Coachee Satisfaction and Beyond- A Systematic Review of the Coaching Relationship

Yi-Ling Lai & Almuth McDowall

Abstract

This report summarises a conference paper presented at the 4th International Congress hosted by the British Psychological Society's Special Group in Coaching Psychology in London, December 2014. A further discussion of a Systematic Review (SR) study which aimed to strengthen evidence-based coaching through reviewing existing studies in Coaching Psychology was presented. This SR focused on investigating effective coaching psychologists' attributes for a productive coaching relationship and how to facilitate desired outcomes. The coaching relationship has been established as a key indicator for a positive coaching outcome through several primary studies. Nevertheless existing competency frameworks of main governing associations (e.g. the British Psychological Society) have not yet outlined explicit behavioural indicators for facilitating an effective coaching relationship. Hence, it is an essential step to study common factors for an effective coaching process and to what extent coaches' attributes impact the coach-coachee relationship. The details of this SR study has been published in International Coaching Psychology Review in 2014 (Lai & Almuth, 2014); this short paper will discuss how this SR study results expand commonly used coaching evaluation from coachees' satisfaction to comprise more concrete outcome measurement.

Keywords: **systematic review, coaching relationship, evidence-based coaching, coaching psychology, coaching competency**

Introduction

This paper reports a Systematic Review (SR) on Coaching Psychology, which synthesised existing coaching relevant studies to identify the research gap and trends through a rigorous and transparent process. Coaching has been widely applied in leadership and organisational development worldwide; nevertheless it is a challenge to integrate and examine the best available evidence for an effective coaching process and outcome due to the diversity of coaching disciplines (e.g. psychology, management, adult-learning etc.). The research focus of each discipline tends to stay within their domains. The diversity of coaching disciplines also resulted in various outcome evaluations. However, most of the short-term coaching programmes were evaluated by satisfaction ratings of the coachees. The measures used tend to general (Peterson & Kraiger, 2003) rather than specific to coaching as such. For instance, positive feedback indicated in Five-point Likert scales does not imply that coaching has produced concrete outcomes. It could be simply interpreted that coachees have a nice time during their coaching sessions which is useful for marketing and to motivate other potential coachees (Ely & Zaccaro, 2011).

That more organisational-based evaluations for coaching such as Kirkpatrick's (1976) Four-level model (such as behavioural changes and ROI) should be applied to coaching outcome evaluation was discussed by Greif (2013); nevertheless there is still a gap between contemporary coaching practice and evidence-based methodology. Although psychological interventions and perspectives have been examined and highlighted as essential elements for an effective coaching outcome by several review studies and book chapters (Bachkirova, 2008; Grant, 2001; Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011; Whybrow, 2008); these studies also indicated more rigorous evidence is required to examine how psychological interventions generate effective concrete coaching outcomes beyond general coachees' satisfaction rating we currently use. A good literature review that informs us about current knowledge as well as gaps and research trends in the field therein is

essential prior to any empirical study (Gough et al. 2012); thus a SR which has been identified as the most rigorous approach for the enhancement of evidence-based practice (Briner, et al., 2009) was conducted. This paper focuses on existing evidence and challenges in the field of coaching to explain why a SR is necessary to identify the further research trend. Following this, brief discussions focus on what extent the findings of this SR contribute to the contemporary coaching evaluation and enhance the evidence-based practice.

Existing issues and challenges

As discussed earlier, the application of coaching in organisations has significantly increased. Coaching has become a $2 billion per-year global market (ICF, 2012) with approximately 47,500 coaches worldwide (Western Europe, 37.5% and North America, 33.2%). In the UK, the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development's (CIPD) Annual Survey Report 2014 showed that 76% of organisations offered coaching, this rose to 85% in the public sector. In addition, coaching was rated as the most effective activity in talent management programmes (CIPD, 2014). Given the increase in coaching application, the evaluation of the impact of coaching on personal and organisational development becomes an essential consideration to organisational stakeholders and coaching practitioners (Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011). Whilst the ultimate objective of coaching is similar to other helping interventions to facilitate positive life and behavioural change, organisations (and coaches) need to demonstrate that coaching produces positive outcomes and is worth continued investment. Thus, the promotion of evidence-based coaching to document any effects on coachees' wellbeing or other concrete outcomes is essential in contemporary coaching study (Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011). Nevertheless, there is still some challenges to prompt concrete outcome evaluation in coaching practice as it is a challenge to design an "experimental" trail in the organisational studies (e.g. RCTs and control groups). It is often impossible or impractical to prove

that the changes have been caused by the program alone (Grant, 2013). Therefore, several studies suggested that future coaching studies should place a greater focus on the antecedents' influence on coaching outcomes, especially the relationship among the organizational stakeholders and actors involved and the process of coaching (Kraiger et al., 1993; Greif, 2013). The following sections will summarise current issues and future trends on coaching practice and study for the development of evidence-based practice.

