Coaching theories and models: fuel and grow

Business, Human Resources



Coaching Models: FUEL and Grow Similarities between FUEL and GROW

models of Coaching One of the similarities between FUEL and GROW models is that both models begin with a well defined purpose or milestone of the coaching process. The FUEL refers to this process of setting milestone as framing the coaching conversation while GROW model refers to it as a goal (Whitmore, 2009). In both cases, trust is built between the manager and the employee if the goal or purpose of engagement is well stipulated. Another similarity between FUEL and GROW models of coaching is that they both apply elements of critical and creative thinking in understanding the current situation and solving problems at the workplace. The models agree that the coach or the manager should use an open and curious mind to examine the current state in order to obtain necessary information needed to make decisions and identify solutions to problems. In both models, coaches or leaders should also consider choice of words carefully and avoid judgmental statement when engaging with coachees or followers (Ramakhrisnan, 2013). This means that both models also require the employer to create a vision for the employees and guide them appropriately towards its achievement.

The third similarity between FUEL and GROW models of coaching is that they both require the leader or coach to identify specific alternatives or options to achieve the vision, goals or milestones agreed upon by the team. FUEL refers to this stage of identifying alternatives as an exploration of the desired state while GROW refers to it as identification of options. In these models, the coach should negotiate with the team and influence employees to accept given minimum of measures of success (Ramakhrisnan, 2013). This

enhances and builds trust between employees and the manager.

Differences between FUEL and GROW models of coaching

The main differences of FUEL and GROW models of coaching are based on the approaches used by the models in developing solutions. FUEL model creates employees' sense of ownership and accountability because the employer agrees with employees on the action plan. The employer should understand the employee's point of view and give them the satisfaction that their needs are met through certain changes or solutions (Whitmore, 2009). On the other hand, GROW model vests the responsibility of identifying alternatives on the hands of the coach as long are SMART, PURE and CLEAR. This does not enhance employee's sense of ownership and accountability in the workplace.

Another difference between GROW and FUEL models is that the latter allows employees to participate in the coaching process by allowing them to create their own vision (Lennard, 2013). On the other hand, GROW model places the sole responsibility of creating the vision on employees. According to the FUEL model, the coach gives various action points some timeline and accountability and the employee develops action steps to follow in each action point. The coach then looks for ways to help the employee to achieve his goals. In GROW model, the coach or manager converts discussions into solutions or decisions by identifying the action needed to achieve the overall goals and setting dates for such actions (Ramakrishnan, 2013). In this case, employees have higher levels of participation in coaching through the FUEL model than the GROW model.

References list

Lennard, D. (2013). Coaching models: a cultural perspective: a guide to model development for practitioners and students of coaching. New York: Routledge

Ramakrishnan, S. (2013). Coaching Models: FUEL and GROW. Accessed May 20, 2014 from http://www.scrumalliance.

org/community/articles/2013/october/coaching-models-fuel-and-grow. aspx. Whitmore, J. (2009). Coaching for Performance: GROWing Human Potential and Purpose – The Principles and Practice of Coaching and Leadership, 4th Edition. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.