soc
<i>Overall average d value</i>	.26	.29	.24	.34	.25	.28	.40	.24
<i>Descriptive information</i>	.42	.39	.29	.45	.40	.42	.51	.25
Coach demographics	.39	.36	.33	.28	.48	.47	.34	.25
Practice information	.64	.41	.33	.52	.44	.24	.58	.34
Participant's job roles	.23	.37	.24	.66	.31	.52	.38	.22
Source of participant referral	.44	.41	.26	.36	.37	.45	.74	.29
<i>Coaching methods</i>	.22	.24	.20	.28	.17	.26	.31	.23
Medium	.17	.17	.18	.20	.09	.27	.14	.17
Typical number of sessions	.31	.32	.22	.45	.18	.31	.55	.22
Scientific/philosophical approach	.17	.23	.19	.20	.24	.21	.23	.29
<i>Tools, activities, topics</i>	.21	.29	.27	.28	.24	.23	.43	.29
Assessment tools	.27	.26	.21	.19	.28	.26	.41	.19
Activities	.14	.39	.33	.45	.22	.25	.61	.46
Topics addressed in coaching	.23	.23	.28	.22	.21	.19	.28	.23
<i>Outcome evaluation</i>	.17	.24	.20	.34	.20	.20	.33	.19
Client reports	.34	.28	.34	.42	.50	.07	.18	.18
Boss reports	.08	.33	.13	.49	.10	.40	.69	.19
Others' reports	.19	.28	.21	.38	.07	.17	.53	.30
Objective reports	.07	.18	.18	.23	.16	.19	.20	.11
Coaches assessment	.18	.15	.11	.19	.18	.16	.07	.16

Note. Table values are average absolute d values. ψ = psychologists.

TABLE 10
Competencies Identified by Psychologist and Nonpsychologist Coaches

Competencies	Psychologists	Nonpsychologists	χ^2 (df)
Diagnostic and planning capabilities			
<i>Questioning:</i> Capacity to ask insightful, probing, discovery-oriented questions	8 (2.84%)	47 (8.69%)	4.67*
<i>Listening:</i> Capacity to actively listen, hear, and understand the participant	33 (11.70%)	101 (19.02%)	1.34
<i>Communication skills:</i> Capacity to communicate effectively, expressing complex ideas simply	12 (4.26%)	28 (5.27%)	.03
<i>Assessment:</i> Capacity to identify and analyze key issues, and use data and measurement tools	13 (4.61%)	13 (2.45%)	5.19**
<i>Analysis and planning:</i> Capacity to reach grounded assessments and insightful solutions, to use data to solve problems, and to develop specific plans	10 (3.55%)	6 (1.13%)	8.11**
<i>Intervention success assessment:</i> Evaluating the success of the coaching intervention, following through with clients after coaching is completed, being focused on achieving results	4 (1.42%)	4 (.75%)	1.45
Intervention and problem solving capabilities			
<i>Large, flexible toolbox:</i> Capacity to use multiple technologies, tools, and methods	0 (0%)	12 (2.26%)	5.59**
<i>Motivator:</i> Capacity to motivate, encourage, empower, influence, or prompt	6 (2.13%)	12 (2.26%)	.14
<i>Building relationships and achieving rapport:</i> Capacity to build rapport, make connections, have empathy/compassion	35 (12.41%)	44 (8.29%)	8.69**
<i>Counseling skills:</i> Capacity to use skills consistent with the psychodynamic, person-centered, modeling, or goal-setting approaches to psychological therapy	28 (9.93%)	53 (9.98%)	1.12
<i>Feedback:</i> Capacity to give honest, clear, unambiguous, nonjudgmental feedback	8 (2.84%)	18 (3.38%)	.05
<i>Holding the client accountable:</i> Ability to hold client accountable for client's commitments to the coaching process	1 (.35%)	6 (1.13%)	1.21

TABLE 10 (continued)

Knowledge				
<i>Business knowledge: Understanding business, organizational structure/strategy, culture, politics, leadership</i>		36 (12.77%)	27 (5%)	23.68**
<i>Knowledge and understanding of human behavior: Knowledge of how people change and learn, broad psychological training, behavioral science background</i>		29 (10.28%)	5 (.94%)	51.22**
<i>Knowledge of participant background: Familiarity with the participant's competence in the area to be coached</i>		0 (0%)	3 (.56%)	2.22
Personal qualities				
<i>Authenticity/self-awareness: Self-understanding</i>		13 (4.61%)	19 (3.58%)	1.91
<i>Honesty and integrity: Being honest, ethical, trustworthy</i>		10 (3.55%)	19 (3.58%)	.35
<i>Other personal qualities: Courage, curiosity, perceptiveness, humor, intuition</i>		22 (7.80%)	29 (5.46%)	4.69**
<i>Life and job experience: Having rich personal and professional experiences</i>		0 (0%)	12 (2.26%)	5.59**
<i>Continuous learning: Being responsible for professional development, pursuing new knowledge, certification</i>		2 (.71%)	8 (1.51%)	.70
<i>Self-management and professionalism: Being prepared, on time, maintain professional appearance/demeanor</i>		0 (0%)	5 (.94%)	2.89
<i>Client focus: Being focused on the client, putting the clients' interests first</i>		0 (0%)	8 (1.51%)	4.01**

