Introduction and Conclusion © Tatiana Bachkirova, Elaine Cox and David Clutterbuck 2014

Chapter 1 © Graham Lee 2014
Chapter 2 © Helen Williams, Stephen Palmer and Nick Edgerton 2014
Chapter 3 © Michael Cavanagh and Anthony Grant 2014
Chapter 4 © Stephen Joseph 2014
Chapter 5 © Peter Bluckert 2014
Chapter 6 © Ernesto Spinelli 2014
Chapter 7 © Alan Sieler 2014
Chapter 8 © David Drake 2014
Chapter 9 © Tatiana Bachkirova 2014
Chapter 10 © John Rowan 2014
Chapter 11 © Ilona Boniwell, Carol Kauffman and Jordan Silberman 2014
Chapter 12 © Rosemary Napper and Trudi Newton 2014
Chapter 13 © Bruce Grimley 2014
Chapter 14 © Bob Tschannen-Moran 2014
Chapter 15 © Elaine Cox and Peter Jackson 2014
Chapter 16 © Peter Hawkins and Nick Smith 2014
Chapter 17 © Jon Stokes and Richard Jolly 2014
Chapter 18 © Andrea Ellinger, Rona Beattie and Robert Hamlin 2014
Chapter 19 © David Clutterbuck 2014
Chapter 20 © Richard Ladyshewsky 2014
Chapter 21 © Anthony Grant and Michael Cavanagh 2014
Chapter 22 © Margaret Moore and Erika Jackson 2014
Chapter 23 © Bruce Hazen and Nicole Steckler 2014
Chapter 24 © Geoffrey Abbott 2014
Chapter 25 © Bob Garvey 2014
Chapter 26 © David Lane, Reinhard Stelter and Sunny Stout-Rostron 2014
Chapter 27 © Peter Hawkins 2014
Chapter 28 © Michael Cavanagh and Andrew Buckley 2014
Chapter 29 © Dianne Stober 2014
Chapter 30 © Diane Brennan and Leni Wildflower 2014
Chapter 31 © Annette Fillery-Travis and Elaine Cox 2014


Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013947175

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4462-7615-0
ISBN 978-1-4462-7616-7 (pbk)
## Contents

About the Editors and Contributors viii  
Foreword xix  

Introduction  
*Tatiana Bachkirova, Elaine Cox and David Clutterbuck*  

SECTION I THEORETICAL APPROACHES 19  

1 The Psychodynamic Approach to Coaching  
*Graham Lee*  

2 Cognitive Behavioural Coaching  
*Helen Williams, Stephen Palmer and Nick Edgerton*  

3 The Solution-focused Approach to Coaching  
*Michael Cavanagh and Anthony Grant*  

4 The Person-centred Approach to Coaching  
*Stephen Joseph*  

5 The Gestalt Approach to Coaching  
*Peter Bluckert*  

6 Existential Coaching  
*Ernesto Spinelli*  

7 Ontological Coaching  
*Alan Sieler*  

8 Narrative Coaching  
*David Drake*
All forms of coaching, in one way or another, seek to develop solutions to the issues brought forward by the client. What then is unique about solution-focused coaching? How does it differ from other forms of coaching? This chapter outlines the background and basic tenets of the solution-focused (SF) approach, and examines some core assumptions and processes underpinning it as a methodology for change.

The SF approach to coaching places primary emphasis on assisting the client to define a desired future state and to construct a pathway in both thinking and action that assists the client in achieving that state. It contrasts with other approaches by eschewing much of the problem state definition seen in other traditions. In so doing, the SF approach is situated squarely in a constructivist epistemology – maintaining that events and their meanings are actively constructed in dialogue rather than simply given to us in experience (O’Connell, 1998).

