

Research Report for the AC, EMCC and ICF

Multi-stakeholder contracting in coaching

May 2015

Eve Turner and Peter Hawkins

<u>Contents:</u>		Page
Section 1	Background and sponsorship	2
Section 2	Methodology and responses	2
Section 3	Main areas of focus	4
Section 4	The current state of multi-stakeholder contracting	5
Section 5	Analysis and emerging issues and areas	6
Section 6	Supervision	12
Section 7	Where next	14
Section 8	Bibliography	14
Appendix A	Further demographic information	15

Section 1

Background and sponsorship

The survey benefited from active support from the three main professional coaching bodies, the AC, EMCC and ICF, who make up the GCMA (Global Coaching and Mentoring Alliance) to whom we are very grateful. These bodies sent the questionnaire links to members in 2014 with encouragement to complete it. The AC sent out an all-members email and published further requests on their LinkedIn group; the EMCC featured it in their Research Spotlight all-members email and also sent out a reminder; the ICF sent it to members throughout the world who had opted in to take part in research and it was sent to all UK members. Additionally Eve regularly posted requests on LinkedIn groups, not only for these three professional bodies, but also those of APECS, the AOCS and the BPS. She and Peter also used their own networks worldwide.

In addition the research was supported by Coaching at Work magazine who put details in their online updates and printed version of the magazine. And a number of organisations took part, encouraging coaches, clients and organisational stakeholders to complete the questionnaire including GlaxoSmithKline, Saint-Gobain, the NHS Leadership Academy and KPMG LLP in the UK.

We employed an experienced PhD researcher, Daria Tkacz, to do some of the survey analysis and would like to express our thanks to her for the quality of her work.

The survey was only aimed at coaches involved in business/executive coaching. One of the limitations may be that coaches, organisations and clients who have some experience or at least understanding of this area were more likely to take part, which could skew the results. Even so this is the first rigorous, quantitative and qualitative study of this area.

Section 2

Methodology and responses

The research questions this project aimed to answer were all linked to the overall objective of discovering how to gain maximum value from multi-stakeholder contracting, in particular to:

1. Highlight any challenges in setting coaching outcomes when the organisation is involved along with the individual client and coach.
2. Gain participants' views on whether multi-stakeholder contract has an impact on the coaching and its outcomes and if so what.
3. Discover best practice from participants as to how can multi-stakeholder contracting meetings can be carried out most effectively for the individual client, the organisation and the coach.
4. Discover what the latest practice is in supervision including related to this area, updating the research done by Peter Hawkins and Gil Schwenk for the CIPD in 2006.
5. Consider whether there are any differences based on geography or other demographics.

The research was not approached with a theory in mind hence it was inductive and followed the process of gathering information, forming categories and looking for patterns. This was particularly important where respondents were able to write in qualitative responses alongside the quantitative replies in the questionnaires.

By far the greatest quantitative response was to the coaches' survey. The total number of people who began the surveys was as follows:

- Coaches' survey 717 (569 completed some parts)
- Organisational survey 76 (of whom 52 completed some parts)
- Individual client's survey 61 (of whom 30 completed some parts)

However completion rates, in brackets, were lower, in part because some people began the wrong survey and not all respondents completed all questions. Further demographic breakdown information is included in Appendix A, p.15.

There were also several hundred qualitative responses and the most popular were in the coaches' survey to the following questions:

Q12 What is your view on stakeholder contracting within organisations? (n=42)

Q13 In what circumstances, if any, do you believe stakeholder contracting is appropriate? (n=44)

Q14 If you believe stakeholder contracting is a good practice, who do you think should be involved? We would like to know at what stage(s) of the coaching programme you think they should be involved in the discussion. (n=101)

Q15 Where you have been involved in contracting with more than the individual coaching client please indicate who has taken part. We would also like to know at what stage(s) of the coaching programme they were involved in a discussion? (n=36)

Q16 From your perspective as the coach, what impact, if any, do you believe initial stakeholder contracting has on the subsequent coaching? (n=75)

Q17 As a coach what do you see as the benefits of stakeholder contracting, if any? (n=21)

Q18 As a coach what do you see as the challenges of stakeholder contracting, if any? (n=45)

Q19 If you think stakeholder contracting is good practice, but sometimes do not do this, what is the reason? (n=77)

Q21 What do you see as your role as coach within the initial stakeholder conversation? (n=28)

Q23 Which of the parties, if any, do you have contact with before the initial 3 or 4 way meeting (whether by phone or face-to-face)? (n=31)

Q27 What question would you most like the research data to help you answer? (n=172)

These responses can be summarised in these questions:

- What evidence is there that stakeholder approach creates better outcomes/makes a difference?
- What are the costs and benefits of stakeholder contracting?
- What is the code of best practice?
- How to deal with ethical challenges of stakeholder contracting?
- How to run meetings effectively, what is their impact?
- How to encourage organisations to see benefits of 3-way coaching, how to engage the stakeholders.