Note. There were a total of 282 competencies provided by psychologists and 531 provided by nonpsychologists. Twelve competencies from psychologists (4%) and 52 competencies from nonpsychologists (9%) were not classifiable, in most cases because they were too vague.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Because the raw number of competencies provided by psychologists and nonpsychologists differed ($N = 282$ for psychologists and $N = 531$ for nonpsychologists), in Table 10 we report both our raw counts and percentages (i.e., the percentage of times that each competency was mentioned by psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches). Results of χ^2 tests reveal a number of significant differences in the frequency with which competencies were mentioned by psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. For example, in the category of diagnostic and planning capabilities, results reveal that nonpsychologist coaches were significantly more likely to mention questioning skills, whereas psychologist coaches were significantly more likely to mention assessment and analysis. Nonpsychologists were more likely to mention building rapport and having a large adaptable toolbox (of methods, technologies, and tools). Psychologists were more likely to mention knowledge of business as a key coaching competency and were significantly more likely than nonpsychologist coaches to mention personal characteristics, such as intuition, humor, courage, or perceptiveness.

Discussion

The primary purpose of our study was to describe the current state of executive coaching practices with a special emphasis on comparing the practices of psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Perhaps the two most striking aspect of our results—considered as a whole—are that (a) differences between psychologist and nonpsychologists coaches are generally quite small (average $d = .26$) and (b) there are as many differences between psychologist coaches of various disciplines ($d = .29$) as there are between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. Our results show that a coach's background significantly predicts how he or she will conduct coaching, who he or she will coach, what assessments and tools he or she may choose, and how he or she will evaluate coaching effectiveness. But, the magnitude of the differences we found is generally quite small, suggesting that it may be time to move the debate about whether or not executive coaches should have psychological training to a debate about what we can expect coaches of differing backgrounds to do *best* and what type of training would help *all* coaches be more effective.

Although we did not find large differences between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, there are a few moderate-sized findings worthy of note, in part because they follow logically from the coach's training. Our results show that psychologist coaches have more experience coaching ($d = .58$), which is not surprising given that performance assessment, development, and behavior change (i.e., coaching) have long been the domain of psychologists, and specific training and certification

of coaches is a relatively new phenomenon. Nonpsychologist coaches derived a higher percentage of their income from coaching ($d = -.56$) and were more likely than psychologists to directly recruit clients and less likely to obtain clients through referrals ($d = -.56$). This may be, in part, because many of the training and certification programs have marketing and sales as an emphasis (see the International Coaching Federation Web site), but graduate psychology programs typically do not. We also found that nonpsychologist coaches had more sessions with their clients ($d = -.49$), were less likely to use multisource behavioral ratings as diagnostic and assessment tools ($d = .54$), and were more likely to measure coaching success by directly asking the person being coached about self-confidence ($d = -.53$) and self-understanding ($d = -.50$).

Some smaller differences (d values $< .50$) in practices between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches were also found. Psychologist coaches were more likely to coach clients face-to-face and were less likely to use approaches where empirical validity evidence is weak (e.g., neurolinguistic programming, psychoanalytic/psychodynamic). They also tended to use multiple methods and sources, such as interviewing third parties (e.g., supervisors and peers) during both the assessment and outcome evaluation stages. Many of these differences (e.g., use of empirically supported approaches, use of multisource assessment tools, and more reliance on third party observations than self-reports) reflect practices taught in psychology graduate programs.

Taken as a whole, our results appear to favor psychologist coaches, especially with respect to strong measurement, use of data from multiple sources, and use of techniques with empirical validity. Nonetheless, our comparison of the four types of psychologists revealed that there are as many differences between types of psychologists as there are between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches. These results suggests that the many journal pages devoted to debates about whether or not psychologists are the best (or worse) executive coaches have missed a key point: Even among psychologists, there are many, albeit mostly small, differences that can be linked to the psychological specialty in which the coach was trained. The largest overall differences were found when clinical psychologists were compared to industrial-organizational, social/personality and counseling psychologists (average $d = .34$)

When it comes to competencies viewed as important by psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches, we found a number of significant differences. Both groups agreed that skills such as the ability to build rapport, and listening and counseling skills were key coach competencies. It was in the broad category of knowledge that psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches differed most. Psychologists were substantially more likely than nonpsychologists to list knowledge and understanding of human behavior

as a key coach competency. In the literature, there is general agreement among psychologist coaches of various subdisciplines that coaching involves "equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (Peterson, 1996, p. 78) with the ultimate goal of sustained behavior change (Brotman et al., 1998). The magnitude of the difference between psychologist and nonpsychologist coaches about the importance of understanding human behavior as a coach competency suggests that sustained behavior change may not be the goal of all coaches; some may view increased insight or self-awareness as an end goal.

We also found that psychologists rated knowledge of business practices, including strategy, culture, and leadership, as a more important competency than did nonpsychologist coaches. Another small, yet important, difference in perceived competencies is that psychologists were more likely to list competencies related to sound needs assessment practices (e.g., using data and measurement tools, analysis and planning), whereas nonpsychologists were more likely to list broader, less specific assessment and intervention competencies (e.g., questioning and probing skills, using a flexible toolbox). It is worth noting, however, that coaches' perceptions of key competencies may not reflect their actual strengths. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, psychologists' greater emphasis on business competencies may reflect their appreciation for the value of business knowledge, which they may feel they lack.

