

IUL School of Social Sciences

Department of Political Economy

Profiling Coaching Training.
What is a Suitable Coaching Training Curricula?

Carolina Gomes Farinha

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of Master in

Developmental Policies in Human Resources

Supervisor:

Doutor Nelson Ramalho, Assistant Professor, ISCTE-IUL

September 2016

Acknowledgments

In order to make this work become a reality, many people – directly or indirectly – were involved and to all of them and for their support I am truly thankful:

To my teacher and supervisor, Nelson Ramalho, for all his support, availability, motivation and for accepting to be my supervisor.

To all the coaches that accepted to participate in this study.

To my teachers, for all their lessons that contributed for my professional growth.

To my family that despite this turbulent year managed to support me.

To my friends Marta, Inês, Ana, Teresa, Vanessa, Vasco and Filipe that helped me walk the walk.

Abstract

This study aims to shed some light into the debate of what is a suitable coaching training curricula, specifically in Portugal.

We conducted a Delphi study with 5 coaching experts to analyse: i) what is the minimum academic training for a future coach, ii) what is the minimum of hours required for a coaching training program, iii) which competencies should it develop, iv) which contents should the training address, v) which are the requisites for one to be a coaching trainer and, vi) what mechanism should regulate coaching practice.

The results show a consensus regarding the coaching competencies profile, which are both the standard of coaching competencies in market. Minimum education background (university degree) also achieved consensus which is superior to market requirements. We also achieved consensus for the requisites to be a coaching trainer but the standards are partially in accordance with the market information. The minimum of hours did not achieve consensus and the minimum of hours required in the study are superior to many coaching programs available. Coaching training contents did not achieve consensus. For coaching practice regulation, the International Coach Federation (ICF) seems to be the preferred regulator entity.

Key-words: coaching, coaching training, coaching regulation, coaching practice, coaching competencies.

Resumo

Este estudo tem como objetivo lançar alguma luz no debate sobre o que constitui um currículo de formação de coaching adequado, nomeadamente em Portugal.

Foi realizado um estudo Delphi com 5 especialistas em coaching para analisar: i) qual é a formação académica mínima para um futuro coach, ii) qual é o número mínimo de horas necessárias para um programa de formação de coaching, iii) que competências devem ser abordadas e desenvolvidas, iv) que conteúdos programáticos deve a formação ter, v) quais são os requisitos para um coach ser um formador de coaching e, vi) que mecanismo deve regular prática de coaching.

Os resultados mostram um consenso sobre o perfil de competências de coaching, que é também o nível de competências que o mercado disponibiliza. A escolaridade mínima também obteve consenso (grau universitário), o que se verifica estar a cima do requerido no mercado. Atingiu-se consenso para os requisitos para se ser formador de coaching embora estes resultados estejam parcialmente de acordo com a informação no mercado. O mínimo de horas não chegou a consenso: o mínimo de horas necessárias indicadas no estudo é superior ao que muitos programas de formação de coaching praticam. Quanto aos conteúdos de formação, não se alcançou consenso. Para a regulamentação da prática de coaching, o ICF parece ser a entidade reguladora preferida para a prática de coaching.

Palavras-chave: coaching, formação em coaching, regulação do coaching, prática de coaching, competências de coaching.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	7
2.1. The emergence of Coaching.....	7
2.2. What coaching is and what is not.....	9
2.3. Regulation of coaching training and practice.....	11
2.4. Research objectives and questions.....	14
3. METHOD.....	15
3.1. Data Collection Instruments.....	15
3.2. Intervention Procedures and Data Collection.....	18
3.3. Organization and collection of documental sources.....	19
3.4. Analysis of Documental Resources.....	20
3.5. Content Analysis.....	20
3.6. Framing / Heuristics.....	21
4. RESULTS.....	25
4.1. Documental Analysis.....	25
4.2. First Round.....	25
4.3. Second Round.....	27
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	28
6. REFERENCES.....	31

1. INTRODUCTION

The exercise of a professional practice with a psychological nature must comply with a set of requirements for an effective and deontological conduct which is a major *raison d'être* of regulatory bodies, associated with this scientific and professional areas. However, there are border areas whose professional identity, resulting either from its emerging character or multidisciplinary nature, may lead to divergent points of view on the guardianship of the profession.

Coaching falls within these border areas as it is manifestly a helping relationship and it welcomes activities that match psychological intervention, even though not clinical, since it mobilizes the coachee into its triple biopsychosocial constitution, where theories and psychological models, related to learning, motivation, personality and behavioural change have full reasoning.

Such implies the existence of specific qualifications for its regular exercise, which has been answered by the society through multiple training offers specifically designed to enable professionals to coaching practice.

Its emergent character justifies, along with the dynamics of free markets, a broad diversity in training offer, which can be, in some forums, subject to question as to its effectiveness and even its legitimacy, against the skills profile required to exercise this professional activity. With this study we intend to make an overview of coaching programs available in the market and to ascertain to which extent they meet commonly agreed criteria amongst experts.

In the 1st chapter we begin by describing the emergence of coaching and its evolution across time until its must-have nowadays, following by a definition and distinction of what is and what is not coaching. Then we will focus on core coaching competencies where we elaborate about research evidence and competencies identified by regulatory entities. That will lead us to the final section focused on the regulation of coaching practice in Portugal.

In the 2nd chapter we describe and justify the methodology used to conduct the research to present and discuss findings in the following chapters taken into consideration the main research goal of this study.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. The emergence of Coaching

It is unarguable the impact a coaching program claims to have in business and life domains, developing people towards their full potential. More than a decade ago, it became common to provide a coach to top leaders / managers to meet monthly to work together on their personal development and issues (Thach & Heinselman, 1999). Despite its recent presence in corporate media and private practice as well as its scarce empirical research¹, coaching is a growing cross-disciplinary area of professional practice which is available to anyone (Grant, 2011).

The origin of the methodology of Coaching dates back to 469 A.C. with the philosopher Socrates using the maieutic method with his disciples (Rego, Cunha, Oliveira & Marcelino, 2004) to stimulate their awareness, curiosity and reflection, inciting them to find by themselves the answers to their own questions. This active search for answers contrasts with a traditional practice where the teacher or master tells their students the answers and formats the way of thinking. It is “the earliest recorded model of life and business coaching through his process of inquiry” (Williams & Anderson, 2006). Etymologically, the word comes from *Kócsi*, a carriage (*coche*) originating in the 15th century in the *Kócs* city (Correia & Santos, 2011). The designation rapidly spread across Europe and specifically in the United Kingdom it went on to describe the act of transporting people and objects.

Later, in the 19th century, the term was absorbed into the academic field and the individual who helped students prepare for the exams was named coach. At a certain moment it was used merely to designate the university sports trainer.

Only recently has Coaching began to untie the sports domain and to claim its status of a personal and professional developmental process. Soon it gained a large relevance among executive markets in EUA and its efficacy spread across the world (Thach & Heinselman, 1999). It was “the latest and hottest trend to invade the workplace” (Williams et al., 2006: 3) and its expansion arisen in the 1990s. Coaching has been in the business and personal field since then, helping people in their developmental process. For that, two facts occurred: The coaching practice experienced a fast propagation worldwide (coaching supply) and the companies were eager to incorporate coaching programs for top managers’ development due to

¹ Although coaching originates from scientifically based psychological theories, studies are needed to validate its effectiveness and to measure its results.

its trends and results in improving performance of the majority of their employers (Stewart, O’Riordan & Palmer, 2008; Liljenstrans & Nebeker, 2008).

As a consequence of this proliferation, many programs that were not coaching-designed, such as training, consulting and commercial, to name a few, saw in coaching popularity their opportunity to enter the business world. This may explain Grant (2015) myth busting that plagues coaching programs. This topic will be addressed with more detail in the following topic entitled *What coaching is and what is not*.

Besides understanding the dissemination and impact of coaching, it is also worth exploring what prompted this event (only) in the 1990s.

The first known reference and concern about personal well-being and motion towards excellence dates from William James, pioneer of Psychology, who stated that “people often mask or bury their brilliance” which can become consciously further developed through life and work design (Kinder, Hughes & Cooper, 2008). Thereafter, one can find several references in literature to psychological well-being and personal development towards a better and fulfilled self.

Carl Rogers made a shift in the psychological paradigm with his book “Client-Centred Therapy” – that still is a must have among psychological therapists and students. This work made therapy and counselling evolved from an non equalitarian relationship where the counsellor detained the knowledge to help the patient through the psychological process, to a relationship where the client is assumed to have the ability to change and grow (Williams et al., 2006).

