La Psicologia del coaching e la prevenzione nel XXI secolo
Innovando il percorso

Annamaria Di Fabio[1] e Gabriele Giorgi[2]

Sommario

Il presente articolo offre un contributo alla psicologia del coaching delineando la definizione di psicologia del coaching e presentando differenti approcci psicologici che hanno contribuito alla psicologia del coaching sia a livello teorico che di intervento. Vengono anche presentati concetti fondamentali della *positive coaching psychology*. Vengono introdotti aspetti innovativi per la psicologia del coaching da una prospettiva preventiva preventiva con particolare enfasi sulle *strength-based and primary prevention perspectives.*

Parole chiave

Psicologia del coaching, Positive coaching psychology, Prevenzione, Strength-based prevention perspectives, Prospettiva della prevenzione primaria.

[1] Direttore dell'International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Work and Organizational Psychology for Vocational Guidance, Career Counseling, Talents and Healthy Organizations» e dell'International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Cross-Cultural Positive Psychology, Prevention, and Sustainability», Dipartimento di Formazione, Lingue, Intercultura, Letteratura e Psicologia (Sezione di Psicologia), Università degli Studi di Firenze, https://www.forlilpsi.unifi.it/vp-30-laboratori.html.
[2] Dipartimento delle Scienze Umane, Università Europea di Roma.

Coaching Psychology and prevention in the 21st century
Innovating the path

Annamaria Di Fabio[1] and Gabriele Giorgi[2]

Abstract

This article contributes to coaching psychology by delineating the definition of coaching psychology and presenting different psychological approaches that have contributed to coaching psychology both at the theoretical and intervention levels. The foundational concepts of positive coaching psychology are also presented. Innovative aspects are introduced for coaching psychology from prevention perspectives, with a particular emphasis on the strength-based and primary prevention perspectives.

Keywords

Coaching psychology, Positive coaching psychology, Prevention, Strength-based prevention perspectives, Primary prevention perspective.

[1] Director of the International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Work and Organizational Psychology for Vocational Guidance, Career Counseling, Talents and Healthy Organizations» and International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Cross-Cultural Positive Psychology, Prevention, and Sustainability», Dipartimento di Formazione, Lingue, Intercultura, Letteratura e Psicologia (Sezione di Psicologia), Università degli Studi di Firenze, https://www.forlilpsi.unifi.it/vp-30-laboratori.html.
[2] Dipartimento delle Scienze Umane, Università Europea di Roma.

Defining Coaching Psychology

The definition of coaching psychology presents numerous opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, the scenario is progressively growing in importance; on the other hand, it is rapidly evolving in line with new professional and research awareness emerging from studies. One definition arose based on the results of Vandaveer et al.'s (2016) study. This study was conducted as an empirically based professional-practice analysis in two steps (the first one involving in-depth interviews with experts and the second one in terms of a Practice-Analysis Survey questionnaire built on the results of the first phase). From this, the following definition of coaching psychology emerged: «a process of professional development in which a psychologist works with individuals and/or groups to help them enhance their performance and effectiveness in their organizational roles and/ or develop their potential for future roles» (Vandaveer et al., 2016, p. 136). This definition could be considered a crucial watershed, linking coaching professional practice and research within psychology based on this significant research project that commenced in 2012 and included both the Society of Consulting Psychology and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. The aim of Vandaveer et al.'s (2016) study was to systematically search for and identify the realm of knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics (i.e., «competencies») emerging as critical for coaching interventions conducted by psychologists. The intent was to outline a foundational competency model (Vandaveer et al., 2016, p. 136). This crucial challenge also lies in the fact that while counseling psychology was founded on a scientific psychological basis — including theories, principles, frameworks, and methods — this project recognized that coaching psychology needs to advance in this framework with the aim of offering advantages to workers, teams, and organizations (Vandaveer et al., 2016, p. 136). Vandaveer et al. (2016) also underlined that it is fundamental for competent coaching psychologists to have both a university degree in psychology and significant psychological training in coaching/coaching psychology, while also undertaking regular valuable professional development.

The importance of Vandaveer et al.'s (2016) study is that it was conducted to individuate the *foundational competency domain* of coaching psychology. It also presented the emergent model of foundational coaching psychology competency on the Society of Consulting Psychology's website (www.div13.org). The authors expressed full awareness of the dynamic process of competence without presenting competences in terms of a static state (Donovan & Ponce, 2009; Rodolfa et al., 2005). Instead, they underlined the need to build in this critical direction of a foundational competency domain for coaching psychology.

The main findings that emerged from this research are summarized here briefly. The findings include the importance of coach quality in terms of expertise,

personal effectiveness, and so on; the quality/strength of the relationship during the coaching process; the coach's readiness in terms of motivation, willingness to learn, and openness to feedback; the fact that skills and individual attributes of coaching psychologists emerged almost homogeneously with coaching competency models in general. Nevertheless, the salient emerging areas of knowledge and reference theories revealed specific and large psychological knowledge and theories linked to the study participants' broad backgrounds (Vandaveer et al., 2016).

