

## **Coaching effectiveness survey instruments: taking stock of measuring the immeasurable**

Julie-Anne Tooth<sup>1</sup>, Sharon Nielsen<sup>2</sup>, Hilary Armstrong<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership, Sydney, Australia*

<sup>2</sup>*Quantitative Consulting Unit, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, Australia*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership, Sydney, Australia*

### **Abstract:**

Measuring the benefits obtained from the use of executive and organisational coaching is of interest both to coaching service providers and to the organisations who engage their services. Survey instruments, designed to measure coaching effectiveness have emerged as a means of easy access to information on the success of the coaching provided to individual recipients (termed in this paper 'coaching counterparts'). However, the appropriateness and reliability of the instruments used are critical to good quality coaching evaluation (Standards Australia, 2011). This paper argues that reliability tests should be undertaken, and assessments made, in terms of the general efficacy of any instrument that is used. It reports on a study that investigated the reliability of a custom-designed survey instrument, the Coaching Effectiveness Survey (CES) which was developed by the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (IECL), a commercial coaching service provider and coach training organisation in Australia. Although the CES has been in use since 2005, this study was completed when a population size of 291 coaching counterparts was reached in 2011. Results revealed that the CES is a reliable survey instrument and that coaching counterparts were most satisfied with the coaching experience for developing benefits in key intrapersonal and interpersonal areas, and importantly, self-efficacy. Finally, this paper reminds us that although no survey instrument is sufficient for measuring the human experience of coaching (the 'immeasurables'), surveys can be a useful and convenient starting point for investigating coaching effectiveness.

**Keywords:** coaching; executive coaching; organisational coaching; coaching evaluation; coaching effectiveness; coaching surveys; leadership development.

## **Introduction**

The development and application of survey tools by coaching providers and practitioners have become a popular method for evaluating the effectiveness of coaching conducted in organisations. This interest is not surprising when the commercial considerations of the industry of coaching are taken into account. Coaches and coaching service providers want to be able to identify factors and data that can be used to differentiate and promote their services and purchasers want to understand what benefits organisational members are receiving from their coaching experiences. It is also understood that the majority of coaches want to follow up with their clients after coaching engagements have concluded (Gale, Liljenstrand, Pardieu, & Nebeker, 2002), suggesting that evaluation is seen by coaches as a *critical window* (Gray, 2004) into coaching practice and as a way of supporting continuing professional and practice development. Despite this interest, it is estimated that only one-third of coaching initiatives are ever evaluated (McDermott, Levenson, & Newton, 2010).

This paper reports on a study of the reliability of the CES, an instrument which was developed in 2005 by the IECL and Changeworks Pty Ltd<sup>i</sup> (a social research organisation) drawing on the results of a series of focus groups that sought to identify the key benefits that coaching counterparts received from executive coaching engagements. At the time the survey was developed, research into coaching effectiveness was still emerging and no suitable instrument could be identified that met all the needs of the IECL, including collecting data for a number of diverse purposes including (1) monitoring and evaluating the quality of the IECL's coaching services; (2) identifying key areas of benefit gained from coaching (and their relevance); highlighting overall satisfaction with the coaching experience and perceptions of value (useful for marketing activities in particular); and (4) providing insights into how the coaching process worked. The IECL, as a provider of a number of executive

coaching programs to a range of organisations, needed a survey that could be easily administered online and distributed to all coaching counterparts at the conclusion of their coaching engagement, regardless of the organisation and industry type, coaching duration, executive coach selected or the psychometric test or 360 degree feedback tool utilised in the coaching (if any). After reviewing the survey related literature available at the time, the IECL decided to develop the CES. Testing the reliability of the CES occurred in 2011 when a population size of 291 coaching counterparts had been obtained for analysis. This study also explored the key benefits obtained by coaching counterparts for the experience of being coached and the relevance of these benefits to them.