The role of psychology in contemporary coaching practice

Summarising from the previous section, there is still an on-going debate on whether psychological principles are the essential factor to facilitate an effective coaching outcome. A global survey (Newnham-Kanas et al., 2012) indicated nearly 50% of coaches were from business backgrounds rather than psychological or behavioural science backgrounds (consultants 49.1 per cent, formal educators, e.g. teachers and professors 20.8 per cent and helping professionals, e.g. psychologists and counsellors 15.6 per cent). In fact, contemporary professional coaching is described as a "cross-disciplinary" methodology, which is considered as strength and a liability (Grant, 2008). This diversity leads the challenge to integrate existing evidence in the field of coaching and examine the best available knowledge for a successful coaching outcome. In another word, there is still a gap toward evidence-based practice in coaching. The application of psychological interventions in coaching practice has been considered as one of the key elements for the enhancement of evidence-based practice (Grant, 2008). Here are the rationales to support this statement: firstly, psychology is a theoretically grounded science that underpins the processes and understanding of human change. The evidence-based coaching interventions (adapted from therapeutic models) fulfil the essential purpose of coaching, which is to facilitate a coachee's continuous learning and growth in the workplace through motivation and attitude change

(Whybrow, 2008). For example, Simons & Cleary (2006) suggested that a high degree of self-knowledge is essential for successful leadership; coaching practitioners should integrate elements of counselling to address the influences of the coachee's past and consequent attitudes, feelings and beliefs that underpin behaviour.

Secondly, psychology is a recognised academic qualification, thus coaches who apply psychological grounded principles can ensure that a coaching process is based on enforceable ethical codes and supervised by relevant governing associations (e.g. British Psychological Society).

Thirdly, having proper training in psychology assists the professional coach to minimise causing harm to a coachee with so far unrecognised mental health problems (Berglas, 2002; Cavanagh, 2006; Naughton, 2002). Though the general aim of coaching is to facilitate individual's behavioural change and performance improvement in the workplace, studies indicated between 25% and 50% of individuals who attend life coaching programmes may have mental health issues (Green et al., 2005; Spence & Grant, 2005).

Therefore these studies implied having a background in psychology or acquiring fundamental psychological knowledge is crucial to be able to identify if coachee has mental disorder issues and refer them to the appropriate therapeutic treatment such as counselling. Several review studies and book chapters have addressed that psychological coaching interventions generate a positive impact on coaching outcomes. But they also suggested it is necessary to build on this groundwork to conduct a more in depth review, with clear review criteria which assess the quality of any primary sources, to allow us to spell out clear hypotheses for further investigation.

Beyond coachees' satisfaction: contemporary coaching evaluation in practice

As discussed earlier, it remains a challenge for coaching researchers to examine the most

effective coaching method for a positive coaching outcome due to the diversity in domains, methods and outcomes. It also causes various coaching evaluation methods in practice. The nature and key features of evaluation research will be presented here prior to the analysis of current most frequently used coaching evaluation practice. Evaluation research is defined as the "systematic application of social research procedures in assessing conceptualisation and design, implementation and utility of social intervention programmes" (Rossi & Freeman, 1993). However, some social interventions (such as coaching and mentoring) are not confined to scientific methods because of the nature of these activities (Greif, 2013). In general, the evaluation of organisational learning and development interventions means "appraisal or assessment of interventions, including their preconditions, costs, processes, and especially their outcomes". Most of the short-term coaching programmes are evaluated by clients' (especially coachees) direct feeling and feedback after their sessions. More specially, it is mainly based on whether the coachee is happy or satisfied with the coach and coaching process.

The main reason of using "client satisfaction" as coaching programme evaluation is that coaching is a relatively new organisational intervention and concept for coachees. Also, it is a challenge to design a comprehensive and standardised evaluation scheme due to the diversity of coaching content and approaches. Nevertheless, some key stakeholders of coaching interventions (e.g. researchers, practitioners and organisational shareholders) are sceptical of this sort of "client satisfaction" evaluation as the ultimate purpose of coaching intervention is to facilitate "coachee's behavioural change" towards "positive organisational impact". Kirkpatrick's (1976) four-level evaluation model was considered as one of the scientific-based coaching outcome measurements in one coaching psychology book chapter (Greif, 2013), which are reaction, learning, behaviour and results.