Although a growing number of nonpsychologist coaches come from business (former managers and former HR professionals), historically, many nonpsychologist coaches came from human services and helping professions. These coaches tended to be more focused on the personal goals of the individual and less concerned about the business side of things. Indeed, when coding the competencies, we observed what appear to be two distinct "types" of competency listings that may be indicative of distinct models or methods of coaching. Some coaches seemed to focus more on business-related outcomes. These coaches focused on assessment and skill development, with an implicit goal of behavior change. Others focused on listening, reflecting, and questioning, with more apparent focus on the personal growth of the individual being coached. Our observations may reflect two distinctly different models (reflection vs. intervention) and goals (business competencies vs. personal growth) of coaching that exist in the marketplace; however, our data suggest that these models are not closely aligned with a coach's training or educational background.

A primary strength of our study was that we went to great lengths to assemble a representative sample of coaches, with a variety of backgrounds and institutional affiliations. This strength is accompanied by some limitations. First, collecting data from over 400 coaches forced us to rely on

a survey with standardized questions and responses, limiting our ability to collect rich data on the intricacies of coaches' work with their clients, which can be hard to characterize in a 1–5 response scale. For example, we did not learn much about the underlying organizational goals that drive executive coaching (e.g., develop high-potential managers, or change the organizational culture) or about the processes used by organizations in selecting coaches or matching coaches with executives. Second, a potentially biasing factor in our interpretation of the data is our own link to psychology, which may tend to focus our attention on some aspects of our results over others. Three of the four authors are psychologists by training (industrial-organizational and counseling); the fourth, although trained in business, spent several years in a psychology department. We acknowledge the possibility that our training influenced the questions that we asked and the issues we viewed as important. A third limitation of our study design is that we asked coaches to self-report their behaviors and approaches. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, it is quite possible that some coaches may have responded in a way that was consistent with how they thought they should respond, based on their training. For this reason, continued empirical work on executive coaching is important. Even though coaches may diverge to some degree—in practice—from what they report on our survey, we still find the similarities and differences between coaches of various disciplines to be informative, both because it is likely that there is an association between what coaches report and what they actually do, and because reported differences may be indicative of philosophical differences in approaches to coaching.

Implications and Application

Our review of the literature makes it clear that executive coaching remains a popular intervention for organizations. One of the reasons that coaching has grown so rapidly is because organizations have become aware of the problems and costs caused by high-potential employees with poor interpersonal skills, because the tight pool of talented employees makes employee development more attractive to organizations than replacement, because retirement among senior executives has prompted organizations to develop formal succession plans, and because managers, due to lack of skills and time, tend to outsource feedback and development of employees. The question facing organizations is how to choose the right coach. The results of our study, although informative about many small differences between coaches, do not provide a clear framework for matching client needs with coaches on the basis of a coach's training and background.

Given that knowing a coach's educational background is not enough to tell an organization how a coach will behave, we suggest that organizations can do a better job of matching clients and coaches by asking two questions—one of themselves and one of coaches they consider hiring. Question 1: *What is the need of the individual to be coached, relative to the necessary and sufficient conditions for development—insight, motivation, capabilities, real-world practice, and accountability?* These five conditions are referred to as the Development Pipeline (Peterson, 2006).¹ Does the person need additional insight, motivation, and skills? Or does the person need to be given the opportunity to apply their existing skills in real-world settings and be held accountable for doing so? The answer to this question tells the company what they need to look for in a coach (e.g., someone who can provide feedback and clarify goals in order to facilitate insight or someone who can provide new knowledge and build the person's skills). Asking this question will also help organizations realize that if they do not know exactly what elements of development the person needs, it is critical that they hire a coach who has training, skill, and experience in problem identification (i.e., developmental assessment and needs analysis). Our data suggests a potential advantage for psychologist coaches in this instance, as they are more likely to use effective tools to diagnose the problem (e.g., multisource behavioral ratings $d = .54$, interview with supervisor $d = .33$, interview with peers $d = .35$, ability/aptitude tests $d = .30$, and review of prior performance data $d = .41$). Our data also suggest that if an executive needs to learn to apply his or her existing skills, a psychologist might be well suited for the task, as psychologist coaches were more likely to assist with skill application ($d = .21$) and to set behavior change goals ($d = .22$) with the individuals they coach.

Once the organization has answered Question 1, they are ready to interview coaches using Question 2: *What is the coach's process for addressing the specific type of need identified in Question 1?* Coaches can be asked to explicitly describe their approach to building insight, enhancing motivation, helping the person learn new skills and gain knowledge,

¹The Development Pipeline lists the five necessary and sufficient conditions for systematic learning, defined as follows (Peterson, 2006). Insight: the extent to which a person understands what area(s) they need to develop in order to be more effective. Motivation: the degree to which a person is willing to invest the time and energy it takes to develop in those areas. Capabilities: the extent to which a person has the skills and knowledge that are needed. Real-world practice: the extent to which the person has opportunities to apply their skills in relevant, real-world settings. Accountability: the extent to which there are internal and external mechanisms for paying attention to change and providing meaningful consequences. An analysis of which elements are missing, or most constrained, will identify where coaching and development efforts should be focused in order to most efficiently facilitate learning.

