SPIM
SOCIETY OF PSYCHOLOGISTS IN MANAGEMENT

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The Psychologist-Manager Journal

1088-7156/18/$12.00

2018, Vol. 21, No. 2, 130–150
http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000070

Coaching Psychology and Positive Psychology in Work and Organizational Psychology

Andrea Castiello D'Antonio
European University of Rome

This article deals with the contribution of positive psychology to coaching psychology in the organizational contexts. First, the current situation of coaching in the world of work is outlined. Many are the "savage" applications of so-called "coaching" in the organizations: The chaos that reigns in this field is stigmatized. It is therefore necessary to identify the "psychological" coaching to define in a serious way the scientific–professional field. Positive psychology could offer to coaching psychology an interesting perspective, but at the same time, we have to avoid trivializing. Seeing only the "positive" aspects of organizational situations of the people at work—as if there were no hardships, sufferings, and serious problems in their organizational life—could drastically reduce the effectiveness of coaching; pros and cons of positive psychology applied to coaching are then outlined.

Keywords: coaching, executive coaching, coaching psychology, positive psychology, positive psychology coaching

A Little Glance at Coaching and Coaching Psychology in the World of Work

The relatively new profession going under the name of "coaching" and "executive coaching" (in this article "coaching" and "executive coaching" are used as synonyms) has provoked numerous reactions, not always positive, in the context of professionals and academics. What do we mean when we

Andrea Castiello D'Antonio, Department of Psychology, European University of Rome.
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrea Castiello D'Antonio, Private Practice, Viale Pinturicchio, 58-I-00196, Rome, Italy. E-mail: casti.a@tiscali.it

speak of "coaching," and/or "executive coaching," in the world of work? And what do we mean with "coaching," and/or "executive coaching," around the world (Passmore, 2013)? Moreover, why would it be absolutely necessary to distinguish the "psychological coaching" from any other form of activity generically called "coaching"?

> Executive coaching is defined as a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client's organization within a formally defined coaching agreement. (Kilburg, 2007, p. 28)

From another point of view, Francis A. Kombarakaran, Julia A. Yang, Mila N. Baker, and Pauline B. Fernandes (2008) have defined executive coaching as follows:

> a short-term interactive process between a coach and a manager to improve leadership effectiveness by enhancing self-awareness and the practice of new behaviors. The coaching process facilitates the acquisition of new skills, perspectives, tools and knowledge through support, encouragement, and feedback in the organizational context. (p. 78)

The aim of this article is to reflect on the contribution of positive psychology to coaching psychology in the current world of work. In the context of too many "savage" applications of so-called "coaching" across organizations, it seems strictly necessary to identify the "psychological" side of coaching, supported by the scientific thinking and the professional status of the most serious applications of this complex methodology and approach to organizational lives.

The "new" movement of positive psychology—a new vision with an old history!—could offer an interesting perspective to coaching psychology, which is directly applicable in a professional manner to managers, leaders, and all professionals who manage high responsibility at work. It is also necessary to avoid viewing only the "positive" aspects of organizational situations of people at work, because the working experience is often merged and blended with other dimensions such as toxic managerial styles and counterproductive organizational behaviors. From this point of view, pros and cons of positive psychology applied to psychological coaching are outlined.

This article aims to enable a critical thinking concerning some of the most meaningful contributions in the field, integrating sources of literature with empirical and professional experiences, also to promote a debate concerning the wide and overall perspective of the contribution of psychology (organizational, social, clinical, and personality psychology) to coaching and executive coaching. To introduce the topic and to offer a possible and concise answer to these questions—starting from this initial thinking and going

toward the contribution that the positive psychology can offer to psychological coaching—we have to admit that a lot (maybe too much) has been written and said about coaching, especially in a commercial and promotion perspective to offer consultant services to potential buyers. Too often we have to deal with a mythic "successful coach" who seems a business man more than a professional psychologist.

Given the veritable explosion of coaching activities from people who suddenly define themselves as coaches, the serious research, theoretical reflections, and methodological confirmations have had difficulty keeping up. The good news is that, at least, diverse aspects of the scientific and professional psychological coaching are emerging with greater clarity: As was imaginable, these variations follow the large schools of psychological thought. Today we can identify the following coaching guidelines: developmental (Bachkirova, 2011), behavioral (Skiffington & Zeus, 2003), cognitive–behavioral (Neenan & Palmer, 2012), existential (Van Deurzen & Hanaway, 2012), person-centered (Joseph, 2005), systemic-psychodynamic (Brunning, 2006), and psychoanalytic (Kets de Vries, Korotov, & Florent-Treacy, 2007; Sandler, 2011).

Coaching could be also based on narrative and motivational interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2012; regarding the narrative approach to counseling, see also Richardson, 2012), on mindfulness (Hall, 2013), on positive psychology (Biswas-Diener & Dean, 2007; Corrie, 2009; Grant & Spence, 2010), on NLP—neuro-linguistic programming (Hayes, 2008), on Gestalt (Clarkson, 2004), on personal constructs (Stojnov & Pavlovic, 2010), and could be addressed toward a "new generation" approach, as in Stelter (2013). Another perspective that is becoming common and of great interest is the one called "evidence-based coaching" (Cavanagh, Grant, & Kemp, 2005; Stober & Grant, 2006).

Looking at the whole context of actual scientific–professional status of coaching, the current situation can be interpreted as a real "kaleidoscope," as it has been described by Kets de Vries, Guillen, Korotov, and Florent-Treacy (2010)—see also the work by Andromachi Athanasopoulou and Sue Dopson (2015, pp. 17–18) that lists 31 types of coaching from a literature review—in which the cultural dimensions (organizational cultures) hardly impact (Grant, 2000; Hawkins, 2012; Lennard, 2010; Passmore, 2013; Schreyögg, Schmidt-Lellek, 2017). According to the best conceptual, theoretical, technical, and applicative coaching definitions, we are finally abandoning the mistaken idea that coaching results from the practices used by the American tennis trainer Timothy Gallwey (1974) who, after his lucky book on the "inner game" of tennis, has published a plethora of other books all about the idea of the "inner game" (of golf, of skiing, of music, of school, of work, of stress . . .). This idea was initially proposed ubiquitous in the writings of many improvised coaches and in the context of the so-called "pop coaching"—which have

stressed the binomial sport-coaching, calling the alleged births of coaching even from the fields of basketball, athletics, hockey, and motoring (in each of these various disciplines books on "coaching," assumed literally as professional training, have been published).