Abraham Maslow, a humanistic and transpersonal psychologist, stated in his book *Toward a Psychology of Being* that people with high vitality and an active search for purpose in life are compelled to grow and to achieve a higher potential because the human being has an inner tendency to search for well-being. Once “removed the obstacles in his pathway, they will actively pursue self-actualization, playfulness, curiosity and creativity” (Williams et al., 2006: 3).

This is probably the *leitmotif* that set the framework for what we today designate as coaching.

Although coaching has undeniable roots in Psychology, it soon expanded to other areas and to professionals from different backgrounds – business consultancy, management, teaching, workplace training, learning and development and sales (Cavanagh, Grant & Kemp, 2005) who

joined the opportunity to enter in companies in this emergent and unregulated work-field in expansion. Moreover, psychological academics expressed no interest in non-clinical populations and left the door open for (possibly) less qualified people in this area (Spence & Grant, 2007; Grant, 2011). This situation resulted from three combined situations: 1 – coaching is intended to work with non-clinical population, which has no restrictions on what type professionals may work in the area (contrary to clinical populations restricted to specialized and recognized trained professionals) and therefore it wouldn't be limited to a professional area; 2 – due to its rapid proliferation, not enough time has passed so that regulation could have occurred; 3- the *Black Monday* in 1989 and its following recession resulted in massive layoffs among executives who being in the possession of a huge knowledge and expertise saw a working opportunity in coaching (Silva, 2012).

The issues and concerns that may arise from this situation will be addressed in *Regulation of coaching practice* sub-chapter.

2.2. What coaching is and what is not

Coaching practice is grounded on evidence-based theories from the psychological domain but being based on scientific theories is not a sufficient condition to affirm coaching as scientific. In order to claim itself the status of science one needs to conduct researches that comply with the scientific method implying the disclosure of explanatory mechanisms and theories scientifically recognized by the scientific community and empirically testable and refutable (Popper). Such as not been the rule but the exception concerning coaching, and this leaves room for a confounding frontier between what is and isn't coaching.

Coaching is a one-to-one relationship where coach is neither the expert nor has the answers to the coachee which makes the relationship a symmetric one. It focuses on the future to achieve the desired results rather than in past problems or in the present.

It is “a robust and challenging intervention, is result-driven, delivers tangible added value, is typically a short-term or intermittent engagement, and enables the attainment of high standards or goals” (Grant, 2008: 24) and is based on 4 cornerstones: 1 – the client is naturally creative, resourceful and whole; 2 – the agenda comes from the client; 3 – the coach dances in the moment and; 4 – it addresses the client's whole life (Whitworth, Kimsey-House, Kimsey-House & Sandahl, 2007). The coachee is expected to quickly attain some achievements - *quick-wins* that work as leverage and stimuli for future changes (Silva, 2012).

We have settled a definition of coaching and explained its evolution throughout time. A concept should not be defined by what it is not. Nonetheless, it seems that some boundaries are not well established or are easy to overlap. Hence, we decided to dedicate some space to help clarifying it, comparing coaching to the areas that are most commonly mistaken.

Psychotherapy – The relation is also one-to-one but the therapist is the expert and is expected to conduct the sessions. Therefore, the relationship is asymmetric and the therapist holds the command. The therapist knowledge is key to the therapeutic process and outcomes. It focuses on the past and works with emotions to fix problems.

Counselling – It is also a one-to-one relationship and the focus is on the present and in what the client is feeling at the moment. The counsellor guides the sessions and asks questions to help the client gain awareness of his feelings. Although not as much as in therapy, it is an asymmetric relationship.

Consulting – The relationship is one-to-several. The consultant is the expert and analyses the situation and then presents some proposals to change.

Training – The relationship is also one-to-several. The trainer transmits the knowledge in a standardized way and then evaluates the students' knowledge. There are learning objectives and the training contents are not subject to changes.

Mentoring – it is also a one-to-one approach, creating the conditions towards reflection, learning and personal development. However, it differs from coaching in the asymmetric relationship: there must be a more experienced person – the mentor – and another less experienced that needs the mentor – the mentee. The purpose of the former is to facilitate the personal and professional growth of the latest (Garvey, Stokes & Megginson, 2014). According to this, mentoring would probably be the nearest area to coaching than any other.

After presenting the way coaching emerged and clarified what coaching is and what practices are not coaching, we are now able to define it in a more comprehensive way. We opt for the definition of Whitmore (2009: 10): “coaching is unlocking a person’s potential to maximize their own performance. It is helping them to learn rather than teaching them – a facilitation approach”.

2.3. Regulation of coaching training and practice

There have been some concerns that coaching is a fad with intangible self-development ambitions (Cavanagh et al., 2005).

Coaching claims of well-being enhancement and sustained self-development require solid studies to sustain (or not) this allegation. They are also critical to improve interventions and to delineate future investigations. The failure to reach and maintain scientific criteria is prejudicial for coaching professional activity leading to a decreasing recognition and credibility, as well as for clients who may inadvertently be injured in the process. This lack of universal standards for coaching practice has continued despite, or perhaps because of, growing demand for coaching services” (Thach et al., 1999). In addition, there is no clear sense of how to evaluate coaching outcomes and effectiveness in the short and long-term, as well as coaches’ competencies to meet the client needs and expectations (The Executive Coaching Handbook, 2008). Garman, Whiston & Zlatoper (2000) and Grant (2007) highlight that there aren’t any requisites to become a coach and that the only real requisite to enter the coaching club is a practitioner’s skills to attract clients. The market deregulation allows anyone to self-entitle as a professional coach (Jones, 2012). In addition, “in a few days’ training and payment of a suitable fee, one can become a Certified Master Coach (...) and there are no penalties for those self-entitled coaches that do not possess any accreditation or qualification process because there is no clear regulation for procedures of how to become a coach (Grant, 2008: 27). Bachkirova and Smith (2015) criticise the nowadays acritical acceptance of the initial systems for coaches’ accreditation despite the development and growth in this area.

Several authors have expressed their dislike about the reductionist view of coaching competencies and expertise, such as articles or case studies that have little to add or the methodology used, not peer-reviewed (Garvey et al., 2014) and accreditation systems underestimating the coaching complexity and being reductionists in coaching expertise (Ferrari, 2006).

This lack of criteria regarding coaching training and practice has raised awareness and concern among professionals who state that this issue has not yet been properly and widely discussed in the literature (Grant, 2011), especially if coaching practice and solicitation continues to increase.

However, there have been some focus on this topic by companies that employ or solicit coaches (Palmer et al., 2008) as they have raised concern regarding coaches’ qualifications and

post-graduations courses in behavioural science for executive coaching practice (Corporate Leadership Council, 2003, cit. Grant, 2008). At the same time, psychologists have also directed their attention towards coaching practice, taking with them their training, knowledge and expertise in human behaviour (Grant, 2008). The raise of the number of post-graduation courses in universities world-wide is also expected to raise the standard for the coaching business (Grant & Cavanagh, 2007).

As previously stated, coaching is intended for non-clinical population. Nonetheless, some people with clinical disorders, such as anxiety or depression, bipolarity, to name a few, may choose a coaching program rather than a suitable therapeutic one, because coaching is more socially acceptable (Grant & Cavanagh, 2007). According with some authors (e.g. Green, Oades & Grant, 2006) there is evidence that the level of psychopathology and distress among coaching clients is at least the same of the general population. In fact, 25 to 50% of coachees in life coaching present clinical levels of psychopathology (Green, Oades & Grant, 2006). This situation exposes the existing gap between the reality of coaching practice and theory, pointing out two main issues: 1- coaching is being used for population that is not intended (clinical population) and 2 – there are non-trained coaches dealing with clinical populations. Both situations raise ethical concerns.

Whitmore (1992) raised doubts regarding the practice of coaching by individuals with no psychological training or that are not made aware of psychological principles underlying coaching practice and effectiveness. This built some tension between coaching psychologists and non-psychologist where the former view the latter as offering para-psychological services and invading their professional domain, while the non-psychologist coaches perceive the others as invaders of this business area (Grant, 2008).

Grant (2007) believed that coaching should not be exclusive to psychologists. However, for those coaches that do not possess a psychological training, they should have deep training in theoretically-based approaches to coaching as well as a robust preparation in recognizing and referring clinical issues. They exemplify that in situations where cognitive or emotional issues pop up, they should be led by or referred to psychologically trained coaches.

