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Life coaching youth is an emerging specialty area in the coaching industry. There is evidence that youth who participate in life coaching programs experience multiple benefits to their health, social, and emotional well-being as well as their academic success. There is, however, a lack of knowledge about youth specific coach training, research and support. This is the first research study conducted to describe and understand the perceptions and practices of current youth life coaches working with youth between the ages of 13–20. Information gathered in the literature review and from an online survey of youth coaches was compared to an untested theoretical model created by the researcher. The proposed “Supportive Youth Coaching Model” consists of three components distinctive to coaching youth. Core Knowledge includes the foundational background for effective coaching. Core Principles are clear guidelines for the coaching experience. Core Methods are key aspects of youth coaching.

A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted, using viral sampling by way of social networking sites to recruit participants who completed a web-based survey.
Results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics; content analysis was completed for open-ended responses. Participants (N=90) represented 10 countries; just over half were from the United States.

Study results indicate that youth coaches believe life coaching is an appropriate process to support youth and does provide them with benefits, including increased sense of self, improved relationships, and strengthened life skills. Respondents indicated they feel the approach to coaching youth is different than coaching adults primarily due to youth’s development. Youth coaches report having distinctive ethical considerations when working with minor youth. Respondents indicated that there is a need for knowing adolescent development and having the ability as a life coach to adapt expectations and approaches when working with youth. Results indicate that use of the “Supportive Youth Coaching Model” could provide timely guidance to youth life coaches and more broadly, coach training organizations. Future research should continue to establish the influence of life coaching on youth outcomes, clarify the qualifications, standards, and trainings for youth life coaches, and examine the usefulness of the Supportive Youth Coaching Model to strengthening youth life coaching practice.

*Keywords:* life coaching, youth coaching, teen coaching, coaching college students, supportive youth coaching model, coaching adolescents
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CHAPTER 1
PROBLEM FORMATION

This dissertation explores life coaching with youth. For the purposes of this research “youth” is defined as adolescents between the ages of 13–20. Information gathered in the literature review was synthesized and compared to an untested theoretical model proposed by the researcher. A survey was created for data gathering related to current practices of coaches. This research is intended to inform and provide evidence that supports the use of this model as a guide for the practice of coaching youth.

Background

Introduction

Coaching is an emerging and growing international industry that began to take shape in the early 1990’s (Grant, 2003a). It has integrated concepts from multiple disciplines, including psychology, sociology, psychotherapy, education, communication, management, and leadership (Bachkirova & Kauffman, 2008; Brock, 2008; Grant & Zackon, 2004). Each year, there is a dramatic increase in the number of coaching schools, organizations and people referring to themselves as “coaches.” Demand for professional coaching is increasing, despite lack of clarity of what professional coaching is (Bachkirova & Kauffman, 2009; Stout Roston, 2009), and lack of substantial research demonstrating the effectiveness of coaching efforts (Brennen, 2008; Burke & Linley, 2007; Grant, 2003a).

Professional coaching has been steadily building its research foundation although executive or business coaching has formed the basis for much of the existing research. In 2001, Anthony Grant discussed how “coaching research is in its infancy” (p. 1) and a few
years later Morrow (2006) stated that various aspects of coaching research continue to grow. Grant and Cavanagh (2007a) discussed the need for evidence-based approaches to this emerging discipline. Grant’s (2009) updated annotated bibliography points out the growth of the knowledge base of coaching research. This is crucial to moving it from its emergent fledgling status to a strong industry that is recognized and valued (Grant, 2001).

In an effort to establish structure and consistency within the field, an organization called the International Coach Federation (ICF) was founded in 1995 (ICF, 2010a). The purpose of the ICF is to give insight into the coaching industry and the standards a credentialed or certified coach holds.

Contributing, in part, to the ambiguity of what coaching is and does, there are various definitions of life coaching (Bachkirova & Kauffman, 2008; Biswas-Diner, 2009; Brock, 2008; Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Grant, 2007). The ICF defines coaching as “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential” (ICF, 2010a, para. 2). Similarly, the International Association of Coaching (IAC), created in 2003, defines coaching as, “a transformational process for personal and professional awareness, discovery and growth” (2010, para. 2). Speaking to some of the needs in the coaching profession, Grant (2006) summarizes coaching as, “collaborative, individualized, solution focused, results oriented, systematic, stretching, fosters self-directed learning, and should be evidenced-based, and incorporate ethical professional practice” (p. 12). Finally, Biswas-Diner (2009) does not define coaching but does describe the core assumptions of coaching, “people have innate ability to grow and develop, focus on mutually agreed upon goals and understand that the relationship is equal and collaborative” (p. 545).
As coaching continues to have multiple definitions the possibility exists of blurring boundaries and interpretations of responsibilities. This results in different expectations about coaching related to dual relationships, responsibility issues, ethical guidelines and the role of supervision in coaching (Bachkirova & Kauffman, 2009).

The term coaching has been used in schools for many years, although the definition has changed. Initially coaching referred only to sports, yet it quickly became a word incorrectly used interchangeably with counseling, tutoring, and mentoring (Dansinger, 2000; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). In the past, coaching research and information in education referred mainly to teachers and school administrators being coached in order to support the students (Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Passmore & Brown, 2009; Reiss, 2007; Tolhurst, 2006). Coaching in a similar manner across all grade levels in a school can support the use of coaching as a learning tool (Creasy & Patterson, 2005). According to Green and colleagues, “Life coaching within educational settings is distinct from educational coaching (or tutoring), which is specifically aimed at improving academic performance (Greet, Grant, & Rynsaardt, 2007). Life coaching youth is aimed at supporting youth development and growth, which may or may not include academics.

The International Coach Federation

The underpinning of coaching is best described from within the context of the International Coach Federation (ICF). The ICF was the first and remains the largest global professional coaching association. According to the ICF (2010g) there are 16,065 members of the ICF in over 90 different countries; interestingly, the four countries with the greatest amount of ICF credentialed coaches are: United States (7,647), Canada (1,763), United Kingdom (1,054) and Australia (1,002). From its inception an important
goal has been the regulation of the coaching industry. The ICF emphasizes the
development of credentialing standards for coaches and accreditation standards for coach
training programs. It has created and defined the core coaching competencies that form
the basis of the professionals’ defined skills and abilities. The ICF created a code of
ethics for coaches, and developed three distinct levels and qualifications of certification
for coaches. The ICF provides certification for qualified individuals and accreditation of
coach training organizations. This organization also initiated efforts to support quality
research for the coaching industry to contribute to establishing credibility and consistency
in coaching practices and preparation. This organization currently represents more than
18,000 professional coaches residing in more than 100 countries (ICF, 2010a). Not all
coaches belong to the ICF, and it is important to acknowledge that other organizations
exist (such as the International Association of Coaches or IAC) and certify qualified
coaches, as do individual coach training schools.

Core Competencies

The ICF’s core competencies include 11 different competencies grouped into four
separate areas. (See Table 1.1.) The four categories are grouped as they are on the
website (A, B, C and D) and the competencies are listed sequentially (ICF, 2010d). Each
competency includes various skill sets that coaches are expected to master, as described
below.

Table 1.1

ICF Core Competencies, Grouped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Setting the Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meeting ethical guidelines and professional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishing the coaching agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Co-creating the relationship
   3. Establishing trust and intimacy with the client
   4. Coaching presence
C. Communicating effectively
   5. Active listening
   6. Powerful questioning
   7. Direct communication
D. Facilitating learning and results
   8. Creating awareness
   9. Designing actions
  10. Planning and goal setting
  11. Managing progress and accountability

Setting the foundation. “Meeting ethical guidelines and professional standards” includes understanding the ICF’s code of ethics and having the ability to apply and follow these standards appropriately. “Establishing the coaching relationship” entails being clear with the client, understanding the guidelines and parameters of the coaching relationship, agreeing upon each individual’s responsibilities, and determining whether this coach and client are an effective match which will meet the needs of the prospective client” (ICF, 2010a, para. 1–2).

Co-creating the relationship. “Establishing trust and intimacy with the client” includes the ability to create a safe and supportive environment, which contains mutual respect. The coach is to demonstrate personal integrity and honesty, establish clear agreements and keep promises, demonstrate respect for the client, provide ongoing support and ask permission to coach client in sensitive or new areas. “Coaching presence” requests the coach to be fully present and create a spontaneous and flexible
relationship with each client. This would include being able to access one’s own intuition, being able to take risks, choosing the most effective way to work with the client using humor and energy and being confident in working with strong emotions (ICF, 2010a, para. 3–4).

**Communicating effectively.** “Active listening” lists eight different aspects of listening which include the ability to focus completely on the client and what they are saying, understanding the meaning of what they say in the context of the client’s desires. “Powerful questioning” involves the coach having the ability to ask questions that reveal information for the benefit of the client and the coaching relationship. These questions might reflect the coach’s active listening, evoke discovery, and ultimately move the client towards what they want. “Direct communication” asks the coach to use language that is clear, direct articulate, appropriate, and respectful. Using metaphors or analogies to help illustrate a point is also encouraged (ICF, 2010d, para. 5–7).

**Facilitating learning and results.** “Creating awareness” is the ability of the coach to achieve agreed upon results by having the ability to accurately read, integrate and respond to multiple incoming sources of information from the client. The main purpose of creating awareness is to assist the client in gaining awareness, which will aid achieving desired results of the coaching. “Designing actions” is what the coach does in order to create opportunities for the client’s ongoing learning, such as brainstorming, helping the client to focus, celebrating successes, challenging assumptions, and advocating without attachment. In “planning and goal setting” coaches are to consolidate information collected and develop with the client a coaching plan and goals that address client concerns and major areas for learning or development. The plan must be
measurable, specific with attainable results and target dates. The coach also makes
adjustments to the plan and helps the client identify needed resources. In “managing
progress and accountability” it is the coach’s responsibility is to support the client staying
on track while working toward goals set. This includes making clear requests,
demonstrating follow through, seeing the big picture and the individualized context for
the desired goals, promoting discipline and positively confronting clients who are not
taking agreed up on actions (ICF, 2010a, para. 8–11).

Currently, the ICF has three separate certification levels: Associate Certified
Coach (ACC), Professional Certified Coach (PCC) and Master Certified Coach (MCC).
Each level requires a specific number of coaching practice hours, hours of training, oral
and written exam, supervision or mentoring hours and certifies deeper level of mastery of
the 11 core competencies beginning with ACC and ending with MCC. The credentialing
tests that the ICF administers are based on these core competencies (2010d; also see
www.coachfederation.org for additional information on certification).

**Coach Training Programs**

Most coach training programs provide initial and basic ‘foundational’ training for
coaching students. Subsequent training programs branch off into specialty certification in
specific areas including: health and wellness coaching, spirituality coaching, business and
executive coaching, and life coaching. There are even more individualized ‘specialty’
areas of coaching that address, for example, leadership, management, relationship, team,
and group coaching. The specialized training in the individual areas appears to be
created by coaches with a background in their specific field. For example, a coach who
has previous professional experience in the corporate world might become a business or
corporate coach; a person with previous training or experience within a church or religious organization might become a spiritual coach, et cetera.

**Coaching Youth**

One of the growing specialty areas of professional coaching is coaching youth. Currently, this specialty is not confined to a definitive age group; for example, there are coaches that specialize in entire generations such as the “Millennials” and “GenY” or “Generation Y.” These terms are used interchangeably to refer to people born after 1980 (Fields, Wilder, Brunch & Newbold, 2008). Other coaches focus on pre-teen children. Some specialize in coaching adolescents and young adults, into their early 20s. In the 2003 online survey conducted by the ICF with 2,529 coaches, coaching minor adolescents was a category in which coaches reported they were least likely to focus (Grant & Zackon, 2004. For each of these youth coaching areas, there is little in the way of coach training for support and education.

There are, however, some coach training programs that have been created by either individuals or small organizations focusing on coaching youth (Coaching Kids, 2010; ICF, 2010b; Project Next Gen, 2010; Teen Wisdom, 2010). The majority of these smaller organizations and training programs appear to have been initiated by coaches who have previous education and experience in working with youth. These coaches come from various backgrounds including youth leadership and development, education, psychology and social work. They already possess certain skills and knowledge, which they apply to their coaching education and practice. This combination has yielded some powerful and practical guidelines for coaching youth from these coaches.
Youth coaching is a fast-growing specialization within the coaching industry. Through 2008, none of the programs for coaches specializing in youth were accredited through the ICF but by October 2010 four programs for youth coaches were either accredited or approved for continuing education credit through the ICF (2010b).

**Coaching Youth in Education**

The cutting edge of coaching youth appears to be in the educational setting (Green et al., 2007). This may be due to the fact that schools are the obvious place where large numbers of youth gather for a predictable amount of time. Schools are great environments for influencing the learning habits of youth; schools “are a major context for adolescent development and are intricately related to key developmental milestones in late childhood and adolescents, including academic achievement, peer relationships, pro-social conduct and involvement in athletics and clubs” (Ozer, Price Wolf, & Kong, 2008, p. 439). Many school administrators are willing to have a coach work with their students as long as it appears to yield value for the student specifically in their education, as well as their overall well-being. Coaching can be offered during the school day or during after-school organized time within the school building. With the recent change in economy, and funding decreases, schools are generally eager to find economical and efficient ways to positively influence the academic success and well-being of a large number of students. Both individual and group coaching of youth within school is one way to have that impact.

**Statement of the Problem**

In 2008 in the U.S., there were no ICF accredited training programs listed on the ICF website for coaching young adults, teenagers, or children (ICF, 2008). Coaching
youth is an emerging specialty area in the coaching industry (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; Youth Coaching Academy [YCA], 2010) and there is little research available on life coaching for youth (Green et al., 2007). The larger coach training organizations have not yet chosen to prioritize youth coaching as a specialty area. There are reasons for this.

The International Coach Federation completed a Global Coaching Study in 2006, and asked over 6,000 coaches to list their leading coaching specialty. Only 0.7% of these coaches listed “children/teens/college students” as their specialty area of coaching. The survey did not include a specific check box related to coaching youth on the survey. Instead, coaches needed to write in their specialty area in “other” if it was not one of the pre-chosen fields. To put that into perspective, there were approximately 20 other specialty areas ranked higher that the area “children/teens/college students” (ICF, 2008).

There are, however, a growing number of coaches who coach youth; my personal experience as the current lead of the Teen Special Interest Group is that there are more than 100 youth coaches currently participating in this ICF sponsored group. One explanation for the low number reported in the survey could be that a number of the respondents also coach adults, and might not claim youth as their primary specialty area.

Professional coaching has been slowly yet steadily building on its research although executive or business coaching has formed the basis for much of the existing research. In 2001, Anthony Grant discussed how “coaching research is in its infancy” (p. 1) and a few years later Morrow (2006) stated that various aspects of coaching research continue to grow annually. Grant and Cavanagh (2007) discussed the need for evidence-based approaches to this emerging discipline. Grant’s (2009) updated annotated bibliography, points out the growth of the knowledge base of coaching research. This is
crucial to moving it from its emergent fledgling status to a strong industry that is recognized and valued (Grant, 2001).

Research about coaching youth is vastly deficient, yet it is a specialty area that is rapidly growing (Passmore & Brown, 2009). Although not yet deemed a priority, there has been some progress in youth, teens or adolescents being mentioned as important participants in coaching research (Institute of Coaching, 2008; Passmore & Brown, 2009). More research is needed to clarify our understanding of coaching and its potential to positively influence diverse youth populations.

In 2008, the International Coaching Research Forum (ICRF) held a meeting at Harvard University, in Cambridge, MA to gather like-minded professionals (40 individuals from seven countries) together to foster coaching research on a global scale (Institute of Coaching; 2008). The result of this meeting was a list of themes related to future coaching research, including:

- Big picture issues related to coaching research: “Coaching research needs to focus on promoting the coaching field rather than promoting individual coaches/coaching programs” (p. 7).
- Interesting Populations for Coaching Research: “Children/adolescent coaches vs. adult coaches” (p. 13)
- Questions related to theoretical frameworks and coaching: “Are there models to inform adolescent career coaching?” (p. 17)

**Purpose of the Study**

As a youth coach who also leads an International Special Interest Group (SIG) for Teen coaches through the ICF, I have regular contact with other youth coaches. Their
experiences with youth, as well as with coaching, are widely varied. I was interested in learning more about the educational background and training of youth coaches and the extent to which this influenced their style and perceptions of coaching this population. I also wanted to explore how my own beliefs about coaching youth, presented in my proposed model, matched those of other coaches. It appeared to me, and I wanted to explore, the extent to which coaches create their own program and agenda for working with youth, and how these coaches are similar or different from each other in practice.

I have developed a youth coaching model that includes three core elements I believe are important based on my combined 25 years of working with youth as a social worker, therapist, case manager, group leader and life coach. The theoretical background for this model draws from the coaching industry; related disciplines including social work and psychology; and theories and research on adolescent, positive youth and leadership development and includes such approaches as cognitive-behavioral, strengths based, solution-focused and positive psychology.

Therefore, the overarching purpose of this study is to explore the degree to which youth coaches utilize proposed model components that might be important when coaching youth. The study aims are to:

- Identify key components of coaching youth in a proposed model;
- Compare each component of the proposed model to existing literature and research;
- Create survey questions and a survey to address questions I have raised about coaching youth;
• Survey youth coaches in order to describe their perception of what is important and what they are doing regarding coaching youth;

• Examine the relationship between the three components in the proposed model; and

• Determine the degree to which youth coaches utilize the components in the proposed model.

**Research Questions**

My primary research question is: “How does the current training and practices of youth coaches align with my proposed model?” My premise is that youth coaches will use a more systematic evidence based logical method if they are embracing what I have identified as core knowledge, principles and methods. I believe that coaches with ‘high’ adolescent development training or experience are more likely to follow my proposed model than coaches with low or no relevant training or experience. To accomplish the study aims, the following research questions will be answered:

• Is life coaching an appropriate process to support youth?

• What methodologies or organizing strategies do current youth coaches use, and do different coaches use similar approaches?

• How do the current perceptions and practices of youth coaches fit the proposed model?

• Is coaching youth different than coaching adults?

• What is the relationship between the three components in the model?

• How and when are parents included in a youth’s coaching?
• How are coaches handling working with minor youth, especially related to getting parental consent, mandatory reporting, duty to warn?

• What support do youth coaches need in order to be successful?

**A Proposed Model for Coaching Youth**

This model of coaching youth was created for the purpose of identifying and clarifying important distinctions that set apart coaching youth from adults. The model will be referred to as a Supportive Youth Coaching Model. This model includes three parts. (See Figure 1.1.):

1) *Core Knowledge: the foundational background for effective coaching of youth*;

2) *Core Principles: clear guidelines for the coaching experience; and*

3) *Core Methods: key aspects of youth coaching.*

The uniqueness of this particular coaching model is the distinct focus on what it takes to coach youth (adolescents ages 13–20) with specific parameters for coaching minor youth (under the age of 18).

![Diagram of Coaching Youth Model](image)

**Figure 1.1. Components of a Model for Coaching Youth.**

There are subcategories within each of the three core areas of the proposed model, as outlined in Figure 1.2.
Figure 1.2. Model Subcategories within each Component.

Many individual coaches who currently coach youth have prior professional youth work experience and/or education. They have individually developed their own youth coaching practices. This proposed model encompasses what I believe to be effective youth coaching practices or factors that support effective practice. Position statements for each of the three components, as well as for each subcategory, are described below.

Relationship Between Components

In the proposed model, the three components are interrelated. The theory behind the model presented is that all three components should be present in order for coaches to be most effective with youth. All of the components include aspects of coaching that are either distinct from adults or have a different interpretation due to youths’ developmental ages and stages.

First, there is Core Knowledge that provides the foundation of what a youth coach needs to effectively coach youth. This would include formal training in and experience with a) life coaching, b) adolescent development, c) group facilitation, and d) ethics. Lack of core knowledge may negatively impact the core principles.
The second component in the model is *Core Principles*. These core principles guide the coaching agreement, and are influenced by the core knowledge. The core principles include aspects of the coaching agreement that might be different than agreements with adults based on youth’s age and lifestyle. This includes a) ethics, b) boundaries and c) logistics.

The third component of the model is *Core Methods*. These core methods are often the heart of youth coaching and focus of where time is spent in coaching sessions with youth. I am not purporting that a coach needs to provide each of these core methods. I am suggesting that by being knowledgeable in these common issues faced by youth, a coach can increase the success of the coaching experience. Lack of core knowledge and principles can negatively impact the actual coaching interaction with youth. Core methods includes a) strengthening self, b) increasing skills, c) supporting education d) including parents e) accessing resources, and f) providing both individual and group coaching. Core Knowledge informs both the Core Principles and the Core Methods. The Core Principles inform the Core Methods.

A metaphorical example of the proposed model is using a recipe to cook. The Core Methods are the most visible and can be interpreted as the key ingredients in a recipe. The Core Principles are like the instructions that go along with the ingredients. The Core Knowledge is the background and culture behind the dish that you are cooking.

Someone coaching youth might take the Core Methods (like ingredients), add some methods of their own, or delete some. The result might be successful with coaching youth, or not (to the detriment of the youth). Without the Core Principles, one might miss out on some important instructions needed to be successful, and might miss
some crucial ingredients that youth need. Being mindful of the ethics and boundaries around working with youth and talking about those with youth, and their parents/guardians, can lead to a more successful working relationship. This success is often influenced by building trust within the relationship. This can be accomplished through setting clear expectations and sharing information prior coaching. This can be achieved through following the core principles. Successful youth coaching includes understanding youth and their culture, and also education about and experience with youth. Without foundational Core Knowledge, the richness of the experience in coaching youth can be lost, as well as the benefit for the youth.

**Core Knowledge**

Position statement of this component is, *In order to be effective; youth coaches need be trained and knowledgeable in coaching, adolescent development, group facilitation (if they are to do groups) and ethics.* This first component includes each of the following areas: coaching training, adolescent development, group facilitation (if applicable) and ethics training.

**Coach training.** *Youth coaches need foundational knowledge of life coaching, the industry and its practices prior to coaching youth.* The first aspect of the training is that those who coach youth should have completed basic coach training that consists of a minimum of 60 educational hours. This is the number currently required for an ICF basic coach certification (ACC). The second aspect of coach training is that the educational offering is accredited or certified by either the ICF or other similar coaching organization.
Adolescent development training. Youth coaches need knowledge of adolescent development, either from education or experience. Due to their age, youth have issues related to their development and lack of experience in the world. It is important for coaches to understand adolescent developmental stages and issues that are unique to this age group. Youth coaches need to understand how to adapt their general coaching specifically to youth based on developmental issues and differences related to gender, ethnicity, ability, identity, socio-economic status, and other factors. The importance of adolescent development knowledge lies in the fundamental ability to understand and therefore effectively work with youth.

Group facilitation training. Youth coaches need training in group facilitation. This, along with training in adolescent development and coaching assists them in understanding how to facilitate youth coaching groups. Many, but not all, youth coaches provide group coaching experiences for youth. With a skilled group coach facilitator this can be a positive experience youth can enjoy with their peers. Developmentally, youth are more focused on and influenced by their peers, than adults. Because many coaches connect with youth in school settings, group coaching is often an acceptable and encouraged way for coaches to work with youth in schools. It is important for coaches who are going to facilitate group coaching with youth, to understand group facilitation processes. Even the most experienced group facilitator can benefit from support via peer critique or supervision (e.g., peer supervision or consultation) of their group experiences.

Ethics training. Youth coaches need information and training related to ethics. This information should include any aspects pertinent to legal obligations the coach may be required to adhere to when working with youth. These obligations may change
depending on region or country in which the coach is working. Youth can be considered vulnerable, and often are protected by law differently than adults. Coaches should have ethics training that includes issues specifically related to working with youth under the age of 18, such as the age of consent or the reporting of suspected abuse. This knowledge will strengthen the coach’s ability to clearly set boundaries and agreements with youth prior to beginning the coaching.

Core Principles

Position statement: *Youth coaches have additional guidelines to follow and clarify in the agreement stage, especially with minor youth. These include ethical considerations, maintaining clear boundaries, and considering various logistics of the actual coaching.* These principles help to distinguish the difference in creating and maintaining ethical guidelines between coaching adults and coaching youth, and making adjustments for the developmental issues commonly associated with adolescence.

**Ethics.** *Youth coaches need clear ethical guidelines to follow that are in addition to the general coaching code of ethics provided for adults.* Many professionals in the U.S. are expected to have parental permission in order to work with minor youth. This permission is to come from the legal parent or guardian, and usually is in writing. Coaches holding other professional licensures must also adhere to those guidelines and related ethical standards (i.e., *duty to warn* and *mandatory reporting* laws). In some states, these two *duties* are required for any professional who works with minor youth (i.e., Minnesota). There may be a difference in these guidelines not only between countries, but also between states within the U.S. (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010).
Depending on the age of youth, parents or guardians may be involved in the coaching process or the engagement of the coach. Parents and youth must be given clear information on confidentiality, in writing and verbally, including specifically clarifying what the coach will and will not share with the parent.

In the U.S. to protect youth, adults who work with minor youth are required to complete a background check, performed by the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA). Background checks are required prior to the start of employment for various professionals working directly with youth; it is important that coaches within the U.S. should have background checks performed by an outside agency annually. Coaches who hire or organize volunteers to work with youth must have background checks completed on those individuals as well.

The code of ethics for life coaching was initially developed by the ICF and approved by the ICF board of directors in 2008. It includes four parts. Part One is the ICF Coaching Philosophy. This philosophy reflects the standard assumptions about a coaching client: each coaching client is creative, resourceful and whole. From that assumption, the coach has certain responsibilities. Part Two of the code of ethics is the ICF definition of coaching. Part Three outlines the ICF’s Standards of Ethical Conduct and includes “Professional conduct at large;” “Professional conduct with clients;” “Confidentiality/ privacy;” and “Conflicts of interest.” Part Four is the ICF Pledge of Ethics. Each coach certified through the ICF is expected to adopt and follow this code of ethics (ICF, 2010c). Various coaching organizations have a code of ethics for coaches to follow, as do many coach training organizations. For a complete list of coaching codes of ethics see Brock, 2008.
**Boundaries.** Youth coaches need to create and maintain clear boundaries while coaching adolescents. It is the responsibility of the coach to clarify and maintain healthy boundaries. Delineation of roles and responsibilities is essential for coaching youth. Example boundary areas to clarify could include money, coach’s personal information, communication patterns and mechanisms, confidentiality, roles and responsibilities, and expectations. Coaches should not overly disclose to youth clients in a way that puts the youth into a care taking role (e.g., “I have marital problems” or “I was an abuse victim too”). Advanced clarification of acceptable communication and frequency will also be important when setting boundaries with youth (e.g., communication by text not more than x times per day or only in an emergency).

Coaches should make clear distinctions between counseling and coaching. These distinctions need to be made in language the youth can understand. The coach’s agenda, if any, needs to be transparent to the youth, typically verbalized specifically, such as, “I am coaching you for the purpose of drop-out prevention.” Also, it is the coach’s responsibility to maintain these boundaries with the parent as well as school staff or other caring and interested professionals working with that youth.

**Logistics.** Youth coaches need to have different considerations for the logistics for coaching youth in order to be successful. Logistics include how youth arrive to their coaching sessions, offering a variety of technical variance, including more flexibility in scheduling, and being willing to adapt one’s coaching style to fit the developmental needs of youth. Depending on their age and development, coaches have additional logistics to pay attention to when coaching youth that might not be required of them when coaching adults. This could include physical logistics to support the coaching session such as
location and venue or logistics that encourage ease of conducting a coaching session such as in-person rather than telephone coaching. Further considerations can optimize coaching youth experiences incorporating knowledge of social networking and other technology (i.e., being tech savvy).

**Transportation.** Youth coaches need to consider transportation when meeting with minor youth; they do not have to provide the transportation. For some youth, ensuring safe and appropriate transportation is important to facilitate successful coaching experiences. It is not the coach’s responsibility to provide this, but instead, an important part of the agreement and planning so that they can be present if coaching is in person. This is most important for minor youth who often rely on others for transportation. Coaches who ignore the issue of transportation may encounter more frequent no-shows.

**In-person coaching.** Youth coaches who offer a choice of in-person coaching may increase the success of the coaching experience for some youth. Many coaches conduct the majority of their coaching over the telephone. Some coaches offer both in-person as well as telephone coaching. My experience is that youth are more likely to be coached in person, and coaches who only offer phone coaching may experience problems and unnecessary roadblocks when coaching youth such as missed sessions. The younger youth are, the more apt they will want to be coached in person. For some youth, Skype is a nice alternative when in-person coaching is not possible. Coaching might be more successful with youth if they have a choice between in-person and telephone.

**Adapting expectations.** Youth coaches should adapt their coaching to fit the age and developmental level of the youth they coach. Youth coaching may require the coach to adapt the typical coaching style they use with adults. Some youth will not be able to
nor want to spend an hour or even 45 minutes focusing on their goals. If the coach is coaching youth within a school, the school may request that not more than 15–20 minutes are spent with a student in order to minimize the amount of class time they miss. Some students might prefer the “drop by” or “on the fly” coaching that is generally more unplanned and can be as short as 5 minutes. My experience indicates that that youth in schools prefer “laser” coaching that may be scheduled or spontaneous, but brief.

**Tech savvy.** Youth coaches who are tech savvy may have an advantage in reaching more youth than those who are not. Due to the availability of technology, most youth have not experienced life without cell phones, texting, Internet and instant messaging. Youth often communicate with their peers and others via texting or social networking sites. In order to reach youth, coaches may benefit from being technologically knowledgeable, so that they can offer these venues of services to youth clients.

**Flexibility.** Youth coaches need to be flexible and may need to adapt their coaching style and patterns in order to better fit youth’s schedule and developmental level. Coaches who work with younger generations will benefit from being extremely flexible when working with youth. This might include being willing to give a reminder call or message for an upcoming session or agreed upon deadline. It could also include offering brief check-ins between sessions for youth, adapting one’s coaching “schedule” to better fit after school hours, or finding ways to involve and update parents of minor youth clients. A key to working with youth is being willing to adjust the agreed-upon plan and adapt to the youth’s needs in the moment (Malekoff, 2007). It is also important to have a few different backup plans. Being flexible especially when working in groups is important (Britton, 2010; Malekoff, 2007). Developmentally, many youth are still
learning time management as well as responsibility skills. For example, a forgotten or late appointment does not necessarily signify lack of interest. Instead it may signify that the youth is in need of either learning or practicing certain life skills. Youth often appreciate reminders. This may assist them in learning responsibility and time management. Youth with ADHD or other learning difficulties may need additional support (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Coaches who have strict rules for not rescheduling forgotten or late appointments can give the message that they are uninterested. Coaches working with Gen Y (defined in Chapter 2) youth need to be patient, open and “requires coaches to be comfortable with more uncertainty than with other clients” (Fields, Wilder, Bunch, & Newbold, 2008, p. 274).

**Agenda.** Youth coaches may have an agenda to target specific issues. Someone other than the youth who wants them to target specific issues may hire them. Coaches need to be transparent and clarify any agenda prior to beginning coaching. Coach training makes clear that coaches should not formulate their own agenda for a client. Any agenda used in the coaching process should be based on the client’s priorities and goals. When coaching youth, this is also true. Youth coaches commonly are hired by a third party (e.g., the school or other non-profits) to work with youth on a specific target area. This, in itself, would constitute a coaching agenda. The ICF’s core competencies includes that the coach is to attend to the coaching client, and the client’s agenda, rather than the coaches agenda for that client (ICF, 2010d). Transparency is key to building relationships, and relationships are the cornerstone of coaching (Gyllensten & Palmer, 2007). Providing an agenda to a client through top-down process can hinder the development of a trusting relationship.
Core Methods

Youth coaches often encounter common areas of focus for youth, which addresses specific developmentally important objectives. Core methods include key aspects that coaches might focus on when coaching youth. All of these are not necessarily included in all coaching experiences with youth. These aspects differ from coaching adults because youth often lack life experience that assists adults in responding to coaching. With knowledge about the physical, cognitive and social-emotional changes adolescents experience we can better understand their behavior (Kahn, LaCroix & Snyder, 2000) and more optimally coach them.