### ***Coaching effectiveness survey research***

In their review of the leadership coaching evaluation literature, Ely et. al (2010) identified a total of 49 relevant studies, noting that the most popular approaches to coaching evaluation included the use of a survey instrument (67%) and self-report data from coaching counterparts (98%). Of the identified studies, 27% also evaluated satisfaction with the coaching experience and 49% explored perceived coaching effectiveness. Coincidentally, these features were also reflected in the CES as important and necessary design features. Sample sizes ranged from one participant (Orenstein, 2006) to 404 participants (Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003). The CES lies towards the higher end of the range here, with a sample size of 291. At least two broad categories of survey instruments were used, those designed as an individual evaluation instrument and those designed to evaluate coaching effectiveness with larger populations.

There are many examples in the literature of the application of a purpose designed survey instrument to measure coaching effectiveness at the individual client level. For example, Orenstein (2006) modified Alderfer and Brown's *Empathic Organic Questionnaire*

to incorporate the coaching counterpart's development areas and selected quotes and phrases obtained from the client's 360 degree feedback reports and 15 qualitative interviews to design a survey tailored to the individual being coached. The factors included in the survey included motivation, communication, and interpersonal skills. Similarly, Wasylyshyn, Gronsky and Haas (2006) sought feedback from recipients of coaching and 'others' against agreed coaching areas which were customized to reflect each executive's specific development goals. Results indicated sustained learning and behaviour change in three areas: emotional competence, impact on others and more effective career management. Such survey instruments are very effective for evaluating coaching at the level of the individual coaching counterpart, but they rely on the development (or customisation) of a survey for each participant. This type of approach was not feasible for the IECL, which needed to be able to easily administer a survey to every coaching counterpart and to make comparisons and report overall results.

Other instruments have been designed to be utilised more broadly, for example, across an organisation or across many coaching counterparts. This approach is preferred by organisations and coaching providers (including the IECL), as it is less labour intensive in terms of design than an individually tailored survey instrument and can be used to generalise about the benefits of coaching. These instruments utilise a self-rating approach whereby recipients of executive coaching respond to surveys in terms of their levels of satisfaction and the perceived benefits of coaching. Of most interest to the IECL were those surveys that explored a full range of potential benefits (including intrapersonal and interpersonal areas) and also explored how the coaching process worked. One of the earliest examples was Gegner's (1997) *Coaching Experience Survey* (which contained 52-items on a Likert scale) and was provided to 48 executives who rated the coaching process across eight components: goals, feedback, self-efficacy, rewards, communication style, interpersonal style,

responsibility and awareness. In Gegner's (1997) study, the communication style, personality and skills of the coach were also identified by executives as important for effective coaching to occur. Wasylyshyn (2003) surveyed 87 executives (her own coaching counterparts) asking them to rate their learning sustainability on a 1-10 scale. More than 50% of the coached executives reported a sustainability level between 6 and 8 and more than 33% were at the 9–10 level in areas that included relationship building, self-awareness and leadership (Wasylyshyn, 2003). 75% of the executives also had a favourable reaction to their coach. As part of a larger multi-source feedback study, Smither et.al (2003) utilised their online *Coaching Effectiveness Survey* to invite reactions to the coach and the coaching process from 286 coaching counterparts selected from a total population of 404 managers who had worked with an external coach. Findings from that study indicated that the executives generally had favourable reactions to both the coach and the coaching process with 86.3% of this population wanting to work with a coach again and 78.5% wanting to work with the same coach. Interestingly, the study of Smither et.al was one of the first to include the additional aspects of seeking feedback on coaching effectiveness from multiple sources (including direct reports and supervisors), over a one year time period, and that also included a control group. It demonstrated that managers who worked with an executive coach were more likely (than other managers) to set specific goals, solicit ideas for improvement from their supervisors and demonstrate greater improvement. In a study by Kombarakaran et.al (2008) coaching counterpart perceptions were measured in an online survey that comprised 62 closed-ended and 3 open-ended questions, rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Findings from that study indicated that executive change occurred in five areas: people management, relationships with managers, goal setting and prioritization, engagement and productivity, and dialogue and communication. Almost all respondents (94%) were pleased with their coaches.

### ***Research questions***

The purpose of this study was twofold.