transfer learning to real-world applications, and/or ensuring that the person is held accountable and sticks to their goals. With that kind of clarity relative to a specific model of development, organizations can assess how satisfied they are with a coach's ability to articulate his or her approach to addressing the executive's need.² Our data suggest that knowing a coach's educational background will provide only limited information of this nature. Indeed, we found it ironic that a common criticism of psychologist coaches is their assumed use of psychoanalytic techniques in the coaching process because our data suggest that psychologists are significantly *less* likely than nonpsychologists to use such controversial techniques in executive coaching. Clearly, organizations cannot rely on a coach's educational background to determine what process they will use in executive coaching. Thus, organizations need to pose questions, such as Question 2, directly to potential coaches. Asking questions such as the two we suggest also allows organizations to determine whether a particular coach's practice tends to focus mostly on behavior change and business goals, or whether the coach tends to focus more on helping individuals with their personal growth and development.

In addition to asking coaches questions about their background and training, organizations—and individual executives looking for a coach—would be well served to clearly communicate their objectives to prospective coaches. Doing so would allow coaches to better determine whether their unique training, capabilities, and typical processes are a good fit for the client, potentially resulting in better matches. Similarly, because our results suggest that a coach's educational background provides only limited information to an organization, coaches must be clear in their conversations (and in their marketing materials) about what they bring to the table, and why their capabilities and processes are appropriate for a particular situation, based on experience and past success with the given audience and need. Coaches can also be clear with organizations about whether their general approach to coaching tends toward intervention versus reflection, and whether the bulk of their coaching is done to develop business competencies or whether they focus more on personal growth. Furthermore, if psychologist coaches feel that their graduate training in human behavior makes them a better coach, it is incumbent on them to explicitly identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities they bring to executive coaching as a result of that training and how those capabilities will make them a better choice for a particular coaching assignment.

²Additional questions and issues related to selecting coaches and designing coaching programs are discussed in Executive Coaching Forum (2004), Peterson (2002), and Valerio and Lee (2006).

Future Research

As systematic empirical examination of executive coaching is in its infancy, there are a number of fruitful avenues for future research. Perhaps the most pressing need is for continuing sound research on the effectiveness of coaching in general (e.g., Peterson, 1993a,b), especially as compared with other methods of training and development, such as group-based skills training, or broad goal-setting interventions. Quasi-experiments in organizations, comparing outcomes of coaching versus other interventions, or looking at the incremental validity of coaching when combined with other interventions, are needed (e.g., Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003). Another critical need, as coaching becomes more and more popular is to understand the differences (in purpose, process, and expected outcomes) between external coaching and supervisory coaching. Over time coaching has shifted from remedial interventions to more positive and proactive needs, such as accelerating high potential development, developing special populations (e.g., minority executives), and special needs (e.g., onboarding or managing remote teams, or managing a specific project); additional research is needed to better understand how coaching varies by the nature of the intervention. We also know little about the processes used in short term, focused coaching, which may also depend more heavily on electronic communication.

In this research, we began the process of identifying coaching competencies by asking coaches themselves what they think the key competencies are. An important area for future research is to determine what knowledge, skills, and abilities coaches must have to address the various types of issues they face (e.g., facilitating insight, motivation, capabilities). Arriving at a concrete set of KSAs (not based solely on coaches' reports) linked to each element and type of executive coaching would help coaches and training programs know what knowledge and skills to develop. Our informal review of graduate training in counseling, clinical, and industrial-organizational psychology, along with International Coaching Federation certified programs, suggests that most training programs have gaps. For example, graduate programs in clinical and counseling psychology focus on human development but typically include no coursework related to either the business environment or employment law. In contrast, industrial-organizational psychology programs have a strong focus on the employee behavior, motivation, attitudes, and performance, as well the legal issues surrounding employment, but they typically do not train students in techniques associated with one-on-one coaching or counseling. Retired executives bring a wealth of business experiences but may not be trained or knowledgeable about assessment and may not know how facilitate sustained behavior change. Coach certification programs are

unique in providing the business and marketing skills needed by coaches, especially those building a new practice, but due to their brevity, cannot provide trainees with strong, foundational knowledge related to human motivation and development.

Another important area in which research is lacking is the coaching process. There is a need for future research to examine the "active ingredients" of coaching. What coach behaviors help someone gain insight? What do coaches actually do to increase motivation? Specifically, how do coaches help someone increase their capabilities and apply those new capabilities in the workplace? How do they hold the person they coach accountable? One way to conduct this type of research would be to conduct a series of interviews with coaches and the people they coach, either after each coaching session or at set time periods during the coaching engagement. The interviewer might ask these questions: Did your coach influence your motivation? If so, what did the coach do? Did your coach do anything to help you build your skills? How did the coach accomplish this? Asking those same questions of the coach (i.e., What did you do to help the person you coach build skills?) would allow for a rich and detailed understanding of what coaches do (and can do) to help the individuals they coach achieve their developmental goals. According to the coaches in our study, the most important competency of a coach is to listen. Effective listening skills may be a prerequisite, but surely there is more to effective coaching than simply listening.