Strengthening self. As youth are continually developing their identity, they benefit greatly from coaches who assist them in becoming more self-aware. This often includes values and strengths identification as well as exploration of their developmental assets. Becoming more self-aware will assist youth in developing self-confidence to take steps towards their dreams. This process differs from adults because youth are continually trying on new identities in order to see what fits best for them. They may, for the first time, consider an identity that differs from the one with which they were raised.

Increasing skills. Youth often want to focus on specific social or life skills that they have not yet mastered. Although there are varying definitions of each, social skills and life skills are often used interchangeable when working with youth. Youth are learning basic skills that will assist them in being successful in life and with others. These skills include but are not limited to goal setting, time management, communication, decision-making, and relationship building. Goal setting is considered a
fundamental part of coaching (Waring, 2008) and routinely encouraged in youth who are coached.

Goal setting with youth often involves not only the teaching of how to set attainable goals, but more frequent check in or feedback with shorter termed goals. Although goal setting is a cornerstone for adult coaching, many youth have not yet learned how to set attainable goals. School staff continually struggle to teach students how to set and achieve their goals. SMART is an acronym that is often used to teach goal setting. Although there are differing variations of the meaning, SMART generally stands for (S)pecific, (M)easurable, (A)chievable, (R)ealistic and (T)ime limited. Youth benefit from learning and practicing the process of breaking goals into smaller, more quickly achievable steps. It might be easy to say “I want to graduate from high school” or “I want to get better grades.” It is much more difficult for a youth to figure out the steps that are needed in order for that to happen, and in what order to prioritize them.

They often become overwhelmed with all there is to do when looking at the steps needed to achieve their goal. Setting short-term goals while knowing their longer-term goal can help youth to experience success and stay motivated. A youth may realize that school attendance affects their grades, but the goal of attending school daily for a year can be overwhelming. Instead, shorter goals with frequent check-ins may provide more motivation. “I’ll arrive at school by 8:30 a.m. every day this week and attend all my classes” may be more appropriate. However, if that youth is currently attending school once a week, then even that goal may be overwhelming and unmotivating. Some youth might need frequent check-ins about their goals and a week may be much too much time between check-ins for some.
**Supporting education.** Youth coaches may need to focus on supporting educational success and career planning as a part of the coaching process. The majority of youth who receive coaching are in school and educational success, including what might be getting in the way of success, is often chosen by youth as an area of coaching focus. For others, supporting the learning of specific life skills might assist in promoting their educational success without directly focusing on education; this could be an important strategy for youth who have had negative academic experiences and find it difficult to initially identify or set goals related to education.

**Including parent.** Youth coaches need clear guidelines related to the involvement of parents in youth coaching. Minor youth often live at home and have parents or guardians who want to be involved in the coaching. As described earlier, it is crucial for coaches to set and maintain clear boundaries about confidentiality with a parent, regardless of the age of the youth. Parents often pay for the coaching of youth, even when the youth is not living at home. The success of youth coaching can sometimes be dependent on how the coach handles the communication and involvement of the parents or guardians.

**Accessing resources.** Youth are in need of resources and often have little experience in finding or knowing how to access them. Youth often need someone to teach or show them how to access community resources, as well as how to practically contact them. Although the Internet is full of resources, youth often lack experience or understanding about how to seek out other adults as resources. Introducing youth to other adults can be a healthy and informative way of helping youth access resources.
Providing individual and group coaching. Youth coaches may want to offer group as well as individual coaching opportunities for youth. Developmentally, youth like to spend time with their peers and often prefer to participate in groups instead of individually when given the choice. Group coaching can be more economical for agencies or schools that might consider hiring a coach. Schools are often looking for group opportunities for their students and might be more open to professionals coming into the school who can provide group experiences.

Importance of the Study

Coaching youth is a field growing in popularity and acceptance. The growth seems to be strongest within the educational arena, possibly because this is an area of easier access to and opportunity to influence youth. Educational venues such as high schools and colleges are discovering the benefits, specifically as it supports youth in attaining greater success in education. In an effort to achieve goals set forth in the No Child Left Behind Act (The Elementary and Secondary Education Act) of 2001, school administrators and boards are interested in delivering evidence-based interventions to youth that target academic success. Schools will often measure this success by test scores, attendance, increased credits taken, decreased behavioral referrals and potentially, increased graduation rates. This study will provide important coaching guidelines at a time when the youth coaching specialty area continues to gain momentum. There is little available research specific to coaching youth. Information from current youth coaches is needed to affirm the development of a model that is informed by both theory and practice experience of professional coaches. This model has potential to inform and guide the work of individuals and coach training organizations and their delivery of appropriate and
quality youth coaching. The model is written in broad categories, so that individual coach or training organization can use it as a framework to create their own programming or training and individualize the model to meet their specific needs.

Scope of the Study

The focus of this study is to determine (a) the experience and education of life coaches have who are coaching youth; (b) their perceptions of what is important when coaching this population; and (c) what guidelines they utilize. Comparison will be made to existing literature about youth and to the conceptual framework outlined earlier in the proposed model.

Limitations of the Study

This study is using a cross-sectional survey design, which will be informative and descriptive; it is not intended nor will it provide data that allow for making predictions or establishing causation. The target population is ‘undefined’ which makes it possible that this research will miss valuable input from potential participants who fit the target population but do not become aware of the survey. Because the survey respondents are not randomly selected, the results cannot be generalized to all youth coaches. The survey is in English, potentially limiting the participation of non-English speaking coaches. The survey required uninterrupted Internet time of 15–40 minutes for completion, which might have hindered some participation.

Definition of Key Terms and Concepts for this Study

Duty to warn. This is a common phrase in the U.S. for therapists, psychologists, teachers and other social service professionals. It refers to the responsibility that is required, for many, to breach confidentiality of a client in order to protect that client or
others. This law also provides for permission to breach that confidentiality and protection from lawsuits for said breach. Minnesota Statutes describes those responsible for duty to warn as, “a third party to notify others if a client is a threat to themselves or to identifiable others” (Minnesota Statutes, 2010a, para. 1).

**Emotional intelligence.** “The innate potential to feel, use, communicate, recognize, remember, describe, identify, learn from, manage, understand and explain emotions” (Hein, 2007).

**Life coaching or coaching.** There are various definitions to describe what is life coaching. In this paper, these two words will be used synonymously. For simplicity, the definition by the ICF is used: “Partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential.” (ICF, 2010a, para. 3).

**Life skills.** “The ability to cope with stresses and challenges of daily life, especially skills in communication and literacy, decision-making, occupational requirements, problem-solving, time management and planning” (Dictionary.com, 2011a, para. 1). Professionals often use the words ‘life skills’ and ‘social skills’ interchangeably. They will be described in the same category in this research paper. See also, **social skills.**

**Logistics.** This word is used to describe important considerations prior to the start of and during the coaching sessions with youth. Logistics are: “The careful organization of a completed activity so that it happens in a successful and effective way” (Cambridge Dictionary Online, 2011, para. 1).

**Mandatory reporting.** By law, many professionals who work with children are required, or mandated, by law to report suspected child abuse. At least 18 of the states in
the U.S. require any individual who is aware of child abuse to report it. Like ‘duty to warn’ this law protects the privileged confidentiality between professionals and client for the protection of a child (Minnesota Statutes, 2010b, para. 1–3).

**Social skills.** “The personal skills needed for successful social communication and interaction” (Dictionary.com, 2011b, para. 1). Professionals often use the words ‘social skills’ and ‘life skills’ interchangeably. They will be described in the same category in this research paper. See also, life skills.

**Self-esteem.** Self-confidence is an important component of self-esteem, and needs to be present in order for self-esteem to exist. Self-esteem can also be related to how your view and value yourself. One definition is: “A confidence and satisfaction in oneself” (Merriam–Webster.com, 2011, para. 1).

**Youth and adolescents.** For the purpose of this research study, youth are defined as those between the ages of 13–20. Some of the discussion related to youth under the age of 18 will specifically refer to them as minor youth. Some parts of the research study asked questions related to minor youth (ages 13–17) and older youth (ages 18–20).

**Youth coaches.** For the purposes of this paper, this definition refers to people who are life coaches who coach youth. Although technically correct, this term is not used in this dissertation to refer to coaches who are also youth.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Life coaching youth is an emerging specialty area that is gaining momentum and popularity (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; Williams & Davis, 2002; YCA, 2010). Evidence supports the belief that life coaching programs for this age group provide multiple benefits to their health, social, emotional and academic success. These benefits include overall health (Green et al., 2007; Grey et al., 2009) and well-being (Campbell & Gardner, 2005). Youth who have been coached have also experienced depression reduction, increased cognitive hardiness, and increased hope (Green et al., 2007; Passmore & Brown, 2009). Life coached students have demonstrated an improvement in academic performance (Passmore & Brown, 2009), goal setting and motivation (Campbell & Gardner, 2005) and confidence and belief in themselves (Passmore & Brown, 2009). Coaching youth also has the potential for building resilience (Campbell & Gardner, 2005), which can help them deal with daily stressors (Green et al., 2007).

Scope of the Literature Review

The literature review covers research, books and articles in English that focus on life coaching of youth between the ages of 13–20. The following search engines were accessed: CINAHL, EBSCO, Google Scholar, MCATPlus, MNCAT, OVID, OvidSP, PubMed, PsychINFO, MEDLINE, and SAGE Journals Online. Three research portals dedicated to coaching research were searched as well, including ICF, Institute of Coaching Research Repository, and the Institute of Coaching. The search also included a website dedicated to highlighting breaking coaching news and information (Coaching Commons, 2008). Terms used in the search included: “coaching” and “life coaching” in conjunction
with: “youth”, “adolescents”, “girls”, “boys”, “teens”, high school”, “non-adults”, “children”, and “college students.” Additional resources relevant to coaching youth were reviewed, including non-peer reviewed articles, books, websites and reports. Exclusion criteria included: non-English, studies in which the mean age of the research group was unavailable or under the age of 13 or over the age of 20, and studies that focused specifically and narrowly on academic, or literacy coaching where the intervention was tutoring rather than life coaching, or sports coaching for youth.

Over 1000 abstracts were reviewed between December 2008 and December 2010. Reviewing abstracts yielded 394 articles that were retrieved and examined for inclusion. From these, 196 articles met the criteria and were included in this review. Only 10 research articles specifically described life coaching youth between ages 13–20. These studies will be highlighted below, along with information gathered from other sources (i.e., books, non-research based articles, etc., and other relevant information). Emergent themes from the literature will be summarized and organized according to the proposed model presented in Chapter 1.

**Growing Research**

Coaching is an emerging discipline (Bennett, 2006; Brennan, 2008; Grant & Cavanagh, 2007). It continues struggling to define itself (Bachkirova & Kauffman, 2008) while simultaneously gaining recognition and acceptance (Brennan, 2008; Grant & Zackon, 2004). Subsequently, coaching-related research is also in the early stages (Bennett, 2006, Brennan, 2008; Burke & Linley, 2007; Grant, 2001). The coaching research that does exist is difficult to access (Stout Rostron, 2009).
The rapid evolution of coaching includes a wide range of coaching models and frameworks (Fillery-Travis & Lane, 2006). The greatest challenge for researchers continues to be the development of coaching-specific theory and evidence-based practice (Grant & Cavanagh, 2007a). This can be seen in the paucity of studies on coaching that use experimental or quasi-experimental techniques to examine coaching outcomes. Also, since most coaching literature focuses on adults, research on coaching youth is very limited (Green et al., 2007; Passmore & Brown, 2009). The scarcity of research about coaching youth leads one to question what provides a uniform base for coach training.

The majority of articles and information found in the searches were sports related rather than life coaching. Most articles relevant to life coaching pertained to educational settings, and often referred to the word ‘coaching’ in different manners, often meaning ‘tutoring’ (i.e., academic coaching, peer coaching, literacy coaching, and even performance coaching). School-based coaching research in high school or college was described in all but 1 of the 10 studies.

The following themes emerged from this literature review: coaching in schools, supporting youth transitioning from high school into adulthood, and health coaching. The research studies found within these themes will be described and then compared to the literature and the proposed model.

**Research Studies on Youth Coaching**

No research studies were found that described coaching youth with a stated mean age between 13–20 and were published prior to 2001. See Table 2.1 below for an overview of the studies found. Powers and colleagues (2001) were among the first researchers to examine the influence of coaching on youth. They, like Cleary and
Zimmerman (2004) utilized cognitive coaching techniques; both found coaching increased motivation of students. After 2004, more studies emerged addressing coaching of youth. The next two studies examined the results of life coaching with high school students (Campbell & Gardner; 2005; Green et al., 2007). Campbell and Gardner also found life coaching increased motivation and both found benefits for students coached. Green and colleagues along with Rollo and Gould (2007) found coaching increased hope in students. Together these studies created an important foundation for youth coaching by demonstrating promising effects using rigorous study designs.

In contrast to the previous studies, other researchers began to examine health coaching with youth (Gorczynski, Morrow, & Irwin, 2008; Grey et al., 2009; Van Zandvoort, Irwin, & Morrow, 2009). All three studies utilized telephone coaching with youth. The first two studies found difficulty with adherence to study protocol and the latter found that those coached would have preferred in-person coaching.

The first documented longitudinal coaching study examining the potential benefits for coaching youth (non-adults) took place in the London, United Kingdom (U.K.). Passmore & Brown (2009) conducted a 3-year longitudinal study coaching with 1987 high school students in multiple school settings to assess the extent to which life coaching enhanced examination performance. Interestingly, they found that coaching is beneficial when used as a tool to support learning, and has the potential to be used as a tool to leverage social disadvantage for educational advancement. Also highlighted are the processes involved in training coaches to coach youth. Most recently, Lacefield, Zeller, and Van Kannel-Ray (2010) examined the impact of a graduation coaching
intervention with 10th grade students to improve academic performance. Like the first two studies, used cognitive coaching techniques.

Table 2.1

*Summary of Articles on Coaching Youth (Ages 13–20), 2000–2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year</th>
<th>Study details</th>
<th>Implications for youth coaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powers, Turner, Westwood, Matusquewski, Wilson and Phillips (2001)</td>
<td>A controlled field-test of a model to promote student involvement in transition planning for 43 students with disabilities. Students received individual, bi-weekly 50-minute coaching sessions (along with other interventions) from professionals trained in coaching skills. Cognitive coaching was to support identification of transition goals, participation in transition planning meetings, creating specific plans for goal action steps and goal attainment.</td>
<td>Findings suggest that with systematic strategies, support and encouragement; it is possible to increase confidence, motivation and activity for youth with disabilities related to their own transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary and Zimmerman (2004)</td>
<td>Article summarizes various pilot studies with urban middle school students and case examples of a training program: Self-Regulation Empowerment Program (SREP) that school professionals could use to empower adolescents to engage in more positive, self-motivated learning. SREP was developed from social-cognitive theory and research and integrates the problem-solving model. Cognitive coaching was one of the described interventions.</td>
<td>Findings from anecdotal data and case studies suggest this model may have positive effects on student achievement and motivation. By using SREP, students learn how to set goals; select, monitor and adjust goals and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell and Gardner (2005)</td>
<td>A wait-list controlled pilot study to assess the effects of life coaching youth in 12 high school seniors. Students were randomly chosen from a group of 71 volunteers, two control groups of 12 students each were also used. The coaching was delivered by a school counselor for 6 months in bi-weekly sessions, by a school counselor.</td>
<td>The study shows there is a demand for professional life coaches within schools. No significant differences were found between the two groups. Students who signed up for coaching reported being less able to manage relationships and problem solve than those who did not sign up. Initial findings suggest life coaching may have potential for building resilience and well-being in youth, as well as a positive effect on students coached, increasing their goal setting, motivation and achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Grant, and Rynsaardt, (2007)</td>
<td>An evidence-based life coaching study for building hardiness and hope 56 female high school students (M=16). This study sought to expand the previous work of Campbell &amp; Gardner. Teachers were trained in life coaching skills and did 10 coaching sessions with the students. A cognitive-behavioral, solution-focused intervention was utilized.</td>
<td>Findings include significant increases in levels of cognitive hardiness and hope, significant decreases in depression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolo, C. and Gould, D. (2007)</td>
<td>A study that was an intervention for fostering hope, athletic and academic performance in 44 university student athletes (M=19). Students were coached in a 6-week, 12 session intervention (10 group sessions and two individual sessions).</td>
<td>Findings include that this short-term study had significant positive impact on student behaviors, and that hope scores of the intervention group increased significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorczynski, Morrow, and Irwin (2008)</td>
<td>A single case experimental design study of the impact of co-active coaching on physically inactive 12–14 year olds (N=5). Students were coached for 2 months over the telephone by a certified professional coach.</td>
<td>Findings found that the coaching had no impact on physical activity of the youth. Low rates of adherence suggest that coaching may not be an appropriate intervention for younger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A randomized school-based study on an intervention to reduce risk for type 2 diabetes in at-risk high school students (N=198). Students were followed for a year. The objective was to see whether or not coping skills training (CST) and health coaching improved diabetes outcomes. The study had significant limitations due to attendance; only 34% of the students received at least half of the intervention.

Results showed students who received CST and health coaching had greater improvement on some indicators of metabolic risk than those who received education only. Both groups showed some improvement in knowledge and health behaviors. The conclusion drawn is that a multifaceted school based intervention may hold promise for reducing metabolic risk in urban, minority youth and that both clinicians and teachers can incorporate the approaches used in this study.

van Zandvoort, Irwin, and Morrow (2009)  
A qualitative study on the impact of Co-active life coaching on female university students with obesity (N=5). Students were coached via telephone with a certified Co-active coach, averaging nine sessions.

At conclusion, students attributed increased self-acceptance, living healthier lifestyles and making themselves a priority to the coaching experience. Life coaching provided psychological support to obese individuals by improving relationships with themselves and serving as a catalyst for weight-loss.

Passmore and Brown (2009)  
A 3-year longitudinal study in 18 high schools (N=1987) to assess the benefits of coaching youth in educational settings. Students who were at risk of academic failure were targeted. Professional adults were trained in coaching skills. Each coach worked with student usually weekly (60-minute sessions) over the 3-year project.

Findings showed benefits of coaching when used as a personal development tool to support learning. Coaching can be an effective intervention with youth to help students increase test scores, and has potential value with youth in supporting educational goals.

An on-going longitudinal study of ‘graduation coaches’ as a GEAR UP intervention (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) in urban high schools. The study followed 2 cohorts of students (N=344 and N=293) into high school and half way through 10th grade; goal to improve academic performance and improve retention for those not passing core course.

Results were that students who were coached were unlikely to drop-out of school for academic reasons. Coaching was useful in assisting students understand how their personal life connects with their educational life, and supported them in learning how to succeed both socially and academically. Graduation coaching may be used as a best practice in education for supporting students.

Emerging Themes

From these and other studies emerged themes of youth coaching that will be discussed below: coaching in schools or educational settings, coaching as a support for youth transitioning and health coaching. Where no information on youth coaching is available, I have supplemented this literature review with relevant research from adult coaching, as well as research with youth conducted in related fields. I will describe how the literature review findings do or do not fit within the proposed model.
Coaching in Schools

Educational settings are a frequent venue for coaching youth (Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Green et al. 2007). School is a natural gathering place, as well as legal requirement in the U.S. for youth under 18 years of age. It is also an attractive setting for youth work, as most students are required to be in school (Komro & Stigler, 2000). Parents as well as school staff are having difficulty finding time and resources for students falling behind (Dansinger, 2000). Schools are increasingly taking on the responsibility for students’ social and emotional learning as well as academics (Baldwin Anderson, Johnson, & Reding, 2005; Weissbert & Utne O’Brien, 2004).

Coaching in schools is increasingly popular in England (Creasy & Paterson, 2005) in addition to the U.S. (Tyre, 2009). Both university and high schools have had success with coaching programs that benefit students (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004; Green et al., 2007; Lacefield et al., 2010; Passmore & Brown, 2009; Powers et al., 2001; Rolo & Gould, 2007; Williams & Davis, 2002). It has been well documented that school connectedness is a protective factor for youth (Blum & Mann Rinehart, 1998) and is a key determinant of the health and well-being of adolescents (Bernat & Resnick, 2009). Coaching can support student insight about their own learning styles, peer relationships and leadership capabilities (Barnett, Henry, & Vann, 2008, p. 7), which can lead to increased school connectedness. Adolescents who report feeling more connected to school also report lower levels of emotional distress, risk taking behaviors and aggression (Resnick & Bearman, 1997).

Coaching students is beneficial to supporting learning, goal achievement, creating competence, peer relationships, and building leadership capacity (Baldwin Anderson, et
al. 2005; Barnett, Henry, Vann & St Clement, 2008; Creasy & Paterson, 2005; YCA, 2010) and has value in supporting educational goals (Passmore & Brown, 2009). Peer, mentor, academic, and graduation coaches for youth are prevalent in schools today (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Dansinger, 2000; Reiss, 2007; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; Tyre, 2009; Lacefield et al, 2010). Both the school as well as the individual can benefit from coaching, especially when coaches work closely with educators (Barnett et al., 2008; Reiss, 2007; Tolhurst, 2006) because it can be use used by teachers to resolve conflicts, address bullying, improve student outcomes, setting goals related to attendance, behavior and career. Also, school coaches can aid youth in changing cognitive structures within a social context so that they better understand how their worlds intersect.

Coaching has been used to support transition planning for students with disabilities (Powers et al., 2001), build resilience and hope (Campbell & Gardner, 2005), and increase self-regulation and attention (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004). Life coaching supports goal setting and achievement; improving the ability to articulate goals may enhance hope (Green, et al., 2007). In a study with college students testing Hope Theory against goal-specific measurement (not a coaching study), students adjusted their hopes as they experienced success or failure with their goals (Feldman, Rand, & Kahle-Wrobleski, 2009, p. 495). Hope has been correlated to increased life satisfaction, academic performance and has predicted increased overall grade point averages (Green et al., 2007). Coaching can support schools because they go beyond academics and support youth through working with outside agencies for youth development (Tolhurst, 2006).

Coaching research in schools often targets one area (i.e., academic improvement, social or emotional functioning) yet impacts other areas. Youth struggling in school, such
as with academics, are often found to also be struggling at home. The reverse is also true, where stressful or challenging home environments can negatively influence how a student performs in school (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Many school-based intervention programs focus either on academic improvement or addressing social problems. Green et al. have observed that “Life coaching programmes have the potential to be an effective holistic mental health promotion strategy for high school students” (2009, p. 30). Additional researchers have similarly demonstrated that coaching improved students’ overall level of functioning (Grey et al. 2009; Campbell & Gardner, 2005) and can be used as a personal development tool (Passmore & Brown, 2009). Life coaching has been successful in improving self-determination and self-efficacy and is receiving attention as an innovative method for promoting health (van Zandvoort et al., 2009).

**Support for Youth Transitioning**

Young adolescents often experience dramatic developmental changes including physical, cognitive ability and social–emotional changes (Kahn, LaCroix, & Snyder, 2000). Although the scope and definitions of transitions or pathways have been debated, they are often used to describe the process of change and direction in young people’s lives, and are not specific to one point in time (Bottrell & Armstrong, 2007). The concept of transition has refined over time to imply a process that is taking longer and is more varied and ambiguous (Kins & Beyers, 2010; Furlong, 2009; Riddell, 2009; Toguichi Swartz & Bengtson O’Brien, 2009). Youth today are faced with new challenges and expectations during transitional times (Lehman, Clark, Bullis, Rinkin, & Castellanos, 2002) and the literature is lacking on what strategies are effective (King, Baldwin, Currie, & Evans, 2006) in supporting youth through transitions.
Because life coaching can provide support to youth in transition (Powers et al., 2001; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; The Coaching Academy, 2010; YCA, 2010), it is important to examine the type of transitions youth experience. Youth experience many kinds of transitions. The literature found on this topic usually describes the developmental transition from adolescence to adulthood with specific issues identified for youth transitioning with disabilities or chronic illnesses.

**General developmental transitions.** Developmental transitions mentioned in the literature fall into two categories that are somewhat variable and at times overlap. The transitions that take place in educational settings such as transition into high school, compounded by typical adolescent development processes, and the transition after high school that is commonly referred to as the transition into adulthood. Adolescent development includes preparation to assume leadership of self, family, community and a society in which life will be maintained and improved (Lerner & Overton, 2008).

The transition to ‘secondary school’ marks the first transition in most developed societies (West, 2009). It can be difficult for middle school children to transition to high school because changes in schools, homework load, class schedule and teachers’ expectation can be overwhelming. Some students transitioning to middle school suffer from a decrease in self-esteem, and “many of them develop negative self-motivational beliefs and struggle to deal with the academic demands for greater self-management” (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004, p. 538).

Older adolescents often try to balance education and employment at the same time, while also being encouraged to consider higher education. These challenges as well as the responsibility of choosing goals for their future are a part of adolescent
development (Montgomery et al., 2008; Walsh, 2008). Educational involvement and success for youth can affect their future transitions in multiple ways (Furlong, 2009) because it has such a dramatic influence on income earning potential and overall quality of life. Education that is disrupted can be a significant barrier for youth in acquiring needed skills and credentials, which in turn impact employment and career (Bottrell & Armstrong, 2007). Life coaching may provide several benefits to youth at different points of transition, including school and career decisions (Campbell & Gardner, 2005).

**Emerging adulthood.** Youth struggle with the transition from high school to adulthood, and often feel unprepared to make difficult and important decisions (Furlong, 2009; The Coaching Academy, 2010). This is true whether or not the youth choose higher education or employment as their next step. Our society generally expects youth to be more independent at each of these transition stages. Often, when youth turn 18 years old, they are expected to have the skills and abilities needed to be fully independent. Arnett (2000) describes his theory that older youth or young adults are living in a period of “emerging adulthood” which is “neither adolescence nor young adulthood but is theoretically and empirically distinct from both” (p. 469). This emerging adulthood has been described as a delayed transition into adult status (Kins & Beyers, 2010).

From late teens to early twenties, youth experience dramatic developmental changes (Armstrong, Dedrick, & Greenbaum, 2008; Arnett, 2000). According to Lehman and colleagues (2002) there are generally agreed upon skills youth are expected to achieve by the time they leave high school: a) live independently, b) determine initial career path, c) have either a job or be enrolled in post-secondary education, d) have healthy
relationships with friends and family, and e) choose leisure activities that enhance their lives (p. 128).

Coaching can support youth by providing a supportive and confidential environment to explore options, express frustration and practice new life or social skills (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Coaching increases self-awareness, improves relationships (The Coaching Academy, 2010; YCA, 2010) and can build resilience in youth (Campbell & Gardner, 2005). As youth set goals about their future, life coaching can facilitate growth processes relevant for goal accomplishment (Harms, n.d.). The same is true for students with mental health conditions (Manteuffel, Stephens, Sondheimer, & Fischer, 2008). A 1990 educational amendment in the United States mandates schools to provide coordinated transition support to youth with disabilities, which should begin in middle school (Lehman et al., 2002). According to Wehmeyer, an individual’s actions that would show self-determination include decision making, problem solving, goal setting and attainment, self-awareness and self-knowledge (1992, p. 4); all of which can be addressed through life coaching.

**Youth with disabilities.** While some youth are able to successfully navigate transitions into adulthood, others are unable or unlikely to do so easily (Bottrell & Armstrong, 2007, p. 353). It is well recognized that we need to do a better job of preparing adolescents and young adults with disabilities for the transition into adulthood (Betz, Redcay, & Tan, 2003; Bottrell & Armstrong, 2007). The “life goals of youth with disabilities are the same as for those without disabilities” (King et al., 2006, p. 156); however, youth with disabilities may encounter a greater number of barriers to healthy transitions due to additional challenges they face. Despite a U.S. mandate that schools
provide coordinated transition support to youth with disabilities, beginning in middle
school (Lehman et al., 2002), many of these youth continue to struggle and lag behind
their peers academically and socially. Students with disabilities also have a higher
dropout rate than peers without disabilities (Powers et al., 2001).

Students with mental health conditions experience similar transition difficulties
(Manteuffel et al., 2008). Transitioning youth with serious emotional disturbance (SED)
have demonstrated “poorer social skills, lower academic achievement, and higher
incidences of psychiatric conditions, particularly conduct disordered problems”

Importantly, coaching has demonstrated positive outcomes specific to supporting
healthy development and transitions for youth with disabilities. For example, Powers and
colleagues (2001) utilized coaching to promote student involvement in transition planning
for students with disabilities. Students identified three specific transition goals and were
coached in three strategies: achievement, partnership development and self-regulation.
Youth were coached in the application of student-directed planning skills to achieve their
transition goals. Coaches reviewed strategies and assisted in applying steps towards those
goals. Study results indicated that students receiving coaching were more involved in
their treatment planning meetings, initiation, transition awareness and empowerment than
the other groups. Further, the coaching yielded increases in “youth confidence,
motivation, and activity related to preparing for the future” (p. 102). They also
determined that a systematic intervention to promote involvement is important, because
otherwise youth often do not actively participate in their transition meetings.

Health Coaching
Health related coaching is another emerging specialty area (Spence, Cavanagh, & Grant, 2008) that is increasing in use with youth (van Zandvoort, Irwin, & Morrow, 2008; Newnham-Kanas, Gorczynski, Irwin, & Morrow, 2009; van Zandvoort et al., 2009).

Grey et al. (2009) conducted a randomized pilot study of an educational intervention and measured health coaching and its ability to reinforce healthy coping skills in inner city high school youth. They wanted to examine if improved coping skills would improve nutrition and physical education participation and sought to answer the question, “Would the risk of type 2 diabetes in at-risk youth be reduced with coaching?” One hundred ninety-eight seventh grade students in New Haven, Connecticut participated in a 3-year program, including a 1-year follow-up. Students received either coping skills training and “health coaching” which was defined as “a patient-centered process that consists of setting goals, identifying obstacles, and mobilizing existing supports” (p. 123) or general health education.

The coaching, via telephone, was intended to reinforce students’ coping skills and support them in setting nutritional and physical education goals. A major limitation of this study was attendance compliance, which limited the amount of coaching received by some of the participants. Study results demonstrated some improvement in anthropometric measures, lipids and depressive symptoms in both conditions but students who received the skills training and health coaching showed greater improvement on some indicators of metabolic risk.

In another study, Gorczynski et al. (2008) examined the impact of coaching on five physical inactive in five younger youth (ages 12–14). This study examined physical activity participation, self-efficacy, social support and perceived behavioral control of the
youth. In this study, coaching had no measurable impact, however common themes included that youth (a) liked talking with the coach; (b) learned the importance of physical activity; (c) disliked completing the questionnaire; and (d) that there was no change in parental involvement in physical activity (p. 24). The researchers theorized that coaching might not be appropriate for this age group (p. 23). Limitations of this study, including small sample size (N=5), poor adherence to coaching expectations and length of time for the intervention might explain the absence of useful results.

A study on the impact of Co-Active life coaching on female university students (N=5) with obesity was done by van Zandvoort et al. (2009). Volunteer students participate in an average of nine 35-minute telephone coaching sessions with a certified coach. Although limited by sample size, self-report data are promising, in that participants reported enhanced self-acceptance, healthier lifestyles and making themselves a priority in their lives (p.115). Other feedback about the coaching included appreciation for being treated as the experts in their own lives, and that the youth would have preferred to be coached in-person (p. 110). Findings suggest that life coaching has the potential to support individuals struggling with obesity.

Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is another health condition coaches have addressed with youth (Murphy, Ratey, Maynard, Sussman, & Wright, 2010; Sleeper-Triplett, 2008, 2010). The popularity of this particular niche is in part noted by the fact that it has its own ICF category, which includes coaching both adults and youth (ICF, 2010b).

Coaching youth with ADHD requires unique considerations due to the additional demands of some clients (IAAC, 2010). Youth may need more frequent communication,
assistance in learning life skills, and more concrete steps in their goal setting (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). With ADHD, youth may have underdeveloped executive functioning skills, and so they may need additional skills in order to begin to accomplish goals.

