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Measuring benefits

Coaching 'Hot Spots'

Executive Coaches

% of US Coaches Charging over $300 / Hour

Executive Coaches
Business Coaches
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Coaching gives leaders a space to test ideas and the confidence to take action.

Executive Coach, UK

More companies are trying to provide internal coaches. External coaches are becoming more of a commodity.

Coach, USA, Midwest

Women in Leadership is a critical topic. With everything going on today, it has come to the forefront. Thanks for addressing this.

Training Executive, Dubai, UAE

There are systemic hurdles for women to overcome, and personal limitations in confidence and self-value.

Coach, USA, San Francisco

I’ve hire coaches for many years. Often, changes in behavior do not last. It’s easy to find a coach, hard to find consistency.

Buyer, Melbourne, Australia
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Welcome to the 2017 Executive Coaching Survey.

This market research is a service of Sherpa Coaching, a team of coaches, authors, educators, and researchers working across the world via telepresence, and based in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA. Your research team consists of Karl Corbett, Managing Partner and Joseph Valeri, Chief Researcher at Sherpa Coaching along with Shawn Herbig and his IQS Research organization.

This year’s research is sponsored by:

- University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Athens
- University of New Mexico Anderson School of Management, Albuquerque
- Howard University School of Business, Washington, D.C.
- Sherpa Coaching, Cincinnati, Ohio

This year, as always, we polled coaches, clients, HR and training professionals, and a wider group of professionals with an interest in leadership development.
With thanks to our sponsors and supporters, the Executive Coaching Survey is a market research project now in its twelfth year. Through this market research, you will discover how to make the most of coaching as a service for your organization – or as a career for yourself.

What exactly is Executive Coaching? Let’s draw some distinctions between two general areas of discipline: ‘executive coaching’ and ‘business coaching’. What are some of the differences in emphasis, focus, and training between these two types of coaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Coaching</th>
<th>Business Coaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Behavior</td>
<td>Strategy and Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hard skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes: communication</td>
<td>includes: finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes: setting</td>
<td>includes: operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business coaching is an alternative term for consulting, as research shows:

“Many business coaches refer to themselves as consultants, a broader business relationship than one which exclusively involves coaching.”


We ask respondents to identify themselves, with two of the choices being:

- business coach (working to develop client’s knowledge and skills)
- executive coach (working to permanently enhance business behavior).
**Defining the Industry**

To gather insightful and useful data we need to distinguish between coaching, training, consulting, and other professional positions. It also allows us to separate and analyze answers that come specifically and exclusively from executive coaches. We can make direct, factual comparisons between different types of professionals.

So, let's focus specifically on *executive coaching* and what it means.

We need a clear, academically sound definition of the role of an executive coach. One early definition described coaching as something that would: “...produce extraordinary results” and “...enhance quality of life.” However, the definition can’t be promotional or guarantee specific results, so that language didn’t last long.

An accurate and viable definition of executive coaching should provide specific information that distinguishes it from other coaching – such as life, sports, fitness or business coaching.

The most widely accepted definition of executive coaching defines it as "regular meetings between a business leader and a trained facilitator, designed to produce positive changes in business behavior in a limited time frame.” *

This definition of executive clarifies:

- Who coaches are: trained facilitators
- What coaches do: produce positive changes in business behavior
- When things happen: on a set schedule within a limited time frame
- How they do it: through regular ongoing meetings

*Definition from 'The Sherpa Guide: Process-Driven Executive Coaching’ (Thomson 2005)*
Over the last twelve years, the Sherpa Coaching definition has been adopted by numerous trade associations and universities. This annual survey, including this definition of executive coaching, has been disseminated or promoted over the years by countless organizations and publications, including:

### Trade Associations
- Asia Pacific Alliance of Coaches
- Association for Coaching
- Association of Corporate Executive Coaches
- COMENSA South Africa
- European Mentoring and Coaching Council
- Institute of Coaching at McLean
- Institute of Learning Practitioners Australia
- International Coach Federation
- South African Org. Development Network

### Universities
- Howard University
- Kent State University
- Miami University
- Penn State University
- Sociedade Brasileira de Coaching
- Southern Illinois University
- Stellenbosch University
- Texas Christian University
- University of Cincinnati
- University of Georgia
- University of Louisville
- University of Pretoria
- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
- Xavier University

### Publications and Resources
- Atlanta Journal Constitution
- Business Week
- Choice Magazine
- Coaching at Work Magazine
- Coaching Commons
- Coaching News
- Dallas Morning News
- European Foundation for Mgmt. Development
- Fort Worth Business Press
- HR Executive Magazine
- Leading Coaches Center
- Library of Professional Coaching
- National Public Radio (USA)
- Organization Development Journal
- USA Today
- Wall Street Journal
- World Business and Executive Coach Summit

### Businesses
- Action Coach
- American Management Association
- Change Partners South Africa
- Hudson Institute
- Human Capital Institute
- Leadership and Management Wales
- Lee Hecht Harrison
- Legal Watch
Coaching Constants

The world of executive coaching changes as markets, practices, and local economies change. Monitoring trends puts us in great position to make predictions about the coaching industry and provide insight for coaches and clients. However, identifying trends is only one side of the coin. While many aspects of the coaching world have changed (or will change) some remain constant. With 12 years of survey data at our fingertips, not only do we see what changes, but we can also see what aspects of the industry remain constant.

"Coaching Constants" are areas of executive coaching that don't seem to change at all. What can these valuable Coaching Constants tell us about the state of executive coaching?

Value & Credibility

As the coaching industry has matured, the perceived ‘value of coaching’ has become very firmly established. The value of coaching started trending from mediocre to very high 10 years ago, and quickly leveled off. For eight straight years:

Over 90% of respondents rated the value of coaching as somewhat or very high.

From 2011-2014 it was over 95%. We stopped asking the question because the answer was clear.

With the high value of coaching firmly established, the ‘credibility of coaching’ emerged as another Coaching Constant. Although credibility started at a lower level, for five consecutive years going into 2016:

Over 90% agreed that the credibility of coaching was somewhat or very high.

It became such a slam dunk guarantee that we didn't include even include the question this year!
First, we saw the value and credibility of coaching trend upward and level off. Then clients started to really “buy in” to the coaching industry – literally and figuratively – and more Coaching Constants emerged.

**Who needs an executive coach most?**

The three options on the survey are:
- people with a specific problem or challenge
- those who need leadership development
- individuals in transition

This is another question where trends emerged before leveling out into constants. The third option, 'individuals in transition,' has hovered at 20% for every single year of the survey. The other two options trended in opposite directions before starting to level out. 'People with a specific problem or challenge' is leveling out at 20%, and about 60% of survey respondents have consistently said an executive coach is most needed by 'people who need leadership development.'
When clients need to hire a coach how do they find one? One option here has dominated the rest, but this Coaching Constant is under siege. About 73% of people find a coach through personal reference – far more than all the other options (web search, trade association, LinkedIn, and service broker) combined. But while personal reference stands above the rest, web search nearly doubled over the last 3 years. As information technology and social media expand, other methods of finding a coach may cause the number of people relying on personal reference to decrease. What was once a Coaching Constant is starting to change.