Q28 What would be your top tip for successful stakeholder contracting? (n=253)

Section 3

Main areas of focus

The authors' interest in the area of multi-stakeholder contracting began several years ago. In the case of Eve she had experienced challenges herself in stakeholder contracting which she had taken to supervision. When she trained as a supervisor she was surprised at how frequently issues around this type of contracting came up and how some supervisees felt they had had little preparation in how to prepare for and conduct such meetings ethically and with confidence. In some cases this had led to coaches feeling compromised, concerned, upset and even angry. Other supervisees had been concerned about evaluation with an organisational representative when that organisation had had no involvement in setting outcomes.

In researching this area Eve found there was little shared best practice and decided to engage in a research study with the key aim of coming up with guidance that drew on the views of all parties to multi-stakeholder contracting, individual clients, organisational representatives and coaches. Eve also wanted to ensure that all perspectives were represented, in the knowledge that for some people, particularly coaches, such contracting was challenging ethically, and was overly goal-focused, and they did not believe it was in the interests of the individual client.

This area of interest was reflected in, for example, the Ridler Report 2013 (with the EMCC) which is based on 145 responses including interviews involving senior managers linked to coaching strategy. Among other things it states there was evidence that "good contracting practices build the foundations for evaluation processes...and successful coaching outcomes." And the report findings suggested that three-way meetings between the coach, coachee and coachee's line manager are seen as a key mechanism to agree coaching objectives. However, an examination of how this was done most effectively was outside the scope of the report.

As part of this study we also looked at when and if multi-stakeholder contracting was considered to be appropriate, how frequently such contracting happened, how long it took, who was involved, the challenges and benefits all parties perceived and its impact on the subsequent coaching. We also had specific questions attached to team coaching as opposed to one-to-one coaching.

Another area of focus was to look at current practice in supervision, given that the importance of dealing with multi-stakeholder contracting had first emerged through supervision. So we added questions that allowed us to track progress since Hawkins and Schwenk's 2006 report. We were also able to undertake a geographical breakdown of the take-up and type of supervision and get comprehensive data on what people pay.

Section 4

The current state of multi-stakeholder contracting

The vast majority of coaches (87.81%, 454) who took part in the survey had experience of contracting in coaching which had involved more people than the individual receiving coaching. There was little variation in this across the world. The highest percentage was for Australia/New Zealand where all but one coach had been involved in multi-stakeholder contracting (96.43%, 27 responses), closely followed by Africa though with few responses (90.91%, 10), Europe (88.33%, 106), the UK (88.24%, 240), Asia (85.71%, 18), the USA and Canada (82.69%, 43) and the lowest although still with three-quarters of coaches experiencing it was Latin America, albeit on a small number of respondents (75%, 9).

The overall result is similar to organisations where again the majority (81.25%, 26) of those responding said that a line manager, HR, L&D or a coaching manager had been involved in contracting meetings.

When it came to clients only half knew for certain that their organisation was involved in multi-stakeholder contracting (48%, 12). However just over another quarter (28%, 7) were unsure whether a line manager, HR, L&D or a coaching manager had been involved in contracting meetings.

When coaches, organisations and clients were asked "What question would you most like the research data to help you answer, there were no themes among clients, but the top themes for the other two groups are below:

Coaches

1. What evidence is there that stakeholder approach creates better outcomes/makes a difference?
2. What are the costs and benefits of stakeholder contracting?
3. What is the code of best practise?
4. How to deal with ethical challenges of stakeholder contracting?
5. How to run meetings effectively, what is their impact?
6. How to encourage organisations to see benefits of 3way coaching, how to engage the stakeholders?

