

The Rise of Coaching Supervision 2006–2014

COACHING: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THEORY, RESEARCH AND PRACTICE, 2017 VOL. 10, NO. 2, 102–114

Peter Hawkins and Eve Turner, Renewal Associates, Barrow Castle, Bath, UK; Eve Turner Associates, Southampton, UK

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2016.1266002>

AIM OF STUDY

The purpose of this research is to understand, by comparison, the levels of coaching supervision taking place in line with the growth of the coaching industry, its usage, motivations, barriers, expectations and how it is received and conducted across geographies. This was established through 3 key practice points:

1. To which field of practice area(s) in coaching is your contribution directly relevant?
2. What do you see as the primary contribution your submission makes to coaching practice?
3. What are its tangible implications for practitioners?

BACKGROUND

The purpose behind the research:

Highlight challenges in setting coaching outcomes when an organisation is involved along with the coach and coachee.	Understanding the view of the coach and coachee on how and if a multi-stakeholder contract impacts coaching outcomes.	Discover best practice for multi-stakeholder coaching contracts
Discover what the latest practice is in coaching supervision and how supervision is or isn't addressed	Consider whether there are any differences in coaching supervision based on geography or other demographics.	Research Outcome – To update research performed in 2006 by Peter Hawkins and Gil Schwenk for the CIPD.

RESEARCH DESIGN -METHODOLOGY

In 2014 they adopted a qualitative and quantitative method based on three questionnaires to be completed by three audiences, namely, coaches, coachee plus organisation HR and L&D personnel. The reason supporting this approach was to uncover specifically which of the channels were more prominent and why. The channels used included the demographic coaching background and experience, plus experience of multi-stakeholder contracting and stakeholder relationships. Frequency, appropriateness, impact, benefits and challenges of these scenarios. Their recommendation on tips for a successful multi-stakeholder coaching/supervision and team coaching for coaches and organisations.

Coaches' survey: 569 people responded. Organisational survey: 52 people responded. Coachee survey: 30 people responded.

Point to note is, in 2006 there's a disparity in terms of inclusion/invite to participate in the research as coachees were omitted. The response rate to the then online questionnaire was 653 from two main groups, coaches and coach supervisors, and organisations employing coaches either externally or internally. Response rate 528 and 125 respectively. Plus 4 focus groups attended by 31 participants and a 'best practice case studies' of six organisations that employed both external and internal coaches.

KEY FINDINGS

2006 Findings:

Key findings revealed that in 2006 coaching supervision was advocated, yet rarely carried out. Survey results revealed that on average 87% of respondents believed that coaches should have coaching supervision, only 44% of coaches actually were receiving supervision, 58% of these has started it in the previous two years, and only 23% organisations provided it regularly.

2014 Findings:

Results of the study on 2014 revealed that many more coaches were receiving supervision with more intrinsic motivations and a commitment to good practice, continued personal and professional development.

Percentage of coaches receiving supervision by geography:

Globally	UK	Europe	Africa	Asia	Australia and New Zealand	Latin America	USA and Canada
83.18	92.31	80.65	90	64.71	72.73	88.89	47.64

Motivation of engaging with supervision by percentage:

Personal commitment to good practice	Contributes to CPD	Requirement of professional body membership	Accreditation by professional body	Organisation engaging an external coach requirement	Organisational engaging internal coach requirement
92.6	51.6	33.96	26.5	19.29	14.7

Reasons given for not engaging supervision by percentage:

Own reflective practice	Discuss issues with coach	Peer network support	Not required by organisation	Expensive	Unable to locate suitable supervisor	Not required
25.54	22.83	32.61	16.3	4.89	4.35	5.98

The expectations of organisations who employ coaches concerning supervision:

Asked if they had supervision	Expected to have	Only use coaches who have supervision	Required and request reference	Explain how it's used in their practice	Not provided to either internal or external
67.79	66.67	37.84	4.65	13.95	27.91

Multi Stakeholder Contracting Supervision by Geography:

UK	Europe	USA & Canada	Australia and New Zealand	Asia
70% YES	60% YES	33% YES	61% YES	41% YES
30% NO	40% NO	68% YES	38% NO	58% NO

Supervision Frequency Results:

Never	Monthly or more basis	Every other month	4 x per year	2 x per year
17%	19%	24%	27%	13%

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the growth of the coaching industry on a global basis is gaining interest from governing and professional bodies associated with the industry for more supervision. They're beginning to push for it to become a requirement for all, regardless of geography or levels of experience. Particularly, as it is a mandatory requirement in some regions of the world, where coaching is more established.

What is impressive, and both encouraging, is the high percentage of coaches through their own desire to serve clients at their highest level, choose to invest financially and otherwise in coaching supervision. That said, it's fair to note, the frequency of supervision is not as high as one might expect, given the nature of the role of a coach.

Nevertheless, the research study illustrates the beginnings of and suggestions around best practice based upon the confines of the study. The focus on defining interconnected relationships to support supervision across coaches and organisations, to better support and provide clarity to all parties, in terms of specific roles and lines of communication. Conversely, what appears to be lacking from the study is the view of the coachee's around how they feel supervision would impact their experience and outcomes. Is it possible to form and shape 'best practice' if a major component is excluded?

To close, there is an opportunity to explore this area further, to include other suggested facets around types and forms of supervision, the benefits, whom they apply to and why.