Regarding the difference between coaching and coaching psychology, many authors before this study presented a common perspective recognized in coaching psychology (Passmore et al., 2018) concerning the use of specific psychological approaches, psychological interventions, and psychological processes applied to coaching practice. For example, this perspective was already indicated by Grant and Palmer (2002) and Lai and McDowall (2014). Furthermore, coaching practice and coaches' behaviors were recognized as nonidentical if coaches were registered psychologists or differently if they were non-psychologists (Jenkins et al., 2012; Passmore et al., 2017).

Passmore (2010) claimed that instead of concentrating on psychological approaches, it was advisable to consider coaching psychology in terms of a diverse field of study, specifically for occupational psychology, health psychology, or forensic psychology. He defined coaching psychology as «the scientific study of behaviour, cognitive and emotion within coaching practice to deepen our understanding and enhance our practice within coaching» (Passmore, 2010, p. 4). On this basis, it is more understandable why Vandaveer et al.'s (2016) study was so important.

Passmore et al. (2018) underlined that because many authors had various positions focusing on different facets of coaching psychology and offering different definitions, a comprehensible need emerged regarding a clear definition as well as an agenda referring to pillars linked to teaching coaching psychology (Grant, 2011). Hence, Passmore et al. (2018) encouraged continuing the debate among coaching psychologists regarding the definition of coaching psychology, the existence of aspects of difference between coaching psychology and coaching, and which modalities coaching psychologists use to distinguish themselves in the marketplace compared to coaching colleagues who are not psychologists. They encouraged answers to whether clients emphasize that practitioners are psychologists or non-psychologists. The debate has been progressively stronger during the past three decades. Now, coaching psychologists have to continue to question and study the borders of coaching psychology, thereby invigorating «the journey of development» (Passmore et al., 2018, p. 122).

Subsequently, Passmore and Lai (2019) continued this pathway by exploring the definitions and research contribution of practicing coaching psychology.

They identified the following three key messages: coaching as a professional, helping relationship, with coaches in the center of the coaching relationship; the value of their motivation to change as a critical antecedent for the coaching intervention's success; social-psychological perspectives as the point of reference regarding the dyadic coaching exchanges. They also urged augmenting research collaborations between scholars and practitioners to build an evidenced-based practice for coaching. They recalled that the first definition of coaching psychology traditionally recognized in the scientific literature, also at the basis of the definition recognized by the British Psychology Society, was offered by Grant (2001, p. 10), considered by Passmore and Lai (2019) as coaching psychology's Godfather: «Coaching psychology can provide a useful platform from which to investigate the psychological factors involved in purposeful, directed behavioural change in normal populations, and in this way further the contribution of psychology to the enhancement of performance, productivity and quality of life of individuals, organizations and the broader social community».

Passmore and Lai (2019) affirmed that psychology — both psychological theory and psychological research — will make a decisive contribution to shaping current research, progress, and development in this field, in particular from psychotherapy and organizational psychology, starting a meaningful, evidence-based perspective and practice. They affirmed this because «interpersonal interactions» are at the basis of the process characterized by dialogic and conversational activities, including careful attention to «body language» and «unspoken manners» and, in essence, to a psychological-professional relationship. Furthermore, psychological theories — such as the therapeutic working alliance, the social-psychological framework, and motivational perspectives — result as core factors for successful outcomes and effective intervention. «We argue that while psychology is not the only theoretical discipline to facilitate an effective coaching process and outcome, it plays an essential part in this human-relationship focused intervention» (Passmore & Lai, 2019, p. 78). Subsequently, the authors implicitly refer to principles that could be defined as key principles of precision medicine transferred to this context, and consequently, to the precise knowledge of the essential ingredients of success regarding the characteristics of the client of the intervention.

Continuing research in this direction and reinforcing an evidence-based perspective is the horizon to obtain an evident and shared baseline for practice and training regarding the discipline. On the other side, the pathway for increasing knowledge of the process of coaching psychology and successful outcomes is a precious mindset for improving the knowledge and quality of coaching psychology services for clients and organizations that cannot be postponed. The road ahead may be long, but some elements are already clear, and the path is very exciting.

The International Coaching Federation Core Competency Model and Coaching Approaches: Anchoring Coaching Psychology

The International Coaching Federation (ICF) presented its Core Competency model (ICF, 2019b), consisting of the following eight core competencies grouped into four domains (ICF, 2019b):

a) *Foundation:* 1. Demonstrates Ethical Practice, 2. Embodies a Coaching Mindset;
b) *Co-Creating the Relationship:* 3. Establishes and Maintains Agreements, 4. Cultivates Trust and Safety, 5. Maintains Presence;
c) *Communicating Effectively:* 6. Listens Actively, 7. Evokes Awareness;
d) *Cultivating Learning and Growth:* 8. Facilitates Client Growth.