The British Psychological Society (2007) spoke out and stated that UK coaching psychologists are not limited to nonclinical practice and they are also eligible to work with clinical problems, as long as they also possess qualifications for the matter. The necessity of intervention and clarification clearly illustrates the lack of consensus and social knowledge

regarding the qualifications and intervention domains of coaches, psychologists and coaching psychologists. It denotes as well that academic psychology has ignored for too long psychological domains not related with illness and did not engage with other areas of knowledge (Grant, 2011).

This raises some tension for those who are committed into make coaching flourishing in a scientific domain. They face the challenge of resisting sensationalism and, at the same time, avoid falling into scientific arrogance and rigidity (Grant et al., 2007).

World-wide, the entities that regulate coaching and have been putting effort in regulating the coaching practice and competencies are the Association of Coaching (AC), the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC), and the International Coach Federation (ICF).

Taking into consideration the coaching credibility among coaching areas, life coaching comes with the lowest levels of credibility (Salerno, 2005, cit Grant, 2008) and regarding professional background, psychologists detain the better credibility especially for areas such as executive or developmental coaching (Seligman, 2005, cit. Grant, 2008).

In 1998 there were 2000 ICF members and of those, 140 were from outside USA and Canada. In 2005, seven years later, the number quadrupled (8000 members) and 2000 were from outside North America, covering the majority of countries (Whitworth et al., 2007). Only 3 years later, the number doubled and it is estimated to be around 16000 coaches registered all over the world, being 61 in Portugal (ICF). However, the real number of individuals that present themselves as coaches is probably much higher due to the above mentioned deregulation and no-necessity of an affiliation which precludes a more accurate estimate.

In Portugal, the entities that regulate coaching practice are ICF (International Coaching Federation) and ICC (International Coaching Community). Another relevant entity but with less expression in Portugal is the CTI (Coaching Training Institute).

A study conducted by Barosa-Pereira (2007) to characterize the coaches and coaching practice in Portugal found that 97,1% of coaches hold a degree, and 41% a Psychological degree. However, this sample was not provided by any regulatory entity and therefore it is yet to be known the training and accreditation status of these coaches.

2.4. Research objectives and questions

Considering the presented framework, we believe there is a research gap concerning what subjects a coaching training curricula must have incorporated and what core skills a forthcoming coach must acquire and develop in order to become an effective coach.

The research questions that arise are the following:

What is a Suitable Coaching Training Curricula?

What is required in order to have the core skills for the practice of Coaching?

3. METHOD

3.1. Data Collection Instruments

To conduct this study, first we gathered information about coaching training curricula available in Portugal. This process corresponded to the organization and collection of documental sources. The second phase of the collection process involved the content analysis of all the coaching training courses. For this purpose, we followed Bardin's (1977) guidelines with an a priori categorization procedure. Thus, we created a table sheet which will be addressed in detail in the analysis section.

Concluded this process, we began conducting the delphi study to answer the research questions, more specifically, to clarify which contents a coaching training curricula should address and also which are the coaching core competencies that gather consensus among experts – also referred in literature as panellists. We shall now make a detailed explanation of each phase.

Taking into consideration the aim and the objectives of our study, the methodology that best suits the purpose is the *Delphi* technique. Designed by Dalkey & Helmer (1962) at Rand Corporation, this technique arose from a situation with scarce information available to make a sustained decision and without consensus about. Therefore, the purpose of this method was to “obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts (...) by a series of intensive questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback” (pp 458) and has been used in research in which expertise judgment is needed to solve complex problems and intuitive interpretation from data is required. Currently, the domains of application are, for instance, program-planning, determining the necessity for assessments, policy determination, resource utilization, forecasting (Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Turoff, 2002; Ludwig, 1997) and it is very helpful in situations in which insufficient research is available (Iqbal & Papon-Young, 2009).

We chose this method due to its intrinsic and unique characteristics that provides an alternative to traditional methods that carry in validity problems due to group pressure and status and therefore avoiding counterproductive discussions and fleeing from the theme (Thangaratinam & Redman, 2005) that we will briefly explore. The communication in traditional methods occurs in a group process that may distort the data and deal with group or individual interests rather than focusing on problem solving. The authors argue that as a result, the information developed from this kind of communication is generally contaminated with

biases not related to the discussed issues and may also result from leaders' opinions, which prevents rational judgement (Weaver, 1971). In a Delphi process, the participants neither interact nor are aware of each other identities due to a controlled feedback process which consists of a well-organized summary of the previous iterations – also called rounds, - intentionally distributed to the panelists (Dalkey et al., 1962). The only pressure is to conformity (Woudenberg, 1991) that is possible through the feedback to all the participant of group statistic response. This allows them to generate additional insights and more thoroughly clarify the information developed by previous iterations (Thangaratinam et al., 2005). In different words, it encourages independent thinking free of influences or leading members (Keeney, Hasson & McKenna, 2001). Additionally, through multiple iterations, experts are expected to become more problem solving oriented, to offer their opinions more insightfully and to minimize the effects of noise (Hsu et al., 2007).

Likewise, in these circumstances there is no real or perceived pressure upon experts to conform to another participant's response due to a sense of obedience, social norms, customs, organizational culture, standing within a profession or even persuasion that work against the desired independent thinking, only to covey to a group response according to Woudengerg (1991). Direct confront may also prompt to rush opinion formation with few data and preconceived opinions and may induce a close-minded setting which in turn would difficult the acceptance of other's points of view and lead to a behavior towards the defense of one's point of view. Further, the iteration process enables experts with the opportunity to consider some aspects that they may have overlooked in the first iteration. All in all, Thangaratinam et al. (2005) highlight a strong advantage of the Delphi technique consisting of a lessened from group dynamics, be it opinion polarization, social conformity, prejudice biases, reviewing one's own position without losing face (Walker & Selfe, 1996).

Finally, the statistical analysis technique allows an objective and impartial analysis and summarization of the collected data while ensuring that opinions generated within each iteration are well represented in the final iteration, from consensus achieved to significant spread among individual opinions (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis & Snyder, 1972).

There are some guidelines regarding timings to conduct the study. Delbecq, Van de Ven and Gustafson (1975) recommend a minimum of 45 days for the entire process and advise to give the experts a two-week response time (Delbecq et al., 1975). These recommendations must be put into context as communication means and speed have changed in the last couple decades (Hsu et al., 2007).

The questionnaire consists of open-ended questions and all experts are invited to answer them. Later, the answers are quantitatively analyzed and the responses are used to design the second questionnaire. After that, each panel member is provided with feedback from the questionnaire being shown their own responses as well as the group response. Then, the expert is asked if he or she wants to consider and (if they wish) change the answer at the light of other panelists' responses in case there is answer divergence from the group (Keeney et al., 2001).

Ludwig (1997) advises there should be at least three-iteration questionnaire survey but the number can depend upon the amount of components in the analysis as well as the degree of consensus reach in the second iteration. Powell (2003) says that only two iterations of questionnaires and respective feedback are required. Altschuld (1993) found that usually three iterations were enough and not sufficient new information was gained to support the cost of more iterations. Two iterations have also been accepted in literature (Delbecq, 1975) since the results of the second round shows no need for a following one and no additional clarification is needed.

It has been suggested that there should be more than seven experts (Linstone & Turof, 2002). However, there is no consensus among this topic, remaining controversial and depending on the study (Walker et al., 1996, Hsu et al., 2007). There is no cut-clear number and we didn't find any suggestions of insufficiency concerning 6 or 5 experts. In a *Delphi*, the representation is judged on the basis of qualities of the experts rather than their numbers (Powell, 2003). Delbecq et al. (1975) recommend selecting the minimum of participants and seeking out verification of results through follow-up surveys. The same authors suggest the snow-ball effect where participants nominate other person they believe to be experts or persons that can refer other potential respondents. Dalkey et al., (1972) reported there was an increase in the reliability of group responses with increasing group size, and a reliability with a correlation coefficient approaching .90 is expected to be achieved with a group size of 13 experts. The majority of Delphi studies have used between 15-20 respondents (Ludwig, 1997).