Organisations

1. What is best practice?
2. How does the 3+ way contracting benefits the overall coaching engagement? How to make the most of such meeting?
3. How to convince coaches that stakeholder contracting is important?

Section 5

Analysis and emerging issues and areas

Summary:

Overall the vast majority of coaches and organisational representatives believe that stakeholder contracting in business/executive coaching is good practice although individual clients have less strong views. The circumstances in which stakeholder contracting is considered appropriate are around the development of the individual, for example through a leadership programme, for promotion or within their current role. More coaches than organisations or clients believe it should be used to help someone develop skills when they could lose their job or be demoted (coaches, 45.67%, organisations 35.48% and clients 34.78%). And more organisational representatives and coaches believe it can be used if the organisation wants to be involved and is paying compared to clients (this was separate from the question which added the phrase "AND the client agrees"): 54.84% organisations; 53.54% coaches; 30.43% clients.

The impact is seen to be around clarity and specificity of outcomes, and alignment of outcomes with organisational needs and strategic development. It also makes the coaching more focussed on outcomes and action. There is some agreement around the major benefits of stakeholder contracting from all three parties to it. The top reasons are around clarity of outcomes and ensuring there is an understanding of what coaching is and what it can achieve. When it comes to challenges more than half of organisational representatives (58.06%, 18) and half of coaches (50%, 227) say that it has sometimes felt like coaching is being used by the organisation to deal with something a line manager has avoided, although only one client (5.25%) mentioned this.

Is stakeholder contracting good practice?

Coaches: A considerable majority (81.82%, 414) of all respondents believes that stakeholder contracting within organisations is a good practice. Only a very small number considers it a poor practice (1.38%, 7) or unnecessary (0.20%, 1). 16.60% (84) of the surveyed do not have strong views on stakeholder contracting. While there was some variation geographically the majority held this view globally: coaches considered it good practice in Asia 85.71%, 18; the UK 84.53%, 224; Africa 81.82%, 9; USA and Canada 78.85%, 41; Europe 78.82%, 93; Australia and New Zealand 76.92%, 20; Latin America 66.67%, 8.

Coaches comments (n=42) in this area fall into four broad categories:

1. It is relative and depends on the culture of the organisation including that around trust and feedback, the individual and their role and the purpose of the coaching (12 comments).
2. It can be useful in addition to the individual client's own ideas, for example it may help them with potential blind spots. Using 360° feedback is mentioned (8 comments).
3. It is necessary because the client is working within a system (7 comments).
4. It can be problematic when used for the wrong reasons such as just being seen to "have done something" for the individual, and because coachees often do not want a third party involved in discussing and agreeing their coaching goals and contracting arrangements (6 comments).

Organisations: Again a majority (78.13%, 25) believe that stakeholder contracting is good practice. Just one person believed it was poor practice (3.13%, 1) or unnecessary (3.13%, 1) and 15.63% (15) of those surveyed did not have strong views.

Clients: The biggest different was with individual clients. Just under half (44%, 11) believed that it was good practice, none thought it was poor practice, and one person (4%, 1) thought it unnecessary. The largest group, just over half (52%, 13) did not have strong views.

Please consider the coaching programmes that you/your organisation has been involved in over the last 12 months. What percentage includes some form of three or more party contracting?

	Coaches	Organisations
None	7.94% (37)	10.34% (3)
1 in 4 or less (25% or less)	32.19% (150)	31.03% (9)
Up to 1 in 2 (26-50%)	16.09% (75)	6.9% (2)
Up to 3 in 4 (51-75%)	11.16% (52)	20.69% (6)
More than 3 in 4 (76-99%)	15.88% (74)	17.24% (5)
All (100%)	16.74% (78)	13.79% (4)

From this more organisations than coaches (51.72% v 43.78%) are involved in multi-stakeholder contracting more than half the time. However, in some organisations (41.37%) and for some business/executive coaches (40.13%) this form of contracting is still relatively unusual (1 in 4 coaching programmes or less).

