Development of Coaches: VII. Are There Any Differences between Personal and Organizational Coaches?

William Bergquist, Ph.D.

This report is the seventh in a series that convey and interpret results from two versions of a questionnaire that was initially prepared by the Development of Coaches Research Collaborative in cooperation with the Collaborative Research Network of the Society for Psychotherapy Research. [Note: for those readers who are familiar with the first six reports, I recommend that you move immediately to the "focus of study" and results sections of this seventh report, given that the initial sections of this report provide background material regarding the two surveys that was already covered in the first reports.]

Critique and Comment

Before moving directly into this seventh report, I wish to honor, as I did in the fifth and sixth article, a criticism regarding this series of Development of Coaches reports, offered by my colleague, Rey Carr. He made this comment after reviewing the fourth report (on gender):

> When it comes to surveys, particularly those conducted via the Internet, it makes little difference if the survey was completed "by a widely ranging group of coaches," or by organizations with "no stake in the outcomes," or distributed by "practitioners." What counts is the reliability and validity of the survey.

> The results of the survey are great for talking points or a place to start a dialogue about the issues raised, but they cannot and should not be understood as representative of coaches. These surveys are typically suspect when it comes to generalizing the results to the coaching industry or population. It doesn't mean you can draw conclusions, but the data should always be accompanied by a set of "limitations" or "cautions" in using the data.

I continue to agree with Rey regarding the credibility of Internet surveys. It is much better to gather opinions, perspectives and concerns from respondents through in-depth personal

interviews, observation of performance (rather than just rhetoric), and phenomenological single-person case studies. If the field and culture of professional coaching is to become "evidence-rich" and research-based, as Francine Campone and Deepa Awal noted in the first report based on this Development of Coaching project, then we need much more than Internet-based survey results. However, as Rey Carr himself has noted, the results from the current surveys can be of value as "talking points" and places to start the dialogue. By offering these provocative findings, we are providing an incentive for what in one of our previous reports we called creating a *culture of collaboration*. These survey results might even provide sufficient irritation to motivate someone or some organization with sufficient resources to conduct higher quality research. Results from the present analysis might prove to be particularly challenging (or at least intriguing)--provoking more refined research. I would fully welcome such an initiative.

Background

Completed in 2009 by 153 coaches from throughout the world, the first survey was followed by a second version that was distributed in 2015 (with only minor editing changes) by the Library of Professional Coaching in cooperation with ITLCInsights. Fifty-eight coaches provided responses to the second questionnaire -- yielding a total of 211 responses to the two surveys. The time interval between the two surveys was six years, enabling us to get a preliminary sense of possible changes in coaching attitudes over this period of time, as well as a sense of stability (low levels of difference in mean scores and variance) in the attitudes of professional coaches regarding their own development.

Unlike most coaching surveys, the two surveys conducted in 2009 and 2015 were directed toward those actually doing the coaching, rather than the users of coaching services. These surveys were completed by a widely ranging group of coaches – in terms of geography, schools of coaching, age and years of experience in providing coaching services. These two surveys are also distinctive in that they have been being conducted by organizations (the Library of Professional Coaching and ITLCInsights) that have no specific stake in the outcomes, and are being distributed to practitioners at many levels of practice and status. These surveys are truly '"neutral" and "democratizing"—though, as Rey Carr has noted, the

results obtained via Survey Monkey must be considered quite tentative and suggestive rather than definitive.

Methods

Both versions of the Development of Coaches questionnaire are based on one devised by the Collaborative Research Network of the Society for Psychotherapy Research in their international study of development among professional psychotherapists described by Orlinsky and Rønnestad in *How Psychotherapists Develop (*Orlinsky & Rønnestad, 005). Both of the coaching studies include questions that parallel those used in the Society's Development of Psychotherapists Common Core Questionnaire. This enables us not only to study varied aspects of coaches' development, but also compare responses of coaches to these made by psychotherapists. Many questions have been posed over the past twenty years concerning the similarities and differences between professional coaching and psychotherapy. The data being gathered in these two surveys will provide some of the first answers regarding this comparison.

Modification of Development of Psychotherapists Survey

In adapting the questionnaire, members of the Development of Coaches Research Collaborative drew on their own experiences as coaches to ask questions that they hoped would seem meaningful and relevant to those responding to the questionnaire. The majority of questions could be answered quickly by checking alternatives that most closely reflected the respondent's own experience.

Instructions to the Respondents

In the case of both surveys, respondents were asked to answer all of the questions and were provided with the following framework:

> The complete set of responses provides us with a fuller understanding of your own work and the context in which you work. You may find these questions offer a useful opportunity to reflect on your own coaching career. If any seem difficult to answer exactly, give your best estimate and continue. To ensure confidentiality, the

questionnaire is completed anonymously. Information you provide will be used only for research purposes.