Expert's consensus are the focus of the study and therefore criteria used in the selection process to choose the experts are critical (Judd, 1972). According with Ludwig (1997) expert selection should not be random but must follow criteria: having knowledge and experience in the area in order to use them as a base to respond to Delphi questions, and be self-motivated in the area. According with Powell (2002), most delphi users suggest that the working field, appropriate work, credibility and target audience are good criteria for deciding who is and who is not an expert. Keeney et al. (2001) warn against potential bias in experts' selection because

having the knowledge in a specific domain is not a sufficient condition, the so called illusory expertise by Linstone & Turof (2002). The identification of experts has been controversial and the topic remains up to discussion (Hsu et al., 2007). These authors propose that Delphi subjects should be individuals highly trained and competent within their area of specialization, related to the topic in analysis. Woudenberg (1991) also raises awareness about the difficulty of evaluation accuracy² and reliability³ of Delphi method since judgements and opinions cannot be compared to measurements.

Dagenais (1978) successfully tested the reliability and consensus of a Delphi methodology using two panels of 11 experts each regarding a situation with no correct-incorrect answers with.

3.2. Intervention Procedures and Data Collection

Departing from the idea that coaching is an activity that fosters on professional reputation and high visibility we searched for information in the internet, using the google drive and the following search words: “coaching expert” “coaching professional”. Other key-words combinations did not provide further information. We also used LinkedIn and searched for “coach”.

To filter the results found and choose our expert panel, we used the following criteria: i) possess a coaching training provided by a relevant entity (ICF, ICC, ICT); ii) have more than 3 years of coaching practice; iii) coaching must be the main professional area; iv) be recognized by his peers (participation in conferences, publication of articles). Due to the fact that coaching is not a profession *per se*, but a professional activity, it is quite difficult to find a coach that fulfills this requisite, nonetheless possess all the previous mentioned criteria. As a consequence, we redefined this criterion and the coaching practice must be a part of the professional activity with a relevant impact (e.g. business consultant including the coaching dimension).

We identified 10 coaches that fulfilled the criteria and sent them an email inviting to participate (appendix A). After two weeks, those that did not respond were sent another email explaining the study was about to start and asking for their collaboration. In total, we received six positive answers, zero negative answers and four absences of response. Accepting coaches

² Accuracy stands for the correspondence between the judgement and its true value. It is equated to external validity in statistics. In other words, it states if the test really measures what it is intended to measure (Urbina, 2004).

³ Reliability is a test quality that indicates their consistency and freedom from measurement error in order to be useful (Urbina, 2004).

were predominantly male (66,7%), and have at least 5 years of professional coaching experience. Around two thirds (n=4) have an academic background in psychology, one in Sociology and another one in Engineering. Nowadays, the professional areas are, besides coaching, international consulting practice (n=2), coaching training (n=2), psychology (n=1) and investigation (n=1). During the collection of data from the first round, the document provided by one responded was not able to be opened and he did not provide us with a new one despite our attempts and therefore we had to consider him out. The results were analysed in first and second rounds with the data provided by 5 respondents.

For the first round of Delphi we sent an email to the participants that accepted to be part of the group with the Delphi questions as well as an explanation of what was intended (Appendix B).

We set two weeks to collect answers. One week after the deadline we sent an email asking for responses in case no reply was already received. Twenty-four days after sending the questionnaires we collected all the responses but from one participant. After a reminder, we opted to continue with five participants.

We analyzed the data from the group and provided feedback indicating in the first column the question, in the second the participant's response and in the third the group's response. Then, a fourth column asked if the participant intended to keep or change the original response. If the response was not the same as the group, and if he intended to keep it, we asked to explain why the group response was not the best answer (Appendix C).

After receiving the second round's answers, we analyzed the data and concluded that no further iterations were necessary.

3.3. Organization and collection of documental sources

This procedure allowed us to identify and document the existing training programs for future coaches that are currently available in the market or had been in the last two years.

In order to achieve this, we previously set the criteria of what is a coaching training program as follows: 1- it must mention or imply that at the end of the course the person is a coach or can work as a coach; 2 – trainings for already formed coaches should be considered as coaching programs; 3 – workshops or any other event with the purpose of clarifying or raise awareness of what is coaching, were not considered.

3.4. Analysis of Documental Resources

We began by creating a table document to compile data gathered from coaching training programs (Appendix D). We searched for the following information: 1- accreditation by a regulator organism (ICC or ICF); 2 – DGERT accreditation; 3 – the coaching training that the coach trainer received as well as his academic and professional background; 4 – the time duration (in hours); 5 – ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) whenever applicable; 6 – coaching core competencies; 7 – levels of training; and 8 – academic and professional background of the trainees. During the data collection we decided to add a new item: “other certifications or acknowledgments” because there was a significant number (30%) of training programs that were said to be certified by other entities such as other schools of coaching / training entities.

To gather the information, we used the internet Google search engine because the internet is a widespread communication vehicle.

3.5. Content Analysis

We used the content analysis technique to extract meaning from participants’ responses. This procedure has been widely used in social sciences and aims to represent rigorous and objectively the responses given (Amado, 2000) in reports of semi-directive interviews or documents, for example, that have a deep complexity without losing methodological rigor (Quivy & Campenhoudt, 2005).

Due to its unique characteristics, it is well suited for scenarios that aim to analyse ideologies and strategies, for instance. It forces the interlocutor to keep a neutral position about the responses and their interpretation. The records (material support) enable a subsequent handling control which can be very beneficial to the researcher (Quivy et al., 2005).

However, this technique also has its downfalls: some methods are simplistic and may not be sufficient or appropriate to some studies, others may be too heavy and meticulous and consequently not compatible with some investigation objectives (Quivy et al., 2005).

The content analysis methods can be separated in two categories: the quantitative methods that analyse the frequency of a given attribute or characteristics in the speech and the correlations among them; and the qualitative ones that analyse a small number of information that is complex and detailed (Quivy et al., 2005).

We can also categorize the techniques according with categories: thematic analysis, formal analysis, and structural analysis. The former intends to express social representations or respondents' judgments. The second analyses the speech itself (vocabulary, sentences length) and the later focuses on how the speech is elaborated (Quivy et al., 2005). This analysis can be decomposed as categorical analysis and evaluation analysis.

Categorization is a classification of elements that first differentiates them and then regroups according with the previous established criteria (Bardin, 1977) and it can be the most challenging part of the content analysis (Amado, 2000).

The categories can be *a priori* concerning a previously existing theoretical framework, or can be *a posteriori* if the purpose of the study is to prompt categories from the documental body (Amado, 2000). The labelling should be of a single word that holds the core meaning thoroughly and accurately of the concept within the category (Hogenraad, 1984).

There are six fundamental rules when categorizing: exhaustiveness – each category should completely incorporate all the units with the same meaning, - exclusivity – a register unit shall not belong to more than one category, - homogeneity – there must be only one type of content analysis, - relevance – the category system must be adapted to the purpose of the analysis and the investigation, - objectivity – the criteria should be objective to minimize subjectivity – and productivity – the investigation should offer a rich and productive material (Ghiglione & Matalon, 1992, cit. Amado, 2000).

3.6. Framing / Heuristics

When writing the questions to be used in a consensus seeking process such as Delphi, it is imperative that the consensus is freely achieved by respondents on the basis of their reasoning rather than on the basis of heuristics that the questions might be inducing. This effect is known to occur under conditions of uncertainty, contrary to the theory of rational choice (Simon, 1987, Kahneman & Tversky, 1973; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). This advises against framing questions in such a manner that any method bias be in play. Therefore, understanding the conditions that underlie such situations is an essential task that researchers must pay attention when they intend to use research methods such as questioning in order to minimize biases.

A framing effect concerns how individuals create internal representations of a presented situation and how these will consequently determine their responses (Maule & Villejoubert, 2007). They are present in our daily lives, including media, without our awareness and slight

nuances in how a question is presented – highlighting a particular issue in the very same content – can produce different responses (Nelson, Oxley & Clawson, 1997).

There are several types of framing studied in the literature which can be comprised in the following categories: word framing, response timing, choice set, and presentation order. We will briefly explain the frames in each as well as some strategies to minimize their effect.

Tversky et al. (1981) studied the effect of positive versus negative wording in a problem presentation and concluded that in a positive wording problem presentation (saving), participants prefer saving 200 people for sure over the possibility of gambling with 1/3 of probability of saving 600 and 2/3 probability that no one will be saved (Tversky et al., 1981). On the other hand, when the situation was presented with the negative word (loss) participants prefer the gambling option of 1/3 possibility that no one will die and a 2/3 possibility that 600 people will die, over the certainty of losing 400 people. Despite the mathematically equal results, people are risk-averse in the positive wording situation and are risk-seeking when faced with the negative wording (Tversky et al., 1981; Mishra, Gregson & Lalumière, 2012). Also, under conditions of need (money need situation) people tend to increase the levels of risky choice (Mishra et al., 2012), amplifying the framing effect.