The Edge Foundation (2010) recently completed a 2-year study in 10 higher education settings to evaluate the effects of a coaching intervention with 110 students with ADHD (ages not specified but likely 18–24 due to higher educational setting). Students were randomly assigned to either the Edge Foundation’s Coaching Model Intervention or a comparison group. Intervention students were coached in half hour sessions by telephone or Skype; email and texting check-ins were provided as needed. This study demonstrated that the Edge Model was “highly effective in helping students improve their self-regulation, study skills and will” (p. 57). This coaching intervention resulted in students’ improved approach to learning, enhanced well-being and increased positive emotional states, as well as enhancing organizational and time management skills. The coaching helped students to “establish more effective goals and pursue those goals in more efficient, less stressful ways” (p. 4). This is the largest study existing to date that examined the effects of coaching youth with ADHD.

**Training For Coaches Specializing In Youth**

Researching youth coaching led me to a few specialized training programs that are important to describe. The search for coach training programs specializing in youth revealed both accredited (through the ICF and others), and non-accredited programs.

ICF approves coaching training in three ways, which need to be based in ICF core competencies (listed in Chapter 1). The Accredited Coach Training Programs (ACTP) offers a minimum of 125 hours of coach-specific training that includes observed coaching
sessions and a final exam (2010b, para. 1). The Approved Coach Specific Training Hours (ACSTH) programs offer a minimum of 30 hours (2010b, para. 2). The third kind of ICF approval is through Continuing Coach Education (CCE). These courses are considered advanced or niche-specific that would satisfy renewal requirements for credentialed coaches and further the development of a professional coach (2010b, para. 3). Five of the 10 training programs are offered in the U.S. and were developed and offered by ICF Teen Special Interest Group members who specialize in working with youth. The other two programs are located in Australia and the U.K.

**ICF Accredited or Approved Coach Training on Youth**

The following alphabetized list, from 2010, was taken directly from the ICF website (ICF, 2010b) and is a ‘snapshot’ of programs related to youth coaching. Each organization applies for and can be approved by the ICF for one training period or program, or extended approval. Those applying need to agree to abide by the ICF Code of Ethics.

**Coaching 4 Teenagers.** (Roseville, Australia) offers a CCE approved program of 16 hours. The training, Parent & Teen Coaching Fundamentals is a 2-day in-person workshop focused on providing coaches, counselors, social workers, educators, and parents to learn the essential fundamentals of coaching for parents and teenagers.

**JST coaching, LCC.** (Herndon, VA) offers training for coaching youth with AD/HD. The program is called “Coaching Teens & College Students with ADHD.” It is a 30-hour, ICF accredited course (CCE) designed to provide skills to coaches and others with young clients with ADHD. The training takes place by phone in weekly 2-hour sessions over 15 weeks.
Next Step for Success. (Redmond, OR) has a program titled “Coaching Parents, Struggling Teens and Young Adults.” The training is considered ACSTH and CCE by the ICF and is a 20-week, 30-hour coach training. The training emphasis is to develop coaching skills to support families with youth who are struggling. The course is available by teleconference or on-site location.

The Academy for Family Coach Training. (Rio Rancho, NM) offers an ACSTH and CCE training called the Advanced Coaching Course. This course is a virtual 10-month course that results in a Certified Family Coach. The CCE training is an 85-hour course that requires a combination of both in-person and virtual training.

Other Accredited Coach Training on Youth

The Coaching Academy. (England) is a coach training organization. It offers a Youth Impact Coaching Diploma. The training consists of six in-person trainings and other coaching exercises, practice and support. The training areas for this diploma include youth specific information, practicalities of coaching youth, parent coaching, effective communication with young people, goal mapping and youth in transition (2010).

Youth Coaching Academy. (Birmingham, UK) This is a non-profit coaching organization that provides an externally accredited youth coaching course for both adults and youth. They have offices in both Canada and the UK, and have trained thousands of adults and young people from around the world. This organization offers both in-person and a home study courses in Youth Coaching Skills. They offer three training levels of Youth Coaching: Level 1 is a Certificate, Level 2 a Diploma, and Level 3 is the Fully Accredited Youth Coach (2010, para. 1–2).

Non-ICF Accredited Coach Training on Youth
Career Coaching for Students. (Prosper, TX) This program is described as “the leading career exploration and planning program” (Career Coaching for Students, 2010, para. 1). Its focus includes greater self-awareness, strengths, career options, networking, obtaining a summer internship, choosing an educational strategy and differentiating yourself. Coaches who have experience working with youth can apply for the Licensed Facilitator Training Program. The training is 20 hours of training conducted via webinar and/or recordings of the trainings, with additional phone support. The license has additional requirements related to education and experience. (Career Coaching for Students, para. 2).

Coaching Kids. (Highlands Ranch, CO) This program provides coaching skills training to volunteers, who then coach youth. They also provide coaching skills training to juveniles incarcerated. (Coaching Kids, 2010, para. 1). This organization offers various programs coaching both adults and juveniles in the system, and has one program (Jericho) that provides coach training to inmates who then coach families (Coaching Kids, 2010, para. 18).

Project Next Gen. (Livingston, NJ) is owned by Your Personal Coach, LLC. This organization offers three training certification programs for working with youth in the ages between 13–20.

- The “LEAP Program” is a 2-day in-person training for coaches who are interested in being certified to use LEAP program with youth. This program helps youth identify their purpose, overcome limiting beliefs, improve peer relationships and create a future plan (Project Next Gen, 2009, para. 1).
• The second program is called *Teen Life Coach Training*. It is a 3-day in-person training program, which focuses on coaching skills and youth issues. This training is geared towards educators and school staff. Successful completion will certify participants as LEAP facilitators, receive business and mentor coaching to assist in building business (Project Next Gen, 2009, para. 2).

• The third program listed is The College/University Training (CUT). This training focuses on post high school experiences. Training completion includes licensing for the Career Jumpstart Program. It focuses on assisting college students to identify goals, overcome fears and develop skills. This program is designed to inspire, motivate and empower college students (Project Next Gen, 2009, para. 3).

**Teen Wisdom.** (Encinitas, CA) offers the “Teen Wisdom™ Certified Life Coach Training.” This training is for women who work with or want to coach girls. The certification includes 40 hours of training (that has previously been ICF approved CCE, but was not as of October, 2010). It is both a teleclass and an in-person live training in San Diego, CA. The program includes supervised practice coaching of girls utilizing the methodologies learned, assignments, follow-up calls, and certification exam. Proof of liability insurance and an annual licensing fee is also required (Teen Wisdom, 2010, para. 11).

**Comparing Proposed Model to the Literature**

Each of the three categories in the model I developed, and described earlier, will be examined in relation to the literature review.
Core Knowledge

Core knowledge is the foundation and background for adults coaching youth, including training in coaching, adolescent development, ethics and group facilitation.

Coach training. A minimum of 60 hours of coach training is important for youth coaches, as observed in the ICF requirements for their basic introductory level (ACC) of coach certification (ICF, 2010f). Coach-specific training is defined by the ICF as “training that is predominantly marketed as teaching coaching skills and not something else and where the major emphasis is on coaching skills or applying technical skills as a coach and in a manner consistent with the ICF core competencies” (ICF, 2010b, para. 2).

Because the coaching industry continues to be unregulated, anyone can call himself or herself a coach (Grant, 2006; Biswas-Diener, 2009). The process through which coaches are selected and trained varies (Brennan, 2008), and there are many roles, models and frameworks for coaching practice (Fillery-Travis & Lane, 2006).

If the most basic certification for the ICF is 60 hours, then less that that might create even more confusion about who is a ‘coach’. In order to be considered a life coach, this minimum should be met so that coaches are well versed and comfortable in the coaching nuances, and subsequently able to focus their attention on the developmental aspects and technicalities of coaching youth. In the studies reviewed, 2 of the 10 coaching studies reviewed specifically mentioned utilizing professional trained coaches (Gorczynski et al., 2008; Van Zandvoort et al., 2009) and 2 studies held coach training sessions for professional adults who work with youth (Green et al., 2007; Passmore & Brown, 2009), with the training ranging from 3 to 4 days. The remaining
studies did not clarify the coach training background. Whether the training was provided by an accredited source or not was not reported in any of the studies.

**Adolescent development training.** It is important for adults working with youth to understand adolescent development, which will help to clarify the differences between coaching adults and youth. Little attention has been given to the training and education of those who work with youth (Huebner, Walker, & McFarland, 2003), including coaches. Adolescence is often described as a time somewhere between the ages of 10–21 (Kahn et al., 2000) where youth are exploring who they are and how they fit into the world (Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001). There is agreement in the literature that adolescence is an important time in human development and includes some form of transition between childhood and adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Furlong, 2009; Kahn et al., 2000; NASW, 2003). Youth work towards identity development, and reexamine beliefs learned from childhood (Arnett, 2000). Bernat and Resnick (2009) indicate there are healthy youth development strategies that are “promising approaches for preventing or reducing a wide range of adolescent health-risk behaviors” (p. S10). They explain that the strategies are based on the belief that youth are “resources to be developed, rather than problems to be solved”, and can be defined as a deliberate process in which “adults provide youth with support, relationships, experiences, resources and opportunities needed to be successful and competent adults” (p. S10).

Numerous theories exist to explain youth development; Muuss (2006) identifies the traditional developmental models, including Freud (psychoanalytic theory), Erikson (theory of identity development), Piaget (cognitive theory) and Kohlberg (cognitive-developmental approach). Steinberg and Sheffield Morris (2001) suggest that new
directions are needed for the adolescent development field to more fully encompass the ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of youth, and their subsequent developmental trajectory diversity. Newer theories on adolescent development are continuously emerging (Arnett, 2000; Muuse, 2006; Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001).

Bronfenbrenner’s ecological approach to development (1979) puts each individual youth in the center of concentric influences, continuously interacting with social relationships and environmental influences at micro- (close) and macro- (distal) levels. Gilligan’s work specifically focuses on moral development in the context of gender differences (1982). Adolescent female identity is based on relationships with others and learning how to navigate through those relationships, while adolescent males develop identity based on the world around them and how to master that world (1982).

A developmental perspective for youth should take into account each youth’s level of functioning, the multiple levels of influence on their developmental pathways as well as the reciprocity between risk and protective factors of each youth (Armstrong & Boothroyd, 2008). Zand and colleagues (2009) discuss youth competencies and how they differ with each developmental level. They explain that difficulty in mastering a developmental task or competency is associated with difficulties in later age developmental tasks. Some common developmental issues in adolescent development include substance abuse, juvenile delinquency, mental health problems, unhealthy lifestyle choices, economic disadvantages, unemployment, non-engagement and family problems (Shek & Wai, 2008). There is a change in thought about youth such that signs of risk behaviors, boredom, alienation or disconnection are signs of a deficiency in positive youth development rather than a deficiency in youth (Larson, 2000). Best
practice for assisting youth in transition is an asset based developmentally appropriate framework that is not deficit based (Betz et al. 2003).

In addition to the obvious physical and social development knowledge coaches should have when working with youth, there are considerations related to brain development, gender and cultural differences, and social environmental influences. Brain development affects how we learn (Males, 2009) and knowing about adolescent brain development can assist youth coaches in setting realistic expectations and adapting their coaching skill to youth’s abilities (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). For example, youth coaches will benefit from understanding that the last part of the brain to develop is the pre-frontal cortex, which is responsible for executive functioning skills that assist in self-regulation, complex decision-making, memory, focus, and impulsivity (Males, 2009; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; Waring, 2008).

Understanding gender as well as cultural differences is crucial to providing individualized and appropriate coaching. Differences in the maturation and development of boys and girls make it imperative that coaches use a gender-responsive focus (Lindgren, 2007). Self-identity develops differently for adolescents, and at different stages (Arnett, 2000; Gilligan; 1982; Muuss, 2006; Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001).

Social divisions and inequities can compound developmental pathways, and those related to ability, gender, race and ethnicity are significant (Furlong, 2009). Poverty is strongly associated with all risk behaviors of adolescence (Males, 2009). Immigrant youth and refugees have additional losses and acculturation issues that need to be considered (Heger Boyle, 2009).
Huebner, Walker and McFarland (2003) discuss concerns about an “unspoken assumption that anyone can work with young people” (p. 206) and problems that can arise when untrained professionals work with youth. A recommendation of Kahn and colleagues (2000) from the Konopka Institute for Best Practices in Adolescent Health in Minneapolis, Minnesota is that “Youth serving professionals and providers will receive cross-disciplinary training on youth development concepts and on components of effective youth program development for prevention, intervention and health promotion” (p. 23). Sleeper-Triplett states, “...youth coaches need to be well trained in coaching and nuances of adolescents” (2008, p. 20). Shek and Wai agree that whomever is going to implement a program for youth needs to have an understanding of adolescent development (2008). According to the National Association of Social Workers standards of practice, “Appropriate and effective work with adolescents requires an understanding of the developmental skills and tasks characteristic of the age, an awareness of the psychosocial and emotional phases of adolescence” (p. 8).

**Group facilitation training.** Youth coaches who provide groups could benefit from group facilitation training, as well as training that is specific to group coaching. Even school counselors, often are in charge of groups in schools, have reported feeling under-prepared for working with adolescents in groups (Goodrich & Luke, 2010).

Britton (2010) describes the principles of coaching in groups include all of the core competencies of coaching which are applied within a small-group process. The intended benefit of group coaching is that the group process has potential to maximize the combined experience and energy in order to achieve individual goals.
The group process takes advantage of youths’ developmental instinct to be with peers. Youth development is an interactive process and programs are developed with the understanding that youth will learn life skills through various structured programs including groups (Huebner Walker & McFarland, 2003. Being in a group setting provides the ability to try out new techniques, skills or ideas in a safe environment, which in turn helps to solidify learning (Garrett, 2005; Maddocks, 2007).

Knowing how to work with a group of adolescents is a necessary part of creating a safe and supportive learning environment (Grumpert & Black, 2006; Jagendorf & Malekoff, 2006; Konopka, 2006; Kurland & Salmon, 2006; Maddocks, 2007; Malekoff, 2007; Ward, 2008). Group facilitation requires flexibility and a conceptual framework to guide your actions with adolescents (Malakoff, 2007). Group leaders are expected to have a wide variety of cognitive techniques and be able to use them in a developmentally appropriate manner (Augustyniak, Brooks, Rinaldo, Bogner, & Hodges, 2009). After learning the basics of group facilitation, the easiest way to learn how to facilitate a group is by doing it. However, this should be done with guidance and supervision for new facilitators. It is one thing to attend training on facilitation skills, and another to actually do it. Supervision or co-facilitation for new facilitators is important. This provides a venue for processing the group experience, debriefing and strategizing for the next group session.

Youth coaches who provide groups could benefit from group facilitation training, as well as group coaching specific training. The principles of coaching in groups include all of the core competencies of coaching (see Chapter 1 for more details). Britton defines group coaching as: “a small-group process throughout which there is the application of
coaching principles for the purposes of personal or professional development, the achievement of goals, or greater self-awareness, along thematic or non-thematic lines” (2010, p. 6).

**Ethics training.** Most professionals that work with other people require some formal ethics training, and this is particularly true for those who serve youth in the U.S. Most coaches could benefit from greater guidance in their ethical decision-making in resolving every day ethical dilemmas (Duffy & Passmore, 2010). Basic ethics training should include youth specific legal and moral obligations, such as obtaining prior parental permission for working with minor youth, not exploiting youth as clients, not having a sexual relationship with clients, mandatory reporting and duty-to-warn laws (although these requirements differ by country) and ideally extend to include decision-making frameworks for situations that will arise in the coaching experiences with youth. Ethical areas of concern listed in the British Psychological Society’s Code of Ethics (2009) include addressing potential concerns regarding multiple relationships, personal relationships, unclear or inadequate standards of practice, breaches of confidentiality, competence and research issues.

Many coach training programs do not include formal training in recognition or referral of mental health issues (Spence, Cavanagh & Grant, 2006). How can coaches best serve clients by referral for mental health when they themselves do not recognize these issues? (Stewart, O’Riordan & Palmer, 2008). Although the ICF code of ethics does not specifically mention mental health issues, they do have on their website under the “assets and tools” for members a “Top Ten Indicators to Refer a Client to a Mental
Health Professional.” Spence and colleagues (2006) raise questions about the degree to which current training assists coaches in their ethical obligations.

In coaching, there are various coaching associations that require members to follow a code of ethics. Coaches have an obligation to uphold high ethical standards, promote ethical behavior, attitudes and judgments (British Psychological Society, 2009; IAAC, 2010; ICF, 2010c). The Coaching Academy’s youth coaching diploma requires a part of the training to include ethical boundaries (2010). In the review of literature, only one study (Passmore & Brown, 2009) described specific ethics training, including boundaries, for the adults hired and trained to deliver the coaching intervention study. The adults trained in coaching skills were required to attend training in ethics and boundaries. None of the other youth coaching studies reviewed clarified ethical training.

Ethical areas of concern listed in the British Psychological Society’s Code of Ethics (2009) are: multiple relationships, personal relationships, unclear or inadequate standards of practice, breaches of confidentiality, competence and research issues (p. 6). To lessen confusion, Stout Rostron (2009) recommends that the five available codes of ethics that exist in the coaching industry be combined to create a universal code although this has not yet been done (2009).

**Core Principles**

This next section will describe the literature as it fits within the domain of Core Principles including ethics, boundaries, logistics, and agenda.

**Ethics.** The core principles aspect of ethics is in addition to the ethics training recommended by the model. Ethical principles involve the ability to apply ethical understandings (learned in training) in daily coaching interactions, as well as follow a
formal code of ethics. Brock (2006) questions where coaches are to align their ethical code because her review of laws and regulations revealed no specificity directed towards coaching. Maxwell (2009) describes the reality that coaches must decide on their own limits of their practice and has concerns “that coaches may (unwittingly) cause harm to their clients through ignorance or failure to exercise the appropriate duty of care” (p. 151). The literature review revealed no additional studies describing how coaches follow ethical standards or demonstrate the ability to do so.

There is also the ethics of referring coaching clients, when they are best served through other services. These include the issues addressed by coaches working with clients who have severe mental health issues. According to Grant and Cavanagh (2007a), coaching clients have the same level of mental health problems as is found in the general population.

Informed consent is a part of the ethical code of the ICF (2010b) and coaches need to actively obtain consent when working with youth. Consent and confidentiality laws exist to protect youth, and often support the ability for youth to get needed services (Konopka Institute, 1999; Lerand, 2007). Confidentiality in health care settings in the U.S. means an agreement to protect information shared (between patient and provider) unless explicit permission is given (Lerand, 2007). The ICF code includes guidelines on informed consent with clients including having clear agreements or contracts, and explaining prior to the start of coaching limits of confidentiality (2010c). Sleeper-Triplett (2010) discusses the importance of informed consent including clear information of if, how and when the parent is involved in the coaching process (2010).
Criminal background checks or investigation is a pre-screening process that includes looking up a person’s criminal history. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (or a similar agency) does background checks in the U.S. A background check is done to protect minor youth, and is often a pre-employment requirement for those who work with youth in order to identify individuals who may be inappropriate (Erwin & Toomey, 2005). Individuals who have been convicted of a felony or any crime that may put a child at risk may be denied the privilege of working with youth under the age of 18 years old. Passmore and Brown (2009) reported that they had criminal background checks done on their trained coaches prior to the start of their work; no other studies reported whether or not criminal background checks were done as part of their research involving coaching youth.

**Boundaries.** Delineation of roles and responsibilities is essential for coaching youth. Healthy boundaries need to be set and maintained because when coaches work with youth they are role modeling many things including boundaries. In the studies reviewed, only one clarified some strategies used to confirm coach awareness of boundaries. Passmore and Brown (2009) provided training and tips from a child protection worker to their trained coaches and emphasized “consideration was also given to ethical issues particularly around boundaries, with young adults in their early twenties working with impressionable and pressurized young people” (p. 57).

**Logistics.** Coaches need to consider aspects outside of the actual coaching that may affect the success of the experience for youth. Logistics are what coaches need to pay attention to and possibly adapt their own planning due to the developmental needs of
youth. These include transportation issues, coaching venues, session time and frequency, technology and flexibility.

**Offering multiple venues for coaching.** Developmentally appropriate services will assist in the success of the experience for youth (Shek & Wai, 2008), which can include venues offered. Non-traditional methods may be more successful with coaching youth; coaches traditionally offer telephone coaching, and some offer in-person coaching and it is a common expectation that the client will call the coach to initiate a session. Two studies using telephone coaching with youth had difficulties with the youth calling the coaches (Grey et al, 2009; Gorczynski et al. 2008). In another study with university students, participants gave feedback that although they enjoyed the study and found the intervention beneficial, they would have preferred to be coached in person rather than over the telephone (van Zandvoort et al. 2009). Coaches can adapt their coaching by offering a variety of choices youth can consider when deciding how to work with the coach. By offering a variety of venues for coaching, the individual needs of youth clients can be better met.

Youth in this generation have not experienced life without cell phones and the Internet and although they might prefer coaching in person, there are other potentially useful benefits to their comfort with technology. An Australian study with teenagers ages 13 to 16 found that using text messages and email for contact with youth worked well and suggest that this form of contact is an effective intervention for improving adolescent health behaviors (Kornman et al., 2010).

**Session frequency and length.** Due to the developmental and generational needs of younger clients, coaching sessions may need to be shorter or more frequent (Sleeper-
Shorter sessions may be appropriate, as some youth may lose attention and focus in longer sessions. Youth may also need the coaching relationship to continue for a longer period of time than adult clients, and they might take longer to develop a trusting relationship, depending on their experiences with adults (Brodie & Howson, 2007; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). When coaching adolescent females, attention to relationships is a key to assisting their psychosocial development (Lindgren, 2007). Time needs to be allowed to attend to not only the coach/client relationship, but to the relationships that affect their lives.

Gorczynski and colleagues (2008) suggested their study duration was not long enough as a possible rational for low adherence and impact of coaching on 12–14 year old youth. In the 10 studies reviewed, youth were coached between 30–60 minutes with the duration ranging from nine sessions to a year.

**Tech savvy.** This generation of youth has been raised with instant and immediate access to information through technology but coaches should not assume that this is always the best method of coaching or communication with them. In one study reviewed, younger youth did not respond as optimally as expected to standard telephone coaching (Gorczynski, et al. 2008). Instead, coaches may need to provide in person coaching with short check-ins in between sessions that could be done via phone calls or text messaging (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). The Edge Foundation (2010) found that some teenagers and young adults benefit from daily short check-ins by telephone or texting. Texting or email has also been demonstrated to be an acceptable intervention with some adolescents (Korman et al. 2010).
Agenda. The ICF core competencies clearly state that the coach is to attend to the client’s agenda, not that of the coach (2010d, para 5). Although this can be an issue with ‘internal coaches’ who are hired by an agency, there is no clear guidance in the literature regarding youth coaches being hired by parents or other adults. None of the youth coaching studies reviewed mentioned this issue.

Core Methods

Core methods are key aspects of youth coaching, including common focus areas and approaches that have an approach that is unique to their age and development. These are identity and self-awareness; social and life skills; goal setting and achievement; educational success; parent or family; access to resources; and individual or group coaching.

Strengthening self. Identity development is a normal part of adolescence. Identity development, transitions, along with risk and protective factors will differ for each individual youth and is influenced by age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability and socio-economic status (Arnett, 2000; Bernat & Resnick, 2006; Furlong, 2009; Mau, 2006; Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001). The National Association of Social Workers (2003) standards for work with adolescents includes knowledge of the “significance of adolescents’ steps in establishing an identity, which may include a natural form of rebelliousness and rejection of authority” (p. 5).

Carol Gilligan explains identity develops different in gender (1982) and that in general, adolescent males develop their identity in relation to the world around them and how to focus and get ahead in that world. Adolescent females, on the other hand develop their identity in relationship with others. They focus on maneuvering through those
relationships while managing their lives. Coaches working with youth often utilize different tools to assist youth in learning more about themselves. This is often done through values identification, learning and practicing using their strengths, increasing self-awareness and exploring their future.

Developmentally, youth are trying to figure out who they are and how they fit into the world. Without self-awareness, youth may not perceive a need for coaching or realize that it would be beneficial to address certain behaviors (Gorczynski, et al., 2008). Self-awareness is crucial for change; coaching can assist youth in self-awareness leading to identification of social skills needed for coaching (Creasy & Paterson, 2005).

In the reviewed youth coaching studies, coaching has been found to support development and understanding of self in various ways including increasing confidence, motivation, hardiness and hope, self-acceptance and well-being in 9 of the 10 reviewed studies. Only Gorczynski and colleagues (2008) found no benefits of coaching, although anecdotally, the youth reported to enjoy discussing health related issues with their coach.

**Values.** Developmentally, youth are often trying out different values, and establishing which familial values they will keep for their own, and which they will discard (Arnett, 2000; Muuss, 2006). The Values In Action (VIA) online survey has been adapted to fit youth development. The six categories of values listed are as follows VIA Institute, 2010, para 1–6):

1. **Wisdom and Knowledge**—cognitive strengths that include: creativity, curiosity, judgment, open-mindedness, love of learning and perspective

2. **Courage**—emotional strengths that include: bravery, perseverance, honesty and zest
3. Humanity—interpersonal strengths that include: the capacity to love, be loved, kindness and social intelligence

4. Justice—civic strengths that include: teamwork, fairness and leadership

5. Temperance—strengths that protect against excess and include: forgiveness and mercy, modesty and humility, prudence and self-regulation

6. Transcendence—strengths that help our connections and provide meaning that include: appreciation of beauty and excellence, gratitude, hope, humor and religiousness and spirituality.

According to Park and Peterson (2008) who examined the VIA inventory of strengths for youth “student academic achievement is influenced by a set of character strengths above and beyond intelligence, which means that these strengths – notably perseverance, gratitude and hope – should be recognized, celebrated and encouraged” (p. 89).

Strengths. Adolescence is a time full of uncertainty and unstable moods. Identifying strengths can assist youth in feeling more secure in themselves, support increased self esteem, and healthy psychosocial development (Bromley, Johnson & Cohen, 2006). Assisting people to build on their strengths can support successful change (Choong & Britton, 2007). Increased self-awareness and identity can support youth in making more confident and positive decisions. Strengths are often described in terms of character development. Park and Peterson (2008) explored positive psychology and strengths based work with youth; they found that “character strengths are related to achievement, life satisfaction and well-being of children and youth” (p. 85). Seligman (2002) contends that assisting youth to identify and use their strengths may support them
in living a fulfilling life; increasing self-esteem and decreasing depression. Identifying and utilizing client strengths should guide both assessment as well as coaching intervention (Linley & Harrington, 2006).

None of the youth coaching studies reviewed specifically mentioned targeting youth’s strengths. However, utilizing a strengths based approach is a cornerstone of coaching, because coaches operate from a premise that each client is resourceful and capable (ICF, 2010; Linley & Harrington, 2006; Linley, Woolston, & Biswas-Diener, 2009). Grant (2003b) describes how a solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral model of coaching is associated with increased goal attainment. The strengths approach is also the common for social workers (Rapp, Saleebey, & Sullivan, 2005), and the norm for healthy youth development (Huebner et al., 2003) and positive psychology (Seligman, 2002).

Attending to strengths supports client development and self esteem (Bromley et al., 2006). Coaches are in a key position to support strength identification and development as well as practice using strengths, which is crucial (Govindji & Linley, 2007; Seligman et al., 2005).

Rapp et al. (2005) identify the six hallmarks of strengths-based social work practice, which fit with the coaching philosophy:

1. It is goal oriented;
2. Systematic assessment of strengths;
3. The environment is seen as rich in resources;
4. Explicit methods are used for using client and environmental strengths for goal attainment;
5. The relationship is hope-inducing; and,
6. The provision of meaningful choices is central and clients have the authority to choose (p. 81–83).

**Increasing skills.** Coaching youth often includes facilitating the practice of social skills. Developmentally, adolescence is the time to learn and practice the skills that will be needed to be a successful adult. Many youth have not had sufficient opportunities to practice life skills needed for independence (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004). Life skills help youth build competence needed for human development (Mangrulkar, Whitman, & Posner, 2001). Social skills that could be increased through strengths work include cooperation, assertion, empathy and self-control (Park & Peterson, 2006). Which social skills should be the focus depends on the needs of the group or individual.

Mangrulkar and colleagues (2001) explored life skills in relationship to healthy development and identified three key categories of life skill development in youth (p. 6):

- Social or interpersonal skills (including communication, negotiation/refusal skills, assertiveness, cooperation and empathy).
- Cognitive skills (including problem solving, understanding consequences, decision making, critical thinking and self-evaluation).
- Emotional coping skills (including managing stress, managing feelings, self-management and self monitoring skills).

Coaches know that goals setting and accountability are cornerstones of coaching. Goal setting for youth is different. They often have not learned how to set achievable goals (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Green and colleagues state “goal setting is central to life coaching and a foundation of self-regulation” (2006, p. 149). Setting inappropriate goals
may lead to a path of self-destruction (Pink, 2009). Youth may need to re-adjust goals frequently and have acknowledgement for progress (Bartholomew, 2008), and weekly goal setting has been beneficial to youth (Rolo & Gould, 2007). Interventions with youth that emphasize goal setting as well as modifying negative beliefs about goal attainment is helpful for generating hope (Rolo & Gould, 2007). A coach can be instrumental in setting goals and helping develop action steps for youth to achieve those goals (Sleeper-Triplett, 2008). Youth can experience success with smaller goals. This can provide motivation to continue working on other goals.

In the 10 youth coaching studies reviewed, each utilized goal setting in different ways. In three of the studies, youth set goals related to their health (Gorczynski et al, 2008; Grey et al. 2009; van Zandvoort et al. 2009). Powers et al. (2001) focused goal setting related to transition planning for students with disabilities. The remainder focused on academic improvement and other areas (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004; Green et al., 2007; Lacefield et al., 2010; Passmore & Brown, 2009; Rolo & Gould, 2007).

Supporting education. The seven studies (listed above) reviewed that supported education, did so in various ways. Some targeted education and academic achievement directly (Lacefield et al., 2010; Passmore & Brown, 2009; Rolo & Gould, 2007). Others, targeted coping or skill building, which in turn positively impacted the educational experience of youth (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004; Green et al., 2007; Powers et al., 2001).

Including parent. Parents and family have and continue to be an important influence on a youth’s development (Muuss, 2006; Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001).
A natural component of youth coaching is the dilemma of how and when to include the parents/guardians and sometimes the family.

The ICF Code of Ethics does not specifically mention minor youth coaching. However, in the “Ethics FAQ’s” listed on their website, an example is given about how to deal with a parent when coaching a 12-year-old child (ICF, 2010c). The example provided specifies that the 12 year old would be the ‘client’ and so the coach would not be able to discuss information about the coaching sessions without the permission of that client.

Youth coaching considers the youth as the primary client and would not involve the parent in the actual coaching sessions (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). It is also important to include the family in the coaching experience so they can support any successes. This may vary according to age and if they are living at home.

Working with youth under the age of 18 requires the involvement of the parents or legal guardians. Their prior written consent is required for participation in coaching. Parental involvement and communication in youth coaching can vary in amount. It can be a key to the success of the coaching. For minors, parents should be involved in the pre-screening as well as the intake process (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Appropriate communication between coaches and parent/guardians can assist and reinforce the coaching. Confidentiality, however, is a key to this communication. The youth are in charge of what information is shared with the parent. They are encouraged to update their parents about their goals and progress. Youth continue to be influenced by their parents and family connectedness is a protective factor (Bernat & Resnick, 2009).
Of the reviewed studies, none specifically mentioned working with parents as a part of the actual coaching intervention. Powers and colleagues included a parental support component separate from the coaching (2001) in the form of home visits, telephone support and monthly workshops that included the youth, parents and mentors. Gorczynski and colleagues recommend that coaches consider including parents in the youth’s coaching sessions, as parents have influence that may promote behavioral change (2008).

Parental consent for coaching was described as being required by 4 of the 10 studies (Green et al., 2007; Grey et al., 2009; Gorczynski et al., 2008; Powers et al., 2001). Campbell and Gardner included parents in the orientation session about the coaching intervention (2005). Passmore and Brown discuss involvement of parents, including them from the beginning to assure them about the study and in the discussion mentioned how coaching can supplement the parental role by providing goals and encouragement to students (2009). Lacefield and colleagues (2010) included parent surveys as a part of the intervention tracking.