In what circumstances, if any, do you believe stakeholder contracting is appropriate? (Comparing the views of coaches, clients and organisations)

Coaches (n=508) Q13	Clients (n=23) Q15	Organisations (n=31) Q16
If the coaching is being used as part of a leadership/management development programme (73.23%, 372 respondents)	If the coaching is being used as part of a leadership/management development programme (60.87%, 14 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills for their current role (61.29%, 19 respondents)
If the organisation wants to be involved, is paying AND the coaching client agrees (69.69%, 354 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills for their current role (56.52%, 13 respondents)	If the coaching is being used as part of a leadership/management development programme (54.84%, 17 respondents)
If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills for their current role (65.55%, 333 respondents)	If the organisation wants to be involved, is paying AND the coaching client agrees (52.17%, 12 respondents)	If the organisation wants to be involved in setting the objectives and is paying (54.84%, 17 respondents)
If the organisation wants to be involved in setting the objectives and is paying (53.54%, 272 respondents)	If the coaching goals lend themselves to evaluation and review (47.83%, 11 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to support someone preparing to apply for promotion (48.39%, 15)

If the coaching is being used to support someone preparing to apply for promotion (52.56%, 267 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to support someone preparing to apply for promotion (39.13%, 9 respondents)	If the coaching goals lend themselves to evaluation and review (35.48%, 11 respondents)
If the coaching goals lend themselves to evaluation and review (49.21%, 250 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills without which they may lose their job or be demoted (34.78%, 8 respondents)	If the organisation wants to be involved, is paying AND the coaching client agrees (35.48%, 11 respondents)
If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills without which they may lose their job or be demoted? (45.62%, 232 respondents)	If the organisation wants to be involved in setting the objectives and is paying (30.43%, 7 respondents)	If the coaching is being used to help someone develop skills without which they may lose their job or be demoted (35.48%, 11 respondents)

In written comments coaches underline the importance of confidentiality. They also mention how useful stakeholder contracting can be, not just for setting objectives but also for creating a forum for communication. The following comment illustrates this, and the need to avoid the trap of filling the manager's role:

'It is crucial when there is an underlying performance issue or where the manager hitherto has not had the conversations which need to be had with the potential coachee- to avoid the traps of the coach doing the manager's job. In this case contracting can take on a different and valuable function which extends beyond goal setting and becomes a forum for facilitating good conversations - this has been my experience.'

What impact, if any, do you believe initial stakeholder contracting has on the subsequent coaching? (Comparing the views of coaches, clients and organisations).

Coaches (n=461)	Q16	Clients (n= 19)	Q17	Organisations (n=31)	Q19
It aligns outcomes to organisational needs and strategic development (86.98%, 401)		It aligns outcomes to organisational needs and strategic development (73.68%, 14)		It makes the coaching more focussed on outcomes and action (87.10%, 27)	
It sets clear and specific goals (72.89%, 336)		It sets clear and specific goals (68.42%, 13)		It sets clear and specific goals (80.65%, 25)	
It makes the coaching more focussed on outcomes and action (71.15%, 328)		It makes the coaching more focussed on outcomes and action (57.89%, 11)		It aligns outcomes to organisational needs and strategic development (80.65%, 25)	

What do you see as the benefits of stakeholder contracting, if any? (Comparing the views of coaches, clients and organisations)

Coaches (n=467)	Q17	Clients (n=22)	Q18	Organisations (n=32)	Q20
It ensures there is clarity of		It ensures there is clarity of		It ensures there is clarity of	

outcomes for the coaching for the individual, the organisation and you as coach (79.66%, 372)	outcomes for the coaching for the individual, the organisation and the coach (68.18%, 15)	outcomes for the coaching for the individual, the organisation and the coach (75%, 24)
It helps all parties to agree what coaching is and what it can/cannot achieve (69.16%, 323)	It helps all parties to agree what coaching is and what it can/cannot achieve (59.09%, 13)	It help all parties to agree what coaching is and what it can/cannot achieve (65.63%, 21)
It helps to ensure the individual client can get support in applying their development back in the organisation (62.10%, 290)	It helps to align the individual's objectives with the organisational objectives (59.09%, 13)	It helps to align the individual's objectives with the organisational objectives (62.50%, 20)
To align the individual's objectives with the organisational objectives (57.6%, 269)	To ensure that you get support in applying your development back in the organisation (54.44%, 12)	To ensure that the individual client can get support in applying their development back in the organisation (56.25%, 18)
To ensure there are clear boundaries in place regarding confidentiality (52.68%, 246)	To achieve greater organisational buy-in to the coaching (27.27%, 6)	To ensure coaching is being used appropriately for example not in place of line management (46.88%, 15)
To ensure coaching is being used appropriately for example not in place of line management (44.54%, 208)	To ensure there are clear boundaries in place regarding confidentiality (27.27%, 6)	To ensure there are clear boundaries in place regarding confidentiality (46.88%, 15)