To lessen the framing effect, Maule (1989, cit. Maule et al., 2007) indicates that the problem must contain both gaining and losing words in both versions, providing information of what happens to the remaining of the 600 people. For example, “400 people will die” should be rephrased as “400 people will die and 200 people will not die” for the loss frame, and “200 people will be saved” to “200 people will be saved and 400 people will not be saved” in the gain frame. In addition to this, Thomas and Millar (2011) found out that this effect can also be minimized when participants were encouraged to think analytically about the situation.

Continuing the research in word framing, Horens and Bruckmüller (2015) found a more-less asymmetry in responses when using comparative statements. People will agree more with statements containing “more than” than the equivalent sentences using “less than”. They express a tendency in preference and consider to be more true the “more than” statements. Furthermore, word interpretation can evoke different meanings (Bostrom, Morgan, Fischhoff, & Read, 1994). For instance, people tend to confuse the meaning of *weather* with *climate* and *stratospheric ozone depletion* with *greenhouse effect*.

When using antonyms, they may not be referring to the exact opposite. For instance, Rugg (1941) point out that there is some susceptibility when forbidding/allowing anti-democratic

speeches. Sixty-two percent of interrogated people said “no” to the statement “The United States should allow speeches against democracy?”, but when faced with the sentence “The United States should forbid speeches against democracy?” only 46% agreed.

Zhang, Yu and Zeng (2015) reported that timing plays an important role when intended to minimize the framing effect. A 5-minute response delay is enough for the framing to lose its significant impact on the decisions made.

Researchers also found out that the environmental context in which the respondent’s process decision making takes place may influence the outcomes. For instance, positive emotional context decreases the framing effect in a financial decision, by decreasing risk-propensity in the loss situation (Cassotti, Houdé, Habit, Poiriel, Aïte & Moutier, 2012). When exposed to a negative emotional context they show no differences from the control group, both in positive and negative wording problem presentation (Cassotti et al., 2012). A positive emotional setting can therefore be used in research to minimize the framing occurrence and consequently avoid biased results.

The options for presenting a response can affect the answer itself. Given a question with a closed-ended response list, the answers differ from an open-ended format (Schwarz, 1999). When asked what is “the most important thing for children to prepare them for life” 61,5% of the respondents chose “to think for themselves” when this option was present in a list. On the other hand, in the open-ended situation, only 4,6% of the respondents gave this answer or one with identical meaning (Shuman & Presser, 1981, cit. Schwarz, 1999).

Another situation of choice set framing arises when using numeric values (Schwarz, Knäuper, Hippler, Noelle-Newmann & Clark, 1991). The authors found out that when asking to rank the success in life, in a -5 to 5 scale, the respondents’ answer was significantly different from when the scale was from 0 to 10. People have a tendency to indicate they have more success in life in the first option (34%) than in the second one (13%). Both lower extremes of the scales were labeled as “not at all successful” and the upper extremes as “extremely successful”.

Schwarz and Scheuring (1992, cit. Schwarz, 1999) reported that in a situation of different labeling of quantitative scales, symptomatic patients reported different symptom frequencies. In a scale ranged from “twice a month or less” to “several times a day” 62% of the patients reported symptoms frequency of more than two times a month, but when the scale ranged from “never” to “more than twice a month”, only 39% reported a frequency of more than twice a

month. Additionally, when presented with a scale response, respondents are likely to assume that the average rate of the responses are situated in the middle of the scale and the limits of the scale represent the correspondent extremes of the distribution (Schwarz, Bohner & Kellenbenz, 1991).

The order in which questions are presented influence the interpretation and therefore the responses given to later questions (Schwarz, 1999). Participants report less satisfaction with their lives in general when there were previously introduced a question of how happy they are with their romantic relationships, than when the questions were presented in the inverse order (Schwarz, Hippler, Deutsch & Strack, 1991). When the general question is re-written to include relationship satisfaction, the presentation order is not significantly affected (Schwarz et al., 1991). Order presentation can also have an influence in situations where individuals are facing a list to select the answers, with options at the beginning to be more likely selected (Krosnick, 1991).

Default settings are present in contexts where there is only one explicit option presented (default). Take as an example the organ donation: in the USA, where people have to sign a donor card to be one, 85% are in favor of organ donation but only a few 28% are donors (Johnson & Goldstein, 2003). However, in the presumed-consent countries in the study, the lowest rate of donation was 85,9%.

Anchoring effect was demonstrated by Tversky & Kahneman (1974). When asked to estimate the probability of a man to be an engineer in a group of 70 engineers and 30 lawyers, respondents made accurate predictions when no further information was added. But when a brief uninformative description followed “Dick is a 30-year old man. He is married with no children. A man of high ability and high motivation, he promises to be quite successful in his field. He is well liked by his colleagues”, the subjects reasoned that the probability for the same question was 0,5 instead of 0,7 regardless of the previous mentioned proportion. Anchoring situations illustrate judgements can be biased by the initial starting point presented in a situation, even when the information is selected randomly (Bobko, Shetzer & Russell, 1991).

4. RESULTS

4.1. Documental Analysis

We gathered information of 27 entities that offer coaching training programmes in the Portuguese market. Two entities were regulatory bodies.

The following information is available in Appendix D for a more detailed view.

Regarding the minimum of hours required, the time duration ranges from 22 hours to 750 hours. It was not possible to estimate a mean because some programs mention the number of days instead of the number of hours.

There are no academic pre-requisites to access a coaching training course, except for three: one mentions that only accepts psychologists, the second one only accepts managers, consultants and psychologists and the third only allows coaches and therapists.

The coaching competencies mentioned by 11 courses are the ICF competencies (Appendix E). One course lists his own competencies that reflect the majority listed by ICF. The remaining programmes do not have this information available.

Concerning the coaches' academic background and professional experience, the information offered in the market is scarce. It ranges from coaching training programmes that list the coaches' names, their coaching certification, number of hours and years of coaching practice and professional activity, to programmes that do not disclose any of this information. Therefore, due to the amount of missing data, it was not viable to analyse this topic.

4.2. First Round

For the first question, "What is the appropriate number of contact hours a training in coaching must have for the exercise of Coach practice?" the results indicate a mean of 149 hours and a standard deviation of 47 hours ($M = 149$, $dp = 47$).

To the second question "What training base should an individual have in the process of attending a training access to Coach?" a university degree was indicated by four out of five as a minimum academic training a person must possess in order to become a coach. Of these, four specified the Degree should be in the area of Social Sciences and the remaining did not provide

further details. Life experience was indicated to outweigh academic degree by a single expert but without indication of any academic level.

The third question asked “What are the competencies required for professional practice of coaching? (name a maximum of ten)”. The data gathered enabled the construction of 13 categories. Only two categories, *Active Listening* and *Powerful Questions*, were itemised by all the respondents. With four experts eliciting the same category we found 7 categories: *Ethics*, *Coaching Agreement*, *Presence*, *Direct Communication*, *Action Plan*, *Definition of Objectives* and *Progress/Accountability*. With three of responses we found the following two categories: *Trust* and *Awareness*. With less expression (one expert) we found the categories *Coaching Models* and *Experience/Maturity*. It is worth mentioning that three of the respondents indicated the ICF competencies without expliciting them. (Appendix E).

In the following question, “What contents would you require training in Coaching have in order to give your approval as training that allows the exercise of Coaching?” we constructed 14 categories of response: *Areas of Coaching* (business, life, career...), *Models of Coaching* (behavioural, co-active, cognitive...), *Coaching Tools* (exercises, instruments, techniques), *Coaching Theories*, *Coaching Foundations* (including what is and what is not coaching and its limitations), *Coaching Practice* (doing and observing coaching sessions), *Supervision*, *Personal Development*, *Competencies*, *Ethics*, *Impact* and *Efficacy Evaluation*. *Coaching Models* and *Coaching Practice* were reported by all experts. *Coaching Tools* and *Coaching Foundations* were indicated by four and *Coaching Theories* was indicated by three experts. With less expression we have the following categories with three experts: *Supervision*, *Personal Development*, *Impact*, *Efficacy Evaluation*, *Competencies* and *Areas of Coaching*. *Ethics*, *Synergy*, *Book Reviews*, *Psychological Theories and Models in the Helping Relationship*, and *Systemic Thinking* were the responses that do not fall within any category.