This model is at the basis of the associated system for becoming credentialed as a coach at the three levels of associate certified coach, professional certified coach, and master certified coach (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

The recent book *Becoming a Coach: The Essential ICF Guide* by Passmore and Sinclair (2020), in addition to defining this Core Competency model in detail, presents a review of psychological approaches, perspectives, and applications for using them in coaching. They also proposed the universal eclectic coaching model based on different psychological approaches: person-centered, behavioral, cognitive-behavioral, gestalt, systems, psychodynamic, evolutionary, and biological. Some of these approaches were also linked to the ICF Core Competency Model (ICF, 2019b). Below you can find a concise review of the approaches the authors presented in the book.

Behavioral Approach and the GROW Model

The GROW model is a «four box model» of coaching developed by Whitmore (2017), Alexander (2016), and Fine and Merrill (2010), which is popular. At its basis, there is behavioral psychology and its theories with the research results of Skinner, Pavlov, and Watson. The four phases of this model are as follows: 1) Establishing the Goal; 2) Exploring the Current Reality; 3) Generating and Evaluating Options; 4) Wrap-Up/Will/Way Forward (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Humanistic Approach and the Time to Think Model

This approach is particularly embedded in coaching interventions that usually present the client as «creative, resourceful, and whole» (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020). At the basis of reaching every goal, there is the process of becoming more aware of these aspects. The coaching model, More Time to Think (Kline, 1999), reflects these assumptions during the intervention, paying attention to the quality

of relationships. It is based on humanistic psychology and its theories, incorporating the studies of Rogers, Maslow, and Csikszentmihalyi. Change is possible if the client experiences the relationship with the coach as safe. The incongruence of the client derives from the gap between the client's experience and their relative awareness. On the contrary, the coach is congruent and authentic, focused on facilitating the client's awareness process using unconditional positive attention to the client and empathy. The model is based on the Ten Components of a Thinking Environment (Kline, 1999): Attention, Incisive questions, Equality, Appreciation, Ease, Encouragement, Feelings, Information, Place, and Diversity.

In the ICF Core Competency Model, we can find many aspects from this approach: *Competency 2:* Embodies a Coaching Mindset; *Competency 4:* Cultivates Trust and Safety; *Competency 5:* Maintains Presence; *Competency 6:* Listens Actively; *Competency 7:* Evokes Awareness; *Competency 8:* Facilitates Client Growth (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Cognitive-Behavioral Approach and the ABCDEF Model

This approach stems from cognitive-behavioral therapy (Lazarus, Beck, and Ellis), and it was recently presented by Dryden (2017). The intervention focuses on helping the client connect thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, thereby enhancing resilience, managing stress, receiving support for organizational change, and modifying faulty thinking. The intervention is goal-directed and focused on the present. It looks for realistic goals, enhances self-awareness, develops effective thinking, strengthens internal resources and resilience for the action plan, and builds the ability to self-coach (Neenan & Palmer, 2001; Palmer & Williams, 2013; Palmer & Szymanska, 2019). Passmore and Sinclair (2020) continue to present this approach, recognizing a widespread tool in the ABCDEF model (Palmer, 2002). The six steps of the tool are as follows: 1) an activating event (or awareness of the issue); 2) beliefs and perceptions (rational or irrational) about the activating event; 3) consequences (emotional, behavioral, and physiological); 4) disputing or examining beliefs; 5) effective new beliefs (response or emotional state); 6) future focus. This intervention helps clients develop as effective thinkers, recognize internal blocks, and improve their actions to achieve better performance and success (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Gestalt Approach and Chairwork

This Gestalt coaching approach is focused on helping clients identify their patterns of behavior, thereby improving insights and new possibilities for changing and experiencing a change in their lives. At the basis of this approach, fitting well with problems such as workplace conflicts and relationship challenges

(Passmore & Sinclair, 2020), we can find the following concepts (Toman et al., 2013): present-centered awareness, the uniqueness of the individual experience, creative relationship, and experimentation. The authors of the review highlighted the value of considering this approach when rational approaches fail concerning client needs and the problems they have to manage (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Solution-Focused Approach and the OSKAR Model

This approach relies on a solution-focused perspective. At its basis, we can recognize Brief Solution-Focused therapy and Milwaukee's Brief Family Therapy Center studies. This coaching intervention focuses on what is possible to achieve based on the value of its realistic and achievable characteristics rather than what could appear desirable. Passmore and Sinclair (2020) reported the OSKAR model (Jackson & McKergow, 2007) as a reference for this approach. The process includes common tools from a solution-focused perspective, such as scaling. The authors underlined that this approach is particularly useful when time is limited. They also highlighted that focusing on the solution and not on the problem helps clients to improve self-efficacy and decrease negative feelings, generating resources for acting (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Systemic Approach and the Force Field Model

This systemic coaching approach enlarges the view of the problem, paying attention to the context and its many factors (role, team, organization, industry sector, economic sector, and even national, cultural, and historical background) as forces able to influence actions (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020). The client is a part of a wider system, and it is important to help them explore the context/system by mapping the constellation. Also, using a physical representation, clients become more able to manage the system and their positions in the system. The authors reported that Whittington (2012) uses this approach in a face-to-face intervention based on constellations, while Hawkins (2017, 2018) realizes a team coaching intervention. The Force Field Model (Lewin & Dorwin, 1951) uses the forces for change. Mapping these forces, clients can learn how to utilize, manage, cope with, or increase them. The underlined passage is as follows: Step 1: Identify the Drivers, Step 2: Identify the Resisters, Step 3: Assess the Strength of the Drivers and Resisters, Step 4: Manage the Forces. This model, presented as especially useful for clients working in organizations, is also recognized in the ICF Core Competency Model in relation to the domains of Foundation, Co-Creating the Relationship, and Communicating Effectively (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