Designers of the original survey proposed that the respondents would benefit in two ways. These two benefits made this truly a collaborative effort between those who designed the questionnaire and those who completing it. Following is a statement offered to those considering completion of the second survey:

> You can sign up to receive the report findings from this study when they become available… These reports will also be made available at no charge to the general coaching public through the Library of Professional Coaching. The reports will identify which modes of development have been found to be the most effective. . . . [Furthermore, results from this survey may] increase the credibility of the coaching profession. As Francine Campone, one of the creators and initiators of the original survey has indicated, a culture of research and evidence needs to be created in the field of professional coaching. The more we learn from one another about professional coaching practices, the more collectively knowledgeable we will become. The more knowledgeable we become, the greater the opportunity for building evidence-based coaching strategies and tools. The better the strategies and tools the more effective we will be as coaching professionals. The more effective we become as a profession, the greater the demand will be for our services.

Focus of the Present Study

This seventh report concerns potential differences in responses to the Development of Coaches survey based on the type of work being done by professional coaches. In two of our previous studies, we focused on typical distinguishing features among human beings (and coaches): the gender and age of respondents. In the sixth study, we examined ways in which coaches who have been certified by the International Coaching Federation (ICF) might differ in their perspectives on development from those who are not certified. In this seventh study, we focus on the setting and type of relationship that exists between the coach and client: is the work being done with an individual client focusing on personal and life issues or is the work being done in an organizational setting focusing on executive performance and related organizational

issues. Specifically, we divided our sample into two groups: (1) those who report that they are engaged primarily in coaching of issues related to personal and life challenges, and (2) those who report that they are engaged primarily in coaching of organization-based issues. We assigned respondents to one of these two categories based on their estimate of percentage of time spent doing personal and organizational coaching. Those who indicate that they are involved primarily in the training of coaches or conducting other types of organizationally-related human service activities were all assigned to the organization-based coaching group. Admittedly these categories are rough-hewed and are meant only to open the dialogue concerning specific differences among those who engage in a variety of coaching practices.

It should be noted that the organization-oriented group is larger than the personal coach-oriented group: 85 personal coaching and 114 organizational coaching. This discrepancy is partially attributable to the fact that the catchment area for organizational coaching was quite a bit larger than that for personal coaching, with those primarily involved in the training of coaches being included with those doing organizational coaching. In future analyses, we will offer a more finely differentiated analysis. And we need to assert the important caveat that many coaches who completed the survey do both personal and organizational coaching: we assigned respondents to our two categories based on percentages—not exclusive engagements-- in one of the two areas of coaching.

Results

Having found results from the two surveys to be closely aligned in our initial analyses, we combined the responses to both surveys (having also done so in the analyses we offered in the three previous reports). Furthermore, as we did in the fourth, fifth and sixth analyses, we went beyond the calculation of means and variances for the two different groups. We conducted simple T-Tests to determine if differences between responses to any of the survey questions by the personal and organizational coaches were significant. We present the mean, variance and T-Test Scores in the next section of this report for each of the seven questions on which we focused in the first six studies, In addition, because some significant (or near significant) differences were found, we present not only the t-test score for each question, but also the degrees of freedom and, when significant, the critical value (cv) associated with the .10, .05, .01 or .001 level of significance.

Question: Since you began formally working as a coach . . .

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
How much have you changed overall as a coach?	Mean=4.05 Variance=0.85	Mean=4.13 Variance =0.84	t = -0.66 df = 200	>.05
How much do you regard this as progress or improvement?	Mean=4.37 Variance=0.96	Mean=4.50 Variance =0.67	t = -1.01 df = 192	>.05
How much do you regard this as a decline or impairment?	Mean=0.20 Variance=0.46	Mean=0.07 Variance =0.07	t = 1.94 df = 200	Near Significant <.10 cv=1.29
How much have you succeeded in overcoming any past limitations in your coaching skills and knowledge?	Mean=3.85 Variance=1.06	Mean=4.06 Variance =0.80	t = -1.55 df = 199	Near Significant <.10 cv=1.29
How much have you realized your potential as a coach?	Mean=3.67 Variance=1.58	Mean=3.91 Variance =1.13	t = -.1.48 df =200	Near Significant <.10 Cv=1.29

Results from these two surveys suggest that those who are most often oriented toward personal coaching are slightly more likely to identify change in their coaching practices (from when they began working as a coach) as a decline, while organizational-oriented coaches are slightly more like to identify this change as an improvement in performance. With regard to both personal and organizational coaches, it should be noted that there is a substantial difference between the improvement and decline scores. Both see improvement from the time when they formally began working as a coach to be much greater than decline—it is only that decline is slightly more commonly found among those oriented toward personal coaching. Do the personal coaches have higher standards for themselves than the organizational coaches, or perhaps higher expectations regarding their performance? We will have to wait until other differences are revealed to offer any preliminary suggestions regarding the nature or etiology of these minor differences.