The fifth question “And to be a trainer in coaching? What training and experience in coaching must a trainer have, besides the Coaching training?”, generated the following responses: i) having had a coaching training (all experts), ii) proof of experience (5 years, 500 hours) (all experts), iii) to be credentialed by ICF (or other regulatory entity) (three experts), iv) to possess a certification to be a trainer of trainers (three experts), v) to have psychological training (a single expert), vi) to be enrolled in a mentoring process (a single expert).

Finally, for the question “Which mechanism do you understand to be enough to certify the time of experience of a coach?” we found 5 categories: *Experience* (in hours), *ICF Verification*,

Results (feedback provided by coachees), *Continuous Development* and *Area of Coaching*. All the respondents indicated the *Results* category and four out of five experts indicated the *Experience* category. *Continuous Development* was indicated by three experts as well as *ICF verifications*.

4.3. Second Round

For question 1, none of the respondents wanted to change his answers. We realised that there are two groups of responses. One group (designated group A, comprehending 3 experts) indicated a mean of 115 hours and a standard deviation of 13 hours ($M_{GA} = 115$, $dp = 13$) and the other group indicated a mean of 200 hours ($M_{GB} = 200$, $dp = 0$). Although group A did not provide further explanation, the respondents of the second group stated that 200 hours are the minimum of time necessary to cover all the relevant topics and to include coaching training, supervision and personal development as they are indispensable to coaching training.

For the second question, regarding the academic qualification, the university degree response was obtained by all of the respondents. While three of the experts indicated a degree in social sciences area or a specific course within that domain, the other two experts specified no academic area.

Regarding the third question, there were no modifications in responses and no further information was added.

In the following question, the participants did not want to change their initial responses. Only one respondent explained his responses that were not in accordance with the remaining group.

In the fifth question, they chose to maintain their answers. One also added that the coach trainer should be credentialed by ICF, raising to four the number of respondents with this answer.

For the latest question there were no changes.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

To be considered as consensus, the agreement must be equal or superior to 60% (four participants out of six). In other words, four or more of the respondents must give the same answer in the same question (Weatherman & Swenson, 1974). Additionally, if an item has a response change superior to 15% then a new round is needed.

The minimum number of hours a coaching program must have did not reach consensus in the first round but no changes were made in the following. We believe that a new round would not trigger significant information nor change answers. However, the results could be polarized in two groups. Noteworthy to say that some experts require a superior number of hours than those established by a worldwide regulatory entity. The minimum training hours mentioned in this study averaged 115 (group A), but there are many cases of training offers which cover as few as 30 hours assuring to be sufficient to become a coach. This supports Grant's (2008) point of view that with a few hours or days of training and the correspondent payment of a fee, one can become a Certified Master Coach (Grant, 2008).

The results provided by the first round display consensus regarding the academic degree of the future coaches, with five out of six experts pointing out a University degree. In second iteration, 100% consensus was achieved by all experts. It is also of valuable observation that three experts indicated, without being directly asked, that the degree should be in social sciences as this area would provide background. One person indicated that futures coaches should have an academic background in Psychology because coaching is based on psychological theories and models. This issue is also present in literature and Grant (2015) defends that a coach with an academic training in Psychology will be more able to provide a helping relationship because he would have a better understanding about psychological theories and models in which coaching practice is founded and also be better prepared to address emotional or mental health situations that coachees may bring to sessions. Although we did not analyse the coaches' academic degree, coaching certification and experience due to the previous mentioned arguments, we can infer that the market either does not recognize the importance of coaches' background or does not believe the trainees value this information.

Coaching competencies seems to be a strong area of consensus among coaches and they all seem to follow the ICF core competencies although some coaches may add a few more competencies they believe to be of relevance in a coaching session. They achieved consensus

in the first round with all categories indicating a consensus equal or superior to 60%. Only two, *Coaching Models* and *Experience/Maturity* did not fit in any category and were not supported by the other experts. The competencies enumerated are the 11 core competencies listed by ICF (Appendix E). Coaching competencies seems to be a subject in which coaches agree upon and we did not find any paper in literature that might say otherwise.

Although we have identified a wide number of coaching training contents, little consensus was achieved. *Areas of Coaching*, *Coaching Models*, *Coaching Tools* and *Coaching Foundations* seem to be the only contents in which they all agree to be necessary. At the same time, those are the contents most detailed in coaching books. *Ethics* did not fit in a category; perhaps it was already included by all the respondents as a competency. It was surprising that *Coaching Theories*, *Impact and Efficacy Evaluation* did not reach consensus because they are what supports coaching and what helps coaches to understand and evaluate their results. Without this knowledge coaching cannot tell how it differentiates from a non-theoretical approach like many others available in the market. Regarding the coaching training programmes available in the market, many do not explicit the training contents.

The relevance of psychological contents in coaching training programmes did not achieve relevance to become a content. However, some authors distinguish coaching psychology from coaching (Spence et al., 2007; Grant, 2011) arguing that they may offer different coaching approaches.

If one intends to become a coaching trainer, possessing verifiable experience in coaching with more than 500 hours or more than 5 years and also a trainer certification seems to be the core requisites. Although these may be quantitative criteria, 5 years may not mean a total amount of a minimum of 500 hours nor and vice-versa. A future trainer coach should possess a sound coaching practice but the meaning of that is yet to be determined. This may explain in some extent the diversity of coaches' experience that we found in our research for coaching training programs. Coaches training may go from less than a few months – therefore they do not possess the 5 year or the 500 hours – of experience to a more solid one similar to what the experts believe to be a requisite to become a trainer. We can only infer that there are coaching programs and coaching trainers in market that may not be sufficiently prepared.

Mentoring was also indicated but had no expressive relevance (a single reference). It is mentioned by ICF (2008) to be a powerful tool to master coaching but is not specified to be mandatory to become a trainer.

It is necessary a more direct presence of a regulatory mechanism of coaching practice. There are a few, such as ICF, that regulate coaching worldwide but it is important to highlight that it is not mandatory to be a membership of a regulatory body Coaching to have a license for coaching practice. This can lead to that some coaches are not members because it is not mandatory and they may not feel the need to do so. The fact that some coaches may not revise themselves into some guidelines may also lead to this situation. It is estimated, as stated earlier, that the actual number of active coaches in Portugal is much higher than those registered (ICF, 2008). There are coaching training programmes available in the market that are not certified by ICF or similar regulatory body. They do not require any requisites to accept trainees but state that at the end of the training they become capable of coaching practice. This goes along with Grant's (2007) critique that this market deregulation enables anyone to become a coach (Jones, 2012).

Despite scarce information available and studies conducted within this domain, the answers gathered were able to mirror some current issues or disagreements found in literature.

Coaching practice is still far from being a discussion theme with consensus and is still a professional growing area.

The quality of some coaching programmes in the market are concerning. Many of them do not accomplish all the minimum criteria set by our experts.

In this study we explored the coaching curricula and how it has been addressed in Portugal with the aim of drawing some inferences through expert's opinion and also understand the coaching market.

Despite the interesting results this study brought up, one must keep in mind that further studies are needed so that more solid inferences can be drawn.

6. REFERENCES

- Altschuld, J. W., (1993). Delphi technique. *Lecture: evaluation methods: Principles of needs assessment II*. Department of Educational Services and Research. Columbus: The Ohio State University.
- Amado, J.S. (2000). A técnica de análise de conteúdo. *Referência*, 5, 53-63.
- Bachkirova, T. & Smith, C. (2015). From competencies to capabilities in the assessment and accreditation of coaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 13(2), 123-140.
- Bardin, L. (1977). *Análise de conteúdo*. Lisboa: Edições 70.
- Barosa-Pereira, A. (2007). *Coaching em Portugal – Teoria e Prática*. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Bobko, P., Shetzer, L. & Russell, C. (1991). Estimating the standard deviation of professor's worth: The effects of frame and presentation order in utility analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 179-188.
- Bostrom, A., Morgan, G. M., Fischhoff, B. & Read, D. (1994). What do people know about global climate change? 1. Mental models. *Risk Analysis*, 14, 959-970.
- British Psychological Society (PPS). (2007). *The aims of the Special Group in Coaching Psychology*. Consulted in www.sgcp.org.uk/coachingpsy/rules.cfm in 05-09-2016.
- Cassotti, M., Houdé, O., Habib, M., Poirel, N., Aïte, A. & Moutier, S. (2012). Positive emotional context eliminates the framing effect in decision-making. *American Psychological Association*, 12(5), 926-931.
- Cavanagh, M., Grant, A. & Kemp, T. (2005). *Evidence-based coaching*. Volume 1, Theory, research and practice from behavioural sciences. Sidney.
- Coaching Training Institute (CTI). (2016). Coaching Training. Consulted in 15-07-2016 in <http://www.coactive.com/coach-training/core-courses>
- Correia, M. C., & Santos, N. R. (2011). Psicologia e Coaching. In M. P. Lopes, P. J. Palma, R. B. Ribeiro e M. P. Cunha. *Psicologia Aplicada* (pp.413-430). Lisboa: Editora RH, Lda.