According to SF theorists, the act of spending large amounts of time and effort in articulating a strong definition of the client’s problem, deconstructing the chain of cause and effect that led to the current state of affairs, or apportioning blame, is often a waste of time and energy. Indeed, SF theorists hold that it is often positively counterproductive (Jackson & McKergow, 2007). Knowing how a problem arose does not necessarily tell one how to fix it. Furthermore, proponents of the SF approach suggest that the very act of articulating a causal explanation may serve to constrain the coach and coachee into a frame of reference that limits potential solutions rather than uncovers them (de Shazer, 1994).
HISTORY OF THE SOLUTION-FOCUSED APPROACH

Like many of the recognized approaches to coaching, the SF approach has its roots in therapy. The foundational work in brief therapy, out of which the SF approach arose, was conducted by Gregory Bateson, John Wicklund and others at the Mental Research Institute in Palo Alto, California, in the 1960s (Jackson & McKergow, 2007). The SF approach as we have come to know it today was first articulated in the late 1970s and early 1980s by Steve de Shazer, Insoo Kim Berg and colleagues at the Brief Family Therapy Centre, in Milwaukee Wisconsin, USA. Since then, considerable work has been undertaken in articulating and developing the main tenets of the approach by a host of authors, both at the Brief Family Therapy Centre and at a range of locations around the world (O’Connell, 1998).

According to Berg and Szabo (2005), therapists and researchers at these centres had become dissatisfied with the traditional therapeutic approach, finding that the more clients talked about their problems the more entrenched they would get. Rather than analysing problems, developing diagnoses, uncovering root causes and prescribing treatment plans, based on a priori theoretical models of the issue, they began to simply ask questions that focused their clients’ attention on building solutions. The key question in developing the approach was ‘what works for the client?’ They found that a focus on solution talk, strengths and resources, rather than problem talk, was very effective for a large range of clients. Indeed, there is a growing body of research suggesting SF therapy can be effective for a wide array of problems, including couple counselling (Murray & Murray Jr, 2004), child and adolescent counselling (Corcoran & Stephenson, 2000; Lethem, 2002) and depression (Dahl, Bathel, & Carreon, 2000). There is also research that supports the use of SF coaching in personal coaching (Green, Grant, & Rynsaardt, 2007; Green, Oades, & Grant, 2006; Spence & Grant, 2007) and workplace coaching (Barrett, 2004).

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The SF approach is distinguished from more traditional models of psychological change (e.g. cognitive behavioural and psychodynamic coaching) by two fundamental philosophical assumptions.

First, as mentioned above, the SF approach adheres to a constructionist philosophy. It holds that it is the way in which the client (and coach) think and talk about events that constructs those events as problematic. The problem is not something given in reality, but constructed in the discourse between the client and others in the client’s world.

Second, the SF approach sees the client as fundamentally capable of solving their problem. That is to say, they already have all they need to create the solution state (Berg & Szabo, 2005; de Shazer, 1988). This conceptualization of the client sees the person as whole and resource-full, rather than as dysfunctional and needy. When taken together these assumptions lead to several key tenets of SF approaches (O’Connell, 1998):

1. Use of a non-pathological interpretive framework. Problems are not indications of pathology or dysfunction. Rather they indicate a need to try different perspectives or behaviours.
2. Client-based expertise. The idea is that the client rather than the coach is the expert in their own life.
3. **Coaching is about facilitating solution construction.** The coach primarily facilitates the construction of solutions rather than trying to understand the aetiology of the problem.

4. **Focus on client resources.** The coach helps the client recognize and utilize existing resources.

5. **Clear, specific and personalized goal setting.** To assist the client in attaining their preferred future, the articulation of that future state should be clear and behaviourally detailed. Because problems and solutions are constructed by the client, coaching interventions should be tailored to each client.

6. **Action orientation.** There is a fundamental expectation on the coach’s part that positive change both can, and will, occur, and that the work of change takes place primarily outside of the coaching session.

7. **Do what works and stop doing what does not work.** Allied to the commitment to an action orientation is a pragmatic focus on identifying what is working for the client and amplifying this. Similarly, if an attempt at problem resolution is not working, then stop and try something different.

8. **Change can happen in a short period of time.** Because the client is already whole, change does not require fixing the client. This stands in contrast to the assumption that change must be worked on over a long period of time.

9. **Enchantment.** Borrowed from the work of Milton Erikson, SF approaches suggest that the coaching process be designed and conducted in a way that is attractive and engaging for the client.

More recently, following a review of the SF literature, Visser (2012a) proposed and tested nine basic assumptions held by SF coaching practitioners (see Table 3.1). Visser (2012a) surveyed 134 practitioners and found significant correlations between these assumptions and the number of years of practice and intensity of use of SF approaches.

