A photograph of a mother duck swimming with her ducklings on a body of water. The mother duck is a brown and white mallard, swimming towards the right. There are four ducklings: one to the left, one to the right, and a pair in the bottom right corner. The water is a deep blue with ripples. The title text is centered in the middle of the image.

THE MISHMASH OF COACHING AND MENTORING ENTREPRENEURS

Ruud Koopman

THE MISHMASH OF COACHING AND MENTORING ENTREPRENEURS

Ruud Koopman

SUPPORTING ENTREPRENEURS BY COACHING AND MENTORING

DISSERTATION

to obtain
the degree of doctor at the University of Twente,
on the authority of the rector magnificus,
prof.dr.ir. A. Veldkamp,
on account of the decision of the Doctorate Board,
to be publicly defended
on Thursday the 9th of December 2021 at 16:45 hours

by

Rudolphus Gerhardus Maria Koopman

born on the 3rd of October 1960
in Tubbergen, The Netherlands

This dissertation has been approved by:

Supervisor:

prof. dr. A.J. Groen

Co-supervisors:

prof. dr. P.D. Englis

dr. M.L. Ehrenhard

Printed by: Saxion, Enschede

ISBN: 978-90-365-5280-6

DOI: 10.3990/1.9789036552806

© 2021 by Ruud G.M. Koopman, Enschede, The Netherlands. All rights reserved.

No parts of this thesis may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission of the author.

Graduation Committee

Chairman/secretary

Prof. dr. Th. A. J. Toonen

University of Twente

Supervisor

prof. dr. A.J. Groen

University of Groningen

Co-supervisors

prof. dr. P.D. Englis

Berry College

dr. M.L. Ehrenhard

University of Twente

Committee Members:

prof. dr. em. E. Laveren

University of Antwerp

prof. dr. H. Neergaard

Aarhus University

prof. dr. ir. L.J.M. Nieuwenhuis

University of Twente

prof. dr. P.C. de Weerd - Nederhof

University of Twente

dr. S.M. Dos Santos Fernandes Costa

University of Groningen

dr. S. Janssen

University of Twente

The mishmash of coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	5
LIST OF TABELS.....	7
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	9
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 Preface	11
Coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs	12
The need for researching the support of entrepreneurs	14
1.2 Researching the support of entrepreneurs	15
Positioning this dissertation in perspective.....	15
The objective and practical relevance of the research	17
Scope of this dissertation	17
Research questions.....	18
1.3 Structure of the dissertation	19
CHAPTER 2 THE CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COACHING AND MENTORING, SIDE BY SIDE DISCIPLINES.....	27
2.1 Abstract	27
2.2 Introduction	27
2.3 Aims and methodology	28
2.4 Until 1900	29
2.5 1900-1970s	31
2.6 1980-1990s	34
2.7 21st century	36
2.8 Conclusions and discussion	39
CHAPTER 3 TOWARDS CLARITY: USING THE SOFT SUPPORT MODEL TO EXAMINE THE LACK OF CONSENSUS ABOUT COACHING AND MENTORING OF ENTREPRENEURS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION	49
3.1 Abstract	49
3.2 Introduction	50
3.3 Teaching Entrepreneurship	51

3.4	Theoretical background	53
3.5	Approach	56
3.6	Results	56
3.7	Discussion and Conclusion	60
	Key findings.....	60
	Limitations	61
	Future research	62
	Practical implications for entrepreneurship education	62
CHAPTER 4	HOW COACHING AND MENTORING ARE DEFINED, IMPLEMENTED AND ATTAINED: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY	69
4.1	Abstract	69
4.2	Introduction.....	70
4.3	Theoretical background	71
4.4	Methodology	75
	Study 1 Developing the scale.....	75
	Study 2 differences in perception.....	78
4.5	Developing the questionnaire	79
4.6	Results of the perceptions	80
4.7	Conclusion and discussion	87
CHAPTER 5	FOCUSING ON THE ENTREPRENEUR IS AT LEAST AS IMPORTANT AS FOCUSING ON THE ENTERPRISE: IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION	95
5.1	Abstract	95
5.2	Introduction.....	96
5.3	Improving the soft and hard skills of entrepreneurs.	98
5.4	Integrating entrepreneurship and education with soft support.	100
5.5	Steps to improve soft support.....	102
5.6	Discussion	103
CHAPTER 6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	109
6.1	Answers and findings of the research questions	109
6.2	Contributions of the dissertation	111
	Theoretical and methodological contributions	111
	Practical implications.....	112
6.3	Limitations of the dissertation	113
6.4	Suggestions and directions for further research.....	114

APPENDIX A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE COACHES	118
APPENDIX B QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE COACHEES.....	121

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 NIKOS support model (A. Groen, 2011, p. 28).....	11
Figure 2 Structure of this dissertation	20
Figure 3 Number of coaching and mentoring citations in PsycINFO database 1935- 2019.....	32
Figure 4 Soft Support Model.....	54
Figure 5 Research model	74
Figure 6 Examples of questions of the survey	77
Figure 7 Scree Plot Factor Analysis.....	80
Figure 8 A plot of coaches and mentors about implementation and attained support	83
Figure 9 Results of the hypotheses with red arrows the rejected hypotheses	84
Figure 10 Education model for soft support of Entrepreneurship based on Fayolle and Gailly (2008) and van den Akker et al. (2003)	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Number of publications about Coaching and Mentoring per journal (1937-2019)	38
Table 2 Categories and value for the Role element	55
Table 3 Categories and value for the Agenda element	55
Table 4 Number of definitions of coaching valued according to the Soft Support Model	57
Table 5 Number of definitions of mentoring valued according to the Soft Support Model.....	57
Table 6 Number of papers with complete description of coaching or mentoring per journal.....	58
Table 7 Number of the term 'coaching' used in papers	59
Table 8 Number of the term 'mentoring' used in papers	59
Table 9 Number of papers in journals in different parts of the world	59
Table 10 Number of papers from first authors of different parts of the world.....	60
Table 11 Number of papers with authors and journals from USA or Europe	60
Table 12 List of keywords for Role	75
Table 13 List of keywords for Agenda.....	76
Table 14 List of used keywords for Role in the survey	76
Table 15 List of used keywords for Agenda in the survey	77
Table 16 Characteristics of the coaches/mentors and the entrepreneurs	78
Table 17 Factor analysis with two components (Role and Agenda).....	79
Table 18 Self-determined support of coaches vs. mentors	81
Table 19 Implemented vs. attained support of coaches	82
Table 20 Implemented vs. attained support of mentors	83
Table 21 Distance between gender combinations	85
Table 22 Anova test for Male and Female pairing of coach/mentor and the entrepreneur.	85
Table 23 Attained support by male and female coaches or mentors.....	86
Table 24 Difference between attained support by male and female coaches or mentors.....	87

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As Confucius (551-479 BC) said, “Roads were made for journeys, not destinations” (Dao, nd); the journey for a Ph.D. is far more interesting than its destination. Meeting new people with different thoughts is very interesting. Working through challenges and creating new ideas is satisfying. All of this in mind means that reaching the destination does not end the journey. Reflecting on the trip and looking forward to new roads is valuable when reaching this destination. In addition, this also gives me a chance to thank everyone who accompanied me during parts or the entire trip.

Reading this dissertation means that you most probably have an interest in things related to the journey I made. My thanks for showing this interest. I am proud of the journey I made and that I reached this destination, but I also let you know that without the help of several people, I would not have had the chance to make this journey. So, this is the moment for me to thank all the people that made this journey possible. Realizing that there is a chance that I miss some, I take that risk and highlight some of these.

First of all, I would like to thank my parents, who raised me and gave me the chance to become who I am. Without their support and love, I would never have started this journey, and I am sure they are proud that I have reached this destination. I also would like to thank Paul Bijleveld, who helped me with the start of this journey. We had some excellent and exciting discussions, which put me on this track. I am sure you will also see the result. Moreover, I would like to thank Matthijs Hammer a friend and fellow, for my journey. I still am confused that you took another road.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Aard Groen, Michel Ehrenhard, and Paula Danskin Englis. Thanks for your believing in me and feeding me with challenges and ideas. Working together with you at NIKOS was the start of this journey. There you let me become the coach coordinator of VentureLab Twente, which led to this dissertation. At the right moments, each of you asked questions that challenged me to find new solutions. You all found the role that fitted you and made me find the right level of joy and frustration to go further. Also, during my difficult periods, you kept your trust and found the way that got me back on track again.

I also want to thank the members of the committee for reading, approving, and reviewing my dissertation. I like to see you at my defense ceremony and hope that we can collaborate in the future.

Subsequently, many thanks to the staff from NIKOS, including the support staff, for all the arrangements regarding the journey, including the defense ceremony. We had several very pleasant meetings, which were also interesting. Also, the help with all the administrative processes is very much appreciated.

Many appreciations also include my colleagues of Saxion. My thanks for your support and comments and the options you gave me to work on my dissertation. You also inspired me to work in this, and the joy I had with you made me have a reminiscent journey.

I also want to thank my fellows of the ECSB and those that joined the conferences and other meetings I attended. Especially the start of the 3E conference in Arhus and all that followed sharpened my research. I enjoyed all of them and looking forward to those in the following years. I hope to meet all again soon.

Moreover, I certainly want to thank my whole family, who were cheering and supporting me all the way. This certainly counts for my wife, Brenda, and my children Esmee and Isabel. Reaching this destination would never have been possible without your support and means that we can now follow our journey and find new destinations. But most of all, we can follow roads that are new to us.

REFERENCES

Dao, S. (nd). Tao Te Ching, The Power of Goodness, The Wisdom Beyond Words. Retrieved from <https://laotzu.xyz/chapter/display?id=45>

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

As this dissertation is a combination of several pieces of research, this introduction shows the connection between these researches. This chapter shows why we research the coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs and the approach we use. In this dissertation, we show a method to improve the education of entrepreneurs' skills. To improve that, there is a need to agree on the terminology of coaching and mentoring as the most used concepts for supporting the development of entrepreneurial skills.

1.1 PREFACE

After some preparation, the University of Twente and Saxion UAS started in May 2009 a business development support program called VentureLab Twente. The target group of this program is people with high ambitions to start or improve their company into a 'high-tech high-growth- company' (A. J. Groen, 2008). This one-year development support program had four elements of support; organization, networking, financing, and idea to strategy support (see Figure 1). Business coaching was an essential factor for the step from idea to strategy

NIKOS SUPPORT MODEL

Figure 1 NIKOS support model (A. Groen, 2011, p. 28)

while using coaching (with training and lectures) as a connecting factor for all four elements. Using the term coaching in different elements was the first hunch that coaching has some confusion in its perceptions. Several recognize VentureLab Twente as an example of supporting (new) companies and creating new jobs, where they mention coaching as essential (Fontein & Kranendonk, 2010; Lambalgen, Tilburg, & Groen, 2012). During the VentureLab program, the question arose as to what the contribution of the coaches exactly is and what the most helpful form of coaching is, and if mentoring would be a more appropriate way of support. When starting to research this, it became clear that answering this question was rather tricky because of the different perceptions of coaching and mentoring by the stakeholders of VentureLab Twente. Further research made it clear that these differences in perceptions were rather common in supporting entrepreneurs (Clutterbuck, 2008; Garvey, 2004; Klofsten & Öberg, 2012). This observation led to the beginning of my study with an interlude with this dissertation.

COACHING AND MENTORING OF ENTREPRENEURS

The concepts of coaching and mentoring can be used in various disciplines like psychology, business, education, sports, and several others (Brock, 2006, 2008; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2008; R. L. Jones, Harris, & Miles, 2009). This dissertation focuses on its use in a business setting and, more specifically, in an entrepreneurial setting. Coaching and mentoring are often used to support managers and leaders (Narayanda and Moldoveanu, 2019; McGill et al., 2019; Bourne and Walker, 2004; Bishop, 2015) and support entrepreneurs (Savoie, Bendickson, & Edwards, 2018). In this dissertation, we mainly look at these concepts in an entrepreneurial setting. When people make use of coaching and mentoring, they experience several benefits like the development of competencies (Ferrar, 2004), better career chances (Stogdill, 1948), or increasing status (Clutterbuck, 2004). There is, however, not much proof of the benefits of coaching and mentoring (St-Jean, Radu-Lefebvre, & Mathieu, 2018; Thompson, 2019) due to the lack of shared understanding of these concepts (Hussey & Campbell-Meier, 2020) and the lack of sound definitions of coaching and mentoring (Salter, 2014).

There are several coaching and mentoring organizations. Two of the largest are the International Coaching Federation (ICF) and the European Mentoring & Coaching Council (EMCC). In 2020 the ICF had about 41.500 members in 147 countries (ICF, 2020). The EMCC had over 6000 members in 2019 in over 90 countries, including China (EMCC, 2019). The ICF defines coaching as: "partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential" (ICF, 2018, p. 2). The EMCC defines mentoring as: "developmental process, which may in some forms involve a

transfer of skill or knowledge from a more experienced person to a less experienced, through learning, dialogue and role modelling." (EMCC, 2020, p. 5). These definitions show that coaching and mentoring are both about developing a person by another person. (Bourne & Walker, 2004; Hussey & Campbell-Meier, 2020). Nevertheless, there is also much struggling going on between these two concepts. Or as Clutterbuck (2008, p. 9) says:

"At the same time as we begin to clarify what makes for effective coaching and mentoring, however, the very popularity of the approach has resulted in greater confusion. Almost every related profession has participated in a land-grab, trying to stake out its coaching territory, with definitions, rules and practices based on its particular perspectives and interests."

Some see coaching and mentoring as (almost) the same (Thompson & Cox, 2017). Some see mentoring as a specific way of coaching. "The term 'coaching' can refer to a form of mentoring (e.g. sports coaching)". Others see the opposite; the coach as a certain role (beside adviser, guidance, teacher, role model, and counselor) of mentoring (Abiddin & Hassan, 2011). All this makes evident that there is no common understanding of the definitions of coaching and mentoring.

Researchers agree that coaching and mentoring are about personal development (R. J. Jones, Woods, & Guillaume, 2016; Klofsten & Öberg, 2012). This development can have different focuses. Coaching and mentoring focuses on the more general development of the person (Thompson, 2019; Rekha and Ganesh, 2012), while others focus more on the work-related benefits (Abravanel & Gavin, 2017; Bozer & Jones, 2018; St-Jean et al., 2018). Most of the papers about coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs, however, are looking at it from an economic perspective as they primarily focus on directly or indirectly improvements at an organizational level by the individual, as shown in some studies (Baluku, Matagi, Musanje, Kikooma, & Otto, 2018; Ho & Turner, 2019; R. J. Jones et al., 2016; Sonesh et al., 2015; Theeboom, Beersma, & van Vianen, 2014). Although the concepts of coaching and mentoring are often used in education (Fletcher, 2007), there is not much research about coaching or mentoring entrepreneurs from an educational perspective. It seems to be challenging to let the fields of entrepreneurship and education join their research. Publishers and databases, for example, most have a big difference between the categories for entrepreneurship and education. The Scimago Journal & Country Rank, for example, show most of the entrepreneurship-related journal in the Business, Management, and Accounting area and the Business and International Management category. In contrast, the education journals find their

journals in the Social Sciences area and the Education category. The integration of education and entrepreneurship is essential for the further development of entrepreneurship education (Nabi et al., 2016) and, therefore, for using coaching and mentoring for this field. Therefore, we combine an entrepreneurship and educational approach in this dissertation to improve the education of the entrepreneur, and specifically the soft skills like emotional fitness skills and challenges they face (Aly, Audretsch, & Grimm, 2021)

Support by coaching and mentoring has many benefits (Leedham, 2005; Thompson, 2019). These support concepts are also considered advantageous in entrepreneurship (Kunaka & Moos, 2019; Sijde & Weijman, 2013). Mentioned benefits for the coachee/mentee are, for example, career advancement, expanded thinking, confidence, facilitation of a collaborative culture, job performance, self-efficacy, and also benefits for the coach and mentor themselves (Carmel & Paul, 2015; Janssen, van Vuuren, & de Jong, 2016; Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018)

The Training Industry (2021) estimates that the companies spend 357.7 billion dollars in 2020 worldwide on leadership training. The spending reduced from 370,3 billion dollars in 2019 due to the COVID pandemic. Business leaders say that 63% of them use executive coaching as a form of leadership development. When developing soft skills in an organizational setting is expensive and costs much time, the return on investment from this support is considered essential. However, this return on investment is more than about the financial aspect, as the objectives of the support can be very diverse (De Meuse, Dai, & Lee, 2009). Therefore, it is difficult to answer whether the benefits of the given support are worth the costs and efforts.

THE NEED FOR RESEARCHING THE SUPPORT OF ENTREPRENEURS

Coaching and mentoring face a history of confusion and struggle about their place in the arena of supporting people. Some try to focus on the common elements of coaching and mentoring (Cox, 2003; Passmore, 2007), where Cox and Ledgerwood (2003) start a journal that combines the research of both concepts. Others try to clarify by giving clear definitions or otherwise showing the differences (Garvey, 2004). This dissertation tries to avoid the battle of both concepts and focus on the similarities. Instead, we focus on the benefits of both concepts. With this approach, we are following the course set by the work of Parsloe (1995).

Coaching and mentoring involve one-to-one support, aimed at the person, the entrepreneur (Narayanda & Moldoveanu, 2019; QAA, 2018). In a world of increasing complexity and changing markets, the entrepreneur's skills are becoming essential for the success and survival of the company (Stambaugh & Mitchell, 2018). Coaching and mentoring are both

supposed to be helpful for developing the entrepreneur (Baluku et al., 2018; St-Jean et al., 2018)

Several papers state the importance of coaching to support entrepreneurs (Dobrea & Maiorescu, 2015; Fielden & Hunt, 2011). However, there is little research about the concrete benefits of coaching entrepreneurs (Crompton, 2012; Stambaugh & Mitchell, 2018).

Also, mentoring is generally seen as a vital support method for entrepreneurs and their enterprises (Memon, Rozan, Ismail, Uddin, & Daud, 2015; St-Jean et al., 2018). Also, with mentoring, the benefits of this support are not researched well. Rigg and O'Dwyer (2012), for example, focus on knowledge acquisition and knowledge transfer. On the other hand, Sijde and Weijman (2013) see that the person of an entrepreneur mainly experiences benefits (like creativity, satisfaction, and trust). This difference in benefits shows that mentors disagree on their goals and methods. Also, Avnimelech and Rechter (2019) see that the mentors have different descriptions, roles, and classifications.

Researchers often tried to find a way out of the confusion by defining coaching and mentoring. In their attempt to find evidence about the benefits of support by coaching and mentoring, researchers often tried to walk this path. This debate results in various definitions (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2010; Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2009) and a struggle in doing a thorough research in these fields. This dissertation will not find the 'right' definition or diverting coaching and mentoring in different settings like executive coaching, life coaching, peer-mentoring, and informal mentoring. This dissertation uses a model for soft support that for mapping coaching and mentoring.

The use of such a map for soft support can also be helpful to make use of experience from both concepts. Some researchers have already tried to learn from both concepts. For example, Bishop (2015) shows that coaches and mentors can use the GROW model. The GROW model is one of the most influential coaching models developed by John Whitmore, Graham Alexander, and Alan Fine (Whitmore, 2009).

1.2 RESEARCHING THE SUPPORT OF ENTREPRENEURS

POSITIONING THIS DISSERTATION IN PERSPECTIVE

Fayolle et al. (2007) distinguish five factors to shift entrepreneurial research from traditional unilateral to modern multilateral. The research approach uses these factors where research should shift from positivist methodologies to a more multidimensional research lens. This

approach also helps to more cultural diversity and also for more women in entrepreneurship. Van de Ven (2007) describes engaged scholarship to create knowledge for science and practice as an answer to the concerns of several journals to become less helpful in solving practical problems. In this dissertation, we make use of the engaged scholarship approach with a multidimensional lens of research. That means that we used practitioners as a valuable source for this research by using data retrieved from practitioners as well as giving suggestions for practical implementations.

With this dissertation, we try to contribute to the entrepreneurship field as a field contributing to society. It means that we do not stick to the 'Silicon Valley' approach of entrepreneurship, which mainly focuses on the economic contribution, but see entrepreneurship as a broad field and also try to look in 'other directions' (Welter, Baker, Audretsch, & Gartner, 2017). The multidimensional approach of engaged scholarship gives the option to look beyond the economic aspects of researching entrepreneurship and also contribute to the field of entrepreneurship education.

The engaged scholarship approach means that we can see interactions between researchers and practitioners of entrepreneurship (Simba & Ojong, 2017). It implies that researchers, as well as practitioners, need a multidisciplinary approach to benefit both. This perspective also counts for studying the support of entrepreneurs like entrepreneurship education. We use those different disciplines in this study by involving different stakeholders (researchers, coaches, mentors, entrepreneurs) and different settings. This dissertation focuses on all four corners of the engaged scholarship diamond model (Van de Ven, 2007) by developing a soft support model. The Soft Support Model helps to combine the concepts of coaching and mentoring (model), looking at the definitions and use of the concepts in research (Theory), researching how coaches and mentors support in practice (Reality) and proposing a method about how developers can improve the support of entrepreneurs (Solution).

In the development of coaching and mentoring, we see lots of similarities. We also recognize that some see differences between both concepts. The approach in this dissertation is not to solve these different realities but approach them both as being valid. Alternatively, as a professor during my master thesis once said, "everything is true. Only the range in which it is true can change." And then finished with 'And there are truths with a truth range of zero'. This approach helps us to find the best solution for supporting entrepreneurs.

In our study, we analyze the support given by coaches and mentors and analyze the received support of the entrepreneurs. By comparing these perspectives, we recognize

different realities of the same process. We also analyze the use of terms by researchers in their papers. It means that the researcher is involved in the data gathering process.

THE OBJECTIVE AND PRACTICAL RELEVANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The research has some main contributions. At first, we combine the concepts of coaching and mentoring in one model about soft support that shows the similarities and differences of both concepts. This model is not about clarifying the concepts by another definition. This Soft Support Model shows the aspects 'goal' and 'method' of coaching and mentoring in one combined model. Doing so avoids the struggle of finding the correct definitions while it also opens the option to use different definitions of both concepts.

The second contribution is that using the model shows that the definitions of coaching and mentoring are different but not opposite. Most of the definitions of mentoring focus on developing the business. Most of the definitions of coaching focus on non-directive support. In papers, most of both concepts are used differently from the definitions. This difference clarifies that relying on definitions is questionable, certainly when comparing different situations of those concepts.

The third contribution is the development of a scale to measure the support that coaches and mentors think that is given and the support that is experienced by the entrepreneurs. Using this scale makes it possible to compare the support coaches, and mentors think they give with the received support that the entrepreneurs experienced.

Measuring the support that is given and received can be used to improve the support of entrepreneurs. Researchers can use these measurements for different situations and compare the given support. Measuring the support is a step to prove the (positive) effects of coaching and mentoring.

SCOPE OF THIS DISSERTATION

In this dissertation, we contribute to the support of entrepreneurs. As coaching and mentoring are both well-known concepts for supporting entrepreneurs, this is the main topic of this dissertation. There are several papers about supporting enterprises. Coaching and mentoring are also often used in other disciplines like healthcare or sports. These are not the focus of this dissertation; although knowledge from these disciplines is sometimes used and reversible, the knowledge of this dissertation can be helpful for enterprises and in other disciplines.

We study the support of starting entrepreneurs in this dissertation. We made this choice because there is much interest in support of novice entrepreneurs that start their businesses. Several universities and other organizations set up business incubators. These business incubators often include coaching or mentoring (Bruneel, Ratinho, Clarysse, & Groen, 2012; Ho & Turner, 2019; Ratinho, Harms, & Groen, 2013). The growth of supporting entrepreneurship at business incubators became possible by the growth in entrepreneurship education (Kuratko & Morris, 2018; Morris, Kuratko, & Cornwall, 2013), often leading to novice entrepreneurs as these incubators often attract students from their universities (Ho & Turner, 2019).

Another reason is that research sees coaching or mentoring as highly beneficial for novice entrepreneurs (Ahsan, Zheng, DeNoble, & Musteen, 2018; Crompton, 2012; Stambaugh & Mitchell, 2018). However, there is not much known about how this support is beneficial and how it influences the outcomes (Brinkley & le Roux, 2018; St-Jean et al., 2018).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This dissertation is about the support of starting entrepreneurs. Coaching and mentoring are the most common concepts to support entrepreneurs. Therefore, we focus on coaching and mentoring starting entrepreneurs. The concepts of coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs are often used but rarely unpacked, making it hard to improve the coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs. As starting entrepreneurs are supposed to benefit a lot from coaching and mentoring, we aim to answer the central question:

Q: How to improve the coaching and mentoring of starting entrepreneurs?

To answer this question, we have four underlying research questions. They are the blueprint of the four studies that we present in this dissertation. These four studies are the backbone of this dissertation and will answer the central question.

q1: What is the similarity and difference in the history of coaching and mentoring?

Coaching and mentoring are concepts that are already in use for many years. The history of both concepts is sometimes very different, but it also shows many similarities. Both concepts have a history of struggling against each other, and acquiring knowledge of each other the development of both concepts is helpful to know. Therefore, we overview the history of coaching and mentoring and focus on the similarities and differences.

q2: What is the similarity and difference in the use of coaching and mentoring in research?

As the research in coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs has been rapidly growing since the beginning of the century, research papers often use these concepts. It is essential to have a common understanding of the definitions and use these concepts for thorough research. We already saw that the coaching and mentoring community tend to struggle against each other, or as Clutterbuck (2008, p. 9) says, "Almost every related profession has participated in a land-grab, trying to stake out its coaching territory, with definitions, rules, and practices based on its particular perspectives and interests. Terms used in one country can have a very different interpretation in another". Therefore, we need to find out how to use coaching and mentoring in the research literature.

q3: How do coaches and mentors think they support and what experience their entrepreneurs?

After we researched the concepts of coaching and mentoring in theory, we also need to know how the practitioners use these concepts to support entrepreneurs. What people communicate (send) is not always the same as what people hear (receive). Therefore, we have to look at the coaches and mentors and their corresponding entrepreneurs. We aim to determine how coaches and mentors of starting entrepreneurs think they support and what the entrepreneurs think support they got.

q4: How can different kinds of support be used to improve the training of entrepreneurs?

Now that we have studied the theory and the practice of supporting starting entrepreneurs by coaching and mentoring, we want to develop a method to improve the support of starting entrepreneurs. As this has many similarities with education, we use some basic theories from education theory and incorporate this into entrepreneurship education. Doing so should lead to an answer to the question: "How can different kinds of support be used to improve the training of entrepreneurs?"

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

In this dissertation, we answer the research questions. As shown in Figure 2, we start with an introduction of this dissertation in chapter 1. In that chapter, we give a short introduction to the dissertation topic and why this topic got our interest.

Figure 2 Structure of this dissertation

Chapter 2 shows how coaching and mentoring became fields of supporting entrepreneurs and what they have in common, and the difference between both concepts. There we see that using coaching and mentoring has happened for many years. Since the start of the century,

the interest in research has increased (Grant & Cavanagh, 2004). We also see that while some scholars already saw similarities in coaching and mentoring (Parsloe, 1995), most research focuses on the differences (Brock, 2008).

Chapter 3 introduces the Soft Support Model we use to classify the definitions of coaching and mentoring and the use of both concepts by researchers in papers about entrepreneurial support. This chapter introduces the Soft Support Model based on Heron's six categories of counseling intervention (Heron, 1976). With this model, we categorize definitions of coaching and mentoring. We also categorize the use of these concepts in papers. We see that the definitions of coaching and mentoring are different but not opposite. We also see that these concepts in papers differ from the definitions but do not differ from each other.