- Dagenais, F. (1978). The reliability and convergence of the *delphi* technique. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 98, 307-308.
- Dalkey, N. & Helmer, O. (1992). An experimental application of the *delphi* method to the use of experts. *The RAND Corporation*, 458-467.
- Dalkey, N. C., Rourke, D. L., Lewis, R. & Snyder, D. (1972). *Studies in the quality of life*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Delbecq, A., Van de Ven, A. & Gustafson, D. (1975). The Delphi technique. In A. Delbecq, A. van de Ven & D. Gustafson. *Group techniques for program planning*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman, and Co.
- Ferrar, P. (2006). Defying Definition: Competences in Coaching and Mentoring. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 2(2), 53-60.
- Garman, A., Whiston, D. & Zlatoper, K. (2000). Media perceptions of executive Coaching and the formal preparation of coaches. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 52(3), 201-205.
- Garvey, B., Stokes, P. & Megginson, D. (2014). *Coaching and Mentoring: Theory and Practice*. 2nd Ed. SAGE Publications.
- Grant, A. M. (2015). Coaching the brain: Neuro-science or neuro-nonsense. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 11(1), 31-37.
- Grant, A. (2011). Developing an agenda for teaching coaching psychology. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 6(1), 84-99.
- Grant, A. (2008). Past, present and future: The evolution of professional coaching and coaching psychology. In S. Palmer & A. Whybrow. *Handbook of coaching psychology: A guide to practitioners*. London and NY: Routledge.
- Grant, A. & Cavanagh, M. (2007). Coaching psychology: How did we get here and where are we going? *The Australian Coaching Psychology*. Consulted in <https://www.psychology.org.au/publications/inpsych/coaching/> in 08-09-2016.

- Grant, A. & Cavanagh, M. (2007). Evidence-based coaching: Flourishing or languishing? *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 239-254.
- Green, L., Oades, L., & Grant, A. (2006). Cognitive-behavioral, solution-focused life coaching: Enhancing goal striving, well-being and hope. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1, 142–149.
- Hoorens, V. & Bruckmüller, S. (2015). Less is more? Think again! A cognitive fluency-based more-less asymmetry in comparative communication. *American Psychological Association*, 109(5), 753-766.
- Hsu, C. & Sanford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(10), 1-7.
- International Coach Community (2010). Consulted in 26-10-2015 in <http://www.internationalcoachingcommunity.com/core-coaching-competencies>
- ICF Portugal. (2008). Accredited courses in Portugal. Consulted in 26-11-2015 in <http://icfportugal.com/acreditacao/cursos-acreditados-em-pt/>.
- ICF Portugal. (2008). Certified coaches in Portugal. Consulted in 02-09-2016 in <http://icfportugal.com/torne-se-membro/coaches-credenciados/>
- ICF Portugal (2008). ICF Competencies. Consulted in 26-10-2015 in <http://icfportugal.com/credenciacao/competencias-icf/>
- ICF Portugal. (2008). Consulted in 26-10-2015 in www.icfportugal.com
- Iqbal, S. & Pipin-Young, L. (2009). The Delphi method. *Methods*, 22(7), 598-600.
- Johnson, E. J. & Goldstein, D. (2003). Do defaults save lives? *Science*, 302, 1338-1339.
- Jones, R. (2012). Coaching psychology research evidence: The role of skepticism. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 8(2), 93-95.
- Judd, R. C. (1972). Use of Delphi methods in higher education. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 4(2), 173-186.
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1973). On the psychology of prediction. *Psychological Review*, 80(4), 237-251.

- Keeney, S., Hanson, F. & McKenna, HP. (2001). A critical review of the Delphi technique as a research methodology for nursing. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 38(2),195-200.
- Kinder, A., Hughes, R. & Cooper, C L. (2008). *Employee well-being support: A workplace resource*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 213-236.
- Liljenstrand, A. M. & Nebeker, D. M. (2008). Coaching services: A look at coaches, clients and practices. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(1), 57-77.
- Linstone, H. & Turoff, M. (2002). *The Delphi method*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc. Reading, M.A. Consulted in <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/delphibook.pdf> in 10-05-2016.
- Ludwig, B. (1997). Predicting the future: Have you considered using the Delphi methodology? *Journal of Extension*, 35(5), 1-4. Consulted in 10-04-2016 in <http://www.joe.org/joe/1997october/tt2.php>
- Maule, J. & Villejoubert, G. (2007). What lies beneath: Reframing framing effects. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 13(1), 25-44.
- Mishra, S., Gregson, M. & Lalumière, M. L. (2012). Framing effects and risk-sensitive decision making. *British Journal of Psychology*, 103, 83-97.
- Nelson, T., Oxley, Z. & Clawson, R. (1997). Toward a psychology of framing effects. *Political Behavior*, 19(3), 221-246.
- Powell, C. (2002). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 41(4), 376-382.
- Quivy, R. & Campenhoudt, L. (2005). *Manual de investigação em Ciências Sociais*. (4ªEd.) Lisboa: Gradiva.
- Rego, A., Cunha, M. P., Oliveira, C. M. & Marcelino, A. R. (2004). *Coaching para executivos*. Lisboa: Escolar Editora.

- Rugg, D. (1941). Experiments in wording questions: II. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 5, 91-92.
- Schwarz, N., Bohner, H. & Kellenbenz, U. (1991). Response scales as frames of reference: The impact of frequency range on diagnostic judgements. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 37-49.
- Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports. How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54(2), 93-105.
- Schuman, H. & S. Presser, S. (1981). *Question and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments on question form, wording, and context*. New York: Academic Press.
- Silva, J. F. (2012). *Coaching psicológico: Um estudo de casos*. Lisboa: University of Lisbon.
- Simon, H. (1987). Decision making and problem solving. *The Institute of Management Sciences*, 17(5), 11-31.
- Stewart, L.J., O’Riordan, S. & Palmer, S. (2008). Before we know how we’ve done, we need to know what we’re doing: Operationalizing coaching to provide a foundation for coaching evaluation. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 4, 127-133.
- Thangaratinam, S. & Redman, C. (2005). The Delphi technique. *Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists*, 7, 120-125.
- Thach, L. & Heinselman, T. (1999). Executive Coaching Defined. *Training and Development*, March, 35-39.
- The Executive Coaching Forum. (2008). *The executive coaching handbook. Principles and guidelines for a successful coaching partnership*. 4th Edition. Consulted in www.theexecutivecoachingforum.com in 10-10-2014.
- Thomas, A. & Millar, T. (2011). Reducing the Framing Effect in Older and Younger Adults by Encouraging Analytic Processing. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 10.1093/geronb/gbr076
- Turoff, M. (2002). The policy Delphi. In H. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.) *The Delphi method*. (pp. 80-96). Consulted in www.isnjit.edu/pubs/delphibook in 30-05-2016.

- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211, 453–458.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgement under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124 – 1131.
- Urbina, S. (2004). *Essentials of psychological testing*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Walker, A. M. & Selfe, J. (1996). The Delphi technique: A useful tool for the allied health researcher. *British Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 3, 677-680.
- Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 55(2), 94-106.
- Weatherman, R., & Swenson, K. (1974). Delphi technique. In S.P. Hencley & J.R. Yates (Eds.) *Futurism in education: Methodologies*. (pp. 97-114). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Weaver, T. (1971). The delphi forecasting method. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 52 (5), 267-273.
- Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for performance: GROWing in human potential and purpose*. 4th Ed. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Whitmore, J. (1992). *Coaching for performance*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Whitworth, L., Kimsey-House, K., Kimsey-House, H. & Sandal, P. (2007). *Co-active Coaching: Coaching People towards success*. (2nd Ed.).
- Williams, P. & Anderson, S. (2006). *Law and ethics in coaching. How to solve and avoid difficult problems in your practice*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Woudenberg, F. (1991). An evaluation of Delphi. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 40, 131-150.
- Zhang, X., Yu, X. & Zeng, J. (2015). Impact of self-framing on decision making: Timing matters. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(4), 629-640.

Appendix A

Convite à participação no estudo “Profiling Coaching Training. What is a Suitable Coaching Training Curricula?”

