Microanalysis of the coaching process: developing an instrument and comparing typical sessions by different coaches (tables, figures and bibliography)

Tatiana Bachkirova, Jonathan Sibley and Adrian Myers

Item No	Statements of the Coaching Process Inventory
1	There is an exploration of the effect of client's choice of words
2	There is an exploration of the client's values
3	There is an exploration of the client's environmental influences (e.g., organizational, family, politics, history)
4	There is an exploration of the client's underlying mindset (e.g., assumptions, beliefs, stories)
5	Coach and client explore the deeper meaning of a presenting issue
6	Coach works with the client's apparent defensiveness
7	Coach points out recurrent theme in client's behaviour
8	Coach points out potential unconscious motives of the client (out of the client's awareness)
9	There is an exploration of the client's in session non-verbal behavior
10	Coach invites client to consider other people's perspectives on an issue
11	Coach initiates exploration of client's resources and how they might be leveraged (including strengths, accomplishments, and/or external resources)
12	Coach explores client's emotions
13	Coach encourages client to feel more deeply within session
14	Coach encourages client to become more aware of his immediate experience in the session
15	Coach challenges client's perspective of situation and/or self
16	Coach asks client to quantify feeling / perception / issue using a scale
17	There is one or more periods of silent reflection
18	There is a discussion of the results of a psychometric instrument
19	There is a discussion of external feedback
20	Coach gives feedback from coach's experience of client
21	Coach discloses own feelings/ bodily sensations evoked in the session
22	There appears to be a productive use of metaphors
23	Coach and client explore their differences in perception of the situation
24	Coach expands on client's statements
25	Coach provides reassurance to client
26	Coach uses humor
27	Coach shows empathy
28	Coach shares personal details about herself
29	Coach discloses own fallibility
30	There appears to be rapport (strong connection) between client and coach
31	Coach and client appear to understand each other
32	Coach and client discuss their relationship
33	Coach asks for permission to give feedback
34	Coach repeats client's words back to him
35	Coach paraphrases the client's statements
36	Coach checks if her understanding is correct
37	There is a sense of optimism in the coaching session

38	There appears to be a shift in energy during the coaching session
39	Coach and client appear to be engaged (vs. disengaged)
40	Coach follows up on key / significant statements made by client
41	Coach asks questions helping the client to elaborate
42	There is a discussion of the coaching "contract"
43	There is a discussion of issues related to the termination of coaching
44	There is a discussion of boundaries and/or ethical issues related to the coaching engagement
45	There is a discussion of a potential referal to an outside specialist (e.g., therapist, doctor, financial advisor)
46	The session is fast-paced
47	The session appears highly structured
48	Coach and client appear to bring the session to closure easily
49	Coach and client discuss the process of the session
50	Coach takes an active role during the session
51	Coach makes explicit a shift in role during the session (e.g., acting as consultant, teacher, therapist)
52	Coach explains the reason behind using a specific intervention
53	Coach appears to be using an intervention mechanistically
54	Coach appears to be pursuing her own agenda
55	Client takes initiative in structuring the session
56	There is a discussion of client's feedback on coaching
57	Coach makes sounds or non-verbally encourages client to continue
58	Coach is verbose
59	Coach interrupts client
60	Client interrupts coach
61	Coach suggests in-session exercise / activity
62	Coach broadens the focus of discussions
63	Coach asks questions that appear to open new possibilities for the client
64	Coach appears to focus on a third-party's agenda (e.g., organization, partner, parents)
65	Client suggests his next course of action
66	There is a discussion of new practices for the client
67	Coach offers possible solutions
68	Coach suggests homework for client
69	Coach shares her knowledge about topic
70	Coach gives advice
71	Coach follows up on previous homework
72	Coach encourages client to make choices
73	Coach asks the client to describe key learnings / take-aways from session
74	There is a discussion of the client's progress
75	There is a discussion about the client's overall goals
76	There is a discussion about how to measure the success of the coaching engagement
77	Coach redirects client to client's agenda
78	Coach explores client's level of engagement in coaching
79	Coach inquires about client's aim for the session
80	There is a discussion of the client's impact on his environment (e.g., organization, family)