First, the study investigated the reliability of the CES as an instrument for measuring the effectiveness of coaching engagements. In this regard, the study attempted to identify relationships between the following broad categories in the survey: benefit, relevance, expectations, value, satisfaction and the coaching process. This study also explored whether items such as age, gender or number of sessions influenced the responses for each of the broad categories. For brevity here, the findings from this latter analysis, particularly the relationships between the broad categories of: benefit, gender, and number of sessions are to be reported at length in a subsequent paper.

Second, the study evaluated the effectiveness of coaching from the perspective of coaching counterparts who had completed the CES at the end of their coaching engagement. In doing so, the study explored the following questions: (1) What were the key benefits that coaching counterparts reported from their coaching engagement? and (2) What was the relevance of these benefits to their work?

### **Method**

#### ***Participants and procedure***

The participants for this study were 291 coaching counterparts who had undertaken executive coaching with an IECL coach as part of a company-sponsored coaching program in the period between January 2005 and July 2011. All coaching counterparts who undertake coaching with the IECL are routinely sent an invitation via email to complete the online CES at the conclusion of their coaching engagement. At the time this analysis was undertaken, 585 participants had been invited to complete the survey and had voluntarily responded, resulting in a 50% response rate.

Participants provided biographical information, including coach, organisation name, job title, age, position, gender, education and number of coaching sessions. Due to confidentiality provisions, participants' names and other self-identifying information were not obtained. Participants were assured in the invitation email (from the CEO of the IECL) that their individual data would not be shared, for example, with their organisation or their coach. To maintain confidentiality, the database of responses was hosted by an external research firm with restricted access to data reports to an identified IECL researcher.

The participants were employed in a diverse range of organisations in the for-profit, not for profit and government sectors and represented a wide variety of roles and professions including (but not limited to), sales, banking and finance, marketing, IT&T, legal, manufacturing, operations and human resources. Of the total population, 136 of the participants were female and 155 were male. The majority of participants held leadership or managerial positions in their organisations as follows: 6% director or C' level, 13% executive manager, 35% senior manager, and 35% middle manager. The remaining participants were employed as follows: 1% specialist/inhouse consultant and 1% other. 9% of participants responded with 'NA' (not applicable). In terms of age, 42% of participants were aged 45-54 years, 29% 35-44 years; and 23% were 55+. Only 6% were in the age bracket 25-34 years.

### ***Coaching programme***

The coaching was conducted by 56 executive coaches who were employees and subcontracted associates with the IECL. All coaches had completed the IECL's accredited coach training program, were experienced executive coaches and participated regularly in ongoing professional development, including coaching supervision. The IECL typically conducts coaching engagements that comprise a total of 6 or 10 sessions. The average number of sessions undertaken by these participants was 7.

### ***Measures and reliability***

The online CES invited participants to rate the extent of benefit gained from the coaching engagement from a list of 25 potential benefits.. Each item contained a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 0 (*nil benefit*) to 4 (*very considerable benefit*) or NA (not applicable). Reliability was measured on these 25 benefit items (termed the 'Benefit Construct') and resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.96 for a sample size of 166. On the same list of items, participants were then asked to rate the significance (or relevance) of these benefits to their work. Reliability was measured on these 25 benefit items (termed the 'Relevance Construct') and resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.94 for a sample size of 203. The lower sample sizes for these two constructs from a total population of 291 individuals reflects the smaller number of participants who rated all items. For many participants, the 25 items represented a 'shopping list' from which they selected (and therefore rated) only the benefit (and relevance) items that were relevant to their coaching experience.

Participants also rated on a 5-point Likert scale a set of 4 questions related to their expectations of coaching ('Expectation Construct', Cronbach's Alpha 0.82, sample 283); 6 questions related to their perceived value of coaching ('Value Construct', Cronbach's Alpha 0.8, sample 282); 5 questions related to their satisfaction with coaching ('Satisfaction Construct', Cronbach's Alpha 0.85, sample 287); and 9 questions related to how the coaching processes contributed to their benefits gained ('Processes Construct', Cronbach's Alpha 0.88, sample 279).

Nunnally (1978, p. 245) suggests that in statistical terms, Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.7 or higher can represent acceptable levels of reliability in basic research. The values in this study are all higher than 0.8, with the benefit and relevance Cronbach's Alpha values at very high levels of 0.96 and 0.94 respectively.

