

The Rating of Eight Coaching Success Factors - Observation Manual -

Siegfried Greif

Frank Schmidt

André Thamm

Version 4

May 2010

We are very grateful to Jennifer Boeun Lee, MA (Harvard), Research Assistant, Evidence Based Psychology, Cambridge (MA) for her editorial support of the English translation.

1 Introduction: Hypothetical success factors that predict coaching outcomes

Can hypothesized success factors, determined via behavioral observation of coaching sessions, predict coaching outcomes? Behrendt (2004) first studied possible success factors in coaching by observing the behavior of coaches in coaching sessions. Using success factors and methods of behavior observation adopted from the psychotherapeutic outcome research of Grawe, Donati and Bernauer (1994), Behrendt recorded a total of 40 coaching sessions with 8 managers (5 sessions each) and had observers rate the behavior of the coaches in 10-minute intervals according to the Cubus-Analysis scales (Regli & Schmalenbach, 1994). Significant correlations were discovered between *resource activation*, one of the success factors, and the satisfaction of the managers who were engaged in coaching ($r = 0.56$). Correlations were also found between *resource activation* and goal attainment rated by employees after the coached managers conducted performance interviews ($r = 0.43$). (1994). A summary of the success factors will be given in the following section.

Behrendt's work encouraged us to first design observable success factors that relate more closely to the field of coaching and our integrative theory of result-oriented coaching (Greif, 2008), and then to begin similar coaching behavior observation studies (Schmidt & Thamm, 2008). We felt the work would be invaluable, as it would: 1) validate observable success factors that can predict coaching outcomes, 2) give coaching students feedback during their coaching education, 3) assess the work of professional coaches and aide in their development, and 4) improve the quality and outcomes of professional coaching.

We will begin with an overview of the success factors and then move on to the results of the initial pilot studies (English publications are in preparation). Finally, eight basic success factors in coaching will be defined together with the rating scales and their behavioral anchors.

1.1 General change principles of psychotherapy

In their meta-analysis of success factors in psychotherapy outcome research, Grawe et al. (1994) studied general change principles during the therapeutic process that predict the outcome of therapy independently of the therapeutic schools. Gassman and Grawe (2006) differentiated between five change principles:

- (1) The therapeutic bond (warm, empathetic and congruent behavior of the therapist, and openness and trust of the patient, resulting in a trusting relationship between the therapist and patient);
- (2) Problem actualization (imagination of the problems and emotions experienced by the patient);
- (3) Resource activation (recognition of the strengths and abilities of the patient, as well as the level of support in the patient's environment);
- (4) Motivational clarification (reflection on the motives and goals of the client, including awareness of behavioral consequences, clarification of the client's conscious and unconscious goals as well as the environmental goals, and a continuous reflection on the relationships between these goals); and
- (5) Mastery (action-oriented coping, transfer into the practice of concrete measures, and support in reaching the goals).

Therapeutic bond. Based on this research, Grawe (2000, 2006) developed an integrative neuropsychological theory of change principles that relate to successful and unsuccessful therapeutic interactions. Such predictors are called "success factors". The findings showed that *resource activation* is the strongest predictor of therapy outcomes (Gassmann & Grawe, 2006); as a result, it forms the central change principle in Grawe's theory. Similar to the solution-focused approaches in the fields of therapy, coaching (Greene & Grant, 2003; O'Connell & Palmer, 2007; Shazer, 1988), and Positive Psychology (Kauffmann, 2006; Kauffmann, Bonniwell & Silberman, 2010), the focus of the intervention changes from deficit-oriented intervention to the activation of the intra- and interpersonal resources of the client (e.g., their intellectual abilities, specific skills, motivational goals, or level of support from family members) (Gassmann & Grawe, 2006, p. 2). Grawe (2006) theorized that the therapeutic bond

– the classic variable describing an understanding and supporting relationship between therapist/coach and client (Rogers, 1980, p. 22 f.; Stober, 2006) – forms the basis of resource activation, and increases the chances of a positive therapeutic outcome. The client must trust in the therapist’s understanding, support, and expertise before being able to grow their own potential and develop hope. Once trust is developed, the client is able to recognize and use their strengths and abilities, as well as the support of other people or technical resources in their environment, to pursue goals.

Problem actualization refers to the re-experiencing and intensively processing of emotions during the therapeutic process. Patients must learn that they are “more than the sum of their problems.” To be able to change, patients must face emotions associated with their problems that have been previously avoided (Gassmann & Grawe, 2006, p. 2). The processes of transference and countertransference are examples in psychoanalysis and other psychodynamic approaches of problem actualization. Exposure therapy, an intervention practiced in behavior therapy, is another common example of problem activation.

Motivational clarification includes any intervention that supports the client in reflecting their personal or intrinsic motives and goals. It also includes actions of the therapist that help the client to clarify external expectations and relationships between goals and consequences.

Mastery focuses on the client’s ability to cope with the problem successfully. Examples of mastery include the actions necessary to solve the problem, as well as the ability to successfully perform these actions and manage the problem.

Problem actualization and resource activation complement one another. While the actualization of the problem helps the client to clarify *what* to change, resource activation focuses on *how* this is possible (Grawe, 2000, p.99). These two success factors are central to the therapy and have largely to do with the changes clients undergo while in therapy (Gassmann & Grawe, 2006, p. 2). Motivational clarification and mastery are complementary as well. Clients take action that can be potentially detrimental to their future without motivational clarification.

1.2 Success factors of coaching

The observation study of Behrendt (2004)

The success factors found by Grawe et al. (1994) are very general and applicable to other types of counseling interventions. Grawe’s success factors are also particularly applicable to the field of coaching. For his observation study, Behrendt (2004) adapted Cubus-Analysis, a rating instrument created by Grawe, Regli and Schmalenbach (1994). In his original manual, Behrendt only made a few changes to the rating instrument such as replacing the words “therapist” with “coach” and “therapy” with “coaching.” The results of Behrendt’s study show that only resource activation correlates significantly with outcome criteria. Upon closer inspection of the scale definitions in the manual, we decided that the success factors needed to be redefined and redesigned to be more applicable to the field of coaching.

A significant issue with Behrendt’s early rating instrument is that the client resources and coach empathy ratings were combined into one common “resources” score; in later publications, Grawe and his colleagues distinguish the therapeutic relationship from resource activation (cf. Gassmann & Grawe, 2006). We reanalyzed the data published by Behrendt (2004) and found (Greif, 2008, p. 267 f.) that the coach rating scales referring to exhibiting esteem/ appreciation and emotional support (empathy factor) towards the client consistently correlates higher with client satisfaction ratings ($r= 0.51 - 0.55$) than with client personal resource activation ratings ($r= 0.39 - 0.46$). Reciprocally, in the performance interview by the interview partner of the client, the correlations between client resource activation ratings and behavior-oriented ratings of goal attainment are higher ($r= 0.63$) than those between the empathy and the goal-attainment ratings ($r= 0.43 - 0.44$). According to our theoretical assumptions (Greif, 2008), empathy and emotional support shown by the coach result primarily in ratings of client satisfaction and similar subjective evaluations of the clients. In contrast, client resource activation is assumed to have a stronger influence on criteria related to behavior changes.

General and specific factors

Following a constructionist position, “success of coaching” is a subjective social construct. The definition of success depends on the perspective of the persons or institution that perform the evaluation, the

quantitative or qualitative criteria selected, and their weighting. Different persons can evaluate the same coaching case completely differently. Client satisfaction and goal attainment are general evaluation criteria applied by both professional coaches and their clients. However, these criteria are not always reliable due to the unique characteristics (e.g., reasons, problems, goals and attributes) of each of the interacting persons. Therefore, coaching cases are often evaluated by very specific evaluation criteria. Criterion also have the potential of being inapplicable to other clients. An example of this would be a client who asks his coach to support him in creating a literature circle as a kind of balance to his stress at work. This is a very specific goal and as a result the methods used by the coach and client, as well as the process leading to a successful outcome, will also be very specific.

Subjective theories of success and failure of coaching

Through semi-structured expert interviews, we analyzed the subjective theories of coaches and their clients on success and success factors of concrete coaching cases (Greif, 2008, p. 239 ff.; in preparation; Schmidt & Thamm, 2008; Zöllner, 2008). The *Change Explorer*, an instrument that uses structure analysis techniques with cards to visualize the grounded individual theories of coaching success factors and outcomes, was used in the analysis. Our findings support the theory that both clients and coaches often apply the general evaluation criteria of client satisfaction and goal attainment in their coaching sessions, and that the agreement between their ratings is high. Also, both ascribe positive changes primarily to intervention methods used in coaching and to the initiative and problem solving competences of the clients. Differences between coach and client were found in the specific outcome criteria, especially in the explanation of specific negative results. For example, coaches attributed negative results to the characteristics of the client more frequently (e.g., low change readiness/motivation and low self-reflexivity), while clients attributed them to low coach competencies, supporting expectation of self-serving bias (Miller & Ross, 1975). In contrast, positive results are credited more often to their own competencies and abilities (Zöllner, 2008). Another significant finding is that the quality of the relationship between coach and client, as well as the quality of the process (e.g., "I felt that it was a good process.") have been mentioned more frequently by the coach. These qualities can be perceived as success factors or outcomes, depending on the case. This may indicate that both trusting relationships and good coaching processes are causes and effects that must be analyzed systemically by circular models.

Limitations of behavior ratings

The focus of this paper is the observation of success factors that can be consistently rated by trained observers. It is nearly impossible to reach rating consistency among observers when rating scales are complex and defined behaviors that are nearly indistinguishable. The success factors presented below, therefore, are by no means exhaustive. For a more comprehensive study, we suggest combining the rating scales used with interviews and questionnaire scales to assess both qualitative and quantitative data (e.g., applying our Change Explorer method) (Greif, in prep.). Additionally, there is the possibility of analyzing the transcripts of the interviews, or observing interactions in coaching sessions for case studies using qualitative methods.