**Accessing resources.** Despite the importance of youth being able to access resources, only Powers and colleagues specifically included knowledge for youth of resources that would facilitate their goal achievement, as well as support for parents finding community resources in order to support their child (2001).

**Providing individual or group coaching.** In core methods, groups are referred to in the *practice* of providing group coaching, as opposed to the training discussed under core knowledge. Youth coaches often offer both individual and group sessions. Because adolescents usually seek out their peers to spend time together, coaching in groups is a
natural way to work with youth. Groups have been found to increase pro-social behaviors in youth (Augustyniak et al. 2009), and have strong abilities to produce action (Konopka, 2006). Youth in groups can try out new skills learned and receive feedback and support from peers (Maddock, 2007; Malekoff, 2007; Ward, 2008). Peer group members can support each other between sessions in a way that is not possible for coaches. Involvement in groups can support leadership skill development in youth (Williams, 2006).

Of the 10 studies reviewed, 1 utilized a group coaching intervention (Rolo & Gould, 2007). Powers et al. 2001 discussed that although the intervention provided was individual, a small group approach is more common to implement the intervention, and should be considered. Rolo and Gould (2007) utilized 10 group sessions and 2 individual for a total of 12 sessions. Group size was limited to nine participants in order to facilitate improved interaction and effectiveness of group discussions. The groups included activities, games, discussions, stories and quotes, pictures and worksheets.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

Evidenced based research supports that coaching benefits youth in multiple ways including improvement in academic success, hope and overall well-being, goal attainment and motivation, self confidence, life and social skills (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Green et al., 2007; Grey et al., 2009; Passmore & Brown, 2009).

Currently, youth coaches are operating within their own perceived models of coaching. A few coach training organizations have created youth coaching models in order to support the learning and development of other coaches. As this field continues to develop, we run the risk of continuing to blur the definitions and boundaries of this
niche. Conducting research to describe the scope and influence of coaching will support streamlining this field as it expands. Providing a uniform model of coaching youth has potential to contribute to successful coaching experiences for youth.

Coaching and youth literature support individual elements of the model proposed in Chapter 1. Gathering information about current practices for those who are coaching youth will be an important aspect of defining a youth coaching model. More research is needed to provide evidence supporting the current belief that life coaching can positively impact the lives of youth (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Passmore & Brown, 2009). Coaching research should advance the field, not the individual (Kauffman, et al., 2008). This is especially true for emerging fields, as generalized knowledge is still being gathered.

A theme with coaching research is emerging; student self-reports suggest that coaching is beneficial even though there may not be statistically significant differences. Campbell and Gardner (2005) found that students who were not coached reported more problems and feeling less able to deal with relationships and academic effort. There is a need for research to replicate their finding that “coaching increases motivation at a time when motivations tends to decrease for youth” (p. 8). Since coaching research is multi-disciplinary in nature, Bachkirova and Kauffman (2008) suggest that subjective information can be as powerful as objective, and that by relying only on empirical evidence we would be missing a part of the truth of what we do in coaching. Coaching research is needed to improve our understanding of the coaching process and to refine it. The outcomes for clients also need to be clarified (Linley, 2006). Future research should also include groups of students not previously involved in research such
as students in elementary or middle school (Green et al., 2007). Studies that compare life coaching interventions with tutoring or positive parental involvement will further advance our knowledge of coaching and how it is distinct from other interventions supporting healthy youth development and success (Green et al., 2007).
It is important to research current youth coaching practices because this specialty area is becoming more prevalent, with little research available (Green et al., 2007; Passmore & Brown, 2009). A handful of research studies with youth provide a solid basis for the belief that coaching is beneficial to youth. It is important to determine components of effective methods for coaching youth. I had many questions about coaching youth, which prompted this research.

- Is it distinctive from adults?
- Are youth vulnerable and in need of protection?
- Do coaches use a systematic approach?
- Do they follow a code of ethics?
- What differences specific to age and developmental stages exist?
- Do youth coaches need additional or different training?
- When is it appropriate to include parents?
- Is having ‘no agenda’ true with youth, as for coaching adults? If so, how does it fit with youth targeted for leadership development, educational success, social skills and managing ADHD symptoms?
These question examples led me to create the proposed model for coaching youth. I wanted to compare this model to the perceptions and practices of other youth coaches.

**Research Approach**

As described in Chapter 1, the three components in the proposed youth coaching model are interrelated. Figure 3.1 below demonstrates the relationship. The core knowledge provides the foundation for, and influences the principles and methods. The core principles influence the methods.

![Diagram of Relational Components of Model]

**Figure 3.1. Relational Components of Model.**

This research study will clarify the relationship between some of the individual variables within each component and if possible, the relationships between and among the three components. I believe the core knowledge and its impact on the other two components is crucial to successful youth coaching. I expect that the results of this study will support the importance of these relationships and provide rich information about current youth coaching practices. The responsibility for much of the success of youth coaching lies in the coaches themselves, including their background, knowledge, experience and practices.
The intent of this research is twofold: a) to inform the coaching practices of this emerging coaching specialty area (youth), and to b) provide evidence that supports the use of this proposed model for guidance and practices of coaching this population.

**Research Design**

This research design is descriptive in nature and cross-sectional in time. A cross-sectional descriptive design is most often used when attempting to describe population characteristics. This is especially true in an emerging profession of an understudied or unknown population.

The study is by nature, both confirmatory and exploratory. It is confirmatory in that an analysis will be done of the association between the proposed youth coaching model and self-reported answers from the target population. I used the proposed model as a basis for the survey. I gathered information from existing life coaches about their practice in coaching youth. This study is also exploratory, because I am researching a coaching specialty area that is new. I surveyed youth coaches about their current practices and perceptions.

**Instrumentation**

**Instrument Design**

I created the online survey, including structured and semi-structured questions. These questions were formulated based on information gathered from the conceptual framework and the literature review. I created the survey and therefore many of the items have not been validated as scales. To address this, two processes were used. Step one involved piloting the survey with five volunteer youth coaches who fit the target population. In addition to responding to the survey, they answered several questions...
about the survey such as clarity of the survey questions, any important information they felt was missing or not assessed, and time taken to complete the survey. Based on their feedback, I refined the survey.

Step two involved refining and developing the survey to elicit information about coaching practice and coaching development/capacity building. Practice-related questions included the amount of training (in coaching, adolescent development, group facilitation and ethics) received; time spent in coaching; and agreements and specific practices distinctive from coaching adults. Questions about building capacity included perceptions about the adequacy of their training to help them be successful in coaching youth.

Survey

The full survey that was posted online can be found in Appendix A. I began the survey with an opening page that introduced who I am, the purpose of survey, eligibility to complete the survey, time commitment, respondent confidentiality, incentives and how to contact me. For Facebook and Twitter where less character space was required, I used a shorter announcement (see Appendix B for example). Reminders were posted on websites every 2 weeks for the 6-week duration of the survey with a short update on the survey and request for completion (see Appendix C). The survey completion was anonymous. No deeply personal questions were asked, which lessoned the risk for any individual. Questions were asked related to their perceptions of coaching youth.

I began the survey with a question to qualify participants and explained, “For this survey, I am defining ‘youth’ as adolescents under the age of 21 (which includes both high school and college students). I need to find out if you qualify to be a survey
participant with this next question.” The question that followed was “Have you ever coached youth aged 20 or younger?” If respondents answered “yes” they were taken to a page to complete the rest of the survey. If respondents answered “no” that they have not coached youth of this age, they were taken to a page thanking them for their participation and offering them a copy of the survey summary (see Appendix D).

The survey naturally separated into pages containing 51 questions organized by key coaching areas including coaching methods (i.e., pre-set strategies or methods coaches use with youth), coaching principles (i.e., experiences related to preparation to coach youth including establishing agreements and adhering to mandated reporting laws), coaching logistics (i.e., adapting processes to reflect developmental needs of youth), and demographics and key knowledge (i.e., level of training received, certification).

No deeply personal questions were asked, which reduced any risks associated with completing the survey. The survey ended with a page thanking participants for taking the time to complete the survey, instructions on how to sign up for the incentive as well as how to sign up to receive a copy of the survey summary (see Appendix E) at study completion.

**Target Population**

The target population of the study are adults who identify themselves as life coaches; who self report that they have experience coaching adolescents (between the ages 13–20) and who associate with other coaches. The association with other coaches is to be through at least one professional coaching association, organization or group. Due to the global nature of coaching and participants in ICF, I anticipated responses from around the world. I conveniently sampled these adults by targeting social networking
sites where coaches associate regardless of membership status. The Human Subjects Research Panel at the International University of Professional Studies approved this study prior to beginning the research.

**Data Collection Procedures**

An introductory email or note was posted to a website or list-serve in the selected participant pool explaining the research study and asked for voluntary participation. All study announcements included a link to the on-line survey site (Survey Monkey, 2010). I also included my email address for them to contact me if the survey link was faulty or if they had difficulties accessing the survey. Through recruitment venues identified below, coaches were also asked to forward the survey link to other known youth coaches who fit the target population. Those that forwarded the survey or posted the link in a public place were asked to send me an email with either the number of people the survey was forwarded to and/or the public site where the survey link was posted. This viral or snowball recruitment approach was used to increase the sample size of the unknown and previously un-sampled target population.

I monitored the incoming surveys via survey monkey. Within the first few hours of posting the live survey link, I received five emails from youth coaches who had attempted to complete the survey and could not (they were immediately taken to the last page). I made the necessary correction within Survey Monkey (my error) and deleted the first seven responses that fit the described problem (less than 2 minutes and only first question answered). All respondents emailed they would try again at a later time. In order to give time for the snowball effect, I used a data collection period of 6 weeks
(October 26–December 5, 2010). I posted reminders periodically on the various sites to encourage high response rates.

**Social Networking Sites**

These are the specific social networking sites and websites used to post the information and survey link:

1. ICF Teen Special Interest Group online group site
2. LinkedIn
   a. Minnesota Coaches Association (MCA) group
   b. International Association of Coaching (IAC) group
   c. ICF group
   d. Student Career Coaching and Mentoring group
   e. Online Counseling network
   f. CHOICE Magazine group
   g. My LinkedIn profile posts
3. Co-Active Network
   a. Youth Coaching & Leadership group
   b. Education group
   c. Main Community Public Discussions group
4. Twitter (my account)
5. Facebook
   a. My profile page
   b. My business’ fan page
   c. Global Coach Conference
d. The Coaching Academy

e. ICF

f. Edge Foundation fan page

g. Teen Experts fan page

6. Coaching Commons website

7. Global Coach Café Skype conference meeting about coaching

I also verbally announced the study and gave a business card with a copy of the
link to the survey in two places: The Institute for Life Coach Training alumni gathering at
ICF annual international conference in Fort Worth, Texas and the Minnesota Coaches’
Association monthly meeting.

Survey Monkey

An online survey site, Survey Monkey, was utilized for data collection and
management. After I created the survey, I manually entered and designed the questions
directly on the Survey Monkey website. Participants were given a link to the survey, and
confidentially completed the survey online.

Incentives

As a thank you, I offered two incentives to participate in this research.
Participants had the opportunity to: a) sign up to receive a summary of the survey results,
and b) have their name placed into a drawing for a free new iPod. After completing the
survey, participants were given the researcher’s email address. If they wanted a summary
of the completed research, they could send a request to this email. In this way, their
request for a copy of the research was not linked to the survey they completed.
Participants were also asked if they wanted to be placed into a drawing for a free iPod. If they responded ‘yes’ they were given a unique email address to send their contact information to enter the drawing. This email address was created and used for this drawing only. Participant’s name and contact information were not linked to the survey completed. After the close of the survey link, I randomly selected a ‘winner’ of the free iPod. With permission, the winner’s first name and location of residence was announced on the initially published sites.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

The main goal of this survey was to inform and provide evidence that supports the use of the proposed model for the practice of coaching youth. Survey results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, inferential statistics and for open-ended responses, the qualitative approach of content analysis.

Quantitative questions were analyzed descriptively, including percent distributions, means, and standard deviations for categorical and continuous variables. Cross-tabulations between variables were conducted as appropriate for comparisons. Cronbach’s alpha values were reported for scales to establish internal consistency of the scale items. Chi-square and fisher’s exact tests, as well as independent sample t-tests were used to examine differences between groups of respondents. The expectation is that the variables within the same areas have high agreement. Content validity of the survey items was also determined through the initial piloting of the survey. Linear and generalized linear models were used to assess associations. Linear models (regression analysis) were considered when outcome variables were scale type, and generalized linear model (logistic regression) were used when outcome variables were binary.
Utilizing both linear and generalized linear models provides an adequate methodology to measure associations between variables with the possibility to adjust for potential confounders. Paired sample t-tests measured differences in means across variables.

Qualitative responses were analyzed manually, with all responses printed out, coded and sorted into themes as described by Padgett (2008). These data results were reported alongside the quantitative data results.

I evaluated whether the proposed coaching model responds to the youth coaching practice, in the following categories: 1) knowledge: coach training, adolescent development, group facilitation and ethics; 2) coaching principles in the agreement stage of coaching: ethics, boundaries, logistics and agenda; and 3) methods used by youth coaches (strengthening self, increasing skills, supporting education, accessing resources, and offering both individual and/or group). The association of variables between the three components (core knowledge, core principles and core methods) was analyzed.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the survey results and analysis are discussed. Participants were between 23 and 65 years of age (mean age group 46–55) and mostly female (69%). One hundred thirty-two respondents began the online survey. Only the first question of the survey required an answer, “Do you or have you coached youth under age 21?” I eliminated 42 responses from the data analysis for two reasons: a) the first question was answered negatively that they have not coached youth under the age of 21 (n=2) or b) only the first question was answered in the survey (n=40). This yielded a final sample size of 90. Respondents did not answer every question, and so percentages reported are related specifically to each individual question. Appropriate statistics were used to quantify agreement, utilizing both the qualitative and quantitative data collected. Using the STATA program (StataCorp, 2009), Cronbach’s alpha, chi-square, t-tests, paired t-tests, linear and logic regression models were used.

In this chapter, I will first describe the demographics and characteristics of the coaches who completed the survey (N=90). Then I will discuss my research questions, organizing the survey results around those questions. Lastly, I will present my preliminary analysis of the data related to my research questions.

Participants
The respondents for this study were English speaking adults (N=90) from at least 10 countries. They identify themselves as life coaches, with experience coaching youth (under the age of 21) and associate professionally with other coaches. I analyzed all responses from coaches who responded, “yes” that they do or they have coached youth aged 20 or younger. They answered various types of questions about their perceptions and experiences coaching youth. Examples of responses requested include, yes or no; giving a percentage; writing an open-ended response; choosing one answer from multiple options; choosing many answers from multiple options; five point and seven-point Likert scales and choosing a percentage. Please see Appendix A for complete survey.

Due to the viral nature of this study, I asked a question about how participants found their way to the survey link (see Table 4.1), and if they saw the link in multiple places to list all, so the numbers will not add up to 100%.

Table 4.1

Where Survey Link was Accessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>35 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>18 (24.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking</td>
<td>21 (28.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>5 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF Conf.*</td>
<td>4 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>3 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ICF International Conference in Dallas Ft. Worth, Texas, October 2010

Many social networking sites have the ability for members of groups to receive new postings to the group via email. This may be one of the reasons for the high number of email responses. Another reason is that I put in a request for others to forward
the survey link to other youth coaches they know. There were 18 respondents that completed the “other” category, which allowed for descriptive comments. Of those, two other categories were mentioned: “Twitter” and “ICF colleagues”.

**Demographics**

Demographics reported include gender, race and ethnicity, age, country of residence, education, professional status, membership and certification. Of the 90 respondents, not all provided all the demographic information. See Table 4.2 for demographic characteristics including age, country of residence, and education level.

Table 4.2

*Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50 (68.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–36</td>
<td>9 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>23 (31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>26 (35.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–65</td>
<td>14 (18.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66–75</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of residence</td>
<td>74 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>41 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US</td>
<td>33 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coach Training, Certification

Of the respondents who answered the question about coach training (n=75), 99% have had formal coach training, and the majority (67%) have more than 120 hours of formal coach training. Of those, 91% indicated their coach training was accredited, with 67% being accredited through the ICF (see Chapter 1 for thorough description of ICF accreditation and certification). Although the ICF also certifies coaches, the majority (75%) in this study reported not being ICF certified. See Table 4.3 for specific information about respondents’ coaching background including training, certification and membership.

Table 4.3

Coaching Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training (hours)</td>
<td>75 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–20</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–60</td>
<td>3 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–120</td>
<td>17 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120+</td>
<td>50 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Accredited?</td>
<td>74 (82.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Portugal                       | 1 (1.4)   |
| Uruguay                        | 1 (1.4)   |
| Education level                |           |
| High School                    | 74 (100)  |
| Post high school courses       | 5 (6.7)   |
| Associates or vocational       | 7 (9.5)   |
| Bachelor’s or 4 year degree    | 34 (46)   |
| Master’s or Ph.D.              | 28 (37.8) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICF Certification</td>
<td>67 (90.5)</td>
<td>7 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18 (24.7)</td>
<td>55 (75.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73 (81.1)</td>
<td>18 (24.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified elsewhere*</td>
<td>71 (78.9)</td>
<td>37 (52.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34 (47.9)</td>
<td>34 (47.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37 (52.1)</td>
<td>34 (47.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents could also be certified by ICF

**Professional Membership**

Fifty-one respondents (70%) indicated yes to the following question: “Are you a member of a professional organization or association for coaches?” The organizations and associations listed by coaches (n=52) can be seen in detail in Appendix F. Forty-three stated they are members of ICF or ICF local chapters. The remainder of the responses listed 28 separate coaching organizations or associations.

**Other Professional Titles**

Respondents indicated they hold a wide variety of professional titles. In fact, among the 42 who answered this question, there were only a few similarities. The most frequently mentioned titles (mentioned between 3–4 times) included therapist/counselor/psychologist, nurse, social worker, youth worker, consultant psychologist and writer.

**Years of Experience**

Coaches were asked to state how many years they have been coaching and working with youth. The mean number of years experience for the 70 youth coaches who answered the question is as follows:

- Coaching (7.2 years)
- Coaching youth (4.6 years)
• Group coaching (4.8 years)
• Group coaching youth (3.4 years)
• Working professionally with adolescents (6.9 years)
• Working with adolescents as a volunteer (7.1 years)

**Who Else Do You Coach?**

I asked the following question, “Aside from youth ages 13–20, who else do you coach?” Seventy-two of the respondents indicated they also coach adults. Respondents could choose as many categories as they coach, and write in missing specialty areas. I used the same specialty areas as those listed on the ICF website (noted in Chapter 1) as well as included additional age ranges of youth. See Table 4.4 below for details. Thirty respondents (42%) also coach parents; 19 coach families. Thirteen respondents (18%) coach youth under the age of 13.

**Table 4.4**

*Other Coaching Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>19 (26.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>30 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under age 13</td>
<td>13 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (18–25)</td>
<td>48 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>57 (79.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD/HD</td>
<td>13 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Organizations</td>
<td>39 (54.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Transition</td>
<td>44 (61.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other coaches</td>
<td>27 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>15 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>30 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>13 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal (inside an org.)</td>
<td>9 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership 37 (51.4)
Life Vision & Enhancement 31 (43.1)
Personal/Organizational 30 (41.7)
Relationship 25 (34.7)
Small Business 28 (38.9)
Spirituality 14 (19.4)
Therapeutic/Alternative 4 (5.6)

Exposure Groups

I analyzed the quantitative data by using the summary from Survey Monkey, Excel spreadsheets with filters, and STATA (StataCorp, 2009). As a part of the analysis for some of the key questions related to testing the proposed model, I divided the 90 respondents into four different ‘exposure’ groups. (See Table 4.5 below.) My rationale behind the dividing of respondents into these groups was to test my proposed model based on the training background reported by the respondents.

Table 4.5
Respondents Grouped by Reported Hours of Training on Adolescent Development and Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Group 1 Hours (n=27)</th>
<th>Group 2 Hours (n=24)</th>
<th>Group 3 Hours (n=24)</th>
<th>Group 4 Hours (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>&lt;60 (27)</td>
<td>0-8 (24)</td>
<td>0-120 (24)</td>
<td>no info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>60–120 (18)</td>
<td>0 (18)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;120 (9)</td>
<td>1-8 (6)</td>
<td>9–16 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17–24 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25–60 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60–120 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>&lt;60 (27)</td>
<td>&lt;60 (24)</td>
<td>8-20 (1)</td>
<td>no info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-120 (8)</td>
<td>61-120 (20)</td>
<td>21-30 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;120 (19)</td>
<td>&lt;120 (4)</td>
<td>31-60 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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My original thought was to divide the exposure groups into those with a defined ‘high’ amount of training in all four areas: coaching, adolescent development, ethics, and group facilitation. This was not possible due to the sample size and response rates. The most important training variables for me are adolescent development and coach training.

For this analysis, the exposure groups are created from the amount of training in adolescent development and these four groups will be compared to the other training areas. Whenever possible, I discuss differences in responses from the U.S. and non-U.S. participants. For the logistic regression models those with high adolescent development (Group 1) was compared to the other three groups. Most frequently the comparison will be between Group 1 and Group 2 due to lack of information from Groups 3 and 4.

I worked with a statistician on the quantitative statistics using the STATA program. Chi-square, t-tests, paired t-tests, linear regression and logistic regression models were used. I analyzed the qualitative data by hand. I printed, coded and then sorted into themes all the qualitative responses. This coding and thematic development is the most commonly used analytic procedure in qualitative research (Padgett, 2008, p. 151). When quoting respondents I made minor obvious spelling corrections. I cited direct quotes by the automatic anonymous respondent number assigned by Survey Monkey.

**Research Questions**

My primary research question is: “How do the current training, practices and perceptions of youth coaches align with my proposed model?” I believe that coaches
with “high” adolescent development training or experience are more likely to follow my proposed model than coaches with little or no adolescent development training.

Additional research questions that guide this study are:

- Is life coaching an appropriate process to support youth?
- What methodologies or organizing strategies do current youth coaches use, and do different coaches use similar approaches?
- How do the current perceptions and practices of youth coaches fit the proposed model?
- Is coaching youth different than coaching adults?
- What is the relationship between the three components in the model?
- How and when are parents included in a youth’s coaching?
- How are coaches handling working with minor youth, especially related to getting parental consent, mandatory reporting, duty to warn?
- What support do youth coaches need in order to be successful?

I will organize and present the survey results according to the above questions. At the end of this chapter I will provide a brief preliminary analysis.

**Is Life Coaching an Appropriate Process for Youth?**

Eighty-six coaches answered the above question (96%). The predominant response to this quantitative closed-ended question was “yes”; nearly all of the respondents indicated that life coaching is an appropriate process to support youth (n=86; 97%). None of the coaches responded “no” and only three responded “unsure.” Coaches were provided a comment area that said “Please comment about why or why not.” Seventy-eight comments were recorded. I coded each response phrase or words, grouped
them into categories including why coaching supports youth, how coaching supports youth, and considerations.

**Why Coaching Supports Youth**

Coaches felt that coaching supports youth at a time when they are developmentally vulnerable and experiencing many changes and stressors. “Adolescence is a hard time to grow” (1237341734) shared one coach. It is a time “where youth are discovering who they want to be as adults” (1228631849) and struggling with important life decisions (1202723830; 1198106686) that “need to be made in a short time frame” (1198484196). Youth are “not aware of what choices and possibilities exist for them besides what they have learned and ‘doctrinated’ by their families, immediate social circles and TV” (1226641806). “Youth do not like to be lectured to or told what to do” (1199912939). “Youth face many of the same challenges as adults, but without the life experience to know how to interpret, choose, act on these challenges” (1222124975). Coaching is “a safe place for teens to turn to without being a parent or teach is a great space for teens to explore who they are and what they want out of life” (1224494686).

**How Coaching Supports Youth**

The supportive process by which this happens is described in the various contexts provided by coaches, including experience, self, life skills, goals, and future which are explained below.

**Experience.** Respondents expressed how coaching supports youths’ experiences. Coaching is a “perspective awakening tool that gives youth the power to choose a perspective and sculpt a reality” (1233693354). It “affirms their dreams” (1234825410) and “helps them to feel they are not alone” (1234513818). “Youth rarely get the chance
to just say what they are trying to do and process without feedback, judgment or ‘advice’ from most adults they know” (1222343463). “It gives them the opportunity to differently ask questions of themselves and deeply explore their thinking processes, actions and life choices in a very safe environment, with objective others” (1235435699). “The coaching process helps youth be invested in the paths they choose and the decisions they make” (1223642114). “Coaching is a powerful tool to get them unstuck” (1234418541). “It also helps them discover their dreams and goals and then choose to take action to move forward toward their goals and dreams” (1217726846). “It gives them the opportunity to differently ask questions of themselves and deeply explore their thinking processes, actions and life choices in a very safe environment, with objective others.” (1235434599)

**Self.** Respondents overwhelmingly stated how important coaching is for youth to become more self-aware and self-confident. “Because it helps young people explore who they are and what they want in life” (1224170063). “An effective coaching relationship supports and fosters the development of their core strengths and innate gifts” (1219662786). “When youth identify their strengths and values their self awareness develops and it’s the beginning of making conscious choices in alignment with what’s important to them and what they are naturally good at doing” (1199664903). “Youth do not like to be lectured or told what to do. Coaching provides them with an opportunity to gain clarity, self-awareness and their own direction.” (1199912939).

**Life Skills.** Learning skills which will assist youth become responsible adults, was repeatedly mentioned by respondents. Coaching helps them “learn valuable thinking skills, especially around decision-making and self-understanding” (1201493825). “The relationship brings accountability, help in finding resources, challenges, support,
encouragement, time management, etc.” (1199611894). Another coach included how coaching helps youth “take practical steps towards change; helps with self-regulation and accountability as the responsibility for action lies with the young person” (1238301005). “I saw it as a means for young people to take responsibility for their lives” (119820635). “I believe if we coach and teach our youth some important life skills our world will be a better place!” (1199664903).

**Goals.** Goal setting was second only to “understanding who they are” in quantity of comments coaches. Goal achievement and the ability to experience success were also included in these comments. “Coaching helps young people build confidence in goal striving” (1238301005). “Coaching helps teens prioritize their goals when many teens are not even thinking about goals” (1233692408). “They benefited by knowing where they are heading, by discovering clear goals or aspirations” (1197671576). Coaching “also helps them discover their dreams and goals and then choose to take action to move forward toward their goals and dreams” (1217726846).

**Future.** Finding out what youth want, discovering their dreams and desires, identifying and designing a future were all mentioned as important ways that coaching supports youth. “Coaching is an appropriate intervention because it helps young people to identify a preferred long-term or short-term future” (1238301005). “They appreciate being heard and having someone affirm the dreams they are willing to share” (1234825410). Youth benefit from having clarity about where they want to go. “It is a good preparation for youth to plan their future” (1220435653).

**Considerations**
The comments about uncertainty in whether or not coaching is an appropriate process appears to depend on the coach’s skill and the youth’s development. Those coaches expressing uncertainty also gave examples of the benefits of coaching. “I believe it all comes down to the maturity level of the youth as well as their desire for coaching. Way too many times it is the parents that want the coaching for their child and it doesn’t work” (1234781386). “Coaching does work if put in a context students can understand” (1200892351). One coach expressed, “My personal experience is that youth either don’t tell the truth about the questions you ask, or they tell you what they think you want to hear” (1238286765). Trying to coach youth that do not need it was another concern. Another expressed “mentoring works better than coaching for Gen Y . . . coaching works very well for Gen X” (1227999237).

**Benefits Youth Receive from Coaching**

The qualitative open-ended question related to benefits to youth was, “In your experience, what benefits do youth receive from individual coaching?” Eighty-five youth coach respondents (94%) answered this question (n=85). The information gathered from this question has been divided into three categories in order of frequency: 1) self, 2) coaching relationship, and 3) tools/life skills. See Table 4.6 below. The category of “self” contains listed benefits that the youth receive related to themselves; identity; confidence; well-being, and thoughts about their future. Under the category ‘coaching relationship’ the benefits that youth receive are related to the actual experience of being in a positive coaching relationship and what it provides. The last category refers to which tools, life skills or strategies youth gain from the coaching experience.

Table 4.6
Benefits to Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Benefit</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Non-judgmental, supportive and safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being listened to and valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective and objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self

The first and strongest message relayed from this question relates directly to the youth’s sense (experience) of self. Sixty-nine of the responses (81%) specifically commented on how youth benefit from coaching. I categorized these benefits into four different categories. The first three include increasing self-awareness, self-confidence, and well-being (described as self-acceptance, autonomy, appreciation, self-empowerment and personal growth). The fourth is related to youth gaining clarity about their future.

Self-awareness. Awareness of self was mentioned by 37 of the respondents (43%) as a coaching benefit for youth. Becoming more aware of self includes understanding their strengths, values and weaknesses. “They become more self-aware so they can make better informed choices, can identify and change their thoughts if they choose, so they can change their actions and the results they ge” (1217726846). “They
get a picture of themselves in relation to others around them. They start to see who they are as a unique individual and identify what is truly important to them” (1216370399).

**Self-confidence.** Confidence in one’s self (and self-esteem) is mentioned by 31 of the respondents (36%) as important benefits to youth. Coaching gives confidence for youth to make decisions. Youth learn that they are capable, and confidence helps them to make decisions. They begin to trust in themselves, and gain confidence to ask for what they want or need that will provide them with support. Confidence allows youth to try something new without the doubts or expectations of others getting in the way.

**Well-being.** Well-being as described by respondents includes self-acceptance, autonomy, self-appreciation, self-empowerment and personal growth. Well-being is mentioned by 30 respondents (35%) as a coaching benefit to youth. Some respondents commented that increased self-awareness leads to increased self-acceptance, self-empowerment and personal growth. “I’ve witnessed immense amounts of empowering feelings and understanding of the choice being theirs and not giving away their power” (1199365259).

**Future.** The last section under “self” relates to the youth’s vision of their future. Twenty-five respondents (29%) specifically commented that coaching assists youth in discovering and gaining clarity of their wants, needs and dreams. The importance of youth being able to have some clarity and visualize their future is helpful to youth “so the world doesn’t get really big, really fast and overwhelm them so much as they transition to whatever the next phase might be” (1199664903). Or as another commented, “They have their dreams affirmed and are made to realize their individuality and power through choice” (1233693354).
Coaching Relationship

Forty-nine of the respondents (58%) specifically mentioned benefits of the coaching relationship. Comments about these benefits were in this second category. These comments have been divided into topic areas below, listed in order of frequency.

**Environment.** The top three most frequently mentioned benefits were related to what the coach provides: *a non-judgmental, supportive and safe environment.* In this environment, youth can speak their minds, explore and experiment with ideas and move forward. Some of the comments included: “safe adult to share and brainstorm with” (1203398620), “safe environment where they can explore themselves/ideas/experiment with new ways of being” (1208058630) and “non-judgmental acknowledgement of them as a valuable, unique individuals” (1234038750). Some comments related to safety included that the relationship is confidential and private.

**Being listened to and valued.** This experience for youth for “who they are with an adult they can trust” was also frequently mentioned. This includes feeling respected, important, taken seriously, treated equally, feeling connected, acknowledged and validated. Some of the comments include: “They feel listened to and important for the first time, which is so sad” (1223530315). “someone who ‘really gets them’ and listens to them and has no hidden agenda for them other than the one that is specified in the coaching agreement” (1208058630). “Being seen, heard, acknowledged, recognized, valued in very specific ways that help them connect to their uniqueness” (1199664903). “Someone to trust, someone to confide, someone who’s on their side, someone there to help hold accountable, someone who truly believes in their greatness” (1199590091).
Perspective and objectivity. The last category of benefits related to the coaching relationship is that it provides perspective and objectivity for the youth. The perspective comments also included a number of references to youth being able to hear views and perspectives different from their own parents, family or friends. In this way, youth themselves can develop a broader view of their own situation. Coaching allows youth to ‘see the bigger picture’ and ‘get a different perspective’ on various concerns from someone more neutral than their parents, family or friends. Brainstorming with another adult can provide new and different ideas and opinions, without pressure or influence of those close to them.