Face validity of the CES had been confirmed when the instrument was developed. Coaches and employees employed at the IECL, members of the original focus group and a selection of 25 coaching counterparts from an insurance organisation confirmed that it 'looked like' it was going to measure what it had been designed to measure.

## **Results**

### ***Coaching benefits and relevance***

Table 1 shows the distribution of ratings for each question and the proportion of questions that had no rating for Benefit and Relevance respectively. The highest rated % shows the items that were rated most highly by coaching counterparts (rated at the highest two levels of the 5-point Likert scale). The questions were ranked in order from the highest rated to the lowest rated. A proportion of missing values calculation was undertaken on the questions in the Benefit and Relevance categories. Calculation of the proportion of missing values was meaningful, as participants in completing the survey could select from a set list of 25 items those that were relevant to them. The benefit and relevance items with a low proportion score therefore represent the benefit (and relevance) items which were seen as sufficiently important enough by participants: (1) to provide a rating for them; and (2) to rate as having benefit (or relevance).

### ***Intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits***

As can be seen from Table 1, the key *benefits* reported by participants included benefits associated with understanding self and self-awareness as well communicating effectively with others. These can be broadly described as intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits. The list also includes benefit items related to confidence/self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the

perception/belief people have about their capacity to achieve in relation to actions and goals (Bandura, 1994). Key benefits included:

- Awareness of my underlying personal issues
- Ability to look openly at my personal strengths as well as my challenges
- Ability to give professional and personal feedback to colleagues
- Ability to look at new ways at the issues and problems I am facing
- New insights and understanding of colleagues behaviours
- Ability to discuss heated issues constructively
- Confidence in my ability to model appropriate behaviour and work styles
- Ability to communicate my ideas persuasively to others
- Confidence in my ability to mentor and support members of my staff
- Ability to speak openly to superiors and colleagues about what I see

### ***Intrapersonal and interpersonal relevance***

As can be seen from Table 1, the key items *relevant to their work* reported by participants similarly included items of an intrapersonal and interpersonal nature and also confidence/self-efficacy. Key benefits relevant to work included:

- Ability to give professional and personal feedback to colleagues
- Ability to communicate my ideas persuasively to others
- Ability to discuss heated issues constructively
- Ability to look openly at my personal strengths as well as my challenges
- Ability to look at new ways at the issues and problems I am facing
- Ability to speak openly to superiors and colleagues about what I see
- Confidence in my ability to mentor and support members of staff.
- Confidence in my ability to model appropriate behaviour and work styles

- New insights and understanding of colleagues behaviours

### ***Relationship between Benefit and Relevance Constructs***

A Spearman Rank correlation test identified a significant relationship between Benefit and Relevance constructs, having a p-value < 0.001. The Spearman Rank correlation coefficient was calculated between the average of all questions in the Benefit and Relevance Constructs and was 0.9. This means that the benefit items selected by participants as developed in coaching were highly relevant to their work.

### **Discussion**

The analyses undertaken has indicated that the CES is a reliable survey instrument based on statistical tests, which included the calculation of the Spearman Rank correlation co-efficient and proportion of missing values analyses. In reviewing coaching evaluation studies, Ely et.al (2010) reported that the majority of studies (69%) presented data using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and means, while fewer studies used interpretive statistics (47%) or inferential statistics (33%). The statistical testing of survey instruments such as the CES is important for ensuring quality coaching evaluation.

The findings for the IECL's CES are consistent with the results of other self-rated coaching effectiveness survey instruments with the most highly rated coaching benefits reported in intrapersonal and interpersonal areas.. In Gegner's (1997) study, 100% of the executives reported learning more about themselves (awareness) or gaining new skills as the most valuable outcome from the coaching process and 24% noted that they had experienced increased personal growth, such as becoming more open to change and having greater self-confidence. Increased self-awareness and understanding were also reported by 48% of participants in Wasylyshyn's (2003) study of her coaching counterparts. As well, 45% of

participants indicated that they were more effective leaders, e.g citing increased optimism, better confidence and motivational ability, and 63% experienced sustained behaviour change (e.g became better at building relationships). Findings of a study by Kombarakaran et.al (2008) also highlighted the impact of coaching on executive self-awareness and indicated that the combination of these insights with new behavioural skills, resulted in executives in that study demonstrating increased confidence in their leadership ability.