The success of coaching may always remain a mystery, at least in part, and may never be fully explained by scientifically defined factors or qualitative analyses. Some colleagues, scientists and practitioners argue that the success of coaching cannot be studied. But mysteries have always challenged not only scientists, but also curious practitioners who want to know and understand as far as possible how and why coaching works. If we reject evaluating coaching processes and outcomes by scientifically controlled qualitative and/or quantitative methods, we cannot argue against those who do not accept any kind of scientific evaluation and discussion of their performance. Process research is of prime importance for the future of coaching, as it will increase both the efficacy of coaching and the opportunity to support coaching clients.

A list of eight observable success factors

Inspired by Grawe and his scholars we began our research by defining observable behavior patterns of the coaches. We defined the factors and ratings that are expected to show a positive relationship to coaching outcomes. We have also begun developing assumptions and analyzing client behavior and interactions. In the future we plan to study individual and specific processes using theory-based case studies and qualitative methods.

In our first observation study (Schmidt & Thamm, 2008) we distinguish between eight elementary success factors that describe observable patterns of coaching behavior:

- (1) Esteem and emotional support;
- (2) Result-oriented problem-reflection;
- (3) Result-oriented self-reflection;
- (4) Affect reflection and calibration;
- (5) Clarification of goals;
- (6) Activation of client resources;
- (7) Support of transfer into practice; and
- (8) Evaluation of process.

(1) Esteem and emotional support (ES)

Esteem and the activation of individual or external resources are separated in our observation system. Since our focus is on coach behavior, ES refers to the coach's observable verbal and non-verbal expression of esteem and emotional support towards the client.

(2) Problem-reflection (PR)

Scales were designed in reference to the facilitation of result-oriented problem- and self-reflection, as these are central to our theory (Greif, 2008).

According to Dörner (1979) a *problem* is typically defined by three components: 1) a given, undesired starting state (as-is state) or situation (S), 2) a desired target state or goal (G), and 3) an unknown means of how to reach the goal (M). A simple example of this is a manager who suffers from intense stress at work (S) and wants to reduce the stress (G), but does not know how (M). Dörner's definition is broad and embraces all imaginable situations or states that a coaching client would want to change.

Clients seek professional coaching for a number of reasons: customer losses, economic hardships, implementation of new technologies, organizational changes, stress, time management, performance improvement, mastery of management techniques, conflict management, and understanding of individual and organizational behavior (e.g., "Why did the employee react aggressively to the customer?", "What caused the team conflict?", "Why were the organizational changes ineffective?"). Excluded from this group of reflections is self-reflection (defined below).

Result-oriented problem-reflection occurs when the coach examines the problem with the coachee and then develops new insights, clarifies how components of the problem are related (e.g., key players or key interactions), and discusses possible consequences. These reflections are considered *result-oriented* when the client derives conclusions for future reflections or actions. The classic technique used by coaches to encourage reflection is to ask open questions. Other techniques include moderation cards to describe the problem, and role play to simulate interactions.

(3) Self-reflection (SR)

In interviews conducted with 89 coaches and 74 clients, Mäthner, Jansen and Bachmann (2005) found that the majority of clients (62%) and coaches (71%) felt there was an increase in self-reflection as a result of the coaching. Examples of this include answers such as, "More awareness of myself and my behavior," and, "Clarification of my personal roles and priorities." Therefore, they concluded that the facilitation of self-reflection is one of the major outcomes of coaching. Other evidence of this increase in self-reflection includes reflection reportedly on personal values, particular interests, abilities and competencies, strengths and weaknesses, typical emotional reactions, habitual behavior and a comparison of the real and ideal self-concept. Open self-reflection requires strict confidentiality and a counselor who follows-up with the interests and goals of the client. In our coaching theory (Greif, 2008), facilitation of intensive self-reflection is one of the core functions and competencies of coaching. It distinguishes coaching from other types of counseling that are less invasive. In this respect, coaching can be compared to psychotherapy.

To be precise, self-reflection is a special subgroup of problem-reflection with the only difference being that self-reflection focuses on aspects very close to the identity of the client. Our coaching theory integrates assumptions and findings from self-concept research and Kuhl's (2001) neuropsychological motivation and personality theory, which argues that the experience of a person with the self is part of a special type of intuitive or implicit memory (the so-called "extension" memory).

We suspect that the phases of self-reflection do not occur frequently in coaching sessions, and are not standard to coaching in general. This may be due to the difficulty of facilitating systematic self-reflection since it is rooted in the implicit memory, organized in an associative way, and based on non-verbal representations. Managers who tend to be more action-oriented are particularly skeptical about the usefulness of self-reflection; we have found them less likely to buy into the benefits of self-reflection, especially in cases where their habitual behavior causes them to act prematurely and without regard to the negative consequences of their behavior. Professional coaches, similar to psychotherapists, know how to engage their coachees in intensive and systematic self-reflection when useful. Typical methods used are circular questions and visualization, or imagination techniques. As with problem-reflection, we have a result-oriented focus for self-reflection. Some clients, especially with a high state of orientation (Kuhl, 2001), tend to ruminate with long, associative, and straining self-reflection without any results. In these situations, it is necessary for coaches to help clients learn how to stop negative self-reflection and to switch to reflection with concrete positive results. This is a significant concept of Positive Psychology (Kauffmann, 2006; Kauffmann et al., 2010).

(4) Affect reflection and calibration (AR)

Affect reflection and calibration relate to the activation, re-experiencing, and changing of affect and emotions in coaching sessions by techniques used in Grawe's (2006) theory of psychotherapy (2006). It is our assumption that systematic, intensive psychotherapeutic techniques are rarely applied to alter affect and emotions in standard business coaching. In coaching sessions, emotions usually function as a means of allowing the client "to let off steam" after an emotionally laden situation, or as a way for the client to describe and analyze their own emotions and reactions or those of the environment. The coach may train the client to manage negative affects and emotions in order to improve psychological well-being.

Following Kuhl's theory (2001), strong negative and positive emotions restrict access to the self. Take, for example, a manager whose strong feelings of aggression, first experienced in a prior conflict situation, are reawakened during a coaching session. The manager is unable to reflect openly on his behavior and attitude that contributed to the conflict, as is fixated on his emotional state. Open access to the self will only be possible after the affect state has been reduced to a temperate level. This can easily be done by asking the manager to clearly describe his emotions. According to Kuhl, this exercise activates rational cognitions that are antagonistic to strong emotions. The typical observable reaction of the client is that their emotions are quickly subdued, and that they speak in a different tone. After this, it is easier for the client to explore and analyze the self. Other techniques, similar to behavior therapy interventions that result in the pacification of emotions (e.g., relaxation techniques) can be applied here. Affect reflection and calibration can be considered as a kind of mediating factor that gives greater access to the self and self-reflections.

(5) Clarification of goals (CG)

Goal clarification is one of the most important coaching tasks that was emphasized early in cognitive behavioral coaching theory and research (Grant, 2006). The definition of this factor is not identical to Grawe's motivational clarification factor. It addresses more concrete definitions and explanations of the goals and intentions of the client in relation to the expectations of the social and organizational environment. The analysis of the personal motives in our system belongs to the self-reflection factor, as it is foundational to goal clarification that is congruent with the self.

As Grant (2006, p. 160) ascertains, it is not always necessary or meaningful to have the client define goals very precisely (e.g., to follow the SMART criteria). It is adequate for the client, in a contemplative state, to set abstract or vague goals and to start to develop a broad vision even if unclear.

(6) Activation of the client's resources (RA)

Resource activation is in direct reference to Grawe's theory and findings (2006). Like Grawe, we distinguish between the *internal resources* of the client (motivational and personality traits, abilities, competencies, and potentials) and the *external resources* the client is able to activate (e.g., expert knowledge, consults, emotional support, concrete help by family and friends, or support from those in the occupational environment). In summary, we call these *personal resources*.

(7) Support of transfer into practice (TP)

In our first manual (Schmidt, Thamm & Greif, 2008), we introduced the rating of the transfer of the intended change into practice as a special, result-oriented rating of resource activation. The corresponding success factor defined by Grawe (2006) in his theory is called mastery. Mastery addresses: 1) action-oriented coping with the problem and solution development, 2) transfer into the practice of concrete measures, and 3) support in reaching the goals of the client. We assumed that it is necessary to focus more quickly and systematically on mastery in shorter result-oriented coaching sessions than in psychotherapy. However, after reviewing two standard German handbooks of coaching tools by Rauen (2004; 2007), we found many techniques facilitating analyses/reflection or changes, and some techniques to evaluate the outcome of the sustained transfer, but not a single technique on how to support the transfer of the intended change into practice. In our theory and practice we focus more on procedures and tools for how to support transfer into practice.

A systematic intervention method is a methodical reflection of and preparation for the possible barriers of transfer. After a trial run of the transfer is conducted, the client is prompted to reflect on the actions and reactions during the transfer, and if necessary, makes changes to the strategy used. A powerful tool used during the transfer is the *shadowing* of the client by the coach in the intended actions or behavior changes. The coach observes the client during the transfer and gives feedback afterward. Then the coach and client together analyze concrete transfer barriers and solutions.

Our preference is for *telephone shadowing*, as it is a more economical tool. In telephone shadowing, the coach and client have a telephone appointment immediately following the situation where the client tries to perform the intended actions. From experience, shadowing is an essential benefit of the intervention. Oftentimes many of the client's intended actions fail due to concrete individual and environmental barriers that are not predicted by the client or coach. When the client is unable to execute the intended actions and the trial run is unsuccessful, the client is much less motivated to try again. If a follow-up coaching meeting does not immediately follow the trial run, the client is more likely to reinterpret the experience in an unhealthy or ineffective way during the lag time, making it difficult to motivate the client for the next attempt. The reflection on and activation of resources directly after the trial coupled with support for the next trial, encourage the client to try again. Normally after an unsuccessful attempt, the second trial run is more successful. The learning of the client can be very demanding during this process, and if successful, the client can be successfully equipped with the ability necessary to overcome typical internal and external barriers without the support of the coach.