### Table 3.1 Assumptions made by solution-focused practitioners (taken from Visser, 2012a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **About people** | 1. People prefer to choose for themselves what they initiate and they want to control as much as possible what they do (need for autonomy).  
2. People prefer to be competent, view themselves as competent and they are already competent to some extent (need for competence).  
3. People want to have and build meaningful and caring relationships with other people and want to do things that make a positive difference to others (need for relatedness). |
| **About change** | 1. There is always already a beginning of the desired situation on which further progress can be built (existence of past success).  
2. People change best by taking actions, one step at a time, and reflecting on and responding to the consequences of those actions so that an intelligible pattern eventually starts to form (stepwise change).  
3. Positive behaviour descriptions, both in the future and in the past, irresistibly trigger positive behaviours (positive behaviour descriptions). |
| **About helping** | 1. Treating clients as cooperative, no matter how resistant they may appear, is the quickest and most promising way to encourage further cooperation (cooperativity).  
2. Working within the client’s frame of reference, without confrontation or blame and without imposing an expert view on the client is the quickest and most promising approach to help the client develop an ever more constructive, realistic and useful perspective (client perspective).  
3. Focusing on identifying and amplifying what works, rather than on explanations in terms of personal characteristics and problem causes, is the quickest and most promising way to help clients make progress (focus on what works). |
Core characteristics of the solution-focused approach

The SF approach was developed as a brief intervention. Brevity here is not about limiting the number or length of sessions. Rather, it reflects an intention to do only that which is necessary for the client to achieve movement forward (Berg & Szabo, 2005). Hence, the goals of SF coaching are often narrower or more limited than goals set in other traditions (Berg & Szabo, 2005). The SF approach does not seek to resolve past injuries, uncover and reduce defence mechanisms, rebuild cognitive schemas, or effect character change. Rather, it seeks to uncover with the client his/her own resourcefulness and bring this to bear in the service of the client’s goals.

Once the goals have been identified, the SF practitioner seeks to assist the client in identifying the simplest and easiest path to achieving a result that is satisfactory for the client. For example, a coachee might identify that they would like a better relationship with their spouse. The coach would assist the coachee in identifying what a better relationship might look, sound and feel like – what sort of behaviours, feelings, thoughts and actions might be present in a better relationship. The coach would then work with the client to identify how much of this desired state needs to be present for the coaching to have been successful and the coachee to feel like they are on the way toward their solution.

Implicit in the above is the goal of building a capacity for self-directed learning in the coachee. This goal lies at the heart of the SF approach. Self-directed learning seeks to build self-efficacy and self-reliance through the process of discovering personalized solutions to problems, identifying solution steps that work for the individual, assessing effectiveness through feedback and then altering one’s behaviour to maximize the effectiveness of one’s attempts to reach the goal. Such a process seeks to elicit a curious, experiential and experimental mind-set. Once this learning capacity is activated in service of the client’s goal, the expectation of the SF practitioner is that the client will continue to self-regulate and integrate these skills into other aspects of their life.

Self-regulation is thus an important part of the SF approach. Greene and Grant (2003) have graphically represented the process of self-regulation as a simple, iterative cycle of setting a goal, developing an action plan, acting, monitoring, and evaluating, and then changing what does not work and doing more of what works (see Figure 3.1). The coach’s role is to facilitate the client’s journey through this cycle while holding the client’s focus on their goal/s.

METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

To enhance and facilitate the development of self-regulatory functioning in the client the SF approach seeks to enhance two types of change – change in the way in which the client views the problem and the development of behaviours consistent with solution attainment. In other words, the two main tasks of SF coaching are to ‘change the viewing’ and ‘change the doing’ (O’Hanlon & Beadle, 1996: 11). A useful metaphor for this is ‘Taking a PEEP at some new MAPS’.
Changing the viewing – PEEP

Changing the viewing is central to the SF approach. Clients, when they are focused on the problem or on all the reasons why the problem is difficult to solve, are by definition not looking toward the solution or the resources and steps needed to make the solution real. We know from experience and research that what you focus on grows. When we habitually focus our attention two psychological processes come into play – sensitization and amplification (Barsky, 1992).

Sensitization refers to the process whereby we learn to notice, or become sensitive to, a particular class of stimuli. For example, many parents become sensitized to the cry of their own child; or we might start to notice a particular model of car when we are considering purchasing one.

Amplification refers to the perceptual impact of what we notice. As we pay attention to a particular stimulus, it seems to grow in its importance or impact. Common examples include lying in bed listening to a tap drip or a dog bark. The more we attend to the sound the louder it gets. Of course, it is our perception of the sound that changes, not the volume of sound itself.