The results from the IECL's CES suggest strongly that the influence of coaching is first and foremost in the domain of self-efficacy. The principal evidence for the primacy of self-efficacy is that the benefits rated the most highly were those to do with self-perception and how it is played out in the workplace, especially in terms of conducting oneself in relationships with colleagues and superiors. This suggests what may be the most important finding of the survey: that the impact of coaching conversations and the change they produce is less in the domain of management techniques and tools and more in the domain of intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships. Less important appear to be general management tasks such as measuring team effectiveness, delegating or monitoring tasks, or strategic context issues. Also in this group, and perhaps surprising, are issues of job satisfaction, stress and work-life balance. Although some psychological literature emphasises the impact of coaching in reducing stress either directly or indirectly (Grant, 2001; 2003; Gyllensten and Palmer, 2006), respondents in this study so far have not rated this benefit highly. However, as one study (Jex and Bliese, 1999) showed, the ongoing development of self-efficacy may have a moderating effect on the stressors over time. In their study of 2,000 Army officers in the US, the researchers concluded that officers with high self-efficacy were not as threatened by stressors and developed more effective ways of coping with them. This may be the case with coaching counterparts in this study.

The importance of coaching for increasing self-efficacy has also been reported in coaching research. For example, in research undertaken in Australia, Finn (2007) undertook three studies focused on the experience of 23 leaders in a year-long leadership development program, demonstrating that executive coaching positively enhanced self-efficacy (among other psychological states) and that these results were sustained over time (as measured 6 months later). Steinwedel (2001) reported an increase in self-efficacy and the ability to achieve goals among an experimental group of 12 college students who participated in weekly coaching sessions over 16 weeks. Similarly, Evers, Brouwers and Tomic (2006) in a study of 30 managers in a government department in the Netherlands, found that coaching was effective in increasing self-efficacy beliefs with respect to setting one's own goals. Dingman (2004) surveyed 104 executives to explore the impact of executive coaching and the quality of coaching relationship on self-efficacy and four job-related attitudes including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, work/family conflict, and family/work conflict. Interestingly, Dingman (2004) found that the quality of the coaching relationship related to higher self-efficacy in the executives. Gegner (1997) (referred to earlier) also reported that the self-efficacy experienced by coaching counterparts was the most critical component of the coaching process.

## **Limitations**

Several limitations were identified in this study.

The design of the online survey itself resulted in much smaller sample sizes than anticipated for reliability. The Benefit Construct had a sample size of 166 and the Relevance Construct a sample size of 203. As described in the results section, this was a product of the initial survey design, which did not require participants to rate each of the 25 items. As can be seen from this analysis, the majority of participants rated only those items that were

meaningful to them from the entire of list of 25 items. The discovery of this limitation has resulted in a change being made to the online CES survey format, which now requires participants to rate each of the 25 items in both constructs. Each item contains a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 0 (*nil benefit*) to 4 (*very considerable benefit*) or NA (not applicable). Participants must include a rating for every single item. This should greatly improve the sample size for future analyses. These analyses should also include further validity testing of the CES as the conduct of face validity testing only is considered another limitation of the instrument. As a client, self-rated instrument, the CES gathers the perceptions of coaching counterparts as to the benefits they have obtained from coaching. This is at Level 1 of participant reaction according to Kirkpatrick's (1994) popular framework for training evaluation. The identified benefits of coaching are self-reported and not triangulated by input from others such as peers, direct reports or supervisors. Although personal reactions provide valuable information on coaching counterparts' perceptions of coaching, they are not assessments of learning and behaviour (Ely, et al., 2010). Findings of observed behavioural changes and performance-related impacts of coaching are often highly valued by organisations which want to identify and quantify the more obvious and tangible benefits from their coaching investments. In the coaching literature, researchers have focused on obtaining feedback on the benefits obtained from executive coaching, not only from the client who has received the coaching, but also from other stakeholders such as the coach, the individual's leader and human resources representative (Dagley, 2006; Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999; McGovern et al., 2001; Olivero, Bane, & Kopelman, 1997; Sullivan, 2006). Ely et.al (2010) have argued that using this type of multi-source data would bring added validity to coaching evaluation research. Future research directions at the IECL involve the implementation of a 360 degree feedback component to the CES to enable changes in behaviour to be reported by others.