The research (Kaufel, Scherer, Scherm & Sauer, 2006) coupled with our practical experience point to the support of transfer via shadowing to be a very powerful intervention. To further explore this, we have planned experimental control studies to test the assumption that this factor very strongly contributes to the behavioral outcome of coaching.

(8) Feedback and evaluations in the process (FP)

A basic principle of result-oriented coaching is to have the client receive useful results in each coaching session. Examples of useful results are concrete goal-oriented action plans and tasks that the client can put into practice, important insights that help the client to understand and overcome problems, and new and valuable knowledge. The more coaching sessions yield useful results, the more coaching, as a whole will be useful. It is therefore reasonable for coaches to ask their clients for feedback after sessions to make sure that the client is satisfied with the results. We define this as a success factor since it enables the coach to change the method of coaching if the client is unsatisfied. If the client were to spontaneously give a positive evaluation of the coaching after many coaching sessions, we would also expect that this is a predictor of the overall positive success rating after the end of the coaching. Therefore, we rate the observable evaluations – both the coach's asking for feedback and the client's spontaneous positive evaluations.

First results: Correlations of the success factors to outcome criteria

We constructed the observation instrument described below. In our first study, trained observers rated the success factors of 44 videotapes of coaching sessions (first, middle, and last). The clients were business and law students, and the coaches were seven graduate psychology students trained with systematic coaching education and supervision (Schmidt & Thamm, 2008). The ratings were taken at 5-minute intervals. Since some of the frequencies and variances of the quality ratings were low, not all observer reliabilities were satisfactory (see below for the details). Therefore, it was surprising to find high and significant correlations between the observed elementary success factors and outcome criteria that conform to our theoretical assumptions. A short summary of some of these is given in the following passages. Details of the observer reliabilities and correlations of the factors will be described in the observer manual.

Significant correlations with outcome criteria:

Non-verbal reinforcement correlates with an emotional clarity scale (0.74), and verbal empathy with scales assessing the client's behavior reflection (0.69), goal reflection (0.67), and goal-attainment satisfaction (0.52). Facilitation of self-reflection is related to the reduction of helplessness (0.56). Resource activation correlates with goal satisfaction (0.49). As expected, support of transfer predicts behavior-oriented scale values of effective time management (0.55) and information management (0.46). But the correlations found between resource activation and information management (0.49), and reduction of the feeling of listlessness ($r=0.50$) are only tendentially significant (10% level).

Since both the sample and the variance of the behavior observation scales of the coaches are small, only high correlations of 0.46 and above are statistically significant. For example, correlations between resource activation and information management (0.49) and reduction of the feeling of listlessness (0.50) are only tendentially significant (10% level). Below in the observation manual the correlations of all scales will be presented.

Contrary to our expectations, non-verbal reinforcement correlates with negative affect (0.53) and facilitation of self-reflection correlates with demotivation (0.57). Since correlations do not show the causal direction of influences or time sequences, the first correlation may be a result of the coaches reinforcing reactions to the clients' negative affect, and the second of the stimulation of self-reflection of clients after evidence of their demotivation. Analyses of the interactions between coaches and clients and their time sequence may help to clarify these results.

Research perspectives

It is promising that the correlations observed in our pilot study are higher than expected. But the sample of our first study is small and we must be careful not to generalize the results to similar samples of students. Behavior observation studies are very laborious, but replication of these studies is necessary. It would potentially be more useful to observe and analyze interactions of professional coaches and business clients.

The observation of coaching sessions opens a new research field that will add to our understanding of the coaching process. Beyond using the rating scale of success factors for session observations, the narrative from each session, obtained through transcription, will prove interesting. Geißler (2009), based on the communication theory of the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas, analyzed frequencies of various fundamental types of communication acts in selected coaching cases (one of our cases was one of these). Examples of Geißler's coach categories include: shows attention, asks, mirrors, questions/confronts/critiques, explains, gives feedback and prompts the client to act. Categories describing the reactions of the client, initiated by the coach, include: focuses cognitively on a subject, describes concretely or reflects on the process, the causes or the meaning, evaluates and develops action intentions. Analysis of ten transcripts of coaching sessions (one of them rated as problematic) found that the most frequent communication act of the coach with a large range is to ask questions (between 26 and 61% of the acts, and only 19% in the problematic coaching). The clients are frequently prompted to focus cognitively on a subject (about 24 to 52%, and 16% in the problematic coaching). Geißler's study merely intended to describe typical communication acts, not success factors. Therefore, further information from coaching process research on factors predicting outcomes of coaching have to be obtained through studies via qualitative methods, quantitative methods (with a focus on scales), or a combination of both of these. In our future research, in addition to conducting research on the observation categories described below, we plan to conduct case-studies applying qualitative methods and to analyze coaching narratives of highly successful and not successful coachings (rated both by clients and coaches).

2 Observation Manual

2.1 Short definitions of the success factors and ratings

The following manual gives the definitions of elementary hypothetical success factors. The list below gives an overview of all ratings. A description of the rating scales, examples of the different types of behavior, and the anchors belonging to the factors follow.

ES: Esteem and emotional support

ES1: The coach verbally shows esteem for the client.

ES2: The coach non-verbally shows esteem for the client.

ES3: The coach emotionally supports the client.

PR: Problem-reflection

PR1: The coach engages the client in result-oriented problem-reflection.

PR1+: The coach guides the client to derive concrete solutions from the problem-reflection (only if a facilitation of problem-reflection is shown).

SR: Self-reflection

SR1: The coach engages the client in result-oriented reflection about the self (e.g., behavior, personal experiences, needs and motives, strengths and weaknesses, ideal and real self-image).

SR1+: The coach guides the client to derive concrete solutions from the problem-reflection (only if a facilitation of problem-reflection is shown).

AR: Affect reflection and calibration

AR1: The coach engages the client in reflection about feelings.

AR2: The coach supports pacification and calm and open thinking about the client's feelings.

CG: Clarification of goals

CG1: The coach supports the client in clarifying goals and concretely defining them.

RA: Resource activation

RA: The coach encourages the client to explore and activate personal internal and external resources, which support goal attainment.

TP: Support of transfer into practice

TP: The coach supports the client to transfer the planned goal-oriented behavior and measures it into practice.

FP: Feedback and evaluations in the process

EP1: The coach asks the client to evaluate progress and satisfaction with the coaching, goal attainment, and/or cooperation.

EP2: The client spontaneously offers feedback regarding the level of satisfaction with the session or the entire coaching engagement.

2.2 Observation periods

Observation periods are the periods of time where the observers are asked to stop the tape and rate the behavior in the sequence before stopping independently from rating other periods. The observers must stop the tape every five minutes and repeat the rating procedure until the end of the recording.

2.3 Rating scales

The attributes used to define the success factors are important for the observers to know. Following Flückiger's behavior rating of resource activation in psychotherapy (Flückiger, Caspar, Holtforth & Willutzki, 2009; Flückiger & Holtforth, 2008), we rate the behavior of the coach by the following quality ratings:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Definition</u>
-1	Negative evaluation.
0	Behavior not shown.
1	Behavior is shown only to some extent; the quality is below standard coaching behavior.
2	Standard of coaching behavior is met; improvement is possible.
3	Ideal behavior; best practice; improvement seems impossible.

The quality ratings of the different factors have been constructed by rules comparable to the ones above. A basic assumption here is that there is a standard coaching behavior that contributes to the effectiveness of the coaching, but that the behavior partly has to be adapted to the situation. These quality ratings are merely meant to give an orientation. The observers are instructed to use their intuitive impression to classify behavior that appears to be maladaptive or disproportional. Therefore, the examples given below used to define the rating levels are not conclusive.

After the observation of each 5-minute period, the observers are expected to compare the behavior with the success factors, scale levels, and examples. The method is to choose the rating that is most similar to the descriptions in the manuals.

2.4 Definitions and behavior anchors of the success factors

The following definitions are used for observer training. The training begins with an introduction and description of the theoretical background. Then, observers are taken through the success factors and

quality rating levels. These must be explained as concretely as possible through examples, (e.g., literal citations, short role-playing sequences of coach-client interactions, or demonstration of video clips (excluding the coaching sessions that are to be rated). In order to reach high agreement between raters and observer reliability, the most important phase of the training is when observers rate 5-minute periods of video or audiotape recordings of all factors and rating levels and then receive feedback on their ratings. The training should not be finished before the observer reaches a very high level of correct ratings (above 95%). Raters who do not reach this level should not be deployed – it is recommended to repeat the training and feedback phase with all observers after two days of the practice phase or after an interruption of more than two days.

Important notes: With intention, the definitions of the success factors refer to rather complex theoretical concepts. To reach satisfactory agreement between the observers, it is necessary that they develop a clear understanding of the theoretical meaning of the factors, their differences and the quality rating levels. The raters need a concrete, convincing and reliable model and many concrete examples. We recommend that the best expert of the system be selected to be the trainer. She/he needs a great deal of experience, persuasive power and self-confidence, since she/he has to decide which ratings are correct. Raters who do not like to rate the behaviour as demanded by the manual and the trainer will never reach high agreement and reliability rates.

Please contact us if you need support (sgreif@uos.de). We will answer your mail as soon as possible, and can arrange a Skype teleconference and help you with concrete suggestions based on our experience!