Caro (a) _____

Chamo-me Carolina Gomes Farinha e encontro-me a desenvolver um estudo sobre o Coaching em Portugal, no âmbito da minha dissertação de Mestrado em Políticas de Desenvolvimento em Recursos Humanos, no ISCTE-IUL sob orientação do Prof. Doutor Nelson Ramalho.

Gostaria de o/a convidar para fazer parte de um grupo de *experts* na área do Coaching, contribuindo com a sua opinião em relação a um conjunto de questões sobre a formação de coaches em Portugal.

Numa primeira fase do estudo, ser-lhe-á pedido que responda a algumas questões sobre o Coaching. Depois, num processo Delphi, ser-lhe-á pedido de seguida que indique o seu grau de concordância com os resultados obtidos em termos grupais.

Estima-se que o tempo de resposta para cada questionário deverá variar entre 10 a 15 minutos.

A sua participação e as suas respostas são anónimas e confidenciais exceto se explicitar que deseja ser identificado como perito que contribuiu para o estudo, o que farei de bom grado nos agradecimentos na tese. É livre de em qualquer momento desistir da sua participação no estudo.

O seu contributo é precioso para melhor compreender os desenvolvimentos e requisitos qualificativos neste domínio de prática profissional que tanta atenção tem atraído. Agradeço-lhe antecipadamente o tempo e contributo!

Appendix B

Caro(a) _____

Agradeço desde já a sua disponibilidade e interesse em participar neste estudo, na qualidade de *expert*, sobre o Coaching em Portugal.

Relembro que as suas respostas são confidenciais e anónimas. É livre de em qualquer momento desistir de participar, devendo para isso comunicar a sua decisão.

O envio das respostas deverá ser feito para o seguinte email: xxxxxxxx@gmail.com

Para que possa haver tempo de maturação e reflexão, cada fase de resposta terá uma semana, seguindo um período de duas semanas para análise dos dados.

Quando se fala em Coaching, refiro-me ao exercício da atividade realizada por profissionais com formação reconhecida e credenciados para o devido efeito. Não estão contempladas outras atividades profissionais como formação, consultoria, aconselhamento, mentoria ou terapia.

Em seguida ser-lhe-ão apresentadas 6 questões de resposta aberta sobre o Coaching em que lhe pedimos que dê a sua opinião.

Appendix C

Caro (a) _____,

Agradeço a sua disponibilidade para responder ao questionário sobre Coaching.

E seguida, são apresentadas as respostas do grupo para cada uma das questões e a indicação de qual foi a sua resposta. É-lhe questionado se pretende reposicionar ou manter a sua resposta e em que sentido. Caso queira manter, é-lhe pedido que justifique brevemente por que razão os valores do grupo não são os melhores.

Nº	Questão	A sua resposta foi:	A resposta do grupo foi:	Deseja manter ou reposicionar a sua resposta? Em que sentido?	Se deseja manter, indique por favor por que razão os valores médios do grupo não são os melhores
1	Qual o número adequado de horas de contacto que uma formação em Coaching deve ter para o exercício da função de Coach?				
2	Que formação base deve ter o indivíduo em vias de frequentar uma formação de acesso a Coach?				
3	Quais as competências necessárias para o exercício profissional do Coaching?				
4	Que conteúdos exigiria que uma formação em Coaching tivesse para dar o seu aval enquanto formação que permite o exercício do Coaching?				
5	E para ser formador em Coaching? Que formação e experiência em Coaching deve ter um formador, para além da formação de acesso a Coach?				
6	Que mecanismo entende suficiente para certificar o tempo de experiência de um Coach?				

Appendix D

Training	ICF/ICC Accreditation	DGERT Accreditation	Other Certifications	Time Duration (hours)	ECTS	Core Competencies	Levels	Trainees Education
ORG 1	Not applicable	Not applicable	No	125h	No	Ethics, Coaching Agreement, Trust and Intimacy, Presence, Active Listening, Powerful Questions, Direct Communication, Awareness, Designing Action, Planning and Goal Setting, Progress and Accountability	3	Any
ORG 2	Not applicable	Not Applicable	No	12h + 10h practice	No	Knowledge, Relationship, Listening, Self-management, Enquiry & Questions, Feedback, Goals, Values & Beliefs, Actions & Tasks	1	Any
ORG 3	No	No	ISCP - International School of Professional Coaching	70h + 130h + 79h(+50h)	No	ICF competencies & 4 internal skills ISPC	3	Any
ORG 4	No	No	ISCP - International School of Professional Coaching	70h + 130h + 79h(+50h)	No	ICF competencies & 4 internal skills ISPC	3	Any
ORG 5	No	No	ISCP - International School of Professional Coaching	70h + 130h + 79h(+50h)	No	ICF competencies + 4 internal skills ISPC	3	Any
ORG 6	Yes	Yes	No	38h + 112h	No	ICF competencies	2	Managers, consultants, psychologists
ORG 7	Yes	No	No	20h + 80h + 14h	No	ICF competencies	3	Any but working in companies
ORG 8	No	No	Ordem dos Psicólogos Portugueses	182h	180 ECTS (OPP)	Active Listening, Questioning, Curiosity, Intuition, Goals Deepening, Humility, Dancing in the Moment,	1	Psychologists

						Feedback, Playfulness, Self- Management		
ORG 9	No	No	Manz	120h	22 ECTS	Not available	1	Any
ORG 10	No	Yes	No	96h	19 ECTS	Not available	1	Any
ORG 11	Yes	No	No	8 days + 6 days + 4 days	No	ICF competencies	3	Any
ORG 12	Yes	Not available	No		No	Not available	1	Any
ORG 13	Yes	Not available	No		No	ICF competencies	1	All
ORG 14	No	No	No	28h	No	Not available	2	Do not refer
ORG 15	No	No	World Coaching	28h	No	ICF competencies	1	Do not refer
ORG 16	No	Not available	MPJ	3 days	No	Not available		Do not refer
ORG 17	No	code 090 personal developmen t	No	190h	No	Not available	1	Any
ORG 18	No	No	No	64h + 90h training	No	Not available	1	Any

ORG 19	Yes ICC	Yes	IEFP, EMCC, Lambent		No	Not available	1	Do not refer
ORG 20	No	Not available	No	18h	No	Not available	1	Coaches and therapists
ORG 21	Internationally	Not available	ISPC (recognised by APCoaching)	70h +92h +54h	No	ICF competencies + Absolute Presence, Inspired Certainty, Integral Connection, Spontaneous Creation	3	Any
ORG 22	No	No	No	Not available	No	Not available	1	Ant
ORG 23	No	No	No	Not available	No	Not available	2	Ant
ORG 24	No	Not available	No	Not available	No	Not available	Not available	Do not refer
ORG 25	No	No	International Humanistic Coaching Society (IHCS), ECA, International Association of Coaching Institutes (ICI)	135h	No	Not available	1	Any / Coaches, depending on the program
ORG 26	No	No	Accredited Certificate in Coaching Training, Association for Coaching	123h	45€ in shopping	Not available	1	Any
ORG 27	No	Not available	No	750h	30 ECTS	Not available	1	Any

Appendix E

Competencies	Description
Meeting Ethical Guidelines & Professional Standards	Understanding coaching ethics and standards and applying them appropriately in all coaching situations.
Establishing the Coaching Agreement	Understanding what is required in the specific coaching interaction and coming to agreement with the prospective and new client about the coaching process and relationship.
Establishing Trust & Intimacy with the Client	Creating a safe, supportive environment that produces ongoing mutual respect and trust.
Coaching Presence	Being fully conscious and creating spontaneous relationships with clients, employing a style that is open, flexible and confident
Active Listening	Focusing completely on what the client is saying and is not saying, understanding the meaning of what is said in the context of the client's desires, and supporting client self-expression.
Powerful Questioning	Asking questions that reveal the information needed for maximum benefit to the coaching relationship and the client.
Direct Communication	Communicating effectively during coaching sessions, and using language that has the greatest positive impact on the client.
Creating Awareness	Integrating and accurately evaluating multiple sources of information, and making interpretations that help the client to gain awareness and thereby achieve agreed-upon results.
Designing Actions	Creating with the client opportunities for ongoing learning, during coaching and in work/life situations, and for taking new actions that will most effectively lead to agreed-upon coaching results.
Planning and Goal Setting	Developing and maintaining an effective coaching plan with the client.
Managing Progress & Accountability	Holding attention on what is important for the client, and leaving responsibility with the client to take action.