The design of the study also assumes that the ideal time to complete the CES is after a coaching engagement has concluded. This summative approach does not take into account that the coaching counterpart's perceptions of benefit and relevance may change over the duration of the coaching engagement. We do not currently know whether the reported benefits at the end of the coaching are consistent with the benefits that coaching counterparts would have reported at various stages during the coaching engagement itself. Further research could investigate how coaching counterpart perceptions of benefit and relevance develop, and are reported, during the course of a coaching engagement.

A survey response rate higher than 50% would also be beneficial in terms of a sample size for analysis of the CES results. Participation is entirely voluntary, and it is not currently understood is whether there is a tendency for those who had a positive experience to complete the survey (as the results are overall highly positive). One reminder email is sent to encourage completion and to promote survey completion. In doing so, the IECL balances the desire to encourage survey responses without being seen to coerce participation.

## **Implications**

It is important that providers of coaching services, coaches and organisations consider carefully the survey instruments they choose for evaluating coaching engagements. If existing instruments are chosen, users should ensure that relevant reliability tests have been undertaken and that they fully understand the way in which such measures should be effectively administered to support repeatability. When coaches, coaching providers and organisations develop their own measures and instruments, such as the CES as developed by the IECL, reliability tests should also be undertaken and assessments made in terms of the instrument's general efficacy. Coaches must know and understand the limits of the instruments they use (and their own capabilities in using such instruments), particularly as the

data obtained can sometimes be used as input for important individual and organisational decisions (Standards Australia, 2011). As informed purchasers of coaching services, organisations can insist on understanding the reliability of any instrument or measure that a coach or coaching services provider uses in measuring the effectiveness of coaching with clients.

However, despite our attempts to select tried and tested measures, the sorts of instruments used to evaluate coaching are not, and by their very nature cannot, be entirely objective. The design of survey instruments is based on the assumptions, philosophical positions and world-views of their designers. The questions chosen, the way surveys are structured and the choices that are made about what is included (and what is not) are all based on assumptions about cause (and effect) and define what is being measured in particular ways. Clients' responses to coaching evaluation surveys entail a highly subjective and interpretive process, influenced by participant's understanding and assigned meanings and a complex range of factors. This means that no instrument is absolutely valid or reliable—all are subject to error (Standards Australia, 2011). We must therefore approach the use of these types of surveys with appropriate care and caution and remind ourselves that coaching is a human and individually experienced phenomenon, which cannot be reduced to absolutes through the use of such instruments. This was reinforced in Bougae's (2005) study in which the executives who had received coaching suggested that it was difficult to describe the impact of executive coaching by showing correlations between coaching and measurable results. Coaching survey data can provide valuable insights into patterns and themes in coaching and can inform coaching practice, but there are many other aspects of the coaching experience that do not lend themselves to measurement.

## **Conclusion**

The study was conducted: (1) to investigate the reliability of the CES as an instrument for measuring the effectiveness of coaching engagements, and (2) to evaluate the effectiveness of coaching from the perspective of coaching counterparts who had completed the CES at the end of their coaching engagement. Coaching counterparts reported overall satisfaction with the coaching experience for developing benefits in key intrapersonal and interpersonal areas and importantly, self-efficacy. The CES was tested and found to be a reliable instrument; limitations and future applications of the survey were also identified. This study demonstrates the importance and value of testing the reliability of survey instruments that are to be used for measuring coaching effectiveness. Finally, this paper indicates that no survey instrument is entirely objective and that not everything that is relevant to the human experience of coaching can indeed be measured, even if key stakeholders would very much like that to be the case.