If we really want to trace the origins of coaching in sports, it would then be necessary to refer to a text unknown to most people, namely, *The Psychology of Coaching*, by Coleman Roberts Griffith (1893–1966; 1926), who is considered the father of American sport psychology (see Green, 2003, 2006; Palmer & Whybrow, 2008). Published in 1926, in this book the author states, among other things, that a good coach should possess the qualities of the athlete, of the physiologist, and of the psychologist (see also the work of Griffith published 2 years later, in 1928, and the book by John D. Lawther, 1951). More recently, an important research has pointed out the perceived effectiveness of coaching from the perspectives of coach, coachee, and sponsor (Ellam-Dyson, 2012; de Haan, Grant, Burger, & Eriksson, 2016; see also Sonesh et al., 2015).

Moving beyond the image of the roots of coaching planted in sport, it is finally possible to take into account the roots of coaching in the psychological field and, particularly, in the counseling psychology. For example, this says Vicki Vandaveer in a recent interview:

> In the US coaching psychology has evolved out of consulting to leaders of organizations—which dates back to the 1940s. Only within the last 20 or so years, has the term "coaching" been used by psychologists to describe their work one-to-one work with executive/leaders to facilitate their professional development. (Palmer & O'Riordan, 2012, p. 102; see also Passmore, Peterson, & Freire, 2013)

A classical definition of coaching psychology sounds as follows:

> Coaching psychology is for enhancing well-being and performance in personal life and work domains underpinned by models of coaching grounded in established adult learning or psychological approaches (adapted Grant & Palmer, 2002). Coaching Psychology is firmly rooted in the discipline of Psychology, while focusing on understanding the skills, approaches and models that benefit well-being and performance in personal life and work domains. Coaching Psychology is a domain of practice for psychologists concerned with the integration of psychological theory and research promoting individual well-being and performance, as well as group and organizational performance. The practice of Coaching Psychology requires a high level of understanding of individual and group development established in psychological and adult learning theory and the application of this understanding to the individual context. (Palmer & Whybrow, 2005, p. 7–8)

Along with these positive indications that help to clarify and define the area of psychological coaching, there is still confusion because of a plethora of people—that can be defined as *coaching vendors and resellers*—who continue to contaminate the professional field, among potential clients and customers. It is important to highlight the many coaching "labels" and the

many ways in which coaching has been applied in total absence of even a minimal basis of scientific thinking. These labels are, in fact, very useful to service marketing toward a general public user characterized by limited psychological culture and naive organizational point of view.

It is perhaps impossible to compose a complete list of "forms" (in the sense of names and labels) attributed to coaching activities, here are some of these: executive coaching, leadership coaching, management coaching, individual coaching, personal coaching, skills coaching, performance coaching, development coaching, business coaching, relationship coaching, sales coaching, professional coaching, empowerment coaching, experiential coaching, career coaching, workplace coaching, corporate coaching, company coaching, ethical coaching, organizational coaching, intercultural coaching, and so on up to the ineffable "super coaching," mental coaching, and life coaching, passing through the inevitable cyber coaching. Because one of the distinctive points of professional coaching activities is the one-to-one setting, the launch of "team coaching" (or "group coaching") seems paradoxical to some people: It is really hard to seriously differentiate team coaching from the multiple and usual training organizational activities (see, for a different point of view, Britton, 2010; Gorell, 2013). And despite that efforts of many colleagues are addressed to define the theoretical and methodological coaching features, it is understandable that some people have seen the development of coaching as a real *Wild West* (Sherman & Freas, 2004) and a possible menace (Loh & Kay, 2003): a threat mainly represented by the worst conjunction of the consequences of fashion, of business (including the agencies that train the new, young coaches, strictly nonpsychologists!), and of the extension of the meaning of the word "coaching," in which the authentic idea of coaching seems to disappear.

Moreover, this perverse dynamic has already been experienced in the field of applied organizational psychology, for example, in the field of personnel training and of assessment of human resources development. It's even difficult to find comfort in the ever-changing definitions proposed by well-known international associations of coaching, and in the continuous rise of definitions altogether invented, without any theoretical references, openly sales-oriented (in fact, some of these definitions were soon marked with the copyright logo). But, as stated by Robert Biswas-Diener and Ben Dean (2007), coaching is now at a turning point (see also Hernez-Broome & Boyce, 2011). In the context of this overall picture, the contribution that positive psychology—that is, "the scientific study of optimal human functioning" (Grant & Spence, 2010, p. 177)—can offer to psychological coaching has emerged (see Castiello d'Antonio, 2013b; Linley, Harrington, & Garcea, 2010).

Psychological Coaching and Positive Psychology in the Organizational Field

Although the foundational work of positive psychology published by Martin E. P. Seligman & Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (2000) more than 10 years ago in *American Psychologist* is very well known, I suppose that the short article published by Martin Seligman (2007) in *Australian Psychologist* is lesser known. It concerns the contribution that positive psychology can offer to psychological coaching—regarding instead the contribution that positive psychology can offer to counseling psychology, see Lopez et al. (2006).

Seligman (2007) started from the observation that coaching appears to be a professional practice with not readily identifiable bounds (he discussed coaching applications in all professional dimensions and not only in organizational settings):

> Coaching is a practice in search of a backbone, two backbones actually: a scientific, evidence-based backbone and a theoretical backbone. I believe that the new discipline of positive psychology provides both those backbones. Positive psychology can provide coaching with a delimited scope of practice, with interventions and measurements that work, and with a view of adequate qualifications to be a coach. (p. 266)

Specifically, positive psychology—defined by Seligman (2007, p. 266) as "the study of positive emotion, of engagement, and of meaning, the three aspects that make sense out of the scientifically unwieldy notion of 'happiness'"—can offer to coaching measuring instruments, methods, techniques and, by doing so, can promote order in the apparent chaos of coaching practices, also proposing the application of scientifically validated research methods (e.g., longitudinal).