Table 1   Full set of statements

Themes	Interpretation
1 Focus on the client	
54 Coach appears to be pursuing her own agenda -5 (i.e. highly uncharacteristic) *64 Coach appears to focus on a third-party's agenda. -4* *79: Coach inquires about client's aim for the session +4* *75 There is a discussion about the client's overall goals +3*	The viewpoint expressed in the factor array is that a typical coaching session is about firmly being of service to the concerns of the client.
41 Coach asks questions helping the client to elaborate +5 *40 Coach follows up on key/significant statements made by the client +2* *11 Coach initiates exploration of client's resources and how they might be leveraged +2* *70 Coach gives advice -4 (i.e. Does not give own worldview)* *59 Coach interrupts the client*	Within this service context, the role of the coach is to ask questions and to work with the sense making processes, worldview and resources of the client rather than from her own or others' frame of reference. The session is about the client, not the coach
72 Coach encourages client to make choices +1 *74 There is discussion of the client's progress +1* *77 Coach redirects client to client's agenda 0*	Understanding the client and working to his immediate in-session concerns appear to be more important than elements of the coaching session that might suggest an active role of the coach in speeding the process or holding the client accountable.
3 There is an exploration of the client's environmental influences (e.g. organizational, family, politics, history) 0 *80 There is a discussion of the client's impact on his environment (e.g. organization, family) 0* *10 Coach invites client to consider other people's perspectives +1* *19 There is a discussion of external feedback -1* *20 Coach gives feedback from coach's experience of client +1* *23 Coach and client explore their differences in perception of the situation 0* *24 Coach expands on client's statements +1* *29 Coach discloses own fallibility-1* *33 Coach asks for permission to give feedback 0* *50 Coach takes an active role in the session 0* *62 Coach broadens the focus of discussions 0*	Some items occupying a mid-range position also seem to indicate a shift in the focus of the session away from the worldview of the client. They relate more to the perspective of others, to the client in relation to others or to influencing factors in the formulation of the client's worldview rather than to the immediate worldview of the client. This does not mean that these aspects of the session are not important; only that they were rated as less salient than the central concerns about focusing on the client's worldview. They seem supportive rather than essential in a typical mid-engagement coaching session.
2 Connection and positivity	**Interpretation**
30 There appears to be rapport (strong connection) +4 *36: Coach checks if her understanding is correct +3* *27 Coach shows empathy +4* *31 Coach and client appear to understand each other +2*	High value is given to the importance of connection, warmth, understanding and respect.
63 Coach asks questions that appear to open new possibilities for the client +5 *37 There is a sense of optimism in the coaching session +3*	A sense of hope and positivity is also evident in rating a typical session.
3 Fluidity of process	**Interpretation**
47 The session appears highly structured -4 *39 Coach and client appear to be engaged +3* *46 The session is fast-paced -3*	The coaching session is considered to be fluid and absorbing but not fast paced or highly structured.
51 Coach makes explicit a shift in role during the session -2 *52 Coach explains the reason behind using a specific intervention 0*	A mid ranking position for items relating to transparency does not mean that they are considered unimportant but that coaches give

	more saliency in their ratings of a typical session to items that ensure engagement and "flow" (Czikszentimihalyi, 1991).
4 Collaboration vs expert mode	**Interpretation**
8 Coach points out potential unconscious motives of the client (out of client's awareness) -2 *6 Coach works with client's apparent defensiveness -2* *13 Coach encourages client to feel more deeply within session -3*	In this group of coaches there seemed to be a general tendency not to consider coaching as a process of uncovering unconscious motivations or feelings as in some therapeutic contexts or particular traditions of coaching.
18 There is a discussion of the results of a psychometric instrument -2	In a typical mid engagement session, the use of psychometric instruments, which typically seek to classify or reach a deeper "expert" insight into the "psyche" of the client, has not been seen as prominent,.
5 Coach and client explore the deeper meaning of a presenting issue +2 *15 Coach challenges client's perspective of situation and/or self +2* *7 Coach points out recurrent theme in client's behaviour +2* *4 There is an exploration of the client's underlying mindset +4* *2 There is an exploration of the client's values +3*	However, deeper meanings of the client's worldview or behavioural patterns are explored together with clients.
5 Role of important but unusual events	**Interpretation**
45 There is discussion of a potential referral to an outside specialist (e.g. therapist, doctor, financial advisor) -3 *43 There is a discussion of issues related to the termination of coaching -3* *44 There is a discussion of boundaries and/or ethical issues related to the coaching engagement -2* *78 Coach explores client's level of engagement in coaching -2*	These events which seem to represent a challenge to the collaborative work of coach and client, while clearly of significance in some coaching sessions may not appear common in a typical coaching session. This supports earlier research e.g. De Haan, 2010).