Psychodynamic Coaching and Transference

This psychodynamic coaching approach is based on psychodynamic psychology and its therapeutic setting, paying attention to psychological forces influencing human behavior (feelings and emotions), and above all to the dynamic existing between conscious and unconscious forces/motivations (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020). For psychodynamic coaching, the Containing Relationship is the example the authors reported. This relationship prioritizes the psychological safety of the relationship, allowing clients to explore every kind of topic they desire, without fearing any judgment. Clients develop a deep respect for the «unfathomable complexity of mental life», using projection, transference, countertransference, and parallel processes.

The authors present this approach as especially useful for helping clients to find new insights to reach the goals of investigating and revealing information to themselves. It is also presented anchored to the ICF Core Competency Model in the following aspects: *Competency 2:* Embodies a Coaching Mindset; *Competency 3:* Establishes and Maintain Agreements; *Competency 4:* Cultivates Trust and Safety; *Competency 5:* Maintains Presence; *Competency 6:* Listens Actively; *Competency 7:* Evokes Awareness; *Competency 8:* Facilitates Client Growth (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020).

An Integrated Model for Coaching Practice

An integrated approach is useful for making choices to fit the client's specific situation better (Passmore & Sinclair, 2020). The eclectic approach presented in the authors' book follows this perspective: asking for awareness not only regarding different approaches but also how and when to use them and/or part of them. An integrated model (like the model presented) also calls for coaches' commitment to experiencing and seeking meaningful pathways in their learning process and using them in their practice.

Positive Coaching Psychology: Foundational Concepts

Structuring the foundational concepts of positive coaching psychology emerged as a current need in the literature, considering the links acknowledged in both research and practice viewpoints between positive psychology and coaching psychology (Biswas-Diener, 2010; Kauffman & Linley, 2007; Seligman, 2007). Burke (2017, p. 16) claimed the «complementary nature of positive psychology and coaching psychology». If positive psychology is focused on studying optimal human functioning (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), coaching psychology

is at the service of individuals and/or groups in contexts to help improve their effectiveness and performance (Vandaveer et al., 2016).

Burke (2017) reviewed positive psychology coaching in terms of a movement of positive psychology in coaching approaches (Oades & Passmore, 2014). He underlines the second wave of positive psychology in coaching (cf. Cilliers, 2011; Sims, 2017) addressed to apply positive psychology theories to coaching practice (Foster & Lloyd, 2007). However, at the same time, proceeding considering only partial elements of positive psychology: for example, the strength-based model of coaching (Elston & Boniwell, 2011; Linley et al., 2011; Oades et al., 2009; Roche & Hefferon, 2013); in other cases using positive psychology interventions (Passmore & Oades, 2015, 2016), and taking into account positive psychology measures (Susing et al., 2011). Furthermore, Burke (2017) claimed that a systematic approach to positive psychology coaching practice is missing in the literature. For this reason, he introduced the Conceptual Framework for Positive Psychology Coaching Practice (Burke, 2017) based on six elements: 1. Knowledge, 2. Strength-based models, 3. Positive diagnosis, 4. Optimal-functioning goals, 5. Positive psychology interventions, and 6. Positive measures. Burke (2017, p. 17) considered «areas as well-being, positive emotions, flow, relationships, strengths, positive traits, forgiveness, gratitude, virtues, self-determination, motivation, fairness, creativity, resilience, hope, self-efficacy, perceived control, coping, spirituality or meaningful life» (Hart & Sasso, 2011; Lopez, 2009).

Positive coaching psychology can use knowledge about positive individual traits and human strengths and virtues (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Sheldon & King, 2001) to achieve optimal human functioning through optimal-functioning goals. This framework of reference is the main difference to consider in improving goal achievement in coaching (Jinks & Dexter, 2012).

Regarding the challenge posed by Burke (2017) about a conceptual framework for a positive psychology coaching practice, it seems useful to structure prior foundational concepts of positive coaching psychology (Di Fabio, 2016, 2020). From this perspective, some reviews could be useful, starting from Magyar-Moe et al. (2015). They presented an articulation of positive psychological concepts, the core theory, and positive processes. Positive psychological concepts are defined as Well-being (Diener et al., 1999; Keyes, 1998; Lent, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989), Meaning (May, 1940; Bernaud, 2015; Di Fabio, 2017a), and Hope (Snyder, 2002). The core theory is considered a strengths theory (Clifton & Nelson, 1992). Positive processes are recognized as positive empathy (Elliot et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2001), leveraging diagnostic labels, and naming strengths (Wright & Lopez, 2002).