Following from the discussion above, the majority of existing coaching programme

evaluation fall into level one – clients' reaction: how do the participants feel about the program they attended? To what extent are they satisfied customers? However, more substantial outcome measurements are required in coaching study to answer whether coaching interventions generate positive impacts on coachees' learning and behavioural change to meet organisation objectives. To sum up, expanding coaching evaluation from "clients' reaction and satisfaction" to concrete outcome measurement (e.g. attitude and behavioural improvement) is a crucial step to the enhancement of evidence-based coaching. The following section will discuss a relatively new concept in the field of coaching, coaching relationship, and explain the role of coaching relationship for the development of evidence-based practice.

The role of the coaching relationship for facilitating coaching outcomes

Coaching research has shifted its focus from examining singular coaching intervention to investigating the common factors in coaching processes in recent years (O'broin & Palmer, 2010; Palmer & McDowall, 2010 and de Haan et al., 2013). This research focus change is considering that the choice of coaching methods should be combined and tailored in accordance with the coachee's individual scenario and organisational context. It indicates that adopting one singular coaching framework is not sufficient for the potentially complex coaching context. Therefore a contextual-model (Stober & Grant, 2006) of coaching which integrates various techniques might be more helpful for effective coaching outcomes. This model is expanded from the components described by Wampold (2001) for a contextual model for psychotherapy. A Contextual Coaching Approach aims to elicit the process of coaching, including "what common themes are beneficial for effective coaching process and outcomes" (Stober & Grant, 2006, P.355). In this model, coaching is considered as a collaborative process in which the coach and coachee work toward mutual goals. Hence, an "effective" and "meaningful" coaching relationship is the key factor for positive

coaching outcomes as most of the coaching process relies on two people's (coach-coachee) conversation and interactions. The concept of the "coaching relationship and alliance" has been highlighted from these seven thematic factors of Contextual Coaching Approach.

De Haan (2008) transferred the concept of Working Alliance from psychotherapy outcome research (Wampold, 2001) to the field of coaching as both interventions share very similar process: the essence of therapeutic and coaching process relies on sustaining interpersonal interactions between therapist/coach and patient/coachee. This meta-analysis indicated there was no significant difference in effectiveness on desired outcomes between different approaches and techniques. The working alliance (relationship) between the therapist and client was identified as the most effective ingredient for facilitating a positive therapy outcome across all approaches. Based on the aspect of 'outcome equivalence' in this study (Wampold, 2001), a quality coaching relationship across the coaching engagement was inferred as the most essential singular factor for positive coaching outcomes. Indeed, the age of "relational coaching" has been confirmed by means of a number of quantitative studies. These studies examined a positive correlation between the coaching relationship and results, such as coachees' self-efficacy (Baron & Morin, 2009; Boyce et al., 2010; de Haan et al., 2013).

Concluding briefly here, psychological interventions have been highlighted and examined as the key factor for facilitating an effective coaching outcome. In order to gather more solid evidence, expanding existing most commonly used coaching evaluation, coachees' satisfaction, to concrete outcome measurement is crucial in contemporary coaching study. Coaching relationship appears as an essential role in contemporary coaching study and practice based on the result of positive correlation with coaching outcomes (e.g. self-efficacy). Therefore, more solid evidence is required to confirm whether psychological interventions bring positive impact on coaching relationship and expand existing evaluation level towards concrete outcome measurement.

It is an essential step to carry out a rigorous literature review prior to any primary research.

Systematic Review Method

What is SR?

SR is a specific methodology that locates existing studies, selects and evaluates contributions, analyses and synthesises data, and reports the evidence through a rigorous and transparent way that shows reasonably clear conclusions to be reached about what is and what is not known (Denyer & Tranfield, 2011). A SR usually starts with a prior specific protocol which includes the review topic, questions/hypotheses, inclusion criteria and review methods to test just a single hypothesis or a series of related hypotheses. Although varied methods for synthesis have been applied to SRs (such as meta-analysis and narrative synthesis), they depend on the nature and quality of the primary studies (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). The overall review process thus comprises scoping and planning the review, searching and screening the references, and evaluating and synthesising the included studies.