From Seligman's article to today about many years have passed: What has changed? Basically we moved from the finding that positive psychology was a sort of "natural interface" for coaching psychology—see, for example, Kauffman (2006)—to the definition of when and how it is so, on what scientific basis, and for what professional purposes. On the other hand, we must not forget that Seligman had been interested in coaching already long before the publication of his aforementioned article. For instance, Seligman has worked on the *Authentic Happiness Coaching* program developed by Ben Dean, within which, between 2003 and 2005, professionals from 19 different cultural contexts have been trained.

Conversely it has to be recalled the acceptance that positive psychology has received in the area of *HRM—Human Resources Management* for its own strengths-based approach applicable in the field of training, development, leadership, and engagement in all organizations. In this context, it is important to recall the seminal contribution of Donald O. Clifton—named as "the father of strength psychology and the grandfather of positive psychology" (McKay & Greengrass, 2003, p. 87)—who, during the 1950s, poses the

question: *What would happen if we studied what is right with people?* (see Buckingham & Clifton, 2001). Starting his early researches, he studied the positive and negative attitudes, the teacher–student relationship, and student–teacher characteristics, developing the so-called "Theory of Strengths Development." He also edited a special issue of *The Psychologist-Manager Journal* on the contribution of positive psychology to management (for an account of the work of Clifton, see Lowman, 2004).

A very important connection between positive psychology and coaching psychology is a kind of common root mainly identifiable in the work of some U.S. psychologists such as Abraham Maslow who developed a great work, not at all limited to the well-known *hierarchy of needs*, but extended to consider the human being as a whole (e.g., see the biography of Maslow by Edward Hoffman, 1988). If Maslow (1954) has referred to the need to deal with the personal health as the aim of psychology, similarly Carl Rogers (1951) has focused his attention on the ability of self-actualization and on the human being as whole mental functions, thus overcoming the typical medical conceptualization seeing health and disease as two dichotomous dimensions.

The whole field of *Humanistic Psychology*—the *U.S. Third Force*—is a framework for psychological coaching as well as for positive psychology. From the field of psychoanalysis, especially the contribution of Karen Horney (1951) has to be outlined, and, more in general, of the so-called social, or culturalist, psychoanalysts, interested in the life of organizations, groups, and human beings in the context of their culture and society: These are Erich Fromm and Harry Stack Sullivan. In this direction have worked also the group of scholars formed around the *William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis and Psychology*, in New York, NY.

In more recent times, the work by Edgar Henry Schein (1999, 2009) on the organizational counseling and that of Harry Levinson (2002, 2008) on organizational counseling and diagnosis are two examples of clinical and organizational dynamics investigation on the three basic levels of organizational life (individual, group, and organization as a dynamic system) that have many points of contact with the consulting and training activities that today are labeled as coaching. It is interesting to note that the concept that moves Schein in his consulting model: "this classic approach to consultation suggested that the goal of organizational consultation was not for the consultant to be an expert in the medical model but rather to facilitate the expertise held within the clients" (Lowman, 2016, p. 71) is supported by the art of asking the right ("powerful") questions (Schein, 2014).

Much of the relevant work carried out by Levinson in the field of organizational counseling can be applied to coaching (Kilburg & Levinson, 2008; Levinson, 1996) and to counseling, addressing not only leaders and managers but also entrepreneurs (Levinson, 2000). From this perspective, the

whole work developed by Levinson stands out as a fine application of the most useful and significant concepts of the psychological field.

From another point of view, we can observe that the psychological coaching has its roots in many areas of psychology such as those of clinical, social, cognitive, occupational, sport, educational, and counseling (Kilburg & Diedrich, 2007; Palmer & Whybrow, 2005; Wildflower, 2013). As noted earlier, the varieties of nonpsychological coaching stem mainly from the athletic and sport tradition based on the discovery of the importance of emotional mental states in learning sports (originally tennis). But it is indispensable to consider coaching as a real form of *applied psychology*, based on the great psychological theories, as well as on micromodels and on the findings of experimental research and field study.

The taxonomy of strengths and virtues created by Peterson and Seligman (2004)—referred to by some people as the *anti-DSM—Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; *DSM–5*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013)—provides a good framework for the work of the coach aiming to support the construction of aspects such as engagement, perseverance, balanced optimism, and intrinsic motivation of their coachee, also in the aim of building a virtuous leader (Kilburg, 2013). On the other hand, there is just to highlight that the spirit of positive psychology is based on the look to the psychological resources of the person at work, rather than the exclusive observation and work on deficits, weaknesses, incompetence, or on the set of personal inadequate characteristics labeled *areas for improvement.*

In this perspective, positive psychology has certainly recovered something that often gets lost in some typical works developed in the ivory white towers, that is to say that one of the basic purposes of the human being is being able to live a life (sufficiently) happy (see Clifford, 2011). If we translate this simple observation to the organizational context, it can be interpreted as one of the trust question that, generally, the coachee carries to his coach, and that goes far beyond being helped, supported, listened to, and understood: How to live the professional life in the best way possible, by complying with organizational goals?

Nevertheless it must be emphasized that "positive psychology is far more than 'happiology' or a familiar song and dance about the importance of focusing on personal strengths" (Biswas-Diener & Dean, 2007, p. 19). Positive psychology has the merit of bringing attention to the emotional sphere of people, a sphere often placed in second place to the behavioral skills and cognitive traits—see the idea of organizational personality as an alternative point of view of the concepts of organizational behavior—and all the conceptualization based on the outdated framework of the human being seen as a simple information processor.

Even more difficult has been the path taken by some people bringing to attention the emotional life in the world of work in which, at most,

were considered the interpersonal and social features, and the emotions were seen as a disturbing interfering variable (Cox & Patrick, 2012; Fineman, 2008). In less recent times, the work of some scholars and consultants from the organizational, systemic, and psychodynamic approaches—for example, see de Board (1978); Jaques (1955, 1960); Jaques and Cason (1994)—has helped to redirect at least part of the approaches to the organizational life.