An applied study, such as the one we describe, would allow us to more clearly understand the behaviors that are associated with effective coaching. Such a study would also reveal differences, if they exist, in behaviors that coaches think are effective and those viewed as effective by the individuals they coach. An intensive study of the coaching process would also shed light on the difference processes used in electronic and face-to-face coaching, in ongoing development and coaching focused on a specific task or project, and between coaching as an external intervention and supervisory coaching. One role that psychologist coaches, especially those trained in industrial-organizational psychology, may be well suited for is to train supervisors how to provide ongoing, developmental coaching for their employees. Finally, because little is known about how executive coaching fits into the overall process of developing executives, additional research focused on when and how organizations select coaching as the preferred intervention is needed.

Conclusion

We embarked on this research with the notion of linking coach training and background to coaching practices. One clear implication of our

results is that the long standing debate about who makes the best coach (psychologists or nonpsychologists) may be of limited value. Our results suggest that relying on educational background alone to predict a coach's philosophy, process, or behavior is ill advised because it provides limited information about a coach's practices. Nonetheless, our results do suggest that psychologist coaches (consistent with their training) tend to use multiple methods of assessment and evaluation, which may provide them with a richer picture of a client's needs and more rigorous outcome evaluation. If organizations expect their executive coaches to evaluate and diagnose problems, they may be well served by psychologists who are trained in and more likely to use multiple assessments. It is important to note, however, that our data show that these differences, even when statistically significant, tend to be small.

Overall, results of our study suggest that energy being devoted to the question of whether or not psychologists make better executive coaches should be redirected to these questions: "What are the knowledge, skills, and abilities coaches need to help individuals gain insight and motivation?"; and "What coach behaviors are the best predictors of long-term behavior change in the individuals they coach?" Psychologists may or may not make better executive coaches; but, psychologists (and psychologist coaches) are clearly well trained to answer questions such as these.

REFERENCES

- American Management Association. (2008). *Coaching: A global study of successful practices*. Retrieved March 2, 2009 from <http://www.amanet.org/editorial/webcast/2008/coaching.htm#blank>.
- Berglas S. (2002). The very real dangers of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 87-92.
- Brotman LE, Liberi WP, Wasylshyn KM. (1998). Executive coaching: The need for standards of competence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50, 40-46.
- Brunning H. (2006). The six domains of executive coaching. In Brunning H (Ed.), *Executive coaching: Systems-psychodynamic perspective* (pp. 131-151). London: Karnac Books.
- Corporate therapy. (2003, November 15). *Economist*, 369, 61.
- Dean ML, Meyer AA. (2002). Executive coaching: In search of a model. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 1, 1-15
- Diedrich RC. (1996). An iterative approach to executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 61-66.
- Executive Coaching Forum. (2004). *The executive coaching handbook: Principles and guidelines for a successful coaching partnership* (3rd ed.). Self-published. Available at www.theexecutivecoachingforum.com
- Feldman DC, Lankau MJ. (2005). Executive coaching: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 829-848.
- Filipczak B. (1998). The executive coach: Helper or healer? *Training Magazine*, 35, 30-36.

- Foxhall K. (2002). More psychologists are attracted to the executive coaching field. *Monitor on Psychology*, 33, 50–53.
- Fritsch J, Powers C. (2006). Similarities and differences in organizational coaching programs between the U.S. government and *Fortune* 500 companies. In Bennett JL, Campone F (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Coach Federation Coaching Research Symposium* (pp. 41–54). Lexington, KY: ICF.
- Garman AN, Whiton DL, Zlatoper KW. (2000). Media perceptions of executive coaching and the formal preparation of coaches. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Research and Practice*, 52, 201–205.
- Grant AM. (2001, July). Towards a psychology of coaching. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Oxford School of Coaching and Mentoring Conference, Heythrop Park, Oxford, UK.
- Grant AM. (2006). Workplace and executive coaching: A bibliography from the scholarly business literature. In Stober DR, Grant AM (Eds.), *Evidence based coaching handbook* (pp. 367–387). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hall DT, Otazo KL, Hollenbeck GP. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27, 39–53.
- Hart V, Blattner J, Leipsic S. (2007). Coaching versus therapy: A perspective. In Kilburg RR, Diedrich RC (Eds.), *The wisdom of coaching: Essential papers in consulting psychology for a world of change* (pp. 267–274). Washington, DC: APA.
- International Coaching Federation. (1998). *Analysis of 1998 survey of coaching clients by the International Coach Federation*. Retrieved on July 24, 2007. Available at <http://www.coachfederation.org/ICF/For+Current+Members/Member+Resources/Research/Research+Repository/Client+Survey+Results/>
- International Coaching Federation. (2007a). *ICF coaching study executive summary*. Retrieved on July 24, 2007. Available at <http://www.coachfederation.org/ICF/For+Coaching+Clients/What+is+ICF/Media+Room/>
- International Coaching Federation. (2007b). *ICF membership tops 11,000*. Retrieved on July 24, 2007. Available at <http://www.coachfederation.org/ICF/For+Coaching+Clients/What+is+ICF/Media+Room/>
- International Coaching Federation. (2007c). Frequently asked questions about coaching. Retrieved on July 24, 2007. Available at <http://www.coachfederation.org/ICF/For+Coaching+Clients/What+is+a+Coach/FAQs>
- Johnson LK. (2007). Getting more from executive coaching. *Harvard Management Update*, 12, 3–6.
- Joo BK. (2005). Executive coaching: A conceptual framework from an integrative review of practice and research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4, 462–488.
- Judge WQ, Cowell J. (1997). The brave new world of executive coaching. *Business Horizons*, 40, 71–77.
- Kampa S, White RP. (2002). The effectiveness of executive coaching: What we know and what we still need to know. In Lowman RL (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology* (pp. 139–158). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kampa-Kokesch S, Anderson MZ. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53, 205–228.
- Kiel F, Rimmer E, Williams K, Doyle M. (1996). Coaching at the top. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 67–77.
- Kilburg RR. (1996). Towards a conceptual understanding and definition of executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 134–144.