What do you see as the challenges of stakeholder contracting, if any? (Comparing the views of coaches, clients and organisations)

Coaches (n=454) Q18	Clients (n=19) Q19	Organisations (n=31) Q21
It has sometimes felt like coaching is being used by the organisation to deal with something a line manager has avoided (50%, 227)	It has never created challenges (36.85%, 7)	It has sometime felt like coaching is being used to deal with something a line manager has avoided (58.06%, 18)
It has created challenges around boundary management between me as coach, my individual client and the organisation (38.77%, 176)	It has created challenges around maintaining confidentiality about what is discussed within the coaching sessions (10.53%, 2)	It has created challenges around maintaining confidentiality about what is discussed within the coaching sessions (32.26%, 10)
It has created challenges around maintaining confidentiality about what is discussed within the coaching	It created challenges around setting measurable objectives (10.53%, 2)	It has created challenges around boundary management between the organisation, the coach and

sessions (36.34%, 165)		the individual client (25.81%, 8)
------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

In written comments for coaches the biggest themes are around the challenge of contracting effectively, setting clear boundaries and addressing ethical issues; the challenge of honest communication between the coachee and organisation and potential conflict of interest between them (18 comments). One possibility is that coaches believe the organisational representative may be engaged in the contracting process. This comment highlights the area of confidentiality which is seen as crucial:

'My experience is that it is important to clarify what will be shared and not shared between sponsor and coach. Even so, some managers try to get more information. The contract then helps to state what can be shared and what not. So contracting can release some of these challenges but then helps to overcome them since an agreement has been signed in advance.'

Another theme is around the lack of engagement from stakeholders and their lack of understanding of their role in the process (11 comments) such as this comment:

'The main challenge is when the line manager is supposed to attend meeting and doesn't turn up or it feels like lip service. I've also had a couple where the client doesn't want the line manager there as they are the perceived problem.'

Stakeholder contracting meetings:

On average how much time do you put aside for initial stakeholder contracting meetings to take place?

	Coaches n=473	Clients n=22	Organisations n=31
Around ½ hour	11.84% (56)	4.55% (1)	16.13% (5)
Around 1 hour	54.33% (257)	31.82% (7)	48.39% (15)
Around 1 ½ hours	21.56% (102)	9.09% (2)	6.45% (2)
Around 2 hours	11.63% (55)	13.64% (3)	16.13% (5)
Around 2 ½ hours or longer	6.77% (32)	4.55% (1)	3.23% (1)
N/A	4.65% (22)	40.91% (9)	9.68% (3)

What is evident from this analysis is that where such contracting takes place a significant amount of time is given to it. In organisations, excluding the N/A, 82.14% (23 out of 28 respondents) of meetings are 1 hour or longer. For coaches the same comparison isn't possible because there are more responses than respondents, however, it is still clear that the vast majority of meetings are at least one hour in duration.

Finally when it comes to who is involved in these meetings and at what stage, coaches state that the most common practice is, as a minimum, to have the individual client, HR/L&D or the coaching manager and line manager involved before the first meeting. But it is also clear that the views of other parties are also sought in many cases such as "A more senior manager than the line manager", and the next, though some way behind is The Board/Executive Team.

Coaches say that it is most common to have an initial contracting meeting involving the client, the coach and the line manager (81.25%), but mid-way evaluation was less likely to involve the line manager (52.86%), and tended to take place between the coach and individual client. At the end of the coaching, evaluation with the line manager was higher (77.86%) and often involved HR or L&D or their equivalent (up to three-quarters of cases).

More than half of the organisational respondents (55.56%, 15) say they do not have mid-way or final evaluations. However only a quarter of coaches say they do not have either of these meetings (25.87%, 111).

There were 101 written coach comments about the involvement of other parties in the contracting beyond the client and coach, and they can be summarised as:

- It depends on the context and purpose of the coaching and on the organisation's culture (53 comments)
- Mentors/sponsors/whoever is relevant to the coachee and the process (10)
- It is not equally necessary to involve different parties at various stages (5)
- Depends on the coachee's preferences and whether they want others involved (4)
- Potential other parties could be involved (4)

Comments include:

'The whole thing would depend on the circumstances of the coaching. Essentially I believe a coaching contract is between the coaching client and the coach. And by agreement of the coaching client with relevant stakeholders. Depending on the issue this may include or indeed exclude specific people from the contract.'