Changing the viewing shifts the perceptual cycles of sensitization and amplification from problem to solution. The more we become practised at focusing on solutions, the more solutions we notice and the more obvious they become. The acronym PEEP covers a wide range of techniques that can be used to change the way a problem is viewed:

Preferred outcome – move quickly to focusing on the preferred outcome rather than unpacking the problem. The miracle question (discussed below) is particularly useful here.

Exceptions to the problem – uncover times when the problem does not exist, or when part of the solution is present.

Figure 3.1 The cycle of self-regulation (used with permission)
Existing resources – focus on the resources already available to the client, rather than what is lacking.

Progress made so far – here the coach helps the client notice success rather than what is left to do. Scaling (discussed below) and complimenting the client are useful techniques to refocus on success.

The logic behind PEEP is that the first step in solving a problem is identifying the approach goal. Once the solution state has been clearly identified, the task then becomes to marshal the resources needed to achieve the chosen goal and build reality-based belief that the solution is possible (O’Hanlon & Beadle, 1996).

SF practitioners have developed dozens of techniques for assisting clients to change the viewing and identify resources. The following techniques are some of the more commonly used:

The Miracle Question. The miracle question is paradigmatic of the SF approach (Berg & Szabo, 2005). In the ‘Miracle Question’, in which the coach asks ‘Imagine that you went to bed tonight, and when you woke up the problem had somehow magically disappeared, and the solution was present … but you didn’t know that the solution had arrived … what is the first thing that you’d notice that would tell you that the solution was present?’

Scaling. Scaling is perhaps one of the most versatile of the SF techniques. It can be used to: (i) identify progress toward a goal – ‘on a scale of 1 to 10 with ten representing the complete solution, and one representing the problem at its worst, where would you say you are now?'; (ii) clarify fuzzy goals – ‘What does an 8 look like; how would you know you were at an 8?'; (iii) identify resources available to the client – ‘so how come you are at a 4 now – what did you do to get that far?'; (iv) articulate small steps toward the goal – ‘so what would be different if you were at a 5, or even a 4½?’. 

Reframing. Reframing is another set of central SF tools. In this set of techniques the coach seeks to reframe the client’s statements in a way that opens up possibilities and focuses the client on resources. Some examples include:

• Reframing problems to solutions:
  
  Client: ‘I feel completely lost.’
  Coach: ‘So, you’d like to get back a sense of direction and control?’

• Reframing problems to highlight hidden resources:
  
  Client: ‘The tender was not successful and all the work I put in was completely wasted.’
  Coach: ‘Sounds disappointing, but was it a complete waste – what did you learn from the experience?’

• Reframing using compliments:
  
  Client: ‘It’s far too expensive.’
  Coach: ‘It’s great that you are concerned about keeping on budget. How can we make it more affordable?’

• Reframing that highlights exceptions:
  
  Client: ‘I really hate my work.’
  Coach: ‘It sounds very unpleasant … tell me, which parts of your job are less unpleasant for you?’

2. Changing the doing – MAPS

Changing the viewing is not enough. If the coaching conversation is to be more than an interesting exercise in how we perceive the world, it must result in action. Hence the second major task of SF coaching is to ‘change the doing’ (O’Hanlon & Beadle, 1996: 11). In this part of the
coaching process, the task is to identify and support patterns of behaviour that enhance goal attainment. This may involve mapping the behavioural sequences present at times when the solution or part of it is present (O’Hanlon & Beadle, 1996). The client and coach then identify helpful patterns that can be replicated and these are practised in homework tasks.

Some techniques that can be useful in changing the doing can be represented by the acronym MAPS:

1. **Multiple options** – assisting the client to generate multiple options for action (O’Hanlon & Beadle, 1996).
2. **Asking ‘how’ questions instead of ‘why’ questions.**
3. **Problems into possibilities** – recognizing possibilities by turning presenting problems into springboards for solution construction (Jackson & McKergow, 2007).
4. **Small SMART steps** – generating initial actions that are achievable so as to build motivation and a history of success (Specific, Measureable Attractive, Realistic and Timebound).