Cooper (2019) reminded us that the framework is addressed to create positive well-being cultures, about hope, personal growth, and flourishing — as in the original claim by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000). We can affirm

that it continues to be the current, exciting opportunity and challenge in positive psychology coaching. If stress management in organizational contexts is always a must, we must improve the culture of well-being, helping organizations and leaders to become more aware of the importance of many aspects, such as valorizing workers and their talents, creating an organizational environment characterized by trust and autonomy, and maintaining work-life balance (Hart & Cooper, 2001). The well-being movement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018) underlines its value for enhancing performance and productivity and reducing negative outcomes, such as mental ill-health, stress-related absenteeism, and high turnover.

Green and Palmer (2019) offered a precious contribution to positive psychology coaching in practice by presenting the theories of well-being, mindfulness research, neuroscience perspective, and a review of a strengths-based approach underlining the importance of persevering in the direction of evidence-based psychology coaching practice. Another interesting direction is the constructive consideration of the three key related areas of resilience, achievement, and well-being (Green & Palmer, 2014), as well as the value of considering and integrating flourishing, achievement, resilience, and well-being.

Innovation: The Road is Open for Coaching Psychology in Prevention Perspectives

An innovative road could be drawn focusing on the opportunities of coaching psychology from prevention perspectives. The traditional prevention perspective (Caplan, 1964) distinguished among primary prevention, secondary prevention, and tertiary prevention. Specifically, primary prevention underlines the importance of avoiding the problem by promoting psychological well-being to prevent it from starting. Secondary prevention refers to precocious interventions in the first moment of symptomatology manifestation. Tertiary prevention focuses on decreasing symptoms, supporting the recovery of functions. Particularly referring to primary prevention, the crucial focus is to avoid a problem before it begins. Furthermore, the prevention perspective is more effective (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2016a; Hage et al., 2007; Kenny & Hage, 2009) when efforts to increase resources result in linked efforts to decrease the risks, centering on building strengths (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2014a, 2014b, 2018, 2020). For this reason, the primary prevention perspective (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2011, 2015, 2016b; Di Fabio et al., 2014) is focused on the early promotion of health and well-being by enhancing individual resources.

Strength-based prevention perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020) highlight the value of improving people's strengths with awareness, methods, and

systematicity through specially prepared specific training. These perspectives are particularly worthy of effectively answering the current challenges regarding personal and working life in the 21st century, with its unpredictability, uncertainty, and incessant mutations (Blustein et al., 2019; Peiró et al., 2012) worsened by the current Covid-19 pandemic (Gori et al., 2020).

Strength-based prevention perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020) have a specific value in promoting well-being in organizations. Work plays a fundamental role in workers' health and well-being (Blustein, 2011; Peiró, 2008; Peiró et al., 2020; Tetrick & Peiró, 2012). The insecurity of the current working situation introduces a further complexity that underlines the importance of promoting healthy organizations (Di Fabio, 2017a; Di Fabio et al., 2020). Strength-based prevention perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020) in organizations must promote and nurture workers' strengths using early interventions on psychological resources, which could be increased through specific training and intervention.

These preventive perspectives introduce the possibility of opening a new promising opportunity road for psychology coaching intervention. Traditionally, coaching psychology interventions were principally focused on problem-solving as well as improving and developing workers. In strength-based prevention perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020) and the primary prevention perspective (Di Fabio et al., 2017), the focus of coaching psychology interventions becomes the early promotion of individual resources and strengths to face the challenges of the world of work and avoid emerging problems. This perspective also underlines the value of work meaning (Di Fabio & Blustein, 2016; Steger et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2015) as an important resource to be promoted through coaching psychology as energizing strength to motivate workers toward action and good performance, building valuable aspects of well-being.

Conclusions and Future Perspectives

Thus, we are ready to open this new road for coaching psychology not only in a remedial perspective (e.g., problem-focused or solution-focused) but also in a broader prevention perspective, in particular starting from the perspectives of primary prevention (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2016a; Hage et al., 2007; Kenny & Hage, 2009) and strength-based preventive (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020). In this framework, coaching psychology is seen as a precious opportunity to continuously enhance the strengths and resources of workers in different positions within organizations, in every possible moment of their working life.

From the perspective of healthy organizations (Di Fabio, 2017a; Di Fabio et al., 2020) and the well-being movement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018), this new road for coaching psychology underlines the value of creat-

ing a virtuous circle. It considers the relevance of promoting performance and productivity and decreasing negative outcomes in organizations.

Therefore, it is fundamental to create a new prevention culture for coaching psychology in organizations. Starting from the primary prevention perspective, it is crucial that organizational management teams recognize that coaching psychology (Izzo et al., 2019) could allow workers to improve their resources early, thus preventing problems before they arise and enhancing different aspects of well-being. On the other side, workers must consider coaching psychology as a valuable possibility to increase their strengths. They should also ask their organizations for coaching psychology interventions without a specific problem to solve but as an enhancement process in various moments of their working life.

From the perspectives of secondary prevention (when the first symptoms of a problem appear) and tertiary prevention (when the problem is serious and overt), it is worthwhile for organizations to recognize the potentialities of coaching psychology to identify workers' strengths and build their resources to effectively face their challenges. On the other side, being aware of the value of coaching psychology, workers could require their organization to provide coaching psychology interventions for the specific problems and difficulties they encounter.