Other responses to this initial question yield results that continue to be suggestive of a difference between personally-oriented and organizationally-oriented coaches. The organizational coaches indicate that they are slightly more likely than personal coaches to have overcome past limitations in their coaching skills and knowledge, and are more likely to have realized their potential as a coach. Once again, these individual items do not yield statistically significant differences (especially given the large number of statistical analyses being performed) – but they do suggest a pattern.

Those coaches who do much of their work in organizations (or provide coach training) seem to be slightly more positive about their work (over time) as a coach and their improvement (over time) as a coach than are those doing much of their work as personal coaches. Is it because the organizational coaches are more experienced than the personal coaches? Or are those oriented toward work in organizations more likely to over-estimate their abilities (or the personal coaches to underestimate their abilities)? We will keep these possible conditions in mind while moving forward with our analysis of results from the remaining questions.

Question: Overall at the PRESENT time . . .

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
How effective are you at co-creating the working partnership with clients?	Mean=4.35 Variance=0.53	Mean=4.44 Variance=0.46	t = -0.87 df =200	>.05
How authentically personal do you feel while working with clients?	Mean=4.57 Variance=0.43	Mean=4.57 Variance=0.41	t = -0.02 df =200	>.05
How good is your general theoretical understanding of coaching?	Mean=4.32 Variance=0.57	Mean=4.40 Variance=0.46	t = -0.81 df =199	>.05
How empathetic are you in relating to clients with whom you have relativity little in common?	Mean=4.43 Variance=0.60	Mean=4.42 Variance=0.51	t = 0.04 df =199	>.05
How effective are you in communicating your understanding and concern to your clients?	Mean=4.38 Variance=0.49	Mean=4.49 Variance=0.45	t = -1.15 df =199	>.05

How much mastery do you feel you have of the techniques and strategies involved in practicing coaching?	Mean=4.38 Variance=0.49	Mean=4.12 Variance=0.59	t = 2.44 df =199	Significant <.05 cv=1.98
How well do you understand what happens moment by moment during coaching sessions?	Mean=4.07 Variance=0.98	Mean=4.20 Variance=0.85	t = -0.99 df =200	>.05
How effective are you at stimulating client insight?	Mean=4.22 Variance=0.70	Mean=4.44 Variance=0.55	t = -2.00 df =200	Significant <.05 cv=1.98
How much precision, subtlety and finesse have you attained in your coaching work?	Mean=4.01 Variance=0.96	Mean=4.19 Variance=0.77	t = -1.33 df =194	Near Significant <.10 cv= 1.29
How confident do you feel in your role as a coach?	Mean=4.22 Variance=0.76	Mean=4.35 Variance=0.67	t = -0.96 df =198	>.05

When appraising themselves as coaches, those who are oriented toward personal coaching are significantly more likely than organizationally-oriented coaches to see themselves as having mastered the techniques and strategies involved in the practice of coaching, whereas organizationally-oriented coaches are significantly more likely than personally-oriented coaches to indicate that they are effective in stimulating client insight and (at a marginally significant level) to provide precision, subtlety and finesse in their work.

At one level, these two sets of results seem to be contradictory: personal coaches have mastered the techniques and strategies of coaching, while organizational coaches perceived themselves as inducting more insights in their clients and operating with more "subtle" expertise as a coach. This seeming contradiction might have to do with differences we noted in one of our previous studies between "fast thinking" and "slow thinking" (Kahneman, 2011). The personal coaches might be "better trained" in the use of specific coaching techniques and strategies that can be readily applied ("fast thinking") in their work with clients. Conversely, organizational coaches might be "more experienced" as coaches and/or might have to work with a much greater diversity of clients and address much more complex client problems, hence have to be more nuanced ("slow thinking") in their work. We will look for more evidence of these potential causative factors in the responses of personal and organizational coaches to the remaining set of questions.

Question: Currently, how often do you feel . . .

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
Lacking confidence that you can provide a beneficial effect for a client.	Mean=1.45 Variance=0.64	Mean=1.41 Variance =0.49	t = 0.40 df =200	>.05
Unsure how best to deal effectively with a client.	Mean=1.44 Variance=0.78	Mean=1.40 Variance =0.42	t = 0.42 df =200	>.05
In danger of losing control of a coaching conversation to a client.	Mean=1.40 Variance=0.42	Mean=0.88 Variance =0.55	t = 5.70 df =20o	Highly Significant .001 cv=3.34