Chapter 4 shows a questionnaire based on the Soft Support Model to measure the support coaches and mentors give to starting entrepreneurs and measure the differences between coaches and mentors and between them and the entrepreneurs they support. See that in our sample, the mentors support opposite with most definitions of coaching and mentoring (EMCC, 2020; ICF, 2017). We also see that female coaches seem to support more in line with the experience of their female entrepreneurs than the male coaches.

In chapter 5, we introduce a way to develop the support of entrepreneurs, focusing on the hard- and soft skills. In this chapter, we combine the economic approach for entrepreneurship education (Fayolle & Gailly, 2008) with the educational process for education development (van den Akker, Kuiper, & Hameyer, 2003) to suggest a method for developing the support program for entrepreneurs. When we combine this with the Soft Support Model, we can design research-based support programs for supporting the development of hard- and soft skills of entrepreneurs.

In chapter 6, we sum up the results and discuss how to use these results can for further research. In this chapter, we sum up the answers to the research questions and the sub-questions. We also discuss the contributions and limitations of this dissertation and give suggestions for further research.

REFERENCES

- Abiddin, N. Z., & Hassan, A. (2011). A Review of Effective Mentoring Practices for Mentees Development. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 2(1). doi:10.5296/jse.v2i1.1226
- Abravanel, M., & Gavin, J. (2017). Exploring the evolution of coaching through the lens of innovation. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 15(1), 24-41.
- Ahsan, M., Zheng, C., DeNoble, A., & Musteen, M. (2018). From Student to Entrepreneur: How Mentorships and Affect Influence Student Venture Launch. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56(1), 76-102. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12362
- Aly, M., Audretsch, D. B., & Grimm, H. (2021). Emotional skills for entrepreneurial success: the promise of entrepreneurship education and policy. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1-19.
- Avnimelech, G., & Rechter, E. (2019). Mentorship Processes within Startup Accelerators. Available at SSRN 3361638.
- Baluku, M. M., Matagi, L., Musanje, K., Kikooma, J. F., & Otto, K. (2018). Entrepreneurial Socialization and Psychological Capital: Cross-Cultural and Multigroup Analyses of Impact of Mentoring, Optimism, and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 5-42. doi:10.1177/2515127418818054
- Bishop, J. (2015). *An investigation into the extent and limitations of the GROW model for coaching and mentoring online: Towards 'prosthetic learning'*. Paper presented at the EEE'15 - The 14th International Conference on e-Learning, e-Business, Enterprise Information Systems, and e-Government, Las Vegas, USA.
- Bourne, L., & Walker, D. H. (2004). Advancing project management in learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 11(3), 226-243.
- Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 342-361.
- Brinkley, M.-L., & le Roux, I. (2018). Coaching as a support function for potential entrepreneurs. *The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 10(1). doi:10.4102/sajesbm.v10i1.99
- Brock, V. G. (2006). *Who's Who In Coaching: Who Shaped it, Who's shaping it*. Paper presented at the ICF Research Symposium.
- Brock, V. G. (2008). *Grounded Theory of the Roots and Emergence of Coaching*. (Doctor Partial Fulfillment), International University of Professional Studies, Maui (HI), USA.
- Bruneel, J., Ratinho, T., Clarysse, B., & Groen, A. (2012). The Evolution of Business Incubators: Comparing demand and supply of business incubation services across different incubator generations. *Technovation*, 32(2), 110-121. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.003
- Carmel, R. G., & Paul, M. W. (2015). Mentoring and coaching in academia: Reflections on a mentoring/coaching relationship. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(4), 479-491. doi:10.1177/1478210315578562
- Clutterbuck, D. (2004). *Everyone Needs a Mentor. Fostering talent in your organisation* (4th ed.). London: CIPD (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development).
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Cox, E. (2003). The Contextual Imperative: Implications for coaching and mentoring. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1(1), 9-22.
- Cox, E., & Ledgerwood, G. (2003). The New Profession. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1(1), 1-3.

- Crompton, B. (2012). *The effect of Business Coaching and Mentoring on Small-to-Medium enterprise Performance and Growth*. (Doctor), RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.
- De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., & Lee, R. J. (2009). Evaluating the effectiveness of executive coaching: Beyond ROI? *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 2(2), 117-134.
- Dobrea, M., & Maiorescu, I. (2015). Entrepreneurial outcomes and organisational performance through business coaching. *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, 17(38), 247-260.
- Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2008). Definition and Evolution of Mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring - A Multiple Perspectives Approach* (pp. 7-20): Blackwell Publishing.
- EMCC. (2019). *Newsletter for Coaches, Mentors, and Supervisors, Spring 2019*. Retrieved from
- EMCC. (2020). EMCC Global Competence Framework. Glossary V2. In E. M. a. C. Council (Ed.), (pp. 9). Brussels, Belgium.
- Fayolle, A., Béchar, J.-P., Betters-Reed, B. L., Carrier, C., Fletcher, D., Gailly, B., . . . Todorovic, Z. W. (2007). *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education*. (A. Fayolle Ed.). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(7), 569-593. doi:10.1108/03090590810899838
- Ferrar, P. (2004). Defying Definition: Competences in Coaching and Mentoring. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 2(2), 53-60.
- Fielden, S. L., & Hunt, C. M. (2011). Online coaching: An alternative source of social support for female entrepreneurs during venture creation. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(4), 345-359. doi:10.1177/0266242610369881
- Fletcher, S. (2007). Educational Research Mentoring and Coaching as Co-creative Synergy. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 5(2), 1-11.
- Fontein, R. J., & Kranendonk, R. (2010). *Venture Lab: de motor voor regionale innovaties. Welke kansen bieden ze voor Greenport Venlo?* Retrieved from Wageningen, Nld:
- Garvey, B. (2004). The mentoring/counselling/coaching debate. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 18(2), 6-8.
- Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2004). Toward a profession of coaching: Sixty-five years of progress and challenges for the future. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Groen, A. (2011). *Innovative entrepreneurship - the NIKOS story*. Retrieved from Enschede, the Netherlands:
- Groen, A. J. (2008). *Innovatief Ondernemen Dissonant of Oplossing?!* Retrieved from Enschede, Netherlands:
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2010). Who Is a Mentor? A Review of Evolving Definitions and Implications for Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304. doi:10.1177/0149206310386227
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. S. (2009). Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 4(2), 143-155. doi:10.1080/03069887608256308
- Ho, Y. F., & Turner, J. J. (2019). 'Entrepreneurial Learning'— The Role of University Led Business Incubators and Mentors in Equipping Graduates with The Necessary Skills Set for Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 4(30), 283-298.
- Hussey, L., & Campbell-Meier, J. (2020). Are you mentoring or coaching? Definitions matter. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 12. doi:10.1177/0961000620966651

- ICF. (2017). ICF Definition of Coaching. Retrieved from <https://www.coachfederation.org/about/?navItemNumber=557>
- ICF. (2018). Ready to Unlock Your Potential? In I. C. F. (ICF) (Ed.), (pp. 12). Lexington. KY, USA: International Coach Federation (ICF).
- ICF. (2020). *Membership and Credentialing Fact Sheet July 2020*. Retrieved from
- Janssen, S., van Vuuren, M., & de Jong, M. D. T. (2016). Informal Mentoring at Work: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 498-517. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12069
- Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Guillaume, Y. R. F. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 249-277. doi:10.1111/joop.12119
- Jones, R. L., Harris, R., & Miles, A. (2009). Mentoring in sports coaching: a review of the literature. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 14(3), 267-284. doi:10.1080/17408980801976569
- Klofsten, M., & Öberg, S. (2012). Coaching versus mentoring: Are there any differences? In A. Groen, R. Oakey, P. van der Sijde, & G. Cook (Eds.), *New Technology-Based Firms in the New Millennium : Strategic and Educational Options* (pp. 39-47). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Kunaka, C., & Moos, M. N. (2019). Evaluating mentoring outcomes from the perspective of entrepreneurs and small business owners. *The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 11(1). doi:10.4102/sajesbm.v11i1.214
- Kuratko, D. F., & Morris, M. H. (2018). Examining the Future Trajectory of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56(1), 11-23. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12364
- Lambalgen, R. v., Tilburg, J. J. v., & Groen, A. J. (2012). *VentureLab Twente: a new business support concept for high tech high growth companies*. Paper presented at the ISAP World Conference on Science and Technology Park, Tallinn.
- Leedham, M. (2005). The Coaching Scorecard: a holistic approach to evaluating the benefits of business coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 3(2), 30-44.
- Memon, J., Rozan, M. Z. A., Ismail, K., Uddin, M., & Daud, D. K. (2015). Mentoring an Entrepreneur: Guide for a Mentor. *SAGE Open*, 5, 1-10. doi:10.1177/2158244015569666
- Morris, M. H., Kuratko, D. F., & Cornwall, J. R. (2013). *Entrepreneurship programs and the modern university*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Narayanda, D., & Moldoveanu, M. (2019). The Future of Leadership Development. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(4), 40-48.
- Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assesing: a practical guide to developing competence (Revised ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- Passmore, J. (2007). Coaching & Mentoring: The role of experience and sector knowledge. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*(S1), 10-16.
- QAA. (2018). *Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers*. Retrieved from Gloucester, UK:
- Ratinho, T., Harms, R., & Groen, A. (2013). Business Incubators: (How) Do they help their Tenants? *New Technology-Based Firms in the New Millenium*, 10, 161-182.
- Rigg, C., & O'Dwyer, B. (2012). Becoming an entrepreneur: researching the role of mentors in identity construction. *Education + Training*, 54(4), 319-329. doi:10.1108/00400911211236181
- Salter, T. (2014). Mentor and coach: Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (Special Issue No. 8), 1-8.

- Savoie, M. L., Bendickson, J. S., & Edwards, C. J. (2018). Embedding MBA Students in Local Incubators and Accelerators. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(3), 243-257. doi:10.1177/2515127418779974
- Schermuly, C. C., & Graßmann, C. (2018). A literature review on negative effects of coaching – what we know and what we need to know. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(1), 39-66. doi:10.1080/17521882.2018.1528621
- Sijde, P. v. d., & Weijman, G. (2013). Benefits and Impact of Mentoring for Entrepreneurs: The entrepreneur's perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 3(4), 194-204. doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v3i4.4581
- Simba, A., & Ojong, N. (2017). Engaged scholarship: Encouraging interactionism in entrepreneurship and small-to-medium enterprise (SME) research. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.
- Sonesh, S. C., Coultas, C. W., Lacerenza, C. N., Marlow, S. L., Benishek, L. E., & Salas, E. (2015). The power of coaching: a meta-analytic investigation. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 8(2), 73-95. doi:10.1080/17521882.2015.1071418
- St-Jean, E., Radu-Lefebvre, M., & Mathieu, C. (2018). Can less be more? Mentoring functions, learning goal orientation, and novice entrepreneurs' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(1), 2-21. doi:10.1108/ijeb-09-2016-0299
- Stambaugh, J., & Mitchell, R. (2018). The fight is the coach: creating expertise during the fight to avoid entrepreneurial failure. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(5), 994-1015. doi:10.1108/ijeb-09-2016-0287
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
- Theeboom, T., Beersma, B., & van Vianen, A. E. (2014). Does coaching work? A meta-analysis on the effects of coaching on individual level outcomes in an organizational context. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(1), 1-18.
- Thompson, S. (2019). The power of pragmatism: how project managers benefit from coaching practice through developing soft skills and selfconfidence. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*(Special Issue No. 13), 4-15. doi:10.24384/86ee-ps25
- Thompson, S., & Cox, E. (2017). How Coaching is Used and Understood by Project Managers in Organizations. *Project Management Journal*, October/November, 64-77.
- Training Industry. (2021, 29 March 2021). Size of the Training Industry. Retrieved from <https://trainingindustry.com/wiki/outsourcing/size-of-training-industry/>
- Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship*. Minneapolis: Oxford University Press.
- van den Akker, J., Kuiper, W., & Hameyer, U. (2003). *Curriculum Landscapes and Trends* (J. van den Akker, W. Kuiper, & U. Hameyer Eds.). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D. B., & Gartner, W. B. (2017). Everyday Entrepreneurship- A Call for Entrepreneurship Research to Embrace Entrepreneurial Diversity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(3), 311-321. doi:10.1111/etap.12258
- Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for performance, Fourth edition*. London, UK: Nicholas Bradley Publishing.

Chapter 2 THE CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COACHING AND MENTORING, SIDE BY SIDE DISCIPLINES¹

Coaching and mentoring are often mentioned in a connection to each other. That's why we describe the development of both concepts over the years in this chapter. Coaching and mentoring organizations often treat both concepts as distinct. In this chapter, we explore whether that approach is justified.

2.1 ABSTRACT

Interest in coaching and mentoring has increased over the past decades. However, confusion about what is meant in practice and in the literature and the lack of sound definitions makes it hard to research the antecedents and outcomes of both concepts. We show that coaching and mentoring share a lot, but they are often treated as separate fields. By developing models that combine the concepts of coaching and mentoring, we aim to provide a base for more rigorous research. Such a base hopefully encourages researchers and practitioners of coaching and mentoring to work together instead of struggling against each other.

2.2 INTRODUCTION

According to the popular press, the vast majority of managers, entrepreneurs, and employees use coaching, mentoring, or a variant of these support methods to be more effective in their work (Stambaugh & Mitchell, 2018). Although such support is not new, popular and academic interest grew substantially in the past decades. It seems that almost every manager who wants to succeed needs a soundboard, motivator, counselor, mentor, or coach for their development. But managers themselves also are encouraged to coach their employees (McCarthy & Ahrens, 2011). In the last 20 years, coaching and mentoring have become a large

¹ This chapter is published: Koopman, R. G. M., Danskin Englis, P., Ehrenhard, M. L., & Groen, A. J. (2021). The Chronological Development of Coaching and Mentoring: Side by Side Disciplines. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 19(1), 137-151.

industry. One estimate mentions 53.300 coaches active worldwide (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2016), while Youth Business International has 14.000 volunteer mentors in 52 countries (Youth Business International, 2018). Although not all are making a living of coaching or mentoring, the relevance of coaching and mentoring for business is clear. To survive as a manager (or employee) in a rapidly changing environment (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Simon, 1965) and to climb the hierarchical ladder (Bowerman & Collins, 1999; Murray, 2001), coaching or mentoring can provide an important contribution. There is evidence that mentoring increases the chance of becoming a leader of a company (Janssen, 2015; Stogdill, 1948) but having a personal coach or mentor is also a sort of status symbol.

Since its first use, the meaning of the words coaching and mentoring changed. First, Thackeray (1849) describes a coach as a tutor. Coaching has been defined as: “The process of on-going, on-the-job training carried out regularly by a person with the intent of developing another person's skills” (Ritter, 1994, p. 7). A more recent description is to facilitate the learning process (Feldman, 2005). These changing definitions show that coaching has shifted from instructing to more facilitating development. For mentoring, Homer (2000) describes Mentor as a guard, advisor, and friend. Kram (1983, p. 608) says that “The mentor provides a variety of functions that support, guide, and counsel the young adult as this important work is accomplished.” Later on, St-Jean, Radu-Lefebvre, and Mathieu (2018, p. 2) describe the “goal of mentoring programs is to strengthen the mentees’ self-efficacy.” This shows that mentoring is widened from a focus on skills development to include also personal development by a more experienced person. Both disciplines struggle with a lack of clear understanding of their professions (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2010; Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2009), but they also struggle with each other, or as Clutterbuck (2008, p. 9) says;

At the same time as we begin to clarify what makes for effective coaching and mentoring, however, the very popularity of the approach has resulted in greater confusion. Almost every related profession has participated in a land-grab, trying to stake out its own coaching territory, with definitions, rules and practices based on its own particular perspectives and interests.

2.3 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

Since the beginning of this century, research about coaching and mentoring has increased (Grant, 2011; McKinstry, Ding, & Livingstone, 2014; Schmitz et al., 2017). Some publications focus on the history of coaching (Brock, 2008, 2009; Stec, 2012) and on the history of mentoring (Alayoğlu, 2012; Colley, 2002; Roberts, 1999). While coaching and mentoring are

both engaged in personal development or learning, the histories of coaching and mentoring are juxtaposed in this chapter.

The aim of this study is to analyze the directions in which the research in mentoring and coaching has evolved, to give a better understanding of the interaction of these and understand the current state. From that point, this chapter looks ahead to what the research lays ahead in the future. To this aim, a comprehensive review of literature has been undertaken to analyze: 1) journals, books, and theses on the history of coaching and mentoring; 2) organizations for coaching and mentoring about their contribution; and 3) conference contributions to coaching and mentoring. Following the work of Grant and Cavanagh (Grant, 2011; Grant & Cavanagh, 2004, 2007), and extending it with mentoring and combined coaching and mentoring, an electronic search was done in the PsycINFO database to identify all peer-reviewed papers and dissertations on mentoring and coaching in a business setting, specifically excluding papers on sports coaching, therapeutic coaching, educational coaching and coaching for psychometric of educational tests.

In our research, the major steps and developments in mentoring and coaching are put into a historical perspective to show the parallels and differences in development. There are many more concepts that could fit this chapter, like consulting, leadership, adult learning, and so (Brock, 2010). However, these concepts are not explicitly mentioned since coaching and mentoring are most commonly connected. For this chapter, we focus on the concepts of coaching and mentoring in business settings.

2.4 UNTIL 1900

There are stories that claim that the origin of personal support is from ancient Africa, where the Swahili “Habari gani menta” means “the person who asks: “What is happening?” or the prehistoric cave paintings in the Pyrenees where ‘men’ take children on a “tour” (Peer Resources, 2004).

However, most of the literature about mentoring agrees that the term Mentor is first mentioned in Homer’s *Odyssey* (Abiddin, 2006; Coll & Raghavan, 2011; Deans & Oakley, 2006; Lentin & Geol, 2003; St-Jean & Audet, 2012). The goddess Pallas Athena, disguised as Mentor, was the steward of the household of Odysseus with his son Telemachus, when Odysseus had to leave for the Trojan war (Homer, 2007). As a guide, protector, and enabler, most of the mentoring roles were fulfilled by Athena herself. Disguised as Mentor, she only fulfills a small role in *The Odyssey* (Roberts, 1999). Roberts (1998) argues that the combination of Athena and Mentor represents the focus on the (instrumental) male role of the mentor

(Mentor) like counseling or guiding, on the one hand, and the (emotional) female role (Athena) affective or emotional quality on the other hand. The combination of male and female roles is known as psychological androgyny.

Later in ancient Greek, Aristotle, who was a student of Plato, who again had Socrates as his teacher (Garvey, Stokes, & Megginson, 2009; The 1911 Classic Encyclopedia, 1911), followed the so-called 'Socratic method'; asking questions instead of arguing. This shows Socrates as one of the first coaches, although the name 'coach' emerged much later (De Haan, 2007; Garvey, 2012b; Kennedy, 2009). Aristotle was one of the first to develop a philosophy of learning by distinguishing three aspects: 1) the theoretical (the seeking of the truth through thought, observation, consideration, and achievement of knowledge for its own sake), 2) the practical (as associated with political and ethical life), and the 3) productive (making something) (Garvey et al., 2009).

Another phenomenon, the master-disciple or craftsman-apprentice relationship, has been used roughly from the 12th century to the 19th century (Malamud, 1996). The guru-disciple tradition from Hinduism and Buddhism (Raina, 2002) is also often considered as a mentoring relationship (Colley, 2002; Crompton, 2012; Slawek, 2000). These are situations where the more experienced master helps to develop the disciple in a subject of common interest (Wach, 1962). This phenomenon is still being used in some situations for educational purposes.

During the Renaissance, aristocrats and scientific communities used mentoring practices to educate promising young people (Wickman & Sjodin, 1997). Fénelon (1699) wrote a follow-up to Homer's *The Odyssey* named *Les Aventures de Telemaque*. Roberts (1999) shows that many examples of wisdom, support, nurturing, and guidance can be found in Fénelon's mentor, in the opposite of Homer's mentor where the character of mentor only fulfills a supporting role and shows up three times (De Haan, 2007). This likely explains why the word 'mentor' became synonymous with wisdom, guidance, counseling, and advising. In that time, there were also several other publications about mentoring; "*Le Veritable le Mentor ou l'éducation de la noblesse*" (de Caracciolo, 1759), translated in English in 1760 into "*The true mentor, or, an essay on the education of young people in fashion*" (Caracciolo, 1760) and "*The Female Mentor*" in three volumes by Honoria (1793 - 1796). These publications linked "mentoring with cognitive development, emotional development, leadership and social integration, all of these rooted in a experiential learning philosophy." (Garvey, 2012b, p. 10).

In "*The History of Pendennis*" by Thackeray (1849), the term coaching is used for the first time in combination with personal support. In this story, some students are traveling in a coach while receiving tutor support. These students are making the same comparison as the

hornpipe, which can be an instrument and a dance. The students use the same word for the vehicle, originally from the place Kocs in Hungary (De Haan & Burger, 2007; Wilson, 2004), and for being tutored while traveling in that vehicle. By the end of the 19th century, coaching was used to support sportsmen, such as in football with the establishment of paid coaching (Dixon, Garnham, & Jackson, 2004) and in rowing where a cyclist shouted advice to the rowers on the river. Coaching sportsmen was seen by several people as an unsporting way of support because the sportsmen got support from others (Garvey, 2012b).

The terms mentor and coach find their origin in this time span. The phenomena of coaching and mentoring, in the meaning of supporting people, existed and were mentioned with different terms. While mentoring was connected to knowledge, coaching was mostly connected to physical aspects.

2.5 1900-1970s

At the beginning of the 20th century, technology developed rapidly, and also knowledge about the organization of technology developed rapidly. This resulted in organizing the support (coaching/mentoring) of technical organizations such as Arthur Dehon Little (MIT) or Jackson's of Symington in Scotland (Glanville & Bonthuys, 2012; McKinstry et al., 2014).

In the 1920's Klages (1926) and Baumgarten (1933) saw the possibilities of the work of Galton (1884), who found about 1000 words that expressed the human character. They took a more systematic study of the "inner states" for a better description of personality as a start for understanding personal support (John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf, 1988). Also, the personality and character of successful leaders were researched, resulting in the "Great Man" theory of Carlyle (Carneiro, 1981). The interest in individual characteristics of leaders was originally the field of psychology but was soon followed by the nascent leadership field (Chemers, 2000). At that same time, Griffith (1926), seen as the 'father' of sport psychology, wrote his book about the psychology of coaching.

Freud was one of the first to explain the human mind exhaustively and developed a theory about human behavior (Freud, 1923, 2010; Spratt, 1929). This theory also made development possible in coaching and mentoring (Vansickel-Peterson, 2010).

In 1937, the first peer-reviewed paper about coaching was published in *Factory, Management & Maintenance* (Gorby, 1937). Terms like HPM (Human Potential Movement), counseling, therapy, and organizational psychology were used to describe the facilitating of personal growth (Brock, 2012; Spence, 2007).

The number of peer-reviewed articles about coaching is very limited in this period (see Figure 3). We did an electronic search in the PsycINFO database using the same method as

Figure 3 Number of coaching and mentoring citations in PsycINFO database 1935-2019

Grant (2011); Grant and Cavanagh (2004, 2007) including life coaching, workplace coaching, and executive coaching². By using the same method as Grant's papers did for coaching in the same (Psychinfo) database, we did not find all the peer-reviewed publications. The PsyINFO database is a comprehensive database which makes it reliable. We extended it with a search for mentoring and with a search for coaching and mentoring. We also extend the search with some extra years. We extended the search on mentoring with the same method and criteria and also the combined coaching and mentoring publications.

Several organizations started support-programs for executives like the Jewel Tea Company that started a mentoring program for every MBA-newcomer (Douglas, 1997; Russell, 1991). Also, employees and staff received support that looked like coaching by their manager or supervisor (Brock, 2009).

Until the 1970s, the term coaching most appeared in connection to sports performance (Gaylord, 1967; Law, 2013). The book "The Inner Game of Tennis" by Timothy Gallwey (1974) changed the focus of coaching from the sport itself, like the techniques and tactics, to the athlete as a person. In this book, Gallwey makes a distinction between the outer game, which is about the opponent and external goals, and the inner game, which is about the mind of the player, nervousness, self-doubt, etc. This book appears to have become the inspiration for developing coaching in the next decade.

² For example, the search string for coaching in the PsychINFO database was:

TX ((coach OR coaching) NOT (editor's column OR model for program development or process consultant OR team models OR coach/trainee OR assessment center OR management technique OR swimming OR working coaches OR lecture OR coach proof OR supervisor "as" coach OR teacher OR teach OR pretest OR Reviews the books OR coaching managerial style OR examination OR motor OR educating OR education OR vocational OR peer-coaching OR athletics OR sport OR basketball OR railway OR baseball OR football OR softball))

In:

Professional Psychological & Health Personnel Issues (3400), Professional Ethics & Standards & Liability (3450), Educational Administration & Personnel (3510), Special & Remedial Education (3570), Occupational Interests & Guidance (3610), Personnel Management & Selection & Training (3620), Personnel Evaluation & Job Performance (3630), Management & Management Training (3640), Working Conditions & Industrial Safety (3670)

That same shift also happened to the development of people in companies, where the person gained more interest. In 1969, Edgar Schein introduced the term process consultation (Schein, 1969, p. 40) to describe coaching in a business environment; a non-directive and questioning (Socratic) role in letting a group solve their problems (Bennett & Bush, 2011). People from the business environment, such as companies, senior executives, and HR professionals, got interested in this approach (Brock, 2009; Gallwey, 1974). The role of leaders in change and personal development was viewed from the juncture of psychology and management (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Zaleznik, 1977). This interest led to an increased variety in words and approaches used for coaching. From leadership programs, terms like executive coaching and business coaching came up (Brock, 2012), which were later followed by terms like life coaching, informal coaching (Vansickel-Peterson, 2010; Walton & Schlesinger, 1979). Also, in mentoring, several variations of that term became popular, like executive mentoring, peer mentoring, group mentoring, and formal and informal mentoring (Clutterbuck & Megginson, 1999; Colley, 2001). This resulted in several books and articles about coaching and mentoring in a business setting.

At the end of the 1970s, two books about coaching that had a large impact were written about how managers could perform their coaching role; Fournies (1978) and Megginson and Boydell (1979) wrote about the use of coaching by managers. Levinson's (1978) book "The Seasons of a Man's Life" where a mentor can help to guide a person through the several stages of his life, also made a big impact. These books placed coaching and mentoring into the field of development of people in a business setting.

From 1900 until the 1970s, coaching and mentoring gained popularity. Coaching started from a more psychological perspective with a focus on theory, whereas mentoring became popular through upcoming companies and focused on practical implications (Roche, 1979).

2.6 1980-1990s

In the 1980s, the use of coaching and mentoring became a more common practice by managers (Crompton, 2012; Evered & Selman, 1989). Mentoring became an accepted and valued way of supporting the social capital of businesses (Laird, 2008). As a result, more rigorous research on mentoring started (Kram, 1980, 1983; Lindholm, 1982). Following the work of Levinson (1978), Kram (1983) wrote one of the most cited papers about mentoring and starting mentoring research in several domains, including business and entrepreneurship. In her book, Kram (1985) also distinguishes the male role, like advice or modeling, and the more female role, like personal- or psychosocial support of Mentor and Athena (Homer, 2007).

In 1988, in the USA, Thomas Leonard began his course, “Design your life” (Kennedy, 2009) which is considered as one of the first to develop coaching as a profession. Around the same time in the UK, the GROW-model³ was developed, building on the work of Gallwey (1974). This GROW-model (sometimes in variations) is one of the most influential coaching models in a business environment. John Whitmore, Graham Alexander, and Alan Fine developed this model in collaboration in the late 1980s (S. Jenkins, 2009; Passmore, 2010; Whitmore, 2009).