Table 2 Interpretation of factor array

Bibliography

Ablon, J. S., Levy, R.A., & Katzenstein, T. (2006). Beyond brand names of psychotherapy: Identifying empirically supported change processes. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 43, 216-231

Ablon, J. S., Jones, E.E. (1999). Psychotherapy Process in the National Institute of Mental Health Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 64-75.

Ablon, J. S., & Jones, E. E. (1998). How expert clinicians' prototypes of an ideal treatment correlate with outcome in psychodynamic and cognitive behavioural therapy. *Psychotherapy Research*, 8, 71-83.

Bachkirova, T. & Cox, E., (2004). A bridge over troubled water: bringing together coaching and counselling, *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 2 (2), June 2004, also in *Counselling at Work, (2005),* Issue 48, Spring, pp. 2-9.

Bachkirova, T. & Kauffman, C. (2009). The blind men and the elephant: using criteria of universality and uniqueness in evaluating our attempts to define coaching, *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice,* 2 (2), 95-105.

Bachkirova, T., Sibley, J. & Myers, A. (2011). *Development of an instrument for microanalysis of coaching sessions*, http://www.instituteofcoaching.org/Index.cfm?page=breakingresearch

Behrendt, P. (2004). *Wirkfaktoren im Coaching.* Diplom thesis, Institute of Psychology, University of Freiburg, Germany.

Berglas, S. (2002) The Dangers of Executive Coaching, *Harvard Business Review,* June, 86-92.

Block, J. (2008). *The Q-Sort in Character Appraisal Encoding Subjective Impressions of Persons Quantitatively*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Block, J., & Eagle, M. (1963). The Q-Sort Method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 136*(6), pp. 604-605.

Bono, J., Purvanova, R., Towler, A. & Peterson, D. (2009). A Survey of Executive Coaching Practices, *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 361-404.

Borgatti, S., & Halgin, D. (2011). Consensus Analysis, in Editor(s): D. Kronenfeld, G. Bennardo, V. de Munck, and M. Fischer (eds) *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology,(pp.* 171-190), Blackwell Publishing

Brown, S.R. (1980). *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cox, E., Bachkirova, T. & Clutterbuck, D. (Eds) (2010). *The Complete Handbook of Coaching,* London: Sage

Czikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper and Row.

De Haan, E. (2008). Relational Coaching: Journeys Towards Mastering One-to-One Learning, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

De Haan, E., Bertie, C.,& Sills, C. (2010). Critical moments of clients and coaches: A direct-comparison study. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 5, 2,109-128.

De Rivera, J. (1981). *Conceptual Encounter*: A Method for the Exploration of Human Experience. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Dziopa, F., & Ahem, K. (2011). A systematic literature review of the applications of Q-technique and its methodology. *European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 39-55.

Elliott, R. (2010). Psychotherapy Change Process Research: Realizing the Promise. *Psychotherapy Research*, 20(2), 123-135.

Ferrar, P. (2004). Defying Definition. Competencies in Coaching and Mentoring. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring,* 2(2), 53-60.

Fillery-Travis, A. & Lane, D. (2006). Does coaching work or are we asking the wrong question? International Coaching Psychology Review, 1(1), 23-36.

Gassmann, D. & Grawe, K. (2006). General Change Mechanisms: The Relation Between Problem Activation and Resource Activation in Successful and Unsuccessful Therapeutic Interactions. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 13(1), 1-11.

Goldman, I. (1999). Q Methodology as Process and Context in Interpretivism, Communication and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Research. The *Psychological Record*, 49(4), 589-604.