Unable to have much real empathy for a client's experiences.	Mean=0.57 Variance=0.34	Mean=0.65 Variance =0.37	t = -0.95 df =200	>.05
Uneasy that your personal values make it difficult to maintain an appropriate attitude toward a client.	Mean=0.55 Variance=0.34	Mean=0.68 Variance =0.38	t = -1.62 df =200	Near Significant < .10 cv=1.29
Distressed by your inability to impact a client's life or work situation.	Mean=0.98 Variance=0.62	Mean=1.00 Variance =0.55	t = -0.21 df = 200	>.05
Troubled by ethical issues that have arisen in your work with a client.	Mean=0.50 Variance=0.37	Mean=0.66 Variance =0.44	t = -1.74 df =200	Near Significant < .10 cv=1.29
Irritated by a client who seems to be actively blocking your efforts.	Mean=0.88 Variance=0.64	Mean=0.94 Variance =0.52	t = -0.59 df =200	>.05
Unable to comprehend the essence of a client's problem.	Mean=0.74 Variance=0.40	Mean=0.79 Variance =0.45	t = -0.55 df =200	>.05
Unable to find something to like or respect in a client.	Mean=0.32 Variance=0.29	Mean=0.35 Variance =0.30	t = -0.42 df =200	>.05
Conflicted about how to reconcile obligations to a client and equivalent obligation to others	Mean=0.64 Variance=0.58	Mean=0.78 Variance =0.65	t = -1.29 df =200	>.05

Bogged down with a client in a relationship that seems to be going nowhere.	Mean=0.90 Variance=0.55	Mean=0.92 Variance =0.50	t = -0.23 df =200	>.05
Frustrated with a client for wasting your time	Mean=0.67 Variance=0.59	Mean=0.73 Variance =0.54	t = -0.54 df =200	>.05

The statistical analysis of differences between personal and organizational coaches on this specific question yielded the most significant results yet obtained in our seven studies. At the .001 level of significant (a t-score of 5.70) the personal coaches are more likely than organizational coaches to perceive a danger of losing control of a coaching conversation with their client. While neither the personal nor organizational coaches admit to frequent occurrence of this fear, the level of concern among personal coaches is quite a bit higher than it is among organizational coaches.

These results are even more striking, given the lack of difference between personal and organizational coaches on many of the other items associated with this question about current feelings regarding coaching. Is it possible that control is related to the finesse perceived by organizational coaches regarding their work with clients? In relying on coaching techniques and strategies that they have learned to apply quickly and effectively ("fast thinking"), are personal coaches more vulnerable to perceived loss of control brought about by unanticipated responses from their clients? Perhaps, instead, it is just the organizational coaches being less candid about their fears and concerns.

There are two other items that yield less dramatic findings, but are still of value in fostering a dialogue about personal and organizational coaching. These two items concern the role to be played by the coach's personal values and ethics, when working with clients. The organizational coaches are slightly more likely to be unease or troubled about these matters when working with their clients than are personal coaches. Is this because values and ethics issues are more prevalent or challenging in an organizational setting than they are in a personal setting? Or do these concerns on the part of organizational coaches relate to their use of subtle (and perhaps sometime elusive) practices, rather than the "tried and true" techniques and

strategies that might be more frequently (and effectively) used by personal coaches? Is part of the "Mastery" that personal coaches report more frequently than do organizational coaching related in some way to their clearer sense of personal values and ethical practices as related to their coaching work? Does the mastery of coaching techniques and strategies provide more structure for the personal coaches, allowing them to feel more comfortable than organizational coaches in negotiating the relationship between their work with clients and their own personal values and ethics? These are important questions that should be addressed in future coaching dialogues.

Question: When in difficulty, how often do you . . .

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
Try to see the problem from a different perspective	Mean=3.95 Variance=0.78	Mean=4.07 Variance =0.70	t = -0.95 df =200	>.05
Share your experience of the difficulty with a client	Mean=2.68 Variance=1.67	Mean=2.81 Variance =1.73	t =- 0.68 df =200	>.05
Discuss the problem with a more experienced colleague	Mean=2.95 Variance=1.81	Mean=3.05 Variance =1.82	t = -0.51 df =200	>.05
Consult relevant articles or books	Mean=2.81 Variance=1.79	Mean=2.75 Variance =1.89	t = 0.32 df =200	>.05
Involve another professional or organization in the case	Mean=1.64 Variance=1.77	Mean=1.70 Variance =1.75	t = -0.35 df =200	>.05
Make changes in your coaching contract with a client	Mean=1.73 Variance=1.90	Mean=1.73 Variance =1.70	t = 0.00 df =200	>.05