The availability of a theoretical framework ensured that the development of business courses was theoretically solid and, therefore, more valuable and more trusted by their participants (Cavanagh, Grant, & Kemp, 2005). Reciprocally, the interest in coaching at companies also influenced the interest of researchers in this field. This interest can be held responsible for large growth in the number of papers and other publications, as found for coaching by Grant and Cavanagh in Australia (Grant, 2011; Grant & Cavanagh, 2004, 2007) and mentoring where Kram and Ragins (2007, p. 660) from the USA mentioned the importance of a framework for ‘a language and method for describing an understanding these multiple sources of support’ (see also Figure 3).

The worldwide number of coach-specific training schools/programs increased from eight in 1995 to 164 in 2004, as also did the number of annual coach conferences; from 0 in 1994 to 16 in 2003. The number of professional coach associations also grew from 0 in 1990 to 12 in 2004 (Brock, 2012; Carr, 2019). The number of mentoring programs at a wide range of organizations increased (i.e., Xerox, McDonald's, Federal Express, Douglas Aircraft, Microsoft) (Russell & Adams, 1997). Mentoring was still much less organized than coaching. However, in the 1990s, some organizations for mentoring started or became international like the International Mentoring Association started in 1988 in the USA as the National Mentoring Association (International Mentoring Association) and the European Mentoring Centre (EMC) of David Megginson and David Clutterbuck, which was rebranded as the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC) (European Mentoring & Coaching Council, 2019).

From the mid-1990s, the first two international certifying organizations for coaching were established in the USA: ‘Personal and Professional Coaches Association’ (PPCA) and the

³ The acronym GROW stand for Goal, Reality, Options and Will, is developed as a framework for coaching sessions and became the standard for the coaching industry (Graham, 2010).

'International Coach Federation' (ICF). In 1997, these organizations merged (Brock, 2008). The ICF had in 2010 over 20.000 members (coaches) from over 100 countries (ICF, 2010). Based on an extensive global survey, Price Waterhouse and the ICF estimated that there were about 53.300 coaches over the world (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2016).

In the 1990's the focus of the papers about coaching and mentoring started to widen, with contributions of coaching to leadership and management and also on feedback improvement (Passmore & Fillery-Travis, 2011). The use of coaching and mentoring also started to widen. For example, the Lone parents' employment and The New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP) program in the UK, which started in 1997 (Evans, Eyre, Millar, & Sarre, 2003). The first attempts were made to systematically examine the effects of coaching (Olivero, Bane, & Kopelman, 1997; Peterson, 1993).

In sum, during this period coaching and mentoring became familiar among business managers. Coaches and mentors started to organize themselves, and more systematic research emerged. Also, the business of coaching and mentoring grew, which had its influence on the approach to each other. Enlarging the market as well as their market share became important.

2.7 21ST CENTURY

At the start of the 21st century, the 'sponsorship' model (Kram, 1983) emphasizing power, influence, and authority of mentoring became popular in the US. In the European context, the developmental model, focusing on self-reliance and personal growth, was more popular (Deans & Oakley, 2006; Garvey, 2012a). This difference in approach was most likely being influenced by the power distance in their culture (Clutterbuck, 2007, p. 646).

Following Parsloe (1995) arguing that coaching and mentoring are similar, a debate started about definitions of coaching and mentoring (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Sperry, 2008). Also, the origin of coaching and mentoring was questioned as it was suggested that the techniques were borrowed from other disciplines like counseling, psychology, teaching, and consulting (Brock, 2008; Feldman, 2005). There were several articles written about the similarities of coaching and mentoring or about elements that are similar (Abiddin, 2006; Audet, Boucher, Couteret, St-Jean, & Laverrière, 2006; D'Abate, Eddy, & Tannenbaum, 2003; Garvey, 2012b; Klofsten & Öberg, 2008; McKevitt & Marshall, 2015; Parsloe & Leedham, 2009). They point out that despite the similarities, coaching and mentoring are not the same. Also, Parsloe and Wray (2000) point out the differences in the "coaching Management Styles Continuum." Others argue that coaching and mentoring should get away from competition and move to

collaboration (Brock, 2009; Clutterbuck, 2004, 2008). As shown in Figure 3, the number of publications that are about the combination of coaching and mentoring increased from 11 between 1990 and 1999 to 73 between 2000 and 2009.

In September 2000, the first master course in Coaching and Mentoring Practice at the Oxford Brookes University was validated, and in 2007 a doctoral course was added. Around that same time, the Association of Coach Training Organization (ACTO) was formed as a group of eight coach training institutes (Brock, 2008; Reding & Richarde, 2016). Then the number of courses increased rapidly, with about 635 coaching schools in 2015 that are valued by all kinds of quality organizations (Carr, 2015, 2018).

Also from the Oxford Brookes University, the *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (IJEBCM) from Cox and Ledgerwood (2003) started in 2003. This journal and the course answered the call for the professionalism of coaching (Bowerman & Collins, 1999; Cavanagh et al., 2005; Grant & Cavanagh, 2004) and mentoring (Lentin & Geol, 2003; Ramanan, Taylor, Davis, & Phillips, 2006). However, the number of journals giving attention to the combination of coaching and mentoring is rather limited, with IJEBCM giving the most. This is shown in Table 1 with results of journals with more than 50 publications on coaching and/or mentoring using a search in the PsycINFO database per journal with the same method as in Figure 3.

Modern communication techniques and the development of the internet have been used as new ways for coaching or mentoring people. For example, e-mentoring is a way of mentoring at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary for women in science (Lentin & Geol, 2003). Coaching and mentoring are becoming one of the most important development tools for leaders and managers (Hailey, 2006; Sullivan, 2000). Technological development changes all kinds of support. The new techniques create new fields of support such as e-coaching, e-mentoring, video support, and chat-bots. This again increases the audience as well as the field that provides support (Kamphorst, 2017; Leitner, 2019; Thompson, Jeffries, & Topping, 2010).

Personalized and situated learning is being adapted by the coaching and mentoring community (Dede, 2010; Kuhn, 2018). A survey of 664 UK training managers in 2005 shows that 88% make use of coaching by line managers, and 72% make use of mentoring/buddying schemes (CIPD, 2005). A 2013 survey of 1004 respondents shows that the focus for coaching and mentoring is now more on effectiveness instead of use (CIPD, 2013). This is in line with Brock (2009) and her hypotheses in 'Emergence Curve' and 'Prominence Curve'.

Table 1 Number of publications about Coaching and Mentoring per journal (1937-2019)

	# Coaching	# Mentoring	# Coaching and Mentoring	Journal starting year
<i>International journal of evidence-based coaching and mentoring</i>	144	80	76	2003
<i>Consulting psychology journal: practice and research</i>	123	9	7	2005
<i>International coaching psychology review</i>	68			1937
<i>The career development international</i>	18	36	8	2002
<i>The coaching psychologist</i>	58			2006
<i>Coaching: an international journal of theory, research and practice</i>	55		3	2008
<i>American psychologist</i>		53		1946
<i>Journal of management development</i>	34	14	3	1982

These changes, however, do not improve clarity about coaching and mentoring (Kanatouri, 2016; Salter, 2014). The overlapping skills of these phenomena (Simon Jenkins, 2013) influence this confusion. Thompson et al. (2010) also recognize that there is still a lack of clear definitions that has their influence on the use of modern technologies. Some try to connect both phenomena and learn from each other (Ghods & Boyce, 2012), for example, by using the GROW-model for mentoring (Bishop, 2015) or using the knowledge in all kinds of helping professions like adult learning, developmental coaching, and innovation (Abravanel & Gavin, 2017; Bachkirova, 2011; Cox, 2013). There is also an approach that coaching and mentoring try to clarify the distinction and still use the knowledge of both phenomena by defining different roles and change between roles (Wiginton III, 2018). More research into the understanding of the interactions between these concepts is important for a better understanding and further development (Bozer & Jones, 2018).

As shown in this review of developments in the 21st century, the fields of coaching and mentoring have more eyes for each other, influenced by modern technology. Indeed in reaction to the lack of accepted identifiable and distinct skills for coaches and mentors (Hill, 2010), the first steps to close the research gap between coaching and mentoring have been made (Abravanel, 2018; Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018).

2.8 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This research aimed to analyze the directions in which mentoring and coaching in a business environment have evolved, giving a better understanding of the interaction of mentoring and coaching and the current state. We presented a comprehensive review of the literature and extended the work of Grant and Cavanagh (2004, 2007) through an electronic search to identify all peer-reviewed papers and dissertations on the executive, business, and life coaching, mentoring, and coaching and mentoring. We found several parallels in the development of coaching and mentoring. We also found that there is a discussion about differences and similarities between coaching and mentoring and the lack of a sound definition makes it difficult to prove the general effectiveness of coaching and/or mentoring (Salter, 2014). In the last decades, there have been movements to more collaboration between both concepts, but commonly accepted definitions about what is meant with several kinds of support fail (Brinkley & le Roux, 2018; St-Jean et al., 2018).

There are roughly three periods in the development of coaching and mentoring. Until 1970 there were some experiments and developments. Until then, some companies and researchers were interested in this support, but no systematic approach was used. From 1970 until 2000, there came more systematic interest, and the fields of coaching and mentoring emerged. Together with interest from the business field, researchers took interest. However, the fields of coaching and mentoring were treated as separate concepts. From about 2000 the interest increased and both concepts were seen as useful to each other as well as competitors.

It is resulting in some directions for further research. To research the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring, there is clarity needed on what is meant by different kinds of coaching and mentoring. Searching for a sound definition is very difficult and may not help as this will not be the solution for the 'land grabbing' (Clutterbuck, 2008) between these fields of supporting people (Salter, 2014). It would be interesting to combine the research on coaching and mentoring instead of considering them as different research areas, as Parsloe (1995) already suggested. In the 21st century, some steps are made in this process, such as with a journal that combines coaching and mentoring (Cox & Ledgerwood, 2003). This journal increased the number of papers talking about coaching and mentoring in part by special issues. Further steps are needed to professionalize coaching and mentoring and to take advantage of both fields.

The next steps could be the development of models that combine coaching and mentoring, and perhaps also other sorts of support and research on the benefits of coaching and mentoring (Clutterbuck, 2009). This would open the option to do more rigorous research in

coaching and mentoring by giving more clarity about these terms (Harding, 2009). To do this, there are, in general, two opposing mindsets that are used: the subjectivist and the objectivist (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). The objectivist mindset is the most prominent among researchers of coaching and mentoring and prefers defining more than describing (Garvey, 2008). On the other hand, Fayolle et al. (2007) argue that modern research on entrepreneurship should use a more subjective (non-positivist) mindset. Therefore, it is important to make clear which mindset is used when researching coaching and mentoring. The clarity about the terms coaching and mentoring can be given from a typology or taxonomy (Bailey, 1994), which involves the mindsets. This chapter shows that further research should include coaching and mentoring as related concepts and not focus on the artificial distinctions between these two concepts. This is in line with the directions set in the last years (Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018).

Besides this main direction, more fields could address interesting questions with further research. For example, what is the influence of certification or type of education of coaches and mentors in their performance, or what is the relation between other concepts of personal support and coaching or mentoring? With some clarity on what is meant with coaching and mentoring, there could be research on the influence of modern techniques on the performance of these concepts.

Our study shows that coaching and mentoring share a large history and that the difference is more in the label than in what is done in practice. We hope that this review, extension, and recommendations for future research move the field forward.

We acknowledge that this chapter has its limitations as the concepts of coaching and mentoring have a wide variety of fields they work with. In this chapter, the focus was on business as a field for both concepts. We tried to show that both concepts have a lot in common and that it would be worthwhile to use both concepts together instead of defending each territory.

REFERENCES

- Abiddin, N. Z. (2006). Mentoring and Coaching: The Roles and Practices. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 2(2), 107-116.
- Abravanel, M. (2018). *Coaching Presence: A Grounded Theory from the Coach's Perspective*. (Doctor), Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.
- Abravanel, M., & Gavin, J. (2017). Exploring the evolution of coaching through the lens of innovation. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 15(1), 24-41.
- Alayoğlu, N. (2012). Mentoring: An Ancient Method of Training and Career Development. *TODAİE's Review of Public Administration*, 6(2), 135-170.

- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. New York (NY), USA: Oxford University Press.
- Audet, J., Boucher, N., Couteret, P., St-Jean, E., & Laverrière, N. (2006). *Mentoring and Coaching the Entrepreneur: Features and Success Factors*. Paper presented at the Mentoring & Coaching Conference, Köln, Germany.
- Bachkirova, T. (2011). *Developmental coaching: Working with the self*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Typologies and Taxonomies. An Introduction to Classification Techniques* (Vol. 102). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Baumgarten, F. (1933). *Die Charaktereigenschaften*. Bern, Switzerland: A. Francke.
- Bennett, J. L., & Bush, M. W. (2011). *Executive Coaching: An Emerging role for Management Consultants*. Retrieved from New York (NY), USA: <http://ideas.repec.org/p/msb/wpaper/2011-03.html>
- Bishop, J. (2015). *An investigation into the extent and limitations of the GROW model for coaching and mentoring online: Towards 'prosthetic learning'*. Paper presented at the EEE'15 - The 14th International Conference on e-Learning, e-Business, Enterprise Information Systems, and e-Government, Las Vegas, USA.
- Bowerman, J., & Collins, G. (1999). The coaching network: a program for individual and organizational development. *Journal of Workplace learning: Employee Counseling Today*, 11(8), 291-297.
- Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2007). Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique. *Administration & Society*, 39(6), 719-739. doi:10.1177/0095399707304119
- Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 342-361. doi:10.1080/1359432x.2018.1446946
- Brinkley, M.-L., & le Roux, I. (2018). Coaching as a support function for potential entrepreneurs. *The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 10(1). doi:10.4102/sajesbm.v10i1.99
- Brock, V. G. (2008). *Grounded Theory of the Roots and Emergence of Coaching*. (Doctor Partial Fulfillment), International University of Professional Studies, Maui (HI), USA.
- Brock, V. G. (2009). Professional Challenges Facing the Coaching Field From an Historical Perspective. *The International Journal of Coaching in Organizations*, 7(1), 11.
- Brock, V. G. (2010). History of Coaching Disciplines. In *History_of_Coaching_Disciplines1.pdf* (Ed.).
- Brock, V. G. (2012). Introduction to Coaching History. In *UT Dallas Coaching News and the Executive and Professional Coaching Program* (pp. 3). Dallas (TX), USA: UT Dallas Jindal School of Management.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Caracciolo, L.-A. (1760). *The true mentor, or, an essay on the education of young people in fashion*. London, UK: J. Coote.
- Carneiro, R. L. (1981). Herbert Spencer as an Anthropologist. *The Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 5(2), 153-210.
- Carr, R. (2015). The End of Coaching As We Knew It. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/end-coaching-we-knew-rey-carr/>
- Carr, R. (2018). Coach Training Programs and Schools. Retrieved from <https://www.peer.ca/coachingschoolsintro.html>
- Carr, R. (2019, 17-7-2019). [Mail about results of the website].
- Cavanagh, M., Grant, A. M., & Kemp, T. (2005). *Evidence-based coaching. (Vol1)*. Bowen Hills Qld, Aus: Australian Academic Press.

- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 27-43. doi:10.1037//1089-2699.4.1.27
- CIPD. (2005). *Annual survey report 2005. Training and Development*. Retrieved from London, UK:
- CIPD. (2013). *Annual survey report 2013. Learning and Talent Development*. Retrieved from London, UK:
- Clutterbuck, D. (2004). *Everyone Needs a Mentor. Fostering talent in your organisation* (4th ed.). London: CIPD (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development).
- Clutterbuck, D. (2007). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Clutterbuck, D. (2009). Coaching and Mentoring in Support of Management Development 1. In S. J. Armstrong & C. V. Fukami (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development* (pp. 477-497). Thousand Oaks (CA) USA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Clutterbuck, D., & Megginson, D. (1999). Every executive needs a mentor. In *Mentoring Executives and Directors*. (pp. 1-28). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Coll, J. H., & Raghavan, P. (2011). Mentoring: Who And How. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 1(8), 65-77.
- Colley, H. (2001). Righting rewritings of the myth of Mentor: A critical perspective on career guidance mentoring. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 29(2), 177-197. doi:10.1080/03069880020047120
- Colley, H. (2002). A 'Rough Guide' to the History of Mentoring from a Marxist Feminist Perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28(3), 257-273. doi:10.1080/0260747022000021403
- Cox, E. (2013). *Coaching understood: A pragmatic inquiry into the coaching process*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Cox, E., & Ledgerwood, G. (2003). The New Profession. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1(1), 1-3.
- Crompton, B. (2012). *The effect of Business Coaching and Mentoring on Small-to-Medium enterprise Performance and Growth*. (Doctor), RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.
- D'Abate, C. P., Eddy, E. R., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (2003). What's in a Name? A Literature-Based Approach to Understanding Mentoring, Coaching, and Other Constructs That Describe Developmental Interactions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 360-384. doi:10.1177/1534484303255033
- de Caracciolo, L.-A. (1759). *Le Véritable Mentor ou L'Éducation de la Noblesse*. Liège, Belgium: De l'Imprimerie de J.F. Bassompierre.
- De Haan, E. (2007). *Relationele coaching. Wegen naar meesterschap in helpende gesprekken*. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- De Haan, E., & Burger, Y. (2007). *Coachen met collega's: Praktijkboek individuele consultatie*. Assen, the Netherlands: Koninklijke van Gorcum BV.
- Deans, F., & Oakley, L. (2006). *Coaching and Mentoring for Leadership - Development in Civil Society*. Retrieved from
- Dede, C. (2010). Technological Supports for Acquiring 21st Century Skills. *International encyclopedia of education*, 3, 158-166.
- Dixon, P., Garnham, N., & Jackson, A. (2004). Shareholders and Shareholding: The Case of the Football Company in Late Victorian England. *Business History*, 46(4), 503-524. doi:10.1080/0007679042000231810
- Douglas, C. A. (1997). *Formal Mentoring Programs in Organizations. An Annotated Bibliography*. Greensboro (NC), USA: Center for Creative Leadership, PO Box 26300, Greensboro, NC 27438-6300.

- European Mentoring & Coaching Council. (2019). From 1992 until now. Retrieved from https://www.emccouncil.org/about_emcc/history/from_1992_until_now/
- Evans, M., Eyre, J., Millar, J., & Sarre, S. (2003). *New Deal for Lone Parents: Second Synthesis Report of the National Evaluation*. Retrieved from Bath, UK:
- Evered, R. D., & Selman, J. C. (1989). Coaching and the art of management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(2), 16 - 32. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(89)90040-5
- Fayolle, A., Béchar, J.-P., Betters-Reed, B. L., Carrier, C., Fletcher, D., Gailly, B., . . . Todorovic, Z. W. (2007). *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education*. (A. Fayolle Ed.). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Feldman, D. C. (2005). Executive Coaching: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 829-848. doi:10.1177/0149206305279599
- Fénelon, F. d. S. d. L. M. (1699). *Aventures de Télémaque, The adventures of Telemachus, the son of Ulysses (translated)* (T. Smollett, Trans. L. A. Chilton Ed.). Athens, Georgia, USA: University of Georgia Press.
- Fournies, F. F. (1978). *Coaching for improved work performance*. New York (NY), USA: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Freud, S. (1923). The Ego and the Id. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. In (Vol. 19).
- Freud, S. (2010). *Freud: Complete Works* (I. Smith Ed.).
- Gallwey, W. T. (1974). *The Inner Game Of Tennis. The Classic Guide to the Mental Side of Peak Performance*. New York (NY), USA: Random House Trade Paperbacks.
- Galton, F. (1884). Measurement of character. *Fortnightly Review*, 36(8), 179-185.
- Garvey, B. (2008). The Meaning of Coaching and Mentoring. In *An Introduction to Coaching and Mentoring* (pp. 7-27). Thousand Oaks (CA) USA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Garvey, B. (2012a). Mentoring for Leadership Development: A Case Study of Executive Mentoring during the Banking Crisis. *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 10(1), 56 - 76.
- Garvey, B. (2012b). *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book About Coaching and Mentoring*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Garvey, B., Stokes, P., & Megginson, D. (2009). *Coaching and Mentoring, Theory and Practice*. London, UK: SAGA Publications Inc.
- Gaylord, E. C. (1967). *Modern coaching psychology*. Dubuque (IA) USA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Ghods, N., & Boyce, C. (2012). Virtual Coaching and Mentoring. In J. Passmore, D. B. Peterson, & T. Freire (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring* (pp. 501-523): John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Glanville, S., & Bonthuys, C. (2012). Arthur D. Little. Retrieved from <http://www.adlittle.com/>
- Gorby, C. B. (1937). Everyone gets a share of the profits. *Factory Management & Maintenance*, 95(82-83).
- Graham, A. (2010). Behavioural coaching - the GROW model. In J. Passmore (Ed.), *Excellence in Coaching* (2nd ed., pp. 83-93). London, UK: The Association for Coaching.
- Grant, A. M. (2011). *Workplace, Executive and Life Coaching: An annotated Bibliography from the Behavioural Science and Business Literature (1st Jan 2011) Scholarly Soaching Publications from 1937 to 1st Jan 2011 (N=634)*. Coaching Psychology Unit, Univeristy of Sydney, Australia. Sydney, Australia.
- Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2004). Toward a profession of coaching: Sixty-five years of progress and challenges for the future. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2007). Evidence-based coaching: Flourishing or languishing? *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 239-254. doi:10.1080/00050060701648175
- Griffith, C. R. (1926). *Psychology of Coaching: A Study of Coaching Methods from the Point of View of Psychology*. C. Scribner's sons.

- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2010). Who Is a Mentor? A Review of Evolving Definitions and Implications for Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304. doi:10.1177/0149206310386227
- Hailey, J. (2006). *NGO Leadership Development. A Review of the Literature*. Retrieved from Oxford, UK:
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. S. (2009). Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Harding, C. (2009). Researcher as Goldilocks: searching for a methodology that is 'just right' for a coaching and mentoring study. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*(Special Issue No.3), 11-21.
- Hill, G. I. (2010). *Executive Coaching: Perspectives of Effectiveness from Executives and Coaches*. (Master by Research), Queensland University of Technology, Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/40237>
- Homer. (2000). The Odyssey (R. Fitzgerald, Trans.). In. New York, USA: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc.
- Homer. (2007). The Odyssey (I. Johnston, Trans.). In (pp. 498). Arlington, VI, USA: Richer Resources Publications.
- Honorius. (1793 - 1796). *Female Mentor: or select conversations*. London, UK.
- ICF. (2010). ICF-Background-info. In ICF (Ed.).
- International Mentoring Association. History. Retrieved from <https://mentoringassociation.org/history.htm>
- Janssen, S. (2015). *A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Mentoring Relationships at Work*. (Doctor), University of Twente, Enschede.
- Jenkins, S. (2009). The impact of the inner game and Sir John Whitmore on coaching. *Annual Review of High Performance Coaching and Consulting*.
- Jenkins, S. (2013). David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 8(1), 139-153.
- John, O. P., Angleitner, A., & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality: a historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality*, 2, 171-203.
- Kamphorst, B. A. (2017). E-coaching systems. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 21(4), 625-632. doi:10.1007/s00779-017-1020-6
- Kanatouri, S. (2016). Mapping the e-coaching field through the lens of an online community. In *Coaching als individuelle Antwort auf gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen* (pp. 322-331).
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. In.
- Kennedy, J. (2009). *A definition of coaching*. (Bachelor), University of Wales (Swansea), Potsdam, Germany.
- Klages, L. (1926). *The Science of Character* (W. H. Johnston, Trans.).
- Klofsten, M., & Öberg, S. (2008). *Coaching versus Mentoring: Are there any differences?* Paper presented at the HTSF, Enschede, the Netherlands.
- Kram, K. E. (1980). *Mentoring processes at work: Developmental relationships in managerial careers.*, Yale University, New Haven (CT), USA.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the Mentor Relationship. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608-625.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*.
- Kram, K. E., & Ragins, B. R. (2007). The Landscape of Mentoring in the 21st Century. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work* (pp. 659-687). Thousand Oaks (CA), USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Kuhn, L. (2018). *Berufs-, Studien- und Laufbahnberatung goes digital*. (Master), ZHAW, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Zurich, Switzerland.
- Laird, P. W. (2008). Putting social capital to work. *Business History*, 50(6), 685-694. doi:10.1080/00076790802431242

- Law, H. (2013). *The Psychology of Coaching, Mentoring and Learning* (2nd ed. Vol. Second Edition). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Leitner, M. (2019). Chatbots & Co - Digitales Coaching mit künstlicher Intelligenz. *Wirtschaftspsychologie aktuell - Zeitschrift für Personal und Management*, 3.
- Lentin, J., & Geol, P. (2003). *Strategies for Success in Mentoring: A Handbook for Mentors and Protégés*: Apega.
- Levinson, D. J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York (NY), USA: Knopf.
- Lindholm, J. (1982). *Mentoring: the mentor's Perspective*. Retrieved from Cambridge (MA), USA:
- Malamud, M. (1996). Gender and Spiritual Self-Fashioning: The Master-Disciple Relationship in Classical Sufism. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 64(1), 89-117.
- McCarthy, G., & Ahrens, J. (2011). *Challenges of the coaching manager*. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Australia New Zealand Academy of Management Conference (ANZAM 2011), Wellington, New Zealand.
- McKevitt, D., & Marshall, D. (2015). The legitimacy of entrepreneurial mentoring. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 21(2), 263-280. doi:10.1108/ijeb-05-2014-0089
- McKinstry, S., Ding, Y. Y., & Livingstone, R. (2014). Anatomy of a rural meat operation: The family values/firm strategy nexus at Jackson's of Symington, c.1890–1981. *Business History*, 56(7), 1143-1168. doi:10.1080/00076791.2013.867329
- Meggison, D., & Boydell, T. (1979). *A manager's guide to coaching*. London, UK: British Association for Commercial and Industrial Education.
- Murray, M. (2001). *Beyond the Myths and Magic of Mentoring: How to Facilitate an Effective Mentoring Process, New and Revised Edition*. San Francisco (CA), USA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Olivero, G., Bane, K. D., & Kopelman, R. E. (1997). Executive Coaching as a Transfer of Training Tool: Effects on Productivity in a Public Agency. *Public Personnel Management*, 26(4), 461-469.
- Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assessing: a practical guide to developing competence (Revised ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- Parsloe, E., & Leedham, M. (2009). *Coaching and mentoring: Practical conversations to improve learning*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Parsloe, E., & Wray, M. (2000). *Coaching and Mentoring: Practical methods to improve learning*. London, UK: Kogan Page Limited.
- Passmore, J. (2010). *Excellence in Coaching. The industry guide*. London, UK: The Association for Coaching.
- Passmore, J., & Fillery-Travis, A. (2011). A critical review of executive coaching research: a decade of progress and what's to come. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 4(2), 70-88. doi:10.1080/17521882.2011.596484
- Peer Resources. (2004). The Mentor News. *The Mentor News*. Retrieved from <http://www.mentors.ca/thementornews13.html>
- Peterson, D. (1993). *Measuring change: A psychometric approach to evaluating individual coaching outcomes*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco (CA), USA.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2016). *2016 ICF Global Coaching Study*. Retrieved from https://coachfederation.org/app/uploads/2017/12/2016ICFGlobalCoachingStudy_ExecutiveSummary-2.pdf
- Raina, M. K. (2002). Guru-Shishya Relationship in Indian Culture: The Possibility of a Creative Resilient Framework. *Psychology and Development Societies*, 14(1), 167-198.
- Ramanan, R. A., Taylor, W. C., Davis, R. B., & Phillips, R. S. (2006). Mentoring matters. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 21(4), 340-345. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00346.x
- Reding, P. J., & Richarde, P. (2016). The History and Future of ACTO. Retrieved from <https://actoonline.org/inside-acto/history-of-acto/>