**Table 1 Coaching benefits and relevance**

Question	Benefits								Relevance							
	0	1	2	3	4	N/A	Highest rated %	Proportion missing analyses %	0	1	2	3	4	N/A	Highest rated %	Proportion missing analyses %
Awareness of my underlying personal issues	5	17	35	95	118	21	73%	7.2	13	16	56	83	111	12	67%	4.1
Ability to look openly at my personal strengths as well as my challenges	5	13	50	105	101	17	71%	5.8	6	16	38	100	117	14	75%	4.8
Ability to give personal and professional feedback to colleagues	6	11	48	131	67	28	68%	9.6	10	7	29	117	105	23	76%	7.9
Ability to look in new ways at the issues and problems I am facing	5	19	56	97	99	15	67%	5.2	7	14	45	104	108	13	73%	4.5
New insights and understanding of colleague's behaviours	4	17	59	96	91	24	64%	8.2	8	11	51	93	108	20	69%	6.9
Ability to discuss heated issues constructively	8	14	54	103	83	29	64%	10	13	12	30	100	117	19	75%	6.5
Confidence in my ability to model appropriate behaviour and work styles	2	20	56	109	76	28	64%	9.6	7	16	46	101	101	20	69%	6.9
Ability to communicate my ideas persuasively to others	7	21	60	113	70	20	63%	6.9	6	11	36	108	113	17	76%	5.8
Confidence in my ability to mentor and support members of my staff	12	14	50	89	92	34	62%	11.7	16	16	34	80	125	20	70%	6.9
Ability to speak openly to superiors and colleagues about what I see	6	21	55	109	71	29	62%	10	14	16	36	88	117	20	70%	6.9
Improved ability to deal with workplace conflict	8	21	52	99	75	36	60%	12.4	12	10	48	92	104	25	67%	8.6
The confidence to pursue my goals wholeheartedly	15	21	53	88	84	30	59%	10.3	12	16	58	86	92	27	61%	9.3
New ways to enhance my relationships with colleagues	5	16	69	103	64	34	57%	11.7	10	8	55	94	96	28	65%	9.6
Visible improvements in my own and/or team's performance	10	15	67	91	73	35	56%	12	10	10	55	85	102	29	64%	10
Awareness of negative self-talk that stops be acting to my full potential	13	26	45	67	97	43	56%	14.8	24	22	43	76	100	26	60%	8.9
Awareness and understanding of team dynamics	5	29	57	100	63	37	56%	12.7	15	16	48	100	87	25	64%	8.6
Clearer vision of my professional development and career path	8	27	65	81	76	34	54%	11.7	19	19	65	75	93	20	58%	6.9
Improved capacity to solve problems I come up against in my work	12	17	69	93	61	39	53%	13.4	14	18	53	98	80	28	61%	9.6
Capacity to empathise with colleagues and their concerns and issues	10	26	65	100	53	37	53%	12.7	13	18	63	99	76	22	60%	7.6
Ability to establish, and work towards, key performance priorities	16	20	55	87	63	50	52%	17.2	22	20	49	88	82	30	58%	10.3
Ability to delegate tasks to others and motivate their performance	11	27	60	83	59	51	49%	17.5	24	13	49	82	92	31	60%	10.7
Capacity to see the bigger picture of the business within which I work	17	33	58	77	55	51	45%	17.5	19	23	49	86	81	33	57%	11.3
An increase in the satisfaction I gain from work	18	35	70	71	57	40	44%	13.7	17	21	76	77	71	29	51%	10
Ways of reducing my levels of stress with work	14	34	76	61	58	48	41%	16.5	21	16	78	66	81	29	51%	10
A better sense of balance between my work and home life and leisure	20	31	69	71	47	53	41%	18.2	26	20	68	71	71	35	49%	12