Processes & Background

So far, we've seen a few Coaching Constants: from the value and credibility of coaching to who needs coaching and how they find it. Let’s look at a few survey questions about coaches’ processes and backgrounds.
Coaching Constants

Do coaches base their coaching on a published process? The answer to this question has remained remarkably consistent over the years. Only 25-30% follow a specific published process while greater than 70% do not. Companies are hiring younger coaches and training them in the use of a published process. If this continues, and some of these coaches become independent, we’ll see a gradual change over decades. Eventually, new trends will emerge out of this apparent Coaching Constant.

What are some constants we’ve seen about a coach’s background? Very consistently over the years, about 95% of coaches have said a background in neuroscience moderately or positively affects credibility. However, only 10% of coaches say their training was based on neuroscience and/or psychology. It has also become very clear that a majority of professionals think coaches should have at least a working knowledge of neuroscience. And 85% of all respondents agree that neuroscience should have a role in coaching.
When this research started in 2005 the field of executive coaching was still in its formative years. Hundreds of coaching schools opened and closed. Trade organizations came and went. The role and definition of coaching remained poorly defined. Coaches themselves were confused about what they did – and what exactly to call it. Since then, the industry has matured, developing some standards and constants along the way.

The average age of executive coaches hasn’t changed much over the years. New coaches enter the market, but they do not encounter a barrier to entry created by an over-saturated market. There is turnover, and the average age of coaches doesn't change. How can we tell?

Rather than their age, what we see increasing is coaches’ tenure – their years of service. The number of veteran coaches with 10 or more years of experience increases every year. This indicates that executive coaching has become a more clearly defined and stable professional field.
The Purpose of Coaching

There are three main reasons coaches are hired. Coaching is used to solve specific behavioral problems, to assist in transition and to develop ‘up and coming’ leaders.

In the first Executive Coaching Survey, published in 2006, behavioral problems were a big part of the rationale for executive coaching. Now, the emphasis has clearly moved to something different: leadership development.

In 2009, responses started to show this change. Over the years, the figures have moved constantly in one direction. Two years ago, we said “this trend won’t be reversed.” Last year, for the first time ever, ‘a specific problem or challenge’ became the least likely reason that someone would be paired with an executive coach. This year’s data confirms the change in rankings.

THE SHERPA EXECUTIVE COACHING CERTIFICATION

University of New Mexico – TWO WEEKS ON CAMPUS
September 11-15 and November 6-9, 2017
Anderson School of Management, Albuquerque, NM
$7,500. Hotel arrangements available
Over the years, the purpose of coaching has shifted from problem solving toward proactive leadership development.

Today, overwhelmingly, business leaders see leadership development as the key purpose of coaching.

Having a coach is now the mark of an up and coming leader.
Strengths versus Weaknesses

There are two basic schools of thought in coaching. One approach involves identifying and working on strengths. The other focuses on identifying and correcting weaknesses, or deficits. Let’s look at the differences between what we call Appreciative Inquiry (focusing on strengths) and the Deficits Approach (focusing on weaknesses):

**Strengths**

*Advocates of strengths-based coaching, drawing from positive psychology, will say: “Know your strengths, craft your life around them and you will be happier, more productive and reach your goals. Positive psychology supports change by focusing on positive emotion and core strengths -- rather than negative emotion and overcoming weaknesses”.*

**Weaknesses**

*The weakness-based approach says: “Your strengths have gotten you where you are. Dealing with weaknesses in behavior is the only way to get to the next level.” Advocates of the deficit approach include Marshall Goldsmith and ‘Sherpa Guide’ author Brenda Corbett, who writes: “Often, a client has reached a plateau with his strengths, but is stuck because of his weaknesses.”*

Although it’s not an either-or situation, which approach did the 2017 Executive Coaching Survey find is favored?

Many coaches use some aspects of both approaches, but 77% favor working with strengths rather than weaknesses. That number is up from 70% last year and 68% in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The approach for coaching that I favor most is:</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Working with strengths / Appreciative inquiry</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Working on weaknesses / Room for improvement</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths versus Weaknesses

So, who gets a coach? How are coaches chosen for an assignment? Does a coach’s preferred approach mean they only work with a certain type of client? You might guess that they do, but there's no evidence of a hard and fast rule. Coaches who favor Appreciative Inquiry aren't necessarily working in a proactive relationship. They might, at times, work with leaders' specific problems or challenges. Similarly, coaches who focus on weaknesses don't work exclusively with clients who have problem behaviors.

In fact, a writer for Forbes Magazine, quoting this survey, concluded incorrectly that coaches who favor one approach work solely in that area, saying: “According to Sherpa’s 2015 Executive Coaching Survey, there are about twice as many coaches in the market who focus on strengthening leadership skills as there are so-called deficit coaches who specialize in problematic leaders.” True, twice as many coaches prefer the strengths approach. But that doesn't mean they're only working with clients in proactive leadership development.
What does the data say? This year, we see both weakness-based and strengths-based coaches working on problems more often than they did last year. We also see plenty of weakness-based coaches working with leadership development clients.

Here’s the overall data for 2017:
Let’s look at some other differences between coaches using the Appreciative Inquiry method versus those using the Deficits Approach.

**Delivery:**

- Deficits coaches are more likely to meet their clients in person, by 38% to 33% of total coaching time.
- Strengths-based coaches more often meet via webcam.

**Process:**

Strengths coaches most often “develop a unique approach from client to client,” and are less likely to follow a published process. Deficits coaches follow a published process more often.

This is, in part, the result of available training and education. The Sherpa process, the most widely used coaching process, and its related university certification is based on the deficit approach. Comments left by our survey respondents tell us that after training, Sherpa coaches stay with the process they were taught.
This is our third year asking coaches which approach they favor. We found slight differences this year in coaches’ appraisal of the results they achieve. Over two thirds (67%) of strengths coaches describe their results as ‘excellent’ while 62% of deficits coaches do.

The gap between the two is shrinking, with deficits coaches reporting much better results than last year:

Every coach deserves fair compensation for their work. Individual coaches can compare their rates to the survey's global numbers, based on approach, type of client, and other important factors. The 2017 survey indicates that deficits coaches charge higher rates for their services. Nearly two thirds (61%) of coaches who prefer the Deficits Approach charge over $300 per hour, while closer to half (54%) of Appreciative Inquiry coaches do.
Do different types of business professionals favor one approach more than the overall averages? It turns out that HR & Training Professionals are more likely than business people or executive coaches to prefer focusing on weaknesses.

About a third of HR professionals favor the Deficits Approach. Other professionals are split about 25% to 75% in favor of strengths.
Executive coaches may get different assignments based on their ability to focus on each of the following basic areas: solving specific problem behaviors, helping individuals in transition or providing leadership development. Coaches who focus on deficits, for example, are more likely to coach someone targeting a specific problem or challenge.

For the first time, Deficit coaches are now equally likely to work on proactive leadership development.
Strengths versus Weaknesses

As coaching evolves in different regions, the approach that coaches choose and executives favor varies from one place to the next. National culture also contributes to the approach people choose for coaching. North Americans are most likely, among major markets, to select the deficits approach. Australians are most likely to work with strengths.

Here is a comparison from the three most-reported markets for 2017:
How coaches feel about neuroscience:

Although both strengths and weakness coaches generally agree that neuroscience has a role in coaching, strengths coaches are more likely to favor its inclusion. They’re also more likely to feel that clients should know something about neuroscience.