- Ritter, M. L. (1994). *Senior Leader Mentoring: Its Role in Leader Development Doctrine*. (Master), U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, West Point, USA. (AD-A284 464)
- Roberts, A. (1998). The Androgynous Mentor: bridging gender stereotypes in mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 6(1-2), 18-30. doi:10.1080/0968465980060102
- Roberts, A. (1999). Homers Mentor. Duties Fulfilled or Misconstrued. *History of Education Journal*.
- Roche, G. R. (1979). Much Ado About Mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, 1979;1, 14-31.
- Russell, J. E. A. (1991). Career Development Interventions in Organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 38, 237 - 287.
- Russell, J. E. A., & Adams, D. M. (1997). The Changing Nature of Mentoring in Organizations: An Introduction to the Special Issue on Mentoring in Organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 1-14.
- Salter, T. (2014). Mentor and coach: Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (Special Issue No. 8), 1-8.
- Schein, E. H. (1969). *Process Consultation: Its Role in Organization Development*. Reading (MA), USA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schermuly, C. C., & Graßmann, C. (2018). A literature review on negative effects of coaching – what we know and what we need to know. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(1), 39-66. doi:10.1080/17521882.2018.1528621
- Schmitz, A., Urbano, D., Guerrero, M., Dandolini, G. A., Ferreira, J. J., Fernandes, C. I., . . . Fernandes, C. I. (2017). *Entrepreneurial Universities. Exploring the Academic and Innovative Dimensions of Entrepreneurship in Higher Education* (M. Peris-Ortiz, J. A. Gómez, J. M. Merigó-Lindahl, & C. Rueda-Armengot Eds.). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Simon, H. A. (1965). *Administrative behavior* (Vol. 4): Cambridge Univ Press.
- Slawek, S. (2000). The Classical Master-Disciple Tradition. In *South Asia: the Indian Subcontinent* (pp. 457-467). New York (NY), USA: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Spence, G. B. (2007). Further development of evidence-based coaching: Lessons from the rise and fall of the human potential movement. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 255-265. doi:10.1080/00050060701648142
- Sperry, L. (2008). Executive coaching: An intervention, role function, or profession? *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(1), 33-37. doi:10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.33
- Sprott, W. J. H. (1929). The Science of Character (Review). *Mind, New Series*, 38(125), 513-520.
- St-Jean, E., & Audet, J. (2012). The role of mentoring in the learning development of the novice entrepreneur. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(1), 119-140. doi:10.1007/s11365-009-0130-7
- St-Jean, E., Radu-Lefebvre, M., & Mathieu, C. (2018). Can less be more? Mentoring functions, learning goal orientation, and novice entrepreneurs' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(1), 2-21. doi:10.1108/ijeb-09-2016-0299
- Stambaugh, J., & Mitchell, R. (2018). The fight is the coach: creating expertise during the fight to avoid entrepreneurial failure. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(5), 994-1015. doi:10.1108/ijeb-09-2016-0287
- Stec, D. (2012). Using history to comprehend the currency of a passionate profession. *Journal of Management History*, 18(4), 419-444. doi:10.1108/17511341211258756
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
- Sullivan, R. (2000). Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6(3), 160-175. doi:doi:10.1108/13552550010346587

- Thackeray, W. M. (1849). *The History of Pendennis*. Univeristy Park (PA), USA: Pennsylvania State University.
- The 1911 Classic Encyclopedia. (1911, 21 Oct 2006.). Socrates (philosopher). *The 1911 Classic Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from [http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Socrates %28philosopher%29](http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Socrates_%28philosopher%29)
- Thompson, L., Jeffries, M., & Topping, K. (2010). E-mentoring for e-learning development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(3), 305-315. doi:10.1080/14703297.2010.498182
- Vansickel-Peterson, D. L. (2010). *Coaching Efficacy With academic leaders: A Phenomenological Investigation*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Nebraska, Lincoln (NE), USA.
- Wach, J. (1962). Master and Disciple: Two Religio-Sociological Studies. *The Journal of Religion*, 42(1), 1-21.
- Walton, R. E., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979). Do Supervisors Thrive in Participative Work Systems? *Organizational Dynamics*, 7(3), 25-38.
- Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for performance, Fourth edition*. London, UK: Nicholas Breadley Publishing.
- Wickman, F., & Sjodin, T. (1997). *Mentoring: the most obvious yet overlooked key to achieveing more in life thaen you dreamd possible: a success guid for mentors*. New York (NY), USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Wiginton III, J. G. (2018). *A Case Study: Broad Insights A Survey of Business Coaching Impacts on Companies and Their Leaders*. (Doctor), Paris School of Business, Paris, France.
- Wilson, C. (2004). Coaching and coach training in the workplace. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 36(3), 96-98. doi:10.1108/00197850410532087
- Youth Business International. (2018). *Exploring the impact of voluntary business mentoring on young entrepreneurs*. Retrieved from https://www.youthbusiness.org/file_uploads/YBI-Report-Exploring-the-impact-of-voluntary-business-mentoring-on-young-entrepreneurs-Digital.pdf
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders. *Harvard Business Review*, 55, 67-78.

Chapter 3 TOWARDS CLARITY: USING THE SOFT SUPPORT MODEL TO EXAMINE THE LACK OF CONSENSUS ABOUT COACHING AND MENTORING OF ENTREPRENEURS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION⁴

In the previous chapter, we saw that coaching and mentoring have many similarities, and they often developed in a similar direction. These similarities raise the question of how the definitions of both concepts relate to each other. In this chapter, we explore the two concepts and whether the use of both concepts in research is consistent with the definitions.

3.1 ABSTRACT

Support of entrepreneurs by coaching or mentoring entrepreneurs is often plagued by a battlefield of terminology. These differences are impairing the research on coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial educational development. To gain a general comprehension of the differences between mentoring and coaching, we use the Soft Support Model (the dimensions of Fillery-Travis and Lane (2006) combined with Heron's six categories of counseling intervention (Heron, 1976). This combined model was used to categorize the definitions of coaching (Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2009) and mentoring (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2010). We found a clear distinction between the definitions of coaching and mentoring. However, the use of the concepts of coaching and mentoring in journal articles about entrepreneurial education and development does not match the definitions and is often used interchangeably. We conclude that there is a distinction between the definitions of coaching and mentoring and how these concepts are used in entrepreneurship-based papers. Using the Soft Support Model, which we developed, can help to bring clarity about what kind of support is given, it can improve the research about coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs, and it can improve the way support is given in entrepreneurship development and education.

⁴ This chapter is under review at the journal of Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy

3.2 INTRODUCTION

In entrepreneurship development, the words ‘coaching’ and ‘mentoring’ are often used to describe some sort of support that is given to entrepreneurs (Bøllingtoft, 2012; Ratinho, Harms, & Groen, 2013) and in entrepreneurship education (Ho & Turner, 2019; Kunaka & Moos, 2019; Sullivan, 2000). (Pittaway, Missing, Hudson, & Maragh, 2009) even say that coaching and mentoring are identified in a way ‘that may be more appropriate to the way in which entrepreneurs learn’ (p. 267). This does not mean that these terms are being used consistently nor that it is clear what is meant when these words are used. Indeed, there are several terms used to write about developmental support. For instance, in addition to coaching and mentoring, there is also supervision, guiding, training, teaching, counseling, moderating, advising, facilitating, etc. (Baluku, Matagi, Musanje, Kikooma, & Otto, 2018; Feldman, 2005; Greene & Grant, 2003; Ives, 2008; Levinson, 1978; Neck & Corbett, 2018). In this chapter, we focus specifically on coaching and mentoring as well-known examples of developmental support (Beattie, 2002).

While scholars see the similarities of coaching and mentoring, most of them point out the differences (Coll & Raghavan, 2011; Goldberg, 2010; Hoepfner, 2006; Law, Ireland, & Hussain, 2010). For example, Deans and Oakley (2006) view that ‘coaching and mentoring share the same principles’(p. 5), but they conclude by defining that coaching is aiming at ‘performance improvement’ (p. 6), while mentoring focuses on supporting people to ‘become the person they want to be’ (p. 6). Also, Stone (1999) has the same conclusion saying that ‘when you coach employees, you improve their ability to do their current jobs’ (p. 1), while ‘mentoring is reserved for the most talented employees help them advance, and they will become assets now and allies in the future’ (p. 1).

The different methods, terms, and behaviors of this developmental support involve a battlefield of hashing out the terminology differences and building walls around coaching and mentoring to avoid losing terrain to other terms. ‘Land grabbing’ is not very helpful in progressing in this field and is a way to take advantage of others (Clutterbuck, 2008). This resulted in a large number of definitions for coaching and mentoring (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2008; Grant & Green, 2018) and several variations for coaching and mentoring, like executive coaching, life coaching, group mentoring, and peer mentoring (Brock, 2012; Clutterbuck & Megginson, 1999; Colley, 2001; Vansickel-Peterson, 2010; Walton & Schlesinger, 1979). Indeed, Haggard et al. (2010) collected 44 definitions of mentoring, and Hamlin et al. (2009) collected 36 definitions of coaching. The confusion about the terms ‘coaching’ and ‘mentoring’ have led to a hodgepodge of meaning and consequently a lack of solid theory building. The

differences in the theoretical constructs of coaching and mentoring make it difficult to prove the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Salter, 2014; Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018). In addition to this, several researchers argue that combining the concepts of coaching and mentoring makes more sense and could improve the research in these fields (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Garvey, 2008; Parsloe, 1995; Parsloe & Leedham, 2009). Finding an approach that combines both concepts and that incorporates different definitions would help researchers to more accurately compare their results with each other. In this vein, the purpose of this chapter is to more fully examine the concepts of coaching and mentoring and how these terms have been used by the field of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education. First, we give a brief overview entrepreneurship education. We then describe how we derived a model to classify coaching and mentoring. Next, we use the Soft Support Model to classify the definitions of coaching and mentoring. Following that we classify the use of both terms in body of entrepreneurial research (i.e., journals). Finally, we discuss the implications of our study for research and entrepreneurship education.

3.3 TEACHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Entrepreneurship development and education have elements from different domains (Mueller & Anderson, 2014), which include not only economic and technological elements but also social domains. Supporting entrepreneurs of new enterprises is often seen as an important part of business incubators and other business development systems (Bøllingtoft, 2012; Ratinho et al., 2013). Entrepreneurship education (EE) fulfills a major role in supporting entrepreneurship (Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2017; Schmitz et al., 2017). Competencies like being able to develop team relationships, think conceptually, organize effectively, and develop commitment are some of the skills noticed in literature as essential for entrepreneurship (Bacigalupo, Kampylis, Punie, & van den Brande, 2016; Man, Lau, & Chan, 2002). Therefore, it is essential to consider the improvement of soft skills (Fayolle, 2013) or personal development (Gielnik et al., 2015) next to the more traditional focus on business planning (Honig, 2004) in the design of EE programs. Although there is much written about non-traditional EE programs (Neck & Corbett, 2018), the design of programs that incorporate the development of soft skills is not so well known (Fayolle, 2013; Toding & Venesaar, 2018).

The need for entrepreneurial development is also influenced by the speed of technological development in modern society and how to prepare people, including entrepreneurs, to handle the growing complexity of it all (Simon, 1965, 1996; Toffler, Longul, & Forbes, 1981). This is shown in the 'fourth-wave of industrial revolution' (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Maynard, 1996)

and the '21st-century skills' (Bennett, 2002; Brown, Green, & Lauder, 2001; Jackson & Chapman, 2012).

For entrepreneurial development, several chapters describe elements like critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity as the next key components to be developed (European_Commission, 2014; Ruskovaara & Pihkala, 2014; Voogt & Roblin, 2010). Implementing the skills needed in modern society into schools' educational programs has been a challenge and has not always been successful.

The elements of the 21st-century skills are considered to be closely related to entrepreneurship education and are seen as an important factor for economic growth (Boyatzis & Boyatzis, 2008; European Commission, 2012). This makes entrepreneurship education and development a major factor for sustainable economic growth (Borzaga & Defourny, 2001; European_Commission, 2006; NIRAS Consultants, 2008; Sijgers, Hammer, Ter Horst, Nieuwenhuis, & Van der Sijde, 2005). This is probably the reason why many universities and schools are developing entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial education programs focused on economic and non-economic programs (CCE-Comissão das Comunidades Europeias, 2012; NIRAS Consultants, 2008; Verheul, Wennekers, Audretsch, & Thurik, 2002). Gibb (1996) and Fayolle (2006) demonstrated that traditional education methods, which focused mainly on the business itself and not the personal development, would not work at the entrepreneurial development level. The non-traditional entrepreneurial development method is new and still in its beginning stages. (Barr, Baker, Markham, & Kingon, 2009; Blenker et al., 2012; Neergaard, Tanggaard, Krueger, & Robinson, 2012). One of the main challenges in this non-traditional way of entrepreneurial education and development is the incorporation of 'softer' entrepreneurial topics or personal development in educational practices (Fayolle, 2013).

To achieve personal development (or soft skills), it is common to use coaching or mentoring (Birrell & Waters, 2007; Gray, Ekinici, & Goregaokar, 2015; Mueller & Anderson, 2014), which we define as soft support in this chapter. In addition to soft support, business support can involve financing and technological support, workspace, shared resources, production facilities, and VCs (Bruneel, Ratinho, Clarysse, & Groen, 2012).

3.4 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Research on coaching and mentoring in entrepreneurship is still relatively young (Barondess, 1995; Brock, 2012). Only in the last two decades has there been an increasing number of papers about coaching and mentoring, as shown in Figure 3.

To view the different elements that are being used to describe coaching or mentoring (soft support), we see two directions that are used. First, the supporter (coach or mentor) can change his goals in the interaction, from sounding board (Berman & Bradt, 2006) to support which is related to decision making (Drucker, 2005) or giving technical expertise (Roy, Schlosser, & Pasek, 2019). Soft support can focus on different aspects of the development of the individual, such as learning about themselves to develop expertise (Wise & Voss, 2002). Cavanagh (2006) focuses on expertise when arguing that the supporter can give guidance when he possesses more knowledge. This direction of soft support is rather stable and does not change much within a session.

The second direction of soft support is about the process or the way support is given. This can differ over a short support period or even within a session. For example, Stober and Grant (2006) argue that supporting is about asking the right questions, but they also recognize that support is on a continuum of giving advice and raising questions. This is similar to what Hamlin et al. (2009) say about soft support, which can be done in a more or less directive way. Also, Morrison, Libow, Smith, and Becker (1978) use this directive versus non-directive approach to distinguish between different kinds of support.

So, there are two general recognized dimensions in soft support. The first is about the focus or goal of the support, while the other is more about the way the support is given. The coaching behavior model of De Haan and Burger (2007) for executive coaching contains both elements. They adapted their model from Heron's six categories of counseling intervention (Heron, 1976, 2001). Berman and Bradt (2006), Ives (2008), and D'Abate, Eddy, and Tannenbaum (2003) also describe the same sort of behavior for soft support. Similarly, Clutterbuck (1998) describes a continuum of who is in control of a coaching session and determines what is being discussed. Fillery-Travis and Lane (2006) describe these dimensions and name the two dimensions of soft support 'Role' and 'Agenda'. The 'Role' is the dimension where you can change the goal from skills support (more business-oriented support) to personal support. The 'Agenda' is about the method that is being used during a session. This Agenda can differ from a fixed or directive way to a free or non-directive way. The 'Supervision' is seen by them as not independent to the Role and Agenda dimension. This shows that several papers show two dimensions that describe the kind of support. First, there is a goal-

oriented dimension focusing on the development of the organization to focusing on personal development. Second, the method dimension goes from a directive to a non-directive way of support. We used two dimensions to develop the Soft Support Model (Figure 4).

		<i>Agenda</i>	
		<i>Fixed / Directive</i>	<i>Free / Non-directive</i>
<i>Role</i>	<i>Skills / organization oriented</i>	<i>Problem solving / Challenging</i>	<i>Solution oriented / Clarifying</i>
	<i>Personal development</i>	<i>Focus on insight / Liberating</i>	<i>Personal Focus / Empowering</i>

Figure 4 Soft Support Model

Our Soft Support Model uses a continuum adapted from John Heron's (1976) model with two dimensions to understand interpersonal relations (i.e., Jenkins (2007) and Burnard and Morrison (1991)). In Heron's model, different types of interpersonal relations and different types of support are distinguished. The borders in the model represent a continuum at the axes. Several of the mentioned papers describe more or less the same structure as the Soft Support Model, but they leave out some aspects or focus only on coaching or mentoring. We added a combined approach of the authors into one model that can be used for coaching and mentoring.

In Table 2, the description and keywords are shown that are used for the role-value of the definitions of coaching and mentoring. These keywords are determined by letting two groups of students first select essential words in sentences (from research papers) that mention coaching or mentoring and adding them to the Role or Agenda dimension. In a second session, both groups valued those words at the corresponding scales. The words that were valued the same in both groups were added as keywords in both lists. The value of a role can range from a focus on skill development (valued as 1) to a focus on the person (valued as 5). For each value, there is a description that corresponds to that value. There are also keywords that fit the specific distribution (and value). In Table 3, the description and keywords are shown that are used for the agenda-value of the definitions of coaching and mentoring. The value of the agenda ranges from directive (valued as 1) to non-directive (valued as 5). Also included is a description for each value with corresponding keywords. We used these descriptions (and keywords) to value the definitions of coaching and mentoring.

In the next section, we discuss our approach to two studies examining definitions of coaching and mentoring using our Soft Support Model, as shown in Figure 4.

Table 2 Categories and value for the Role element

<i>Value</i>	<i>Role</i>	<i>Keywords</i>
1 (skills)	Focus on the skills with (almost) no eye for the development of the person	Expert(ise) Strategic choices Company growth Specific skills Job performance Finance, law, accounting, market, handle a problem
2 (skills)	Focus on the skills with an eye for the development of the person	Providing knowledge, experience Planning, Management, develop leadership Network, business plan, models
3 (both)	Focus on personal development	Intellectual and social capital
4 (personal)	Focus on the development of the person with a direct eye for the skills	Start thinking, develop thoughts, resilience Team building, personal relations
5 (personal)	Focus on the development of the person without direct eye for the skills	self-efficacy, personal growth/satisfaction

Table 3 Categories and value for the Agenda element

<i>Value</i>	<i>Agenda</i>	<i>Keywords</i>
1 (directive)	The supporter (coach/mentor) steers the situation, gives direction during the process	Control, act as CEO, Paternalistic, instruction, injecting, participate
2 (directive)	The supporter (coach/mentor) steers most of the time the situation with an eye for the needs of the person	Supervisor Learning, teaching, advising, guide, assistance, providing, training, support
3 (both)	The steering of the process switches or is in the hands of both.	Helping, parental, training, working together
4 (non-directive)	The coach/mentor influences the process but lets the person decide.	Encouraging, discussion, talking, reflecting, cheer
5 (non-directive)	The coach/mentor lets the person free to decide about the process	Delegation, jolly time, Inverse knowledge creation

3.5 APPROACH

For the first study of classifying definitions, we decided to use Hamlin et al.'s (2009) 36 definitions of coaching and Haggard et al. (2010) 44 definitions of mentoring. These definitions were then categorized by the Soft Support Model with the intention or purposes relating to the role-axis and the processes relating to the agenda-axis.

For the second study of how the terms coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs are being used in literature, we made an inventory of definitions and descriptions of coaching in mentoring in various high-ranked journals and classified them using the Soft Support Model. A review was conducted at eight highly-ranked entrepreneurship journals (Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Family Business Review, International Small Business Journal, Journal of Business Venturing, Journal of Small Business Management, Small Business Economics, Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal) and six highly-ranked general management journals (Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, Organization Science, Strategic Management Journal, Technovation and the Journal of Applied Psychology). We selected papers by their use of coaching or mentoring for entrepreneurs and managers in their roles of running businesses (CEO). We did a search on these journals on the terms: 'coach', 'mentor', 'coaching' or 'mentoring'. The first selection was made by the article title, where we excluded all papers that clearly were not about entrepreneurship or managers. Then we looked more closely at each abstract for the deselection of papers that did not meet the context. After that, the full text was searched to examine exactly how the paper used the terms mentoring or coaching.

3.6 RESULTS

Study 1.

First, we excluded the definitions of coaching and mentoring that did not include the role and the agenda dimension. We found that 26 of the 36 definitions of Hamlin et al. (2009) described the role and the agenda dimension. From these complete definitions, 12 are about non-directive processes and include both skills support and personal-oriented support (12 out of 26). Of the definitions of mentoring from Haggard et al. (2010), 26 of the 44 definitions describe the role and agenda dimension. From these complete definitions, 14 are about non-directive and directive processes and skills-oriented support (14 out of 26).

Table 4 shows the complete results of the definitions of coaching. In this table, values 1 and 2 are directive skills-oriented, and values 4 and 5 are non-directive personal oriented, consistent with the values in Table 2 and Table 3. Similarly, Table 5 shows the complete results of the definitions of mentoring. Here we find that the definitions of mentoring are more about skill-focused support and are both directive and non-directive processes.

Table 4 Number of definitions of coaching valued according to the Soft Support Model

		Agenda		
		Directive	Both	Non-directive
Role	Skills	2	3	3
	Both	1	2	12
	Personal	0	1	2

Table 5 Number of definitions of mentoring valued according to the Soft Support Model

		Agenda		
		Directive	Both	Non-directive
Role	Skills	5	14	1
	Both	1	4	0
	Personal	1	0	0

The results from Table 4 and Table 5 show that while most definitions of coaching and mentoring are not the same, they are also not opposites. Table 4 shows that most definitions are about non-directive support. Table 5 shows that most definitions are about non-directive support. According to our evaluation of definitions using the Soft Support Model, we see that the goal and the way to achieve this clearly differs between coaching and mentoring. This difference impacts the person being supported or educated by a coach or mentor, and this likely has an influence on the goals and methods used in the educational program (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006; Grant, 2008; Holden, Mavor, Sadler-Smith, & Gray, 2010; Janssen, van Vuuren, & de Jong, 2016).

Study 2. The second study examined how coaching and mentoring are used in entrepreneurial research (Abravanel, 2018; Baluku et al., 2018; Grant & Green, 2018; Kunaka & Moos, 2019). From a total of 1116 papers that used the terms coaching or mentoring in those 15 journals, we found 71 papers that had an explanation of coaching, mentoring entrepreneurs, or CEOs running a business. Of these, 20 papers described only one aspect of coaching or mentoring. For example, "... its managers behave as mentors, paternalistically."

(Vallejo, 2009, p. 138) describes only the agenda aspect of mentoring. And "...there is limited attention for coaching on market development and organizational development in comparison with coaching on finance, R&D, production and operations." (Gilsing, van Burg, & Romme, 2010, p. 20) describes only the role aspect of coaching. The remaining 51 papers used these terms in an entrepreneurial context and also had a complete description of these terms. For example, "... informal female 'mentoring' systems whereby the women confided in each other, discussing marriage as well as business issues. In so doing, the women shared tactics and strategies which enabled them to protect their businesses against interference and criticism" (Al-Dajani & Marlow, 2010, p. 478) describes the role and the agenda. In total, there were 55 descriptions (four papers included both coaching and mentoring). Table 6 shows the number of papers per journal and how many use coaching and mentoring descriptions.

Table 6 Number of papers with complete description of coaching or mentoring per journal

	Number of papers			
	Coaching	Coaching/ Mentoring	Mentoring	Total
ENTREP REGION DEV	1	1	1	3
ENTREP THEORY PRACT	1	0	6	7
FAM BUS REV	2	2	10	14
INT SMALL BUS J	2	1	2	5
J BUS VENTURING	3	0	2	5
J SMALL BUS MANAGE	0	0	0	0
SMALL BUS ECON	3	0	0	3
STRATEGIC ENTREP J	0	0	1	1
Total Entrepreneurship	12	4	22	38
ACAD MANAGE J	0	0	1	1
ACAD MANAGE REV	1	0	0	1
ADMIN SCI QUART	0	0	0	0
ORGAN SCI	0	0	0	0
STRATEGIC MANAGE J	0	0	0	0
TECHNOVATION	6	0	4	10
J APPL PSYCHOLOGY	1	0	0	1
Total Management	8	0	5	13
Total	20	4	27	51

In terms of the journals, two entrepreneurial journals have one or no papers about coaching and mentoring in our sample. Most of the management journals only have a single complete description of coaching or mentoring, except for Technovation. In general, we found that coaching, as well as mentoring, are looked upon by most authors as (entrepreneurial) skills and directive oriented. More specifically, we found that the term coaching was used in 13 out of 24 papers, and the term mentoring was used in 19 out of 31 papers (see Table 7 and Table

8). This shows that both terms are used the same way and different from the definitions of those terms.

Table 7 Number of the term ‘coaching’ used in papers

		Agenda		
		Directive	Both	Non-directive
Role	Skills	13	3	5
	Both	0	1	0
	Personal	0	0	2

Table 8 Number of the term ‘mentoring’ used in papers

		Agenda		
		Directive	Both	Non-directive
Role	Skills	19	4	3
	Both	1	2	0
	Personal	1	0	1

Looking at the terms in the management and entrepreneurship journals, it seems that ‘Mentoring’ is a bit more common than the term ‘Coaching’. Only in Small Business Economics and Journal of Business Venturing have an opposite ratio. We also looked at where the journal was based (Table 9) and found that the USA-based journals used the term

Table 9 Number of papers in journals in different parts of the world

	Total papers	Papers with coaching	Papers with mentoring
USA	30	10	23
UK	13	8	6
Europe	8	6	2
Total	51	24	31

‘Coaching’ 10 times and the term ‘Mentoring’ 23 times. For the European mainland base journals, the ratio was 6 for ‘Coaching’ and 2 for ‘Mentoring’. The UK-based journals were rather equal; 8 for ‘Coaching’ and 6 for ‘Mentoring’. When looking at the location of the first author of each paper, we see similar results (Table 10). Of the 18 USA-based authors, 6 of them used ‘Coaching’ while 14 of them used ‘Mentoring’, and from the 17 European mainland-based authors, ten used ‘Coaching’ and 8 used ‘Mentoring’.

Table 10 Number of papers from first authors of different parts of the world

	<i>Total papers</i>	<i>Papers with coaching</i>	<i>Papers with mentoring</i>
<i>USA</i>	18	6	14
<i>UK</i>	11	6	6
<i>Europe</i>	17	10	8
<i>Canada</i>	2	1	1
<i>rest</i>	3	1	2
<i>Total</i>	51	24	31

We did see a pattern that USA-based journals and authors use more often the term ‘Mentoring’ while the European-based journals and authors use more often the term ‘Coaching’ in soft support of entrepreneurs see Table 11. However, the numbers are too low for significant findings, and further research on this could bring more clarity.

Table 11 Number of papers with authors and journals from USA or Europe

<i>Journal</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Coaching</i>	<i>Mentoring</i>
<i>USA</i>	<i>USA</i>	14	4	12
<i>USA</i>	<i>Europe</i>	5	1	4
<i>Europe</i>	<i>USA</i>	3	1	2
<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	4	4	0

3.7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to more fully examine the concepts of coaching and mentoring and how these terms have been used by the field of entrepreneurship education and research. Overall, we found some interesting results about how these terms were used in research by examining existing definitions and research through the Soft Support Model.