The SF approach makes no prediction about what should be done. Rather, the coach and coachee work together to discover a pathway to success that works for the client, in their context. Hence, identifying what has worked in the past and experimenting with new possibilities are both important. This experimental mind-set is consistent with a scientist-practitioner model of coaching practice (Cavanagh & Grant, 2006).

The philosophical belief that the client is not broken also encourages the SF coach to change as little as possible (de Shazer, 2005). Hence small steps and active engagement in the feedback and evaluation process are important.

**The solution-focused coaching engagement**

From the client’s perspective, the SF approach is often an attractive strengths-based intervention (Chou, 2007). By avoiding delving deeply into an examination of the client’s problems, or searching for aetiological explanations in the client’s psychological profile, clients are enabled to experience themselves as healthy and capable.

The principal challenge for the coach is taking on the mind-set needed for effective SF coaching. Do we really believe in the essential wholeness of the client? Holding the client in this way is not always easy, but it is vital to the SF enterprise – the quality of the working alliance significantly contributes to success (Horvath & Symonds, 1991).

The SF mind-set is a challenge for clients too. Some clients are able to clearly articulate what they want to achieve. They seem to fall naturally into solution talk. Other clients will more naturally move into problem talk and feel the need to explain the problem in detail. The coach’s task is to help the client shift from a problem-focused to a SF mind-set as quickly as possible. Sometimes this shift occurs very quickly. However, with heavily problem-saturated clients the coach needs to exercise patience and sensitivity. It is important to meet such clients where they are – and gradually to help shift the conversation toward a more SF frame. Failure to empathically reflect the client’s experience is likely to lead to a break in rapport.

As the coaching conversation unfolds, the coach works with the client to build up a picture of their preferred future through reflection and reframing. Scaling can be used to help the client judge
their progress in relation to specific goals. As Grant (2006: 85) states: ‘Scaling is nearly always an opportunity for the coach to give a compliment. Even if the clients say that they are at a 3 on a 10-point scale, the coach can respond – “well done – one third of the way there already”.’

Like many of the SF techniques, the giving of compliments and reframing must be done from a position of genuine positive regard and desire to really understand and move toward the client’s goals. Without this fundamentally respectful stance, SF techniques can appear as superficial and manipulative.

Some SF authors suggest that a hallmark of the SF approach is the use of the miracle question, typically delivered in the first session (de Shazer 1988; O’Connell, 1998). However, we have found that it is often best to ask this question, once the client is ready to shift from an exploratory or deliberative mind-set to an implementational mind-set (Bayer & Gollwitzer, 2005; Oettingen & Gollwitzer, 2002). The deliberative mind-set is characterized by a careful exploration of the issue and potential goals (Carver & Scheier, 1998) and is therefore more likely to produce abstract problem-focused responses to the miracle question. The implementational mind-set, on the other hand, is focused on identifying means to change, and is therefore more behaviourally focused and detailed (Bayer & Gollwitzer, 2005). To ask the miracle question while the client is still exploring the problem can result in client confusion, a lack of engagement and even anger or resentment.

For some clients, the wording of the miracle question can be problematic. They experience talk of miracles as polyanna-ish. For such clients, more concrete variations of the miracle question may be useful – e.g., the ‘Two Videos Question’. Here the client is asked to imagine two videos playing. One shows the problem as it is being enacted. The other shows the preferred outcome being enacted. The client’s role is to simply describe the difference between the two.

These questions help the client describe their situation and the solution in concrete behavioural, emotional and relational terms – i.e. ‘who is doing what, how and with whom and what impact does that have?’ By describing the solution in this way, both the coach and client are usually able to identify do-able actions that will lead toward the goal.

The miracle question and its variants also help to build the client’s capacity for mindfulness. These questions require the client to emotionally disengage from the problem so as to envisage a different future. This metacognitive distance helps to make visible a solution that cannot be seen when we are ‘in’ the problem – changing the viewing to change the doing!

**Ending the coaching engagement**

As mentioned above, the SF approach is designed to minimize intervention. For this reason, contracting for particular numbers of sessions is not entirely consistent with SF coaching. While the coach might ask at the beginning of the engagement about the client’s expectation of the number of sessions needed, each session in the SF model is complete in itself (Berg & Szabo, 2005; O’Connell, 1998). Terminating the coaching engagement occurs when the client has met their goal, or feels satisfied that they can move toward it without the coach. Hence, SF coaching typically ends each session with a real question as to whether another session is needed: ‘Do we need to meet again, or do you feel like you have done what you needed to do?’
APPLICATION

The SF approach is a methodology that is applicable in a wide range of coaching settings. Because it seeks to work with the client’s goals and begins with the client’s perspective, the application across settings is very similar. Nevertheless, it is worth noting some differences in emphasis found in different settings.