Grant, A. (2006). A personal perspective on professional coaching and development of coaching psychology, *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 1 (1), 12-22.

Grawe, K., Donati, R. & Bernauer, F. (1994). *Psychotherapie im Wandel: von der Konfession zur Profession.* Hogrefe: Göttingen.

Grawe, K. (2006). *Neuropsychotherapy: How the Neurosciences Inform Effective Psychotherapy*: Erlbaum.

Grawe, K. (2000). Psychologische Therapie (2. korr. Aufl.). Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Greif S., Schmidt F. Thamm, A. (2010). *The Rating of Eight Coaching Success Factors – Observation Manual* as found at http://www.home.uni-osnabrueck.de/sgreif/downloads/Rating_of_Coaching_Success_Factors_Version4-May_2010.pdf

Jones, E.E. (2000). *Therapeutic Action: A guide to psychoanalytic therapy.* Northvale: Jason Aronson.

Kilberg, R. R. (1996). Towards a Conceptual Understanding and Definition of Executive Coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48(2), 134-144.

Lowman, R.L. (2005). Executive Coaching: The Road to Dodoville Needs Paving With More Than Good Assumptions. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 57, 90-96.

McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). *Quantitative applications in the social sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Palmer, S., & Whybrow, A. (Eds.) (2007). *Handbook of Coaching Psychology: A guide for practitioners*. Hove: Routledge.

Pole, N., Ablon, J.S., O'Connor, L.,& Weiss, J. (2002). *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 39(1), 88-96.

Pole, N., Ablon, J. S., O'Connor, L.E. (2008). Using Psychodynamic, Cognitive Behavioural, and Control Mastery Prototypes to predict change: A new look at an old paradigm for long-term single-case research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(2), 221-232.

Rice, L.N., & Greenberg, L.S. (Eds.), (1984). *Patterns of change: Intensive analysis of psychotherapeutic process.* New York: Guilford Press.

Romney, A. (1999). Cultural Consensus as a Statistical Model. *Current Anthropology, 40* (S1), 93-115.

Romney, A., Weller, S., & Batchelder, W. (1986). Culture as consensus: A theory of culture and informant accuracy. *American Anthropologist,* 313-338.

Schmidt, F. & Thamm, A. (2008). Wirkungen und Wirkfaktoren im Coaching. – Verringerung von Prokrastination und Optimierug des Lernverhaltens bei Studierenden. Diplom thesis, Work and Organizational Psychology Unit, University of Osnabrück, Germany.

Shedler, J., & Westen, D. (1998). Redefining personality disorder diagnosis: Integrating science and practice. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161, 1350-1365.

Schottenbauer, M., Arnkoff, D.B., Glass, C.R., & Gray, S.H. (2006). Psychotherapy for PTSD in the Community: Reported Prototypical Treatments. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 13, (2), 108-122.

Siegfried, J. (Ed), (1995). *Therapeutic and Everyday Discourse as Behaviour Change: Towards a Micro-analysis in Psychotherapy Process Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Sherman, S. & Freas, A. (2004). The Wild West of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review,* 82, (11), 82 – 90.

Stein, I.F. (2009). Which hat am I wearing now?: an evidence-based tool for coaching self-reflection Coaching. *An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice,* 2 (2),163-75.

Stenner, P., Cooper, D.,& Skevington, S. M. (2003). Putting the Q into quality of life; the identification of subjective constructions of health-related quality of life using Q methodology *Social Science & Medicine,* 57, 2161–2172.

Stenner, P., Watts, S., Worrell, M. (2007). In C Willig & W. Stainton Rogers (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology.* London: Sage.

Stephenson, W. (1935). Correlating persons instead of tests. *Character and Personality,* 4, 17-24.

Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behaviour: Q technique and its methodology.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stober, D.R., & Grant, A.M. (2006). *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting best practice to work for your clients,* New York: Wiley.

Watts, S. (2002). *Stories of partnership love: Q methodological investigations.* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of East London.

Watts, S. & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 67-91.

Weller, S. (2007). Cultural consensus theory: Applications and frequently asked questions. *Field Methods, 19*(4), 339-368.