Simply hope that things will improve eventually	Mean=0.64 Variance=0.65	Mean=0.68 Variance =0.61	t = -0.35 df =200	>.05
Seriously consider terminating coaching	Mean=1.27 Variance=1.05	Mean=1.28 Variance =0.75	t = -0.06 df =200	>.05
Review privately with yourself how the problem has arisen	Mean=3.51 Variance=1.26	Mean=3.71 Variance =1.34	t = -1.23 df =200	>.05
Just give yourself permission to experience difficult or disturbing feelings	Mean=3.22 Variance=1.44	Mean=3.26 Variance =1.38	t = -0.28 df =200	>.05
See whether you and your client can deal together with the difficulty	Mean=3.53 Variance=1.33	Mean=3.48 Variance =1.73	t = 0.32 df =199	>.05
Sign up for a conference or workshop that might bear on the problem	Mean=1.55 Variance=1.93	Mean=1.38 Variance =1.65	t = 0.87 df =199	>.05
Modify your stance or approach with a client	Mean=3.35 Variance=1.33	Mean=3.35 Variance =1.25	t = -0.01 df =199	>.05
Avoid dealing with the problem for the present	Mean=0.92 Variance=0.81	Mean=0.89 Variance =0.78	t = 0.28 df =199	>.05
Show your frustration to the client	Mean=0.72 Variance=0.76	Mean=0.78 Variance =0.92	t = -0.48 df =199	>.05
Explore the possibility of referring the client to another coach	Mean=1.59 Variance=1.21	Mean=1.69 Variance =1.14	t = -0.65 df =199	>.05
Refer the client to some other non-coaching professional	Mean=1.73 Variance=1.47	Mean=1.67 Variance =1.35	t = 0.33 df =199	>.05

There doesn't seem to be much difference between personal coaches and organizational coaches in their responses to difficult coaching situations. They seem to handle these difficulties in a similar manner. Our analysis of ICG certified and non-ICF certified coaches similarly yielded very few differences (only a difference regarding the greater tendency for ICF certified coaches to terminate the coaching engagement). We will have to look elsewhere for potential differences in the way difficult situations are handled—or perhaps there are deeply-ingrained tendencies for all coaches (or maybe most people in contemporary societies) to face difficulties in a similar manner.

Question: In your RECENT coaching how often . . .

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
Do you feel you are changing as a coach?	Mean=3.53 Variance=1.31	Mean=3.62 Variance =1.41	t = -0.54 df =200	 >.05
Does this change feel like progress or improvement?	Mean=4.00 Variance=1.26	Mean=4.11 Variance =1.09	t = 0.74 df =199	 >.05
Does this change feel like decline or impairment?	Mean=0.15 Variance=0.18	Mean=0.11 Variance =0.11	t = 0.83 df =199	 >.05

Do you feel you are overcoming past limitations as a coach?	Mean=3.44 Variance=1.83	Mean=3.45 Variance =1.77	t = -0.06 df =199	>.05
Do you feel you are becoming more skillful in practicing coaching?	Mean=3.93 Variance=1.04	Mean=4.13 Variance =0.93	t = -1.42 df =199	Near Significant <.10 cv=1.29
Do you feel you are deepening your understanding of coaching?	Mean=4.05 Variance=1.09	Mean=4.12 Variance =0.99	t = -0.53 df =199	>.05
Do you feel a growing sense of enthusiasm about doing coaching?	Mean=3.90 Variance=1.37	Mean=4.11 Variance =1.11	t = -1.33 df =197	Near Significant <.10 cv=1.29
Do you feel you are becoming disillusioned about coaching?	Mean=0.37 Variance=0.70	Mean=0.29 Variance =0.67	t = 0.67 df =199	>.05
Do you feel you are losing your capacity to respond empathetically?	Mean=0.15 Variance=0.27	Mean=0.10 Variance =0.26	t = 0.72 df =199	>.05
Do you feel your performance is becoming mainly routine?	Mean=0.40 Variance=0.34	Mean=0.38 Variance =0.64	t = 0.25 df =199	>.05
How capable do you feel to guide the development of other coaches?	Mean=3.59 Variance=2.01	Mean=3.67 Variance =1.87	t = -0.41 df =199	>.05
How important to you is your further development as a coach?	Mean=4.68 Variance=0.59	Mean=4.67 Variance =0.67	t = 0.10 df =199	>.05

Results from the items associated with this question about recent coaching experiences are interesting in that a comparable question (which we analyzed above) concerning the long-term perceptions of coaches ("Since you began formally coaching") yielded some interesting differences. By contrast, there were virtually no differences of any significance in the responses to items about recent experiences. The organizational coaches were a bit more positive than were the personal coaches, but the differences (if any) were minor. Organizational coaches perceive themselves to be a bit more skillful in practicing coaching than do the personal coaches who responded to this survey, and feel more like they have a growing sense of enthusiasm about engaging in the coaching enterprise than do their personal coaching colleagues.

As we move to our report on the final two questions, we wish to note that the respondent scale changes from a 1-5 rating to a scale that ranging from plus 3 to minus 3. Hence, the mean scores will usually be lower than is the case with the previous questions.

Question: How much influence has each of the following had on your OVERALL development as a coach?