The following descriptions start with a general definition of the factor and the individual ratings (between negative one and three for each factor). The next passage gives examples of observable behaviors and specifies what the observer should pay attention to, or how the factor is distinguishable from similar or related factors. Following this, a description of the quality rating levels and examples of behavior anchors are given. At the end of each description, a table shows the intraclass coefficients (where possible), the mean and standard deviation of the quality rating, the percentages of agreement between raters, and significant correlations between the quality ratings or frequencies of positive observations of the factors with outcome criteria. All data below and the correlations described above are based on version 3 of the manual (Schmidt & Thamm, 2008).

The first intraclass coefficients in the tables show the reliability of a “mean rater”, while the second shows the reliability of the “mean ratings” (normally higher). Most of the reliabilities compared to other studies can be classified as mean values – only some reliabilities are lower. According to Wirtz and Caspar (2002), low reliabilities may be tolerated if, as in our case, the variances of the ratings are low. It is remarkable that instead of their low frequencies and variances, some of the ratings correlate rather high with outcome criteria. Therefore they have not been completely eliminated from our study. It would be beneficial to improve the reliabilities by developing better definitions and/or observer training.

The definitions of the present version 4 of the manual include minor changes in order to sharpen the definitions of the ratings with low reliabilities and high correlations. The changes will be mentioned below.

ES: Esteem and emotional support

This success factor describes how much the coach shows empathy and esteem for the client.

ES1: The coach verbally shows esteem for the client.

Verbal remarks made towards the client are observed.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Produces an agreeable/warm-hearted atmosphere (e.g., pays attention, tunes in, uses small talk, asks sensitive questions).

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

- Verbally expresses a positive attitude towards the client (e.g., “I am happy to see you,” “It is wonderful that you...,” “It is admirable that you...”).
- Shows interest in the client beyond the subject of coaching (e.g., hobbies, important episodes in her/his life).
- Takes up client remarks, mirrors or paraphrases what the client expresses (e.g. repeats important sentences), or summarizes statements to show that she/he listens attentively.
- Positively reinforces statements through methods such as approval and accentuation (e.g. “This is a very important point that you have mentioned here!”).
- Adapts language and wording to the language of the client, and avoids unnecessary technical terms. The coach speaks in a way that is easy to understand.

Remarks:

Esteem may not be formulated in a circumstantial or exaggerated way. The overall impression must be credible in the view of the rater.

Esteem and negative feedback or criticism:

Negative feedback and criticism must not be classified as negative or of showing low esteem. Positive feedback and an appreciation of the strengths of the client should be accounted for, along with how the negative feedback is communicated.

Delineation: Evaluations of client feelings are not classified as esteem behavior. They must be coded as affect reflection (AR).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach expresses skepticism, a negative attitude, and/or indifference towards the client, and formulates feedback circumstantially or with exaggeration. The coach lacks sincerity or credibility.
0: The coach shows none of the standard attributes or behavior examples mentioned in the description of the factor, does not follow-up with remarks made by the client, and remains reserved in speech (e.g., uses abstract formulations without warmth or emotional adjectives, or speaks impersonally without addressing the client).
1: The coach shows some of the behaviors defined by the standard attributes (e.g., takes up the client’s remarks in a cursory or selective manner, only briefly expresses esteem and empathy, makes few positive remarks, and proceeds without asking questions or waiting for the client to respond (i.e., does not go into answer)).
2: The coach shows the standard behavior (e.g., makes positive verbal remarks that the rater believes are credible and sincere). The coach expresses interest in client beyond the goals of coaching, listens to the client and follows-up on significant remarks, speaks with “I-messages,” addresses the client directly through positive evaluations, uses comparative forms (e.g., says “very helpful” with a friendly slant instead of “helpful”). However, there is room for improvement.
3: The coach’s behavior and coaching methods are ideal (e.g. uses accurate wording, and creates a very good atmosphere and relationship with the client).

The following table shows the intraclass coefficients of the raters and the ratings, the mean and standard deviation of the quality rating, and the percentages of agreement between raters. The last column of the table enumerates significant correlations between the quality ratings or frequencies of positive observations of the factors with outcome criteria.

Observer reliability and frequency:

<i>Intraclass Coefficient</i>		<i>Frequencies</i>		<i>Percentages</i>		<i>Correlation with</i>	<i>r</i>
<i>Mean rater</i>	<i>Mean ratings</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>		
.54**	.70**	1.4	0.3	74.8%	16.4	Goal satisfaction Result-oriented self-reflection	.52* .68*

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

* $p > 0.05$

** $p > 0.01$

The intraclass coefficient of the mean ratings is satisfactory, but the percentage of the agreement between the raters is very unsatisfactory (50%). An inspection of this factor shows that the definition is too broad and the examples too heterogeneous. For some examples, the rating depends too much on the subjective impression of the observer (e.g. the creation of a positive atmosphere). It is difficult to distinguish the observations from emotional support (ES3). It might be better to focus on short verbal reinforcement behaviors of the coach. Surprisingly, the factor shows high and significant correlations to important outcome criteria.

ES2: The coach non-verbally shows esteem for the client. (Only partly observable by audio tapes.)

The scale codes approve non-verbal behavior observable by body language (e.g., friendly nodding and attentive eye contact).

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Has a posture that is turned towards the client.
- Seeks eye contact and holds it.
- Demonstrates a positive attitude towards the client through facial expressions (e.g. smiling) or gestures that show accord (e.g. a movement of the hand that emphasizes a sentence of the client).
- Reinforces the client with affirmative phonemes (e.g. mmhhhh) and nodding of the head.
- Has a posture where the arms and legs appear open and turned towards the client indicating openness.
- Speaks with a friendly and warm tone of voice.

Remarks:

The non-verbal behavior may not be maladjusted or exaggerated (e.g. permanent nodding). The overall impression has to be credible as evaluated by the rater.

Delineation: Non-verbal reactions of the coach to feelings expressed by the client are not classified as esteem behavior. They must be coded as affect reflection (AR).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach's posture is not turned toward the client. Eye contact is infrequently made. The coach mimics ineffectively, showing little interest, absent-mindedness, inhibition, and a lack of authenticity. The coach's voice lacks warmth and is not adapted to the situation in volume, intonation, or speed. The coach's behavior is intimidating and aggressive; the coach does not keep a safe space.
0: The coach shows none of the standard attributes mentioned in the definition (e.g., does not use affirmative phonemes like "mmhhhh"). However, the coach's behavior does not appear inappropriate.
1: The coach shows some of the behaviors defined by the standard attributes, but in a rudimentary way (e.g., the coach's posture is only turned slightly to the client, the voice shows a little warm, the eye contact is there but very short, etc.).
2: The coach shows the standard behavior: posture is turned towards the client, voice is warm and friendly, mimic and gestures are active and appropriate, reactions of the client are supported non-verbally (e.g., by nodding and saying, "mmmh, mmmh"), and the eye contact is good. The whole impression is supportive. However, there is room to improve some attributes or the whole pattern of behavior.
3: The coach shows appropriate behavior and is flexibly adapted to the client. The observer does not perceive any possible improvements in behavior or in general. The coach has an optimal and relaxed posture, very warm voice (but not exaggerated), sensitive and supportive affect with smiling and nodding. The coach establishes a very safe environment and relationship with the client. The observer focus here is the flexibility and perfect adaption of the coach's behavior to different situations.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.44**	0.61**	1.7	0.4	96.3%	3.4	Emotional Insight	.74*
						Helplessness	-.57*
						Angry feelings	.59*

* p> 0.05; ** p>0.01

The low intraclass coefficients may partly reflect the low variance of the factor, but the unsatisfactory percentage of the agreement between the raters (65.7%) shows that it is more difficult than expected to observe the non-verbal behavior precisely. The difficulty may result from the high percentage of time sequences (96.3%) where raters had to rate minimal non-verbal reactions. Although three cameras and split-screens were used for observation, this seemed inadequate as raters reported that the tasks demand full attention. A possible solution to this is an increase in rest pauses. We have to be very careful not to interpret causal directions between non-verbal and emotional outcome criteria. It would be plausible that the non-verbal behavior of the coach is not a cause, but rather a result of emotional insight, lower helplessness, and openly showing angry feelings or a circular process. Here, interaction process analyses of the behavior of the coach and the client are necessary.

ES3: The coach emotionally supports the client.

This rating refers to the verbal supporting behavior of the coach and the methods used to help the client (e.g. to reach her/his goals).

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Communicates with optimism (e.g., “I am sure that you will be successful if you...”) and explains why optimism is realistic.
- Helps the client to overcome negative emotional states through supporting tools (e.g., worksheets), writing down essentials, and giving information on how to solve a problem or get access to special knowledge (e.g., literature).
- Is reliable (e.g., observes planned actions and agreements; is accessible).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach appears uninterested and expresses a pessimistic perspective on the client’s chances of goal-attainment. The coach apologizes for arriving late or for postponing the appointment for a long time. The coach has completely forgotten about agreements and plans made with the client.
0: The coach does not show any of the behaviors in the standard definition (e.g., does not express optimism, and does not prepare supporting tools to overcome negative emotional states). However, the overall behavior of the coach remains moderate. The coach arrives slightly late for the appointment, and/or does not remember well agreements or plans made with the client.
1: The coach shows standard behavior in a rudimentary way. The coach expresses some optimism, but it is not very convincing and does not explain why the optimism is realistic (e.g., uses standard flowery language such as, “Cheer up! You will be successful!”). Some signs of supportive behavior are shown but seem superficial (the assessment is based merely on the intuitive impression of the rater).
2: The coach shows the standard behavior. The coach expresses optimism and explains why, helps the client to overcome emotionally straining states through the use of supporting tools, and arrives on schedule and remembers all agreements and plans without difficulty. There is room for improvement.
3: The coach behaves so credibly that further improvement does not seem possible. The client acknowledges that the coach has invested much work into the coaching (e.g., has prepared a very useful worksheet or planning tool), or that the coach has organized the provision of helpful information for

the client.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.53**	0.69**	1.3	0.2	37.4%	14.6	Helplessness Listlessness (pre-post-differences)	-.56* -.56*

* p> 0.05

** p>0.01

The mean value and variance of the quality rating is low. This may explain unsatisfactory intraclass coefficients. The percentage of agreement between raters remains low (61.1%) as well. Therefore, the description and examples have been sharpened for future studies.