The advantages of a SR method

The advantages of SRs have been widely discussed, which can be summarised as two key points. Firstly, compared to traditional narrative literature reviews, SR method is based on a rigorous and transparent process; it includes a well-defined review protocol, searching terms and inclusive criteria which are usually drawn on perspectives from the experts in the field. The rigorousness of study selection criteria reduced the possibility to neglect critical studies. Secondly, explicit methodology of SR mitigates research bias by applying systematic paper evaluation and synthesis approaches. Thus, a SR produces more reliable and accurate conclusions than traditional literature reviews do (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007).

The process of this SR

This SR comprised three main stages, which are summarised in Table 1. Please refer to Lai &

McDowall's paper in 2014 for the detailed review process and findings.

Table 1. A Systematic Review Process

Stage	Purpose	Methods
Stage One	Scoping the studies of the field and planning the review.	The researcher searched through PsyINFO, Business Source Complete, Index to Theses in 2010 to ensure there was no SR of coaching studies yet. 10 coaching experts were invited (either academics or practitioners from international locations) to explore their perspectives on the review topic, review questions and methods proposed by the researcher. Semi-structured interviews were conducted either by phone or face-to-face.
Stage Two	Undertaking the literature search and screening the references.	58 searching terms were identified and were searched through 8 electronic databases (e.g. Individual differenc* and coaching). Inclusion Criteria for reference screening: • Written in English. • Published after 1995 (including 1995). • Empirical research (both quantitative and quality studies) which set clear research methods, participants, measurements and outcomes. • Focused on personal life, work and executive coaching. • Applied in any psychological interventions and principles • Involved in any coach's attributes (competences, skills, attitudes and personality etc.). • Involved in any factors about coaching relationship.
Stage Three	Evaluating and synthesising the included studies.	The included studies in this SR were rated by adding up the scores gained from three indicators, which are each paper's research method, coaching result evaluation method and coaching interventions. Narrative Synthesis: Organising the descriptions of each study into logical categories. Analysing the findings within each of the categories. Synthesising the findings across all included studies.

Lai & McDowall (2014)

Discussion

The enhancement of psychological principles in coaching study

First of all, we could confirm that psychological methods and approaches play a key role in current field of coaching for the development of evidence-based practice. The review findings showed that more than 50 % of the included papers aimed to examine the impact of psychological interventions on coaching outcomes. They were published in psychological focused journals (e.g. International Coaching Psychology Review). A total of 69% included papers (97 of 141 studies) evaluated the effectiveness of specific psychology approaches and psychometric assessments in the field of coaching; these approaches included Cognitive Behavioural Change, GROW model and Solution-focused approach (Lai & McDowall, 2014). In a brief summary, this SR initially answered one of our review questions: psychological principle is the key domains facilitating positive coaching process and outcomes.

Scientific-based coaching outcome evaluation – beyond coachee's satisfaction

Second, this review also corresponded to one of the issues in coaching practice and study: the enhancement of scientific-based coaching outcome evaluation. As discussed earlier in this paper, most of the existing short-term coaching programmes were evaluated by seeking coachees' feeling (e.g. satisfaction) after their coaching sessions (Greif, 2013). However, the standard of evaluation implies an appraisal of alternative measures and serves as a basis of planning and decision making. It is usually a purpose orientated activity for review and future improvement, which also has to meet the requirements of scientific techniques and methods (Wottawa and Thierau (1998).

The most commonly used coaching evaluation in current coaching practice (e.g. coachees' satisfaction) falls into the general measure category. It means there is still a gap towards concrete outcome measurement. Kirkpatrick's (1976) four-level HR training evaluation model was

considered as a more scientific-based method for coaching outcome measurement as the purpose of coaching intervention is similar to other HR training activities: to facilitate learning and behavioural change to meet organisational objectives.

Therefore, we adopted Kirkpatrick's (1976) model as one of the criteria to assess included papers. All of the included studies which aimed to examine the effectiveness of specific psychological coaching approaches (92 papers) were sorted into four groups based on the evaluation scheme used in their studies (Lai & McDowall, 2014). There were merely 5% of these included studies assessing their coaching programmes by investigating coachees' feeling and satisfaction, which was considered as the first level of Kirkpatrick's (1976) model. A total of 67 studies (67 of 92 papers) employed second (attitude change) and third level (behavioural improvement) of Kirkpatrick's (1976) evaluation model to examine their coaching outcomes. Nevertheless, the evaluation methods adopted in these included studies were varied; some of them were what we call "homemade" scales. There are some debates on the validity of these "self-developed" coaching evaluation measures.