Nearly half (45%) of coaches using appreciative inquiry feel strongly that neuroscience should play a role in coaching, while nearly none (only 1%) disagree.

The gap between the two approaches has closed over the last year. Support for neuroscience remained flat among strengths-based coaches, and improved significantly among deficit coaches.
Measuring the Benefits

The only way to gauge whether results are improving is to measure them. How do business leaders measure the benefits of coaching?

360 Feedback, a before-and-after method pioneered many years ago by Marshall Goldsmith, is used most, 29% of the time. Other common methods include ‘Well-being and Engagement’ and ‘Performance Reviews,’ which are both used 20% of the time. The 2017 survey found our newest measure, IOB (Impact on Business), in fourth place, with traditional ROI and ‘Effectiveness of Learning’ on the lower end of the scale.

Compared to last year, the two lowest-rated methods, ROI and Effectiveness of Learning, fell further. Well-being and engagement lost about 10% of its support, dropping from 22% to 20%. Performance reviews surged from 16% to 20%, and Impact on Business picked up two points, from 13% to 15%. 360 stayed constant at 29%.
With so many different methods in use it can be helpful to see which type of professionals use which methods. Do all professionals use the 360 Feedback method most? Who uses Performance Reviews or Impact on Business?

The 2017 survey shows that HR, training, and other professionals actually prefer to measure the benefits of coaching through IOB: Impact on Business. Executive coaches only use IOB 13% of the time while Human Resources people use it considerably more often, 33% of the time.
Over the last few years, the number of executive coaches using ROI to measure the benefits of coaching has hovered at 10% or less. In a notable change, the number of consultants (business coaches) who use ROI to measure coaching’s value dropped from 33% to 25% three years ago, and now stands at 19%.

Last year in the UK performance reviews are once again edged out by 360 assessments. Performance reviews, however, are gaining on 360’s.

Globally, before-and-after 360 assessments are still the most frequent method of measuring benefits gained from coaching. but Impact on Business took 6% of market share over the past year.
In addition to collecting an extensive amount of quantitative data, the annual survey gathers some qualitative data as well. Respondents are asked to provide their own open-ended comments about the benefits of coaching. While responses varied to some degree, some clear themes emerged from these comments: 1) improved awareness, 2) lasting behavioral changes, and 3) improved relationships in all aspects of life, not just business.

An improved sense of awareness (of self and others) was mentioned literally hundreds of times by those who took the 2017 survey.

- A business coach from Toronto, Canada mentioned “knowing yourself and elevating your awareness” as benefits of coaching.
- A UK business professional commented that “greater levels of self-awareness and awareness of others [creates] more trusting and effective relationships, enabling a shift in organizational performance.”
- An executive coach from Phoenix in the USA responded: “examination of blind spots [leads] to greater self-awareness, increased confidence, and more effective engagement, influence, and action.”

Tied in with the theme of improved awareness is the idea of creating real, lasting changes in behavior.

- A coach in Canada said the benefits of coaching include “the direct one-to-one contact of learning, applying and evaluating,” and that “the chances of noticeable improvement are greatly enhanced with one-to-one coaching.”
• A UK coach points out that “clients feel they have achieved change through their own effort,” which is a key point mentioned by many others.

• A coach in the Washington D.C. area says a great coach “creates meaningful behavior change that the client can sustain over time and that improves the well-being and effectiveness of the individual, team, and organization.”

Many other coaches, HR staff, and business professionals echoed the same thoughts. Several also pointed out that these lasting changes go beyond the business world and create improved relationships and successful endeavors in other aspects of life.

• A coach from the Southeast region of the USA says a coach’s role is “navigating client breakthroughs to transform the human capital attitudes and performance in their respective industry.”

• A German coach pointed out that great coaching teaches leaders “to be authentic and autonomous. Becoming a leader is authentic with becoming yourself, and ... success is due to your ability to communicate, negotiate, and lead.”

Comments like these showed up extensively throughout the 2017 annual survey. Finally, this comment, from a business professional in Calgary, Canada, touches on all 3 of these themes. The benefits of coaching include gaining “self-awareness which translates into effective behavior, on-the-job application, and life fulfillment.”
The role of executive coaching in the modern business organization is now firmly established. The perceived value and the credibility of coaching stand at record highs.

Every year we have a chance to see what people predict about coaching and compare that with actual results. Optimism about demand for coaching has faded slightly over the last three years. Last year more than 5% of coaches changed their positive estimations to neutral or negative, perhaps reflecting economic uncertainty.

Take a look at the anticipated demand for executive coaching in the coming year. Optimism has cooled over the last few years, back to 2011 levels, as this graph shows:
Executive coaches are less optimistic than business and life coaches. Levels of optimism are nearly equal across gender and age.

### 12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey 1/1/2017

Compared to the past year, demand for coaching next year will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Executive Coach</td>
<td>a. Increase substantially</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Increase slightly</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Stay about the same</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Decrease slightly</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Decrease substantially</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. No opinion</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Business Coach</td>
<td>a. Increase substantially</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Increase slightly</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Stay about the same</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Decrease slightly</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. No opinion</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Life, Personal or Wellness Coach</td>
<td>a. Increase substantially</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Increase slightly</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Stay about the same</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. No opinion</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again this year, optimism among HR and training professionals equaled or bettered the results from coaches themselves.
The Coaching Confidence Index

You may have heard of the Consumer Confidence Index – a tool that measures the state of the economy based on consumer data. We’ve developed a similar tool to analyze the state of the coaching industry based on several factors that affect it:

- Perceived credibility
- Perceived value
- Optimism from coaches and clients
- Change in billing rates
- Change in coaches’ workloads
- The state/direction of the economy

What direction is the field of executive coaching headed? To better answer this question, we developed a tool called the Coaching Confidence Index (CCI). The CCI gives us a snapshot of the industry’s direction by combining a variety of important factors.

We’ve tracked an extensive amount of data as the world economy has shifted over the years. We can combine data from these categories to create the CCI: inflation-adjusted rates charged by coaches; the number of clients they serve; predictions about demand; the amount of effort coaches put into marketing; and more. We continue to fine tune this formula each year.

A few years ago, the Coaching Confidence Index improved at a healthy rate. This improvement reflected economic recovery, which led to higher employment and larger budgets for professional development. For three years, the coaching market settled in to a very stable position.
The Coaching Confidence Index

After three solid years, the CCI fell sharply the past two years. The current index is again negative (below 100). Factors including the number of clients seen, a decrease in billing rates and lower optimism have pulled the index back significantly, with little change this year over last.
How Coaches Market Their Services

The landscape of marketing and promotion has changed in recent years. Advertising and networking now go way beyond the traditional methods of the past. This year, for the second time, we asked executive coaches how they make the public aware of their services. Respondents chose among these options:

- Brochures
- Direct Mail
- Facebook
- Google Plus
- Internet ads
- LinkedIn
- Newsletter
- Personal networks
- Twitter
- Website
- YouTube

Coaches who responded to each item indicated whether they used the medium or planned to use it. This distinction gives us clues about how the climate of marketing will continue to evolve. Based on the data we found the 'big three' to be personal networks, websites and LinkedIn. Over 70 percent of executive coaches make use of these three, or plan to. In the next tier, we found that coaches use direct mail, Facebook, newsletters and Twitter.