In the area of positive psychology, there is a wide range of contributions applicable to all kind of psychological coaching, as well as career counseling and organizational counseling aimed to the potential development, such as those proposed by Carol Ryff (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), who has developed a model of psychological well-being and assessment tools concerning the dimensions of autonomy, mastery, growth, relatedness, and self-acceptance. In a general way, the tools provided by positive psychology may well be applied in the early stages of coaching psychology process. As other counselors, coaches, and HR professionals and academics have stressed (see Butcher, Gucker, & Hellervick, 2009), it seems absolutely necessary to make an accurate psychological diagnosis (i.e., clinical and organizational assessment) of the coachee before beginning the coaching process during the first stages of the working alliance building—this step stands out as one of the distinctive features of psychological coaching.

Leaving aside the use of questionnaires and psychological tests that mainly aim to assess the psychopathological dimension of people (see Lowman, 1989), and going beyond the use of tools such as, for example, some wide-range personality questionnaires as MBTI—*Myers–Briggs Type Indicator* (Myers & Briggs, 1962), ACL—*Adjective Check List* (Gough, 1960), and FFM—Five-Factor Model questionnaires (Digman, 1990), we can also take in account as the so-called *welcome packets*, in which there are many and varied tools designed to particularly display the resources of the coachee. "Good psychological tests used appropriately can be useful tools for coaches to support their clients in building awareness through self-exploration and understanding" (Allworth & Passmore, 2012, p. 22). From a pragmatic point of view, the perspective of positive psychology applied to coaching (a) helps the coachee to be aware of his personal resources—which are often taken for granted because they are experienced as naturally present, (b) creates the conditions for skill and capability development beyond the usual professional activities, or beyond the prescribed area of organizational role, and (c) develops a sense of confidence and mastery in the coachee, by moving the view toward the strengthening of his capabilities (empowerment), taking charge of his own career development (ownership) and life-professional project (see also Kilburg, 2016; McDonald & Hite, 2016).

Some Limitations of Positive Psychology Applied to Coaching in the Work Contexts

The prospects opened from the positive approach to the human beings' psychological and working realm seem to have some limitations. When the specific contribution of positive psychology to coaching is invoked, some boundaries of this approach emerge: for instance, limits in the application of the psychological assessment tools. Not by chance, questionnaires known as those based on Jungian typology or on psycho-lexical studies are frequently cited, whereas the *scientifically validated measures* (as presented by the authors that deal with them), on variables such as hope and optimism, do not always seem applicable in organizational contexts and with middle-aged managers (see the list of these tools in Lopez & Snyder, 2003). Some recent researches suggest that managers of different ages may differ in some psychological attributes as self-reflection and degree of change (Tamir & Finfer, 2016), but there is still need for further researches investigating the relationship between the age of a coachee and the process and outcome of coaching. The emphasis on specific issues that have been recalled in the area of positive psychology coaching emerge from one side as the recovery of traditional ideas (e.g., the importance of developing and building coachee awareness, sense of control over his life, and his intrinsic motivation), and from another side it is not easy to operationalize and apply them in the work setting.

Among the latter, the so-called *flow experience* (flow state, or *état de grâce*) is really achievable only in the context of a freely chosen and highly self-motivating job—a condition not just prevalent in the organizational world. Yet this particular *state of mind* is and remains the only authentic existential condition that allows human being to take an *intrinsic pleasure* from the work he or she is doing—as already noted by Sigmund Freud (1929). Positive psychology coaching is a "coaching approach that seek to improve short term well-being (i.e., hedonic well-being) and sustainable well-being (i.e., eudaimonic well-being) using evidence-based approaches from positive psychology and the science of well-being and enable the person to do this in an ongoing manner after coaching has completed" (Passmore & Oades, 2014a, p. 15; see also Passmore & Oades, 2014b).

To support the effectiveness of coaching centered on positive psychology, a lot of references show that the positive emotions have a constructive impact in everyday life (see, e.g., the work developed by Barbara Fredrickson team in: Fredrickson, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005): But what is still not always clear is how and how much the positive emotions experience may be achievable in the world of organizations. For example, from a phenomenological point of

view, stressing on the positive experiences of the coachee could interfere with or hinder the reconstruction of the inner world of experience of the person (see Krieger, 2010), inhibiting the process of mentalization (or "mentalizing")—the process of making sense of mental states in oneself and other persons—and the process of insightfulness regarding the less bright aspects of the managerial and professional life (see Di Stefano, Piacentino, & Ruvolo, 2017). In other words, we have to consider the "dark side" of organizations and the dynamics that occur in the real working life of every person-at-work (see Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Zeigler-Hill & Marcus, 2016). There is a great need for longitudinal studies and follow-up (Bozer, Sarros, & Santora, 2014; Grant, 2000): the risk is, indeed, to limit, settle, and be satisfied with a positive outcome at very short time from the closure of coaching conversations, and not verifying the outcome in the real and dynamic organizational life of today, of how positive psychology coaching actually worked.

Referring to the coaching activities we could recall the adage that in the eighties it was usual to mention in relation to Assessment Center method: It works, but it is not easy to say why and in which manner (International Task Force on Assessment Center Guidelines, 2008; Klimoski & Brickner, 1987). This appears in close connection to the general difficulties that we encounter when we want to search evidence for the effectiveness of the methodology placed in action in the organizational world (see, Grant, 2016; Osatuke, Yanovsky, & Ramsel, 2017; Reed, 2013; Vandaveer, Lowman, Pearlman, & Brannick, 2016). Authoritative opinions have already been expressed in favor of the use of a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies—short-, medium-, and long-term centered—based on different sources, and enriched by the use of different techniques (e.g., self-report questionnaires, structured and unstructured interviews, focus groups, performance evaluation, potential assessment, 360 degree feedback, and other kind of observations from bosses, peers, internal and external clients). Some people have advised organizational psychologists about the necessity "to borrow evaluation methods from their clinical cousins, approaching the evaluation from a clinical trial standpoint rather than other, more traditional training evaluation methods" (Salas & Weaver, 2016, p. 72).

Even today, one of the most well-known frameworks in the field of positive psychology coaching is the *Authentic Happiness Coaching Model* developed by Seligman et al. (see Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005): a model that can easily disappoint the expectations of the coach when we look at the operational sets proposed by the authors. Surely, the practice of coaching drew attention to the need to work through field researches, researches linked to the realities of organizational life, and in this regard a number of scholars have turned to an evidence-based optic (Briner, 2012; Jones, 2013; Lee, 2013).