KEY FINDINGS

Study one showed us that the definitions of coaching and mentoring seem to have some consensus about what they mean. Also, there is a clear difference between these terms. Coaching and mentoring are not defined as opposites but instead focus on different directions. The key findings are that coaching definitions show a non-directive approach, while mentoring definitions show a skill-oriented goal.

Another key finding is that if authors write about coaching or mentoring in an entrepreneurial setting, they tend to use these terms differently from generally used definitions (in study 1). Sometimes authors use the terms interchangeably in one paper or even in one

sentence. For example, “One issue at this stage is access to outside ‘coaches’ for mentoring” (Ndonzuau, Pirnay, & Surlemont, 2002, p. 286). In the 51 papers, only one paper defined mentoring: *Can be any interpersonal relationship that guides, influences, and supports one’s career progress; can be performed in either a formal or informal manner* (Boyd, Upton, & Wircenski, 1999, p. 301). Our results show there is a need for clearer knowledge about what is meant when people talk or write about coaching or mentoring, especially in an entrepreneurial setting (Gannon, 2021).

As expected, almost all the papers on coaching and mentoring are from ‘entrepreneurial’ journals because entrepreneurship was one of the selection criteria. There is one interesting exception which is Technovation. There has been some discussion in the field as to if this should be considered an entrepreneurial journal (Stewart & Cotton, 2013), but our results support this assertion.

Finally, when looking back at both of our studies, most of the descriptions of coaching or mentoring could be valued in accordance with the Soft Support Model. Our findings show that the Soft Support Model seems to be useful in giving more clarity about what is meant with coaching or mentoring without getting stuck in the pitfall of terms and definitions (Clutterbuck, 2008; Grant & Cavanagh, 2007). We hope that this will help entrepreneurship development and education move forward with consistency and intent in training and educating the next generation of entrepreneurs.

LIMITATIONS

This research used Hamlin et al.’s (2009) 36 definitions of coaching and Haggard et al.’s (2010) 44 definitions of mentoring. It also was conducted using only 15 top entrepreneurship and management journals. So, there are some limitations around the samples as to the definition sets and the journals we chose. We considered Hamlin et al.’s (2009) and Haggard et al.’s (2010) definition selections to be representative of those in the entrepreneurship domain. We also considered our selected journals to have enough papers about coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs and represent the way researchers/authors in the field think about this. Further research could expand this by selecting their own definition sets or involving journals that focus more on coaching or mentoring. Another limitation is that we looked at ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’ as commonly used concepts for soft support. Other concepts of soft support were left out of this research, as they are less known. However, it would be interesting to value other concepts, like counseling, consulting, etc., in comparison with the use of the Soft Support Model (Parsloe & Leedham, 2009).

FUTURE RESEARCH

The next step is research on what kind of soft support for entrepreneurs is being used in practice and if different sorts of support have different results. It would also be interesting to look at the context from entrepreneurial education in colleges and universities to entrepreneurial development in incubators, etc., to see if there are differences between coaching and mentoring. This could be especially interesting because many descriptions in the literature about soft support rarely see the entrepreneur as a person who can be developed (Burger-Helmchen, 2012; Nabi et al., 2017; Pittaway & Cope, 2016). Another interesting research possibility would be to extend the Soft Support Model to examine other types of soft support value, such as being able to develop team relationships, think conceptually, organize effectively, and develop commitment.

There could also be some research done on soft support of starting entrepreneurs in special skills, such as the financial and marketing field and personal development. In the most valued journals, we did find almost nothing about this item. Most of the time, when they looked at the soft support of entrepreneurship, they thought about their skills or competencies and the strategy of business models. Additionally, research on supporting soft skills is limited (Fayolle, 2013). Other gaps in the literature could be on how coaches or mentors support entrepreneurs in practice. Researching how practitioners are coaching or mentoring entrepreneurs would be fascinating.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

The Soft Support Model can be used to do support different methods of entrepreneurial education and development. This would help to bring a more consistent approach to entrepreneurship education without having to struggle with the words and definitions. The Soft Support Model can also be used to classify the support that is given to developing the entrepreneur, or what is expected from a coach or mentor for educating a successful entrepreneur, or from teachers if they coach or mentor in entrepreneurship education.

The model also can help entrepreneurs to specify their need for support and to help coaches, mentors to specify the support that they give. The model gives them a framework to specify the type of support that is requested or offered. And it also gives them a framework to discuss on a meta-level the interactions between the entrepreneurs and the person who supports them.

The model also gives venture capitalists and other support organizations of entrepreneurs the ability to specify the eventual lack of support that is given or what is needed to have better

alignment of the type of support provided. Also, policymakers can make use of the results to get more targeted and effective funding for the support of entrepreneurial development and education.

To conclude, the Soft Support Model can help educators, trainers, and others to reflect on the way they support. By using this model, they can express and discuss what they do, and then use this to improve their support.

REFERENCES

- Abravanel, M. (2018). *Coaching Presence: A Grounded Theory from the Coach's Perspective*. (Doctor), Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.
- Al-Dajani, H., & Marlow, S. (2010). Impact of women's home-based enterprise on family dynamics: Evidence from Jordan. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(5), 470-486. doi:10.1177/0266242610370392
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). The Relationship Between Formal Mentoring Program Characteristics and Perceived Program Effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 125-153.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. New York (NY), USA: Oxford University Press.
- Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y., & van den Brande, G. (2016). *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*. Retrieved from Luxemburg:
- Baluku, M. M., Matagi, L., Musanje, K., Kikooma, J. F., & Otto, K. (2018). Entrepreneurial Socialization and Psychological Capital: Cross-Cultural and Multigroup Analyses of Impact of Mentoring, Optimism, and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 5-42. doi:10.1177/2515127418818054
- Barondess, J. A. (1995). President's Address: A Brief History of Mentoring. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association*, 106, 1-24.
- Barr, S. H., Baker, T., Markham, S. K., & Kingon, A. I. (2009). Bridging the Valley of Death: Lessons Learned From 14 Years of Commercialization of Technology Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(3), 370-388.
- Beattie, R. S. (2002). *Developmental managers- line managers as facilitators of workplace learning in voluntary organisations*. (Doctor), University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.
- Bennett, R. (2002). Employers' Demands for Personal Transferable Skills in Graduates: a content analysis of 1000 job advertisements and an associated empirical study. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 54(4), 457-476. doi:10.1080/13636820200200209
- Berman, W. H., & Bradt, G. (2006). Executive Coaching and Consulting: "Different Strokes for Different Folks". *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37(3), 244-253. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.37.3.244
- Birrell, S., & Waters, L. (2007). The Role of Mentoring and Peer Support in Contributing to Perceived Progress Towards Small Business Success: A Cross Sectional Study. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 12(1), 33-48.
- Blenker, P., Frederiksen, S. H., Korsgaard, S., Iler, S., Neergaard, H., & Thrane, C. (2012). Entrepreneurship as everyday practice: towards a personalized pedagogy of enterprise education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 26(6), 417-430. doi:10.5367/ihe.2012.0126
- Bøllingtoft, A. (2012). The bottom-up business incubator: Leverage to networking and cooperation practices in a self-generated, entrepreneurial-enabled environment. *Technovation*, 32(5), 304-315. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.005

- Borzaga, C., & Defourny, J. (2001). *The emergence of social enterprise* (Vol. 4): Psychology Press.
- Boyatzis, R., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(1), 5-12. doi:10.1108/02621710810840730
- Boyd, J., Upton, N., & Wircenski, M. (1999). Mentoring in Family Firms: A Reflective Analysis of Senior Executives' Perceptions. *Family Business Review*, 12(4), 299-309.
- Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 342-361. doi:10.1080/1359432x.2018.1446946
- Brock, V. G. (2012). Introduction to Coaching History. In *UT Dallas Coaching News and the Executive and Professional Coaching Program* (pp. 3). Dallas (TX), USA: UT Dallas Jindal School of Management.
- Brown, P., Green, A., & Lauder, H. (2001). *High Skills: Globalization, Competitiveness, and Skill Formation: Globalization, Competitiveness, and Skill Formation*: Oxford University Press.
- Bruneel, J., Ratinho, T., Clarysse, B., & Groen, A. (2012). The Evolution of Business Incubators: Comparing demand and supply of business incubation services across different incubator generations. *Technovation*, 32(2), 110-121. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.003
- Burger-Helmchen, T. (2012). *Entrepreneurship-Born, Made and Educated*.
- Burnard, P., & Morrison, P. (1991). Nurses' interpersonal skills: a study of nurses' perceptions. *Nurse Education Today*, 11(1), 24-29. doi:10.1016/0260-6917(91)90121-P
- Cavanagh, M. (2006). Coaching from a Systemic Perspective: A Complex Adaptive Conversation. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- CCE-Comissão das Comunidades Europeias. (2012). *Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe. National Strategies, Curricula and Learning Outcomes*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:
- Clutterbuck, D. (1998). *Learning Alliances: tapping into talent*. London: Institute of Personnel and development.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Clutterbuck, D., & Megginson, D. (1999). *Mentoring Executives and Directors*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Coll, J. H., & Raghavan, P. (2011). Mentoring: Who And How. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 1(8), 65-77.
- Colley, H. (2001). Righting rewritings of the myth of Mentor: A critical perspective on career guidance mentoring. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 29(2), 177-197. doi:10.1080/03069880020047120
- D'Abate, C. P., Eddy, E. R., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (2003). What's in a Name? A Literature-Based Approach to Understanding Mentoring, Coaching, and Other Constructs That Describe Developmental Interactions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 360-384. doi:10.1177/1534484303255033
- De Haan, E., & Burger, Y. (2007). *Coachen met collega's: Praktijkboek individuele consultatie*. Assen, the Netherlands: Koninklijke van Gorcum BV.
- Deans, F., & Oakley, L. (2006). *Coaching and Mentoring for Leadership - Development in Civil Society*. Retrieved from
- Drucker, P. F. (2005). Manging Oneself. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(1), 535-537.
- Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2008). Definition and Evolution of Mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring - A Multiple Perspectives Approach* (pp. 7-20): Blackwell Publishing.
- European Commission. (2012). *Effects and impact of entrepreneurship programmes in higher education*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:

- European_Commission. (2006). The Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe. In E. Commission (Ed.), (pp. 4).
- European_Commission. (2014). *Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:
- Fayolle, A. (2006). *Essay on the Nature of Entrepreneurship Education*. Paper presented at the International Conference Entrepreneurship in United Europe - Challenges and Opportunities, Sunny Beach, Bulgaria.
- Fayolle, A. (2013). Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(7-8), 692-701. doi:10.1080/08985626.2013.821318
- Feldman, D. C. (2005). Executive Coaching: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 829-848. doi:10.1177/0149206305279599
- Fillery-Travis, A., & Lane, D. (2006). Does coaching work or are we asking the wrong questions? *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 1(1), 14.
- Gannon, J. M. (2021). Applying the Lens of Social Movements to Coaching and Mentoring. *Philosophy of Coaching: An International Journal*, 6(1), 5-29. doi:10.22316/poc/06.1.02
- Garvey, B. (2008). The Meaning of Coaching and Mentoring. In *An Introduction to Coaching and Mentoring* (pp. 7-27). Thousand Oaks (CA) USA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Gibb, A. A. (1996). Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management- Can We Afford to Neglect Them in the Twenty-first Century Business School? *British Journal of Management*, 7, 13.
- Gielnik, M. M., Frese, M., Kahara-Kawuki, A., Katono, I. W., Kyejjusa, S., Muhammed, N., . . . J., D. T. (2015). Action and action-regulation in Entrepreneurship: Evaluating a Student Training for Promoting Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(1), 69-94. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0107.
- Gilsing, V. A., van Burg, E., & Romme, A. G. L. (2010). Policy principles for the creation and success of corporate and academic spin-offs. *Technovation*, 30(1), 12-23. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2009.07.004
- Goldberg, I. B. (2010). Mentoring, Consulting or Coaching? *Coaching World Newsletter*, p. 5.
- Grant, A. M. (2008). Personal life coaching for coaches-in-training enhances goal attainment, insight and learning. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 1(1), 54-70. doi:10.1080/17521880701878141
- Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2007). Evidence-based coaching: Flourishing or languishing? *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 239-254. doi:10.1080/00050060701648175
- Grant, A. M., & Green, R. M. (2018). Developing clarity on the coaching-counselling conundrum: Implications for counsellors and psychotherapists. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 18(4), 347-355. doi:10.1002/capr.12188
- Gray, D., Ekinci, Y., & Goregaokar, H. (2015). Decisions to engage with executive coaching and the impact of coaching on managers' personal development in SMEs: a mixed method approach. 20. http://www.academia.edu/download/31041798/Coaching_mixed_methods_article4.doc
- Greene, J., & Grant, A. M. (2003). *Solution-focused coaching: Managing people in a complex world*. London: Momentum Press.
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2010). Who Is a Mentor? A Review of Evolving Definitions and Implications for Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304. doi:10.1177/0149206310386227
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. S. (2009). Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 4(2), 143-155. doi:10.1080/03069887608256308

- Heron, J. (2001). *Helping the client: a creative practical guide* (5 ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Ho, Y. F., & Turner, J. J. (2019). 'Entrepreneurial Learning'– The Role of University Led Business Incubators and Mentors in Equipping Graduates with The Necessary Skills Set for Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 4(30), 283-298.
- Hoepfner, A. (2006). Zukunftstrends und ihre Implikationen für das Coaching. *Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching*, 13(3), 281-292. doi:10.1007/s11613-066-0036-y
- Holden, R., Mavor, P., Sadler-Smith, E., & Gray, D. E. (2010). Teaching and learning intuition: some implications for HRD and coaching practice. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(8/9), 822-838. doi:10.1108/03090591011080995
- Honig, B. (2004). Entrepreneurship Education: Toward a Model of Contingency-Based Business Planning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(3), 258-273. doi:10.5465/amle.2004.14242112
- Ives, Y. (2008). What is 'Coaching'? An Exploration of Conflicting Paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(2), 100-113.
- Jackson, D., & Chapman, E. (2012). Non-technical competencies in undergraduate business degree programs: Australian and UK perspectives. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(5), 541-567. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.527935
- Janssen, S., van Vuuren, M., & de Jong, M. D. T. (2016). Informal Mentoring at Work: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 498-517. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12069
- Jenkins, E. (2007). Six Categories Intervention Analysis. In.
- Kunaka, C., & Moos, M. N. (2019). Evaluating mentoring outcomes from the perspective of entrepreneurs and small business owners. *The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 11(1). doi:10.4102/sajesbm.v11i1.214
- Law, H., Ireland, S., & Hussain, Z. (2010). Coaching & Mentoring. Differences between coaching and mentoring. Retrieved from http://www.sath.nhs.uk/Library/Documents/Library/Resource_packs/Differences%20between%20coaching%20and%20mentoring.pdf
- Levinson, D. J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York (NY), USA: Knopf.
- Man, T. W. Y., Lau, T., & Chan, K. F. (2002). The competitiveness of small and medium enterprises: A conceptualization with focus on entrepreneurial competencies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(2), 123-142. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(00\)00058-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00058-6)
- Maynard, H. B. (1996). *The fourth wave: Business in the 21st century*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Morrison, J. K., Libow, J. A., Smith, F. J., & Becker, R. R. (1978). Comparative effectiveness of directive vs. nondirective group therapist style on client problem resolution. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 34(1), 186 - 187.
- Mueller, S., & Anderson, A. R. (2014). Understanding the entrepreneurial learning process and its impact on students' personal development: A European perspective. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3), 500-511. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2014.05.003
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. F. j., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277-299. doi:10.5465/amle.2015.0026
- Ndonzuau, F. N., Pirnay, F., & Surlemont, B. (2002). A stage model of academic spin-off creation. *Technovation*, 22(5), 281-289.

- Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 8-41. doi:10.1177/2515127417737286
- Neergaard, H., Tanggaard, L., Krueger, N. F. j., & Robinson, S. (2012). Pedagogical Interventions in Entrepreneurship from Behaviourism to Existential Learning.
- NIRAS Consultants, F., ECON Pöyry. (2008). *Survey of Entrepreneurship in Higher Education in Europe*. Retrieved from
- Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assesing: a practical guide to developing competence (Revised ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- Parsloe, E., & Leedham, M. (2009). *Coaching and mentoring: Practical conversations to improve learning*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2016). Entrepreneurship Education. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 25(5), 479-510. doi:10.1177/0266242607080656
- Pittaway, L., Missing, C., Hudson, N., & Maragh, D. (2009). Entrepreneurial learning through action: a case study of the Six-Squared program. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, 6(3), 265-288. doi:10.1080/14767330903299480
- Ratinho, T., Harms, R., & Groen, A. (2013). Business Incubators: (How) Do they help their Tenants? *New Technology-Based Firms in the New Millenium*, 10, 161-182.
- Roy, N., Schlosser, F., & Pasek, Z. (2019). Stimulating Entrepreneurial Interest in Engineers Through an Experiential and Multidisciplinary Course Collaboration. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*. doi:10.1177/2515127419856602
- Ruskovaara, E., & Pihkala, T. (2014). Entrepreneurship Education in Schools: Empirical Evidence on the Teacher's Role. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 108(3), 236-249. doi:10.1080/00220671.2013.878301
- Salter, T. (2014). Mentor and coach: Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (Special Issue No. 8), 1-8.
- Schermuly, C. C., & Graßmann, C. (2018). A literature review on negative effects of coaching – what we know and what we need to know. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(1), 39-66. doi:10.1080/17521882.2018.1528621
- Schmitz, A., Urbano, D., Guerrero, M., Dandolini, G. A., Ferreira, J. J., Fernades, C. I., . . . Fernandes, C. I. (2017). *Entrepreneurial Universities. Exploring the Academic and Innovative Dimensions of Entrepreneurship in Higher Education* (M. Peris-Ortiz, J. A. Gómez, J. M. Merigó-Lindahl, & C. Rueda-Armengot Eds.). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Sijgers, I., Hammer, M. H. M., Ter Horst, W., Nieuwenhuis, P. A. W., & Van der Sijde, P. (2005). *Supporting the contribution of Higher Education Institutes to regional development*. Retrieved from Enschede, Netherlands: <http://www.oecd.org/netherlands/35883426.pdf>
- Simon, H. A. (1965). *Administrative behavior* (Vol. 4): Cambridge Univ Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA, USA London, UK: The MIT Press.
- Stewart, A., & Cotton, J. L. (2013). Making Sense of Entrepreneurship Journals. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 19(3).
- Stober, D. R., & Grant, A. M. (2006). Toward a contextual approach to coaching models. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stone, F. M. (1999). Coaching Counseling & Mentoring. *Soundview Executive Book Summaries*, 21(4), 8.
- Sullivan, R. (2000). Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6(3), 160-175. doi:doi:10.1108/13552550010346587

- Toding, M., & Venesaar, U. (2018). Discovering and developing conceptual understanding of teaching and learning in entrepreneurship lecturers. *Education + Training*, 60(7/8), 696-718. doi:10.1108/et-07-2017-0101
- Toffler, A., Longul, W., & Forbes, H. (1981). *The third wave*: Bantam books New York.
- Vallejo, M. C. (2009). Analytical Model of Leadership in Family Firms Under Transformational Theoretical Approach: An Exploratory Study. *Family Business Review*, 22(2), 136-150. doi:10.1177/0894486508327892
- Vansickel-Peterson, D. L. (2010). *Coaching Efficacy With academic leaders: A Phenomenological Investigation*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Nebraska, Lincoln (NE), USA.
- Verheul, I., Wennekers, S., Audretsch, D., & Thurik, A. R. (2002). An eclectic theory of entrepreneurship: policies, institutions and culture. In *Entrepreneurship: Determinants and policy in a European-US comparison* (pp. 11--81): Springer.
- Voogt, J., & Roblin, N. P. (2010). *21st Century Skills*. *Discussienota*. Retrieved from Enschede, Netherlands:
- Walton, R. E., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979). Do Supervisors Thrive in Participative Work Systems? *Organizational Dynamics*, 7(3), 25-38.
- Wise, P. S., & Voss, L. S. (2002). *The case for executive coaching*. Retrieved from

Chapter 4 HOW COACHING AND MENTORING ARE DEFINED, IMPLEMENTED AND ATTAINED: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ⁵

The previous chapter showed that the definitions of coaching and mentoring often do not match the use of these concepts in research. This chapter explores what coaches and mentors do and how entrepreneurs experience their support by measuring the implemented and attained support with the newly developed scale of the Soft Support Model.

4.1 ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship and the training of entrepreneurs attract a lot of interest. In this chapter, we focus on the support of the entrepreneur with coaching and mentoring. Research on coaching and mentoring is still brawling with many different and not generally accepted definitions, making it difficult to measure and improve the support of entrepreneurs. In this chapter, we develop a s Soft Support Model to calculate the support that entrepreneurs get.

The Soft Support Model involves the goal of the coaching and mentoring support and methods used for that support. We measure the implemented and experienced support by coaches/mentors and their starting entrepreneurs.

The results show that mentors focus more on personal support than coaches. The entrepreneurs who receive coaching experience the support even more focused on the business skills than the coaches think they do, which is also completely different from the definitions. Therefore, researchers cannot rely on definitions for coaching and mentoring, but neither can researchers rely on what coaches and mentors say they do. The results also show that female coaches/mentors seem to differ less than if the coach/mentor and the entrepreneur are both males, supporting the idea that unlocking the potential of (female) entrepreneurs can be done by deploying female coaches/mentors.

⁵ This chapter is under review at the journal Industry and Higher Education

4.2 INTRODUCTION

There is much interest in enterprises and entrepreneurship from many directions, such as government, schools, and universities resulting in several kinds of support to stimulate entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur (Ratinho, Harms, & Groen, 2010; Zalan & Lewis, 2010). Raposo and Paco (2011) acknowledge that supporting the person (the entrepreneur) is one of the key factors in stimulating entrepreneurship. Various terms describe this entrepreneurial support, including coaching, mentoring, supervision, guiding, training, teaching, counseling, moderating, advising, etcetera. The common element of this support is using personal interaction, mostly between two persons (or a person with a group), to improve one person with another person's help. Also, in an educational setting, the improvement of a person with the help of another person is often used and should thereby be important for entrepreneurship education (Hägg & Gabrielsson, 2019; Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2016).

However, the focus on supporting the entrepreneur is diverse. St-Jean and Audet (2012) see mentoring as a personal development tool, while Brien and Hamburg (2014) and Schlosser (2012) see mentoring more as a tool for business improvement. Sperry (2008) again recognizes the business and psychological focus of coaching. J. Thompson and Downing (2007) see coaching as transferring knowledge. It shows that researchers use the terms coaching and mentoring with different meanings, and sometimes they even use them interchangeably. The research of coaching and mentoring is still struggling with this lack of sound and commonly accepted definitions. For example, there were 44 definitions of mentoring collected by Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, and Wilbanks (2010) and 36 definitions of coaching by Hamlin, Ellinger, and Beattie (2009). As shown in chapter 3, these definitions, in general, do not match with the use of these terms by researchers. The effects of coaching and mentoring are recognized in general but for rigorous research on the benefits of coaching and mentoring in entrepreneurship consensus is needed about the use of these terms (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018). We wonder if the use of coaching and mentoring in practice matches the definitions. That brings up the central question of this chapter:

Is the support by coaches and mentors in line with the experience of the entrepreneurs?

Answering this question contributes to the clarity of concepts of coaching and mentoring and the interaction between them (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Kanatouri, 2016; Salter, 2014). This clarity is needed to conduct more rigorous research on the effects and effectiveness of coaching and mentoring (Harding, 2009). In this chapter, we first show the Soft Support Model that we use to value the coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs. We then develop a scale

used to assess the support coaches and mentors presume they give and the support that entrepreneurs experience. Finally, we show the results which answer the main question. Using the Soft Support Model, which combines coaching and mentoring, is a different approach. Often research tries to clarify what is meant by the concepts of coaching and mentoring by expressing the differences (Clutterbuck, 2008; Salter, 2014) or the similarities (Parsloe (1995).

4.3 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Although personal support, like coaching and mentoring, has been around for many years (Barondess, 1995; Brock, 2012), the research in this field is very young. However, in the last decade, there has been an increasing number of papers about personal support like coaching and mentoring (Grant, 2009, 2011; Grant & Cavanagh, 2007). Several researchers see similar principles in personal support; they all handle developmental interactions (Abiddin, 2006; D'Abate, Eddy, & Tannenbaum, 2003). Although they see similarities, most of them point out the differences (Coll & Raghavan, 2011; Goldberg, 2010; Hoepfner, 2006; Law, Ireland, & Hussain, 2010). For example, Deans and Oakley (2006) state that coaching and mentoring share the same principles, but they conclude that coaching aims to improve performance while mentoring focuses on supporting people to become the person they want to be. Also, Stone (1999) has the same conclusion: coaching helps improve all employees to do their current jobs while mentoring is reserved for the most talented employees to help them advance to become allies in the future.

The different elements of supporting personal development are most times divided into two dimensions. Personal support can focus on the job or the person's tasks (Drucker, 2005) or on the person itself, like mental health (Berman & Bradt, 2006). These are different intended purposes or goals of personal development (Hamlin et al., 2009). The other dimension differs from asking questions (Stober & Grant, 2006) to advise (St-Jean, Radu-Lefebvre, & Mathieu, 2018). These are differences in the process or how support is given (Hamlin et al., 2009). Jenkins (2007) and Burnard and Morrison (1991) also use these two dimensions. For the Soft Support Model, we used the terms 'Role' for the goal or purposes of support and 'Agenda' for how the given support as used by Fillery-Travis and Lane (2006) for interpersonal relations as shown in Figure 4.

The Soft Support Model consists of two dimensions. The Agenda dimension goes from directive support to non-directive support and reflects the method of support used. The Role dimension goes from business skills (organization oriented) to personal development and reflects the goal of the support. These two dimensions lead to four quadrants. The solution-

oriented quadrant is a directive way of support to help the entrepreneur with his organization. A way to characterize it is by adding knowledge to the solution. The problem-solving quadrant is a non-directive way to support to help the entrepreneur with his organization. A characterization of problem-solving can be: challenging to reflect on the problem. The quadrant of personal focus is a directive approach to personal development. To characterize this quadrant is positive support to empower the entrepreneur to develop him as a person. The last quadrant is a non-directive approach to personal development. Reflecting the entrepreneur's feelings to liberate other perspectives is a way to characterize this. (Cox, Bachirova, & Clutterbuck, 2010).

There are three stages of education programs recognized; the intended program, the implemented program, and the attained program (van den Akker, Kuiper, & Hameyer, 2003). The intended program is about the vision and intention of the program. The implemented program is how, for example, teachers interpret the program and how they teach in reality. The attained program is how, for example, students experience the program and the effect of the program on the students. When we see coaching and mentoring as methods of education, this means that in the coaching/mentoring process, we also can distinguish three stages; the definitions (by the organization), the implementation (by the coaches and mentors), and the experience (by the entrepreneurs). Some research from education that these three stages are not always in line (Assen, 2018). Recognizing the three stages of education not always being in line raises whether this is also the case with coaching and mentoring. We researched coaching and mentoring if they are in line with each other during the three support stages. The Soft Support Model is used to measure these. We already saw in chapter 3 that the definitions of coaching and mentoring do not match how the research literature uses these concepts.