Some of the quotes from coaches include: “They are able to appreciate the role of parents in their lives” (1199611894). “Working with a coach allows them to separate from parents while still benefiting from an adult’s close involvement in supporting their growth and development” (1206631021). And,

Coaching helps youth think larger than they are accustomed to thinking. It lays out options out on the table that youth may not have otherwise considered. Young adults come equipped with many adopted or inherited concepts from family and friends, and coaching allows them to sort through these ideas and decide which ones they want to hold onto and which ones don’t work for them any longer.

(119848196)

Tools/Life Skills

This last area of benefit for youth from coaching relates to what the youth learns from the coaching experience. Fifty-six percent (n=48) of respondents made specific mention of this question about the importance of youth learning needed skills, strategies,
and having more ‘tools’, to support their continued learning and development. “I believe they also learn tools that are applicable across all domains of the personal and future professional lives” (1238301005). Another coach commented, “They learn valuable life skills and tools early, rather than stumbling on them over time” (1223642114). The number one life skill mentioned by respondents is related to goals. Goal setting, goal striving, and goal attainment were mentioned more than any other life skill or tool. “I find helping them clarify values and goals leads to a more empowered state as a youth and to more fulfilling decisions that lead to where they want to be . . . a sense of purpose!” (1199839164).

The list of life skills and tools mentioned, other than goals, were varied. The next most frequently mentioned skills include: decision-making, communication, time-management and learning how to focus. Other skills listed by coaches include problem solving, organizing, executive functioning, stress reduction, empathy, planning, independent and critical thinking and learning discipline.

Peppered throughout the comments related to skills and tools were the importance of youth having options or choices. Comments included the “power of choice” for youth, “awareness of choice” as well as the importance of knowing that they do have a choice leads to improved decision making. One coach commented, “Watching my clients empower themselves with their life skill tools and become more independent” (1234513818).

Another coach commented that youth “Learn more skills and strategies, change and develop their brain/decision making skills, have more confidence, achieve at higher levels, faster than without coaching” (1217726846). The other piece related to having
more tools or life skills includes that youth learn accountability and responsibility through coaching. “They get the benefit of learning to establish real goals . . . and learning how to set action items and follow through, they learn about accountability, etc.”

(123369408).

**Risks for Youth**

The open ended question posed was, “In your opinion, what “risks” might exist for youth who receive coaching?” Eighty-two coaches (91%) answered this question. As in the previous question, I have coded respondent’s words and phrases, and then grouped them into the most obvious categories from that data. Overall risks (shown in Table 4.7 below) listed for youth fall in two categories: 1) avoidable risks that could be prevented based on the coach’s skills, abilities and boundaries and 2) natural risks that might happen from a positive coaching experience. The largest concern reported for potential risks for youth has to do with the training, experience and professionalism (or lack thereof) of the coach. Risk related to a positive coaching experience directly related to the two most influential groups of people in a young person’s life, peers and parents (or family).

Table 4.7

*Risks for Youth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>2(^{nd}) level</th>
<th>3(^{rd}) level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable (Coach’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of training; unethical and unprofessional actions by coach; no or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility)</td>
<td>Coach’s boundaries,</td>
<td>unclear agreements, expectations or guidelines related to boundaries and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethics and</td>
<td>confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Relying on coach for problem solving, only outlet for expression or idea exploration. Potential misunderstanding of process, youth feeling targeted or categorized, mentoring may be more useful, confusion of coach’s role, difficulty with commitments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth maturity level</td>
<td>Unknown or untreated mental health issues, mandatory reporting or duty to warn, need for resources, knowing when to refer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive Experience**

- Increased maturity and self confidence
- Parents and family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential to create social stigma for youth who may adopt ‘a mask’ to fit in with peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More confident youth may upset the family’s status quo and challenge belief systems and create conflict at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodologies of Youth Coaches**

Eighty-three respondents (92%) answered the open-ended question related to their coaching methodology with youth under the age of 18. Only 3 coaches specifically stated their methodology for coaching youth does not differ from adults. The remaining (majority) did not make this same statement, although their comments were related to how their approach is youth specific. These comments fit into two categories: basic coaching methodology 1) with youth specific modifications and 2) without specifics to youth. Answers to this question were varied, and were not clear methodologies. Some
people described theory, practice models, techniques used as well as communication styles. These will be described below.

**Basic Coaching**

Several (n=29) of the comments (35%) could be described as basic coaching. These answers included both methodologies and/or steps taken in a coaching session. There was no specificity related to youth. An example of this from one respondent:

- Listening without judgment. Having confidence they can handle anything.
- Consistency by the coach. Going beneath the presenting ‘story.’ Testing assumptions by asking open-ended questions. Presenting new frameworks without telling. Creating clarity by doing this. Challenging when necessary, after developing trust and earning respect (done so by giving it to them), and with permission. Celebrating the ‘aha’ moments and achievements. (1232595347)

Or another stated,

- Methodology is the same as I use for adults . . . Discovery, inquiry, setting the foundation, co-creating the relationship, establishing trust, raising awareness, powerful questioning, opening possibilities, creating actions, inviting accountability. I invite youth to identify, challenge/goal/dream, what s/he needs to overcome it or reach it, what actions will serve s/he, in what time frame, how/to whom they will be accountable. (1215577988)

Methodologies named (rather than described) were varied and included methodologies, theories, practice models and intervention techniques. Specific program models that coaches followed when working with youth under the age of 18 also varied. Twenty-two unique approaches were mentioned as methodologies. The most frequently
mentioned approach was that the coach developed their own program or methodology (based on training and experience). Various coaches mentioned combining training programs they had attended. Co-Active and ADD/ADHD coaching were mentioned by 4 respondents (5%); solution focused and Coaches Training Institute were mentioned by 3 of the coaches. Two coaches mentioned ‘performance based’, ‘Adler’ and ‘process based’ as methodologies and the remainder were mentioned once. Please see Appendix G for a full list.

**Youth Specific**

Many respondents (n=50, 60%) described steps or methodologies with specific mention of aspects important to youth or for coaching youth. The comments are divided into two different categories of responses: 1) coaching skills, and 2) concrete and logistical issues. Comments about coaching skills include:

- Adapting specific coaching aspects for younger ages
- Adapting coaching to developmental issues of youth
- Listening skills
- Building trust with youth
- Assisting the youth with self-discovery (self-esteem, self-confidence, values exploration).

Comments from respondents about logistical and concrete issues for minor youth include the following:

- Meeting with the parents
- Having a family session
- Clarifying the agreement or contracting
• Giving extra time for completion of projects
• Short nightly check-ins with the youth
• Shorter sessions
• Explaining limits of confidentiality
• Being more concrete
• Providing more structure
• Consistency
• Being playful
• Acting as a mentor and
• Clarifying that you are not the parent, friend or teacher

One coach described they have, “Progressively longer coaching sessions-beginning with 5 minutes . . . and moving up to 15 or 20 once trust is built” (1234418541). Another stated,

My methodology is much more directive when coaching youth people. Meaning there is a structure to the process that is designed to support the client in his/her needs that includes, it is less ‘in the moment. Also, with young people I use follow up structures in between sessions that are more day to day (e.g., SMS every other day). (1199352899)

Areas of Focus

Various areas of focus were also listed as a part of coaching methodology for youth. Many responses talked about using activities, tools, assessments or games in addressing certain issues. “Activities and tools relating to visioning, goal setting, managing change, learned optimism, strengths identification; scaling, perspective taking,
developing an understanding of what well-being and ‘happiness’ really are” (1238301005). Additional focus areas listed were:

- Visioning
- Goal setting
- Managing change
- Priorities, strengths
- Values
- Learned optimism
- Perspectives
- Career exploration
- Developing resiliency
- Accountability
- Responsibility
- Building empathy and
- Critical thinking.

The statements and phrases from respondents about areas of focus included belief systems:

Listen and watch for how they process, what their values are, their goals for the coaching partnership. I’ve found with youth, it’s important to recheck these often. Highlighting their identity-forming belief systems and give them plenty of opportunities to explore options. (1197675017)

Another developed their own program to address specific areas of focus:
I use a program that I have developed that includes professional personality and interest assessments, skills and ability questionnaires, values discovery, peak experience stories, evaluating past and current experiences and other methods. Of course, life and career coaching are paramount in my client sessions, but I use the program I have developed to guide our sessions. (1199534470)

Developing areas of focus within youth-appropriate structure was important for another:

I find that youth benefit from more structure and more concreteness than adults. I begin with a series of assessments; personality type, learning and thinking styles. We look at ways of setting goals and breaking the goals into small, positive and achievable steps. I explain the concept of levels of learning and we discuss success/failure and recovery – giving them a chance to try it on and develop resiliency. We do exercises on motivation. We evaluate what and how they study and make adjustments. We explore limiting beliefs and assumptions. We put together systems to help them become organized in their life and studies. We look at relationships, communications and build empathy. We develop a mission statement and design a leadership project. (1223642114)

Clarification of goals and actions in a safe environment was another theme:

Teenagers are not as capable of describing what they are seeking out of life, so my sessions with teens usually involve a lot of clarifying of goals and brainstorming real-life actions. Other times, teenagers simply want a safe place to speak their mind. (1199750171)

Parental involvement was another area for some respondents:
Get input from the parents, get info from the student, work with the student on what they want to better in their lives while also focusing in on parents concerns. We meet 4 times a month for 45 minutes with the 4th session including the parents. (1224494686)

Current Perceptions and Practices of Youth Coaches

This section of the results is organized and reported within the three components of the proposed model for coaching youth core knowledge, core principles and core methods. Each of the sub-components will also be included with answers reported within each subcategory. Cronbach’s alpha for each of the three components of the model showed acceptable reliability: Core Knowledge (α=.7792), Core Principles (α=.7056) and Core Methods (α=.9023).

Core Knowledge

As indicated in Chapter 1, core knowledge has to do with the coach’s own experience, training and knowledge in the related areas. Questions were asked about the amount and type of training in coaching, adolescent development, ethics and group facilitation.

Coach training. Seventy-five coaches (83%) answered questions about coaching training accreditation and hours. The majority of those coaches (n=67) have completed more than 60 hours of formal coach training from an accredited organization (89%); 67% have completed more than 120 hours (n=50). Nearly all youth coaches (n=74, 99%) have had formal coach training, and the majority of those trainings (n=67, 89%) were from accredited schools. Seven (9%) noted that they had formal coach training that was not accredited and 1% noted they have not had any formal coach training.
Adolescent development. I asked questions about their perceptions related to adolescent development and any training they have had in this area. I also asked coaches to describe any developmental needs of youth that can be addressed in coaching.

Perceptions. Respondents (n=71) answered questions about their perceptions and agreement level to the following statements (79%): “Developmentally, I believe youth and adults are different”, and “I approach my coaching with youth differently, based on their developmental level.” The majority (86%) agreed and strongly agreed that youth and adults differ developmentally. Eighty-nine percent indicated they approach youth differently, based on their developmental level. In analyzing the exposure groups, there was no significant difference in agreement in perceptions that youth and adults are different developmentally. Coaches with high adolescent development training (Group 1) were significantly more likely to approach coaching with youth differently based on developmental level than Group 3 (p<.01). Please see Table 4.8 below for details.

Table 4.8

Perceptions about Adolescent Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binary: Develop mentally, youth and adults different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strongly) disagree/undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/strongly agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binary: approach coaching with youth differently, based on dev level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strongly) disagree/undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/strongly agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adolescent development training. With respect to training received in adolescent development, 1 in 4 youth coaches surveyed had not received any training. (See Table 4.9 below.) As the proposed model recommends a minimum amount training in this area, this variable is the key variable used in testing the exposure group comparisons.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Training</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaches who answered</td>
<td>71 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>18 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8 hours formal training</td>
<td>7 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–16 hours</td>
<td>11 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–24 hours</td>
<td>5 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–60 hours</td>
<td>14 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–120 hours</td>
<td>7 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120 hours</td>
<td>9 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of respondents had received at least 16 hours of training in adolescent development with 75% having more than 8 hours of this training.

Respondents also indicated their agreement level to the following statement; “I’ve received sufficient training in adolescent development to feel comfortable working with youth by myself.” Of the 47 respondents that answered this question (52%), 67% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A chi-square was done to compare this question to amount of training in adolescent development. Of those than indicated the ‘agree’ or
‘strongly agree’ they have sufficient training to feel comfortable working by themselves with youth, 80.85% reported have more than 9 hours of adolescent development training (p<.001).

**Developmental needs coaching can address.** Comments indicating developmental needs that coaching can address were given by 24 respondents (34%) and are reported in Table 4.10 below. I have categorized these into the following three areas; self, life skills, and self in relation to others. There are items listed that fit into multiple categories. Since the categories themselves overlap, they will only be listed once, and are listed in order of frequency mentioned.

**Table 4.10**

*Developmental Needs Addressed in Coaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Need</th>
<th>Related Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-confidence, self-esteem, self-acceptance, self-identity, individuation, self-empowerment, self-awareness were more frequent. Also mentioned: taking initiative, self-motivation, values clarification, character development, career choice, and puberty issues (hormonal changes, body image, sleep, emotional self-control and awareness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Life and social skill development. Also mentioned: communication, goal setting, transition to independence, time management, decision-making, learning, follow through, focusing, organization and prioritizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self in relation to others</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships (peers and family), dealing with bullying and abuse, peer pressure and community leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group facilitation training.** I asked questions about group facilitation and related training, as well as supervision related questions. I began with a question to identify those that had facilitated a group; those that had not were eliminated from further
questions about groups. Although I believe there is a difference related between group coaching and group facilitation, I thought I would gather more meaningful information by focusing on group facilitation, as it is more common. I also asked questions about experience, training and supervision related to group facilitation.

**Experience.** Ninety respondents (100%) answered this first question: 75 (83%) have facilitated a group. I then asked a series of questions about amount of groups facilitated. Of the respondents who answered the question about coaching groups (n=70, 78%), 89% have provided group coaching. Of those who answered the question about having facilitated an adolescent group (n=67), 84% indicated they have. Sixty-seven respondents (65%) have conducted adolescent groups in the past year.

**Training.** When asked about estimating formal training received, over half (n=38, 54%) of coaches have had more than 25 hours of general group facilitation. A similar number (55%) estimated they have had at least some adolescent specific group facilitation training. Please see Table 4.11 below for the breakdown.

Table 4.11

*Hours of Group Facilitation Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Hours</th>
<th>General Group</th>
<th>Adol. Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total per question</td>
<td>70 (78)</td>
<td>67 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13 (18.6)</td>
<td>30 (44.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8 hours</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
<td>9 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–16 hours</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–24 hours</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–60 hours</td>
<td>25 (35.7)</td>
<td>13 (19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–120 hours</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square was done comparing answers to the statement, “I’ve received sufficient training in group facilitation to feel comfortable facilitating groups by myself” with the reported amount of hours trained in group facilitation. Of those that ‘agree/agree strongly’ they have sufficient training 87.5% of them have more than 9 hours of training (p<.001).

In looking at the exposure group comparisons, linear regression models were run. There is a significant difference in both the amount of hours of group facilitation training as well as the amount of hours in adolescent specific group facilitation training. See Table 4.12 below for details. Group 1 has more training in both areas.

Table 4.12

*Exposure Groups with Group Facilitation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gp 1: Hi Coach Tr/Hi Adol Dev</th>
<th>Gp 2: Hi Coach Tr/Low to No Adol Dev</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Gp. 3: Some training-Does not meet standards</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binary: hours of group facilitation training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9 hours</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours or more</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binary: hours of adol group facilitation training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9 hours</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coaches were asked their perception of their training and to indicate their agreement level to the statement, “I have received sufficient training in group facilitation to feel comfortable doing so by myself”. Of the 70 respondents, 70% agreed with this statement. Another question was, “I feel sufficiently trained to facilitate adolescent groups.” Of the 70 who answered this question (78%), over half (n=43) responded they agree or strongly agree to the statement (61%). In comparing exposure groups through linear regression models, there was no significant difference in the question about group facilitation (general), although Group 1 tended to ‘agree/strongly agree’ more than Group 2 (87.50% vs. 68.20%). In regards to adolescents groups, Group 1 was significantly more likely than Group 2 to indicate they ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ that they are sufficiently trained to facilitate adolescent groups (83.30% vs. 52.40%, p<.05).

**Supervision.** Of those who have conducted group coaching, more respondents have not received formal supervision for group facilitation (53% vs. 47%). Forty-five coaches agree that this supervision for adolescent group facilitation is important (65%); 18 (26%) are undecided and 6 (9%) disagreed with this statement. Linear regression models were run to examine exposure group comparisons; there were no significant differences. More respondents in Group 1 indicated they “agree/strongly agree” than Group 2 that supervision for adolescent group facilitation is important (62.50% vs. 38.90%). A chi-square was done to look at the comparison between amount of training in ethics and the belief that formal supervision for adolescent group facilitation is important. There were no significant differences, however of the 36 respondents who “agree/strongly agree” that formal supervision is important, 75% of them have ethics training each year.
**Miscellaneous.** Coaches who facilitate groups most frequently (n=48, 67%) are alone; 19 co-facilitate with another coach (28%) and 12 have a co-facilitator who is not a coach (17%). One respondent noted the co-facilitator is a horse, as in equine coaching. The optimal group size for groups chosen by the majority of all respondents who answered the question (n=70) is between 6–10 participants (60%) for adolescent groups.

**Ethics training.** I asked coaches to estimate the amount of hours, whether or not they had requirements for ethics training and to estimate their continued education in ethics training. Respondents were also asked if they believe they have received sufficient ethics training to work with youth.

Although the number of hours varies, the majority of youth coaches have received ethics training (89%) and just over half (56%) have received adolescent specific ethics training. (See Table 4.13 below for the breakdown of hours).

Table 4.13

*Ethics Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>General Ethics</th>
<th>Adol. Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total per question</td>
<td>72 (80)</td>
<td>70 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8 (11.1)</td>
<td>31 (44.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8 hours</td>
<td>13 (18.1)</td>
<td>11 (15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–16 hours</td>
<td>13 (18.1)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–24 hours</td>
<td>9 (12.5)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–60 hours</td>
<td>18 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–120 hours</td>
<td>8 (11.1)</td>
<td>2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;120 hours</td>
<td>3 (4.2)</td>
<td>2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty-three of the coaches (88%) responded (n=72) that they do not have any requirements for taking ethics training. Sixty of those responding (67%) report that they do receive at least 1 to 2 hours of ethics training per year with 8 (13%) receiving 3 to 4 hours as well and more than 5 hours per year, respectively.

In regards to the exposure group comparisons, linear regression models were run; there is no significant difference in the amount of ethics training per year. There is, however a significant difference (p<.05) in the total amount of ethics training (general) as well as ethics training focused on working with adolescents (p<.001). See Table 4.14 below for details.

Table 4.14

_Ethics Training by Exposure Groups_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>binary: hours of ethics training</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 1: Hi Coach Tr/Hi Adol Dev No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 2: Hi Coach Tr/Low to No Adol Dev No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 3: Some training-Does not meet standards No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-21.30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.24</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>binary: hours of adol ethics training</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 1: Hi Coach Tr/Hi Adol Dev No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 2: Hi Coach Tr/Low to No Adol Dev No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gp 3: Some training-Does not meet standards No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-60.19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.36</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>32.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 69 coaches (77%) responding, 41 agreed to the statement, “I have received sufficient ethics training to work with youth” (59%). With this same question, 14 coaches (20%) were ‘undecided’ and 9 (13%) disagreed.
I ran linear regression models to examine exposure groups by respondent answers to the question, “I’ve received sufficient ethics training to work with youth” by the amount of hours in ethics training per year. There was a significant difference (p<.05) between Group 1 and Group 2. In order to examine this further, a chi-square was done. With the chi-square, no significant differences were found. However, the trend was that Group 1 was more likely than Group 2 to indicate they have received a sufficient amount of ethics training to work with youth 18 (72%) vs. 6 (29%).

Core Principles

Questions around core principles were asked to help clarify any age or developmental considerations for youth coaches. Some questions were specifically related to work with minor youth. The survey results will be reported following the outline of the proposed model. The outline will follow the previous chapters: which include ethics, boundaries, logistics and agenda. (See Table 4.15.) Additional details to each category are included based on responses from youth coaches.

Table 4.15

Categories of Core Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>2nd level</th>
<th>3rd level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Criminal Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Agreement</td>
<td>Duty to Warn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Obligations</td>
<td>Mandatory Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</td>
<td>Parental Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Coach’s Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethics. Ethics related questions were asked in various ways. They will be reported here in the following categories: code of conduct, formal agreement, written permission, potential legal obligations, therapy, roles and responsibilities and confidentiality.

*Code of ethics.* “Do you follow a written code of ethics or conduct?” Seventy-one of the respondents answered this question (78%). The majority (n=52), indicated that yes, they “always” follow a written code of ethics (73%) compared to 7 (10%) who “never” do.

*Sharing a code of ethics.* Seventy respondents (78%) answered questions about how frequently they share their codes of ethics or conduct with clients. Of these, coaches are slightly more likely to share their code of conduct with adult clients (43%) than youth clients (41%). Coaches (n=67) were less likely to share their code of conduct with parents of youth clients (39%). Fourteen coaches (20%) answered they “never” share their code with either adult or youth clients. Exposure groups were compared by chi-square to each of questions asked about code of conduct. No significant differences were found. There was a trend, however, for Group 1 to respond they ‘always/often’ follow a code of ethics at a higher rate than Group 2. The same trend followed for the three
questions about with whom they share their code of conduct (adult clients, youth clients and parents of youth clients).

*Which code of ethics?* Coaches who responded that they do follow a code of ethics were asked to specify which code they follow. Forty-two respondents made comments (47%) related to this question. The majority, (n=29, 69%) stated that they follow the ICF Code of Ethics. A few respondents listed other coaching codes (such as those of the International Association of Coaching, Coach Training Institute, International Advancement of AD/HD Coaching and The Coaching Academy). A few coaches mentioned they follow the codes of conduct from the ICF and their professional associations (e.g., counseling or teaching). Two mentioned that they follow a religious or church code of ethics.

Several coaches who responded gave examples of how they might discuss ethics. One coach wrote, “confidentiality, honesty, safe environment, empowering context for coach session, asking permission to go deeper into conversation” (1234825410). “It’s not a codified ethical statement. I simply state my ethical duty as a coach so the client is not taken aback if I state something bluntly” (1199750171). “I usually make sure parents understand my boundaries and how I would be communicating with their child” (1199611894). “With youth I specifically make it clear that I will be acting in the client’s interests and not that of the schools or parents. The one time I advocated for the youth client I did so with her permission” (1199495279).

*Formal Agreement.* I asked, “Do you use a formal coaching agreement with your clients?” Although the majority of coaches (n=51) answered that they “always” do (62%), there were a large number who do not do this consistently. (See Table 4.16 below
for details.) One coach responded, “Parameters at the beginning of the coaching agreement are very important. In my earlier work I was coaching as a part of my role as a youth worker so there was less formality involved. In my work now as a professional coach it is more formalized” (1238301005).

Table 4.16

*Percentage of Coaches Using a Formal Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>51 (62.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>12 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8 (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not applicable

Additional questions asked were related to who signs the coaching agreement (if there is one). Respondents indicated that they “always” have clients sign the agreement for adults (n=49, 61%); older youth ages 18–20 (n=47, 57%); parents of older youth (n=19, 24%), parents of minor youth (n=40, 49%) and minor youth (n=31, 38%).

There were no significant differences between U.S. and non-U.S. respondents in use of formal coaching agreement or who they have sign the agreement with one exception. There was a significant difference in regards to having minor youth sign the agreement. U.S. respondents were significantly more likely to have minor youth sign the coaching agreement than non-U.S. respondents (65.8% vs. 37.5%, p<.05).
In regards to the exposure group comparisons, there were no significant differences in those who often or always use a formal coaching agreement and who signs the formal agreement between all four exposure groups. See Table 4.17 below for details of Groups 1 and 2. There was a slight tendency for those in Group 1 (high coach and adolescent development training) to be more likely than the other groups to have clients sign an agreement (exception minor youth).

Table 4.17

*Formal Agreements by Exposure Groups 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hi Coach Tr/Hi Adol Dev</th>
<th>Hi Coach Tr/Low to No Adol Dev</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binary: formal coaching agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binary: sign an agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binary: youth 18-20 sign an agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binary: parents of youth 18-20 sign an agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binary: youth under 18 sign an agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely,</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**binary: parents of youth under 18 sign an agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agreeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential obligations.** Depending on the location where coaches live, there may be legal, moral, or ethical obligations for coaches when working with youth that differ from working with adult coaching clients. (Refer back to Table 4.15 for details.) I have organized these obligations under the following areas: criminal background checks, duty to warn, mandatory reporting, and parental permission.

**Criminal background checks.** Various professionals who work in the U.S. with minor youth, are required to have a criminal background check prior to employment. Questions were asked about coaches’ experiences and practices. The first question was, “Have you ever had a criminal background check completed on yourself for employment purposes?” Of the 80 who answered the question (n=89), 54 responded “yes” (68%). I then asked questions about criminal background checks, and included a “not applicable” (n/a) option for respondents. Seventy-six (84%) responded to the question, “Do you share with parents of minor clients (under 18 years old) that you’ve had a criminal background check completed on you?” Twenty-nine (38%) indicated they have, 26 (34%) indicated they “never” share this information, and 21 (28%) chose “n/a.” Seventy-four (82%) answered the subsequent question, “Is your background check updated...”
Sixteen indicated “always” (22%) compared to 24% who indicated they “never” update it.

Respondents were asked additional questions about criminal background checks and indicated their frequency on a Likert scale from never, rarely, sometimes, often, always, and N/A. The first question was, “If you have ever employed or had volunteer adults work with youth in your organization or care; do you have criminal background checks completed on them? They were also instructed to chose “N/A” if they have not employed or had volunteer adults. Seventy-four coaches answered this question, 24 (32%) indicated they have hired or had volunteers work with youth under their organization or care. Of those, 10 (42%) stated they have “never” completed criminal background checks on “adult staff or volunteers and 10 (42%) stated they “always” do. Seventy-four respondents answered the question, “Have you ever denied someone as an employee or volunteer to work with youth because of the results of a criminal background check?” Of those who completed this question (82%), the majority (n=51) answered ‘N/A’ (69%). For the remainder, 4 indicated they “always” have (5.4%); one indicated they “often”, 1 “always” and 1 “rarely” have (1.4% for each category); 16 (21.6%) “never” have denied someone employment due to results of a background check.

Logistic regression models were run to compare U.S. to non-U.S. respondents to the question, “Have you ever had a criminal background check done on yourself for employment purposes?” Those from the U.S. were significantly more likely to report that they have had a criminal background check than those from non-U.S. countries (78.05% vs. 51.61%, p<.05). There were no differences in the comparison on whether or not they update their background check annually. Linear regression models were run to
compare exposure groups to the questions about having done a criminal background check and updating it annually. There were no significant differences between exposure groups in both of these comparisons.

*Duty to warn.* This term is an American term with which not all survey participants were familiar. I included an “N/A” option to the question as well, for those that did not consider it relevant. Eighty (90%) coaches completed the two questions related to “duty to warn”. The answers relating to both youth and adult clients were similar. Sixty-two percent of coaches do explain “duty to warn” with adult clients and 60% do with their youth clients. Sixteen percent “never” share this information with either adult or youth clients. One coach commented, “Duty to Warn I am guessing is an American term but I am presuming that it is if there risk to youth that the appropriate authorities must be advised. It is the same in Canada, just worded differently” (1216370399).

In regards to the comparisons, there were no significant differences between the U.S. and non-U.S. respondents to how frequently they discuss Duty to Warn with both adult and youth clients. See Table 4.18 below for percentages.

Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Non-U.S. No.</th>
<th>Non-U.S. %</th>
<th>U.S. No.</th>
<th>U.S. %</th>
<th>Difference No.</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>binary: Duty To Warn with adults</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74.20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>binary: Duty To Warn with youth</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of exposure groups, there was a significant difference in that those with high coach and adolescent development training were significantly more likely than the others to indicate they often or always discuss Duty to Warn with youth. See Table 4.19 below for details.

Table 4.19

Duty to Warn by Exposure Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gp 1: Hi Coach Tr/Hi Adol Dev</th>
<th>Gp 2: Hi Coach Tr/Low to No Adol Dev</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Gp 3: Some training-Does not meet standards</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Warn with adults:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never,rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Warn with youth:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never,rarely, sometimes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, always</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory reporting. Another American term, “mandatory reporting” questions were answered by 81 respondents (90%). Fifty (61%) indicated they “always” explain this concept to youth; 41 indicated they “always” do this with parents of youth clients (51%). Although this term is commonly used within the U. S. there were no significant differences in respondent (U.S. vs. non-U.S.) answers related to frequency of explaining to both youth and to parents of youth this concept.
In comparing exposure groups with linear regression models, there was no significant difference for the question about explaining mandatory reporting to parents. There was a significant difference in explaining mandatory reporting to youth between Groups 1 and 3, in that those in Group 1 (high coach and adolescent development training) were significantly more likely to discuss mandatory reporting with youth than those with some training (91.7% vs. 70.0%, p<.05).

Comments from coaches indicate some confusion regarding whether this is appropriate or needed for coaches to discuss with clients; others said clearly that it is important. “Duty to warn is new to me as I do not have a counseling/therapy background” (1204396324). “Since I am a Coach, I am dealing with the student moving forward, I do not discuss things like ‘Mandatory Reporting’ with my clients” (1199611894). “My youth coaching is with a school environment and Duty to Warn and Mandatory Reporting is explained by the school to all those prior to coming on the programme” (1200738044). Another respondent commented, “I am generally coaching students for their career focus, so many of the disclaimers are not relevant” (1220583676).

*Parental permission.* One question specifically asked the frequency of coaches obtaining written parental consent to work with minor youth. This is not required in all countries. The majority of respondents indicated that they do; Table 4.20 demonstrates the differences in answers.

Table 4.20

*Written Parental Consent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

128
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(57.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*not applicable

There were no significant differences in comparison of U.S. and non-U.S. respondents to this question. However, U.S. respondents were more likely to indicate they ‘often or always’ obtain written parental consent to work with minor youth (76.3% vs. 61.5%). In comparing the exposure groups, there also were no significant differences. Those in group one (high coach and adolescent development training) were more likely to indicate they “often” or “always” obtained written parental consent than the other groups.

More than half of the youth coaches responded that they always obtain written parental consent, however some of the comments indicate that this is not a requirement in all countries. “In my country we don’t have the obligation of getting parental consent to work with youth under 18, but this task is always demanded by the parents” (1234038750). However, the answers are also varied for coaches from the U.S. Some never get written consent to work with minor youth, but rely on verbal permission. “Parent signing is dependant on who is financially responsible for my fee” (1234781386). “When I work with students in schools, the schools have the parent sign off. In my private practice I have parents and youth sign the agreement” (1217726846). Another coach stated their coaching is informal and in the context of being a sports coach, “When
doing small groups with youth, I have informally asked the parents for consent, but no written form “ (1233770347).

Roles and responsibilities. Eighty-one respondents (90%) answered the question, “Do you clarify your own roles/responsibilities with a youth client?” The majority (n=68) of the respondents “always” do (84%); 4 “never” do (5%). There were no qualitative comments on this area. Another related question asked, “Do you discuss the difference between coaching and therapy with your clients?” Eighty-two respondents (n=82) answered this question. The majority (n=58, 70.7%) “always” discusses the difference. For the remainder, 14 (17%) indicated “often”, 4 (5%) indicated “sometimes” and 3 (4%) who indicated they “never” discuss the difference between coaching and therapy with their clients. Logistic regression models were run to compare U.S. and non-U.S. respondents; no significant differences were found. Logistic regression models were run to compare answers by exposure groups to this question; no significant differences were found. The slight difference in exposure groups was that 100% of Group 1 indicated they ‘always/often’ clarify their roles and responsibilities, compared to 91.7%, 87% and 85.7% for Groups 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

Confidentiality. “Do you discuss confidentiality with the youth and parent together?” Just over half of the respondents (n=42, 51.2%) answered that they “always” do and 11 (13.4%) indicated they “never” do. Sixty-four respondents indicated that they either “often” or “always” do (90%). Nine (11%) responded that this question was not applicable to them. There were few comments related to this question. One coach stated, “I explain confidentiality in my contract and then I explain it in person to my client” (1199495279). Another coach commented they explain confidentiality to both youth and
parent, but separately. Other comments indicate there may be coaches who work in schools or youth centers that do not have access to parents.