Anyone involved in positive psychology emphasizes the aspiration in moving beyond the so-called zero-point centered on deficit and failures (Lewis, 2011; Peterson, 2000). Nevertheless, especially when coaching—a reflexive process consultation—is not conducted by competent professional psychologists, we run the risk of forcing the vision of human and organizational realities toward an ideal world where there is no place to deal with the (inevitable) disappointments, problems, and sufferings. This is true even today, in a time in which high-level bosses and middle management placed at the top of organizational pyramids and in the high responsibility professional and commercial roles are exposed to pressures and distress in a massive way (see Korotov, Florent-Treacy, Kets de Vries, & Bernhardt, 2012).

Today, the idea that coaching is effective in developing areas of emotional intelligence is widespread (Boyatzis, Smith, Van Oosten, & Woolford, 2013; Chapman, 2005; Neale, Spencer-Arnell, & Wilson, 2009)—as also evidenced by recent researches (Lynn, 2017). Because managerial and leadership competencies are strongly connected with the emotional intelligence (Boyatzis, 2011), coaching represents a powerful means to improve these human qualities in the wide area of the workplace life (Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Khalili, 2012).

Not surprisingly, by reading the published report of coaching conversations based on positive psychology, we realize the deny of the negative side that is often made by the coach. It is therefore important to insist in the direction of a holistic view of the human being, encompassing every dimension of existential and subjective experience: Just as it is wrong to pathologize every signal, it is equally incorrect wanting to see in every human situation—almost exclusively and necessarily—the positive side.

Concluding Comments

Some time ago, I read in a business magazine the staggering definition written by two well-known business consultants that the coach would be . . . *the armed wing of Top Management*! I believe that everyone can see the great distance that separates this astounding idea from the proper application of psychological coaching: The hard work of serious, professional, and competent coaches is—and will be—to make clear to their customers and clients, what is really the psychological coaching and, also very important, what is not (Angel & Amar, 2005; Bachkirova, 2011; Castiello d'Antonio, 2007, 2012; Kilburg, 2004; Kilburg & Diedrich, 2007; Law, Ireland, & Hussain, 2007; Looss, 1991; Peltier, 2010; Rogers, 2012). It should also be very important to minimize the influence of the people that approach and promote

professional coaching mainly as a "business engagement," giving advice on how to build a good business coaching, and useful strategies to connect with customers (see Newton, 2013).

As mentioned earlier, embracing the perspective of positive psychology in doing psychological coaching cannot mean to take for granted neither the "positivity" of the workplaces, nor of all human beings working in the organizational milieu. Especially today, in a tense socioeconomic status and in a context of great suffering for much people, persons at work can manifest many characteristics and many mode of dysfunctional and counterproductive organizational behavior: This is especially true for those people working in organizational roles of high responsibility (Castiello d'Antonio, 2001; Goldman, 2009; Grant & Spence, 2010; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1984).

It is not always true that "coaches work with clients who are relatively well adjusted, and often relatively successful" (Wildflower, 2013, p. 28), or at least it is important to underline the adverb "relatively." Therefore, it is apparent the need to conduct an accurate and in-depth initial psychodiagnosis (or psychological–organizational assessment), addressed to both clinical and organizational perspective (Castiello d'Antonio, 2013a; Jeanneret & Silzer, 1998). This means conducting a deep psychological assessment in the initial coaching sessions—also to promote a constructive introspection of the coachee (Krieger, 2010; Watts, 2012)—using appropriate tools and, of course, carrying out the initial diagnostic interview.

These tools go beyond the light questionnaires as those had been built within the *FFM Model*, the so-called *Big Five* emerged from factor analysis (McCrae & Costa, 1999), or as lists of self-describing adjectives as in the *ACL—Adjective Check List* (Gough, 1960) and other self-reports that have the great merit of helping a person to describe him/herself but cannot accurately report the presence of important psychopathological traits. I believe that a coach who is not able to recognize, in addition to the strengths and positive qualities, also the weaknesses and the most important pathological traits of his coachee cannot do a good job; however, this topic is part of the process of professionalization of coaching (and of the building of personal and professional skills of the coach).

We should apply, indeed, some clinical personality techniques used in the world of work within the relationship between expert (professional psychologist) and client, in a setting that is protected by the obligation of professional secrecy and professional ethics—built on the basis of an authentic working alliance (Kemp, 2011; Passmore, 2011). For example, together with the use of psychometric tools and questionnaires (see Passmore, 2012) such as those developed by psychologists as Guilford and Zimmermann (1949), Comrey (1995), and McCrae and Costa (1999), I believe that it would be useful to employ projective techniques such as the *Zulliger Projective Technique* (Carruba & Castiello d'Antonio, 2008; Castiello

d'Antonio, 2013c; Zulliger, 1948, 1962), the *TAT—Thematic Apperception Test* (Morgan, 1995; Murray, 1943), and the thematic techniques developed by David McClelland (1985), and other tests as the sentence completion test (see Sacks & Levy, 1950).

It is always useful to integrate the findings thus obtained with the results of the 360 Degree Assessment and Feedback (Lepsinger & Lucia, 2009), and with the reports arising from Assessment Center and Development Center (Castiello d'Antonio, 2003a, 2003b; Thornton III, Rupp, Hoffman, 2015; Willis, 2017). To ascertain the psychological resources and strengths of the coachee, it is necessary to apply the typical tools of positive psychology and other, more extensive methods as, for example, the approaches that assess the construct of the "organizational intelligence" (Gardell & Johansson, 1981). So, with this scenery in mind, the positive psychology point of view and techniques can make a valuable contribution both in the setup of the psychological coaching process, and during the coaching conversations.

Going back to the roots of coaching psychology and positive psychology, the common ground of these two disciplines that have arisen almost simultaneously, relying on the same sources, should be noted. These two disciplines have recovered the teaching of some great psychologists of the 20th century, especially by sharing the confidence in the human being: Positive psychology and coaching psychology, together, are linked in the effort to develop the human potential and the well-being in all the areas of social life. This trend looks well established (see Linley & Harrington, 2008), but, at the same time, it is a base from which to move and to go further, probably building new paths in the field of the work and organizational psychology (Blunstein, 2006, 2013).