- Kilburg RR. (2004a). Trudging toward Dodoville: Conceptual approaches and case studies in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 56, 203–213.
- Kilburg RR. (2004b). When shadows fall: Using psychodynamic approaches in executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 56, 246–268.
- Levinson H. (1996). Executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 115–123.
- Lowman RL. (2005). Executive coaching: The road to Dodoville needs paving with more than good assumptions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57, 90–96.
- McCaughey CD, Hezlett SA. (2002). Individual development in the workplace. In Anderson N, Ones D, Sinangil HK, Viswesvaran C (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology, Vol. 1: Personnel psychology* (pp. 313–335). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McGovern J, Lindemann M, Vergara M, Murphy S, Barker L, Warrenfeltz R. (2001). Maximizing the impact of executive coaching: Behavioral change, organizational outcomes, and return on investment. *The Manchester Review*, 6, 1–9.
- Peterson DB. (1993a, April). Measuring change: A psychometric approach to evaluating individual coaching outcomes. Presented at the Eighth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco.
- Peterson DB. (1993b). *Skill learning and behavior change in an individually tailored management coaching and training program*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Peterson DB. (1996). Executive coaching at work: The art of one-on-one change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 78–86.
- Peterson DB. (2002). Management development: Coaching and mentoring programs. In Kraiger K (Ed.), *Creating, implementing, and managing effective training and development* (pp. 160–192). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Peterson DB. (2006). People are complex and the world is messy: A behavior-based approach to executive coaching. In Stober DR, Grant AM (Eds.), *Evidence-based coaching handbook: Putting best practices to work for your clients* (pp. 51–76). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Peterson DB, Hicks MD. (1999, February). The art and practice of executive coaching. Presented at the annual conference of the Society of Consulting Psychology, Phoenix, AZ.
- Peterson DB, Kraiger K. (2004). A practical guide to evaluating coaching: Translating state-of-the-art techniques to the real world. In Edwards JE, Scott JC, Raju NS (Eds.), *The human resources program evaluation handbook* (pp. 262–282). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan AM, Sackett PR. (1987). A survey of individual assessment practices by I-O psychologists. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 40, 454–488.
- Saari LM, Johnson TR, McLaughlin SD, Zimmerle DM. (1988). A survey of management training and education practices in U. S. companies. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 41, 731–743.
- Saporito TJ. (1996). Business-linked executive development: Coaching senior executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 96–103.
- Seifert C, Yukl G, McDonald R. (2003). Effects of multisource feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behavior of managers towards subordinates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 561–569.
- Smither JW, London M, Flautt R, Vargas Y, Kucine I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental study. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 56, 23–44.

- Spychalski AC, Quinones MA, Gaugler BB, Pohley K. (2001). A survey of assessment practices in organizations in the United States. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 50, 71–90.
- Thatch L, Heinselman T. (1999, March). Executive coaching defined. *Training and Development*, 53, 35–39.
- Tobias LL. (1996). Coaching executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 87–95.
- Valerio AM, Lee RJ. (2006). *Executive coaching: A guide for the HR professional*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Wasylyshyn KM. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 55, 94–106.
- Witherspoon R, White RP. (1996). Executive coaching: A continuum of roles. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 124–133.

APPENDIX
TABLE A1
Comparison of Effect Sizes for Descriptive Information for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
<i>Coach demographics</i>	.39	.36	.33	.28	.48	.47	.34	.25
Age	-.11		-.17	-.61	-.69	.49	.09	.60
Education	1.25		.90	-.01	.86	.77	-.67	-.01
Race	.15		.32	.22	.41	.09	-.15	-.06
Sex	.17		-.34	.38	-.43	-.76	.86	.09
Management experience	-.08		-.23	-.03	.13	-.20	-.15	-.35
Years coached	.58		-.04	-.46	-.35	.49	-.09	.35
<i>Practice information</i>	.62	.43	.31	.50	.61	.24	.57	.33
Hourly fees	.27		.17	.15	.32	.08	-.43	-.36
% income from coaching	-.56		-.81	-.93	-.56	.04	-.30	-.23
Liability insurance	.37		.02	-.66	.27	.74	-1.04	-.25
Licensed psychologist	1.28		-.41	-.76	.13	.33	-.91	-.53
Certified coach	-.91		-.44	-.52	-.68	.07	.10	.17
% coaching in US	.43		.12	-.09	.68	.20	-.71	-.49
<i>Participants' job roles</i>	.23	.42	.24	.72	.31	.51	.36	.26
CEO/president	.02		-.33	-1.04	-.50	.75	-.53	.17
VP/director	.11		-.01	-.49	-.08	.57	-.48	.08
Mid-level manager	-.25		.10	-.27	-.13	.53	-.19	.28