PR: Problem-reflection

Problem-reflection refers to an elaborate analysis of a problem situation where the client embraces the antecedents, interactions, and processes in the situation and the perceived consequences. The reflection is classified as “result-oriented” only if the coach instructs the client on how to develop concrete solutions, which guide future actions of the client. The following ratings differ between the facilitation of problem-reflection (RP1) and a result-oriented focus of the problem-reflection (RP1+).

Remarks:

Following logic, the second rating depends on the first. Therefore, correlations between both ratings should not be calculated, as they will be artificially high.

PR1: The coach has the client reflect on problems.

The rating assesses how much the coach stimulates intensive reflection on a problem or problematic situation.

Delineation:

It is difficult to differentiate between problem-reflection (PR) and self-reflection (SR). Where there is doubt, the reflection should be classified as problem-reflection (the subordinate term). The reflection should only be categorized as a self-reflection if the focus is on the following client attributes:

- Strengths and weaknesses;
- Needs and motives;
- Real and ideal self-concept or self-image;
- Personal, cultural, or family background;
- Peculiar abilities, competencies, potentials, and their future development;
- Personal behavior, feelings, and experiences; and
- Personal and intrinsic goals and plans for self-changes or self-development.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Prompts the client to reflect on the problem situation (e.g., antecedents, interactions, processes, and consequences).
- Asks direct questions to have the client think more deeply about the problem.
- Summarizes and structures the client’s reflection on the problem situation.
- Asks the client to describe examples of similar experiences.

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

- Supports the client in structuring the problem situation (e.g., “What is most important? What is of minor importance?” or “How did it start? What followed next?”).
- Asks the client to change their perspective of other persons in the situation (e.g., “How did person X react and how did he probably feel?” or “Imagine you were person X. How would you feel after your remark in the discussion?”), or uses techniques like role playing (e.g., changing chairs) to facilitate thinking on different perspectives of those involved in the situation.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach gives advice without having knowledge of the situation. The coach fails to acknowledge a significant problem mentioned by the client, does not support a client who has clearly asked for help in trying to solve a problem, or does not help to structure a problem situation.
0: The coach does not show elements of the standard behavior. The coach does not ask the client to describe or reflect on a problem situation.
1: The coach shows some elements of the standard behavior, but the intervention remains incomplete (e.g., the coach asks the client to describe a problem, but then changes the subject before the description is complete or comprehensible). The coach does not provide support in systematically structuring a complex situation, or treats the situation in a cursory manner.
2: The coach shows behavior similar to the standard definition above. The coach prompts the client to think and talk about the problem situation, and directly asks the client to describe the antecedents, interactions, processes, and consequences. The coach helps the client through systematic techniques to change client perspective. The coach also structures the descriptions and analysis. However, the rater has the impression that there is room for improvement in the coach’s behavior.
3: The behavior of the coach is an example of best practice in the facilitation of client problem-reflection. The coach helps the client to develop new insights, which impresses the client.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.5**	0.67**	1.1	0.1	37.2%	13.7	-	

* $p > 0.05$

** $p > 0.01$

The mean value of 1.1 shows that the quality of the problem-reflection behaviour of the coaches is rather low. The variance is minimal. This explains why the intraclass coefficients remain low, while the absolute percentage of agreement between the raters is satisfactory (72.8%). It is plausible that the factor does not correlate substantially with outcome criteria. It is interesting that the following subcategory, which focuses on result-oriented problem-reflection, comes up with a prediction of low fear of failure after coaching.

PR1+: The coach facilitates result-oriented problem reflection for the client:

Remarks:

Result orientation does not only refer to reflection on consequences for future actions. It also embraces concrete insights, plans, or intended actions for future analysis.

PR1+ can only be coded if facilitation of problem-reflection is shown (i.e. if PR1 is coded at least by 1). The behavior categories PR1 and PR1+ therefore are not independent. (In statistical analyses, artificial correlations are expected.)

Observable behavior:

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

In addition to facilitation of problem-reflection (see above, PR1) the coach:

- Prompts the client to derive concrete consequences for future actions.
- Points to the relevance of problem analysis for future action or reflection.
- Trains the client to become aware of aimless rumination and trains the client on how to stop it (e.g., by self-instruction techniques and deviation of thoughts to positive experiences).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach allows the client to think aimlessly or erratically, or asks the client erratic questions.
0: The coach does not show any of the standard behaviors.
1: The coach shows elements of the standard behavior (e.g., begins problem-reflection and rudimentarily mentions possible action consequences without describing or explaining them precisely, or without asking the client to cogitate autonomously).
2: The coach shows behavior similar to the standard behavior. Following the problem analysis, the coach asks the client to derive concrete actions or future consequences. The coach instructs the client in how to identify rumination and how to stop recurring thoughts via thought-stopping techniques or similar interventions. The rater has the impression that there is room for improvement.
3: The support of result-oriented problem-reflection is ideal. The coach prompts the client in a convincing way to derive important or creative solutions from the problem analysis. The coach helps the client to stop rumination in a sensitive and effective way.

Observer reliability and frequency:

<i>Intraclass Coefficient</i>		<i>Quality ratings</i>		<i>Percentages</i>		<i>Correlation with</i>	<i>r</i>
<i>Mean rater</i>	<i>Mean ratings</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>		
		1.1	0.2	15.2%	9.5	Fear of failure	-.47*

* $p > 0.05$ ** $p > 0.01$

Intraclass coefficients could not be calculated because of a very low quality rating and low variances. The absolute percentage of agreement between raters is satisfactory (74.8%). It is remarkable that the factor, instead of these preconditions, shows a significant correlation, indicating a reduction of fear of failure. A single significant correlation may be not replicable in follow-up studies, but additional correlations to other success factors (e.g., high negative correlations with SR1 self-reflection (-.64**) and SR1+ result-oriented self-reflection (-.51*) show a pattern that fits with our theoretical expectations that problem-reflection is a factor that is different from self-reflection.

SR: Self-reflection

Self-reflection is a special type of problem-reflection that specifically regards the self. As mentioned above, typical examples are reflections that focus the client's:

- Strengths and weaknesses;
- Needs and motives;
- Real and ideal self-concept or self-image;
- Personal, cultural, or family background;
- Peculiar abilities, competencies, potentials, and their future development;
- Personal behavior, feelings, and experiences; and
- Personal and intrinsic goals and plans for self-changes or self-development.

The rater is asked to observe the behavior of the client when instructed by the coach to reflect on these problems systematically.

Remarks:

Delineation: The rating focuses on broad reflections of personal strengths and weaknesses, or potentials. Resource activation (RA) is classified as the reflection, evaluation, and activation of concrete personal resources (e.g., special abilities or competencies, see below RA) that directly support the attainment of concretely defined goals of coaching.

SR1: The coach has the client engage in self-reflection (e.g., on behavior, personal experiences, needs and motives, strength and weaknesses, ideal and real self-image).

The rating assesses whether or not the coach is able to engage the client in self-reflection (e.g., strengths and weaknesses, personal motives, attributes and typical behavior (see list above), and to what degree.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Guides the client’s self-reflection through questions about the client’s personal attributes.
- Reinforces descriptions of special abilities and competencies of the client by verbal communication.
- Helps the client to develop new insights about the self, or between behavior and the reactions of others.
- Facilitates the exploration of the relationship between the client’s actions and self-concept or personality.
- Uses special techniques and tools that help the client analyze real and ideal self-concept (e.g., by drawing a self-image).

Remarks:

Prompting the client to reflect on or apply her/his personal resources (e.g. abilities and competencies) or the resources of the social networks of the client to reach goal attainment should not be coded here. They belong to the factor resource activation (RA, see below).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach makes statements without respecting the client’s personal needs, goals, or special abilities and competencies. The coach generalizes, gives standard advice, and interprets the client’s behavior without making sure the client feels accepted. The coach does not seize on the self-reflection of the client or does not help structure orderless self-descriptions.
0: The coach does not show any of the standard behaviors described above. The coach does not stimulate self-reflection.
1: The coach shows some of the behaviors and attributes mentioned in the standard behavior description. The coach does not prompt the client systematically or intensively to think and talk about motives, special abilities and competencies, strengths, and weaknesses. The coach merely comments in a cursorily manner on the client’s self-reflection and does not support deep reflection and insight. The coach does not use systematic or adequate methods to encourage self-reflection.
2: The coach shows behavior similar to the standard behavior description. The client stimulates reflection on personal motives, norms, cultural background and experiences, abilities and competencies, experiences, or strengths and weaknesses, ideal and real self-concept of the client by direct, or circular questions or other methods. The behavior of the coach conforms to the standard, but there is room for improvement.
3: The performance of the coach is ideal. The coach behaves sensitively, wording questions well and explaining the importance of the client to reflect on strengths and weaknesses. The coach helps the client explain self-reflection in concrete terms. Through probing questions or other methods, the coach helps the client to obtain new insights about the self that are not easily forgotten.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.41**	0.58**	1.1	0.1	21.2%	12.4	Demotivation	.57*
						Helplessness (pre-post-differences)	-.49
						Goal reflection	-.49
						Behavior reflection	-.51

* p> 0.05 ; ** p>0.01

Again the mean values and variance of the ratings of this factor are low and worsen the preconditions to reach satisfactory intraclass coefficients. The absolute percentage of agreement between raters is satisfactory (74.8%). As discussed above, the significant correlation found shows that demotivation and self-reflection may be related. The remaining correlations in our study are not significant.