References

Allworth, E., & Passmore, J. (2012). Using psychometrics and psychological tools in coaching. In J. Passmore (Ed.), *Psychometrics in coaching: Using psychological and psychometric tools for development*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Angel, P., & Amar, P. (2005). *Le coaching*. Paris, France: PUF.

Athanasopoulou, A., & Dopson, S. (2015). *Developing leadership by executive coaching*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199681952.001.0001

Bachkirova, T. (2011). *Developmental coaching*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Biswas-Diener, R., & Dean, B. (2007). *Positive psychology coaching*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Blunstein, D. L. (2006). *The psychology of working: A new perspective for career development, counseling and public policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associate.

Blunstein, D. L. (Ed.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of the psychology of working*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Boyatzis, R. (2011). Managerial and leadership competencies: A behavioural approach to emotion, social and cognitive intelligence. *Vision, The Journal of Business Perspectives, 15,* 91–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/097226291101500202

Boyatzis, R., Smith, M., Van Oosten, E., & Woolford, L. (2013). Developing resonant leaders through emotional intelligence, vision and coaching. *Organizational Dynamics, 42,* 17–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2012.12.003

Bozer, G., Sarros, J., & Santora, J. (2014). Academic background and credibility in executive coaching effectiveness. *Personnel Review, 43,* 881–897. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2013-0171

Briner, R. B. (2012). Does coaching work and does anyone really care? *OP Matters, 17,* 4–12.

Britton, J. J. (2010). *Effective group coaching*. Mississauga, Canada: Wiley.

Brunning, H. (Ed.). (2006). *Executive coaching: Systems-psychodynamics perspectives*. London, United Kingdom: Karnac.

Buckingham, M., & Clifton, D. O. (2001). *Now, discover your strengths*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Butcher, J. N., Gucker, D. K., & Hellervick, L. W. (2009). Clinical personality assessment in the employment context. In J. N. Butcher (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of personality assessment* (pp. 582–598). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195366877.001.0001

Carruba, P., & Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2008). *Zulliger Test. La tecnica proiettiva di Hans Zulliger nella diagnosi di personalità* [*Zulliger Test. The Hans Zulliger projective technique in the personality assessment*]. Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2001). *Psicopatologia manageriale* [*Managerial psychopathology*]. Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2003a). *Assessment Center*. Torino, Italy: Isper.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2003b). *Development Center*. Torino, Italy: Isper.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2007). IL coaching nei contesti organizzativi [Coaching in the organizational setting]. *Mente e Cervello, 5,* 82–87.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2012). Luci e ombre sul coaching [Lights and shadows on coaching]. *Psicologia Contemporanea, 231,* 76–80.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2013a). *L'Assessment manageriale delle qualità manageriali e della leadership* [*Assessment of managerial qualities and leadership*]. Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2013b). Coaching e coaching psicologico [Coaching and coaching psychology]. *Qi Questioni e Idee di Psicologia, 7,* 1–3.

Castiello d'Antonio, A. (2013c). Hans Zulliger: Life and work. *Newsletter of History of Applied Psychology, 2,* 6–7.

Cavanagh, M., Grant, A. M., & Kemp, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Evidence-based coaching*. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.

Chapman, M. (2005). Emotional intelligence and coaching: An exploratory study. In M. Cavanagh, A. M. Grant, & T. Kemp (Eds.), *Evidence-based Coaching: Vol. 1. Theory, research and practice from the behavioural sciences*. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.

Clarkson, P. (2004). *Gestalt counselling in action*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Clifford, T. (2011). What happens when coaches explore their strengths? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 5,* 139–153.

Comrey, A. (1995). Career assessment and the Comrey Personality Scales. *Journal of Career Assessment, 3,* 140–156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/106907279500300203

Corrie, S. (2009). *The art of inspired living*. London, United Kingdom: Karnac.

Cox, E., & Patrick, C. (2012). Managing emotions at work: How coaching affects retail support worker's performance and motivation. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 10,* 34–51.

de Board, R. (1978). *The psychoanalysis of organizations*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203321812

de Haan, E., Grant, A. M., Burger, Y., & Eriksson, P.-O. (2016). A large-scale study of executive and workplace coaching: The relative contributions of relationship, personality match, and self-efficacy. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68,* 189–207. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000058

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five factors model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41,* 417–440. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221

Di Stefano, G., Piacentino, B., & Ruvolo, G. (2017). Mentalizing in organizations: A psychodynamic model for an understanding of well-being and suffering in the work contexts. *World Futures, 73,* 216–223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2017.1333851

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, L. C. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: CRC Press.

Ellam-Dyson, V. (2012). Coaching psychology research: Building the evidence, developing awareness. *OP Matters, 17,* 13–16.

Fineman, S. (Ed.). (2008). *The emotional organization. Passion and power.* London, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology. The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56,* 218–226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition and Emotion, 19,* 313–332. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930441000238

Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science, 13,* 172–175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00431

Fredrickson, B. L., & Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist, 60,* 678–686. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.678

Freud, S. (1929). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XXI (1927–1931).* London, United Kingdom: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1961.

Gallwey, W. T. (1974). *The inner game of tennis.* New York, NY: Random House.

Gardell, B., & Johansson, G. (1981). *Working life: A social science contribution to work reform.* Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Goldman, A. (2009). *Destructive leaders and dysfunctional organizations.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805097

Gorell, R. (2013). *Group coaching.* London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Gough, H. G. (1960). The adjective check list as a personality assessment research technique. *Psychological Reports, 6,* 107–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1960.6.1.107

Grant, A. M. (2000). Coaching psychology comes of age. *PsychNews, 4,* 12–14.

Grant, A. M. (2016). What can Sydney tell us about coaching? Research with implications for practice from down under. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68,* 105–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000047

Grant, A., & Palmer, S. (2002). Integrating positive psychology and coaching psychology into counselling psychology. *Counselling Psychology Review, 30,* 22–25.

Grant, A. M., & Spence, G. B. (2010). Using coaching and positive psychology to promote a flourishing workforce: A model of goal-striving and mental health. In P. A. Linley, S. Harrington, & N. Garcea (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology at work* (pp. 175–188). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Green, C. D. (2003). Psychology strikes out: Coleman R. Griffith and the Chicago Cubs. *History of Psychology, 6,* 267–283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1093-4510.6.3.267

Green, C. D. (2006). Coleman Roberts Griffith. In D. A. Dewsbury, L. T. Benjamin, Jr., & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Portraits of pioneers in psychology* (pp. 55–62). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Griffith, C. (1926). *The psychology of coaching: A study of the coaching methods from the point of psychology.* New York, NY: Scribner's.