TABLE A1 (continued)

Entry-level or supervisor	-.16	.15	.38	.17	-.26	.25	-.02
Entrepreneur	-.63	-.61	-1.12	-.65	.50	-.43	.05
Source of participant referral	.44	.26	.38	.37	.44	.72	.26
Participant contacts coach directly	-.48	-.22	.11	-.65	-.35	.82	.43
Participant referred by manager	.33	.07	-.54	.00	.80	-.65	.07
Participant referred by HR	.39	.31	-.19	.71	.55	-1.06	-.37
Coach contacts participant directly	-.56	-.46	-.59	-.12	.10	-.42	-.29
Average <i>d</i> value	.43	.28	.47	.38	.48	.48	.25

Note. $N = 172$ psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 30$ Clinical, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social psychologist (P/Soc). $\psi =$ psychologist. Values are standardized effect sizes (*d* values). Average *d* values = average of absolute *d* values, indicated in bold. The comparisons are coded so that the top group (e.g., I-O) is compared to the group below (e.g., Coun); in the column comparing I-O versus Coun, for example, a positive value indicates a higher mean for the top group (I-O) and a negative value indicates a higher mean for the bottom group (Coun).

TABLE A2
Comparison of Effect Sizes for Coaching Methods for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
<i>Medium</i>	.17	.17	.19	.08	.27	.14	.17		
Telephone	-.28	-.26	.03	-.09	-.28	.11	-.16		
Face to face	.40	.33	-.24	.05	.50	-.25	.23		
E-mail	.04	-.09	-.40	-.05	.28	-.33	-.04		
Web site/chat	-.18	-.05	-.41	-.33	.27	-.07	.20		
Videoconference	.10	-.15	-.08	-.01	-.07	-.07	-.11		
Traditional mail	.01	.21	-.04	-.02	.22	-.02	.25		
<i>Typical number of sessions</i>	.31	.22	.47	.18	.28	.53	.22		
5 or fewer	.42	.08	.22	-.01	-.16	.25	.09		
6-10	.01	.13	-.21	.43	.37	-.74	-.29		
11-20	-.31	-.29	-.77	.08	.51	-.84	-.34		
21-30	-.49	-.38	-.61	-.20	.19	-.38	-.17		
<i>Scientific/philosophical approach</i>	.17	.19	.21	.25	.21	.23	.29		
Behavior modification	-.31	-.21	.37	.17	-.62	.18	-.37		
Cognitive behavioral	.16	-.03	.08	.43	-.11	-.38	-.45		
Process/facilitation oriented	-.01	-.05	-.34	-.21	.29	-.13	.14		
Goal setting	-.03	-.37	-.33	-.31	-.06	.00	-.05		
Neurolinguistic programming	-.44	.09	.00	.36	.10	-.42	-.34		
Psychoanalytic/dynamic	-.22	.18	-.02	.03	.23	-.05	.18		
Skill training	-.03	-.36	-.26	.18	-.10	-.43	-.51		
<i>Average D value</i>	.20	.19	.26	.17	.25	.27	.23		

Note. $N = 172$ psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 30$ Clinical, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social psychologist (P/Soc). $\psi =$ psychologist. Values are standardized effect sizes (d values). Average d values = average of absolute d values, indicated in bold. The comparisons are coded so that the top group (e.g., I-O) is compared to the group below (e.g., Coun); in the column comparing I-O versus Coun, for example, a positive value indicates a higher mean for the top group (I-O) and a negative value indicates a higher mean for the bottom group (Coun).

TABLE A3
Comparison of Effect Sizes for Tools, Activities, and Topics for Psychologists and Nonpsychologists

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
<i>Assessment tools</i>	.27	.27	.21	.20	.31	.26	.42	.20
Interview with client	.20		-.25	-.26	-.51	-.01	.64	.38
Interview with supervisor	.33		.09	-.29	.40	.40	-.76	-.30
Interview with peers	.35		.05	-.40	.33	.51	-.84	-.28
Interview with family	.10		-.27	-.22	-.06	-.07	-.15	-.19
Ability or aptitude test	.30		.33	.13	.41	.23	-.32	-.10
Interest inventory	-.35		-.19	-.09	-.21	-.10	.11	.01
Personality inventory	-.08		.50	-.09	.21	.58	-.29	.26
Multisource behavior ratings	.54		.31	.08	.32	.25	-.25	.00
Role plays	.05		.06	-.06	-.01	.12	-.04	.07
Access to performance data	.41		.07	-.27	.36	.35	-.72	-.28
<i>Activities</i>	.14	.38	.34	.48	.20	.24	.55	.44
Build rapport	.27		-.29	-.38	.26	.13	-.68	-.60
Increase motivation	-.19		-.39	-.31	.03	-.10	-.32	-.38
Develop insight	.00		-.36	-.08	.05	-.26	-.11	-.47
Teach a new skill	.05		-.38	-.70	.45	.30	-.12	-.75
Assist with skill application	.21		-.16	-.73	.24	.59	-.106	-.34
Hold coaching participant accountable	.05		-.49	-.45	-.25	-.04	-.22	-.27
Set behavior change goals	.22		-.21	-.49	.22	.31	-.80	-.42
<i>Topic addressed in coaching</i>	.23	.26	.45	.23	.21	.18	.27	.23
Interpersonal skills	.17		.06	-.13	.10	.18	-.23	-.03

continued

TABLE A3 (Continued)