Most of the definitions of coaching show a non-directive method of support that can focus on business skills and personal support. The definitions of mentoring show a focus on business skills support that can be directive and non-directive. So, if the coaches and mentors follow the definitions, the coaches, in general, should give support that is more non-directive than the mentors give. Furthermore, the mentors should give support focusing more on business skills development than the coaches do. The definitions of the International Coaching Federation (ICF, 2018) and the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC, 2020) show this distinction. Defining coaching as “*partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential*” (ICF, 2018, p. 3). Defining mentoring as ‘*A developmental process, which may in some forms involve a transfer of skill or knowledge from a more experienced person to a less experienced, through learning, dialogue and role modelling. In other forms may be a partnership for mutual learning between peers or across differences such as age, race or discipline*’ (EMCC, 2020, p. 5). In

line with the difference between definitions and use of the concepts of coaching and mentoring in the research literature, the people that are involved in coaching and mentoring identified the concepts different from the definitions when they see coaching more focusing on work-related issues and mentoring more on general personal and career development with a more informal and open process (CIPD, 2009). This difference in definitions and use in research literature raises whether the support that coaches and mentors give is more in line with the definitions or more in line with the people involved in coaching and mentoring. Following the definitions of coaching (Hamlin et al., 2009) and mentoring (Haggard et al., 2010), we hypothesize that mentors give support that is more focused on business skills development than coaches and that coaches give support that is more non-directive than mentors.

H1a Mentors intend to provide support that is more business skills development than coaches intend to provide.

H1b Coaches intend to provide support that is more non-directive than the mentors intend to provide.

How coaches and mentors think they support is about implemented coaching and mentoring. After the differences in implementing coaching and mentoring, these implemented coaching and mentoring are translated to the attained coaching and mentoring. As this type of support is between people, communication is essential. Communication has different elements, like cognitive, the message itself, the affective, the emotion in the message, the conative, the meaning of the message (Fayolle et al., 2007; Kurczewska, Kyrö, Lagus, Kohonen, & Lindh-Knuutila, 2018). There is often some loss of communication in the translation between implemented and attained programs. Differences between what teachers think they do and what they do are also found by Assen (2018) when she shows that teachers behave teacher-oriented while they believe they act student-oriented. Other studies also indicate that support, as perceived by the participants, differs from what coaches and mentors think (Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000; Hussey & Campbell-Meier, 2020; Kunaka & Moos, 2019; Schermuly & Graßmann, 2018). We suggest it would be best if coaches' and mentors' support align with what the entrepreneurs experience. Following this idea, we hypothesize that implemented support that coaches or mentors give on the role or the agenda dimension is the same as the support experienced by the entrepreneurs (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Weinberg, 2019).

H2a: The role dimension support that coaches implement is the same as experienced by entrepreneurs.

H2b: The agenda dimension support that coaches implement is the same as experienced by entrepreneurs.

H2c: The role dimension support that mentors implement is the same as experienced by entrepreneurs.

H2d: The agenda dimension support that mentors implement is the same as experienced by entrepreneurs.

Figure 5 shows the research model with the hypotheses in relation to each other.

Figure 5 Research model

Entrepreneurship tends to be seen as male-oriented (Gupta, Goktan, & Gunay, 2014; Shinnar, Hsu, Powell, & Zhou, 2018). More males start (Bosma & Kelley, 2019) and run an enterprise than women (Bosma & Kelley, 2018; Turker & Sonmez Selcuk, 2009). In terms of coaching and mentoring, Hamilton (2014) suggests considering the interaction between the (female) entrepreneur and the people that support them. To address this, we also look at the difference in implemented and attained support using the Soft Support Model from male or female coaches and mentors and male or female entrepreneurs. Although the research on gender matching for entrepreneurs is limited, some of the existing research indicates that ‘at least for a minority the coachees in executive coaching gender is an essential factor’ (Gray & Goregaokar, 2010, p. 538) Bachirova, Spence, and Drake (2016, p. 248) follow this with the suggestion “that coaching and mentoring share similar dilemmas when it comes to cross-gender matching.” The gender issue in matching means that also for supporting entrepreneurs,

similar dilemmas appear, and gender matching can be an issue. The gender issue for entrepreneurs is also supported by St-Jean et al. (2018) as he concludes for entrepreneurs 'that gender matching of mentors and mentees is essential for women' (p. 15).

4.4 METHODOLOGY

This research consists of two parts. First, we developed a scale for measuring support by coaching or mentoring and using this scale for measuring the differences in the perception of coaching and mentoring by the coaches and mentors. We also measure the difference between the implemented and the attained support of both concepts with this scale. We inquire at coaches and mentors and their protegees (entrepreneurs) in several organizations for this research.

STUDY 1 DEVELOPING THE SCALE

We collected keywords from 51 papers of literature research about coaching or mentoring entrepreneurs in 15 high-ranked (A-ranked) journals for this part of the research. There were eight entrepreneurship journals, six general management journals, and the Journal of Applied Psychology (Sassmannshausen, 2012; Stewart & Cotton, 2013). To collect these keywords, we searched for descriptions of coaching or mentoring in these journals. From these descriptions, we retrieved keywords and valued them with two groups of students according to the Soft Support Model (see Table 12 and Table 13).

Table 12 List of keywords for Role

<i>Role</i>	<i>Weight</i>
<i>Expert(ise), Strategic choices, Company growth, Specific skills, Job performance, Finance, Law, Accounting, Market, Solve problems</i>	<i>1 Business Skills/organization oriented</i>
<i>Providing knowledge, Experience, Planning, Management, Develop leadership, Network, Business plan, Models</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Intellectual and social capital</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Start thinking, Develop thoughts, Resilience, Team building, Personal relations</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Self-efficacy, Personal growth/satisfaction</i>	<i>5 Personal development</i>

Table 13 List of keywords for Agenda

<i>Agenda</i>	<i>Weight</i>
<i>Control, Act as CEO, Paternalistic, Instruction, Injecting, Participate</i>	<i>1 Directive</i>
<i>Supervisor, Learning, Teaching, Advising, Guide, Assistance, Providing, Monitor, Training, Support</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Helping, Parental, Training, Working together</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Encouraging, Discussion, Talking, Reflecting, Cheer</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Delegation, Jolly time, Inverse knowledge creation</i>	<i>5 Non-directive</i>

For example, Cater and Justis (2009) wrote ‘I would coach her on “This is the problem. This is the way we handle it.” ‘ (p. 7). Chan and Lau (2005) wrote, ‘The mentoring system requires the constant contact between the technology firm and the mentor, providing advice on solving problems they face during the incubation process.’ (p. 1220). These sentences made clear that mentioning ‘solve problems’ as a key for the role (the goal) of support and, therefore, is derived as a keyword and that ‘advising’ is a keyword for the agenda (the method) of support. The keywords are paired by randomly choosing a keyword from Role of Table 12 List of keywords for Role or value 1 or 2 and pairing it with a keyword with value 3, 4, or 5. The same method is used for Agenda with the keywords of Table 13 List of keywords for Agenda. This results in seven pairs for Role and seven pairs for Agenda. The pairing resulted in 14 items to measure what coaches and mentors think they do and what the entrepreneurs experience when being coached or mentored (see Table 14 and Table 15).

Table 14 List of used keywords for Role in the survey

<i>Pair</i>	<i>Question #</i>	<i>Keyword</i>	<i>Keyword</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Expertise</i>	<i>Start thinking</i>	<i>Removed</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Personal growth</i>	<i>Company growth</i>	<i>Reverse</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Experience</i>	<i>Developing thoughts</i>	<i>Removed</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Personal relations</i>	<i>Strategic choices</i>	<i>Reverse</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>Specific skills</i>	<i>Intellectual and social qualities</i>	<i>Removed</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Self-efficacy</i>	<i>Providing knowledge</i>	<i>Reverse/Removed</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>Solve problems</i>	<i>Teambuilding</i>	

Table 15 List of used keywords for Agenda in the survey

Pair	Question #	Keyword	Keyword	Remarks
1	2	Control	Cheer on	Removed
2	4	Jolly time	Instruction	Reverse/Removed
3	6	Teaching	Discussion	
4	8	Reflecting	Assistance	Reverse
5	10	Act as CEO	Parental	Removed
6	12	Delegation	Monitor	Reverse/Removed
7	14	Training	Cheer	

Following the further steps of E. R. Thompson (2009), we use the paired keywords to survey the coaches/mentors and the entrepreneurs. According to the conjoint method (Luce & Tukey, 1964), at each pair of keywords, the question to the entrepreneur was “which of the keywords are most fitting to the way you receive support?”, or in the case of the supporter (coach/mentor), “which is most fitting to the way you are supporting?” On a 5-point Likert scale, the answer could be divided between the two keywords. See Figure 6 for an example. In appendix A, the questionnaire for coaches is shown. In appendix B, the questionnaire for the entrepreneurs (coachees) is shown. The questionnaires for mentors and mentees are the same, except the words ‘coach’ and ‘coaching’ are replaced with ‘mentor’ and ‘mentoring’.

1. What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That the participant receives Expertise or that the participant Starts thinking?

Expertise				Start thinking
-----------	--	--	--	----------------

13. What do you, as a coach, focus on in guiding the participants? Solving Problems or developing Teambuilding with the participant (and the stakeholders)?

Solve problems				Teambuilding
----------------	--	--	--	--------------

Figure 6 Examples of questions of the survey

We mixed the two sets of seven questions in two ways. In each set of seven questions, the even questions of each set (pair 2, 4, and 6) we reversed, and the sets themselves we mixed; first a role question, then an agenda question, then a role question again, etcetera, shown with the question number (see Table 14 and Table 15). The scores for Role and Agenda can be calculated with a formula. The formulas for the score are as follows:

$$\text{Role} = (42 - 4 \times Q3 - 3 \times Q7 + 3 \times Q13) / 10$$

$$\text{Agenda} = (6 + Q6 - Q8 + Q12) / 3$$

Where Q3 is the score of question 3 (Table 14) and so on. This way, the weight of each keyword is taken into account and recalculated to a scale of 1 to 5.

STUDY 2 DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION

To compare the implemented and the attained support, we asked coaches and mentors and their starting entrepreneurs (coachees and mentees) to fill out the survey from the soft support scale. There we valued the answers according to the developed soft support scale.

We surveyed coaches and mentors and their starting 'entrepreneurs' of several organizations for entrepreneurship incubators. Before sending the survey, we asked the coaches and mentors, and their entrepreneurs for permission to send the survey. Several organizations or individual coaches/mentors refused cooperation. All who agreed did send back some of the questionnaires. For 13 received questionnaires, we could not find the matching coach/mentor or participant. This left a total of 84 complete pairs of surveys (coach/mentor and their entrepreneurs) from the different types of organizations. This includes student entrepreneurs and their mentors (47 pairs), two incubators (17 pairs), and a professional coach organization (20 pairs). All of the coaches/mentors are helping entrepreneurs who are at the beginning of starting their own businesses. There are 61 male entrepreneurs and 23 female entrepreneurs, as shown in Table 16. There are 37 coaches and 47 mentors. The experience of the coaches/mentors is in different domains, from business administration, government to human relations. The same goes for the domain of the entrepreneurs starting their businesses. Some examples are construction work, retail, consultancy, or translation. The age of the company is going from 'not started' to four years with two exceptions of 10 and 27 years. The coaches and mentors have between four and more than 20 years of experience as coaches or mentors. The pairing of the coach/mentor and entrepreneur is as follows: 46 pairs of male coach/mentor and male entrepreneurs, 17 pairs of male coach/mentor and female entrepreneurs, 15 pairs of female coach/mentor and male entrepreneurs, and six pairs of female coach/mentor and female entrepreneurs.

Table 16 Characteristics of the coaches/mentors and the entrepreneurs

	Coaches/mentors	Entrepreneurs
<i>Male</i>	63	61
<i>Female</i>	21	23
<i>Bachelor or higher finished</i>	22	27

4.5 DEVELOPING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Using a factor analysis, we found six questions divided into two components with values above 0.6. These questions fitted to the theoretical Soft Support Model of a role (Table 12) and an agenda (Table 13) component. The questions correspond with these components (see Table 17) (3, 7, and 13 with role and 6, 8, and 14 with agenda) and the scree plot (Figure 7).

Table 17 Factor analysis with two components (Role and Agenda)

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
@3.persgrow.companygrow	,852	
@6 teaching discussion		,674
@7 relations strategy	,804	
@8 reflecting assisting		,662
@13 probsolv teambuilding	,601	
@14 training cheering		,718

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

We see that the questions about personal growth vs. company growth, personal relations vs. strategic choices (reverse), and solving problems vs. teambuilding contribute to component 1, which corresponds with the Agenda component. The questions about teaching vs. discussion, reflecting vs. assisting (reverse), and training vs. cheering contribute to component 2, which corresponds with the Role component. The reliability of the questions' scores on the Cronbach's alpha coefficient scale is 0.83, which is considered acceptable for internal reliability.

Figure 7 Scree Plot Factor Analysis

4.6 RESULTS OF THE PERCEPTIONS

When we see the results of the self-determined support of the coaches and mentors and compare this, see Table 18, we see that the coaches score a mean of 3,01 at the role dimension where the mentors score a 3,48. This difference is significant ($p=0.015$). The difference in score means that mentors tend to give more personal-focused support than coaches do, which is the opposite of what the definitions suggest, where mentors are more focused on business skills. Therefore, we reject H1a. At the agenda dimension, the mean scores are 3,46 for the coaches and 3,36 for the mentors. This difference is not significant ($p=0.505$). The way of giving support by coaches and mentors does not differ much, in contrast to the definitions. That is why we reject H1b. It shows that coaches and mentors implement the support differently than the definitions. The implemented support by the goals (role dimension) is the opposite of the definitions, and the same is true for methods (agenda dimension).

Table 18 Self-determined support of coaches vs. mentors

Averages of implemented coaching and mentoring

	Coach/ Mentor	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Role	Coach	37	3,0090	,73487	,12081
	Mentor	47	3,4752	,97739	,14257
Agenda	Coach	37	3,4595	,69100	,11360
	Mentor	47	3,3617	,64392	,09393

Independent Samples Test if implemented coaching and mentoring

		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	
Role	Equal variances assumed	8,935	,004	-2,413	82	,018	-,46617	,19323	-,85056
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,495	81,853	,015	-,46617	,18687	-,83793
Agenda	Equal variances assumed	3,291	,073	,669	82	,505	,09776	,14615	-,19299
	Equal variances not assumed			,663	74,718	,509	,09776	,14740	-,19590

When we look at the translation of coaching from implemented support to attained support (see Table 19), we see that with coaching at the role dimension, the implemented support of the coaches scores a mean of 3,01, and the attained support by the entrepreneurs score a 2,12 ($p=0,000$). On the agenda dimension, the implemented support by the coaches scores 3,46, and the attained support by entrepreneurs scores 3,45 ($p=0,941$). The difference in role score means that the entrepreneurs experience their support to be much more focused on the business skills development than the coaches think they do. Therefore, we reject H2a. The agenda score for the support is almost the same for implemented and attained, namely non-directive confirming H2b.

Table 19 Implemented vs. attained support of coaches

Paired Samples Statistics of coaches

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Role	Entrepreneur	2,1171	37	,89310	,14683
	Coach	3,0090	37	,73487	,12081
Agenda	Entrepreneur	3,4505	37	,82108	,13498
	Coach	3,4595	37	,69100	,11360

Paired Samples Test (distance) of coaches

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Role	Entrepreneur Coach	—,89189	1,17340	,19291	-1,28312	—,50066	-4,623	36	,000
Agenda	Entrepreneur Coach	—,00901	,73487	,12081	—,25403	,23601	—,075	36	,941

For mentoring, the mean scores are at the role dimension 3,48 for the implemented support, and 3,32 for the attained support ($p=0,347$), as shown in Table 20. The score at the agenda dimension is 3,36 for the implemented support and 3,14 for the attained support ($p=0,347$). Both differences mean that the mentors do not have much difference between their implemented and attained support. These results show that H2b, H2c, and H2d are confirmed, and H2a is rejected.

Table 20 Implemented vs. attained support of mentors

Paired Samples Statistics of mentors

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Role	Entrepreneur	3,3191	47	,62923	,09178
	Mentor	3,4752	47	,97739	,14257
Agenda	Entrepreneur	3,1418	47	,64360	,09388
	Mentor	3,3617	47	,64392	,09393

Paired Samples Test (distance) of mentors

		Paired Differences		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper		
Role	Entrepreneur	-,15603	1,12686	,16437	-,48689	,17483	-,949	46
	Mentor							
Agenda	Entrepreneur	-,21986	,96628	,14095	-,50357	,06385	-1,560	46
	Mentor							

The results are also plotted in Figure 8, which shows that coaches are more focused on business support than mentors and that the entrepreneurs that are supported by coaches even experience more business-focused support.

Figure 8 A plot of coaches and mentors about implementation and attained support

In summary, the rejected hypotheses are H1a, H1b, and H2a; see Figure 9, which shows the rejected hypotheses with red arrows and the confirmed arrows in green. There we see that

Figure 9 Results of the hypotheses with red arrows the rejected hypotheses

the coaches and mentors do not support in line with the definitions. Next, we see that the mentors are more supportive in personal development than the coaches (which is the opposite of the definitions, at which the definitions of mentors show a focus on business skills support), but the used method does not differ much. We also see that the entrepreneurs experience more focus on business skills instead of the personal support than the coaches think they give.

In our sample (Table 16), we see a majority of male entrepreneurs and also male coaches/mentors. This is in line with other findings as entrepreneurship seems to be a male-dominated area (Roy, Schlosser, & Pasek, 2019; Welter, Baker, Audretsch, & Gartner, 2017), and the number of male coaches/mentors is in other research also more than female coaches/mentors (Haneberg & Aaboen, 2021; Kunaka & Moos, 2019). García Pereiro and Dileo (2019) already found that female participation in education has a positive influence on the female share of entrepreneurship. So, we wondered if gender influences the difference in implemented and attained support. If we look at the pairs' gender (Table 21), we see that the 46 male (coach/mentor)-male (entrepreneur) pairs (MM) score a mean distance between coach/mentor and entrepreneur of 1,44 ($\sigma=0,88$) and the female-male (FM) pairs even score a mean distance of 1,51 ($\sigma=0,66$), while the female-female pairs (FF) score a difference between coach/mentor and entrepreneur of 0,82 ($\sigma=0,30$). The Games-Howell test measures the significance of this difference (see Table 21 and Table 22) of 0,011 between MM and FF and 0,019 between FM and FF. There is no significant difference measured with the other

groups for the male coach/mentor and female entrepreneur (MF). The number of female coaches/mentors and female entrepreneurs (six) is too small to take definite conclusions about this issue, but this is worth researching further.

Table 21 Distance between gender combinations

Male/ Female	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
MM	1,4427	46	,87679
MF	1,0790	17	,71619
FM	1,5104	15	,66690
FF	,8150	6	,30301
Total	1,3363	84	,80073

Table 22 Anova test for Male and Female pairing of coach/mentor and the entrepreneur.

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Distance

Games-Howell

(I) Sexe	(J) Sexe	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
C/M-Ent	C/M-Ent				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
MM	MF	,364	,217	,350	-,221	,948
	FM	,068	,215	,989	-,652	,517
	FF	,628*	,179	,011	,125	1,130
MF	MM	-,364	,217	,350	-,948	,221
	FM	-,431	,245	,310	-1,097	,234
	FF	,264	,213	,611	-,333	,861
FM	MM	-,068	,215	,989	-,517	,652
	MF	,431	,245	,310	-,234	1,097
	FF	,695*	,212	,019	,098	1,293
FF	MM	-,628*	,179	,011	-1,130	-,125
	MF	-,264	,213	,611	-,861	,333
	FM	-,635*	,212	,019	-1,293	-,098

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0,05 level.

The results show further, see Table 23, that female coaches/mentors value their agenda support more to non-directive (mean score 3,91) than their male coaches/mentors do (mean

score 3,26). The difference is validated for a 2-tailed T-test at 0,000 (Equal variances assumed), as shown in Table 24. The entrepreneurs don't see that difference (male coach/mentor mean 3,31 and female coach/mentor mean 3,18 2-tailed significance 0,496). There is no significant difference for the role dimension, nor is there for the gender of the entrepreneurs.

Group Statistics

Table 23 Attained support by male and female coaches or mentors.

	C/M gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Role Coach/Mentor	Male	65	3,1949	,93892	,11646
	Female	19	3,5263	,73967	,16969
Agenda Coach/mentor	Male	65	3,2564	,60026	,07445
	Female	19	3,9123	,62699	,14384
Role Entrep	Male	65	2,6821	,94727	,11749
	Female	19	3,1579	,94522	,21685
Agenda Enntrep	Male	65	3,3077	,76673	,09510
	Female	19	3,1754	,64184	,14725

Table 24 Difference between attained support by male and female coaches or mentors.

Independent Samples Test:

		t-test for Equality of Means							95% Confidence Interval of the	
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	(2-Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Role Coach/Mentor	Equal variances assumed	1,372	,245	-1,414	82	,161	-,331	,234	-,798	,135
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,610	36,66	,116	-,331	,206	-,749	,086
Agenda Coach/Mentor	Equal variances assumed	1,580	,212	-4,148	82	,000	-,656	,158	-,970	-,341
	Equal variances not assumed			-4,049	28,36	,000	-,656	,162	-,987	-,324
Role Entrep	Equal variances assumed	,038	,846	-1,927	82	,057	-,476	,247	-,967	,015
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,929	29,41	,063	-,476	,247	-,980	,028
Agenda Entrep	Equal variances assumed	,443	,508	,684	82	,496	,132	,193	-,252	,517
	Equal variances not assumed			,754	34,46	,456	,132	,193	-,224	,488

4.7 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This chapter shows that the model for soft support can measure the support given to starting entrepreneurs. These measurements give us some interesting results.

This research made clear that researchers cannot rely on the definitions when researching coaching and mentoring and instead should measure the support given. Also, using these concepts in research papers differs from those definitions, as shown in chapter 3. For measuring the support by coaching and mentoring, we used the Soft Support Model to develop a scale for measuring the implemented and attained soft support. This model is reliable and scores on two axes. The role axis shows the goal of the support, varying from the business (hard) skills to the personal (soft) skills. Furthermore, the agenda axis shows how the support was given, varying from directive to non-directive.

The differences between the implemented coaching and mentoring show that they differ in their goal, with the mentors seeming to support more personal development than the coaches do. Their focus on personal development is the opposite of the definitions, showing that the mentors support more on business skills. Both concepts seem not to differ much at the agenda dimension, suggesting that coaches and mentors implemented somewhat similar methods for their support. The similarity in methods is also not in line with the definitions. These results confirm the earlier findings in chapter 3 that you cannot rely on the definitions at researching coaching and mentoring.

Another result shows that when coaches support entrepreneurs, they mostly think that they support in a non-directive way focusing on personal development. However, it is not what entrepreneurs perceive as the support they receive. Entrepreneurs experience the support as primarily focusing on business skills development. Most of the definitions of coaching are non-directive and between personal development and business skills development, while the definitions of mentoring are primarily about personal development and between directive and non-directive (author, 2018). So, the coaches think they act more according to most definitions of coaching than the entrepreneurs who experience the support. The entrepreneurs experience coaching support more, according to the definitions of mentoring. The different perception of the coach and the entrepreneur influences the communication between coach and entrepreneur (Fayolle et al., 2007). The difference in perceptions will influence the relationship between the coach and the entrepreneur and, therefore, harm the quality of the support (Bishop, 2015; Ehrich, 2013). It also means that the coaches most likely do not achieve what they implemented or thought to achieve. Giving the coach feedback on the difference between their perceived focus and the experienced focus by the entrepreneur would be helpful to close that gap and therefore improve the support of entrepreneurs. Some initial experiences with this method of feedback support this idea. Coaches (and mentors) recognize by the model their way of working, and they can easily discuss their support. Getting feedback can also be helpful for mentoring, even when their implemented and experienced support seems not to differ much.

There also is a difference between genders when they support entrepreneurs. Although some research already shows that gender influences the coach/mentor relation, especially for women, there is not much research about what causes this influence and its effect on the support results (Gray & Goregaokar, 2010; St-Jean et al., 2018). The male coach/mentor and male entrepreneur and the female coach/mentor and male entrepreneur seem to differ in their support (mean difference 1,4 and 1,5) than the female coach/mentor and female entrepreneur (mean difference 0,8). There are two questions raised about this. First, there is the question of

whether that difference is good or bad. As mentioned before, there is agreement that the difference between intended support and perceived support can cause problems in communication, and therefore it is preferred to minimize those differences. There is some research that cross-gender support is less effective than same-gender support (Kao, Rogers, Spitzmueller, Lin, & Lin, 2014) and some research suggesting that cross-gender support can cause differences in understanding how to function in organizations (Bachirova et al., 2016). More research is needed to find out the effectiveness of differences in implemented and experienced support. Also worthwhile to research is the cause of that difference? Are, for example, women more consensus-oriented and men more competitive-oriented? Or are female entrepreneurs better to coach/mentor or feel safer with a female coach/mentor? However, it gives the chance to unlock a considerable potential of female entrepreneurs supporting their ambition to become entrepreneurs when supported by female coaches/mentors.

We hope that this research on the Soft Support Model will help incubators and other entities that work with entrepreneurial development to better design and implement coaching and mentoring programs. Our results show that mentors focus more on personal support than coaches. The entrepreneurs who receive coaching experience the support even more focused on the business skills than the coaches think they do, which is also completely different from the definitions. Therefore, researchers cannot rely on definitions for coaching and mentoring. The results also show that female coaches/mentors seem to differ less than if the coach/mentor and the entrepreneur are both males, supporting the idea that unlocking the potential of (female) entrepreneurs can be done by deploying female coaches/mentors.

As this research has a limited amount of data with 84 pairs, and there is also some information as shown in Chapter 3 that the terms 'coach' and 'mentor' are used differently over the world, we would encourage others to add more data to improve the robustness of the results.

REFERENCES

- Abiddin, N. Z. (2006). Mentoring and Coaching: The Roles and Practices. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 2(2), 107-116.
- Assen, H. (2018). *From a teacher-oriented to a learner-oriented approach to teaching: The role of teachers' collective learning processes*. (Doctor), Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- Bachirova, T., Spence, G. B., & Drake, D. (2016). The Sage Handbook of Coaching. In T. Bachirova, G. B. Spence, & D. Drake (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Coaching* (pp. 7). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Barondess, J. A. (1995). President's Address: A Brief History of Mentoring. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association*, 106, 1-24.