Griffith, C. (1928). *Psychology and athletics: A general survey for athletes and coaches*. New York, NY: Scribner's.

Guilford, J. P., & Zimmermann, W. S. (1949). *The Guilford-Zimmermann Temperament Survey: Manual of instructions and interpretations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sheridan Supply.

Hall, L. (2013). *Mindful coaching. How mindfulness can transform coaching practice*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Hawkins, P. (2012). *Creating a coaching culture*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Hayes, N. (2008). *NLP coaching*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press/ Mcgraw-Hill.

Hernez-Broome, G., & Boyce, L. A. (Eds.). (2011). *Advances in executive coaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hoffman, E. (1988). *The right to be human: A biography of Abraham Maslow*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Horney, K. (1951). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York, NY: Norton.

International Task Force on Assessment Center Guidelines. (2008). Guidelines and ethical considerations for Assessment Center operations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17*, 243–253.

Jaques, E. (1955). Social systems as a defence against persecutory and depressive anxiety. In M. Klein, P. Heimann, & R. E. Money-Kyrle (Eds.), *New directions in psychoanalysis* (pp. 478–498). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Jaques, E. (1960). The mental processes in work. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, XLI*, 146–168.

Jaques, E., & Cason, K. (1994). *Human capability: A study of individual potential and its application*. Falls Church, VA: Cason Hall & Co.

Jeanneret, R., & Silzer, R. (1998). (Eds.). *Individual psychological assessment: Predicting behavior in organizational settings*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, R. (2013). The evidence base for coaching. *OP Matters, 18*, 14–15.

Joseph, S. (2005). Person-centered coaching psychology. *The Coaching Psychologist, 1*, 3–5.

Kauffman, C. (2006). Positive psychology: The science at the hearth of coaching. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence based coaching handbook* (pp. 219–253). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.

Kemp, T. (2011). Building the coaching alliance: Illuminating the phenomenon of relationship in coaching. In G. Hernez-Broome & L. A. Boyce (Eds.), *Advances in executive coaching* (pp. 151–176). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., Guillen, L., Korotov, K., & Florent-Treacy, E. (2010). (Eds.), *The coaching kaleidoscope*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan & Insead.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., Korotov, K., & Florent-Treacy, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Coach and couch: The psychology of making better leaders*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Miller, D. (1984). Neurotic style and organizational pathology. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 169–174.

Khalili, A. (2012). The role of emotional intelligence in the workplace: A literature review. *International Journal of Management, 29*, 355–370.

Kilburg, R. R. (2004). (Ed.). Executive coaching. (Special Issue). *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice an Research, 48*, 2. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/cpb/index.aspx?tab=1

Kilburg, R. R. (2007). Toward conceptual understanding definition of executive coaching. In R. R. Kilburg & R. C. Diedrich (Eds.), *The wisdom of coaching: Essentials papers in coaching psychology for a world of change* (pp. 21–30). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11570-001

Kilburg, R. R. (2013). *Virtuous leaders: Strategy, character, and influence in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kilburg, R. R. (2016). The development of human expertise: Toward a model for the 21st-century practice of coaching, consulting, and general applied psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68*, 177–187. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000054

Kilburg, R. R., & Diedrich, R. C. (Eds.). (2007). *The wisdom of coaching: Essentials papers in coaching psychology for a world of change*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kilburg, R. R., & Levinson, H. (2008). Executive dilemmas: Coaching and the professional perspectives of Harry Levinson. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60,* 7–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.7

Klimoski, R. J., & Brickner, M. (1987). Why do assessment centers work? The puzzle of Assessment Center Validity. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 243–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00603.x

Kombarakaran, F. A., Yang, J. A., Baker, M. N., & Fernandes, P. B. (2008). Executive Coaching: It Works. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60,* 78–90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.78

Korotov, K., Florent-Treacy, E., Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Bernhardt, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Tricky coaching: Difficult cases in leadership coaching*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krieger, L. H. (2010). Success vs. wisdom: Phenomenological foundations of psychological practice. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 13,* 93–104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10887151003761291

Law, H. C., Ireland, S., & Hussain, Z. (2007). *Psychology of coaching, mentoring and learning*. Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley and Sons.

Lawther, J. D. (1951). *The psychology of coaching*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs.

Lee, R. J. (2013). The journey of an executive coach, by way of consulting psychologist and manager. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 16,* 1–4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0094736

Lennard, D. (2010). *Coaching models: A cultural perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lepsinger, R., & Lucia, A. (2009). *The art and science of 360-degree feedback*. II Ed. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Levinson, H. (1996). Executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48,* 115–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.48.2.115

Levinson, H. (2000). On becoming an entrepreneur. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 4,* 91–95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0095882

Levinson, H. (2002). *Organizational assessment. A step by step guide to effective consulting*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10453-000

Levinson, H. (2008). *Consulting psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lewis, S. (2011). *Positive psychology at work: How positive leadership and appreciative inquiry create inspiring organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781119990390

Linley, P. A., & Harrington, S. (2008). Integrating positive psychology and coaching psychology. In S. Palmer & A. Whybrow (Eds.), *Handbook of coaching psychology: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 40–56). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Linley, P. A., Harrington, S., & Garcea, N. (Eds.). (2010). *Oxford handbook of positive psychology at work*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Loh, M., & Kay, P. (2003, February). The coaching menace. *The Business Times Online Edition.*

Looss, W. (1991). *Coaching für manager*. Landersberg/Lech, Germany: Verlag Moderne Industrie.

Lopez, S. J., Magyar-Moe, J. L., Petersen, S. E., Ryder, J. A., Krieshok, T. S., O'Byrne, K. K., . . . Fry, N. A. (2006). Counseling psychology's focus on positive aspects of human functioning. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34,* 205–227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000005283393

Lopez, S., & Snyder, C. R. (2003). *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10612-000

Lowman, R. L. (1989). *Pre-employment screening for psychopathology: A guide to professional practice*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Exchange.