SR1+: Facilitation of result-oriented self-reflection: The coach guides the client to derive concrete solutions from the problem-reflection

(Only if facilitation of problem-reflection is shown.)

Remarks:

Result orientation does not only refer to action consequences for future actions. It also embraces concrete insights for future analysis, plans, or intended actions.

SR1+ can only be coded if facilitation of self-reflection is shown (SR1 is rated at least by 1). The behavior categories SR1 and SR1+ therefore are not independent. (In statistical analyses, artificial correlations are expected.)

The exploration of abilities, competencies, and social networks of the client to reach goal attainment do not need to be coded. They belong to resource activation (RA).

Observable behavior:

In addition to engaging the client in self-reflection, the coach:

- Prompts the client to derive concrete consequences for future actions from self-reflection.
- Points to the relevance of the insights derived from the reflection for future plans or self-reflection.
- Stimulates the client’s commitment to stick to the solution derived from self-reflection.
- Trains the client in how to be aware of rumination and trains in how to stop it (e.g., by self-instruction techniques and deviation of thoughts to positive self-images).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach does not stop the client from engaging in aimless or erratic self-reflection or self-description. The coach does not stop the client from ruminating.
0: The coach does not show any of the standard behavior. The coach does <i>not</i> ask the client to derive concrete actions or other consequences from self-reflection.
1: The coach behaves rudimentarily and therefore only facilitates cursory, result-oriented self-reflection. The coach attempts to stop the client from ruminating, but does so inefficiently. The results or consequences remain abstract or without commitment.
2: The coach shows behaviors similar to the standard description above. The coach encourages the client to derive concrete consequences from the self-reflection and a commitment to these consequences. The coach helps the client to stop rumination effectively. There is room for improvement in coach’s behavior.

3: The coach’s facilitation of the result-oriented self-reflection is ideal. The coach systematically asks the client to derive significant concrete consequences from the self-reflection. The coach activates a strong and sustained commitment by the client to follow-through with the solutions.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
		1.1	0.2	3.2%	4.4	Goal satisfaction	.41
						Irritation	-.46
						Helplessness	-.52

* p> 0.05 ; ** p>0.01

The very low mean of the quality rating and the variance of the specification of result-oriented self-reflection forbid a calculation of intraclass coefficients. The absolute percentage of agreements between raters is satisfactory (74.8%). It is remarkable that under such preconditions several high but insignificant correlations can be observed that are theoretically plausible and differ from other factors.

AR: Affect reflection and calibration

Preliminary remark: Basic positive and negative emotions such as anxiety, anger, or happiness are often referred to as types of “affect”. In some theories, “emotion” is the superordinate term while in other theories “emotion” refers to more complex feelings that integrate cultural meaning (e.g., feelings of success or helplessness). We use the term “emotion” for simplicity and clarity.

The following two rating factors are often related. Calibrations of emotions often require prior reflections, and the reflection itself reduces strong emotion. Therefore, the observations are not logically independent, and a correlation between both results in artificially high values.

The ratings aim at assessing coach behavior, which directly stimulates the description and reflection of affect or emotion by the client (AR1), as well as behavior that pacifies emotion.

AR1: The coach has the clients reflect on their own feelings.

The coach has the client engage in deep and intensive reflection on emotion.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Prompts the client to specify and describe emotions or feelings in critical situations.
- Asks the client to explain feelings in a friendly manner. If the descriptions of the client’s feelings as well as the factors that elicit those feelings are ambiguous, the coach offers possible hypotheses’ about situation elicitors or intra-individual causes, and asks the client to evaluate their relevance.
- Encourages the client to analyze and understand possible situational and personal reasons for the feelings and consequences contributing to their general affect state, well-being, performance (e.g., lower quality), typical reactions of the social environment to emotional behavior of the client, and backlashes.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach responds negatively or neutrally to the client’s emotions.
0: The coach does not show any standard behavior. Attempts of the client to talk about their feelings are neglected. The coach does not comment on the client’s observable emotional reactions, or on possible consequences and reactions of the environment.
1: The coach shows some of the behaviors described, but in a rudimentary way. The coach asks the client to describe feelings, but does not pick up on the descriptions and does not help to specify them. Elicitors and consequences are also not specified.

2: The coach shows behaviors similar to the standard descriptions above. The coach encourages the client to describe feelings precisely, and asks the client to give situational elicitors or causes in a personal way. The coach helps the client to analyze and understand the consequences (e.g., negative affect and low well-being), the reactions of the environment, and the possible backlash. There is room for improvement in the coach's behavior related to the factor.

3: The coach's support of affect reflection is ideal. The coach sensitively facilitates deep reflection and specifies the client's feelings. The client is able to develop new and lasting insights through a systematic and precise analysis of situational elicitors, personal causes and consequences, environment, and backlashes.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.11*	0.2*	1.1	0.3	7.7%	5.1	Feeling of anger at the time of the first and middle session	.63* .66*

* p> 0.05 ; ** p>0.01

The absolute percentage of agreement between the rater is good (88.9%), but the intraclass coefficients are too low. This shows that compared to psychotherapy, affect reflection is seldom used in coaching, as seen in the first comparison study (Borsum, 2008). The plausible correlation between the affect sales measuring state feelings of aggression at the time of the first and middle sessions show that it may be premature to discard the factor from future coaching observations. We plan to conduct coaching-intervention studies with clients who work under high-stress conditions. Here, we would expect that both ratings of AR factors are of high relevance.

AR2: The coach pacifies the client's feelings and is able to facilitate calm and open thinking about the feelings.

The coach intervenes in way that pacifies the emotions of the client (e.g., with calming words or relaxation techniques) during a critical situation, and facilitates open conversation about the feelings and their possible negative consequences.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- By verbal or non-verbal communication shows appreciation and understanding of the client's emotions.
- Gives the client time to deescalate by sharing an emotionally moving experience.
- Asks the client to explain the emotionally intense reaction and to consider whether there are long-term negative consequences (e.g., stress reactions, irritation, or low personal well-being) or negative reactions of other persons in the environment (e.g., negative feelings, hidden rejection or stress reactions of team members), and if the client would prefer to reduce the intensity of the feelings in future similar situations
- Uses relaxation techniques or similar systematic methods, and/or trains the client in the practice of these techniques.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach reinforces negative emotions (e.g., aggressive feelings) or tries to explain the emotions with inadequately simple or speculative causes (e.g. "The only reason of the emotional reaction of your team colleague is that he hates you.")

0: The coach does not show any of the behaviors described above.

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

1: The coach shows some of the behaviors described in a rudimentary form. The coach accepts the client's emotions, but unsuccessfully tries to calm them.

2: The coach demonstrates behavior similar to the standard descriptions. The coach allows the client to deescalate, sympathizes with the client, helps the client to understand the emotional reaction and personal consequences, as well as reactions of other persons in the environment. The coach also takes the client through methods of reducing such intense reactions in similar situations. Relaxation techniques or similar methods are used to train the client to pacify emotions. The reduction of emotions can still be improved.

3: The coach behaves in an ideal way, applying the appropriate relaxation techniques or methods. The coach trains the client to apply these techniques for self-pacification in the best possible way. The client is able to use the methods effectively.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
		1.4	0.5	1.1%	1.6		

* $p > 0.05$; ** $p > 0.01$

As expected, the percentage of situations where affect calibration is observable in our coaching study is marginally low. This forbids any further analysis of the intraclass coefficients even where the percentage of agreement between raters is artificially high (98.9%). As mentioned above, the rating is assumed to be more important for the coaching of stress management where pacification of affect is used systematically to reduce post-work stress levels.

CG: Clarification of goals

The rating assesses whether the coach helps the client to clarify goals in a concrete way, to what degree this is done, and if goals are prioritized.

CG1: The coach supports the client's clarification and/or defining of goals.

The rating focuses on the coach's ability to clarify and explain the client's goals (e.g., by a concrete description, definition, or specification of criteria, and measures the rate of goal attainment).

Remark:

Goal clarification should be observed throughout the coaching.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Asks the client to describe or define goal(s).
- Uses direct questions to deepen the client's goal descriptions.
- Helps the client clarify the relationship between extrinsic and intrinsic goals.
- Asks the client to describe in concrete terms what will be different once the goals have been achieved.
- Helps the client understand which goals are realistic.
- Helps the client detect conflict between different goals that are being pursued.
- Systematically guides the client to decide which of the goals is a priority.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach constrains or disrupts the client from clarifying goals.

0: The coach does not show any of the behaviors described above. The coach does not clarify the client's goals, or help to define them concretely.

1: The coach shows some of the behaviors of the standard description, but in a rudimentary way. The goals are noted, but their definitions remain vague – further clarification is possible and necessary. Potential conflicts with the goals remain undetected, and the client and coach do not examine the goals to see if they are realistic.
2: The coach shows the standard behaviors. The coach helps the client analyze and define the goals concretely, detecting potential conflicts and ascertaining whether the goals are realistic. Where necessary, the coach encourages the client to redefine the goals. There is room for improvement in goal clarification.
3: The coach helps the client to clarify the goals. All aspects described above are accounted for in an ideal way.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.62**	0.77**	1.2	0.2	20.3%	10.3	Overall sum of negative-affect scales	-0.48
						Activity level at the start of the coaching	.61*

* p> 0.05; ** p>0.01

The intraclass coefficients and the percentage of agreement between raters (86.4%) is satisfactory. Goal clarification correlates significantly with problem-reflection (PR1 .46* and PR1+ .55*) and the activity level at the start of the coaching.

RA: Resource activation

The coach helps the client become aware of internal and external resources to reach concrete coaching goals.