Taking into account the number of coaches responding and their current or planned use, we created a power ranking, rating each medium on a scale of 1 to 100.
The newsletter passed Twitter this year in our power rankings.

Only two of the top eleven, YouTube and Internet ads, showed more coaches planning to use versus already using.

The survey identified five media that the greatest number of coaches is planning to use. You would expect the majority of new promotion to fall in these categories, in order of importance:

1. **YouTube** (far and away the top choice in planning)
2. **Newsletter and Facebook** (high intent)
3. **Website and LinkedIn** (moderate intent)
4. **Direct mail and Internet ads** (low intent)
5. **Brochures, Twitter, Google Plus and networking** (lowest level of intent)

*Note: Networking is so highly used that few coaches are still planning to use it, hence the low score in this area.*
Executive coaches, like any other service professionals, must connect with their clients. There are time-honored traditions, and brand new ways to communicate a message and build a network. Some ways of ‘spreading the word’ are free. Others come at a cost. Every method takes time and energy.

How do people actually find their coaches? The market tells us that people find coaches through ‘personal references’ a vast majority of the time. They also use web searches, trade associations, service brokers and LinkedIn. Personal references, however, are used ten times more often than any other method, at 73%. The other four combined for a total of 27%.

Over the last two years, however, it seems that people are using web searches to replace personal networking, brokers lost effectiveness in reaching clients. LinkedIn maintained its 4% share. Trade association directories showed little gain from two years ago.

As technology makes it easier for people to connect remotely, will the need for personal referrals decline further? We will continue investigating and look for new trends in this area.
How Buyers Find a Coach

With twelve years of data, annual analyses and reports, and an ongoing invitation to a large global sample of coaches and clients, this survey becomes more important as a conclusive source of market research.

Our sample size for HR and other professionals is small, so we only report significant changes in their behavior.

The biggest change is a significant one. HR professionals registered a noticeable change in the way they find an executive coach. They are increasingly finding coaches through web search, augmenting – or even replacing – personal networks as a recruitment tool. It appears that HR and training professionals rarely use trade association directories or LinkedIn to find coaches. Our small sample of ‘other professionals’ continues to show little interest in anything other than personal reference. Service brokers lost ground this year among both groups.
Delivery and Technology

Delivery of coaching services goes hand in hand with emerging consumer technology. In their 2005 book “The Sherpa Guide: Process-Driven Executive Coaching,” Brenda Corbett and Judith Colemon wrote: “Technology has added another option for coaching, that of point-to-point video.... Over time, the quality of sound and images will only improve, making coaching over the Web more and more like a live meeting.” That day has certainly arrived.

Coaches can deliver their services any number of ways, including: in person, by phone, by videoconference, and more. As we investigate these methods of service delivery we analyze two factors: how many coaches use a given method; and how much of their coaching is conducted that way.

Let’s look at a hypothetical example. One coach conducts meetings entirely in person. Another works in person half the time while using the phone for the other half. We can describe this small sample by saying 50% of coaches use the phone (at some time or another), and that 75% of all coaching is delivered live.

Technology has changed the way coaches and clients interact. We first reported the use of webcams and applications such as Skype in 2009. Between 2011 and 2012, use of these methods exploded. More than half of coaches and clients experience webcam coaching to some extent, and nearly a quarter (21%) of all coaching services are delivered that way.
Nearly 100% of coaching clients (and purchasers of coaching services) prefer ‘face-to-face’ coaching.

Seven years back, 85% of coaches had in-person meetings with clients, at least some of the time. Four years ago, that number had climbed to 93%. Almost every coach meets their clients in person, at least some of the time.

But when it comes to the overall number of meetings, and how services are delivered, the percentage of coaching delivered in-person has fallen in the last seven years, now hovering around 35%. That is happening because high-definition video conferencing (HD) is starting to replace the in-person meeting. In person meetings are dropping by almost the same amount at which HD is rising.
We separate high-definition videoconferencing from web-based video, which STILL has limitations that interfere with the quality of a conversation. Large screen, high definition systems deliver consistently high image quality, synchronized audio and video, and real-time delivery, without lags or dropouts. High definition studios are becoming more widely available to coaches and clients at larger firms and shared office centers.

**Percentage of Coaching Meetings, by delivery method used:**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of coaching meetings by delivery method from 2008 to 2017. The bars represent HD video, Webcam, Phone, and In-person. The chart shows a decrease in HD video and an increase in In-person meetings.](image-url)
Delivery and Technology

The way coaches deliver their services falls across a broad spectrum:

There are executive coaches who meet via Skype, or meet on the phone, and never have face-to-face meetings. They tell us that their average hourly fees are about 30% under industry averages.

There are coaches who only meet in person or via HD video. These coaches charge the highest rates in the industry.

In between are coaches who use some combination of methods, without going to one end of the spectrum or the other.

Technology is changing service delivery on both ends of the spectrum. Internet video is replacing telephone coaching, while HD video is replacing the face-to-face meeting.

Starting with a big shift in 2011-2012, the amount of coaching done by telephone has dropped by just about the same amount that webcam use has risen. Webcam coaching accounts for 21% of all coaching, and 50% of executive coaches have at least some experience with webcam coaching.

In-person meetings are being replaced, hour for hour, by meetings in HD video. HR and training professionals now report that HD video is used for 11% of all coaching.

As high-def becomes more widely available and less expensive, it may replace webcam coaching in the same way it is replacing in-person meetings. At least 12% of coaches already have some experience with HD video.
Who Gets a Coach?

Coaching can be an expensive endeavor. It can be risky, too, since not all coaches produce lasting results. Leaders at the top of an organization have the most influence, and seem to be the most obvious place to allocate coaching resources. There is also benefit to be had coaching at lower levels, and coaching the ‘rising stars’ in an organization.

Where is the money going? Here’s the global breakdown for 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top execs only</th>
<th>Senior managers</th>
<th>All levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive coaching, in its early days, was being democratized, spreading across ‘all levels in the organization’. Then, several years ago, it became the province of senior leaders and, even more so, reserved for top executives. Coaching became more exclusive. The number of organizations that reserved coaching for top executives grew, year by year, for five years or more.
The pendulum has swung back toward democratization, as confidence is restored in world economies. The number of organizations with coaching ‘at all levels’ is on the rise. Coaching for ‘senior managers only’ is also rising.

Internal coaches work at lower levels, while coaching engagements at higher levels are often reserved for veteran external coaches. Issues of objectivity and confidentiality come into play, as external coaches are far more likely to work with top-line executives. This year, there was a shift toward outside coaches for ‘top-line executives’.