Skills and performance coaching

The psychological literature distinguishes between two types of development – horizontal development or assimilation, and vertical development or accommodation. Horizontal development occurs when a person is able to assimilate new information or new practices into their current worldview. Skills and performance coaching would typically fall into this category of development. In skills and performance coaching, the task is to focus on the development and application of specific knowledge skills and abilities in order to enhance workplace performance or achieve specific organizational targets (Standards Australia, 2011).

This focus on organizational goals and needs adds some complexity to SF coaching. In cases where there is congruence between what the organization and the coachee’s goals goal setting within coaching is often straightforward. However, when there is a mismatch between the coachee’s perceived needs and the organization’s requirements, then goal clarification becomes critical.

A SF approach to this conundrum is to treat this apparent dilemma as a platform for more solutions (Jackson & McKergow, 2007). For example, the coach might bring the issue into the foreground as follows: ‘I notice that you would like to achieve X, and at the same time, the organization is requiring that we work toward Y. I wonder is it possible for us to work toward both targets together, or is one more important for you? Perhaps there are other solutions possible?’

Skills and performance coaching often require the use of organizational metrics such as 360-degree feedback and other data driven performance measures. These metrics may encourage a focus on what is missing or undone, rather than what is positive about the client’s performance. Here the SF coach’s role is to help the client see measurement as feedback in service of their goals. Reframing of metrics as identifying progress and resources is also important.

Developmental coaching

Developmental coaching differs from skills and performance coaching in that it requires the coachee to form new ways of seeing the world so as to more effectively meet the challenge he/she is facing (Kegan, 1994; Standards Australia, 2011). In other words, it requires vertical development or accommodation. The curiosity and respectfulness that characterizes the SF approach is critical to the formation of more spacious meaning-making.

There is, however, an inherent tension in the developmental enterprise. The goal of constructing developmental solutions often requires the coach to challenge, at least implicitly, the current worldview of the coachee. For example, let us say a coachee has a goal of dealing with team
conflict more effectively and they are considering an action plan that involves avoiding an aggressive team member. The SF coach might enquire into, and affirm, the client’s positive intent, while asking the client to consider other perspectives and any possible unforeseen consequences of their course of action (Berg & Szabo, 2005) with a view to exploring more effective options.

**Executive and leadership coaching**

Executive and leadership coaching also hold some particular challenges for the SF coach. Typically, executive coaching involves a mix of skills, performance and development coaching. Unlike other areas of SF practice, executive coaching often involves the identification of a coherent personalized model of leadership and the competencies that support it.

A second area of difference is that leaders and executives often present in coaching with goals that need others to change behaviour. However, a basic assumption in the SF approach is that change is not something we can determine for others. When a client has a strong need to change another person’s behaviour, the SF approach calls for questioning that assists the client in making their view of the situation explicit and tangible, exploring alternate views and identifying what the client can do to influence self-directed change in the other person, rather than repeating past unhelpful strategies like simply insisting that the other person change.

As in all SF coaching, clear identification of the desired outcome is important. Similarly, identifying positive intentions and providing support for trying new ways of seeing and dealing with the situation are likely to be useful. The coach might use a number of techniques to assist the client to focus on what is do-able and what works. For example, the coach might ask the client to recall conversations that seemed to be effective in helping the target person modify their behaviour, or enquire with the client as to what might be going on for the target person and how the client might check this out. Encouraging the client to experiment with different types of change conversations with the target person often leads to successful outcomes.

**EVALUATION**

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing the SF coach is to let go of causal problem-focused explanations as a foundation of practice. Given that most of us have had a lifelong education based on deterministic principles and scientific method, this is not always an easy task.