Internal resources are potentials within the individual, e.g., motivational and personality traits, abilities, competencies and experiences. *External resources* are potentials in the social and material environment that the client is able to use (e.g., expert knowledge, consultations, emotional support or concrete help from people in the occupational environments, family or network of friends, technical literature /knowledge of IT systems, and financial resources).

RA: The coach encourages the client to explore and make use of internal and external resources that will support goal attainment.

The rating assesses the level to which the coach helps the client explore and evaluate external resources, and to what extent the coach encourages the client to use the resources that will potentially support concrete coaching goals.

Remarks:

Delineation: The rating focuses on resources directly supporting the attainment of concrete coaching goals. Broader reflections of personal strengths and weaknesses or potentials are classified as self-reflections (SR1 or SR1+).

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Encourages the client to explore and specify internal strengths and potentials that may result in establishing concrete coaching goals (e.g., strong achievement motivation, special abilities and competencies, or experiences).
- Encourages the client to explore and name possible external resources that may support the attainment of concrete coaching goals (e.g., knowledge of experts, consultations, emotional

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

support, or concrete help from people in the occupational environments, family or network of friends, technical literature or IT knowledge systems, and financial resources).

- Asks the client to remember former successes, the personal resources that helped in those instances, and how the same resources can be applied in the current situation.
- Explains how the client can use personal resources to reach goals in the current situation.
- Appreciates the client's personal resources, explaining their value and stimulating positive self-evaluation.
- Encourages the client to use personal resources in pursuing concrete coaching goals.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach gives skeptical remarks concerning the client's personal resources, or distracts the client by asking to focus on their weaknesses and problems.
0: The coach does not show any of the behaviors described above. The coach does not try to activate the client's strengths and potentials.
1: The coach shows the standard behaviors described above, but only in a rudimentary way. The coach asks the client to name strengths, competencies, or external resources in the environment etc., but the analysis is not deep or precise.
2: The coach helps the client to analyze and activate internal and external resources in a similar way as described above by the standard behaviors. For example, strengths and competencies or external resources are analyzed precisely and the client identifies new ones that she/he did not think of beforehand. The client is asked to evaluate how useful the resources will be for the attainment of the coaching goals. Improvements of the behaviors of the coach are possible.
3: The coach helps the client analyze and activate internal and external resources in an ideal manner. This is shown by high precision, intensity, or completeness of the analysis, and a convincing evaluation that raises the motivation of the client to use the resources intelligently.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.29**	0.45**	1.1	0.1	17.4%	12.3	Goal satisfaction	.49*
						Listlessness	-.50
						Information management	.49

* $p > 0.05$; ** $p > 0.01$

The intraclass coefficients of this important scale are not satisfactory, but the absolute percentage of agreements between raters is (75.76%). As the low mean value and very narrow variance show, the coaches did not realize the factor as optimally as demanded by the standard attributes. This may explain why the correlations with outcome criteria do not reach the level of significance. A problem may also result from delineation to goal clarification and support of transfer into practice. A more intensive training of the observers highlighting the differences here may be useful.

TP: Support of transfer into practice

TP: The coach encourages the client to put the planned goal-oriented behavior and measures into practice.

The coach encourages the client to put the planned behavior and/or other measures into practice through a persistent pursuit of goal-oriented actions and measures despite difficulties and barriers.

Observable behavior:

The coach:

- Helps the client develop a plan of concrete goals and subgoals comprised of small actions and measures that the client is able to perform.
- Stimulates the client to explore and analyze possible internal and external difficulties or barriers to taking the intended actions and measures.
- Helps the client develop a realistic plan of actions and measures despite possible difficulties and barriers.
- Consults the client on how to overcome possible internal and external difficulties and barriers to trials and to act according to plan.
- Encourages the client, after a seemingly insurmountable difficulty, to try again after re-examining and redefining goals, actions, or measures.
- Uses systematic questioning techniques or tools to support the transfer of planned changes into practice (e.g., telephone shadowing).

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The behavior of the coach interferes with client's attempts to perform intentions practically. The client expresses indifference or disrespect towards the client's attempts to transfer the intended actions and measures into practice. The coach criticizes the action plans without developing alternative plans that might be more realistic.
0: The coach does not show any of the standard behaviors.
1: The coach shows basic support that helps the client transfer the planned behavior into practice. The coach asks the client to develop a plan of action or a measure that will analyze some internal and external difficulties. The analysis and the measures for how to overcome them, however, remain vague or abstract.
2: The coach helps the client to prepare the transfer of the planned behavior into practice. The behavior is similar as described in the examples above. The analysis and support is systematic and incorporates nearly all of the important facets of the transfer problems of the client. The coach helps the client to develop a realistic plan of small steps of actions, to analyze possible internal and external difficulties, and to measure how to overcome them. The coach encourages the client to redefine goals after setbacks. Improvement of the behavior is possible, (e.g., the analysis is not completely systematic, does not embrace all important barriers and relevant measures, or is not fully convincing).
3: The coach supports the transfer into practice. The coach helps the client analyze all relevant internal and external difficulties and barriers, as well as effective measures in a convincing way. The coach uses systematic transfer tools (e.g., telephone shadowing) and other methods (e.g., simulations by role-playing). After a setback, the coach sensitively helps the client to understand inner transfer difficulties and change resistances in the environment. The coach motivates the client to draw adequate conclusions from the trials and sustainably motivates them to redesign the plans and try again until goals are reached.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.6**	0.75**	1.2	0.2	26.7%	18.1	Helplessness	-.55*
						Listlessness	-.58*
						Self-management (procrastination)	.55*
						Goal satisfaction	.44

* p> 0.05; ** p>0.01

The intraclass coefficients and the percentage of agreement between the raters (73.74%) are satisfactory. But the low mean value and variance show that the coaches did not perform well in comparison to the standard example behavior descriptions of the factor. It is surprising that relatively high and significant correlations to outcome criteria have been found here.

FP: Feedback and evaluations in the process

The ideal standard of *result-oriented* coaching demands that each coaching session create concrete results perceived by the client. This is shown by a positive evaluation at the end of the session, either after a question from the coach or by a spontaneous positive feedback from the client.

FP1: The coach asks the client to evaluate progress in the coaching as well as satisfaction with the coaching, especially in goal attainment.

The coach asks the client for feedback, to evaluate that specific coaching session or the coaching in general, especially in relation to the perceived progress or goal attainment. The evaluation of the client is positive.

Observable behavior:

The coach receives positive feedback and/or evaluation from the client, after:

- Asking the client to rate satisfaction with the session or the coaching up to that point.
- Asking the client to rate progress in the coaching or the goal-attainment rate.
- Using rating scales to assess satisfaction, goal attainment, or other evaluation criteria of the coaching.
- Applying specialized instruments or standard questionnaires.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The coach hinders the client from evaluating important aspects of the coaching, or gives the impression of being disinterested in the results. The client gives negative feedback or expresses disapproval of a session or of the coaching up to that point. The coach does not mention possible changes.
0: The coach does not ask the client for feedback. The coach does not show any of the behaviors described above and does not apply instruments assessing the client's satisfaction with the coaching.
1: The coach briefly asks the client for feedback or evaluations. The feedback or evaluations of the client remain rudimentary or cursory. The coach does not ask the client to explain the evaluation. Also, if the evaluation is merely somewhat positive, the rating of 1 is to be coded here.
2: The coach asks the client for feedback or uses rating scales and evaluation instruments, similar as described above. The overall results of the evaluation are unambiguously positive and the coach protocols them. An improvement of the behavior is possible.
3: The coach sensitively asks the client to give feedback, or uses systematic scales or evaluation instruments and interprets the results together with the client. The client's overall evaluations are very positive. The results of the evaluation are analyzed systematically and are used for future planning of the subjects and changes to the coaching or client's plans.

Observer reliability and frequency:

Intraclass Coefficient		Quality ratings		Percentages		Correlation with	r
Mean rater	Mean ratings	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
0.64**	0.78**	1.1	0.2	10.2%	8.3	Coaching start: Overall sum of negative affect	.61*
						Coaching ending: Happiness	.57**
						Activity	.69**

* p> 0.05; ** p>0.01

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

The intraclass coefficients and the percentage of agreement among raters (88.4%) is satisfactory. The remaining values are based on the whole range of the ratings (-1 to -3). In the study the highest affect state measures can be found in the starting and ending session. Also, evaluations are more meaningful in the starting and ending phase of the coaching. It is an interesting observation that positive evaluations of the clients correlate with the sum of all negative-affect scales. This could mean that clients who are in a negative mood are more grateful for starting the coaching and are more likely to give positive feedback. The high correlations at the end of the coaching show that positive evaluations of the clients are associated with their happiness, but also that they might activate them.

FP2: The client spontaneously remarks satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the meeting or the whole coaching engagement.

The client spontaneously expresses satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the session or the whole coaching engagement.

Examples of behavioral anchors:

-1: The client spontaneously gives negative feedback or evaluation of the coaching.
0: The client does not make spontaneous evaluations of the coaching.
1: The client briefly expresses satisfaction with special aspects of the coaching without any prompting.
2: The client briefly expresses satisfaction with the overall coaching engagement without any prompting.
3: The client expresses great satisfaction with the coaching without any prompting.

Observer reliability and frequency:

<i>Intraclass Coefficient</i>		<i>Quality ratings</i>		<i>Percentages</i>		<i>Correlation with</i>	<i>r</i>
<i>Mean rater</i>	<i>Mean ratings</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>		
-	-	1.17	0.33	0.73%	1.32	-	

* $p > 0.05$; ** $p > 0.01$

Due to a low quality rating and variance, intraclass coefficients could not be calculated. The percentage of agreement between raters is extremely high (97.9%). We doubt that it is useful to use this scale in future studies, since the frequency of the behavior is very low and it does not correlate as expected with overall client satisfaction.