Therefore, the challenge is to create an organizational culture of coaching psychology with both top-down and bottom-up processes of promoting coaching psychology also firmly entrenched in primary prevention (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2016a; Hage et al., 2007; Kenny & Hage, 2009) and strength-based preventive perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2020) for healthy people and healthy organizations (Di Fabio, 2017a; Di Fabio et al., 2020). This is in line with the call of the well-being movement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018) to construct performance and well-being simultaneously.

Bibliography

Alexander, G. (2016). Behavioural coaching — The GROW model. In J. Passmore (Ed.), *Excellence in coaching — The industry guide* (3rd ed., pp. 99-112). London: Kogan Page.

Bernaud, J.-L. (2015). *Psychologie de L'accompagnement: Concepts et Outils pour Développer le Sens de la vie et du Travail*. Paris: Dunod.

Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). *Practicing positive psychology coaching: Assessment, activities, and strategies for success*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Blustein, D. L. (2011). A relational theory of working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *79*(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.10.004

Blustein, D.L., Kenny, M. E., Di Fabio, A., & Guichard, J. (2019). Expanding the impact of the psychology of working: Engaging psychology in the struggle for decent work and human rights. *Journal of Career Assessment, 27,* 3-28. doi: 10.1177/1069072718774002

Burke, J. (2017). Conceptual framework for a positive psychology coaching practice. *Coaching Psychologist, 14*(1), 16-25.

Caplan, G. (1964). *Principles of preventive psychiatry.* New York: Basic Books.

Clifton, D. O., & Nelson, P. (1992). *Soar with your strengths.* New York, NY: Dell Publishing.

Cooper, C. L. (2019). Foreword. Positive Psychology and health and wellbeing. In S. Green & S. Palmer (Eds.), *Positive psychology coaching in practice.* Routledge.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125,* 276-302. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276

Di Fabio, A. (2016, July). *Similarities and differences between coaching, coaching psychology and counseling psychology.* Invited lecture at the seminar organized the Faculty of Health Sciences, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan, July 30, 2016.

Di Fabio, A. (2017). Positive Healthy Organizations: Promoting well-being, meaningfulness, and sustainability in organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology, 8,* 1938. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01938

Di Fabio, A. (2020, December). *Similarities and differences between coaching, coaching psychology and counseling psychology.* Invited Lecture Virtual Conference «Essere uno psicologo coach e contribuire oggi allo sviluppo delle Organizzazioni», Università Europea di Roma, Roma, 12 dicembre 2020.

Di Fabio, A., & Blustein, D. L. (2016). Editorial. In A. Di Fabio & D. L. Blustein (Eds.), Ebook Research Topic «From Meaning of Working to Meaningful Lives: The Challenges of Expanding Decent Work» in *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology,7,* 1119. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01119

Di Fabio, A., Cheung, F., & Peiró, J.-M. (2020). Editorial Special Issue Personality and individual differences and healthy organizations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 166.* doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110196

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2011). Promoting emotional intelligence and career decision making among Italian high school students.

Journal of Career Assessment, 19, 21-34. doi: 10.1177/1069072710382530

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2015). The contributions of emotional intelligence and social support for adaptive career progress among Italian youth. *Journal of Career Development, 42,* 48-59. doi: 10.1177/0894845314533420

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2016a). From decent work to decent lives: Positive Self and Relational Management (PS&RM) in the twenty-first century. In A. Di Fabio & D. L. Blustein (Eds.), From meaning of working to meaningful lives: The challenges of expanding decent work. *Frontiers in Psychology.Section Organizational Psychology, 7,* 361. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00361

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2016b). Promoting well-being: The contribution of emotional intelligence. In G. Giorgi, M. Shoss, & A. Di Fabio (Eds.), From organizational welfare to business success: Higher performance in healthy organizational environments. *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology, 7,* 1182. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01182

Di Fabio, A., Kenny, M. E., & Claudius, M. (2017). Preventing distress and promoting psychological well-being in uncertain times through career management intervention. In M. Israelashvili & J. L. Romano (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of international prevention science* (pp. 233-254). Cambridge University Press.

Di Fabio, A., Kenny, M. E., & Minor, K. (2014). Emotional intelligence. School-based research and practice in Italy. In M. J. Furlong, R. Gilman, & E. S. Huebner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology in the schools* (2nd ed., pp. 450-464). Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2014a). Comparing ability and self-report trait emotional intelligence, fluid intelligence, and personality traits in career decision. *Personality and Individual Differences, 64,* 174-178. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.024

Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2014b). Promoting individual resources: The challenge of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and*

Individual Differences, 65, 19-23. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.026

Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2018). The contributions of personality and emotional intelligence to resiliency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 123,* 140-144. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.012

Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2020). The relationship of compassion and self-compassion with personality and emotional intelligence. *PAID 40*th *Anniversary Special Issue. Personality and Individual Differences, 157.* doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110109

Donovan, R., & Ponce, A. (2009). Identification and measurement of core competencies in professional psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3,* S46-S49. doi: 10.1037/ a0017302

Dryden, W. (2017). *The coaching alliance: Theory and guidelines for practice.* Taylor & Francis.