## References

- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bougae, C. (2005). *A descriptive study of the impact of executive coaching from the perspective of the executive leader*. Unpublished Ph.D., Capella University, United States -- Minnesota.
- Dagley, G. (2006). Human resources professionals' perceptions of executive coaching: Efficacy, benefits and return on investment. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 1(2), 34-44.
- Dingman, M. E. (2004). *The effects of executive coaching on job-related attitudes*. Unpublished Ph.D., Regent University, United States -- Virginia.
- Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leadership coaching: A review and integrated framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(4), 585-599.
- Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2006). A Quasi-experimental Study on Management Coaching Effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research Summer*, 58(3), 174-182.
- Finn, F. A. (2007). *Leadership Development Through Executive Coaching: The Effect on Leaders' Psychological States and Transformational Leadership Behaviour*. Queensland University of Technology.
- Gale, J., Liljenstrand, A., Pardieu, J., & Nebeker, D. (2002). Executive Summary. Coaching: Who, what, where and how. Retrieved 25 May 2007, 2007, from [http://www.badergroup.com/coaching\\_summary.pdf](http://www.badergroup.com/coaching_summary.pdf)
- Gegner, C. (1997). Summary of Executive Coaching Research Project. Retrieved 20 September 2006, 2006, from <http://www.coachingnetwork.org.uk/ResourceCentre/Articles/>
- Gray, D. E. (2004). Principles and processes in coaching evaluation. *International Journal of Coaching and Mentoring*, 2(2).
- Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27(3), 39-53.
- Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Executive Coaching: A Comprehensive Review of the Literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research Fall*, 53(4), 205-228.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: the four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kombarakaran, F. A., Yang, J. A., Baker, M. N., & Fernandes, P. B. (2008). *Executive coaching: It works!* : Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research Vol 60(1) Mar 2008, 78-90.
- McDermott, M., Levenson, A., & Newton, S. (2010). What coaching can and cannot do for your organization. *Human Resource Planning*, 30, 30-37.
- McGovern, J., Lindemann, M., Vergara, M., Murphy, S., Barker, L., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2001). Maximizing the impact of executive coaching: Behavioral change, organizational outcomes, and return on investment. *Manchester Review*, 6, 1-9.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olivero, G., Bane, K., & Kopelman, R. E. (1997). Executive coaching as a transfer of training tool: Effects on productivity in a public agency. *Public Personnel Management*, 26(4), 461-469.

- Orenstein, R. L. (2006). Measuring Executive Coaching Efficacy? The Answer Was Right Here All the Time. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research Spring*, 58(2), 106-116.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(1), 23-44.
- Standards Australia. (2011). HB 332-2011 Coaching in organisations. Sydney: SAI Global Limited.
- Steinwedel, S. C. (2001). *An evaluation of the effects of an individually tailored coaching intervention used with allied health students at Delaware Technical and Community College*. Wilmington College.
- Sullivan, M. A. (2006). *The effectiveness of executive coaching in the development of emotional intelligence competencies*. Unpublished Ed.D., Spalding University, United States -- Kentucky.
- Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 55(2), 94-106.
- Wasylyshyn, K. M., Gronsky, B., & Haas, J. (2006). Tigers, stripes, and behavior change: Survey results of a commissioned coaching program. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58(2), 65-81.

Corresponding author: Julie-Anne Tooth, [jat@iecl.com](mailto:jat@iecl.com)



Julie-Anne Tooth is currently finalising her PhD research into the nature and experience of executive coaching in Australia with the Education for Practice Institute (EFPI) at Charles Sturt University. She also undertakes research at the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (IECL) and is a practising executive/organisational coach.



Sharon Nielsen is the Director of the Quantitative Consulting Unit (QCU) at Charles Sturt University. The QCU provides statistical support and consulting services for research activities conducted by the University. She is also a Lecturer in Statistics in the School of Computing and Mathematics, Faculty of Business.



Dr Hilary Armstrong is the Director of Education at the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (IECL) and is responsible for the design and development of the organisation's training and education programs for professional coaches and clients. She is a Master Coach and an experienced facilitator, researcher and educator.

To cite this article: Julie-Anne Tooth, Sharon Nielsen & Hilary Armstrong (2013): Coaching effectiveness survey instruments: taking stock of measuring the immeasurable, *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, DOI:10.1080/17521882.2013.802365

---

<sup>i</sup>We acknowledge the work of Dr Peter Melser from Changeworks Pty Ltd in the design of the CES