Correlations between the success factors

Non-verbal empathy is an analogue communication process that is performed parallel to all other verbal behaviors. Therefore, it does not make sense to define it as a so-called disjunct behavior category. In the 5-minute observation periods, the coach is able to show up to three different behaviors. Therefore, we did not try to design disjunct behavior ratings or to force the observers to choose only one factor to be rated. (Exceptions are the PR and SR ratings, see below.) As a methodological consequence, it is necessary to examine the correlations between the ratings and to make sure that they are not too high. In addition, the correlations are theoretically very interesting.

Table 1 shows the correlations between the success factors in our study. They range from $r = -0.64$ to $r = 0.89$. The majority of the correlations are low and not significantly different from zero correlations.

The Rating of the Coaching Success Factors

Table 1: Correlations between success factor ratings based on version 3 (*p>.05; **p>.01)

	ES1	ES2	ES3	ARI	AC2	RP1	RP1+	RS1	RS1+	GCI	RA	ST1
ES1	–											
ES2	.56*	–										
ES3	.51*	.10	–									
ARI	.36	-.19	.41	–								
AC2	-.03	-.43	.09	.47*	–							
RP1	.09	.38	-.25	.06	-.53*	–						
RP1+	.29	.22	.02	.38	-.13	.74**	–					
SR1	-.18	-.18	.45	.09	.40	-.64**	-.32	–				
SR1+	.25	.03	.57*	.18	.30	-.51*	-.13	.81**	–			
GCI	.30	.16	-.14	.26	-.31	.46*	.55*	.45	.01	–		
RA	.33	.11	.79**	.16	.28	-.56*	-.23	.66**	.65**	-.37	–	
ST1	.26	.00	.71**	.03	.27	-.60*	-.43	.46*	.51*	-.34	.89*	–
EP1	.41	.25	.65**	.03	-.14	-.10	-.03	.17	.53*	.24	.47*	.53*

As mentioned above, the correlations between RP1 and RP1+ and also SR1 and SR1+ are influenced by a logical dependency (the second ratings can be observed only if the first are present). Therefore they are artificially high and cannot be interpreted. In the table they are marked with grey shading.

Resource activation (RA) and the support of transfer (ST1) correlate by $r = 0.89$. This is definitively too high. As mentioned above, in this version 4 of our manual, the differences between the ratings have been sharpened, and the recommendation has been put forth to train the raters more rigorously so that they are able to distinguish better between the activation of the client's resources (RA) through identifying them, reflecting on them, and supporting how to overcome difficulties in the transfer of intended actions into practice by systematic interventions (ST1), e.g. shadowing.

A similar problem in part is shown by the correlation of $r = 0.79$ between emotional support (ES3) and resource activation (RA) and also $r = 0.71$ with support of transfer (ST1). Both constructs have some similarity in their definitions. Therefore we have sharpened the descriptions and examples of ES3. But here the reason for the high correlation may also be that for resource activation and support of transfer, emotional support is a necessary companion. Emotional support (ES3) correlates with ratings of these factors, which demand sensitive interventions by the coach. Future analyses of interaction may be helpful to clarify the problem.

It is plausible that the esteem and emotional support items (ES1, ES2 and ES3) form a correlating cluster. Also expected is the finding that problem-reflection and self-reflection correlate negatively. They have been designed as disjunct ratings. The negative correlation shows that the raters are able to distinguish the constructs. Two further correlating pairs of factors that we hoped to find are the correlations (from $r = 0.46$ to 0.66) between the two self-reflection-ratings (SR1 and SR1+) with resource activation (RA) and support of transfer (ST1). This may show that self-reflection is necessary for activating strengths and abilities of the client and supporting the transfer of the planned behavior into practice. In contrast to this, reflection on problems not directly related to the self (PR1 and PR1+) correlate negatively, but positively with goal clarification (GC).

We have to be careful not to overrate the correlations found in our first study. Future replication studies with similar and different samples are necessary, before we interpret them as reliable results and draw expansive theoretical conclusions. But since the results largely confirm our theoretical assumptions (Greif, 2008) and the correlations between the factors and the outcome criteria are astonishingly high, future research may be encouraged. Also professionals may discuss about possible practical conclusions in observing and improving the factors as a means improving coaching outcomes.

References

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

- Borsum, F. (2008). *Vergleich von Coaching und Psychotherapie – Vergleich und Abgrenzung von Wirkfaktoren und Inhalten*. Diploma thesis, Work and Psychology Unit, University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- Dörner, D. (1979). *Problemlösen als Informationsverarbeitung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Flückiger, C., Caspar, F., Holtforth, M. G. & Willutzki, U. (2009). Working with patients' strengths: A microprocess approach. *Psychotherapy Research*, 19(2), 213-223.
- Flückiger, C. & Holtforth, M. G. (2008). Focusing the therapist's attention on the patient's strengths: A preliminary study to foster a mechanism of change in outpatient psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64(7), 876-890.
- 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.
- Geißler, H. (2009). Die inhaltsanalytische „Vermessung“ von Coachingprozessen. In B. Birgmeier (Hrsg.), *Coachingwissen - Denn sie wissen icht, was sie tun?* (pp. 93-128). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Grant, A. M. (2006). An Integrative Goal-Focused Approach to Executive Coaching. In D. R. Stober, Grant, A. M. (Hrsg.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting Best Practices to Work for Your Clients* (S. 153-192). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Grawe, K. (2000). *Psychologische Therapie* (2. korr. Aufl.). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Grawe, K. (2006). *Neuropsychotherapie: How the Neurosciences Inform Effective Psychotherapy*: Erlbaum.
- Grawe, K., Donati, R. & Bernauer, F. (1994). *Psychotherapie im Wandel: von der Konfession zur Profession*. Hogrefe: Göttingen.
- Grawe, K., Regli, D. & Schmalbach, S. (1994). *Cubus-Analyse*. Bern: University of Bern.
- Greene, J. & Grant, A. (2003). *Solution Focused Coaching*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Greif, S. (2008). *Coaching und ergebnisorientierte Selbstreflexion. Theorie, Forschung und Praxis des Einzel- und Gruppencoachings (Coaching and result-oriented self-reflection. Theory, research and practice of individual and team coaching)*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Greif, S. (in prep.). *Analysis of Subjektive Theories on Success and Failure of Coaching by the Change Explorer Method*. Osnabrueck: University of Osnabrueck, Work and Organizational Psychology Unit.
- Greif, S. (in preparation). *Analysis of Subjektive Theories on Success and Failure of Coaching by the Change Explorer Method*. Osnabrueck: University of Osnabrueck, Work and Organizational Psychology Unit.
- Kaufel, S., Scherer, S., Scherm, M. & Sauer, M. (2006). Führungsbegleitung in der Bundeswehr - Coaching für militärische Führungskräfte. In W. Backhausen & J.-P. Thommsen (Hrsg.), *Coaching. Durch systemisches Denken zur innovativen Personalentwicklung* (pp. 419-438). Wiesbaden: Gabler.
- Kauffmann, C. (2006). Positive Psychology: The Science of the Heart of Coaching. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Hrsg.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting Best Practices to Work for Your Clients* (pp. 219-254). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kauffmann, C., Bonniwell, I. & Silberman, J. (2010). The Positive Psychology Approach to Coaching. In E. Cox, T. Bachkirova & D. A. Clutterbuck (Hrsg.), *The Complete Handbook of Coaching* (pp. 158-171). London: Sage.
- Kuhl, J. (2001). *Motivation und Persönlichkeit. Interaktionen psychischer Systeme*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Mäthner, E., Jansen, A. & Bachmann, T. (2005). Wirksamkeit und Wirkung von Coaching. In C. Rauen (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Coaching* (pp. 55-76). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Miller, D. T. & Ross, M. (1975). Self-Serving Bias in the Attribution of Causality. Fact or Fiction? *Psychological Bulletin*, 82, 213-225.
- O'Connell, B. & Palmer, S. (2007). Solution-focused coaching. In S. Palmer & A. Whybrow (Hrsg.), *The Handbook of Coaching Psychology: A Guide for Practitioners* (S. 278-292). London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Rauen, C. (Hrsg.). (2004). *Coaching-Tools. Erfolgreiche Coaches präsentieren 60 Interventionstechniken aus ihrer Coaching-Praxis* (6st ed.). Bonn: managerSeminare.

- Rauen, C. (Hrsg.). (2007). *Coaching-Tools II. Erfolgreiche Coaches präsentieren Interventionstechniken aus ihrer Coaching-Praxis*. Bonn: managerSeminare.
- Rogers, C. R. (1980). *A Way of Being*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schmidt, F. & Thamm, A. (2008). *Wirkungen und Wirkfaktoren im Coaching. – Verringerung von Prokrastination und Optimierung des Lernverhaltens bei Studierenden*. Diplom thesis, Work and Organizational Psychology Unit, University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- Schmidt, F., Thamm, A. & Greif, S. (2008). Rating-Manual der Wirkfaktoren im Coaching. In F. Schmidt & A. Thamm (Hrsg.), *Wirkungen und Wirkfaktoren im Coaching. – Verringerung von Prokrastination und Optimierung des Lernverhaltens bei Studierenden - Appendix* (pp. 78-94). Osnabrück: University of Osnabrück, Diploma thesis.
- Shazer, S. d. (1988). *Clues: Investigating Solutions in Brief Therapy*. New York: Norton.
- Stober, D. R. (2006). Coaching from the Humanistic Perspective. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Hrsg.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook: Putting Best Practices to Work for Your Clients* (pp. 17-50). New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Wirtz, M. & Caspar, F. (2002). *Beurteilerübereintimmung und Beurteilerreliabilität*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Zöllner, R. (2008). *Evaluation von Erfolgskriterien und Erfolgsfaktoren im Coaching. – Ein Vergleich der Perspektiven von Coaches und Klienten*. Diplom thesis, Work and Organizational Psychology Unit, University of Osnabrück, Germany.