Therefore, more rigorous studies are necessary to promote evidence-based coaching evaluation research. In a brief summary, this SR provided an overview of existing coaching evaluation research, and the review results showed a great number of coaching psychology studies placed an emphasis on scientific-based coaching evaluation (e.g. self-efficacy and 360 degree evaluation). It also indicated we have reached a further step towards evidence-based coaching study and practice. The next step the coaching community should focus on is to investigate the common principles for facilitating scientific method for future coaching evaluation research.

Coaching relationship is an initial benchmark towards scientific coaching evaluation research

Inheriting previous discussion, it is an essential step to investigate common ingredients in coaching process for the development of scientific coaching evaluation research. Coaching relationship has been examined as the key indicator for an effective coaching process and positive outcomes (Baron & Morin, 2009; Boyce et al., 2010; de Haan et al., 2013). Combining Greif 's discussion paper (2013) and de Haan (2012) study, coaching evaluation model, coac-coachee relationship and coach's behaviours were defined as key process variables to influence coaching outcomes. Therefore, the draft framework outlined from this SR could be considered as a fundamental benchmark to develop an objective, reliable, and valid scale for coaching evaluation research. In another word, this SR results expanded existing commonly used coaching evaluation method, coachees' satisfaction, towards a further step: to investigate common variables which influence on concrete coaching outcomes.   In a brief conclusion, this SR confirmed psychological interventions facilitate positive coaching outcomes and coaching relationship was identified as one of the benchmarks to evaluate concrete coaching outcomes. Furthermore coaching relationship was identified as one of the benchmarks to evaluate concrete coaching outcomes.Most of the short term coaching programmes used "coachees' satisfaction" to show their clients the "effectiveness" of coaching sessions; however scieitific methods are required to provide reliable and valid information for future decision making. Subsequent to this SR, a three-stage extended research was conducted, a total of 75 behavioural indicators were identified and examined through mixed-research methods (Lai & McDowall, 2016).

References

Bachkirova, T. (2008). Role of coaching psychology in defining boundaries between counselling
and coaching. In Palmer S. and Whybrow A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Coaching Psychology: a
Guide for Practitioners*. (2nd ed), (pp. 351-366).

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological
Review, 84(2)*, (pp.191).

Baron, L., & Morin, L. (2009). The coach-coachee relationship in executive coaching: A field study.
Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20(1), (pp. 85-106).

Berglas, S. (2002). The very real dangers of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review, 80(6)*,
(pp. 86-93).

Boyce, L., A Jackson, R Jeffrey Neal, & J, L. (2010). Building successful leadership coaching
relationships: examining impact of matching criteria in a leadership coaching program.
Journal of Management Development, 29(10), (pp. 914-931).

Briner, R. B., Denyer, D., & Rousseau, D. M. (2009). Evidence-based management: concept
cleanup time? *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 23(4)*, (pp. 19-32).

Cavanagh, M. (2006) Coaching from a systematic perspective: a complex adative conversation. In
D.R. Stober and A.M. Grant (eds) *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting Best
Bractices to Work for Your Clients*. Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2014). *Learning and Talent Development
Annual Survey Report*. Retrieved April, 2014, from
https://www.cipd.co.uk/binaries/learning-and-development_2014.pdf

de Haan, E. (2008). *Relational coaching: journeys towards mastering one-to-one learning*.
Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

de Haan, E., Culpin, V. & Curd, J. (2011). Executive coaching in practice: what determines helpfulness for clients of coaching. *Personnel Review 40(1)*, (pp. 24-44).

de Haan, E., Day, A., Sills, C., Bertie C. & Blass E. (2008). Coaches' experience of critical moments in the coaching. *International Coaching Psychology Review 3(3)*, (pp. 207-218)

de Haan, E., Duckworth, A., Birch, D., & Jones, C. (2013). Executive coaching outcome research: The contribution of common factors such as relationship, personality match, and self-efficacy. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 65(1)*, (pp. 40).

Denyer, D. & Tranfield, D. (2011). Producing a systematic review. In Buchanan D. and Bryman A. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Organisational Research Methods.* (2nd ed) (pp. 671-689). London, U.K: Sage.

Ely , K. and Zaccaro , S.J. (2011) Evaluating the effectiveness of coaching – a focus on stakeholders, criteria, and data collection methods . In: G. Hernez-Broome and L. A. Boyce (eds) *Advancing Executive Coaching – Setting the Course for Successful Leadership Coaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass . (pp. 319 – 49).

Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2012). *An Introduction to Systematic Reviews*. London SAGE Publications.