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
Stress management	-.44		-.30	-.35	-.36	.05	.01	.07	
Strategic thinking	-.02		-.07	.31	.08	-.43	.26	-.17	
Time management	-.53		-.20	.05	-.28	-.25	.34	.07	
Conflict management	.04		-.15	-.17	-.38	.01	.23	.22	
Staffing	-.02		-.38	-.32	-.52	-.06	.21	.15	
Management style	.28		-.20	-.19	.01	-.02	-.28	-.24	
Leadership	.08		-.36	-.29	-.06	-.09	-.28	-.38	
Communication	-.36		-.29	-.41	-.16	.11	-.26	-.13	
Adaptability/versatility	.23		-.27	-.24	.11	-.04	-.36	-.36	
Motivation	-.42		-.35	.08	-.16	-.49	.27	-.19	
Delegation	.01		-.41	-.25	.29	-.18	-.58	-.67	
Planning	-.23		-.44	-.08	-.07	-.46	.00	-.37	
Sales/financial performance	-.30		-.31	-.29	.10	-.03	-.43	-.41	
Mentoring	-.27		-.46	-.11	-.49	-.37	.40	.03	
<i>Average d value</i>	.22	.28	.27	.27	.24	.22	.39	.27	

Note. $N = 172$ psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 30$ Clinical, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social psychologist (P/Soc). $\psi =$ psychologist. Values are standardized effect sizes (d values). Average d values = average of absolute d values, indicated in bold. The comparisons are coded so that the top group (e.g., I-O) is compared to the group below (e.g., Coun); in the column comparing I-O versus Coun, for example, a positive value indicates a higher mean for the top group (I-O) and a negative value indicates a higher mean for the bottom group (Coun).

TABLE A4
Comparison of Effect Sizes for Coaching Outcomes

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
<i>Client reports</i>	.33	.31	.35	.45	.54	.07	.19	.23
Satisfaction with process	-.35		-.26	-.32	-.45	.05	.18	.21
Satisfaction with outcomes	-.21		-.20	-.20	-.48	-.01	.45	.36
Attainment of coaching goals	-.12		-.33	-.46	-.54	.11	.13	.19
Increased confidence	-.53		-.52	-.61	-.64	.09	.03	.11
Increased self-understanding	-.50		-.42	-.52	-.39	.11	-.14	-.02
<i>Boss reports</i>	.08	.34	.13	.56	.11	.39	.66	.19
Satisfaction with process	.02		-.22	-.74	-.08	.57	-.75	-.14
Satisfaction with outcomes	.13		-.06	-.46	.10	.45	-.74	-.16
Attainment of written goals	.09		-.07	-.39	.08	.36	-.63	-.15
Attainment of implicit goals	.02		-.10	-.43	.16	.35	-.72	-.26
Behavior change	.16		-.11	-.46	.15	.40	-.87	-.28
Learning or skill development	.02		-.20	-.46	-.07	.26	-.46	-.13
<i>Others reports (peer, HR)</i>	.20	.30	.21	.52	.08	.17	.53	.31
Behavior change	.21		-.10	-.37	.10	.28	-.55	-.20
Learning or skill development	.18		-.33	-.40	.05	.05	-.50	-.40
<i>Objective reports</i>	.07	.20	.18	.23	.16	.19	.19	.23
Business outcomes (\$, sales)	-.09		-.10	-.09	-.19	-.02	.11	.09
Promotion	.00		.02	-.43	-.08	.46	-.35	.10

continued

TABLE A4 (Continued)

Variable	ψ vs. non	Avg. ψ vs ψ	I-O vs. Coun	I-O vs. Clin	I-O vs. P/Soc	Clin vs. Coun	P/Soc vs. Clin	P/Soc vs. Coun
Reduced complaints	.05		-.15	.15	-.20	-.32	.40	.04
ROI based on utility analysis	-.03		-.36	-.25	-.13	-.09	-.12	-.23
Employee attitude change (survey)	.16		-.27	-.21	-.20	-.08	.00	-.08
<i>Coaches assessment of</i>	.18	.15	.11	.19	.18	.16	.07	.17
Efficacy of coaching process	-.18		-.06	-.15	-.13	.08	-.02	.06
Efficacy of coaching outcomes	-.12		-.02	-.21	-.22	.18	.02	.19
Attainment of written goals	-.09		-.13	-.20	-.11	.07	-.09	-.02
Attainment of implicit goals	-.14		.24	-.12	-.27	.33	.15	.45
Increased self-understanding	-.35		-.10	-.25	-.19	.15	-.06	.09
<i>Average d value</i>	.16	.23	.19	.27	.23	.21	.31	.18

Note. $N = 172$ psychologists and 256 nonpsychologists; $N = 39$ Counseling, $N = 83$ Industrial-organizational (I-O), and $N = 20$ Personality and social psychologist (P/Soc). $\psi =$ psychologist. Values are standardized effect sizes (d values). Average d values = average of absolute d values, indicated in bold. The comparisons are coded so that the top group (e.g., I-O) is compared to the group below (e.g., Coun); in the column comparing I-O versus Coun, for example, a positive value indicates a higher mean for the top group (I-O) and a negative value indicates a higher mean for the bottom group (Coun).