The lack of causal reasoning in the SF approach has led to claims that it is a superficial intervention (e.g. Ellis, 1997). Some authors have suggested that for coaching to be truly effective, a ‘deeper’ approach is necessary (e.g. Berglas, 2002; Kilburg, 2004). The idea that an approach is superficial or deep is interesting. The extended discussion of causes can take place with little or no positive change in the person’s sense of self, worldview or behaviour. In what sense then is such an approach deemed to be ‘deep’? Conversely, the construction of a preferred future and the identification of hitherto untapped personal resources can have profound impacts on the person’s worldview and sense of self, and lead to significant behavioural change.
There are times when the SF approach is not appropriate. Some clients may have causal explanations that form a central and protected part of their worldview. Similarly, when clients have deeply felt needs to explore etiology, attempting to impose a methodology that feels incongruent is likely to be counterproductive. While clients often respond favourably to a well-presented rationale for the SF approach, when they do not referral or use of an alternative methodology may be indicated. To force a SF perspective onto an unwilling client runs counter to the core principle of respect the client.

The SF approach has sometimes been called theory-free, maintaining that the imposition of external theories undermine the client’s own expertise. The coach does not need any expert knowledge about the client’s problems, beyond asking the right questions to unlock the client’s own knowledge and solutions (e.g. de Shazer, 1988). However, this cannot truly be the case. In order for the coach to ask meaningful questions, the coach must have at least an implicit theory about the issue, and a theory about what kind of question will best help the client explore and articulate a solution. If the coach really had no expertise and no theory about how best to help a client, on what basis can they presume to help? (See Held, 1996 for a detailed discussion of these issues.)

Is the coach then the real expert in coaching? No – complexity theory teaches us that outcomes are an emergent property of the system and not the sole responsibility of any single part of the system (Lewin, 1993). As a complex adaptive system, the outcome of the coaching engagement emerges from the complex interaction of the coach and client together (Cavanagh, 2006). In other words, the solution is radically co-created by both client and coach.

When viewed from this perspective, expert-centric views of coaching which suggest that the coach ‘adds value’ either by imposing expert knowledge, or by their ability to view the client’s system from a more objective perspective, are fundamentally flawed. Similarly, overly simplistic understandings which suggest that the client is the ‘expert’ in the coaching session are also distorted.

Nevertheless, the idea that the solution lies within the client, and the coach’s role is merely to facilitate the client in discovering what they already have within them, is a useful metaphor for helping coaches develop an attitude of curiosity and facilitation. In that sense, the SF project requires the coach to take the beginner’s mind. While the catch cry ‘Ask, don’t tell’ is often used to encourage this attitude, experience shows that sometimes, no matter how long we ask, the solution does not emerge, because it is not ‘in’ the client.

This leads us to another more serious limitation of the SF method. As Einstein is oft quoted to have said, ‘a problem cannot be solved with the same level of thinking that created it’. What counts as a solution is relative to the network of beliefs, assumptions and rules that make up a person’s worldview (their ‘level of thinking’ or meaning-making). The belief that the client has the solution within them, assumes the client can readily rise above their current pattern of meaning-making to embrace a wider, more effective worldview. Experience and research suggest this is not always the case (see Kegan, 1994). For example, if one believes that businesses are only viable when growing, then the choice to shrink or limit long-term growth in one’s business is unlikely to arise as a solution, even though this might best serve the goal of creating a more resilient organization.
Coaching is often sought to assist clients face challenges for which their current level of meaning-making produces only suboptimal solutions. As the rate of change, and complexity of issues, facing organizations increase, the need to challenge current perspectives and solutions will become an even more important part of the coach’s role (Cavanagh & Lane, 2012). This task is not readily supported by the basic assumptions of the SF approach. Visser (2012b) has shown that many experienced SF coaches do tell and do challenge the solutions and goals formed by clients. The SF approach needs to find a way to recognize the critical role of the coach in the co-creation of goals.

Valuing the tensions

There is an important tension between the different expert knowledge bases brought to the session by the coach and client. The creativity of the SF approach relies on this tension; for it is out of the interaction between the two understandings that creative solutions are born. Hence, tension should not only be valued, but also actively sought, nurtured and, where necessary, managed (Stacey, 2000). Rush to closure on a goal stifles creativity. Too much tension between the understandings brought by coach and client is also counterproductive, and usually indicates one or other of the parties have stopped being open to alternate views. The great contribution of the SF approach is to provide a perspective and techniques that assist the coach to remain genuinely curious in their asking, and respectful and timely in their telling.

FURTHER READING


DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- What is the coach’s expertise in the SF approach?
- When is it OK to tell?
- How can I develop an SF mind-set?
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