Lowman, R. L. (2004). Donald O. Clifton (1924–2003). *American Psychologist, 59,* 180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.3.180

Lowman, R. L. (2016). *An introduction to consulting psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lynn, G. (2017). Performance coaching to develop emotional intelligence through a lens of double loop learning: A U. K. hospitality industry study. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 8,* 15–51.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1999). A five factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 378–396). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McDonald, K., & Hite, L. (2016). *Career development*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McKay, J., & Greengrass, M. (2003). People. *Monitor on Psychology, 34,* 3.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2012). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Morgan, W. G. (1995). Origin and history of the Thematic Apperception Test images. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 65,* 237–254. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6502_2

Murray, H. A. (1943). *Manual of the Thematic Apperception Test*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Myers, I. B., & Briggs, C. K. (1962). *Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14404-000

Neale, S., Spencer-Arnell, L., & Wilson, L. (2009). *Emotional intelligence coaching. Improving performance for leaders, coaches and the individual*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Neenan, M., & Palmer, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Cognitive behavioural coaching in practice*. Hove, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Newton, S. (2013). *Success as coach*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Osatuke, K., Yanovsky, B., & Ramsel, D. (2017). Executive coaching: New framework for evaluation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 69,* 172–186. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000073

Palmer, S., & O'Riordan, S. (2012). Putting coaching psychology into practice: An evidence based approach. Interview with speakers from the SGCP Annual Coaching Psychology Conference 2012. *The Coaching Psychology, 8,* 96–103.

Palmer, S., & Whybrow, A. (2005). The proposal to establish a special group in coaching psychology. *The Coaching Psychologist, 1,* 5–12.

Palmer, S., & Whybrow, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of coaching psychology. A guide for practitioners*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Passmore, J. (Ed.). (2011). *Supervision in coaching: Supervision, ethics and continuous professional development*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Passmore, J. (Ed.). (2012). *Psychometrics in coaching. Using psychological and psychometric tools for development*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Passmore, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Diversity in coaching: Working with gender, culture, race and age*. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Passmore, J., & Oades, L. G. (2014a). Positive psychology coaching. In J. Passmore (Ed.) *Mastery in coaching: A complete psychological toolkit for advanced coaching* (pp. 15–40). London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.

Passmore, J., & Oades, L. G. (2014b). Positive psychology coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist, 10,* 68–70.

Passmore, J., Peterson, D. B., & Freire, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The psychology of coaching and mentoring*. London, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Peltier, B. (2010). *The psychology of executive coaching* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist, 55,* 44–55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.44

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Reed, J. (2013). A journey between two worlds—Executives and psychologists: A brief comparison. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 16,* 11–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0094738

Richardson, M. S. (2012). Counseling for work and relationship. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40,* 190–242. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000011406452

Rogers, C. R. (1951). *On becoming a person. A therapist view of psychotherapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, J. (2012). *Coaching skills: A handbook* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 719–727. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Sacks, J. M., & Levy, S. (1950). The sentence completion test. In L. E. Abt & L. Bellak (Eds.), *Projective psychology. Clinical approaches to total personality* (pp. 357–402). New York, NY: Knopf. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11452-011

Salas, E. & Weaver, S. J. (2016). Employee growth and development: Cultivating human capita. In M. J. Grawitch & D. W. Ballard (Eds.), *The psychologically healthy workplace* (pp. 59–86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sandler, C. (2011). *Executive coaching. A psychodynamic approach*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press/Mcgraw-Hill.

Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship*. Boston, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing.

Schein, E. H. (2009). *Helping. How to offer, give, and receive help*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koeler.

Schein, E. H. (2014). *Humble Inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koeler.

Schreyögg, A., & Schmidt-Lellek, C. (Eds.). (2017). *The professionalization of coaching. A reader for the coach*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Coaching and positive psychology. *Australian Psychologist, 42,* 266–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00050060701648233

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55,* 5–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Sherman, S., & Freas, A. (2004). The Wild West of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review, 82,* 82–90, 148.

Skiffington, S., & Zeus, P. (2003). *Behavioural coaching: How to build sustainable personal and organizational strengths*. North Ryde, Australia: McGraw-Hill.

Sonesh, S. C., Coultas, C. W., Marlow, S. L., Lacerenza, C. N., Reyes, D., & Salas, E. (2015). Coaching in the wild: Identifying factors that lead to success. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 67,* 189–217. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000042

Stelter, R. (2013). *A guide to third generation coaching*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Stober, D. R., & Grant, A. M. (Eds.). (2006). *Evidence based coaching handbook*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Stojnov, D., & Pavlovic, J. (2010). An invitation to personal construct coaching: From personal construct therapy to personal construct coaching. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 5,* 129–139.

Tamir, L. M., & Finfer, L. A. (2016). Executive coaching: The age factor. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68,* 313–325. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000069

Thornton, G. C., III, Rupp, D. E., & Hoffman, B. J. (2015). *Assessment center perspectives for talent management strategies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vandaveer, V. V., Lowman, R. L., Pearlman, K., & Brannick, J. P. (2016). A practice analysis of coaching psychology: Toward a foundational competency model. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68,* 118–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000057

Van Deurzen, E., & Hanaway, M. (2012). *Existential perspective on coaching*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-39062-1

Watts, G. W. (2012). The power of introspection for executive development. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 15,* 149–157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10887156.2012.701136

Wildflower, L. (2013). *The hidden history of coaching*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press/Mcgraw-Hill.

Willis, L. C. (2017). *Mastering the assessment center process: The fast track to promotion*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Zeigler-Hill, V., & Marcus, D. K. (2016). *The dark side of personality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Zulliger, H. (1948). *Der Z-Test: Ein formdeut-verfahren zur psychologischen untersuchung von gruppen* [Z-Test. A form interpretation process for the psychological examination of groups]. Bern, Switzerland: Hans Huber.

Zulliger, H. (1962). *Der Zulliger-Tafeln-Test (Tafeln-Z-Test): Ein rorschach-verfahren mit drei tafeln für individuelle psychologische prüfungen* [The Zulliger-Tafeln (Tafeln-Z-Test): A Rorschach method with three plates for individual psychological examinations]. Bern, Switzerland: Hans Huber.