Logistic regression models were run to compare U.S. and non-U.S. respondents; no significant difference was found. Linear regression models that examined exposure groups also resulted in no significant differences in their answers.

**Boundaries.** I asked questions related to boundary issues in order to identify some issues that may be pertinent to coaching youth. One of the reasons for this is that coaches who work with youth are hired by adults or organizations the majority of time (rather than the youth themselves). See Table 4.21 below for details. Although this may be a common practice for internal coaches within an organization, this issue may be more sensitive with a minor youth living with their parents.

Table 4.21

*Payment Source for Youth Coaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment source*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>69 (76.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-bono</td>
<td>48 (69.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>26 (37.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth themselves</td>
<td>14 (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organization/Non-profit/Grants</td>
<td>13 (18.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family</td>
<td>10 (14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family</td>
<td>7 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % does not add up to 100% as respondents could indicate multiple answers

A total of 18 (26%) respondents commented on the above question. Comments from the respondents fall into two sub-categories of boundaries: coach’s responsibility and parental involvement.
Coach’s responsibilities. Rather than repeat anything previously mentioned, I have included a few related comments from coaches: “It’s important that boundaries are maintained and parameters are set and reviewed” (1238301005). Another coach responded that youth are at risk when “misguided by an unprofessional coach” (1224494686). “Coaches need to be qualified to work with students in a safe, professional way” (1217726846). Another coach expressed concern that a youth is at risk if the coach “leads” in a way that is not suitable for the youth, and, “The youth may also fall in love with the coach be it same or opposite gender, due to they may suddenly feel that there is someone who really takes care of them, care about their feelings and emotions (1202723830).

Parental involvement. The other area related to boundary issues that coaches mentioned is with parents. The majority of youth coaches in this study responded to a question related to whom they coach; 81–98% answered questions about their coaching of minor aged youth (percentage varies due to multiple questions).

Ninety-eight percent of all coaches answered the question, “Do you include parents in a youth’s coaching session?” The highest percentage of coaches (31%) answered that they “never” include parents in a session. However the majority (69%) do include parents to some degree, as shown in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Coaches who Include Parents in Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I ran logistic regression models to compare the U.S. and non-U.S. respondents’ answers to this question and found no significant differences. However, U.S. respondents indicated they “often” or “always” include the parents more than non-U.S. respondents (22.0% vs. 10.3%). Non-U.S. respondents were more apt to “never” or “rarely” include parents in a youth’s session when compared to U.S. respondents (89.7% vs. 78.0%). In comparing the exposure groups with linear regression models, there also were no significant differences to this question.

I utilized a chi-square to compare respondent answers from the above question to the amount of training they have in adolescent development. This resulted in no significant differences. Regardless of amount of training, 68 of respondents (83.8%) indicated they ‘never/rarely/sometimes’ include a parent in a youth’s session (compared to 16.2% indicating they ‘often/always’).

The answers related to their practices of the inclusion of parents in the coaching sessions are inconsistent. Those who responded negatively, never include parents. Anecdotally, some of these mentioned that they coach within a school or community center, and so parents are never included. Those that responded favorably include parents with varying frequency.

Several comments gave some clarification to responses. “I’ll never include any parents while coaching youth. When coach shows this trust, youth can hold it easily” (1226970327). Then the opposite opinion, “I always include the parent(s) in the coaching when the client is financially reliant on the parent(s), because the client’s
performance/ work is always tied in with the family system” (1199645463). “I believe that the parents like to see workbooks and sheets as a part of the process and it adds credibility to my program” (1199534470). One coach commented, “All work is done with parents present. For groups, all parents may not be present but some parents are always present. For individual clients, parents are always present” (1233704298)

Some coaches limit parental involvement based on what the youth want. “Parents are always aware of the coaching their child is receiving. The amount that they are involved depends on the ‘agreements’ built between myself, the young adult and the parent” (1208397304). Another coach discusses their opinion:

Parents are only involved if the youth wants them to be there. If the youth is living at home, I think it is important that the parents have an awareness of the process and coaching but never share information about the sessions. Parents are an important part of the successful process with youth coaching so if their youth are being coached, perhaps the parents need support too. (1216370399)

Logistics. As described in Chapter 1, logistics includes what coaches need to plan for or take into consideration when coaching youth to increase the likelihood of a successful experience. Examples of this included transportation, in-person coaching, adapting expectations, tech savvy and flexibility. Because transportation was not addressed in the survey, it will not be reported below. Some areas may overlap so the redundant answers will be focused only in one area.

In-person coaching. Two questions were asked related to the type of coaching venues offered. The first was that coaches were asked to identify the various coaching venues they offered to clients of different age groups. There were four separate age
categories: a) adults over 25 years old, b) young adults ages 21–25, c) older youth ages 18–20, and d) adolescents ages 13–18. Seventy-two respondents answered the questions about adults (80%), and 59 about youth (66%). Coaches had the option to choose as many as they offered. Because of this there is less ability for statistical analysis. The trends are consistent between respondents with a slight variation. In-person coaching had the highest percentage across the age ranges (between 88–91%). The next most popular venue was telephone coaching (client calls the coach). A much higher percentage of coaches (79%) offered this to their adult clients (over age of 25) compared with 49% to adolescent clients.

In terms of comparing U.S. to non-U.S. respondents, a chi square test was done to look at differences. There was no significant difference in answers about coaching venues offered for youth. There were two significant differences in regards to venues offered to adult clients. U.S. respondents were significantly more likely to call their adult clients than vs. non-U.S. respondents (50.0% vs. 25.0%, p<.05). Non-U.S. respondents were more likely to see their adult clients in-person than U.S. respondents (100% vs. 80%, p<.01).

In looking at the exposure group comparisons, linear regression models were run to examine comparisons. The two areas in which there were significant differences between exposure groups related to adult clients (not youth). Group 3 was significantly more likely to call an adult client than Group 1 (58.3% vs. 25.9%, p<.05). The other difference was that respondents in Group 1 were significantly more likely to offer their adult clients virtual venues than those in Group 2 (85.2% vs. 54.2%, p<.05). There were
no significant differences in answers of venues offered to youth between the exposure groups.

The most comparable difference related to time coaches spend within the various venues, are between the categories of adults over age 25 and minor youth between the ages 13–18. Coaches were asked, “What percentage of your total coaching time with (adults) and (youth) do you typically use the following venues?” They completed this question twice; once for time spent with youth and another for time spent with adults. Seventy-five respondents answered these two questions (83%). The answers to these two questions were compared through a paired t-test. Coaches reported they spent significantly more time with youth on the phone, compared to adults \[ t (74) = 6.38, p<.001 \]. They also reported they spent significantly more time with youth in-person, than with adults \[ t (74) = 5.77, p<.001 \]. There was no significant difference found in the amount of time spent virtually with both adult and youth clients. Logistical regression models were run to compare the exposure groups to these two questions as well. There were no significant differences found between the exposure groups related to amount of time spent in the various venues.

Adapting expectations. One way I believe that coaches adapt to youth clients is in time scheduled or spent in coaching as opposed to venues (which will be discussed in more detail below under tech savvy). Scheduling differences will also be discussed under ‘flexibility’ below. I asked one question relating to the typical length of coaching sessions. Coaches most commonly spend 45–60 minutes in coaching sessions with all age groups, answered 79 respondents (88%). The numbers are not statistically significant. There are however, some interesting differences reported between the
amount of time for adults over 25 years old and adolescents as shown in Table 4.23. It appears that shorter sessions are more common for adolescents and longer sessions for adults. The few anecdotal comments mentioned coaching sessions in school for adults could be as long as 3 hours. Another described, “group coaching is more like workshop sessions of four hours” (1233704298).

Table 4.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th># Minutes</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>16–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 13-18</td>
<td>63 (70.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>17 (27.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults &gt;25</td>
<td>78 (87)</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tech savvy. I asked questions about the venues offered to their different coaching clients. In the previous paragraph I discussed the answers related to in-person and telephone coaching. In the following section I will report on the use of various technologies. The same two questions as described under in-person coaching are used here. One question asked coaches to list which venues they offer clients (according to the various age groups listed previously). The other question asked coaches to divide up their time spent within the various venues listed (with total time adding up to 100%). The venue choices related to technology included texting, instant messaging, social network chatting, Skype and email. A chi square test was done to compare U.S. and non-U.S. respondents. There were no statistical differences between venues offered to youth and adults.
For the exposure group comparisons on venues offered, logistical regression models were run for these tests due to the binary variables. There was a significant difference in the amount of time spent with adult clients virtually, those in Group 1 (high coach and adolescent development training) reported spending significantly more time with their adult clients virtually than those in group two (low amount of training) (85.2% vs. 54.2%, p<.05). There was not a significant difference in time spent with youth clients virtually, although respondents in group one spent more time than the other groups with youth clients virtually (55.6%) versus 37.5, 33.3% and 26.7% for Groups 2, 3 and 4 respectively). However, none reported spending more than 9% of their time in any of the areas listed, and texting is the only venue that coaches used slightly more with youth (5.24% with youth vs. 3.19% of time with adults). The rest were very similar in amount of time spent in those categories.

In Table 4.24 below, the results are based on coach’s answers to which coaching venues they offer for various age groups.

Table 4.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Texting n (%)</th>
<th>SMS/Inst. Msg n (%)</th>
<th>Social Network/Chat n (%)</th>
<th>Skype n (%)</th>
<th>Email n (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13–18</td>
<td>19 (29)</td>
<td>11 (17)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>19 (29)</td>
<td>25 (38)</td>
<td>65 (72.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>19 (25)</td>
<td>13 (17)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>26 (11)</td>
<td>32 (43)</td>
<td>75 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>20 (27)</td>
<td>13 (17)</td>
<td>9 (12)</td>
<td>29 (39)</td>
<td>38 (51)</td>
<td>75 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults &gt;25</td>
<td>16 (21)</td>
<td>11 (14)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>35 (45)</td>
<td>41 (53)</td>
<td>78 (86.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages will not equal 100% as multiple categories could be chosen.

There are no significant difference in the age groups of older youth (ages 18–20) and young adults (ages 21–25). There are slight differences between adults and
adolescents, but nothing significant. Skype and Email are more frequently offered to adults. Texting, Instant messaging, and social networking are more frequently offered to adolescents. Anecdotally, some coaches commented that Skype is used more for coaching sessions, texting, email, or instant messages are used for in between session reminders or quick messages relayed. A paired t-test was also run comparing the percentage of time coaches reported spending in these ‘virtual’ categories. There were no significant differences found.

**Flexibility.** Flexibility is looked at by how coaches schedule their appointments, the time spent in appointments, whether or not they give reminders and the duration of the coaching contract or agreement. As length of time spent during appointments was covered above under ‘adaptations of expectations’ above, it will not be covered here.

**Scheduling.** Coaches answered the question, “Do you schedule youth coaching differently than you do with adults?” and indicated never/rarely/sometimes/often/always and n/a. Of the 78 (87%) who answered these questions about scheduling, 25 (32%) indicated they “often” or “always” do; 18 (36%) “sometimes” do; 13 (16.7%) rarely and 9 (11.5%) “never” schedule youth clients differently than adults.

I asked two questions about scheduling, and respondents answered separate questions based on age group. The first question was “Do you call (age group) who misses their scheduled appointment?” The second question was, “Do you make up ‘missed’ or forgotten appointments by (age group)” The majority of coaches “always” call clients who miss a scheduled appointment, and they “sometimes” make up ‘missed’ or forgotten appointments. There were no significant differences in any of the answers within all age groups. There was a slight tendency (but not significant) for coaches to
call adult clients more than minor youth clients if they missed an appointment. In addition, there was a slight tendency (but not significant) for coaches to make up “missed or forgotten” sessions more for adult than minor youth clients.

**Reminders.** I asked the question, “Do you give reminders of upcoming sessions to coaching clients?” They were then instructed to indicate their frequency within different age groups of clients. According to respondents they more frequently give reminders to minor youth than any other age group. The largest difference is frequency in reminders for minor youth where 35 respondents (45%) “often” or “always” give reminders compared to 22 (28%) do so for adult clients. See Table 4.25 below for details.

Table 4.25

**Reminders by Age Group***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Mean (overall)</th>
<th>Never/Rarely n (%)</th>
<th>Sometimes n (%)</th>
<th>Often/Always n (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>38 (48.1)</td>
<td>17 (21.5)</td>
<td>22 (27.8)</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20 y.o.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>21 (26.6)</td>
<td>24 (30.4)</td>
<td>31 (39.2)</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor youth</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>16 (20.5)</td>
<td>18 (23.1)</td>
<td>35 (44.9)</td>
<td>78 (86.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of minors</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>21 (28.4)</td>
<td>20 (27.0)</td>
<td>19 (25.7)</td>
<td>74 (82.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>24 (34.2)</td>
<td>10 (13.7)</td>
<td>17 (23.3)</td>
<td>73 (81.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Category answer ‘N/A’ not included

Linear regression models were run to compare U.S. and non-U.S. respondents; there were no significant differences. Logistic regression models were run for these questions to compare exposure groups. Here also, no significant differences were found.

**Duration.** The question was, “What duration do you typically agree to for a coaching agreement with the following clients?” The four age groups given for this question were as previous (adults>25, young adults 21–25, older adolescents ages 18–20
and adolescents ages 13–17). Seventy-five and 61 coaches responded to these questions according to ages with the 61 applying only to minor youth. There were no statistically significant differences in the answers between age groups. The average length of time for coaching sessions scheduled across the age groups is between 3 and 4 months. However, this percentage increases with age group (from 43% mean for youth ages 13–17 up to 51% for adults >25. There was also a trend for the 13–17 aged youth to more frequently have a duration of 1 to 2 months than adults >25 (23.3% vs. 8%).

**Agenda.** Information was gathered as to the frequency that youth coaches have an agenda. I asked questions about having an agenda, utilizing “pre-set strategies”, specific strategies and being hired to target specific issues. One question related to the use of specific strategies to assist them. A second question related to issues they are hired to target.

I asked a direct question about agendas; “Do you have an agenda when coaching youth?” Of the 88 coaches answering this question (98%), the majority (n=78) indicated they do at some point have an agenda when coaching youth (89%). The frequency of how often coaches have an agenda varies. Thirty-two coaches either often or always have an agenda when coaching youth (36%). The remainder is as follows: 29 “sometimes” (33%); 17 “rarely” (19%) and 10 “never” (11%).

In comparing exposure groups to this question, I ran logistical regression models. There were no statistically significant differences between the exposure group answers for having an agenda. There were some slight variations in that respondents in Group 1 (high coach and adolescent development training) were more likely than Group 2 (high
coach and no to low adolescent development training) to indicate they “often” or “always” have an agenda when coaching youth (38.5% vs. 25.0%).

Some of the qualitative comments describe what ‘agenda’ means to them. “I sometimes have an agenda if I have been hired by an employer or parent to work with them on a particular agenda” (1224170063). “Do we have a set program? Yes. Are we flexible with the program? Yes” (1223642114). “My agenda is to be the best I can for them at that time” (1200738044). “My personal agenda of self-reliance and autonomy is always running in the background” (1199645463). “It’s my agenda to get them clear, clean, focused and moving” (1198206268). One expressed confusion over the term, “Not quite sure what you mean by Q7a with an agenda” (1223642114).

Strategies. I asked a direct question, “Do you utilize pre-set strategies when you coach youth?” Eighty-eight respondents (98%) indicated their frequency (always/often/sometimes/never/rarely). The majority of those coaches (n=86) indicated they do to some extent (98%) to some degree utilize pre-set strategies with youth (compared to two (2%) who “never” do). The degree of frequency varies for coaches with 31 indicating they often or always do (38%). Thirty-five percent indicated they “sometimes” use pre-set strategies.

I also ran logistic regression models for this question to compare exposure groups. For this first question, there were no significant differences between the four groups. However, those with high adolescent development training indicated they “often” or “always” use pre-set strategies with youth more frequently than those with low to no adolescent development training (40% vs. 26%).
Another question targeting strategies was a statement in which respondents would indicate their agreement level; “I use specific strategies to assist me in supporting a youth’s developmental issues.” Of the 69 who responded to this question (77%), the majority (n=49) ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to this statement (71%); 17 were ‘undecided’ (25%) and three ‘disagreed’ or ‘strongly disagreed’ (4%).

I ran logistic regression models in order to compare exposure groups to this question. Data was available to compare Group 1 to Groups 2 and 3. Coaches with a high coach and adolescent development training were significantly more likely than those with little to no adolescent development training to use specific strategies (80% vs. 50%, p<.05).

Some of the comments related to using strategies varied and included doing physically active or outdoor activities and using a personally developed program that is tailored to individual youth. Online assessments and progress measurements are also utilized. One coach specifically mentioned pre-set strategies are only used with youth that are ‘not very open’ to coaching. The next few comments summarize the overall comments related to strategies. “I have various models/strategies to rely on like tools in a toolbox, but without a ‘pre-set’ strategy in mind” (1232595347). “Successful youth coaching must be tailored to the needs, issues and personality of the youth being coached” (1199912939). “I’m not sure what you mean by pre-set strategies” (1199495279). “Feel like pre-set strategies could be an agenda . . .hmmmmm” is another example (1237341734).
I asked one question about use of worksheets and another about workbooks, these were answered by 88 respondents (97%). Respondents indicated they utilize worksheets more frequently than workbooks. See Table 4.26 below for details.

Table 4.26

Use of Worksheets and Workbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never/Rarely n (%)</th>
<th>Sometimes n (%)</th>
<th>Often/Always n (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets</td>
<td>26 (30)</td>
<td>25 (28)</td>
<td>34 (39)</td>
<td>88 (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbooks</td>
<td>40 (45)</td>
<td>25 (28)</td>
<td>20 (23)</td>
<td>88 (98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third question related to strategies was to identify their agreement level to the following statement: “I use specific strategies to assist me in supporting a youth’s developmental issues.” Sixty-nine coaches responded (77%). The majority (n=49, 71%) indicated they agreed to this question. Of the rest, 17 indicated they were “neutral” (25%) and three (4%) indicated they disagreed. Coaches listed developmental needs they address in coaching above (under core knowledge), which includes many of the strategies used. One coach who disagreed with this commented, “While they might be developmentally different, the process works the same. The difference I find is that I spend more time reframing and helping with identifying choices” (1199495279).

Specific issues. The question, “When you’re hired to coach youth is it to target a specific issue?” was answered by 78% of respondents (n=70). The short answer is “sometimes”, which the majority (52.9%) answered (n=37). The remainder were more clear; 31% (n=22) indicated “yes, and 15.7% (n=11) indicated “no”.

A comment area was indicated by the following instructions, “If yes or sometimes, please provide examples of the issues.” Forty-five of those responding gave
examples (65%). Respondents could list as many examples as they wanted. For simplification purposes I have organized the issues indicated by coaches into six categories: self, school, skills, relationships, career and motivation. (See Table 4.27 below.) They will be listed in order of frequency mentioned (highest first). Many of these issues overlap, and may fit into various categories. I chose the categories most obvious to me. No issues were duplicated in more than one category.

Table 4.27

**Issues Coaches are Hired to Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th># of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-confidence, self-esteem, efficacy, belief in self, identity (GLBT, AD/HD), self-aware, strengths, self-care (sleep, hormones, body-image, cutting, drug-use)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Academic performance, study habits, school planning, college choice, college application process, transition into college, school engagement, school stress, grades, organization and school engagement</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Time management, organization, stress reduction, anger management, leadership, planning, communication and study skills</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Family, peer, and general “social integration”, “how to get along”, bullying, “girl drama”, teamwork and antisocial behavior</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>Exploring career goals and options, transition from school to a career and job tardiness</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Motivation, lack of drive, underachievement, lack of focus, lack of goals, lack of commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As one coach responded,

An issue may be identified e.g. young person struggling to gain employment but most often this turns out not to be the main focus of the coaching. It is more likely to end up another issue the young person brings to the table and chooses to focus on which once resolved has a positive impact on the future job chances.

(1238301005)

**Core Methods**

There are two parts in this discussion of core methods: issues and groups. The majority of this section will report on the issues, which consist of 19 individual variables, and will be discussed first. The 19 variables were listed in a question asking respondents to indicate their level of importance, “When coaching youth (between the ages of 13–20) how important is it to focus on the following? At the end of the question, a comment area was left for coaches to indicate any missing issues. The last section of ‘methods’ will be the report of findings on group coaching (which will be discussed separately from the 19 variables). Table 4.28 below demonstrates how I have divided the 19 variables into five categories for discussion: strengthening self; increasing skills; supporting education; including parent; accessing resources.

**Table 4.28**

*Methods for Coaching Youth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Categories</th>
<th>Individual variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Self</td>
<td>• Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developmental Assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to choose between a five point Likert scale that listed: never, rarely, sometimes, often and always. This question (19 parts) was answered by 99–100% of the respondents. Each individual issue has an individual response rate that varies from n=89–90, with the exception of ‘responsibility’ (n=86). I combined the categories for comparison to see rank of importance and U.S. and non-U.S. comparisons, as well as to compare exposure groups. Table 4.29 shows the order of importance of the 19 issues according the combined response of “often” and “always”.

Table 4.29

*Variables Ranked in Order of Importance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>often/always n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>82 (91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>82 (91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal setting &amp; Achievement</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>78 (86.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories. I divided the 19 variables (listed above in Table 4.29) into five separate categories according to likeness: (a) strengthening self; (b) increasing skills; (c) supporting education; (d) including parent; (e) accessing resources. Cronbach’s alpha was done on all 19 variables as a whole and then as subgroups in order to test for internal consistency. The overall score for the variables (\(\alpha=.9\)) demonstrates high internal consistency in the way respondents answered the questions. The Cronbach’s alpha for five of the six categories also showed internal consistency. (I was unable to test Cronbach’s alpha on parent category as there is only one variable.) Since I created this question as well as the combined sub-groups, it was important for me to know that respondents were answering the question consistently. Two sample t-test with equal variances were also performed on the subgroups looking at U.S. and non-U.S. respondents and they way there were ranking those categories and the priorities they set for coaching youth; no significant difference was found.
**Strengthening self.** I have combined four response categories, which fit under this heading: identity, self-awareness, values, strengths identification, developmental assets, and character traits. The majority (more than 70%) of youth coaches believe that each of the top four categories (strengths, self-awareness, identity and values) are either “often” or “always” important for coaches to focus on with youth. (See Table 4.30 below for details.) The last two traits (developmental assets and character traits) were not considered as important.

Table 4.30

**Self: Category and Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>often/always n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths Identification</td>
<td>82 (91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>82 (91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>77 (85.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Identification</td>
<td>75 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Assets</td>
<td>58 (65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>55 (61.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently, coaches indicated that self-awareness (64%), strengths identification (55%) and values identification (46%) are “always” important. Cronbach’s alpha for this category (α=.7596) showed internal consistency in the responses. T-tests results showed no significant differences in answers between U.S. and non-U.S. respondents for this category “self.” Linear regression models were also run with this category in order to examine any differences within exposure groups. There were no significant differences found.

**Increasing skills.** Social and life skills encompass various “skills” that we generally need in order to be successful. This was the second most important category
chosen by youth coaches. In this category I have included eight variables in order of
importance: goal setting and achievement, communication skills, decision making skills,
healthy relationships, responsibility, prioritizing, time management, and social skills.

Table 4.31 below describes the breakdown of percentages.

Table 4.31

Skills: Category and Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Often/almost often/always (n (%))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting &amp; Achievement</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>79 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>78 (86.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Relationships</td>
<td>75 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>71 (82.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing</td>
<td>68 (75.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>59 (65.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>58 (65.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha for this category ($\alpha = .8765$) showed internal consistency in the
responses. T-tests results showed no significant differences in answers between U.S. and
non-U.S. respondents for the category “skills.” Linear regression models were also run
with this category “skills” in order to examine any differences within exposure groups.
There were no significant differences found.

Supporting education. This category includes educational success as well as
career and future planning. Career and future planning is ranked 10th of the 19 variables.
See Table 4.32 below for details. Educational success is tied for last place (19th) with
“access to community resources.”

Table 4.32
**Education: Category and Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>often/always n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career and Future Planning</td>
<td>68 (76.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Success</td>
<td>45 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 45 percent coaches believed this was “sometimes” important to focus on with youth. Cronbach’s alpha for this category (\( \alpha = .6427 \)) showed moderate but acceptable internal consistency in the responses. T-tests results showed no significant differences in answers between U.S. and non-U.S. respondents. Linear regression models were also run with this category of ‘education’ in order to examine any differences within exposure groups. There were no significant differences found.

**Including parent.** There was only one variable in this category. It ranks 16th of the 19 variables with 60% of coaches indicating it is “often” or “always” important. Although not high on the order of variables, more than half of youth coaches believe this is an important focus. Forty-four percent indicated this is “sometimes” important with youth. Cronbach’s alpha was not possible to test with one variable. The T-test score showed no significant differences in answers between U.S. and non-U.S. respondents. Linear regression models were run with this category ‘parents’ in order to examine any differences within exposure groups. There were no significant differences found.

**Accessing resources.** This category contains two variables: access to other adults as resources and access to resources in the community. These were ranked 17th (51 %) and 18th (50 %) respectively in order of importance for youth. In comparing US and non-U.S. responses, non-U.S. coaches rated these two as slightly more important (56 percent) as U.S. coaches (45 percent). See Table 4.33 for details.
Table 4.33

*Resources: Category and Ranking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>often/always n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to other adults as resources</td>
<td>45 (50.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources in the community</td>
<td>45 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha for this category ($\alpha=.8659$) showed internal consistency in the responses. T-tests results showed no significant differences in answers between U.S. and non-U.S. respondents. Linear regression models were also run with this category of ‘resources’ in order to examine any differences within exposure groups. There were no significant differences found.

Mean ranking of categories. After internal consistency was established in the above categories (with the exception of ‘parent’ with one variable), I thought it important to report on the mean scores of the categories for ranking. These are reported in Table 4.34 below.

Table 4.34

*Mean Ranking of Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.5337265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.577801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.7197066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.8941702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.8769663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from coaches. At the end of the list of variables, coaches were asked to comment on “what’s missing?” Fifty-two respondents (58%) responded. The majority
of the comments are directly related to the list in the survey. These comments fit into the following four categories: *identity*, *values*, *strengths* and *social skills*. One respondent observed that many of the interrelated issues may affect the outcome of another issue. “Conflict-resolution, limiting beliefs—although these could go under many of the areas listed above, as so many of these are interrelated; ex: time management often influences educational success as does responsibility and decision making skills, etc.”

A few new issues were mentioned. This first I categorized as ‘health’. Comments here included: nutrition, general health, drug use, life balance and sleep. Balancing education with other aspects of life, especially sleep and nutrition were listed as important issues for college students and those with ADD/ADHD.

Additional issues mentioned could fit into one or several of the categories listed on the survey. These include: trust, resilience, optimism, peer relationships, transitions, physical environment, balance, cultural and social expectations, impact of self on others, procrastination, and motivation.

**Providing individual or group.** The majority of respondents (n=54, 77%) provide coaching to youth both individually and in groups. The majority of the survey questions focused on individual coaching, with a few designated for group coaching. (See core knowledge section for more details related to group facilitation). Respondents who stated that they have not facilitated groups bypassed the questions about group coaching via the set up in Survey Monkey. In this section I will talk about group size, group settings (comparing individual to group) and benefits of group coaching.
Group size. The majority of coaches responded that the optimal group size is less than 11 group members. In response to group size for different age groups, the majority agrees that between 6 and 10 group members is optimal. The breakdown in percentage of coaches who chose this answer within the various age groups is as follows: adult groups (n=23, 33.3%), youth between ages 13–17 (n=39, 59%), and youth between ages 18–20 (n=34, 51%). There is a slight tendency for group size preference to be larger with increasing age of group members, although there is no significant difference.

Group and individual settings. The most common location for both group and individual coaching is in school. Respondents indicated that 40% coach youth at school individually and 39% in groups. See Table 4.35 for details.

Table 4.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Individual n (%)</th>
<th>Group n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>71 (79)</td>
<td>66 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My office</td>
<td>28 (39.4)</td>
<td>17 (25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their home</td>
<td>21 (29.6)</td>
<td>7 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Center</td>
<td>19 (26.8)</td>
<td>27 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My home</td>
<td>14 (19.7)</td>
<td>9 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>6 (8.5)</td>
<td>8 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % will not equal 100 as respondents were allowed to choose multiple settings.

Linear regression models were run for each setting category above to examine exposure group comparisons for both individual and group coaching settings. No significant differences were found between the exposure groups.

There was an option to choose “other” and write in a category. For the question about group coaching settings, 10 respondents commented (15%). They listed public
places (e.g., coffee shops and libraries); out of doors; hotel meeting rooms (renting space); colleges and universities; community centers and at the youth’s place of work. In regards to coaching individually, 24 (33.3%) responded. The most frequently mentioned area (other than the above) was “neutral public location” such as a coffee shop. The next most popular place was out of doors. One creative coach answered the question with, “On the farm, in the barn or in the paddock” (1237341734). Another commonly listed location was either phone or Skype. The remainder included: youth’s place of employment, a group home, and “as requested by parent.”

Benefits of group. The question I posed was, “Please list any benefits youth have received from your group coaching (using one word descriptions when possible).” Fifty-two respondents (58%) commented on benefits youth receive from their group coaching. Two coaches made statements regarding individual coaching being more effective than group coaching. “I’m not as much of a fan [of] group coaching as one-to-one coaching. I’ve found group coaching to not lead to as many benefits” (1200892351). The rest of the respondents listed positive multiple benefits to youth. There were a total of 87 different words describing the benefits of group coaching. In Table 4.36 below, I have placed the summary of benefits into five different categories: self, experiences, peers, skills, and results. Each word participants mentioned fit into at least one of these five categories; none of which were counted twice. The most frequently mentioned descriptive words are included in the table in order of times mentioned.

Table 4.36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Coaching Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**What Support Do Youth Coaches Need?**

“What support do youth COACHES need in order to be successful?” This was an open-ended question answered by 79 respondents (87%). I examined and divided the qualitative responses into five categories, in order to quantify the responses. See Table 4.37 below for details. The overwhelming need that emerged is that they need more opportunities for collaboration and sharing of experiences with other youth coaches. The second most listed need is that of supervision or mentoring. The last three themes, in order of frequency mentioned are awareness and cooperation, training and coach qualities.

Table 4.37
### Needs of Youth Coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other Youth Coaches</td>
<td>Support and contact with others who are doing similar work; opportunities to network, learn from one another, and share best practices and strategies; exchange ideas on what works, what does not work; discuss trends and issues that arise in youth coaching.</td>
<td>37 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>The supervision mentioned included formal supervision, mentoring, mentor coaching and peer coaching.</td>
<td>24 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness &amp; Cooperation</td>
<td>Four categories were listed in this area: parents, community, students’ schools and coach training schools. Concern mentioned was that lack of awareness negatively impacted coaching. If awareness of the value that coaching could provide for youth were increased, there would be more “buy in” from them. Buy-in mentioned included financial backing (buying of services), how they can support a youth who is being coached and that youth can be fully capable individuals.</td>
<td>21 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training in coaching methods, youth development, mental health issues, experiential learning, youth psychology, emotional intelligence, working with different generations, and a coaching approach to working with youth.</td>
<td>18 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities of Coach</td>
<td>The quality repeatedly mentioned was having good, clear boundaries. Others included: being non-judgmental, non-biased, being a good listener, tolerant, creative, spending time with and understanding youth, keeping informed on latest youth trends, holding the youth’s agenda, having a sense of humor, having integrity, morals and great faith in the coaching process.</td>
<td>17 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration

Ideas listed included networking, a place to exchange experiences either online, or through local associations. “It’s great to have professional peers to help brainstorm and develop new ideas/methods” (1223642114). Another coach shared, “Peer sharing of resources, approaches, techniques, methodologies and feedback” (1202620224). “Youth coaches need each other for support, encouragement and introduction to new ideas” (1197675017). “They need a robust space for conversation with other youth coaches to debate/explore/question what they are doing and how they are doing it” (1233781053).
One coach shared some frustration with the lack of collaboration of youth coaches.