- Berman, W. H., & Bradt, G. (2006). Executive Coaching and Consulting: "Different Strokes for Different Folks". *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37(3), 244-253. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.37.3.244
- Bishop, J. (2015). *An investigation into the extent and limitations of the GROW model for coaching and mentoring online: Towards 'prosthetic learning'*. Paper presented at the EEE'15 - The 14th International Conference on e-Learning, e-Business, Enterprise Information Systems, and e-Government, Las Vegas, USA.
- Bosma, N., & Kelley, D. (2018). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2018/2019 Global Report*. Retrieved from Santiago, Chile:
- Bosma, N., & Kelley, D. (2019). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2018/2019 Global Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.gemconsortium.org/report/gem-2018-2019-global-report>
- Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 342-361. doi:10.1080/1359432x.2018.1446946
- Brien, E. O., & Hamburg, I. (2014). Supporting Sustainable Strategies for SMEs through Training, Cooperation and Mentoring. *Higher Education Studies*, 4(2). doi:10.5539/hes.v4n2p61
- Brock, V. G. (2012). Introduction to Coaching History. In *UT Dallas Coaching News and the Executive and Professional Coaching Program* (pp. 3). Dallas (TX), USA: UT Dallas Jindal School of Management.
- Burnard, P., & Morrison, P. (1991). Nurses' interpersonal skills: a study of nurses' perceptions. *Nurse Education Today*, 11(1), 24-29. doi:10.1016/0260-6917(91)90121-P
- Cater, J. J., & Justis, R. T. (2009). The Development of Successors From Followers to Leaders in Small Family Firms: An Exploratory Study. *Family Business Review*, 22(2), 109-124. doi:10.1177/0894486508327822
- Chan, K. F., & Lau, T. (2005). Assessing technology incubator programs in the science park: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Technovation*, 25(10), 1215-1228. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2004.03.010
- CIPD. (2009). *Mentoring – CIPD Factsheet*. Retrieved from https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.110468!/file/cipd_mentoring_factsheet.pdf
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Coll, J. H., & Raghavan, P. (2011). Mentoring: Who And How. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 1(8), 65-77.
- Cox, E., Bachirova, T., & Clutterbuck, D. (2010). *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- D'Abate, C. P., Eddy, E. R., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (2003). What's in a Name? A Literature-Based Approach to Understanding Mentoring, Coaching, and Other Constructs That Describe Developmental Interactions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 360-384. doi:10.1177/1534484303255033
- Deans, F., & Oakley, L. (2006). *Coaching and Mentoring for Leadership - Development in Civil Society*. Retrieved from
- Drucker, P. F. (2005). Manging Oneself. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(1), 535-537.
- Eby, L. T., McManus, S. E., Simon, S. A., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). The Protege's Perspective Regarding Negative Mentoring Experiences: The Development of a Taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(1), 1-21. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1726
- Ehrich, L. C. (2013). *Developing Performance Mentoring Handbook.: The State of Queensland*.
- EMCC. (2020). EMCC Global Competence Framework. Glossary V2. In E. M. a. C. Council (Ed.), (pp. 9). Brussels, Belgium.
- Fayolle, A., Béchar, J.-P., Betters-Reed, B. L., Carrier, C., Fletcher, D., Gailly, B., . . . Todorovic, Z. W. (2007). *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education*. (A. Fayolle Ed.). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

- Fillery-Travis, A., & Lane, D. (2006). Does coaching work or are we asking the wrong questions? *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 1(1), 14.
- García Pereiro, T., & Dileo, I. (2019). Female National-Level Entrepreneurship and the Gendered Dimension of the Cultural Environment. *Rivista italiana di economia, demografia e statistica*, LXXIII.
- Goldberg, I. B. (2010). Mentoring, Consulting or Coaching? *Coaching World Newsletter*, p. 5.
- Grant, A. M. (2009). *Workplace, Executive and Life Coaching: An Annotated Bibliography from the Behavioural Science and Business Literature (May 2009)*. Retrieved from Sydney, Australia:
- Grant, A. M. (2011). *Workplace, Executive and Life Coaching: An annotated Bibliography from the Behavioural Science and Business Literature (1st Jan 2011) Scholarly Soaching Publications from 1937 to 1st Jan 2011 (N=634)*. Coaching Psychology Unit, Univeristy of Sydney, Australia. Sydney, Australia.
- Grant, A. M., & Cavanagh, M. J. (2007). Evidence-based coaching: Flourishing or languishing? *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 239-254. doi:10.1080/00050060701648175
- Gray, D. E., & Goregaokar, H. (2010). Choosing an executive coach: The influence of gender on the coach-coachee matching process. *Management Learning*, 41(5), 525-544.
- Gupta, V. K., Goktan, A. B., & Gunay, G. (2014). Gender differences in evaluation of new business opportunity: A stereotype threat perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(2), 273-288.
- Hägg, G., & Gabrielsson, J. (2019). A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. doi:10.1108/ijebr-04-2018-0272
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2010). Who Is a Mentor? A Review of Evolving Definitions and Implications for Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304. doi:10.1177/0149206310386227
- Hamilton, E. (2014). Entrepreneurial Narrative Identity and Gender: A Double Epistemological Shift. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(4), 703-712. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12127
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. S. (2009). Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Haneberg, D. H., & Aaboen, L. (2021). Entrepreneurial learning behaviour of community insiders. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- Harding, C. (2009). Researcher as Goldilocks: searching for a methodology that is 'just right' for a coaching and mentoring study. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*(Special Issue No.3), 11-21.
- Hoepfner, A. (2006). Zukunftstrends und ihre Implikationen für das Coaching. *Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching*, 13(3), 281-292. doi:10.1007/s11613-066-0036-y
- Hussey, L., & Campbell-Meier, J. (2020). Are you mentoring or coaching? Definitions matter. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 12. doi:10.1177/0961000620966651
- ICF. (2018). Ready to Unlock Your Potential? In I. C. F. (ICF) (Ed.), (pp. 12). Lexington. KY, USA: International Coach Federation (ICF).
- Jenkins, E. (2007). Six Categories Intervention Analysis. In.
- Kanatouri, S. (2016). Mapping the e-coaching field through the lens of an online community. In *Coaching als individuelle Antwort auf gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen* (pp. 322-331).
- Kao, K.-Y., Rogers, A., Spitzmueller, C., Lin, M.-T., & Lin, C.-H. (2014). Who should serve as my mentor? The effects of mentor's gender and supervisory status on resilience in mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(2), 191-203. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2014.07.004
- Kunaka, C., & Moos, M. N. (2019). Evaluating mentoring outcomes from the perspective of entrepreneurs and small business owners. *The Southern African Journal of*

- Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 11(1). doi:10.4102/sajesbm.v11i1.214
- Kurczewska, A., Kyrö, P., Lagus, K., Kohonen, O., & Lindh-Knuutila, T. (2018). The interplay between cognitive, conative, and affective constructs along the entrepreneurial learning process. *Education + Training*, 60(7/8), 891-908. doi:10.1108/et-09-2016-0148
- Law, H., Ireland, S., & Hussain, Z. (2010). Coaching & Mentoring. Differences between coaching and mentoring. Retrieved from http://www.sath.nhs.uk/Library/Documents/Library/Resource_packs/Differences%20between%20coaching%20and%20mentoring.pdf
- Luce, R. D., & Tukey, J. W. (1964). Simultaneous Conjoint Measurement: A New Type of Fundamental Measurement. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 1, 1-27.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. F. j., & Walmsley, A. (2016). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, To be published.
- Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assesing: a practical guide to developing competence (Revised ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- Raposo, M., & Paco, A. d. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: relationship between education and entrepreneurial activity. *Psicothema*, 23(3), 453-457.
- Ratinho, T., Harms, R., & Groen, A. J. (2010). Are Business Incubators helping? The role of BIs in facilitating tenants' development.
- Roy, N., Schlosser, F., & Pasek, Z. (2019). Stimulating Entrepreneurial Interest in Engineers Through an Experiential and Multidisciplinary Course Collaboration. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*. doi:10.1177/2515127419856602
- Salter, T. (2014). Mentor and coach: Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (Special Issue No. 8), 1-8.
- Sassmannshausen, S. P. (2012). 99 Entrepreneurship Journals: A Comparative Emperical Investigation of Rankings, Impact, and H/HC-Index. In (pp. 20). Wuppertal, Germany: Schumpeter School of Business and Economics Wuppertal.
- Schermuly, C. C., & Graßmann, C. (2018). A literature review on negative effects of coaching – what we know and what we need to know. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(1), 39-66. doi:10.1080/17521882.2018.1528621
- Schlosser, F. K. (2012). Taking an Active Approach in Entrepreneurial Mentoring Programmes Geared towards Immigrants. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 21(2), 201-221. doi:10.1177/0971355712449411
- Shinnar, R. S., Hsu, D. K., Powell, B. C., & Zhou, H. (2018). Entrepreneurial intentions and start-ups: Are women or men more likely to enact their intentions? *International Small Business Journal*, 36(1), 60-80.
- Sperry, L. (2008). Executive coaching: An intervention, role function, or profession? *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(1), 33-37. doi:10.1037/1065-9293.60.1.33
- St-Jean, E., & Audet, J. (2012). The role of mentoring in the learning development of the novice entrepreneur. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(1), 119-140. doi:10.1007/s11365-009-0130-7
- St-Jean, E., Radu-Lefebvre, M., & Mathieu, C. (2018). Can less be more? Mentoring functions, learning goal orientation, and novice entrepreneurs' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(1), 2-21. doi:10.1108/ijeb-09-2016-0299
- Stewart, A., & Cotton, J. L. (2013). Making Sense of Entrepreneurship Journals. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 19(3).
- Stober, D. R., & Grant, A. M. (2006). Toward a contextual approach to coaching models. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stone, F. M. (1999). Coaching Counseling & Mentoring. *Soundview Executive Book Summaries*, 21(4), 8.

- Thompson, E. R. (2009). Individual Entrepreneurial Intent: Construct Clarification and Development of an Internationally Reliable Metric. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 33(3), 669-694.
- Thompson, J., & Downing, R. (2007). The entrepreneur enabler: identifying and supporting those with potential. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), 528-544. doi:10.1108/14626000710773592
- Turker, D., & Sonmez Selcuk, S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), 142-159. doi:10.1108/03090590910939049
- van den Akker, J., Kuiper, W., & Hameyer, U. (2003). *Curriculum Landscapes and Trends* (J. van den Akker, W. Kuiper, & U. Hameyer Eds.). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Weinberg, F. J. (2019). How and When Is Role Modeling Effective? The Influence of Mentee Professional Identity on Mentoring Dynamics and Personal Learning Outcomes. *Group & Organization Management*, 44(2), 425-477. doi:10.1177/1059601119838689
- Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D. B., & Gartner, W. B. (2017). Everyday Entrepreneurship- A Call for Entrepreneurship Research to Embrace Entrepreneurial Diversity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(3), 311-321. doi:10.1111/etap.12258
- Zalan, T., & Lewis, G. (2010). Entrepreneurs: Drivers of Economic Change. *Social Science Research Network*, 11.

Chapter 5 FOCUSING ON THE ENTREPRENEUR IS AT LEAST AS IMPORTANT AS FOCUSING ON THE ENTERPRISE: IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION ⁶

One of the emerging aspects of entrepreneurship education is the coaching and mentoring of the entrepreneur. With the Soft Support Model, we can now measure what is done and use the results to improve the education of entrepreneurial skills. We focus on this method at the bachelor and master levels, but this method can be used at all education levels where education of entrepreneurial skills is done.

5.1 ABSTRACT

The interest in entrepreneurship education with its corresponding growth of educational programs and research so far lacks evidence-based programs supporting the entrepreneur; the person. In this chapter, we propose an innovative method to develop the support of the entrepreneur as a person. By combining the entrepreneurship education approach and a 'soft support' model, we offer the steps needed for research-based soft support. The focus of this method for entrepreneurship education, where people intend to start an enterprise but using this method in other entrepreneurship development programs is also possible. The method helps to build an evidence-based program for soft support. Using the Soft Support Model, we first decide about the 'intended' support, and with the same model, we measure the 'implemented' and 'attained' support. Comparing these three stages of education gives feedback to get them more in line with each other. Some first tests show that this model is easily understood and used by teachers, coaches, and mentors. It is possible to translate the method into other economic and non-economical domains where the person's support is essential.

⁶ This chapter is under review at the journal Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy

5.2 INTRODUCTION

The support of helping entrepreneurs get started is gaining lots of interest, resulting in an increasing amount of entrepreneurship education (EE) programs (European_Commission, 2014; Kamovich & Foss, 2017; Roy, Schlosser, & Pasek, 2019; Team, 2017; Winkler, Saltzman, & Yang, 2018) and also a growth in the research in EE (Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2017). However, there is not much research about the content, objectives, pedagogy, and connection between them (Kamovich & Foss, 2017; Naia, Baptista, Januário, & Trigo, 2014). There is a need for more research-based education on the connection between pedagogy and the desired outcomes (Pittaway & Cope, 2016; Scott, Penaluna, & Thompson, 2016)

Most EE programs find their origin in Business Schools and have an economic background (Hägg & Gabrielsson, 2019; Roy et al., 2019). The origin in Business Schools means that the focus is mainly on the business, for example, by writing business plans (Akhmetshin et al., 2019; Hägg & Gabrielsson, 2019). However, the human factor, the entrepreneur, is recognized as the vital factor for the performance of a new venture (Lackéus, 2020; Morris, Webb, Fu, & Singhal, 2013).

Supporting entrepreneurship often happens with using business incubators. This support with business incubators developed from support to the business, with issues such as taxes (reduction), subsidies, infrastructure, buildings (Ratinho, Harms, & Groen, 2010; Vanderstraeten, Matthyssens, & Witteloostuijn, 2012), to support that is also helping the entrepreneur with skills development by soft support like coaching or mentoring (Bruneel, Ratinho, Clarysse, & Groen, 2012; Raposo & Paco, 2011). We are dividing the development of skills into the development of hard skills and soft skills. For functioning in today's (and future) world, hard skills are not enough. Increasingly, people see soft skills as an essential quality. In several situations with ambiguity and wicked problems, soft skills as more important than hard skills (Kohlbacher, 2017; Pop, 2017). Research showed that soft skills are essential factors for a person's success, especially for an entrepreneur who has a complex task (Heckman & Kautz, 2012). The importance of soft skills is the same for EE because entrepreneurs often must deal with ambiguity and complex problems. Soft skills are also crucial for acquiring financial capital (Clement & Silvernagel, 2019) and engineering projects (Walesh, 1997).

In education, researchers also conclude that entrepreneurship needs other skills than 'traditional education' (Groen, de Weerd-Nederhof, Kerssens-van Drongelen, Badoux, & Olthuis, 2002; Ho & Turner, 2019; Kutzhanova, Lyons, & Lichtenstein, 2009; Lackéus, 2020; Leitch, Hazlett, & Pittaway, 2012). The other skills that are needed influence the EE process,

as already argued by Gibb (2002). It means that, in education, focusing on the (student) entrepreneur is at least as necessary as focusing on the enterprise. Also, Fayolle (2013) pleads for more attention to the “softer’ entrepreneurial topics such as the entrepreneurial mindset, opportunity construction, work-life balance, managing emotions and learning from failure” (p. 699) in EE. While the hard skills, or technical or functional area skills, are developed by work, training, and (formal) education, learning the soft skills should go through understanding, practice, and personal support like coaching and mentoring (Daniels, 2011; Lewis, 2007). In most EE and training programs, the entrepreneurs receive coaching or mentoring (Nabi et al., 2017; Ratinho, Harms, & Groen, 2013).

We see the entrepreneur as the essential person for starting an enterprise. Therefore the (soft) support of the entrepreneur is seen as an essential part of EE. This chapter contributes to the effectiveness of supporting the entrepreneur, as a part of EE, by using a ‘soft support’ model to measure entrepreneurs' soft support. By measuring the soft support of entrepreneurs, we develop an innovative way for the evidence-based development of an enterprise's most critical asset; the entrepreneur. Measuring the soft support is done by the Soft Support Model (Figure 4). This model has two dimensions; the role, which differs from business-oriented to person-oriented, and the agenda, which differs from directive to non-directive.

In EE, we distinguish three stages in the education process; the intended-, implemented- and attained program (van den Akker, Kuiper, & Hameyer, 2003). These three stages are also present in the soft support of entrepreneurs. We measure all three stages and compare the results. This way, we can get all stages more in line with each other, which helps to improve the soft support of entrepreneurs. First, this method helps to define the ‘intended’ soft support for entrepreneurs. The ‘intended’ support can differ in the focus of the goal. The entrepreneurs' hard skills, running the business, can be the focus. Alternatively, the focus can be on the entrepreneurs' soft skills, the person. Furthermore, to support by a more directive approach or a non-directive approach. Second, this method also helps to improve the ‘implemented’ support by measuring the difference between the support is experienced by the entrepreneurs. Getting feedback from the entrepreneurs in how they experience the support helps coaches and mentors discuss the support they ‘implemented’ and helps them to improve it. This method gives an instrument to improve the support given to entrepreneurs and, therefore, improve entrepreneurs' training and support. We use this theoretical method in a few courses, and the first results are promising. Developers and teachers are happy to work with it and give them structure in the design of the courses. We would like others that use this method to share their results.

5.3 IMPROVING THE SOFT AND HARD SKILLS OF ENTREPRENEURS.

Most people use the term ‘soft skills’ to describe a set of qualities about organizing, thinking, personal and interpersonal relations essential for further development. However, there is no clear shared understanding of soft skills, and besides skills, it often includes knowledge, attitudes, and values (Matteson, Anderson, & Boyden, 2016). We use the description of (Hendarman & Cantner, 2017) where soft skills are skills that “are largely intangible, not associated with a deliverable or a real output, and they are employed without the use of tools or templates” (p142) as complementary to hard skills “indicate the specific capabilities to perform a particular job” (Cimatti, 2016, p. 98). Hendarman and Cantner (2017) also argue that the distinction between hard skills and soft skills is not always clear.

The hard skills are, for example, financial, marketing, management, planning, and technical skills (Fayolle, Verzat, & Wapshott, 2016). Cimatti (2016) defines hard skills as skills that ‘indicate the capabilities to perform a particular job’ (p. 98). Soft skills can be about entrepreneurial mindset, work-life balance, motivation, and attitude (Fayolle, 2013; Metrôlho, Ribeiro, Silva, Silva, & Barbosa, 2017; St-Jean & Audet, 2012). Both types of skills are essential to development. ‘Soft Skills give Hard Skills the required plasticity to develop and keep up-to-date in changing circumstances’ (Cimatti, 2016, p. 99). As entrepreneurs are dealing with a turbulent environment, soft skills are important to develop for entrepreneurs.

The question of how to improve soft skills follows the rise of attention to soft skills. How learning to deal with uncertainty, build relationships or embrace failure? Studies show that using activating forms and real-world education (Anthony & Garner, 2016; Moldoveanu & Narayandas, 2019), and personal support like coaching and mentoring (Baluku, Matagi, Musanje, Kikooma, & Otto, 2018; Cinque, 2016; Velasquez, 2019) are essential factors in developing the soft skills. However, there is not much research that connects the content of (hard and soft) skills development with the methods like coaching or mentoring (Kamovich & Foss, 2017; Naia et al., 2014). The problem that comes up is that measuring the best way to improve skills faces the obstacle of not having a common language (Cinque, 2016). Lacking a common language can be solved using the Soft Support Model (Figure 4) that connects coaching and mentoring methods with developing the entrepreneur's skills.

There are three stages for developing education programs (van den Akker et al., 2003). The ‘intended’ program, which is about the vision and intentions of the program. The ‘implemented’ program is about how teachers perceive the programs and translate them into how they operate. And third, the ‘attained’ program is about how the students experience the program and what they have learned. The three stages are not automatically in line with each

other (Assen, 2018). The teacher (coach/mentor) translates the 'intended' program into the 'implemented' program. The student, or entrepreneur, translates the 'implemented' program into the experienced program. These translations clarify that the 'intended' objectives of a program are not automatically the same as the results achieved.

As mentioned before, EE is often developed from an economic perspective and focuses on EE's economic outcome (Naia et al., 2014). The pedagogical approach most times focuses on the process of EE and not going beyond the entrepreneurial intentions of the individuals (Kamovich & Foss, 2017; Neck & Corbett, 2018). In this chapter, we make use of the teaching model (Figure 10) in which we combine the teaching model framework for entrepreneurship education of Fayolle and Gailly (2008), which researchers often use for EE, and the typology of curriculum representations of van den Akker et al. (2003), which education developers often use. Combining these give the is building a bridge between the economic and pedagogical approaches. It also gives the option to consider EE from the design to the education stage (Fayolle & Gailly, 2008).

The teaching model framework for entrepreneurship education of Fayolle and Gailly (2008) also includes the focus on entrepreneurship as a teaching field and the implication for educators and students in the entrepreneurship context. The 'for whom' dimension, the audience, may differ in the background or experience of the students or entrepreneurs (Roy et al., 2019). The 'what' dimension, the contents, can be divided into three approaches; professional, social, and theoretical objectives (Johannisson, 1991). The 'why' dimension is the central dimension. This 'why' is about the objectives of EE. We recognize that different stakeholders can have different objectives; for example, the objective of universities can be that students become an entrepreneur (Liñán, Ceresia, & Bernal, 2018) while governments

Figure 10 Education model for soft support of Entrepreneurship based on Fayolle and Gailly (2008) and van den Akker et al. (2003)

often focus more on employment (CCE-Comissão das Comunidades Europeias, 2012). The ‘how’ dimension is about the pedagogy. There is research done about several pedagogical approaches in entrepreneurship (Blenker et al., 2012; Gibb, 2011), but it is hard to choose the ‘how’ if there is no agreement about the ‘why’ (objectives) and its connected soft skills (Fayolle et al., 2016). Dividing the ‘for which results’ dimension leads to three levels; school level, institutional level, and individual (or student) level (Biggs, 1996).

5.4 INTEGRATING ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND EDUCATION WITH SOFT SUPPORT.

The ‘intended’ program answers the questions about the prospective participants to follow the program and the program's objectives. In this chapter, we focus on developing the entrepreneurial skills of entrepreneurs or want to become one. This focus means that the ‘for whom’ in the education model is about people that think about becoming an entrepreneur by starting an enterprise or have already taken the first steps in starting their business. They can be students with an economic background and a technological or healthcare background and with (al lack of) all kinds of experiences.

For the objectives, we follow the outcome of 'wide' entrepreneurship (Lackéus, 2015) and directing 'for' entrepreneurship (QAA, 2018), meaning that the objective of EE in this chapter is to start the entrepreneurial activity by creative, opportunity oriented, proactive and innovative development of the person (entrepreneur). Focusing on 'for' entrepreneurship means that the EE should combine cognitive (hard-) and non-cognitive (soft-) entrepreneurial skills (Moberg, 2014), with support by, for example, coaching or mentoring, as crucial factors in entrepreneurial learning (Ho & Turner, 2019). The hard skills and soft skills correspond with the role dimension of the Soft Support Model. This way, the Soft Support Model can be used to determine the 'intended' program.

The objectives ('why') Influence the contents ('what') and the Pedagogies ('how'). The role dimension of the Soft Support Model represents the content ('what') which can differ from the hard- to the soft skills. The hard skills represent the business skills (professional aspects), and the soft skills represent personal skills (social aspects) (Ho & Turner, 2019). The pedagogical ('how') direction can differ from a directive way of support (Cavanagh, 2006) or to a non-directive or Socratic way of support by asking questions (Dinkins & Hansen, 2016). The agenda dimension of the Soft Support Model represents this aspect. We use the Soft Support Model to measure this 'implemented' support.

The soft support of entrepreneurs focuses on the person, the entrepreneur. The 'for which results' evaluates the results; the 'attained' results. The results of the soft support are often not clear and sometimes show contra dictionary outcomes (Fayolle, 2013; Martin, McNally, & Kay, 2013). Using the Soft Support Model, we measure the 'attained' support of the entrepreneurs to understand better the support and what kind of support is most valuable.

We use the Soft Support Model to compare the 'intended', the 'implemented', and the 'attained' support of entrepreneurs. These stages follow action research (Lewin, 1946, 1947; Winkler et al., 2018) which shows the steps for improving the support of entrepreneurs. The planning, or 'intended' support, includes goal setting and the design of the actions to reach that goal. This planning, which is about the goals to support entrepreneurs, includes the general idea and the objectives (the why). 'Exactly how to circumscribe this objective, and how to reach it is frequently not too clear' (Lewin, 1946, p. 37). The acting, or 'implemented' support, is about the activities taken to achieve the goal. The contents (what) and the pedagogy (how) influence this acting. The observing, or 'attained' support, step is about measuring the effects of the action. There is a need to use this step for factfinding, as it is unclear how to reach the objectives. We use the Soft Support Model to measure the 'intended' support and compare that with experienced support. Measuring the soft support of entrepreneurs has four reflection functions (Lewin, 1946) which help to improve this soft support;

- Evaluate the action; Is the 'attained' support in line with the 'intended' support?
- Learn to improve the action; is the 'implemented' support in line with the 'attained' support?
- A basis for planning the following cycle: improving the program of soft support for this situation?
- A basis for modifying the overall plan; how to improve EE?

The last part shows that measuring the 'implemented' and 'attained' support can improve the development of the soft skills of the entrepreneur. This measuring can be done by the Soft Support Model, along three stages of education (van den Akker et al., 2003). The first stage is the 'intended' support, the objectives of the support given to the (starting) entrepreneurs. The second stage is the 'implemented' support, the content and methods executed by the teachers in their role as coach or mentor. The third stage is the received support, evaluated by the entrepreneur.

5.5 STEPS TO IMPROVE SOFT SUPPORT

Following the Soft Support Model, there are four types of support to distinguish. First, there is business-oriented, non-directive support called 'challenging'. Second, there is business-oriented, directive support called 'clarifying'. Third, we have 'liberating', which is person-oriented, directive support. And fourth, there is the person-oriented, non-directive support; 'empowering'. It means that each organization that supports the entrepreneur, like schools, universities, incubators, etcetera, should be aware of the 'intended' support. This intention can differ depending on the entrepreneur and the situation. Also, the coaches/mentors should be selected or instructed as to the 'intended' of support. The best type of support is unclear, as research about the different types of support is almost non-existing (Fayolle, 2013; Nabi et al., 2017).

The next step for using the Soft Support Model is to translate the 'intended' support into the 'implemented' support with the same four types of support. The 'implemented' support is how the coach/mentor executes the 'intended' support. The 'implemented' support is known to differ from the 'intended' support based on various influences, like the type of the entrepreneur, the type of coach/mentor, the art of the decisions or situation of the enterprise (Memon, Rozan, Ismail, Uddin, & Daud, 2015). Practical issues like grouping, location or time, or substantive issues like knowledge, society, or learners also influence the implementation (van den Akker et al., 2003). The coach/mentor can cause a difference between the 'intended' support and the

'implemented' support because of a lack of knowledge or skills (Assen, 2018). Training the coach/mentor can contribute to getting the 'implemented' support more in line with the 'intended' support. Feedback from the 'attained' support can also help the coach/mentor to be aware of his/her type of support and develop the support.

As shown in chapter 4, the coach/mentor who supports an entrepreneur will give "implemented" support that often does not match the entrepreneurs' support. The difference between this 'implemented' and 'attained' support can cause frustration and blame the other groups for failing to get the desired results. Feedback of the differences is essential to get the 'implemented' and 'attained' support more in line with each other (van den Akker et al., 2003), a starting point for improvements. Discussing this difference with the coach/mentor and the entrepreneur or other coach/mentors gives information to improve the support.

Measuring the 'implemented' support and the 'attained' support can also get information about what kind of support has which results (for which results) and does this meets the 'intended' objectives (why). A proper evaluation of the performance of the support needs this information (Scott et al., 2016). It is clear that different situations, like the entrepreneur's experience, stage of the enterprise, need appropriate support (Ho & Turner, 2019; Turner & Gianiodis, 2018). The results of these measurements are helpful information to choose the appropriate 'intended' support for different situations. This information is also helpful in improving the overall program of EE.

5.6 DISCUSSION

This study addresses an important issue in EE. The field of EE has gained much interest, but the research of it, and especially the research of educating the soft skills of entrepreneurs, is almost non-existing (Fayolle, 2013; Nabi et al., 2017). The struggle between coaching and mentoring (Clutterbuck, 2008) also influences this lack of research. This chapter gives a direction to find a way out of this by using the Soft Support Model that makes it possible to measure entrepreneurs' soft support (coaching or mentoring) in three stages of the education process; intended-, implemented- and attained program. These measurements are helpful for the reflecting step of the action research cycles (Winkler et al., 2018).

Because this method helps to define the 'intended' and 'implemented' soft support for entrepreneurs, it would be interesting to see what kind of support is beneficial for entrepreneurs. Recent literature often sees soft skills support as very important or even more

important as hard skills (Clement & Silvernagel, 2019; Haneberg & Aaboen, 2021; Ho & Turner, 2019) without showing evidence for it.