### Internal vs. External Executive Coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey</strong> 1/1/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who receive executive coaching, in my experience, are most often:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Internal Coach</td>
<td>a. Top-line executives 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Senior managers 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. At all levels in an organization 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Individuals who privately engage a coach 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. External / contract coach</td>
<td>a. Top-line executives 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Senior managers 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. At all levels in an organization 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Individuals who privately engage a coach 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North America places high in the race for unrestricted access to executive coaching. The US and Canada are in a virtual tie, with over a third of all organizations seeing coaching delivered ‘at all levels’. Both countries saw an increase of coaching ‘at all levels’ last year. This year, there was a move toward coaching for senior managers. Coaching reserved for ‘top-line executives’ fell slightly.
In Europe, the UK is the largest reporting market once again this year. Their level of unrestricted coaching trails the USA by about 10 percentage points.
Women in Leadership

This year, for the first time, we investigated several questions aimed specifically at issues related to women in leadership. While these issues aren't new, they're relevant to organizations and business professionals around the world. With Sherpa's annual survey, we're able to gather data that reveals peoples' perceptions in addition to facts on various topics. The perception of leaders, coaches, HR & training staff, and other business professionals reflects how organizations operate and reveals an overall attitude towards women in leadership.

What can we draw from the data? What does the survey tell us about overall perceptions of women in leadership? One thing we're able to do is break down the results and compare men's versus women's perceptions. We can also look at age differences – do younger executives see things differently than older ones?

If different groups' perceptions differ by a wide margin, it might indicate a disconnect. It might show what needs improvement in terms of women's opportunities to advance to positions of leadership. Overall, the 2017 survey results paint a fairly optimistic picture. As you look at the following data, you'll see that we're generally doing well. Our industry-leading survey will continue to investigate these questions and look for emerging trends.
Women in Leadership

We asked the following four questions about women in leadership. Survey respondents answered on a 5-point scale: always, usually, sometimes, rarely, never.

- If women have the skills, they are given equal opportunity for advancement.
- Men and women are equally aware of opportunities when they arise.
- Both men and women have an equal chance to hold positions of power.
- My organization values women as leaders.

Looking at our 2017 responses, we appear to be in good shape overall:

What can we make of these results? 'Always' and 'Usually' dominate the responses, and 'Never' doesn't even show up. On one hand, no one fully thinks women have equal opportunity – 'Always' doesn't hit 100% in any of the questions. But 'Rarely' scored very low, and the majority answered that women are highly valued as leaders.
Let's look at the data another way and ...

We can use a 5-point rating system. The 'Always' answers get 5 points. 'Usually' earns 4 points, 'Sometimes' gets 3, 'Usually' gets 2, and 'Never' scores 1 point. Here's how our 4 questions perform in the 5-point rating system:

- Equal chance for advancement 4.11
- Equally aware of opportunities 4.18
- Equal chance to hold power 4.23
- Women are valued as leaders 4.55

Every question scores between 4 and 5, so let's zoom in a little closer:
Organizations tend to value women as leaders, with a rating over 4 ½ points. However, survey respondents tend to think women don't quite have an equal chance for advancement. Nor are they equally aware of advancement opportunities. Both questions scored nearly a half point lower. The difference here could indicate that most organizations hold a positive attitude toward women in leadership – but don't quite give them an equal chance to get there. Both questions about women as leaders scored higher than the two questions about women becoming leaders.

Let's dig deeper into these results and break down some of these questions by gender, age, and other factors.

Executives are more likely than HR and training staff to say:

- women get equal consideration for advancement (by 84% to 77%)
- women are aware of opportunities to advance (by 86% to 75%)
- women have an equal chance to hold power (by 91% to 77%)

There are clearly differences among the ranks, with executives holding a more optimistic opinion. Which category of professional – executive or HR & training staff – is more likely to have an accurate perception of an organization?

We also found that men and women see these issues differently. Men in leadership are more likely than women in leadership to believe:

- their organization values women as leaders (by 92% to 85%)
- women get consideration for advancement (by 82% to 67%)
- women are aware of opportunities for advancement (by 88% to 70%)

This result extends the global result described above. Women do think their organization values female leadership, but they don't feel they're given an equal chance to reach those roles.
What are some other differences we seen in the way men in leadership operate as compared to women in leadership? Men seem to be ahead of the curve in offering leadership development to their teams.

- More men in leadership are likely to have established team coaching in place, 44% to 27%.
- Women in leadership are more likely than men, 31% to 24%, to have team coaching programs in design or startup.

Along the same lines:
- Men in leadership are more likely than women to have established coaching skills training in place: 53% to 23%.
- Women in leadership tend to have such programs in design or startup mode: 44%

What could these differences mean? Why do more men in leadership have coaching programs in place while women leaders' programs tend to be in startup mode? We will watch trends as we move further into our research.
Performance Management

The University of California, Berkeley, defines performance management as “an ongoing process of communication between a supervisor and an employee that occurs throughout the year, in support of accomplishing the strategic objectives of the organization. The communication process includes clarifying expectations, setting objectives, identifying goals, providing feedback, and reviewing results.”

Performance management is the way an organization ensures that its goals, large and small, are being met proficiently and efficiently. Performance management can focus on the entire organization, a department, specific processes and, of course, people. When individuals are the focus, data is collected, performance is measured against ideals and results are shared in an event called the performance appraisal.

When there is a difference between ideal results and actual results, the performance management system is supposed to proscribe activities that improve performance. That can mean any number of things. There is always the division between skills and behavior. Performance enhancement will, most obviously, work on skills and knowledge. That means testing and training, to see how much people know and what they need to learn.

Organizations with a ‘coaching culture’ include questions about business behavior in their performance evaluations, and may recommend behavioral change for performance improvement that includes one-on-one coaching, or training in coaching skills. It is not apparent that people can do this successfully, however. This year, we saw a drop in the number of organization who included questions about business behavior in their performance management systems and reviews.
Performance Management

Our 2015 report showed a high incidence of coaching being ‘usually’ integrated into performance management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Global Respondents Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Annual Coaching and Leadership Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching is integrated into performance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFO 2017 showed a much higher incidence of coaching being ‘always’ integrated into performance management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching is integrated into performance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards of Practice

Prior years’ research tells us that coaching will never be regulated. We know that the industry reaches standards all on its own, with no outside intervention. Case in point: the use of assessments as a coaching tool. Over time, every coach came to use an assessment. Five assessments dominate the market. Their market share doesn’t change, year to year. This standard of practice is so firmly embedded that we no longer ask about it.

So, what standards is the industry developing for the future? How do we distinguish trends from emerging standards?

If the entire executive coaching industry moves one way or the other over time, it is a trend. However, trends can be influenced by fads, fashion or the state of the economy. Not every trend becomes a standard.

For a trend to become a standard, it needs three characteristics:

- It shows steady growth in one direction over a period of years.
- It will lead to a universal practice of some sort.
- We see widespread adoption of this practice by coaches just entering the market.

Let us take some examples:

Will we ever see a standard duration for a coaching engagement? Not likely. There are really no trends in either direction. There is a strong minority favoring engagements of three months or less. The majority favors engagements of six to twelve months. The number of coaches and clients who opt for ‘open-ended’ engagements is small, but it has not changed over the years. No trends, no standards.
Standards of Practice

Will all coaches eventually follow a published process, similar to those used in accounting and financial planning? Not likely. There has been agreement with that idea over the years, but support leveled off six years ago.

As coaches take part in this study, they write in the process they use, if any. Again this year, the most widely-used process for coaches is the Sherpa process, focused on weaknesses. In second place, coaches list ICF Competencies, which does not seem to be a process in the truest sense. The next highest mention goes to the Coactive process, which focuses on strengths. These numbers include business coaches and life coaches.