Another coach shared:

It would be nice for a group of teen coaches to come together and share what works and what doesn’t. My experience has shown that there are many people that are unwilling to share what they do in the coaching realm, which is unfortunate. There are many teens that could benefit from coaching and sharing our ideas is a wonderful way to reach youth. (1233692408)

**Supervision**

The majority of the comments did not include specific areas of supervision or their rationale. Those that did, specifically mentioned boundary issues, and “knowing your limits.” One comment specifically mentioned boundaries related to sharing youth client information with parents. Youth coaches “need to be regularly supervised and have access to a network of professionals to who the coaches can be referred if necessary” (1238301005).

**Awareness and Cooperation**

If others knew the value that coaching could provide for youth, there would be more “buy in” from them. Buy-in includes financial backing (buying of services), how they can support a youth who is being coached and that youth can be fully capable individuals. “Buy in from educators, parents, other adults involved to allow youth to be who they are, take responsibility for and live their own dreams” (1215577988). Another coach commented “better understanding amongst parents and other supporters of youth as to what coaching is, and how it can benefit teens and help get them on track” (1234418541). “We need support from school administrators as well as teachers. We
need to educate anyone involved with youth what the benefits of coaching are and how it can assist our youth in becoming more self-aware, confident and focused” (1199534470).

Also mentioned is that training organizations need to provide more support to youth coaches. Included in this list is youth specific training, support, and updated research. Guidelines are needed for dealing with parents and support for building a practice that is financially sustainable. One coach commented the need for “coaching organizations to keep coaches informed on the latest and best strategies to use while coaching youth” (1206354400). And another commented,

I am a youth coach at 22 years old, and I coach youth. As a youth, it is difficult to establish myself as a credible authority in the coaching field. Also, the (coach training school she completed) does not offer any strategies regarding how to build your practice or attract clients—this needs to be addressed. (1199750171)

**Training**

Some of the comments were general, such as “Training, training and more training!” (1208397304). Others wanted training specific to coaching youth; “Specialized niche workshops are handy” (1233693354). Another coach stated, “I think this is a niche that needs more practical training and resources” (1208397304). “They need to be adequately trained in coaching methodologies and in recognizing signs of mood and personality disorder” (1238301005).

**Preliminary Analysis**

My primary research question was, “How does the current training, practices and perceptions of youth coaches align with my proposed model?” I believe that this mixed method research does demonstrate alignment of youth coaches with the proposed model.
For certain questions statistical analysis did reveal significant differences between coaches with high amount of adolescent development training compared to coaches with no or a low amount of training in adolescent development. The level of training that a coach had in adolescent development did appear to have an impact on their views about coaching youth as well as the approach they took to their professional practice. The qualitative information gave some clear support for various aspects within the three components: core knowledge, core principles and core methods. In addition, information from the literature review adds validation to the idea of having model to support coaching this population, as well as raising further questions. These will be discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this last chapter, I will discuss the results in the context of the research questions and discuss the proposed model in terms of how it fits (or does not fit) with the literature as well as information gathered from youth coaches in this study. Lastly, I will discuss limitations, recommendations for future research and implications of this research study.

Discussion

This discussion will highlight the study findings in light of what is known in existing literature. This study demonstrates that coaches who reported ‘high’ adolescent development training are more likely to follow aspects of the “Supportive Youth Coaching Model” than those who reported ‘low’ or ‘no’ training in adolescent development. They are more likely to adhere to many of the three core areas within the model than coaches with less training in adolescent development.

Core Knowledge

The knowledge skills and abilities of the coach can impact the success of coaching for a youth client. According to the Supportive Youth Coaching Model, youth coaches should have a minimum amount of training the following areas:

- 60 hours accredited coach training
- 8 hours adolescent development
- 2 hours adolescent specific ethics
• 8 hours group facilitation skills (for those providing groups)

**Coach training.** “Youth coaches need a minimum of 60 hours of accredited coach training from an accredited school.” Accredited coach training is widely available worldwide (ICF, 2010b), and will assist those who want to coach in learning and practicing the essential skills of a coach. Accreditation is supporting the professionalism of coaching. It is important for coaches to pay attention to quality effectiveness of service as well as ethical integrity (Stout Rostron, 2009). The basic level of ICF coach certification requires a minimum of 60 hours coach training from an accredited program (ICF, 2010f). Nearly all (99%) of youth coaches in this study have had formal coach training. Of those, 89% have completed more than 60 hours. Anthony Grant is a prominent research world wide on coaching research. In a keynote speech for the International Coach Federation Coaching Research Symposium, he stressed that in order for coaching to become widely respected cross-disciplinary profession, that it must best based on a solid foundation (2003a). Evidence-based coaching “requires the coach to have the ability, knowledge frameworks and skills to be able to find such information, understand it, determine its applicability, apply it and finally evaluate its effectiveness. (p. 3). Youth coaches need to know and understand the nuances of coaching in order for youth to benefit from the coaching process, as well as to distinguish between coaching and counseling. Professional coach training is a must (Williams & Menendez; 2007).

**Adolescent development training.** Coaches who work with youth need to have a minimum of 8 hours of training in of adolescent development (more is preferred). Youth coaches need to understand the basic nuances of development so that their interactions and strategies used are developmentally appropriate. The majority of youth coaches in
this study agree that youth differ from adults developmentally. In fact, aside from the traditional theorists on adolescence (such as those proposed by Freud, Erikson, Piaget, Kohlberg), newer theorists and those advancing the field of adolescent health emphasize differences between adolescents and adults (Armstrong et al., 2003; Arnett, 2000; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lehman et al., 2002; Steinberg & Sheffield Morris, 2001; Muuss, 2006; Zand et al., 2009). They also agree that transition from childhood to adulthood is a core distinction between ‘youth’ and ‘adults’ (Arnett, 2000; Furlong, 2009; Kahn et al., 2000; NASW, 2003).

Coaches with more training in adolescent development reported feeling more comfortable working with youth by themselves, both in groups and individually. As youth’s competencies change and they master developmental tasks (Zand et al., 2009), this can become extremely confusing and uncomfortable for the worker who is not familiar with basic developmental stages and common strategies to support them. Imagine how confusing or even damaging this can be to an experience for a youth. Sometimes adults have expectations of youth that are not developmentally appropriate. This was a concern of Gorczynski and colleagues (2008) who ran into adherence challenges with the youth (ages 12–14) and suggested that “coaching may not be an appropriate intervention for youth of this age” (p. 23). I would recommend that we as coaches adapt our coaching intervention itself to the developmental level of the youth being served.

**Group facilitation training.** *Youth coaches who facilitate groups should have at least 8 hours of group facilitation training.* The majority of youth coaches who responded, facilitate adolescent groups. More than half of those who reported having
more than 25 hours of training in group facilitation, also have received some adolescent specific group facilitation. It is not surprise, then that there was a significant difference reported in that those with more training (<9 hours) felt more comfortable facilitating groups. Those coaches trained in adolescent development were significantly more likely to not only have training in group facilitation (both general and adolescent specific), but feeling sufficiently trained to facilitate youth in groups.

Working with youth in groups is a common practice and can be effective in increasing pro-social life skills, and are used to facilitate coping and practice of developmental skills and ideas (Augustyniak et al, 2009; Garret, 2005; Huebner et al., 2003; Maddocks, 2007). The group environment with peers may support them learning new perspectives and ways of coping (Augustyniak, et al., 2009). It is important for adults facilitating the group process to know how to work with youth (Gumpert & Black, 2006; Jagendorf & Malekoff, 2006; Konopka, 2006; Kurland & Salmon, 2006; Maddocks, 2007; Malekoff, 2007; Ward, 2008). Group leaders are expected to have knowledge and skills in order to be prepared for and involved in the many levels and nuances within a group process (Augustyniak et al., 2009; Jagendorf & Malekoff, 2006; Gumpert & Black, 2006). Being knowledgeable about the group process supports the group experience being supportive and positive rather than harmful or destructive (Hartford, 2006). There is theory behind group work and it is a myth that the best way to learn is just to “do it” unless there is planning and knowledge behind the group (Hartford, 2006). Group leaders must plan for the unexpected (Jagendorf & Malekoff, 2006). Group work needs to take place in a safe environment (Britton, 2010; Ward, 2008).
**Ethics training.** *Youth coaches should have a minimum of 2 hours of adolescent specific ethics training.* The majority of youth coaches in the study reported that they have had training in ethics, with just over half having received adolescent specific ethics training. Most are not required to take on-going ethics training, but more than half of the respondents reported that they do. Youth coaches in this survey who had a high amount of adolescent development training reported having significantly more training in both ethics and adolescent-specific ethics than those coaches with low or no training in adolescent development. Passmore and Brown included ethical issues in their required training for youth coaches (2009) although this was the only one of the 10 studies reviewed who specifically mentioned training on ethical issues. It makes sense, therefore that coaches take the initiative to learn about and receive support for ethical issues they encounter.

**Core Principles**

According to my model, youth coaches should have some specific guidelines to follow that that are specific to this age group. There are key issues to address prior to begin coaching with youth, some of which may include moral, ethical and legal issues. According the Supportive Youth Coaching Model, there are four areas of focus in core principles: ethics, boundaries, logistics and agenda. Refer back to Table 4.15 in Chapter 4 for outline.

**Ethics.** *Youth coaches have ethical obligations that are above and beyond those of coaching adults that fall under the coaches’ responsibility to be knowledgeable of, and have in place prior to the start of coaching.* Ethics include following a code of ethics or
conduct, what should be included in the formal agreement, potential obligations, roles and responsibilities and confidentiality.

**Code of ethics.** It is imperative that coaches follow a code of ethics (Buckley, 2007; Duffy & Passmore; 2010; ICF, 2010c; IAC, 2010; IAAC, 2010) that is supported and sponsored by a professional association. The intent behind a coaching code of ethics is to help protect clients from harm (Law, 2005). If coaches are clinically trained and/or hold licensure in a profession, that code of ethics should supersede the coaching code of ethics. Codes of ethics provide coaches a framework and values upon which coaches base their practice (IAC, 2010). Ethical issues in coaching can arise in many arenas including within groups (Gumpert & Black, 2006); dealing with potential mental health issues (Spence, Cavanagh, & Grant, 2006); with confidentiality (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010); working beyond your expertise (Passmore, 2009); managing conflict (Law, 2000) and crossing boundaries (Duffy & Passmore, 2010). Some youth coach respondents indicated they do not follow a code of ethics and others were confused about ethical responsibility while coaching youth. Coaches not only need to be trained in ethics, but also have the ability to make appropriate ethical decisions. Some of these decisions can be guided by what is outlined below.

**Formal agreement.** A formal coaching agreement is the cornerstone of informed consent and setting the stage for professional boundaries. The majority of youth coach respondents “always” use a formal agreement with their clients. Although not all countries require parental consent to work with minors, it is recommended that both youth and parent (if youth is a minor) sign an agreement. The formal agreement assists in clarifying boundaries and setting clear guidelines for confidentiality, roles and
responsibilities of coaches (including potential legal obligations). One of the guiding principles in the ICF code of ethics definition of a coaching relationship is that the coaching includes formal contract or agreement that defines roles and responsibilities (ICF, 2010c). Clear distinctions between counseling and coaching is a part of the ethical code of conduct. This clarification should be in language youth understand. This includes not only the spoken language they best communicate in, but also communicating on a level they can understand. These distinctions might need to be made several times in different manners due to the developmental level of the client. Considerations of learning style, literacy levels and ability level would also be key considerations for anything written related to agreements as well as ‘assignments’ for youth and parents.

The absence of a formal agreement leaves room for increased potential for ethical and boundary violations, as well as unclear guidelines and expectations for the coaching relationship.

Potential obligations. Coaches working with minor youth may have potential legal obligations, which could include a criminal background check, Duty to Warn, Mandatory Reporting and obtaining parental consent. Because of the age of the client, as well as differences in legal requirements by country or state, adherence to these obligations may not be required in all cases. These obligations would depend on a coach’s state and country of residence as well as other professional licensures held by the coach. The ethical obligations of a licensed profession (such as psychology, counseling and social work) take precedence and must be adhered to by those coaches.

I recommend that all coaches working with minor youth have a criminal background check done on themselves (through an outside agency) and to have criminal
background checks done on any volunteer or employee that works with minor youth. Criminal background checks are required by many youth serving organizations for the protection of youth client’s from abuse or harm by an adult hired to support them. The majority of youth coach respondents have had criminal background checks completed on them. Of those coaches who either employ or have adult volunteers work with youth, half completed criminal background checks on those adults prior to employment, and half do not.

Youth coaches from the U.S. were significantly more apt to report having had a criminal background check than the non-U.S. respondents. This is most likely due to the variance in different states and countries related to these checks. Of the small number of coach respondents who do hire others (n=23), 30% of them have had to deny employment due to background check results. Although this number does not sound high, and it is not the majority; these are adults who would have been coaching youth who were not appropriate to work with youth. I believe that youth coaches in the U.S. or other countries where criminal background checks are expected could improve adherence to this principle. Passmore and Brown (2009) required coaches to pass background checks prior to beginning their research with high school students. For the protection of the youth we serve, it is important for us to have verification that a youth coach does not have a criminal history that may put minor youth at risk.

Mandatory reporting and duty to warn. Two other issues for youth coaches are whether or not they are to report suspected abuse (mandatory reporting) or to provide notice of impending harm to someone (duty to warn). Both of these would breach the normal realms of confidentiality and so need to be discussed with the client (and parent if
client is a minor) prior to the commencement of coaching. If this were not a legal obligation for the coach, it would still be an important consideration as these laws were created for the protection of minor clients (Minnesota Statutes, 2010a, 2010b; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Youth coach respondents trained in adolescent development were significantly more apt to discuss both Mandatory Reporting and Duty to Warn with their youth clients than those with no or little training.

A large number of countries have laws requiring the mandatory or voluntary reporting of suspected child abuse (Mathews & Kenny, 2008). Being clear about confidentiality and the potential to break it would be considered a crucial part of a coach being transparent in the relationship. Transparency is a key to building a safe relationship in which clients can explore their ideas and goals in order to move forward. Being upfront about Mandatory Reporting and Duty to Warn fits in with the ICF ethical code of conduct which requires coaches to explain the nature and limits of confidentiality (ICF, 2010c).

Spence, Cavanagh and Grant (2006) have raised the issue of coaches’ responsibility towards duty of care. They discuss critical ethical factors for coaches include referral of clients for mental health needs. Research indicates that many coaching clients do have mental health issues and needs (Passmore, 2009; Spence et al., 2006; Stewart, O'Riordan, & Palmer, 2008). Clear distinctions between counseling and coaching for clients is necessary, and coaches who are licensed therapist need to not enter a dual relationship providing services as a coach and services as a therapist (Online Therapy Institute, 2010; Williams & Davis, 2002). This clarification should be in language youth understand. This includes not only the spoken language they best
communicate in, but also communicating on a level they can understand. These
distinctions might need to be made several times in different manners due to the
developmental level of the client “Developing an informed and professional strategy for
dealing with mental health issues, coaches will be working towards both a legal and
ethical duty of care owed to their client, and moving the coaching industry toward a more
professional footing” (p. 84).

*Parental permission.* Youth coaches should ensure parental permission has
been obtained to work with minor youth, prior to the commencement of services,
according to local laws. The majority of youth coach respondents do obtain written
parental consent to work with minor youth. Respondents from countries where parental
permission is not required indicated that they obtain this, as it is the expectation of the
parents. Those with a high amount of training in adolescent development were
significantly more apt to obtain written parental consent than those who had no or little
training.

One reason that coaches may not obtain this (especially in the U.S.) is that
schools may take on this responsibility. According to information gleaned from the
qualitative answers, one reason this is not a higher percentage is that some coaches work
with youth in a school setting. Coaches who work in schools often have no contact with
the parent and permission is arranged with parent by the school instead of the coach.
This would be sufficient according to law related to parental consent, but would not be
sufficient for obtaining parental consent for the youth’s participation in research on the
coaching intervention. I recommend that youth coaches have both parents and youth sign
a formal agreement. This is yet another way to not only ensure that permission is granted
(if required), and to ensure informed consent covering all the above ethical obligations as well.

**Boundaries.** Youth coaches have additional boundaries to pay attention that may be the result of being hired by someone other than the youth, and parental involvement in coaching. Of youth coach respondents, the majority responded that parents were the main payment source of their youth coaching. Providing pro-bono coaching and being hired by schools were the next highest payment sources. Being hired by someone other than the client may be a common practice for internal coaches within an organization, this issue may be more sensitive with a minor youth living with their parents. Establishment of appropriate boundaries in a coaching relationship is an ethical obligation. Coaches may not share information about a youth’s coaching session without permission of the youth, who is the coaching client. This is a part of the ICF code of conduct, and follows with other treatment modalities related to working with adolescents.

Boundary issues mentioned by youth coach respondents include the importance for youth coaches to set and maintain professional boundaries. These include the importance of maintaining a professional relationship, the coach role modeling professional behavior, and the issue of confidentiality with parents. When working with youth a coach does not disclose personal issues in a way that puts the youth in a care taking role (e.g., I have marriage problems, I was an abuse victim too, etc.). As some youth are more impressionable by those adults they trust, coaches need to be aware of the potential influence they have over youth, or the “power imbalance becomes precariously dangerous” (Lindgren, 2007, p. 29). As developmentally, youth may not have the
cognitive ability to understand ethical boundaries, it is the responsibility of the coach to set and hold these boundaries in place (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010).

Youth coaches in general seem confused and conflicted about how and when to include parents in sessions and how and what amount of information should be kept confidential. The general trend seems to be to include parents at least in the first session, for intake purposes (clarifying roles and responsibilities, etc.) but then to limit parental involvement to what the youth client wants. This practice would be along the ethical guideline recommendations of the ICF, as well as general confidentiality laws pertaining to minor youth receiving professional services. Coaching is founded on knowledge and guidance from multiple disciplines (Bachirova & Kauffman, 2008; Grant, 2003a). It makes sense then that coaches utilize the existing confidentiality guidelines from the mental health and health care professions, and be clear about the realms of confidentiality. In the U. S. all but four states (as of 2007) require parental permission for adolescent health care (Lerand, 2007), although the specifics vary from state to state. Youth may not seek services unless confidentiality is ensured (Lerand, 2007).

**Logistics.** Youth coaches need to pay attention to and when possible adapt to logistics that may be necessary for a successful coaching experience for youth, including offering in-person coaching, adapting expectations, being tech savvy and flexible. A common format for coaching is over the telephone. Youth coach respondents reported spending significant more time with youth on the telephone and in-person, than with adults. This is most likely due to the fact that the survey target population was youth coaches, so it makes sense that they would spend more time with youth in all venues than with adults. Recent studies using telephone coaching with youth, found both some
challenges with youth calling or being reached as well youth stating their preference would have been in-person coaching (Gorczynski et al., 2008; Grey et al. 2009; van Zandvoort et al. 2009).

Coaches may need to make adaptations to their coach offerings for youth clients due to their development (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Youth may want or need shorter coaching sessions than adults. Respondents in this study indicated that shorter duration (in minutes) coaching sessions are more common with youth than with adults (although the difference was not significant). Informal, shorter coaching conversations in schools with youth can be effective when tied to “clear principles linked to action” (Creasy & Paterson, 2005, p. 10).

Developmentally, youth often do not yet have the skills or even awareness of adults related to time management, responsibility and follow through. Flexibility is a key to success in working with youth (Fields et al., 2008; Malekoff, 2007). Working with youth may require coaches to be more comfortable with uncertainty than with adults (Fields et al. 2008). Minor youth often cannot make independent choices when setting goals (Sleeper-Triplett, 2008), so allowance for time and ability to adjust those goals based on what they are or are not allowed to do is important. Goal setting is a fundamental part of coaching. Goal setting involves the pre-frontal cortex of the brain (Waring, 2008), which is not fully developed until early 20s. Because of this, youth’s executive functioning skills may not yet be developed, yet are needed for goal accomplishment (Sleeper-Triplett; 2010).

For coaches who work in schools or other educational settings, sessions may be ‘on the fly’ (e.g., in a school hallway for 5 minutes as they are walking between classes).
For youth working on time management or organizational skills, they may need daily check-ins via text, email, or telephone (Sleeper-Triplett, 2010). Shorter check-ins related to specific tasks can often be enough to assist them in re-focusing on their goals for the day. Flexible adaptations may be necessary, depending on the youth’s need and ability (e.g., shorter, more frequent sessions, in multiple formats).

An additional change for youth coaches may include giving reminders to youth clients of upcoming sessions. Developmentally, youth are often still learning time management and responsibility, along with other life and social skills (Komro & Stigler, 2000; Mangrulkar et al. 2001; Muuss, 2006; Sleeper-Triplett, 2010; Weissbert & Utne O’Bien, 2004; Zand et al. 2009). Not only addressing these issues, but allowing for the development of learning is key for youth coach’s successfully providing developmentally appropriate services.

Youth coaches may increase their likelihood of success with youth by being tech savvy. The current generations of adolescents and young adults have been raised with immediate access to information and technology. A common result of reliance on the Internet and text messaging for communication is reduced interpersonal skills (Fields et al., 2008).

Coaches need to individualize their services to meet client needs. Youth clients deserve this same approach and coaches may be more successful with certain clients by using non-traditional coaching methods. By offering a variety of venues for coaching, the individual needs of youth clients can be better met. Examples include Skype, texting, email, instant messaging, and communication through social networking sites. A recent study in Australia found that texting and email communication is a feasible and
acceptable intervention for improving health behaviors in some youth (Kornman et al., 2010).

**Agenda.** Someone other than the youth often hires youth coaches. According to both survey respondents and the literature, this could create potential conflicts with the traditional coaching philosophy of the coach not having and agenda while being paid to address a specific issue. The two areas in which an agenda appears in youth coaching is in utilizing specific strategies or addressing specific issues. Prior to the commencement of coaching, it is imperative for the youth coach to be transparent about the agenda given, and then prioritizes the youth’s agenda within the coaching sessions. Once that agenda is discussed, the coach is to let go of any other agenda they might have in order to facilitate a successful coaching experience. This is an expectation of the coaching practice with adults as well as youth. The majority of youth coach respondents indicate they do have an agenda when coaching youth, with varying levels of frequency.

Another form of agenda includes the coach utilizing specific strategies in their work with youth. Nearly all of the survey respondents indicated they utilize pre-set strategies in their youth coaching, to some degree. Those with more training in adolescent development were significantly more likely than coaches with no or low amount of adolescent development training to use specific strategies. Some strategies mentioned included physical activity, online assessments, or programs developed for youth. Strategies listed by respondents that target specific developmental issues of youth include addressing and supporting the individual self and identity, academic success and future, life and social skills, relationships, career and motivation. Other strategies will be addressed in the next section of core methods.
Have an agenda or specific strategies to work with youth may provide coaches with developmentally appropriate tools to use that may enhance the coaching experience and success for the youth. Coaching was founded on principles of adult development and learning, and taught from an adult developmental perspective (Laske, 2003; Williams & Menendez, 2007). Providing developmentally appropriate services to youth would include the adaptation of the theory, method or approach to fit the developmental level of the coaching client. Since the coaching industry and education has not yet clearly defined what coaching with youth would look like, this model may provide some clear guidelines as well as a starting point for discussion about the practice of life coaching youth.

**Core Methods**

Youth coaches often utilize specific methods and strategies that fit best with the developmental stages of the youth they coach. This research suggests six methods for youth coaches to consider in order to provide developmentally appropriate coaching with youth: strengthening self; increasing skills; supporting education; including parent; accessing resources and providing both individual and group offerings. Strategies listed by respondents that target specific developmental issues of youth include addressing and supporting the individual self and identity, academic success and future, life and social skills, relationships, career and motivation.

**Strengthening self.** Categories listed in the survey under this category include: (a) self-awareness; (b) identity; (c) values identification; (d) developmental assets and (e) character traits. Youth coaches also separately identified developmental needs addressed in coaching include issues related to self, skills and relationships. The most frequently
mentioned issues related to “self” include: self-confidence, self-esteem, self-acceptance, self-identity, individuation, self-empowerment, and self-awareness. Not only is identity development a normal part of adolescence, the development, transitions, risk and protective factors will differ for individual youth and is influenced not only by age, but also race, gender, ethnicity, ability and socio-economic status (Arnett; 2000; Bernat & Resnick, 2006; Furlong, 2009; Muuss, 2006; Steinberg & Sheffield Morries, 2001).

Another key to strengthening self includes the discovery and development of a youth’s strengths, values and competencies (Arnett, 2000; Bromley et al., 2006; Choong & Britton, 2007; Muuss, 2006; Park & Peterson, 2008; Seligman, 2002; VIA Institute, 2010).

**Increasing skills.** The issues related to “skills” include various life and social skills development. Skills listed in the survey included: (a) goal setting and achievement; (b) communication; (c) decision-making; (d) healthy relationships; (e) prioritizing; and (d) time management. Youth coach respondents also identified issues related to relationships include interpersonal relationships with peers and family, dealing with bullying and abuse, peer pressure and community leadership.

Developmentally, adolescence is the time to learn and practice skills, which will support their successful transition into adulthood. Life skills to support healthy development include social or interpersonal skills, cognitive skills and emotional coping skills (Mangrulkar et al., 2001, p. 6). Goal setting is another important part of coaching youth and is not only central to life coaching, but is the foundation of self-regulation (Green et al., 2006, p. 149). Youth coaches need to know that goal setting and achievement with youth may be different due to their development (Males, 2009;
Sleeper-Triplet, 2010) and may need to re-adjust goals frequently for youth (Bartholomew, 2008).

**Supporting education.** Youth are often involved in academics and coaching is becoming increasingly popular in educational settings (Green et al., 2007; Passmore & Brown, 2009). Youth coach respondents to the survey indicated that ‘career and future planning’ was more important than ‘educational success.’ In fact, educational success was tied for lowest of importance of 19 individual variables. One of the reasons for this is that many of the 19 variables listed are interrelated, as was mentioned by a few respondents. Regardless of the setting for youth coaching, focusing on education and future planning will undoubtedly be a part of the coaching process. Whether or not it is a central focus, will depend upon the individual youth.

**Accessing resources.** Teaching and showing youth how and where to access resources is important. Introducing youth to other adults, who could be a resource, can be a healthy and informative way of helping them access resources. Although the Internet is full of resources, youth often lack the experience or skills in how to access other adults. Only 1 of the 10 studies reviewed discussed the importance of youth accessing resources (Powers et al., 2001). Youth benefit from connecting with adults who can provide resources for them (Sullivan & Larson, 2010).

**Providing individual and group coaching.** Importance of group offerings is outlined above. The benefits of group coaching will be discussed here. Youth coach who responded to the question about the benefits of groups for youth were overwhelmingly in favor of group coaching with youth. Only two respondents made statements that individual coaching was more beneficial. One indicated the group
process does not work for all youth. The other indicated they have not found group coaching to be as beneficial to youth as individual.

Providing coaching groups for youth is a natural way for coaches to support their normal developmental needs. Groups can help increase pro-social behaviors in youth (Augustyniak et al. 2010), as they try out new skills and receive feedback and support from peers (Maddocks, 2007; Malekoff, 2007; Ward, 2008). It would benefit both the coach as well as youth served, if the coach has sufficient training and knowledge in group facilitation to provide a choice for youth. I agree that not all youth would benefit from group coaching and that some may be better served through individual coaching.

Additional Research Questions

Relationship between model’s three components. The three components of the Supportive Youth Coaching Model do appear to be interrelated with Core Knowledge being the guiding factor. By first ensuring youth coaches are adequately trained and knowledgeable (Core Knowledge). This in turn will assist coaches in setting up clear guidelines (Core Principles) for the coaching relationship with youth. It would be difficult for coaches to set clear guidelines without adequate knowledge of key components of adolescent development. The combination of knowledge and practice can support coaches knowing developmentally appropriate aspects (Core Methods) or strategies in their actual work with youth.

There does appear to be a correlation in that those coaches who report having ‘high’ adolescent development training following more of the listed Core Principles. Although there were no significant differences between the exposure groups with five of the six aspects of Core Methods, respondents in general indicate that those methods listed
are important aspects of youth coaching. In the last aspect (providing group as well as individual coaching), those with ‘high’ adolescent development training we significant more apt to a) be trained in group facilitation, b) be trained in adolescent specific group facilitation and c) feel sufficiently trained to facilitate adolescent groups than those coaches with ‘no/low’ adolescent development training.

**Appropriate process.** According to the findings of recent research, life coaching is an appropriate process to support youth and may provide multiple benefits to their health, social, emotional and academic success (Campbell & Gardner, 2005; Green et al., 2007; Grey et al., 2009; Passmore & Brown, 2009). According to my study, youth coaches agree. The rational provided by survey respondents includes the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ coaching supports youth. Coaching provides youth with the experience of discovery and growth in a supportive environment. This includes developing the self, learning valuable life skills that are crucial to being successful as an adult as well as exploring their future. Considerations to youth coaching would include age of youth, developmental level as well as skill of the coach. Other benefits youth receiving from coaching according to survey respondents include strengthening the self (self-awareness, self-confidence and well being); benefiting from the coaching relationship and learning new skills or tools.

The risks for youth, according to survey respondents fall into two categories: positive and negative. The positive risks may happen as a result of the natural coaching process, although are risks nonetheless. These include increased maturity and self-confidence. For youth, the inherent risk in this positive outcome could affect their relationship with their peers (potential to create a social stigma for youth who may be
trying to fit in) or with family (a more confident youth may upset the status quo and challenge familial belief systems, creating conflict).

The negative risks tend to be avoidable risks and fall under the responsibility of the coach. These risks tend to be higher with less knowledgeable and less skilled coaches. These risks include boundary issues, coach dependency, youth maturity level and at-risk youth. The latter two fall under the coach’s responsibility as it is the coach who is responsible for assessing whether or not a youth is ‘ready’ for coaching, or if they need to be referred for further services elsewhere. Youth coaches who put into practice the principles recommended in this model would support addressing the potential risk factors of coaching for youth.

**Methodologies and organizing strategies.** Youth coach respondents use different approaches and methodologies, and adapt their coaching approaches to fit youth. These approaches described by the coaches were consistent with those mentioned in the literature. However, there does not appear to be any consistent use of evidence-based theory and methodology among youth coach respondents. Existing literature supports the use of interventions that include cognitive or cognitive-behavioral model for youth coaching (Green et al., 2006; Green et al., 2007; Lacefield et al., 2010; Passmore & Brown, 2009; Rolo & Gould, 2007). Specific mentions among respondents were for the importance of utilizing a solution-focused and strengths based approach, although this may be more general coaching approach for youth and adults.

**Different from adults?** Youth coaches believe that coaching youth is different than coaching adults. The literature clearly points out developmental differences in youth and adults as well as various approaches for working with youth. This difference is basis
of the recommended model. This study illustrates important considerations that must be addressed when coaching youth. Although positive youth development field has created clear information about how to promote positive health and adolescent development, it is less clear about how to put these ideas into practice in youth programs (Huebner et al., 2003). The same is true for youth coaching. With such clear differences between youth and adults, the need for training is paramount. Adults who work with youth need cross-disciplinary training on youth development as well as effective program development for this population (Kahn et al., 2000). Coach training for professional coaches who work with youth needs to include specifics related to youth development and issues related to working with minor youth. Training for youth serving professionals is crucial to the success of implementation of a program yet often overlooked (Shek & Wai, 2008).

Limitations

The sampling approach of this study had some strengths as well as some drawbacks. The target market (youth coaches) was difficult to find, and unknown in number. A convenience sample was used, so the results cannot be generalized to all youth coaches. In addition, although several non-U. S. Countries were represented in the sample, it is not known whether their representation is proportionate to the number of youth coaches practicing in that country. The viral method of the announcement and data collection allowed for the discovery of unknown youth coaches. Keeping the survey open and the link ‘live’ for a longer time period may have resulted in a higher sample size. The sample size of respondents (N=90) limited the ability to use more sophisticated inferential statistics. Despite a relatively small sample size, some statistically significant results were observed.
Recommendations

Improvements

This research process could be improved with a shorter; more focused online survey that is available for a longer period of time. As it is a global survey, partnering with various coaching organizations worldwide could enhance the reach globally as well as increasing the number of youth coach respondents. Piloting the survey in multiple countries would also help to fine tune the language used so that it is more universally understood (e.g., the words mandatory reporting and duty to warn are not known in all countries).