"This will be totally context specific and agreed in a dynamic environment - alignment with overarching aim for the organisation, team and individual is most relevant"

'It depends on situation and why the coaching is initiated and agreed. My experience (within organizations) is that the sponsor should be involved as well as naturally the client. In what stage depends on how it is initiated. If client agrees and if helpful it is good to have some additional stakeholders, that the client trust, to give feedback to the client and support in achieving the objectives of the coaching.'

'Most importantly, every situation is a special case that must be analyzed by the coach. It is the strength and specificity of coaching!'

'Depends on the circumstances and nature of the contracting - I walk away if the line manager is going to suggest the agenda for coaching because it is often based on unsubstantiated value judgements or dubious 360 feedback! I have participated in most of the above but with a clear confidentiality clause and a no interference agreement.'

Section 6
Supervision

This research was sparked by coach supervisees bringing cases around multi-stakeholder contracting to Peter and Eve for supervision and it is clear from the coaches' data that in Europe, the UK and Australia and New Zealand a majority of business/executive coaches do use supervision for this aspect of their coaching. This is also the case in Africa and Latin America albeit on a much smaller response group.

Have you discussed stakeholder contracting in supervision?

Geographic region	Yes	No
UK	159 (69.13%)	71 (30.87%)
Europe	54 (59.34%)	37 (40.66%)
USA and Canada	13 (33.34%)	28 (66.67%)
Australia and New Zealand	13 (61.9%)	8 (38.1%)
Asia	7 (41.18%)	10 (58.82%)
Africa	7 (77.78%)	2 (22.22%)
Latin America	5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)

Out of 428 coaches who responded, 72 said they never have supervision. Broken down by geographic region it suggests that the highest numbers without supervision are in the USA and Canada and Asia and the lowest numbers are in the UK, Africa and Latin America (though on a small response rate in the case of the latter two):

- UK 18/234 (18 out of 234 coaches who replied to this question, 7.69%)
- Europe 18/93 (19.35%)
- Africa 1/10 (10%)
- Asia 6/17 (35.29%)
- Australia/New Zealand 6/22 (27.27%)
- Latin America 1/9 (11.11%)
- USA and Canada 22/42 (52.38%).

The key reasons for not having supervision are that coaches do their own reflective practice, work with a coach or are part of peer networks. Cost was not a key factor, cited by 9 coaches (9.1%) out of 99 who said they didn't have supervision.

Where coaches did have supervision the top two reasons given were positive ones:

It is part of my personal commitment to good practice	92.6%
It contributes to my CPD	51.6%
It is a requirement of a professional body of which I am a member	33.9%
It is a requirement for accreditation by a professional body	26.5%
It is a requirement of organisations using me as an external coach	19.2%
It is a requirement of organisation using me as an internal coach	14.7%

However this masks some geographical divides, for example

- It is a requirement of organisations using me as an external coach (23.18%, 51 in the UK; 14.77%, 13 in Europe; 5.26%, 1 in the USA and Canada)
- It is a requirement of organisation using me as an internal coach (21.36%, 47 in the UK; 0.00%, 0 in Europe; 5.26%, 1 in the USA and Canada)
- It is a requirement of a professional body of which I am a member (35.91%, 79 in the UK; 29.55%, 26 in Europe; 15.79%, 3 in the USA and Canada)
- It is a requirement for accreditation by a professional body (27.73%, 61 in the UK; 51.59%, 19 in Europe; 10.53%, 2 in the USA and Canada)
- It is part of my personal commitment to good practice (86.82%, 191 in the UK; 79.55%, 70 in Europe; 84.2%, 16 in the USA and Canada)
- It contributes to my CPD (64.09%, 141 in the UK; 27.27%, 24 in Europe; 10.53%, 2 in the USA and Canada)

In terms of organisations, 65.79% (38) of the respondents said they did ask their coaches whether or not they had supervision. 66.67% (42) said that they expected their coaches to have supervision, but only 37.84% (37) said they would only use coaches who had supervision. In a further question out of 43 organisations responding, 4.65% (2) said they require supervision and also ask for a supervisor's reference, 13.95% (6) require coaches to explain how they use supervision with examples from their practice. Finally 2.33% (1) said they require coaches to explain how they use supervision with examples and to have a supervisor's reference.