Duffy, R. D., Autin, K. L., & Bott, E. M. (2015). Work volition and job satisfaction: Examining the role of work meaning and person–environment fit. *The Career Development Quarterly, 63*(2), 126-140. doi: 10.1002/cdq.12009

Elliott, R., Bohart, A. C., Watson, J. C., & Greenberg, L. S. (2011). Empathy. *Psychotherapy, 48,* 43-49. doi:10.1037/a0022187

Fine, A., & Merrill, R. (2010). *You already know how to be great: a simple way to remove interference and unlock your greatest potential.* New York: Portfolio Penguin.

Gori, A., Topino, E., & Di Fabio, A. (2020). The protective role of life satisfaction, coping strategies and defense mechanisms on perceived stress due to COVID-19 emergency: A chained mediation model. *PLOS ONE, 15*(11), e0242402. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0242402

Grant, A. M. (2001). *Toward a psychology of coaching: The impact of coaching on metacognition, mental health and goal attainment.* Sydney: Coaching Psychology Unit, University of Sydney.

Grant, A. (2011). Developing an agenda for teaching coaching psychology. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 6*(1). 84-99.

Grant, A.M. & Palmer, S. (2002, May). *Coaching Psychology.* Meeting held at the Annual Conference of Division of Counselling Psychology, British Psychological Society, Torquay, 18 May.

Green, S., & Palmer, S. (2014). *Positive psychology coaching: Enhancing resilience, achievement & well-being.* Workshop presented on 15 November 2014, at the 4th International Congress of Coaching Psychology, Melbourne, Australia.

Green, S., & Palmer, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Positive psychology coaching in practice.* Routledge.

Greenberg, L. S., Watson, J. C., Elliott, R., & Bohart, A. C. (2001). Empathy. *Psychotherapy, 28,* 380-384.

Hage, S. M., Romano, J. L., Conyne, R. K., Kenny, M., Matthews, C., Schwartz, J. P., & Waldo, M. (2007). Best practice guidelines on prevention practice, research, training, and social advocacy for psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35,* 493-566. doi: 10.1177/0011000006291411

Kenny, M. E., & Hage, S. M. (2009). The next frontier: Prevention as an instrument of social justice. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 30*(1), 1-10. doi: 10.1007/s10935-008-0163-7

Hart, K.E. & Sasso, T. (2011). Mapping the contours of contemporary positive psychology. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 52*(2), 82-92. doi:10.1037/a0023118

Hart, P.M., & Cooper, C.L. (2001). Occupational stress: Towards a more integrated framework. In N. Anderson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Work, Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2). London: Sage.

Hawkins, P. (2017). *Leadership team coaching: Developing collective transformational leadership.* London: Kogan Page.

Hawkins, P. (2018). *Leadership team coaching in practice: Case studies on developing high-performing teams.* London: Kogan Page.

International Coaching Federation (ICF) (2019). *ICF core competency model.* Retrieved April 19, 2020, from https://coachfederation.org/core–competencies.

Izzo M., Piccinini N., Saladino E., Polani D., Alessio F., Bondanini G., Vitiello M., Giorgi G. (2019).

La competenza e la pratica professionale del Coach psicologico a vantaggio della performance nei contesti lavorativi: Una review. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni, 12*(3). doi: 10.14605/CS1231903

Jackson, P., & McKergow, M. (2007). *The solutions focus: The simple way to positive change* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Jenkins, L., Passmore, J., Palmer, S., & Short, E. (2012). The nature and focus of coaching in the UK today: A UK survey report. Coaching: *An International Journal of Theory, Practice & Research, 5*(2), 132-150.

Jinks, D., & Dexter, J. (2012). What do you really want: An examination of the pursuit of goal setting in coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 10*(2), 100-110.

Johnson, S., Robertson, I., & Cooper, C.L. (2018). *Wellbeing: Productivity and Happiness at Work*. (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kauffman, C. & Linley, P.A. (2007). The meeting of the minds: Positive psychology and coaching psychology. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 2*(1), 90-96.

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*, 121-140.

Kline, N. (1999). *Time to think*. London: Cassell Publishers.

Lai, Y-L., & McDowall, A. (2014). A systematic review (SR) of coaching psychology: focusing on the attributes of effective coaching psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 9*(2), 120-136.

Lent, R. W. (2004). Toward a unifying theoretical and practical perspective on well- being and psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,* 482-509. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.482

Lewin, K., & Dorwin, C. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lopez, S. J. (2009). *The encyclopaedia of positive psychology* (*Vols. 1 & 2*). Chichester, UK: Wiley- Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444306002

Magyar-Moe, J. L., Owens, R. L., & Conoley, C. W. (2015). Positive psychological interventions in counseling: What every counseling psychologist should know. *The Counseling Psychologist, 43*(4), 508-557. doi: 10.1177/0011000015573776

May, R. (1940). *The springs of creative living: A study of human nature and God*. New York, NY: Abingdon-Cokesbury.