	Personal Coaching	Organizational Coaching	T-Test	P Level
Experiences in coaching clients	Mean=2.73 Variance=0.29	Mean=2.81 Variance =0.17	t = -1.07 df =197	 >.05
Taking coaching specific courses, seminars or workshops (including online courses)	Mean=2.43 Variance=0.55	Mean=2.25 Variance =0.70	t = 1.55 df =195	Near Significant <.10 cv=1.29

Collaborating with other coaches	Mean=1.92 Variance=1.02	Mean=1.91 Variance =0.87	t = 0.01 df =198	>.05
Getting formal supervision, mentoring or consultation	Mean=1.81 Variance=1.15	Mean=1.92 Variance =1.15	t = -0.75 df =200	>.05
Having informal case discussion with colleagues	Mean=1.67 Variance=1.00	Mean=1.77 Variance =1.04	t = -0.66 df =197	>.05
Reading books or journals relevant to your coaching practice	Mean=1.95 Variance=0.75	Mean=1.98 Variance =0.69	t = -0.23 df =195	>.05
Observing coaches in workshops, films or on tapes	Mean=1.40 Variance=1.08	Mean=1.44 Variance =1.20	t = -0.24 df =199	>.05
Getting personal coaching	Mean=2.10 Variance=1.06	Mean=2.04 Variance =1.03	t = 0.48 df =198	>.05
Giving formal supervision, mentor coaching, or consultation to other coaches	Mean=1.73 Variance=1.52	Mean=1.83 Variance =1.31	t = -0.63 df =196	>.05
Teaching coaching courses or seminars (face to face or online)	Mean=1.69 Variance=1.89	Mean=1.71 Variance =1.72	t = -0.10 df =196	>.05
Doing coaching related research	Mean=1.17 Variance=1.47	Mean=1.20 Variance =1.44	t = -0.14 df =197	>.05

			t = 0.18	
The institutional conditions in which you practice	Mean=1.23 Variance=1.14	Mean=1.10 Variance =1.15	t = 0.18 df =192	>.05
Experiences in your personal life	Mean=2.10 Variance=0.84	Mean=2.06 Variance =0.81	t = 0.32 df =198	>.05

Unlike the analysis of differences regarding influence (overall) for ICF certified and non-certified coaches, there are virtually no differences of significance between respondents who work primarily as personal coaches and those who work primarily as coaches in an organizational setting. There is a near significant difference in the item concerning coaching course, seminars and workshops, with personal-oriented coaches being often influenced by these activities than organization-oriented coaches; however, nothing else emerges as a differing impact on coaching practices between personal and organizational coaches. It will be interesting to see if a subgroup of the organizational coaching group (those who provide training) are less influenced by training they have received as learners than are the coaches that they themselves train. This will have to await future analyses.

Question: How much influence does each of the following have on your CURRENT development as a coach?

	Personal Coaching	**Organizational Coaching**	**T-Test**	**P Level**
Experiences in coaching with clients	Mean=2.58 Variance=0.44	Mean=2.54 Variance =0.69	t = 0.39 df =193	>.05

Taking courses, seminars or workshops (including online courses)	Mean=2.01 Variance=0.94	Mean=2.05 Variance =0.88	t = -0.31 df =193	>.05
Getting formal supervision or consultation	Mean=1.66 Variance=1.66	Mean=1.68 Variance =1.71	t = -0.12 df =193	>.05
Having informal case discussion with colleagues	Mean=1.73 Variance=0.95	Mean=1.70 Variance =0.96	t = 1.62 df =193	Near Significance <.10 cv=1.29
Reading books or journals relevant to your coaching practice	Mean=1.84 Variance=0.96	Mean=1.88 Variance =0.98	t = -0.32 df =195	>.05
Getting life coaching for yourself	Mean=1.65 Variance=1.49	Mean=1.51 Variance =1.44	t = 0.79 df =193	>.05
Getting coaching on your coaching work	Mean=1.48 Variance=1.81	Mean=1.46 Variance =1.63	t = 0.06 df =190	>.05
Coaching other coaches on professional or life issues	Mean=1.56 Variance=2.08	Mean=1.68 Variance =1.65	t = -0.61 df =191	>.05
Giving supervision or consultation to other coaches	Mean=1.41 Variance=2.17	Mean=1.53 Variance =1.86	t = -0.57 df =189	>.05
Teaching coaching courses or seminars (face to face or online)	Mean=1.45 Variance=2.30	Mean=1.60 Variance =2.19	t = -0.69 df =190	>.05
The workplace conditions in which you practice	Mean=0.83 Variance=2.82	Mean=0.81 Variance =2.70	t = 0.12 df =190	>.05

Experiences in your personal life outside coaching	Mean=1.73	Mean=1.67	t = 0.36	
	Variance=1.64	Variance =1.72	df =189	>.05

This final set of items is directly aligned with those of the previous question—except in this instance the items focus on the current (rather than overall) development of the coaches. Once again, very few differences were found between personal and organizational coaches. There was only a marginally significant difference to be found with regard to current influence: personal coaches are more likely to be influenced by case discussions with their colleagues than are organizational coaches. Given the isolation to be found among coaches (as we noted in an earlier report based on these two surveys), it might be important to identify and support those areas where dialogue does occur and where the walls of the professional silo can be breached— at least for those doing personal coaching.