To look at this data carefully, we can ignore coaches who do not follow a process, those that did not specify one, and processes only mentioned by one coach worldwide.

Now, let’s focus on executive coaches only. Use of the Sherpa process is reported by 28% of those who specify one. The ICF Competencies and the Coactive process are reported by 17% and 16% of coaches, respectively. GROW and Sociedade Brasiliera de Coaching trail, with a market share of 5% or less. The list, going past the first five slots, changes from year to year.
However, fewer than three in ten coaches follow a published process. This means it is unlikely that following a published process will become a universal practice, at least not any time soon.
With so many training and certification programs for executive coaches, very few coaches follow a published process. Things are starting to change. The following pages tell the tale, with research only available in this hard copy report.

Younger coaches, and coaches who have entered the business more recently are most likely to follow a published process, as this breakout report shows.

### Response Summaries - Coaches by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 and under</td>
<td>a. I have developed my own process for coaching: 26% b. I develop a unique approach from client to client: 36% c. I follow a specific published process: 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>a. I have developed my own process for coaching: 29% b. I develop a unique approach from client to client: 40% c. I follow a specific published process: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and older</td>
<td>a. I have developed my own process for coaching: 33% b. I develop a unique approach from client to client: 44% c. I follow a specific published process: 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results may be skewed, and perhaps they do not seem to represent a force that will become trend. Here’s why:

Younger executive coaches are far more likely to be internal coaches. Their employer selects their certification, and their coaching techniques are uniform.

As coaches go independent, they tend to develop their own process from a combination of sources, or abandon process altogether.

As the industry matures, the number of people starting out and learning the trade becomes less of an influence to the industry as a whole. There are far more coaches 56 years and older than there are 55 and under, and the trend toward seniority continues.

Even if ‘following a published process’ does become universal, that does not mean that there will only be one process. It most likely will be two or more, with one process appealing to coaches who work with strengths, and another process appealing to those who work with weaknesses.
We can split executive coaches into two general categories: *internal* and *external*. Let’s review again how their roles differ.

What image comes to mind when you picture an executive coach? Most are outside experts. These *external* coaches – often from a one-person shop – offer independent services to several client companies. They are professionals assigned to coach employees of various organizations and businesses. Ninety four percent of coaches this year described themselves as external coaches.

As internal coaches gain experience and seniority, they can take on higher-level assignments, working with top leaders in an organization. Often, however, their reach is limited as an employee. As time goes on, many internal coaches go independent, to take full advantage of their experience.

The following comments highlight some of the different roles and responsibilities of internal versus external coaches:

---

*An executive coach and trainer from Los Angeles, California told us:* “Clients experience a release from the circularity of their own thinking process, which is augmented by external coaches who can provide a level of confidentiality unavailable to internal coaches.”

*A veteran executive coach in Phoenix, Arizona says her clients have* “freedom to be honest and vulnerable with someone who is committed to supporting growth but detached from internal communication, reporting systems and career decisions.”
Internal and External Coaches

This year’s study shows an increase in the number of men working as internal coaches, now comprising nearly 50% of all internal coaches. That would indicate that men have entered the ranks of coaching in greater numbers than women recent years. Women still dominate among the ranks of external coaches, at 62% of the total, an increase from five years ago.

12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Option A: Internal Coach</th>
<th>Option B: External / Contract Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 and under</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and older</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our study shows some other significant differences between internal and external coaches’ styles. A company’s internal coaching staff will typically train together and aim to produce consistent results as a team. As you can see below, internals are almost twice as likely to follow a specific published process. Externals tend to “develop a unique process for each client”.

![Process Usage by Coach Type](image)
Since internal coaches and their clients often work in the same building, you would expect them to have more opportunities for face-to-face meetings. This year’s survey confirms that expectation, although the survey also indicates that internal coaches are replacing face-to-face meetings with HD video conferencing when the technology is available.

### 12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey

**1/1/2017**

In my experience, coaching is often delivered via (check all that apply):

| a. Internal Coach          |  
|---------------------------|-----|
| a. In-person meetings     | 38% |
| b. By telephone           | 28% |
| c. Internet video / Skype or webcam | 15% |
| d. Email, chat, text or other | 11% |
| e. HighDef videoconference / Telepresence | 13% |

| b. External / contract coach |  
|-----------------------------|-----|
| a. In-person meetings       | 34% |
| b. By telephone             | 28% |
| c. Internet video / Skype or webcam | 22% |
| d. Email, chat, text or other | 9% |
| e. HighDef videoconference / Telepresence | 8% |
We also found differences in the way the two types of coaches measure the benefits of their training. Externals use the 360 Method more than other measures, at a 35% rate. Internals use Impact on Business at an ever-increasing rate, now at 38%.

Return on Investment (ROI) has fallen below 10% for both groups.

---

**12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey**

1/1/2017

In my experience, the benefits of coaching are most often measured by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Coach</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 360 assessments before and after (Goldsmith method)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Well being and engagement framework</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IOB: Impact on Business (Sherpa method)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Performance reviews</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ROI: Return on Investment formula</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Effectiveness of Learning (Kirkpatrick method)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External / contract coach</th>
<th>35%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 360 assessments before and after (Goldsmith method)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Well being and engagement framework</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IOB: Impact on Business (Sherpa method)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Performance reviews</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ROI: Return on Investment formula</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Effectiveness of Learning (Kirkpatrick method)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Coach, Business Coach

For years, we have asked coaches to identify themselves as either:

- Executive coaches, those who work on business behavior, or
- Business coaches, who help clients develop knowledge and skills.

The role of the business coach can also be described as consulting, a term we will use in the following report, for simplicity’s sake.

Here’s a sampling of what we found for 2017:

Demographics:
Women are the majority in executive coaching. 62% of executive coaches are female. Males are predominant in consulting/business coaching, by a 57% to 43% ratio.

Consulting has fewer veterans and more new entrants than executive coaching. 86% of executive coaches have been in business 5 years or more, while 81% of consultants are 5-year veterans. There is far more turnover in life coaching, with only 66% having lasted 5 years or more in business.

Service Delivery:
In the past, our study showed that executive coaches worked with clients face-to-face more often than consultants did. For the last two years, things have evened out, as consultants now meet face-to-face with clients as often as executive coaches.
Executive coaches do more via HD video, at 8%, versus consultants, where only 5% use video conferencing.

![12th Annual Executive Coaching Survey]

Additional information on billing rates and earnings is available in the 2017 Coaches’ Earnings Report, available at:  http://sherpa-university.com/courses/44.
Billing Rates: In general, executive coaches charge more for services than consultants, and their rates are on the rise.
Executive coaching dominates business coaching on the very high end as well, with 14% of executive coaches reporting hourly earnings at $500 or above. Just 7% of business coaches make more than $500 an hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On average, I charge an hourly rate for coaching services of (in US $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Executive Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. up to $75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $75 - $149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although we ask respondents to characterize themselves as either ‘business coaches’ or ‘executive coaches’, there are practitioners who do both, and organizations who are combining the benefits of the two disciplines.

Publishers Note: On earnings for coaches: Global contributors converted their local currencies into US dollars, for comparison here. In the US, the number of coaches billing $300 per hour or more stands at 60%, slightly higher than global averages.
The Purpose of This Research

The Executive Coaching Survey is a market research project, now in its twelfth year. The report originates with Sherpa Coaching, headquartered in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA and is copyrighted by Sasha Corporation.