Support for Youth Coaches

What support do youth coaches need in order to be successful? Respondents in the study indicated two main areas in which they need support, which are closely tied together: (a) opportunities for collaboration and sharing experiences with other youth coaches; (b) supervision and mentoring. Youth coaches want support and contact with others who are doing similar work. They want opportunities to network, learn from each other, share best practices and strategies, exchange ideas and discuss trends that arise in youth coaching. Along with this, youth coaches want supervision. Types of supervision mentioned by respondents include formal, mentoring, mentor coaching and peer coaching; all from others who are also youth coaches and understand the particular nuances of adolescent development and youth work.

Considering the lack of information and existing research on youth coaching, it is no surprise that youth coaches are yearning for more information and support. It is also a good sign. As the current leader of the ICF Teen Special Interest Group (SIG), I can
attest that we have grown from 45 members in January 2010 to over 100 members by March 2011. Considering that the majority of youth coaches in this study are not members of the ICF, there appears to be a large pool of growing youth coaches worldwide. The Teen SIG provides youth coaches with many of the above requests, yet it is only opened to ICF members. There is currently a lack of global leadership and guidance about youth coaching, most likely due to the small percentages of coaches indicating this is their specialty area in the global coaching studies that have been conducted. It may be a crucial time for the ICF as well as other coach training organizations to take a stand on youth coaching and create clear and ethical training and guidelines for coaching this population.

Additional areas of support mentioned by youth coach respondents include awareness that youth coaching exists; not just from parents and academic institutions of youth, but from the existing coach training organizations that already exist. Youth coaches often feel isolated in their work and unsupported by the coaching industry. Acknowledgement that youth coaching is important along with growing research in this field will assist increasing awareness of the benefits of coaching youth.

**Further Research**

Because the survey for the research was not a random sampling of youth coaches, this would be an area to explore in more depth. As this specialty area of coaching grows, there will be more opportunity for collecting information and data. This study raised many questions for future consideration. Although there is promising research demonstrating positive results and benefits of life coaching for youth, there remains quite a bit of work for us to do in order to further clarify this field of coaching. I agree with the
International Coaching Research Forum (Institute of Coaching, 2008) that we need more research on coaching children and adolescents.

In order to assist the organization of the following recommendations, I am using Bennet’s (2006) recommendation of six categories of coaching research: (a) coach; (b) client; (c) relationship; (d) process; (e) results; (f) theories or thinking.

**Coach.** When coaching youth, their development needs to be taken into consideration in order to be most effective as a coach. The coach’s knowledge, skill and ability can impact the success of coaching. Research questions to explore:

- Should youth coaches complete additional specialized training prior to coaching youth, especially minor youth?
- What are necessary knowledge, skills and abilities of successful youth coaches?
- Does the coach need to be a professionally trained and certified coach? Or is an adult trained in some coaching skills, adequate to positively impact youth through coaching? This would include exploring the differences between volunteer mentor coaches, training educators or other youth serving professionals in coaching skills to use in their current work with youth?
- How effective are youth trained in coaching skills as peer coaches, especially within a high school setting?
- How does the coach’s gender influence or impact the coaching?
- Is it appropriate for youth coaches to have an agenda? How should that be handled?
Client. The age of the youth as well as their developmental level may determine the best approach in coaching. Research questions to explore:

- What are the differences between coaching youth and coaching adults?
  Coaching young adults and coaching minor youth? Coaching teens and coaching pre-adolescent children?
- How does one determine when a youth is ‘ready’ for coaching?
- What are the cultural, economic, identity, and orientation implication for youth receiving coaching?
- What are the parameters of confidentiality issues between coaches, minor youth clients, and their parents? How does a coach decide what to share, and how does the coach handle issues they want to share but the client does not?

Relationship. The success of coaching is often based on the relationship between the coach and the coaching client (Gyllensten & Palmer, 2007). This is true for other helping professions as well. It is the coach’s responsibility to create a safe and trusting environment in which clients can explore and grow. Research questions to explore:

- What are the parameters of confidentiality when coaching minor youth with involved parents? Should parents be included in coaching sessions? Should parents receive summaries of the coaching session? How do coached bring in parents to support a youth’s coaching process while maintaining confidentiality? How or does this change with age of youth client?
- What are the boundaries that need to be set by the coach when working with youth? Do they differ than boundaries with adult clients? How do coaches ethically handle ‘teachable moments’ with youth related to boundaries (e.g.,
wanting to be ‘friends’, to visit coach at their home, borrow money, intervene with youth’s friends, etc.).

- When confidentiality needs to be breached due to legal or ethical obligations of the coach, how does the coach maintain a supportive relationship with the client so that growth may continue?
- What are the legal, ethical and moral obligations for the coach related to coach/client relationship and technology? May coaches be ‘friends’ with youth clients on social networking sites? If so, within what parameters?

**Process.** According to Kauffman and Bachkirova (2009) the process and dynamics of coaching is as important as evaluating research outcomes. In this research study, many questions were raised about different ways to work with youth through coaching. Greif (2007) discussed how coaching research has different results based on the coaching intervention, that the effects are not always consistent and recommended that “we need more experimental studies, using random assignment to intervention and control groups, and group based research as opposed to single case studies” (p. 222).

Research questions to consider in this area:

- What are the differences between coaching and mentoring youth? Can these two processes be mixed? What are influences of age and development?
- What are the distinguishing differences between academic coaching and life coaching of students?
- What are the pros and cons of individual and group coaching for youth? Does one work better than the other?
• What is the comparison between being coached by peers and being coached by a professional coach?

• What is the impact of coaching in schools as opposed to coaching outside of school for youth?

• What is the time frame most appropriate for coaching youth? Is a 10-week program enough? Do youth need longer time in coaching (than adults) in order to be most effective?

• What determines success or effectiveness in coaching youth?

• What theories or processes common within other fields (such as social work, psychology, counseling) appropriate to use or adapt for coaching (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy).

Results. Campbell and Gardner provided evidence that life coaching does make a positive difference for youth (2005). We need more evidence-based research to identify the specific benefits, both short term and long term. Questions to consider:

• What is the impact of coaching on changing behaviors in youth that are perceived to be more serious with immediate consequences (such as suggested by Gorczynski et al. 2008)?

• What is the impact of coaching on goal attainment for youth using a standardized scale that allows for comparison between studies (as suggested by Fillery et al., 2006)?

• What is the minimum or ideal length for a group coaching experience with youth, in order to obtain long-term benefits?
• What are the differences and similarities in benefits of individual compared to group coaching for youth?

• If educational success is a protective factor for youth experiencing success, and if life coaching really does increase test scores, attendance, grades and graduation rates, how can we ethically not offer this to all students?

**Theories.** According to Bennet (2006) theories are the foundation, which guides the coaching relationship and process, as well as the instruction of coaches (p. 244). There should be evidence to support the theories used in coaching youth, while using evidence-based interventions and approaches (Grant & Cavanagh, 2007b; Bennet, 2006).

• What theories guide the coaching methodologies that result in the greatest improvement in youth outcomes?

• Is there a difference between the approach and knowledge needed for coaching minor youth and young adults or emerging adults?

• How does brain development research impact coaching youth?

• How do we as coaches come to an agreement on the knowledge skills and experience needed to be effective with youth (as Huebner et al., 2003 have recommended for healthy youth development)?

• What should be the supervision requirements or recommendations for youth coaches, and should these differ than for adults and minor youth?

• Should the coaching codes of ethics require youth specific wording on issues related to informed consent, limits of confidentiality, and other topics in which moral and legal obligations to youth clients may differ from adults?
• What are the legal, moral and ethical issues in coaching minor youth? Are coaches mandated reporters?

• What is the psychopathology of youth coaching clients and how does a coach follow through on recommendations for therapy if they have not been trained in recognizing early signs of mental health issues? How does a coach follow through on a recommendation for mental health treatment if the parent is not in agreement?

• How do certified coaches who hold another professional license in a related field clarify, and distinguish between the two professions—especially related to moral and ethical responsibilities related to youth work (i.e., psychologists, social workers, counselors, therapists, etc.)?

• What are the differences between trained certified coaches compared to others provided with ‘coaching skills training’ and their effectiveness in youth coaching. How do the few existing youth coaches reach more youth; and is it effective to provide coach training to other professionals to use coaching skills?

• Are youth coaches who utilize the Supportive Youth Coaching Model more effective than those coaches who do not?

**Implications**

Youth coaching is an emerging specialty area that is lacking in research and in guidance, especially when it comes to minor youth. In fact, a 2003 study conducted of ICF coaches, coaching adolescents under age 18 was one of the least reported specialty areas of coaching (Grant & Zackon, 2004). However, this field of coaching youth seems
to be growing exponentially (Sleeper-Triplett; 2010; YCA; 2010), as evidenced by not only the increasing research on youth coaching, but also by the increased offerings of training related to this specialty area. Use of the “Supportive Youth Coaching Model” could provide guidance to youth coaches as well as coach training organizations that want to improve the lives of youth through life coaching. This is the first research conducted on the perceptions and practices of current youth coaches. The literature and the study results support several aspects of this model.

There appears to be a small subset of coaches who do not believe as I do, especially as it relates to adolescent development and the ethics that surrounds working with minor youth. This is a crucial time for not only the coaching industry, as it works towards establishing a credible and ethical base (Grant, 2003a). There are currently no requirements for training, no formal controls or guidelines for anyone seeking to call themselves a life coach (Brennan, 2008; Brock, 2008). The most crucial risk then, for youth, is the potential for harm. The Supportive Youth Coaching Model, supported by existing coaching literature as well as the findings of this study, provides a beginning framework for establishing guidelines for the practice of youth coaching.

We are at an important crossroads for youth coaching. The benefits to creating youth specific guidelines for youth coaching far outweigh the risks and time consuming process. It is not only youth that can suffer consequences of an unregulated profession. The profession itself, opens itself to less credibility, less professionalism and therefore less successful in its continuous goal to create a sustainable profession.

This research was important for me as a licensed social worker as well. Because of the training, skills and ethical regulation of the well established and credible social
work profession, we are in an excellent position to work as life coaches. Coaching can be used with non-clinical populations as well as being a positive intervention with clinical clients (Biswa-Diener, 2009). For those of us that are both licensed social workers and certified coaches who work with youth, our training provides us with not only a key opportunity to influence the ethics of coaching youth, but a responsibility to do so.

“Advocacy is not a choice but a duty for social workers (Jagendorf & Malekoff, 2006, p. 230). That is my goal in creating the Supportive Youth Coaching Model and in conducting this research.
REFERENCES


doi:10.1080/13676260701342616


doi:10.1080/17521880802346238


Britton, J. J. (2010). *Effective group coaching: Tried and tested tools and resources for optimum group coaching results*. Ontario, Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Canada, Ltd.


The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (the no Child Left Behind Act of 2001), [http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html)


doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2009.07.014


doi:10.1300/J009v29n04_05


International coach federation. (2010e) *Research and Education Portal.* Retrieved from
http://www.coachfederation.org/research-education/icf-research-portal/research-articles/


National Association of Social Workers (NASW). (2003). *NASW standards for the*


http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=44289876&site=ehost-live


StataCorp, L. (2009). *Stata statistical software: Release 11*. College Station, TX: StateCorp LP.


Stewart, L. J., O'Riordan, S., & Palmer, S. (2008). Before we know how we've done, we need to know what we're doing: Operationalizing coaching to provide a foundation for coaching evaluation. *The Coaching Psycholgist, 4*(3), 127–131.


Toguichi Swartz, T., & Bengston O'Brien, K. (2009). Intergenerational support during the transition to adulthood. In A. Furlong (Ed.) *Handbook of youth and young*


http://www.aahperd.org/rc/publications/rqes/upload/RQES_June08.pdf


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: COPY OF FULL SURVEY POSTED ONLINE

YouthCoachingSurvey2010 Edit

Edit Survey

To change the look of your survey, select a theme below.

+ Add Page

PAGE 1

1. Youth Coaching Survey 2010

Hi!

Thank you for participating in the first global survey on Life Coaching Youth!

This survey is done in partial fulfillment for my doctorate in Professional Coaching and Human Development through the International University of Professional Studies (www.iups.edu). The purpose of this survey is to gather information to compare the experiences, perceptions and practices of youth coaching to a proposed youth coaching model. This survey supports a larger study which will recommend best practices for coaching youth.

You are eligible to complete this survey if you identify yourself as a coach, and you do or have coached youth under the age of 21.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The results will be reported without identifying information. No names or contact information is required. While answering this survey you will be asked questions about your training, experience and beliefs about coaching youth. No personal questions will be asked about your own experience as a youth. Therefore, there is no risk seen in participating in this survey.

As a special thank you for completing this survey, I have two gift offerings for you, which will be made available at the end of the survey:
1. A FREE summary of the results of this survey.
2. A chance to win a brand new FREE iPod Nano with Multi-Touch ($150.00 value!)

Instructions on how to request a copy of the summary and how to enter the drawing for a free iPad will be given to you at the end of the survey. If you choose either (or both) of these gifts, your contact information will not be tied in any way to your answers in this survey.

Thank you in advance for taking your time to complete this survey and participate in groundbreaking research about life coaching youth!

-Sandi Lindgren, LICSW, PCC
2. Survey Participants

For this survey, I am defining "youth" as adolescents under the age of 21 (which includes both high school and college students). I need to find out if you qualify to be a survey participant with this next question.

Q1

1. Q1: Have you ever coached youth aged 20 or younger?
   Yes
   No

3. Thank you for attempting to complete this survey.

You have answered "no" that you have not coached youth aged 20 or younger, therefore you are not eligible to complete this survey.

I thank you regardless.

If you are interested in a FREE copy of the survey summary, please send an email to me at sjlindgren@mac.com and put "request survey summary" in the subject line.

Thank You.

Sandi Lindgren, LICSW, PCC

4. Coaching Methods

Some youth coaches have some pre-set strategies or methods they use when they coach youth, specifically because of where they are developmentally. These might include addressing issues youth typically struggle with or skills they need to learn. This page is to gather information on what YOU think are important issues or strategies for coaching youth.

Q2

2. Q2: Is life coaching an appropriate process to support youth? Please comment about why or why not.
   Yes
   No
   Unsure

   Q2a: Please comment:
Q3. Briefly describe your coaching methodology with youth under age 18.

Q4. When coaching youth between the ages of 13-20 how important is it to focus on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a: Identity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b: Self-awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c: Value identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d: Goal setting &amp; achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e: Strengths identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f: Character Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g: Developmental Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h: Social Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i: Educational Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j: Prioritizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k: Parental/peer influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4l: Access to resources in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m: Access to other adults as resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4n: Career/future planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4o: Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4p: Decision-making skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4q: Healthy relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r: Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4e: Other (please specify): What's missing from this list?
Q5
1. Q5: In your experience, what benefits do youth receive from individual coaching?

Q6
4. Q6: In your opinion, what "risks" might exist for youth who receive coaching?

Q7
7. Q7: Please answer what best fits your style of coaching with youth.

Q7a: Do you have an agenda when coaching youth?
Q7b: Do you utilize pre-set strategies when you coach youth?
Q7c: How often do you include the parent in minor aged youth coaching?
Q7d: Do you use workbooks as a part of your youth coaching?
Q7e: Do you use worksheets as a part of your youth coaching?
Q7f: Do you use text books or other books already in print with youth?
Q7: Do you use initiative games when group coaching youth?

Q7a: Comments on any of the above:

---

Q8: What support do youth COACHES need in order to be successful?

---

Q9: Have you ever facilitated a group?

Yes
No

---

5. Coaching Groups

Q10: Have you ever facilitated an ADOLESCENT group?

Yes
No

---
11. Q11: Have you ever received formal supervision for your group facilitation?
   Yes | No

12. Q12: Please estimate the approximate number of groups you have facilitated in each of the categories below. A group could meet once or ten times, they would both be counted as one group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups - general lifetime:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a: Groups - coaching groups (lifetime):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c: Adolescent groups (lifetime):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d: Groups in the past year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e: Coaching groups in the past year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f: Adolescent groups in the past year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12g: Adolescent coaching groups in the past year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-35</th>
<th>36-50</th>
<th>50+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Q13: In your opinion what is the optimal group size for the following type of groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>40+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13a: Adult?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13b: Youth ages 13-17?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13c: Youth ages 18-20?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Q14: Please choose the answers that most fit your group coaching with youth. You may choose more than one answer.

- Q14a: NA
- Q14c: I have a co-facilitator who is a coach
- Q14d: I have a co-facilitator who is not a coach
- Q14e: Other (please describe below)

Q14b: I am the only coach

Q14f: Other (please specify):
### Q15
15. Q15: Please list any benefits you have received from your group coaching (use one word descriptions when possible):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q16
16. Q16: In what setting(s) have you or do you coach youth in groups? Please check all that apply.

- Q16a: School
- Q16b: Church
- Q16c: Their home
- Q16d: My home
- Q16e: My office
- Q16f: My youth
- Q16g: Other (please specify)

### 6. Coaching Principles

This part of the survey asks questions related to your experience and perceptions related to the coaching agreement, intake sessions and some of the preparation to coach youth.

### Q17
17. Q17: The following question is related to having a formal coaching agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17a: Do you use a formal coaching agreement with your clients?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17b: Do adult clients sign an agreement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17c: Do youth ages 18-21 sign an agreement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17d: Do parents of youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17b: Do you explain "Duty To Warn" with your adult clients?
Q17c: Do you discuss the difference between coaching and therapy with your clients?
Q17d: Do you explain to youth Mandatory Reporting?
Q17e: Do you explain to parents of the youth Mandatory Reporting?
Q17f: Do you discuss confidentiality with the youth and parent together?
Q17g: Do you include parents in a youth's coaching session?
Q17h: Do you clarify your own roles/responsibilities with a youth client?

Q18. Q18: Please describe your perceptions of how and when to include the parents of a minor youth client.
Q19. Have you ever had a criminal background check done on yourself for employment purposes?

Yes  No

Q20. The following questions are about criminal background checks, where a professional agency does a criminal background check of your personal record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20(g): Do you share with parents of minor clients (under 18 years old) that you have a criminal background check completed on you?
Q20(h): Is your background check updated annually?
Q20(i): If you have ever employed or had volunteer adults work with youth in your organization or care; do you have criminal background checks completed on them? (N/A if you have not employed or had volunteer adults)
Q20(j): Have you ever hired someone as an employee or volunteer to work with youth because of the results of a criminal background check?
Q20(k): Comments:

7. Coaching Logistics
In this section, I will be asking about aspects outside of the actual coaching sessions. Logistics are what coaches might pay attention to and possibly adapt their own planning, due to the developmental nature of youth clients.
21. Q21: Please answer the following according to your perception and your practices with youth.

Q21a: Do you schedule youth coaching differently than you do with adults?

Q21b: Do you call an adult client who misses their scheduled appointment?

Q21c: Do you call a youth (under 18) who misses their scheduled appointment?

Q21d: Do you call a youth (ages 18-20) who misses their scheduled appointment?

Q21e: Do you make up missed or forgotten appointments with adults?

Q21f: Do you make up missed or forgotten appointments with older youth (18-20)?

Q21g: Do you make up missed or forgotten appointments with youth (under 18)?

22. Q22: Please describe the coaching venues you offer for each type of client.

Telephone
(client calls you)

Telephone
(you call client)

Texting

Social
Messaging

Social
Instant
Network
Messaging

In person

Skype

Email

Q22a: Adults over 25 years old

Q22b: Young adults ages 21-26

Q22c: Older youth ages 18-20

Q22d: Adolescents ages 13-18

Q22e: Other (please specify)

23. Q23: This question is related to typical length of time for your coaching sessions.

Q23a: Adults (25+)

5-15 minutes

16-30 minutes

31-45 minutes

46-60 minutes

1 hour or longer

https://www.surveymonkey.com/m/survey_builder/full.aspx?hn=hp/r9/U0ypr3qoO7nFzFvG3z1WWk4cty3bUZ6F8pMwO8h3d
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Q21b: Young Adults (21-25)
Q21c: Older Adolescents (16-20)
Q21d: Adolescents (13-18)
Q21e: Other (please specify)

Q24
24. Q24: What duration do you typically agree to for a coaching agreement with the following clients?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>1-2 months</th>
<th>3-4 months</th>
<th>5-6 months</th>
<th>6-9 months</th>
<th>9+ months</th>
<th>1 year or longer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24a: Adults (over 25 years old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24b: Young adults (ages 21-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24c: Older Adolescents (ages 16-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24d: Adolescents (ages 13-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24e: Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q25
25. Q25: What percentage of your total coaching time with ADULTS do you typically use the following venues (please be sure your total time adds up to 100%)?

Q25a: In-person
Q25b: Telephone
Q25c: Skype
Q25d: Texting
Q25e: Instant messaging/chatting
Q25f: Email
Q25g: Other

Q26
26. Q26: What percentage of your total coaching time with YOUTH do you typically use the following venues (please be sure your total time adds up to 100%)?

https://www.surveymonkey.com/M3survey editar?full.aspx?z=9ppYd4sycV5z7ZrFZwQe21W44qctv310hZ8FbpMXw0I3d
### Q26: In-person
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26b: Telephone
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26c: Skype
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26d: Texting
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26e: Instant messaging/chatting
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26f: Email
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### Q26g: Other
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

---

### Q27: Do you give reminders of upcoming sessions to coaching clients? Please answer regarding the following populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27a: Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27b: Youth ages 18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27c: Minor youth (under 18 yrs old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27d: Family Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27e: Parents of minor clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 8. Demographics and Key Knowledge

This last page is to collect information on who you are, a little of your background and your experiences and perceptions related to coaching youth. This is the last section!

---

### Q28: Please confirm your age (in years):

- [ ]

---

https://www.surveymonkey.com/M3Survey_EditorFull.aspx?z=a1h8tUYJyprzqod792fvtGez21WW4pcty3z1bq/Zt9F9xfqC3d
29. Q29: Please confirm your gender.

30. Q30: Please state your race/ethnicity. Multiple options possible, or fill in the blank with 'other'.
- Q10a: American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Q10b: Asian
- Q10c: Black or African American not of Hispanic Origin
- Q11: Chinese
- Q12: Other (please specify)

31. Q31: Please specify your country of residence.

32. Q32: What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

33. Q33: What prompted you to take this survey? If you received this link more than one time, please list all ways this survey link was shared with you. If you are willing to share which websites or social networking sites it came from, that would be helpful.
- Q33a: Received survey link in email
- Q33b: Link posted on social networking site
- Q33c: Link posted on a newsletter
- Q33d: Link posted on a website
- Q33e: Link was given to me by a colleague
- Q33f: Link was given to me by a network
- Q33g: I heard about the survey from the following: (please describe below)

Q33f: Other (please specify)
Q34. Do you have formal coach training?

Q35. Please estimate the amount of formal coach training you have had.

Q36. Are you a member of a professional organization or association for coaches?
   Yes (please list below)
   No
   Q36a: If yes, please list the professional organization(s) or associations of which you are a member.

Q37. Please list other professional titles you hold (e.g., psychologist, social worker, youth worker, accountant, etc.).

Q38. Please state your answers in (whole numbers): number of years. If less than 6 months, use 0. If 7 months more in any year, round up. How many years have you been:
   Q38a: Coaching?
   Q38b: Coaching YOUTH?
   Q38c: GROUP coaching?
   Q38d: Group coaching YOUTH?
Q38: Working professionally with adolescents?

Q39: Are you certified by the International Coach Federation (ICF)?

Q39a: If yes, please state how many years you have been ICF certified?

Q40: Are you certified or accredited through a coach training organization other than ICF? If yes, please list your coaching credentials and the name of the organization where you earned that credential. (e.g., Certified Life Coach - Institute for Life Coach Training).

Yes

No

Q40a: If yes, please list your coaching credentials and the name of the organization where you earned that credential.

Q41: Aside from youth ages 13-20, who else do you coach? Please check all that apply, including specialty areas.

Q41a: Families

Q41b: Parenting

Q41c: Children under 13

Q41d: Young Adults (18-25)

Q41e: Adults

Q41f: ADD/ADHD

Q41g: Business/Organizations

Q41h: Other (please specify)
42. Q42: Who pays for the youth coaching you do?
   Q42a: Youth themselves
   Q42b: Parents
   Q42c: Other family
   Q42d: Courts
   Q42e: County
   Q42f: Other (please specify):

43. Q43: Please estimate the amount of formal training you've received in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>less than 6 hours</th>
<th>9-16 hours</th>
<th>17-34 hours</th>
<th>25-60 hours</th>
<th>60-120 hours</th>
<th>More than 120 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Q43a: Adolescent development
   Q43b: Group facilitation (general)
   Q43c: Adolescent-specific group facilitation
   Q43d: Ethics
   Q43e: Ethics that focuses on working with adolescents

44. Q44: Do you have any requirements to take ethics training?
   Yes
   No

45. Q45: How often do you take ethics related training?
   (Please specify)
46. Q46: Please state your perceptions about the following statements regarding training.

| Q46a: I've received sufficient training in adolescent development to feel comfortable working with youth by myself. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
| Q46b: I've received sufficient training in group facilitation to feel comfortable facilitating groups by myself. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
| Q46c: I've received sufficient training to work with youth. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
| Q46d: I've received sufficient ethics training to work with youth. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
| Q46e: Formal supervision for adolescent group facilitation is important. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A |
| Q46f: Other (please specify): | |

47. Q47: Indicate your agreement with these statements about coaching youth and developmental issues:

| Q47a: Developmentally, I believe youth and adults are different. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Q47b: I approach my coaching with youth differently, based on their developmental level. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Q47c: I use specific strategies to assist me in supporting a youth's developmental issues. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Q47d: Please describe any developmental needs of youth that can be addressed in coaching: | |

https://www.surveymonkey.com/M3Survey_EditorFull.aspx?mr=hpNhWUOuIrSpS9qodizZcFvGe21WW4qctx3z1BrZfFp8kUwRh8d
48. Q48: In what setting/s have you or do you coach youth individually? Please check all that apply.
   Q48a: School
   Q48b: Church
   Q48c: Their home
   Q48d: Other (please specify)

49. Q49: When you’re hired to coach youth is it to target a specific issue?
   Yes
   No
   Sometimes

Q49a: If yes or sometimes, please provide examples of the issues:

50. Q50: This question is regarding following an ethical code or code of conduct. Please answer the following questions.

| Q50a: Do you follow a written code of ethics or conduct? |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Never   | Rarely      | Sometimes  | Often       | Always      |
|         |             |             |             |             |

| Q50b: Do you share a written code of ethics or conduct with your adult clients? |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Never   | Rarely      | Sometimes  | Often       | Always      |
|         |             |             |             |             |

| Q50c: Do you share a written code of ethics or conduct with your youth clients? |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Never   | Rarely      | Sometimes  | Often       | Always      |
|         |             |             |             |             |

| Q50d: Do you share a written code of ethics or conduct with parents of your youth clients? |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Never   | Rarely      | Sometimes  | Often       | Always      |
|         |             |             |             |             |

Q50e: If you follow a code of conduct or ethical code please specify which:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/M3survey_editO?ll.aspx?nm=hpYyWU3yyp9p4od75d5vGcZ1WWxqGly5x3xhFbpWfXuw0bd
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Q51

51. Q5: This is the last question! :-) Anything that you believe is essential, related to coaching youth, which has not been mentioned here? Or do you have any other comments?

+ Add Question

9. THANK YOU!!

Thank you SO much for taking your time to complete this survey on coaching youth. I REALLY appreciate your time and effort in supporting life coaching for youth.

Please forward or send the survey link that you found to any other youth coaches you know. Also feel free to post this survey link in a place where other youth coaches may see it. This survey will be open and available to complete until DECEMBER 31st, 2016.

As a special THANK YOU, I have two gift offerings for you below.
1. A free summary of this survey results
2. An opportunity to win a FREE iPod Nano with Multi-Touch ($150.00 value)!

In order to maintain your privacy and anonymity, you will have to send an email (or two) per the instructions below to receive your free gifts. Please take the time to write down the emails given below, as you cannot return to this page.

Thank you!
-Sandi Lindgren, LICSW, PCC

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MySurveyBuilderFull.aspx?in=hpTHWU1y3p3qos3hGk21Wkqtc3jw28f3fMxw023b4
APPENDIX B
SCREEN SHOT EXAMPLE OF SHORTER INTRODUCTION
(FOR FACEBOOK AND TWITTER)
APPENDIX C

SCREEN SHOT EXAMPLE OF REMINDER POSTING ON WEBSITES


docard

Do young adults and teens benefit from life coaching? 
Are you passionate about coaching youth? I need your help if you've coached young adults or teenagers! I'm in the midst of my dissertation research on coaching youth. I need your expertise, thoughts and experiences to help me come up with a youth coaching model that supports best practices for coaching this population. I've created an online survey to complete, which takes about 25 minutes and should be completed in one setting. I realize this is a large chunk of time to donate, and hope that your passion about youth will motivate you to complete it. :) Those who complete the survey may receive a free copy of the survey summary and a chance to enter the drawing for a free iPod multi-touch!

I need more completed surveys. So far, approximately 34 people from six different countries have completed the survey (Canada, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain, UK and USA). I'm hoping for at least 100 completed surveys! If you coach this population, please take the time to complete the survey (link below), I would love it if you would be willing to pass this information and link onto other youth coaches. You can post this information anywhere youth coaches may see it. (The survey link will be open until December 5th, 2010).

THANK YOU in advance for taking the time to complete this survey and participate in groundbreaking research about life coaching youth!
Sandi Lindgren, PCC
9 seconds ago
YouthCoachingSurvey2010 surveymonkey.com

See all updates >
APPENDIX D
SCREEN SHOT MESSAGE TO DISQUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

3. Thank you for attempting to complete this survey.

You have answered "no" that you have not reached youth aged 20 or younger, therefore you are not eligible to complete this survey.

I thank you regardless.

If you are interested in a FREE copy of the survey summary, please send an email to me at: sjlindgren@mac.com and put "request survey summary" in the subject line.

Thank You!

Sandi Lindgren, LICSW, PCC
APPENDIX E
COPY OF SURVEY ENDING

9. THANK YOU!!!

Thank you SO much for taking your time to complete this survey on coaching youth. I REALLY appreciate your time and effort in supporting life coaching for youth.

Please forward or send the survey link that you found to any other youth coaches you know. Also feel free to post this survey link in a place where other youth coaches may see it. This survey will be open and available to complete until DECEMBER 5th, 2010.

As a special THANK YOU, I have two gift offerings for you below.
1. A free summary of this survey results
2. An chance to win a FREE iPod Nano with Mutli-Touch ($150.00 value)

In order to maintain your privacy and anonymity, you will have to send an email (or two) per the instructions below to receive your free gifts. Please take the time to write down the emails given below, as you cannot return to this page.

Thank you!
-Sandi Lindgren, LICSW, PCC

If you would like a FREE summary of the survey results, please send an email to me (Sandi Lindgren) at sjlingren@nac.com. Put in the subject line "requesting survey summary"; please be sure to include your name as well. I will send you the summary when it is available.
APPENDIX F
ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Association*</th>
<th># of respondents of n = 52**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICF Global</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI (Coaches Training Institute)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA (Minnesota Coaches Association)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF-Turkey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA (Greater Toronto Area Coaches)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Active Network</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach U</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Coach Alliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine Facilitator’s Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF—New England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF –Vancouver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli Coaching Federation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Career Counseling Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Youth Mentoring Network</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bandler Society—NLP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Professional Coaches Alliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK PPD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney Coaching &amp; Mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some organization names are unknown and so are printed as written by respondents
** Respondents could list more than one organization
# APPENDIX G

## COACHING APPROACHES LISTED BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodologies</th>
<th># of respondents of n = 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A methodology “that I developed”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Active</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD/ADHD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Focused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI (Coaches Training Institute)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance based</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process based / processing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent as Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Wisdom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firework Career Coaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story based</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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