Neenan, M., & Palmer, S. (2001). Cognitive behavioural coaching. *Stress News, 13*(3), 15-18.

Oades, L.G. & Passmore, J. (2014). Positive psychology coaching. In J. Passmore (Ed.), *Mastery in coaching: A complete psychological toolkit for advanced coaching* (pp.15-40). London & Philadelphia: Kogan Page; distributed by Ingram Publisher Services, Chambersburg, PA.

Peiró, J. M. (2008). Stress and coping at work: new research trends and their implications for practice. In K. Näswall, J. Hellgren, & M. Sverke (Eds.) (pp. 284-310), *The Individual in the Changing Working Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peiró, J. M., Bayonab, J. A., Caballer, A., & Di Fabio, A. (2020). Importance of work characteristics affects job performance: The mediating role of individual dispositions on the work design-performance relationships. *PAID 40*th *Anniversary Special Issue. Personality and Individual Differences, 157*. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.109808

Palmer, S. (2002). Cognitive and organisational models of stress that are suitable for use within workplace stress management/prevention coaching, training and counselling settings. *The Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapist, 10*(1), 15-21.

Palmer, S., & Szymanska, K. (2019). Cognitive behavioural coaching: An integrative approach. In S. Palmer & A. Whybrow (Eds.), Handbook of coaching psychology: A guide for practitioners (2nd ed., pp. 108-128). Hove: Routledge.

Palmer, S., & Williams, H. (2013). Cognitive behavioural approaches. In J. Passmore, D. Peterson, & T. Freire (Eds.), The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of coaching and mentoring (pp. 339-364). Chichester: Wiley.

Passmore, J. (2010). A grounded theory study of the coachee experience: The implications for training and practice in coaching psychology. *International Coaching Psychology Review,* *5*(1), 48-62.

Passmore, J. Brown, H. & Csigas, Z. (2017). *The State of Play in European Coaching and Mentoring. Henley on Thames*: Henley Business School & EMCC.

Passmore, J., & Lai, Y. (2019) Coaching psychology: Exploring definitions and research contribution to practice? *International Coaching Psychology Review, 14*(2), 69-83.

Passmore, J. & Oades, L.G. (2015). Positive psychology techniques — random acts of kindness and consistent acts of kindness and empathy. *The Coaching Psychologist, 11*(2), 90-92.

Passmore, J. & Oades, L.G. (2016). Positive psychology techniques — Three Good Things. *The Coaching Psychologist, 12*(2), 77-78.

Passmore, J., & Sinclair, T. (2020). *Becoming a coach: The essential ICF guide*. Switzerland: Springer.

Passmore, J., Stopforth, M., & Lai, Y. (2018) Defining coaching psychology: debating coaching and coaching psychology definitions. *The Coaching Psychologist, 14*(2), 120-122.

Peiró, J. M., Sora, B., & Caballer, A. (2012). Job insecurity in the younger Spanish workforce: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*(2), 444-453. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.007

Robertson, I., & Cooper, C.L. (2010). *Wellbeing: Productivity and Happiness at Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roche, B. & Hefferon, K. (2013). The assessment needs to go hand-in-hand with the debriefing: The importance of a structured coaching debriefing in understanding and applying a positive psychology strengths assessment. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 8*(1), 20-34.

Rodolfa, E., Bent, R., Eisman, E., Nelson, P., Rehm, L., & Ritchie, P. (2005). A cube model for competency development: Implications for psychology educators and regulators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 36,* 347-354. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.36.4.347

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 1069-1081.

Seligman, M.E.P. (2007). Coaching and positive psychology. *Australian Psychologist, 42*(4), 266-267. doi:10.1080/00050060701648233

Seligman, M.E.P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Sheldon, K.M., & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 216-217.

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, *13*, 249-275. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1304_01

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, *20*(3), 322-337. doi: 10.1177/1069072711436160

Susing, I., Green, S. & Grant, A.M. (2011). The potential use of the Authenticity Scale as an outcome measure in executive coaching. *The Coaching Psychologist, 7*(1), 16-25.

Tetrick, L. E. & Peiró, J. M. (2012). Occupational Safety and Health. In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Toman, S., Spoth, J., Leichtman, R., & Allen, J. (2013). Gestalt approach. In J. Passmore, D. Peterson, & T. Freire (Eds.), The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of the psychology of coaching and mentoring (pp. 385-405). Chichester: Wiley.

Vandaveer, V. V., Lowman, R. L., Pearlman, K., & Brannick, J. P. (2016). A practice analysis of

coaching psychology: Toward a foundational competency model. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68*(2), 118-142. doi: 10.1037/cpb0000057

Whitmore, J. (2017). *Coaching for performance* (5th ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey.

Whittington, J. (2012). *Systemic coaching and constellations: An introduction to the prin-ciples, practices and application*. London: Kogan Page.

Wright, B. A., & Lopez, S. J. (2002). Widening the diagnostic focus: A case for including human strengths and environmental resources. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 26-44). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.