Nearly half of the clients responding, 48.28%, did not know whether their coaches had supervision (14 out of 29) with the remainder knowing their coaches did. Further research could clarify whether clients didn't know because coaches aren't mentioning their supervision or because the coaches were not having it so it was not relevant. The client response was greatest in the UK [76.67% (23) of clients were from the UK, 20% (6) from Europe and just 3.33% (1) from Latin America] where supervision take up is high.

More work is being done on the coaching supervision data and will be presented at the 2015 5th Oxford Brookes International Supervision Conference.

Section 7

Where next

Peter and Eve will be doing further analysis of the data, and may seek additional support from those happy to take part in interviews or focus groups if needed, once this is done. The analysis will provide a breakdown of the top tips recommended by coaches, organisations and clients based on the qualitative responses from 267 written responses which will be organised into themes. There will also be further analysis of the supervision data and the demographic information and clients views as to how they determine a coach is good and professional.

Many areas have been raised that could warrant further research and these will be highlighted.

Section 8

Bibliography

David, S., Clutterbuck, D. and Megginson, D (editors) (2013). *Beyond Goals - Effective Strategies for Coaching and Mentoring*. Farnham: Gower Publishing Limited

Eriksson, K (2011) *Executive Coaching: diverse stakeholder perspectives and a model for agreed procurement procedures (abridged version)*. Submitted for the award of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Derby (unpublished).

Hawkins, P and Schwenk, G. (2006). *Coaching Supervision: Maximising the Potential of Coaching* [electronic version]. London: CIPD <http://www.cipd.co.uk/NR/rdonlyres/5EBC80A0-1279-4301-BFAD-37400BAA4DB4/0/coachsupervca.pdf>

Ridler Report, 2013. *Trends in the Use of Executive Coaching* (with collaboration from the EMCC).

Appendix A Further demographic information

Geographically the largest responses rates for the coaches' survey were from the UK (301), Europe (129) and USA and Canada (59). The next largest was Australia and New Zealand with 28.

European respondents are almost equally represented by males and females (65 males, 64 females), in Australia and New Zealand it is close with 16 females (57.14%) and 12 males. In the UK, 69.44% (209) respondents are female and in the USA and Canada the distribution is even more skewed towards females, with 72.88% (43) females and 27.12% (16) respondents male.

When it comes to age in the UK the majority (52.15%, 158) of respondents are aged 50-59 years old. In Europe the dominant age category is wider, with 70% aged 40-59 (32.31%, 42 respondents aged 40-49; 37.69%, 49 respondents aged 50-59); this is a similar figure for Australia and New Zealand where 71% are 40-59 (28.57%, 8 aged 40-49 and 42.86%, 2 aged 50-59). While in the USA and Canada more than three-quarters of respondents are in the age group 50-69 (50%, 30 are aged 50-59; and 26.67%, 16 respondents are aged 60-69).

When it comes to accreditation from recognised professional accrediting bodies, a greater percentage of respondents in the USA and Canada (48.34%, 29) and Australia and New Zealand (46.42%, 13) have accreditation at Senior Practitioner level or above than in Europe (37.7%, 49) or the UK (25.25%, 76). Similarly at Practitioner level, 38.33% (23) respondents in the USA and Canada have accreditation at this level, in contrast to 23.59% (71) respondents in the UK and 28.46% (37) in Europe. A small number of coaches in the UK, 5.32% (16) were accredited in a single tiered scheme, compared to 3.08% (4) in Europe and none in the USA and Canada. In the UK a greater percentage of respondents said they had no accreditation at all (38.54%, 116) than in Europe (28.46%, 37), Australia and New Zealand (28.57%, 8) and the USA and Canada (13.33%, 8).

The greatest majority of respondents were external coaches: UK (58.80%, 177), Australia and New Zealand (78.57%, 22), Europe (76.15%, 99), and the USA and Canada (73.33%, 44). Interestingly in the UK internal, in-house coaches in a public body were the second largest represented group (19.60%, 59), whereas in Europe this group was the smallest with only 0.77% (1 respondent) working as an internal coach in a public body. In the USA and Canada the group was also small with only 5% (3) of the respondents working as an internal coach in a public body.