Why do we undertake this research? Over the years, our team has worked to build the credibility of executive coaching and ensure the industry’s future. In 2005, we made a commitment to run an annual survey, open to anyone who wishes to participate, and release significant results to coaches, business leaders and the public at no charge.

Our focus has shifted as the industry has changed. As standards emerge and answers become predictable, we move on, and study different topics. We have more questions for business leaders, HR and training professionals than ever before.

What was once a single report has now become three:

- The Executive Coaching Survey: a hard-copy report issued in February. This full report is available for purchase at the Sherpa Store, www/sherpacoaching.com/store. An abbreviated public report is available in March as a free download at the Sherpa Coaching website.

- The Global Study on Corporate Culture: This has now become a permanent, year-round survey housed at www.corporateculture.cc

- The Coaches’ Earnings Report: This report is offered at no charge, as a class at the Sherpa Leadership Institute Online.

Details about all our research is available at www.sherpacoaching.com.

Business leaders use this research to design internal coaching programs and make intelligent decisions about change management and corporate culture. Coaches use this report to make strategic decisions about their careers.

Our most striking support is from individuals who take the time to participate, and eagerly await the results each year. Their appreciation is ample reward for our investment in this research.
Report Topics and Distribution

This report spotlights the professional activities of executive coaches, and serves as a benchmark that guides the careers of coaches and the decisions of the people who hire them.

Several years ago, corporate culture emerged as a major theme in the Executive Coaching Survey. With the term ‘corporate culture’ becoming a part of daily language, HR personnel, training professionals, and business leaders felt a need to know how their corporate cultures compared to a global benchmark. Our research led to the creation of a new way of measuring corporate culture across three dimensions:

1. Command and Control
2. Communication and Cooperation
3. Coaching

Again in 2017, we make this information available on its own. A PDF version of the report is available from March 29th, 2017. Information about corporate culture is continuously gathered at a new website, www.corporateculture.cc. Visit the website to see the latest results. Contact Sherpa Coaching to have your culture surveyed and compared to global benchmarks.

The 2017 Coaches’ Earnings Report will be published in the first half of the year. The report will be available from February 28 as a free program at the Sherpa Leadership Institute Online (SLI Online), a new online learning center. Access the report at https://www.sherpa-university.com/courses/44. You will want to set up a user account, at no cost or obligation, so you can conveniently review research and other programs going forward. Visit www.sherpa-university.com for details.

EXCO 2017, the twelfth annual Executive Coaching Conference, will feature detailed, exclusive information from this market research, with a chance to pose questions to the research team. See the last two pages of this document for details.
Participation

A large number of responses came in for this 12th annual report. In fact, we saw a surge of over 50% from last year’s participation. It was still not enough to break our record, set by the 10th annual survey.

This report is about executive coaching. You’d expect most of our contributors would be executive coaches. That proves to be the case once again this year, with seven in ten respondents describing themselves as ‘executive coaches, working on business behavior’.
Participation

How accurate is this survey? The chance our answers are not meaningful is called ‘sampling error’. Look at this in its simplest sense. If you ask one person to respond to a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ question, your results will either be 100% accurate, or 100% inaccurate, depending upon whether that one person agreed with what we all think collectively. Your margin of error is 100%. You just might be totally wrong.

If you ask 100 people a question, your answer might be off by 10%. You can say they are at least 90% accurate. Your margin of error is 10%.

If 300 people answer your question, you will be at least 94% accurate, and the odds get better and better that your sample group’s answer is exactly right.

This year, over 900 people responded to this survey, providing a margin of error of under 3.2%. The accuracy of the survey’s conclusions is also confirmed by comparison with responses from previous years, allowing the confirmation of trends over time. Based on an ever-increasing body of knowledge, this 2017 report can share changes and trends available nowhere else.

This survey gets information from a wide variety of people. We do not control or limit who participates. There are no user-specific invitations with passwords and the like. If we limited our invitations to a controlled list, then our reporting would lose accuracy due to sampling bias, however:

- Anyone who wants to participate in this research can do so.
- Anyone can invite others to participate.
- We always invite people who took the prior year’s survey, so our answers year to year reflect trends based on answers from the same people.
- Anyone can provide anonymous answers.

Our university sponsors and relevant trade associations invite participation, working from their private mailing lists. People share our invitations, ensuring a free flow of information and a sample that fully represents the world of executive coaching. As always, almost half our respondents come from outside our list of invitees. That ensures fresh and accurate results, year after year.
Analytics

The Executive Coaching Survey has three ways of finding information that is relevant to interested professionals.

We began in 2005 with questions of interest to coaches and their clients. Each year, we tend to ask certain questions in exactly the same way, to identify trends. When the answers stop changing, we go on to different questions, knowing our respondents have identified the state of the art.

A few years back, we created a special web version of this report. Based on the number of page visits to each topic, we know what interests you most, and we focus on that.

We ask for comments on trends in coaching and the benefits of coaching, and give people free reign to tell us what they think and share their observations. That ensures we have new topics each year.

We have now reached critical mass in our research on corporate culture, with questions exclusively for HR, training professionals and business leaders. This allows us to report on topics of broader interest, with yearly information that will tell us where corporate cultures are headed. The Corporate Culture Survey is now housed at its own website: www.corporateculture.cc

Each year, we review the way our research is designed. Since 2005, we have solicited help in survey design from university executive education programs. In addition, we rely on the expertise of Shawn Herbig, President of IQS Research in Louisville, Kentucky, USA. Mr. Herbig and his research team, who offer solid advice any time we consider additions or changes.

Headquartered in Louisville, Kentucky, IQS Research delivers research on markets, customers, and employees, with studies designed to identify issues and opportunities, and map a path to reliable decisions and profitable outcomes.
Global Reach, Global Results

Over the years, the Executive Coaching Survey has received responses from over 65 counties, representing the vast majority of the world’s population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whose views are reflected? It’s up to our respondents. Which cities and countries provide enough response for detailed analysis and breakout reporting?

For 2017, here are the top 20 metro areas we heard from, in order of response rates. Some of these are new to our top twenty. Four are from outside the USA, reflecting global participation in this 12th year of research.

- New York
- London
- Washington
- San Francisco
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Toronto
- Los Angeles
- Philadelphia
- Boston
- Denver
- Baltimore
- Minneapolis
- Atlanta
- Houston
- Johannesburg
- San Diego
- Charlotte
- Columbus
- Cleveland
- Vancouver
- Dallas
Karl Corbett is Managing Partner of Sherpa Coaching in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA. He handles strategy, marketing and client relations for Sherpa Coaching Certifications at the University of Georgia, the University of New Mexico and Howard University. He was contributing editor for “The Sherpa Guide: Process-Driven Executive Coaching” (Thomson, 2005) and several other books in the Sherpa library.

Karl created this Executive Coaching Survey, the largest and longest-running market research on executive coaching.

Joe Valeri recently finished 15 years at the Robotics Institute at Carnegie Mellon University. During this academic technology project, Joe worked in neuroscience and artificial intelligence.