Discussion

There are not as many significant differences among survey respondents as a function of the type of coaching in which they are engaged as was the case among respondents as a function of whether or not they completed ICF certification. Nevertheless, there were some intriguing—in one case perhaps even startling—differences found in our analyses. We seem to have discovered another source of variance in the responses of coaches to some of the items in the two surveys—though we should be reminded of Rey Carr's cautionary note regarding Survey Monkey results. Furthermore, we need to be reminded that when many statistical calculations are being performed, the use of .05 and .01 confidence levels become suspect. Put simply, if one hundred calculations are performed, then five of them will be significant by chance. Technically, the levels of confidence should be adjusted and the "bar" of significance raised when multiple t-test (or analyses of variance) are performed.

Given these cautions, it is important to note that some of the differences to be found among respondents who are personal-based or organization-based are quite striking (as is the case with ICF and non-ICF certified respondents). The differences to be found in these two analyses do not resemble in any way the minimal or nonexistent differences to be found as a function of age or gender. Furthermore, as in our analysis of ICF certification, there are some specific

differences that reached significance: our respondents seemed to be discerning in their rating of specific items. There is not some generalized "social desirability" or "acquiescence" biases that impact one of our two groups. With finer differentiations in future studies, even greater differences are likely to be found. With these caveats and considerations in mind, we can turn specifically to the significant differences we did discover and speculate on what these differences might mean.

Overall and Current Assessment of Coaching Performance

When respondents reflected back on their coaching ("since you began") we find that coaches who most often provide personal coaching are slightly more likely that those providing coaching in an organizational setting to identify change in their coaching practices as a decline—though the ratings for virtually all respondents are quite low when assessing potential decline. No one apparently sees much evidence of decline in their own practices, though personal-based coaches are a bit more inclined to admit to some decline. On the other side of the ledger, we find that organization-based coaches are slightly more likely to identify change in their coaching practices ("since you began") as an improvement, and are slightly more likely to indicate that they have overcome limits and realized their potential. While these differences between the two coaching groups are not great, they represent a pattern of responses that suggest there might be some important differences among those doing personal coaching and those doing organizational coaching. Are these real differences, or are the personal coaches simply being a bit more candid in their responses?

In general, the differences between personal and organizational coaches disappear when we turn to their responses to similar items related to the coaches' current practices. While organizational coaches remain a bit more positive, the differences are minimal. On several items, however, there are significant differences between personal and organizational coaching with regard to their current practices. First, the mean score for personal coaches is significantly higher than it is for organizational coaches with regard to mastery (at the present time) of coaching techniques and strategies. There is a second significance difference regarding current practices that heads in the opposite direction. Organizational coaches are more likely than personal coaches to indicate that they are effective at stimulating client insights. This difference is significant at the .05 level. At a more marginal (.10) level, organizational coaches are more

likely than personal coaches to indicate that they have attained precision, subtlety and finesse in their work with clients.

How do we make sense of these seemingly contradictory (or at least confusing) results? We might speculate that any differences that exist when our respondents are beginning their work as coaches relate at least in part to the amount of experience when enter coaching. Those doing personal coaching might be newer to the field or have less prior experience in related human service fields. Many organizational coaches, for instance, have already done organizational consulting work or have conducted leadership development workshops. Once the two groups reflect on their current experiences (rather than their overall experiences), the differences disappear. The personal coaches might have "caught up" with the organizational coaches in terms of the amount of experience they have had and their own personal judgement about their competency. Perhaps, personal coaches face fewer challenges in mastering coaching techniques and strategies than organizational coaches—there certainly are many more settings in which organizational coaching can take place than is the case with personal coaching. Organizational coaches might also require (and therefore have mastered) greater precision, subtlety and finesse in their work because they face more diverse settings in which their coaching takes place.

I recognize that these speculations might be missing the mark. We might find that many personal coaches also come to their coaching work with significant experience in an affiliated area (such as counselling or psychotherapy). The challenges faced by personal coaches and their clients might be just as complex as the challenges faced by coaches and clients in an organizational setting. And are some of the differences (as I have often noted) just a matter of candor or self-insight? It is important that we explore these issues and concerns in our future analyses and that dialogue about these issues and concerns be engaged in other venues. In coming essays, we will be looking at potential differences between personal and organizational coaches regarding amount and type of previous experience. We will also be examining potential differences in gender, age, education and training when comparisons are drawn between personal and organizational coaches. Each of these analyses will help us gain greater clarity regarding the source and nature of differences between those who work primarily in the domain of personal coaching and those who work primarily as coaches in organizational settings.

Locus of Control

In our sixth essay, we identified locus of control as a potential source of difference in the responses of coaches with ICF certification and those without ICF certification. Specifically, we concluded the following:

> There does seem to be a pattern . . . that can lead us to a theme that I believe might be worth further discussion within the profession of coaching. This theme concerns the so-called "locus of control" to be found among respondents to the Development of Coaches Survey.