Grant, A. M. (2001). *Toward a psychology of coaching: The impact of coaching on metacognition, mental health and goal attainment*. Sydney: Coaching Psychology Unit, University of Sydney.

Grant, A. M. (2008).Past, present and future: the evolution of professional coaching and coaching psychology. In Palmer S. and Whybrow A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Coaching Psychology: a guide for practitioners*. (2nd ed),) (pp. 23-39). East Sussex Routledge.

Grant, A. M. (2013). The efficacy of coaching. *Handbook of the psychology of coaching and mentoring,* (pp.15-33). Misses publisher and city

Oades, L. G., Green, S. & Grant, A. (2005). An evaluation of a life coaching group program: initial findings from a waitlist control study. In M. Cavanagh, A. Grant & T. Kemp (Eds.), Evidence-based coaching (pp. 127-142). Bowen Hills, Qld, Australia: Australian Academic Press. Misses publisher and city

Greif, S. (2013). Conducting organizational based evaluations of coaching and mentoring programs. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*, (pp. 445-470). Chichester, West Sussex, John Wiley & Sons , Ltd

International Coach Federation (2012). *Global Coaching Study Executive Summary*. Retrieved October 20, 2012, from http://www.coachfederation.org/includes/media/docs/2012ICFGlobalCoachingStudy-ExecutiveSummary.pdf

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1976) Evaluation of training. In: R.L. Craig (ed.) *Training and Development Handbook. A Guide to Human Resource Development.* New York: MacGraw-Hill. (pp. 181 – 91).

Kitchenham, B.A. & Charters, S. (2007). *Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering*, Version 2.3, Keele University, EBSE Technical Report, EBSE-2007-01.

Kraiger, K., Ford , J .K. , & Salas, E. (1993). Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 2, 311– 28.

Lai, Y. & McDowall, A. (2014) A systematic review (SR) of coaching psychology: Focusing on the attributes of effective coaching psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review* 9(2), 120-136.

Lai, Y. M. & McDowall, A. (2016) Enhancing evidence-based coaching practice by developing a

coaching relationship competency framework. In Van Zyl, L.; Odendaal A. and Stander M. (Eds) Coaching Psychology: Meta-theoretical perspectives and applications in Multi-cultural Contexts. Swissland, Springer.

Naughton, J. (2002). The coaching boom: Is it the long-awaited alternative to the medical model? *Psychotherapy Networker, 42, July/August*, (pp. 1–10)

Newnham-Kanas C., Morrow D., & Irwin J.D. (2012). Certified Professional Co-Active Coaches: Why They Enjoy Coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 10 (1)*, (pp. 48-56).

O'Broin, A., & Palmer, S. (2010). Building on an interpersonal perspective on the coaching relationship. *The Coaching Relationship: Putting People First*, (p. 34).

Palmer, S. & McDowall A. (2010). The coaching relationship: putting people first: an introduction. In S. Palmer & A. McDowall (Eds.). *The Coaching Relationship: Putting People First* (pp. 1-8). London: Routledge.

Passmore, J. & Fillery-Travis, A. (2011). A critical review of executive coaching research: a decade of progress and what's to come. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 4(2)*, (pp. 70-88).

Peterson, D.B. and Kraiger, K. (2003) A practical guide to evaluating coaching: Translating state-of-the-art techniques to the real world . In: J.E. Edwards, J.C. Scott, and N.S. Raju (eds) *The Human Resources Program-evaluation Handbook*. London: Sage. (pp. 262 – 282).

Petticrew, M. & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic review in the social sciences: a practical guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rossi , P., & Freeman, E. (1993). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (5th edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching*, *54*(4), (pp. 307-319).

Spence, G. B., & Grant, A. M. (2005). Individual and group life-coaching: Initial findings from a randomised, controlled trial. *Evidence-based coaching, 1*, (pp. 143-158).

Stober, D., Wildflower, L., & Drake, D. (2006). Evidence-based practice: A potential approach for effective coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 4(1)*, (pp. 1-8).

Stober, D. & Grant, A. M. (eds). (2006). *Evicence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting best practices to work for your clients.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

Wampold, B. E. (2001). *The Great Psychotherapy Debate: Models, Methods, and Findings*. New York and London, Routledge.

Whybrow, A. (2008). Coaching Psychology: Coming of Age? *International Coaching Psychology Review, 3(3)*, (pp. 219-240).

Wottawa, H. & Thierau, H. (1998). *Lehrbuch Evaluation*. Bern: Huber