He joined the Sherpa research team in 2015, where he has done extensive work on Selfware – the marriage of coaching and neuroscience. Mr. Valeri is a regular presenter at EXCO, the annual Executive Coaching Conference.
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**Sherpa Coaching** is based in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA. For managers and executives, Sherpa offers one-on-one coaching. For leadership groups and teams, Sherpa conducts programs based on their university texts. For coaches, Sherpa offers training and certification on campus at major universities. Custom programs are available on site or on campus.

Sherpa Coaching is uniquely qualified to help you with leadership development.

Major universities trust Sherpa Coaching as an executive education partner:
- University of Georgia
- Howard University
- University of Pretoria
- University of Cincinnati
- Texas Christian
- Penn State
- Xavier University
- and others...

They have done their homework. They chose Sherpa. You can feel confident. Call us today. (513) 232-0002.

We are trusted business partners to our clients, including:
- National Cancer Institute
- Stanley Black & Decker
- Toyota
- L’Oréal
- Human Genome Institute
- Procter & Gamble
- Cintas
- Duke Energy
- Oshkosh Industries
- U. S. Bank

Come to sherpacoaching.com. Learn more.
Call us now at 513.232.0002. Tell us what you need.
Benefit from our decade and more of experience.
The University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education in Athens, Georgia, USA, provides programs and services which connect the University with lifelong learners throughout the world. The Center designs, develops and delivers a variety of executive programs in a dynamic learning environment with a luxury hotel, restaurants, meeting rooms and banquet facilities.

Sponsors
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Four easy ways to register:
Phone: +1-706-542-3537 or 800-811-6640 (toll free in the USA)
Fax: +1-706-542-6596
E-mail: questions@georgiacenter.uga.edu

What You Will Learn

Program Content
The Sherpa process involves six phases, each with comprehensive exercises, assessments, tools, and activities. The author/educators share new material and insights from their own case studies and experiences, adding depth to program content. Participants get a full immersion classroom program and 90 days of guided support for a practicum coaching client.

The fundamentals of coaching are covered in depth, including:
- Definitions: What executive coaching is, and needs to become
- Communications styles for coach and client
- What does it take to be a good coach?
- Who needs a coach?
- Why does coaching need a process?
- The Sherpa Stance: Keeping coaching professional
- What questions do I ask while I am coaching? Framing the question
- How can I tell if my client is “getting it”? How can I tell when my client is finished?

Sherpa Executive Coaching Certification Program will be peppered with examples from the experience of the author/instructors, adding depth to the content of the book. Demonstration assignments will guarantee that students acquire the assured ability to coach in any business environment, with clients at any management level.

Whether you’re looking for a new career, or want to enhance your work as a consultant or coach, this program will help you become a top-level executive coach. Working with published experts, you will master the six-phase “Sherpa” coaching process and learn the skills and techniques necessary to enable others to achieve professional success.
Phase I: Taking Stock
- Process Overview
- Self Discovery
- Agreement

Phase II: Global View
- Support Mountain
- Perception
- Values
- Change Management

Phase III: Destination
- Logistics
- Weakness Mountain
- Expectation Mountain

Phase IV: Charting the Course
- Relational Route
- Organizational Route
- Goal Setting

Phase V: Agenda
- Commitment
- Accountability
- Browsing the Journal
- Long Term Outlook

Phase VI: The Summit
- Support and Sustainability
- Follow-up

What You Will Earn
Upon your successful completion of the program requirements, you will earn:
- The designation Certified Executive Coach, granted by Sherpa Coaching, LLC
- A co-branded Certificate of Completion from Sherpa Coaching and the University of Georgia
- 6 University of Georgia Continuing Education Units (CEUs)

How Your Grades Are Calculated
Evaluation and certification grades are based on attendance for at least 90% of class hours, and:
- Participation and contribution
- Path demonstration
- Quizzes, tests and homework
- Completion of practicum client coaching using Sherpa Executive Coaching Process: Includes post-course participation (phone) coaching support

All details are subject to change without notice.

For more information about Sherpa Certified Executive Coaching, contact questions@georgiacenter.uga.edu or dial +1-706-542-3537.
The University of New Mexico (UNM) is proud to announce the debut of the Sherpa Coaching Certification in the fall of 2017.

The UNM Anderson School of Management’s Executive & Professional Education Center houses two accelerated MBA programs, non-credit professional development programs, and customized programming for businesses.

The Center connects exceptional students, renowned faculty, accomplished alumni, prominent business partners, and dedicated staff to provide high-quality educational resources to New Mexico’s business community.

Custom Programs

Partner with Anderson to develop strategic solutions to your business challenges and achieve organizational success with highly skilled employees who are focused on meeting your goals. Drawing from Anderson School’s prestigious faculty and the business community’s premier corporate coaches, our consultants get to know your organization, and then craft a relevant and effective approach for improvement.
Howard University is in Washington, DC, USA. Its Business School offers executive education alongside graduate programs in entrepreneurship, finance, management, international business and supply chain management. Howard University and the U.S. Small Business Administration operate a Small Business Development resource center on campus.

The Howard University – Sherpa Executive Coaching Certification Program

Contact us regarding our upcoming programs – Offerings in Spring and Fall 202.806.1610

TRAINING and CERTIFICATION
This three-month executive coach training and certification program, ICF approved, puts you to work with the industry’s leading authors, at your site or on campus.

As you take the class, you’ll have two weeks in the classroom, and expert weekly support as you work with a practicum client.

Successful completion of this executive coach certification results in the Certified Sherpa Coach (CSC) designation. Your efforts, aligned with our reputation, help you build your brand and realize your full potential as a coach.

Graduates receive a Certified Executive Coaching Certificate and official letter of completion.

University Based Executive Coach Training
• Want to begin or enhance a career as an executive coach? Start with an executive coaching certification that’s process-driven and university-endorsed. The Howard – Sherpa Coaching Certification has been approved by the International Coach Federation for ACC Portfolio Certification.
• Participants may request support for business startup and marketing, outside of class hour
This year we go back to basics. EXCO 2017 will focus exclusively on mastery of the Sherpa process for executive coaching. Who should attend? Every certified Sherpa coach, and every practitioner of the Sherpa process, should be there!

The primary speakers will be the founders of Sherpa Coaching. Brenda Corbett and Judith Kinebrew are the world’s leading educators in the coaching industry. Karl Corbett leads the most extensive market research in the history of coaching, 12 years running. The three of them, along with several Master Sherpa coaches will ramp this conference up to a whole new level.
It’s the 12th annual event. New venue: Fountain Square in Cincinnati.

The benefits of a trip to EXCO:

| Invest in your career. Build your network. Learn from leading authors, educators and researchers. | Get the latest on corporate culture and leadership, based on the best research in the business. | Continuing coach education to renew your certification. Content that’s ‘all business’. Endorsed by 10 universities. |
|---|
| Get new, exclusive information about Sherpa technology, direct from the authors. | Celebrate Executive Coaching Week with our annual awards. Find out who will win in 2017. | Take action. Save the dates now, and register early. June 4, 5 and 6, 2017. Bring your team! |

Come discover, learn and build your network. These are the people you really want to spend time with.

**EXCO 2017 IS A 'DON'T MISS' EVENT!**

**REGISTER NOW**

Visit www.sherpacoaching.com / For Coaches /