> Substantial research has been done that suggests people differ with regard to the extent they have adopted an "internal" or "external" locus of control. Those who hold a bias toward an internal locus of control tend to believe that they have considerable control over (and accountability for) the actions they have taken as well as the environment in which they live (and have helped to create). Conversely, those with a bias toward external locus of control tend to believe that they have very little control over (and hence minimal accountability for) the actions they have taken or the environment in which they live. For those with an external locus of control, life seems to be in the hands of other people (authority) or other forces in their world (fate). The men and women who tend to embrace an internal locus of control are inclined to take responsibility for everything in their life. They are always putting in extra time and devoting extensive energy to getting everything "right."

> In examining the results obtained in this study, it would seem that those with ICF certification are more inclined toward an external locus of control, while those who are renegades tend to be inclined toward an internal locus. The certified coaches look to outside resources when preparing to be a coach and seek external verification (through ICF) regarding their own professional competence. They also might be more sensitive to their environment and might consider themselves to be more interpersonally-sensitive (personal authenticity) than are their more internally-focused colleagues without certification. The renegades, on the other hand, might (as their name implies) be loners who are "guided by their own star", rather than relying on any external verification.

We seem to have found a similar pattern with regard to the work done by personal and organizational coaches – at least as revealed in one highly significant (.001 level) difference. Personal coaches are much more likely than organizational coaches to indicate that currently they are "in danger of losing control of a coaching conversation to a client." While responses to this one item stands out amidst many other items where minimal differences were found between personal and organizational coaches, it is hard to ignore this one major difference. What seems to be going on?

This issue of control generates several important questions. Do personal coaches have a stronger need for control in their work with clients? Are personal coaches (like ICF certified coaches) more inclined toward an external locus of control—meaning that they are more sensitive to the control exerted by their clients. We all know that clients are supposed to be in charge of the coaching engagement—but there still might be legitimate concern about losing all control among some coaches. If personal coaches are more reliant on and view themselves as being more skilled in the use of coaching strategies and techniques than is the case with organizational coaches, then are they likely to be more concerned (or even threatened) when control is lost? With the precision, subtlety and finesse that organizational coaches purport to possess, are they likely to be more flexible in their work with clients—allowing these coaches to be less concerned about loss of control.

Are the organizational coaches, in other words, more included toward internal locus of control and less reliant on external cues from their clients? This doesn't mean that organizational coaches are in some manner more competent than their personal coaching colleagues: they might be insensitive to the needs of their clients or too unpredictable in their flexibility. When is it the right time for coaches to dance and when should they stay put and provide stable and reliable support to their clients? These are questions that should be broached in future sessions where coaching practices are being critically examined and best practices are identified. Locus of control might be a central theme to be explored in these sessions.

Facing Difficulties and Identifying Influences

We turn to two final areas of analysis. In what ways if any do personal coaches and organizational coaches differ with regard to how they face difficulties in their coaching and the factors that have influenced their career. We have grouped these themes together because,

frankly, there are not many differences at a level of significance worth noting. The items associated with difficulty yield no significant differences. It would seem that personal and organizational coaches face challenges in a similar manner. Similarly, influences are comparable for personal and organizational coaching, though it is interesting to note that those who teach coaching (included in the organizational coaching category) might be less influenced by the coaching courses they themselves have taken than are personal coaches. Our future analyses will provide more differentiated analysis concerning those who teach coaching. A near significant difference between our two groups with reference to the discussion of cases should also be noted. Personal coaches are more likely to be influenced by their discussion of cases with colleagues than are organizational coaches.

In general, are the organizational coaches simply more confident about their abilities than are the personal coaches? Can they more readily work in isolation from other coaches – or is it more the case that personal coaches are open to receiving support and insights from their colleagues? The differences are not great, so we must be cautious about offering even tentative conclusions or speculating on the causes of any differences that do exist. Clearly, the major finding in this study concerns the issue of control and, to a lesser extent, the differences occurring overall in the development of coaches (as compared to the recent experience of coaches). The world does not look profoundly different for those who primarily engage in personal coaching and those who do coaching primarily inside organizations – but the differences that do appear to exist are quite intriguing and provide the grist for future dialogues about the similarities and differences between these two orientations to coaching.

––––––––––

Reference

Bergquist, William (2016) "Development of Coaches: VI. Does ICF Certification Make a Difference?" *The Library of Professional Coaching*. December 30.

Campone, Francine and Awai, Deepa, "Life's thumbprint: the impact of significant life events on coaches and their coaching", *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, DOI: 10.1080/17521882.2011.648334.

Kahneman, Daniel (2011) *Thinking Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Orlinsky, D.E. and Rønnestad, M. H. (2005), *How Psychotherapists Develop; A study of therapeutic Work and professional growth.* Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.