We can also find out the preferred kind of support as we can measure the 'implemented' support of coaches and mentors. It would be interesting to do some research about the type of support that coaches and mentors can give and if they can adapt the support to the preferred support of the entrepreneur. Getting feedback from the entrepreneurs is essential for the coaches and mentors to develop their support. The first tests of this method showed that coaches and mentors could quickly work with the Soft Support Model, which gives them a way to discuss the support they give with coaches and mentors. Furthermore, using one model for 'intended' and 'implemented' support can help use the same language.

Another discussion in research is the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring (Lee, Kreiser, Wrede, & Kogelen, 2018; Thompson, 2019). Most of the research on coaching and mentoring depends on the definitions. Doing so is a source of struggle and debate, making it difficult to compare them (Clutterbuck, 2008; Koopman, Danskin Englis, Ehrenhard, & Groen, 2021). We suggest that approaching the support of entrepreneurs by coaches and mentors with the Soft Support Model can help do more rigorous research in this field.

We developed the Soft Support Model for the concepts of coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs, but supporting businesses and entrepreneurs makes use of different concepts like supervision, guiding, training, teaching, counseling, moderating, advising, etcetera (Feldman, 2005; Greene & Grant, 2003; Ives, 2008; Levinson, 1978). It would be interesting to see if this approach would also be helpful for other concepts of entrepreneurial support or even other kinds of support. These concepts face the same sort of problems as coaching and mentoring do. Using this model for other concepts can start with researching the definitions of those concepts and how they fit the Soft Support Model.

Another research direction could be to expand this support and not use it only for entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship and other business or economic support types. Other non-economical disciplines that use coaching and mentoring to teach or support persons can use this approach to do more rigorous research.

REFERENCES

- Akhmetshin, E. M., Pavlyuk, A. V., Ling, V. V., Mikhailova, M. V., Shichiyakh, R. A., & Kozachek, A. V. (2019). The use of private start-ups in higher education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*.

- Anthony, S., & Garner, B. (2016). Teaching Soft Skills to Business Students. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), 360-370. doi:10.1177/2329490616642247
- Assen, H. (2018). *From a teacher-oriented to a learner-oriented approach to teaching: The role of teachers' collective learning processes*. (Doctor), Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- Baluku, M. M., Matagi, L., Musanje, K., Kikooma, J. F., & Otto, K. (2018). Entrepreneurial Socialization and Psychological Capital: Cross-Cultural and Multigroup Analyses of Impact of Mentoring, Optimism, and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 5-42. doi:10.1177/2515127418818054
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32(3), 347-364. doi:10.1007/bf00138871
- Blenker, P., Frederiksen, S. H., Korsgaard, S., Iler, S., Neergaard, H., & Thrane, C. (2012). Entrepreneurship as everyday practice: towards a personalized pedagogy of enterprise education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 26(6), 417-430. doi:10.5367/ihe.2012.0126
- Bruneel, J., Ratinho, T., Clarysse, B., & Groen, A. (2012). The Evolution of Business Incubators: Comparing demand and supply of business incubation services across different incubator generations. *Technovation*, 32(2), 110-121. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.003
- Cavanagh, M. (2006). Coaching from a Systemic Perspective: A Complex Adaptive Conversation. In D. R. Stober & A. M. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- CCE-Comissão das Comunidades Europeias. (2012). *Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe. National Strategies, Curricula and Learning Outcomes*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:
- Cimatti, B. (2016). Definition, Development, Assessment of Soft Skills and Their Rol for the Quality of Organizations and Enterprises. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 10(1), 97-130. doi:10.18421/IJQR10.01-05
- Cinque, M. (2016). "Lost in translation". Soft skills development in European countries. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, 3(2). doi:10.18543/tjhe-3(2)-2016pp389-427
- Clement, T., & Silvernagel, C. (2019). A Conceptual Framework of Entrepreneurial Finance. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 2(4), 308-332. doi:10.1177/2515127419846629
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Daniels, V. S. (2011). Assessing The Value Of Certification Preparation Programs In Higher Education. *American Journal of Business Education*, 4(6), 1-10.
- Dinkins, C. S., & Hansen, F. T. (2016). Socratic Dialogue as a Way Twoward Wonder and Aletheia in Qualitative Research and Action Research. *HASER. Revista Internacional de Filosofía Aplicada*, 7, 51-88.
- European_Commission. (2014). *Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:
- Fayolle, A. (2013). Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(7-8), 692-701. doi:10.1080/08985626.2013.821318
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(7), 569-593. doi:10.1108/03090590810899838
- Fayolle, A., Verzat, C., & Wapshott, R. (2016). In quest of legitimacy: The theoretical and methodological foundations of entrepreneurship education research. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(7), 895-904. doi:10.1177/0266242616649250
- Feldman, D. C. (2005). Executive Coaching: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 829-848. doi:10.1177/0149206305279599

- Gibb, A. A. (2002). Creating conducive environments for learning and entrepreneurship: living with, dealing with, creating and enjoying uncertainty and complexity. *Industry and Higher Education*, 16(3), 135-148. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5367/000000002101296234>
- Gibb, A. A. (2011). Concepts into practice: meeting the challenge of development of entrepreneurship educators around an innovative paradigm: The case of the International Entrepreneurship Educators' Programme (IEEP). *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 17(2), 146-165. doi:10.1108/13552551111114914
- Greene, J., & Grant, A. M. (2003). *Solution-focused coaching: Managing people in a complex world*. London: Momentum Press.
- Groen, A. J., de Weerd-Nederhof, P. C., Kerssens-van Drongelen, I. C., Badoux, R. A. J., & Olthuis, G. P. H. (2002). Creating and Justifying Research and Development Value: Scope, Scale, Skill and Social Networking of R&D. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 2-16.
- Hägg, G., & Gabrielsson, J. (2019). A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. doi:10.1108/ijeb-04-2018-0272
- Haneberg, D. H., & Aaboen, L. (2021). Entrepreneurial learning behaviour of community insiders. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. *Labour Economics*, 19(4), 451-464. doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2012.05.014
- Hendarman, A. F., & Cantner, U. (2017). Soft skills, hard skills, and individual innovativeness. *Eurasian Business Review*, 8(2), 139-169. doi:10.1007/s40821-017-0076-6
- Ho, Y. F., & Turner, J. J. (2019). 'Entrepreneurial Learning'– The Role of University Led Business Incubators and Mentors in Equipping Graduates with The Necessary Skills Set for Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 4(30), 283-298.
- Ives, Y. (2008). What is 'Coaching'? An Exploration of Conflicting Paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(2), 100-113.
- Johannisson, B. (1991). University training for entrepreneurship: Swedish approaches. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 3(1), 67-82. doi:10.1080/08985629100000005
- Kamovich, U., & Foss, L. (2017). In Search of Alignment: A Review of Impact Studies in Entrepreneurship Education. *Education Research International*, 2017, 1-15. doi:10.1155/2017/1450102
- Kohlbacher, F. (2017). Skills 4.0: How CEOs shape the future of work in Asia. *Asian Management Insights*, 4, 40-47.
- Koopman, R. G. M., Danskin Englis, P., Ehrenhard, M. L., & Groen, A. J. (2021). The Chronological Development of Coaching and Mentoring: Side by Side Disciplines. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 19(1), 137-151.
- Kutzhanova, N., Lyons, T. S., & Lichtenstein, G. A. (2009). Skill-Based Development of Entrepreneurs and the Role of Personal and Peer Group Coaching in Enterprise Development. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 23(3), 193-210. doi:10.1177/0891242409336547
- Lackéus, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in Education, What, Why, When, How*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf
- Lackéus, M. (2020). Comparing the impact of three different experiential approaches to entrepreneurship in education. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- Lee, Y., Kreiser, P. M., Wrede, A. H., & Kogelen, S. (2018). University-Based Education and the Formation of Entrepreneurial Capabilities. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(4), 304-329. doi:10.1177/2515127418788893

- Leitch, C., Hazlett, S.-A., & Pittaway, L. (2012). Entrepreneurship education and context. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(9-10), 733-740. doi:10.1080/08985626.2012.733613
- Levinson, D. J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's live*. New York (NY), USA: Knopf.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of social issues*, 2(4), 34-46.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. *Readings in social psychology*, 3(1), 197-211.
- Lewis, A. (2007, 2019/12/13/). Attention to Soft Skills. *Tech Directions*, 66, 6.
- Liñán, F., Ceresia, F., & Bernal, A. (2018). Who Intends to Enroll in Entrepreneurship Education? Entrepreneurial Self-Identity as a Precursor. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(3), 222-242. doi:10.1177/2515127418780491
- Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211-224. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.03.002
- Matteson, M. L., Anderson, L., & Boyden, C. (2016). "Soft Skills": A Phrase in Search of Meaning. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 16(1), 71-88. doi:10.1353/pla.2016.0009
- Memon, J., Rozan, M. Z. A., Ismail, K., Uddin, M., & Daud, D. K. (2015). Mentoring an Entrepreneur: Guide for a Mentor. *SAGE Open*, 5, 1-10. doi:10.1177/2158244015569666
- Metrólio, J. C., Ribeiro, F., Silva, A. P., Silva, A. d., & Barbosa, F. P. M. (2017). Learn as a team to work in a team. *2017 12th Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI)*, 1-4.
- Moberg, K. (2014). *Assessing the Impact of Entrepreneurship Education*. (Doctor), Copenhagen Business School, Frederiksberg, Denmark. (PhD Series 19.2014)
- Moldoveanu, M., & Narayandas, D. (2019, 2019/03/01/). Educating the Next Generation of Leaders. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2019/03/educating-the-next-generation-of-leaders#the-future-of-leadership-development>
- Morris, M. H., Webb, J. W., Fu, J., & Singhal, S. (2013). A Competency-Based Perspective on Entrepreneurship Education: Conceptual and Empirical Insights. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 352-369. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12023
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. F. j., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277-299. doi:10.5465/amle.2015.0026
- Naia, A., Baptista, R., Januário, C., & Trigo, V. (2014). A Systematization of the Literature on Entrepreneurship Education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 28(2), 79-96. doi:10.5367/ihe.2014.0196
- Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 8-41. doi:10.1177/2515127417737286
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2016). Entrepreneurship Education. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 25(5), 479-510. doi:10.1177/0266242607080656
- Pop, O. (2017). Managing ambiguity in business. A holistic and innovative approach. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence*, 11(1), 843-851. doi:10.1515/picbe-2017-0090
- QAA. (2018). *Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers*. Retrieved from Gloucester, UK:
- Raposo, M., & Paco, A. d. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: relationship between education and entrepreneurial activity. *Psicothema*, 23(3), 453-457.
- Ratinho, T., Harms, R., & Groen, A. (2013). Business Incubators: (How) Do they help their Tenants? *New Technology-Based Firms in the New Millenium*, 10, 161-182.
- Ratinho, T., Harms, R., & Groen, A. J. (2010). Are Business Incubators helping? The role of BIs in facilitating tenants' development.

- Roy, N., Schlosser, F., & Pasek, Z. (2019). Stimulating Entrepreneurial Interest in Engineers Through an Experiential and Multidisciplinary Course Collaboration. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*. doi:10.1177/2515127419856602
- Scott, J. M., Penaluna, A., & Thompson, J. L. (2016). A critical perspective on learning outcomes and the effectiveness of experiential approaches in entrepreneurship education. *Education + Training*, 58(1), 82-93. doi:10.1108/et-06-2014-0063
- St-Jean, E., & Audet, J. (2012). The role of mentoring in the learning development of the novice entrepreneur. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(1), 119-140. doi:10.1007/s11365-009-0130-7
- Team, T. I. I. (2017). Infographic: The Growth Of Entrepreneurship Around The Globe. *Entrepreneur*.
- Thompson, S. (2019). The power of pragmatism: how project managers benefit from coaching practice through developing soft skills and selfconfidence. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*(Special Issue No. 13), 4-15. doi:10.24384/86ee-ps25
- Turner, T., & Gianiodis, P. (2018). Entrepreneurship Unleashed: Understanding Entrepreneurial Education outside of the Business School. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56(1), 131-149. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12365
- van den Akker, J., Kuiper, W., & Hameyer, U. (2003). *Curriculum Landscapes and Trends* (J. van den Akker, W. Kuiper, & U. Hameyer Eds.). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vanderstraeten, J., Matthyssens, P., & Witteloostuijn, A. v. (2012). Measuring the Performance of Business Incubators., 46. <http://www.ua.ac/be/tew>
- Velasquez, L. (2019). Coaching can help fill the soft skills gap - Chief Learning Officer - CLO Media. *Chief Learning Officer - CLO Media*.
- Winkler, C., Saltzman, E., & Yang, S. (2018). Improvement of Practice in Entrepreneurship Education Through Action Research: The Case of Coworking at a Nonresidential College. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(2), 139-165. doi:10.1177/2515127418773410

Chapter 6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There are a few studies in entrepreneurship that combined coaching and mentoring as similar fields. In most studies, where the researchers discuss both concepts, they focus on the differences or treat them similarly. Therefore, there is a lack of knowledge about how to improve coaching and mentoring to support entrepreneurs. This dissertation contributes to the knowledge about supporting entrepreneurs with coaching and mentoring. The main question of this dissertation was:

Q: How to improve the coaching and mentoring of starting entrepreneurs.

We summarize the findings of the research in this chapter. We do this by following the sub-questions which we presented in the introduction. Then we present the main contributions, followed by a discussion of the limitations. In the end, we give some suggestions and directions for further research.

6.1 ANSWERS AND FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this dissertation, we answered the development and use of coaching and mentoring of entrepreneurs. Chapter 2 deals with the development of both concepts through the years. It shows the similarities and differences between coaching and mentoring. We found that both concepts share much history in their development. Both concepts are about developing people with the use of one-on-one conversations. The circumstances in which the development of coaching and mentoring takes place have much influence. The differences are influenced mainly by the 'team that owns the concept,' meaning that coaching organizations often see mentoring as a specific way of coaching, while mentoring organizations often see coaching as a specific way of mentoring. Since the beginning of this century, some have tried to focus on the similarities and combine both concepts. Chapter 2 answers the first sub-question:

q1: What is the similarity and difference in the history of coaching and mentoring?

In chapter 3, we focus on the use of both concepts in research. We developed a Soft Support Model to characterize both concepts to avoid getting involved in the discussion between both 'teams' and finding the 'right' definitions. We first used this model to classify the definitions of coaching and mentoring. We found that most definitions show a clear difference between both concepts but are not the opposite. Most definitions show that coaching is about giving non-directive support, while most definitions show that mentoring is about giving business-oriented support. Then we used the Soft Support Model to see how entrepreneurship researchers use both concepts. In a survey of A-ranked journals, we saw that they use both

concepts different from the definitions but not different from each other. Sometimes they even use both concepts interchangeably. Most researchers see coaching and mentoring as both focused on directive business support. These findings answer the next sub-question.

q2: What is the similarity and difference in the use of coaching and mentoring in research?

In chapter 4, we look at how coaching and mentoring in reality support entrepreneurs. This chapter shows that coaches and mentors support differently, but both do not support according to both concepts' definitions. We also found that entrepreneurs experience support differently than what their coaches think they do. Also interesting is that we found some indications that the entrepreneurs experience less difference in the support with their female coach or mentor. This experience could be a step toward encouraging more female entrepreneurs. These findings answer the third sub-question.

q3: How do coaches and mentors think they support and what experience their entrepreneurs?

Chapter 5 proposes a method for developing a program to support (coaching or mentoring) the entrepreneur in developing his/her hard- and soft skills. In this method, we combine the economic approach of entrepreneurship education with the three stages of general education development. The Soft Support Model can be used to determine if all three stages are in line with each other. Comparing these three stages helps to evaluate and evidence-based improve the support program. These findings answer that last sub-question.

q4: How can different kinds of support be used to improve the training of entrepreneurs?

By answering these sub-questions, we also find an answer to the central question of this dissertation.

Q: How to improve the coaching and mentoring of starting entrepreneurs.

We saw that the terms coaching and mentoring do not make clear what happens. There is a difference in definitions used by researchers, coaches, mentors, and experienced by entrepreneurs. Using the Soft Support Model helps to overcome these differences and helps to find what happens. The Soft Support Model can also be helpful to measure these differences and improve the support, by coaching and mentoring, of starting entrepreneurs. In the next paragraph, we elaborate on this.

6.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation shows contributions to the theory, methodology, and practical aspects of coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs. In the previous paragraph, we showed the summarized answers to the research questions. Based on these answers, this paragraph shows a brief overview of the contributions.

In general, this dissertation contributes to the education of entrepreneurship education and, specifically, to the skills of the entrepreneur. The training of these skills is often part of entrepreneurship education, as advocated by Fayolle (2013) for example. However, there is a need for more research to improve these elements of entrepreneurship education (Kamovich & Foss, 2017; Naia, Baptista, Januário, & Trigo, 2014). In this dissertation, we showed that the lack of consistency between definitions used by researchers and practitioners and between coaching and mentoring. This lack of consistency makes it difficult to do robust research. As a way out of this, we developed the Soft Support Model and a scale to measure the intention, implementation, and attainment of this. With the use of these results, we suggested a method to develop the training of skills in entrepreneurship education.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The first contribution is about the definitions of coaching and mentoring. We found that the definitions of coaching and mentoring are different but not opposite. This finding clarifies that the 'land grabbing' (Clutterbuck, 2008) between both concepts is understandable. However, we think that this is unnecessary as both concepts have much in common and are complementary.

The second contribution is about using coaching and mentoring in research. It is not clear what the content of support is when using these terms. This uncertainty leads to conclusions only applicable for specific situations and to advise of more rigorous research (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Bozer & Sarros, 2012; Jones, Woods, & Guillaume, 2016). This dissertation shows that researchers and practitioners use coaching and mentoring in several different ways. The definitions of coaching (Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2009) and mentoring (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2010) clearly distinguish between the concepts. The use of both concepts in entrepreneurship research shows a distinction with the definitions but not a clear distinction between both concepts, while the use of both concepts by coaches and mentors of entrepreneurs shows a clear distinction and shows that they are also not in line with the definitions. Also, the entrepreneurs do not always experience the support of coaches the same as they think they give. These differences in the use of the terms clarify that researchers cannot

rely on the definitions and not on the terms used when researching coaching and mentoring. Using specific types of coaching and mentoring (Salter, 2014) could help but fails a systematic classification of the support.

The following contribution is the finding that coaches and mentors in practice do not act in line with the definitions. This difference between definitions and practice influences the research about the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring. Attempts to research the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring often assume that it is clear what they do when using coaching and mentoring (De Meuse, Dai, & Lee, 2009). As shown, there is often confusion about what practitioners do when they are coaching or mentoring. As the definitions and descriptions do not match the reality of coaching and mentoring, researchers need to measure what they do instead of using definitions or descriptions when researching the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring. The Soft Support Model can help to measure the real support by the coaches and mentors. These results can help to find evidence for the effectiveness of coaching and mentoring.

A fourth contribution is the development of programs to support entrepreneurs. The proposed method combines the economic and educational approaches of entrepreneurship education. This way, the support of the entrepreneur's hard- and soft skills can be evidence-based. Specifically, soft skills have a considerable influence on the emotional challenges of the entrepreneur and still have to find their way into the training of entrepreneurs (Aly, Audretsch, & Grimm, 2021). Using the Soft Support Model and measuring the different stages to develop a program for supporting the entrepreneur gives an evidence-based road to focus on the hard and soft skills.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS.

This dissertation found that focusing on the similarities of coaching and mentoring can be beneficial for the support of entrepreneurs. Labeling the support as coaching or mentoring is less important than the support given. The labels people use are geographically or culturally influenced (Clutterbuck, 2007; Garvey, 2012). Focusing on the kind of support given or wanted gives more clarity about the support and benefits all stakeholders (Abravanel & Gavin, 2017).

Measuring the support can help determine what support is best for starting entrepreneurs (Salter, 2014). Depending on the situation, entrepreneurs need other kinds of support (Dobrea & Maiorescu, 2015; Ho & Turner, 2019). We saw that coaches and mentors using the Soft Support Model for discussing entrepreneurs' needs helped them understand each other. It helps to overcome the different definitions and ideas about coaching and mentoring. As a result, coaches and mentors are more open to using the experience of other concepts. Also,

entrepreneurs can discuss the support they get with their coach or mentor and with each other. Discussing the support with others helps them to be more specific about the support they want or need.

Measuring the support can also be beneficial for developing this support. We found that entrepreneurs experience support differently from what their coaches and mentors think they do. When the coaches and mentors know this difference, they can improve their support (Gray, 2007; Janssen, van Vuuren, & de Jong, 2016). Knowing what their entrepreneurs experience as support gives valuable information to each coach and mentor. Based on this information, coaches and mentors can reflect on the support given, and then changes can be planned and executed again, followed by a subsequent measuring to check that results (Lewin, 1946). Doing so will give a quick and solid way to improve the support given.

This dissertation also includes a method to develop programs for supporting entrepreneurs in developing their hard- and soft skills. Some see soft skills development as inferior (Lilischkis, Vokmann, Gruenhagen, Bischoff, & Halbfas, 2015), but most of the research acknowledges that soft skills are essential for developing entrepreneurial competencies (Baluku, Matagi, Musanje, Kikooma, & Otto, 2018; QAA, 2018). While the proposed method uses data to develop the support program of entrepreneurs, this can help to overcome the hesitations of the people that have “reservations against EE because it is considered as providing “soft skills”, as opposed to “hard science”.” (Lilischkis et al., 2015, p. 22). Providing the development of soft skills with “hard data” can help to overcome these hesitations.

6.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

Like all research, this dissertation has some limitations due to the design choices and methods used. For instance, we did not distinguish between some specific sorts of coaching and mentoring. For example, executive coaching, informal coaching, business coaching were seen as coaching, while we see formal mentoring, informal mentoring, peer mentoring as mentoring. Although this support has differences, we think the outcome would not change. We already stated that labeling the support doesn’t matter when there is no agreement on what is done by the coach or mentor.

The dissertation focuses on the coaching and mentoring of starting entrepreneurs. This focus means that generalizing the outcome to other fields, like counseling, consulting, or experienced entrepreneurs or managers might be attractive but is not researched. Although these concepts are also about support, we did not specifically focus on these labels. This difference in labels might influence the outcomes. Furthermore, in chapter 3, the selected

literature on coaching and mentoring was limited to high-ranked and entrepreneurship-related journals, which also might have influenced the research outcome.

In addition, the selected pairing of coaches or mentors with entrepreneurs, as presented in chapter 4, might face some selection bias. We found that some coaches and mentors were hesitating to cooperate with the research due to, for example, privacy reasons. Also, some entrepreneurs did not join the research for this reason. We needed the participation of the coach or mentor with his/her entrepreneur for this research. If one of them hesitated to participate, we did not incorporate that pair into the research.

Chapter 5 suggested steps to develop a support program for starting entrepreneurs' hard and soft skills. Most researchers recognize developing entrepreneurs' skills as an essential part of EE, but not the only part. In the suggested method, we did not incorporate other vital aspects of EE like knowledge development. The development of these aspects influences the development of skills and vice versa. The developers cannot separate these aspects when developing an EE program, but they can be distinguished.

6.4 SUGGESTIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In this dissertation, we focused on the coaching and mentoring of starting entrepreneurs. Coaching and mentoring are the most common concepts for supporting entrepreneurs and starting entrepreneurs seem to be one of the most beneficial entrepreneurs of support. In this light, we would like to see research of other concepts to support entrepreneurs. For example, consulting of entrepreneurs is often used for more experienced entrepreneurs (Goldberg, 2010; Narayanda & Moldoveanu, 2019). Incorporating other concepts and support of other persons besides starting entrepreneurs would enrich the field of supporting persons.

As shown in chapter 2, the concepts of coaching and mentoring have a lot in common, so we suggest more research that focuses on the knowledge and experience of both concepts. Combining this can be beneficial for both fields and, perhaps more importantly, for the clients of coaches and mentors, in this case, the entrepreneurs. The process started with Parsloe (1995) and had a follow-up with the start of a journal from (Cox & Ledgerwood, 2003) that combines both coaching and mentoring has excellent potential.

It would also be interesting to categorize the other concepts' definitions, like consulting, counseling, supervision, intervision, with the Soft Support Model. Doing so would help to give more clarity about other forms of support and might also help to learn from these concepts and combine the efforts for better supporting entrepreneurs (Baluku et al., 2018; Kuhn, 2018). In

addition to this would also be interesting to research what counselors, consultants, supervisors, and so do in reality when they support entrepreneurs.

Chapter 4 shows that female coaches and mentors seem to support more in line with what the entrepreneurs experience. It would be interesting to research this more in-depth. By doing so, there could be an answer in unpacking the potential of female entrepreneurs (Pardo-del-Val, 2010; Westhead & Solesvik, 2015). In order to take further steps, it is essential to research the correlation between the distance of the implanted and attained support and the quality of the support.

In chapter 5, we suggested a method to develop support for the development of skills of entrepreneurs. This method gives the option to research several aspects. Researchers can gather data to get more general information about the support of entrepreneurs. What is in different situations the best support for entrepreneurs? Is it, for example, in the three phases of entrepreneurship (opportunity recognition, opportunity preparation, and opportunity exploitation) (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000) better to use a different focus for the support?

In general, developing this Soft Support Model and measuring the support opens a field for more research in supporting entrepreneurs and other people. Avoiding the problems that come with defining coaching and mentoring makes it possible to research the support. Furthermore, measuring the support given opens the option to research the coaching and mentoring results of starting entrepreneurs. This approach might also be helpful for research in other sorts of support and in other fields that receive support.

REFERENCES

- Abravanel, M., & Gavin, J. (2017). Exploring the evolution of coaching through the lens of innovation. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 15(1), 24-41.
- Aly, M., Audretsch, D. B., & Grimm, H. (2021). Emotional skills for entrepreneurial success: the promise of entrepreneurship education and policy. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1-19.
- Baluku, M. M., Matagi, L., Musanje, K., Kikooma, J. F., & Otto, K. (2018). Entrepreneurial Socialization and Psychological Capital: Cross-Cultural and Multigroup Analyses of Impact of Mentoring, Optimism, and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 5-42. doi:10.1177/2515127418818054
- Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(3), 342-361. doi:10.1080/1359432x.2018.1446946
- Bozer, G., & Sarros, J. C. (2012). Examining the Effectiveness of Executive Coaching on Coachees' Performance in the Israeli Context. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 10(1), 14-32.

- Clutterbuck, D. (2007). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2008). What's happening in coaching and mentoring? And what is the difference between them? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 22(4), 8-10. doi:10.1108/14777280810886364
- Cox, E., & Ledgerwood, G. (2003). The New Profession. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1(1), 1-3.
- De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., & Lee, R. J. (2009). Evaluating the effectiveness of executive coaching: Beyond ROI? *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 2(2), 117-134.
- Dobrea, M., & Maiorescu, I. (2015). Entrepreneurial outcomes and organisational performance through business coaching. *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, 17(38), 247-260.
- Fayolle, A. (2013). Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(7-8), 692-701. doi:10.1080/08985626.2013.821318
- Garvey, B. (2012). Mentoring for Leadership Development: A Case Study of Executive Mentoring during the Banking Crisis. *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 10(1), 56 - 76.
- Goldberg, I. B. (2010). Mentoring, Consulting or Coaching? *Coaching World Newsletter*, p. 5.
- Gray, D. E. (2007). Towards a systemic model of coaching supervision – some lessons from psychotherapeutic and counselling models. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(4), 300-309.
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2010). Who Is a Mentor? A Review of Evolving Definitions and Implications for Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304. doi:10.1177/0149206310386227
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D., & Beattie, R. S. (2009). Toward a Profession of Coaching? A Definitional Examination of 'Coaching,' 'Organization Development,' and 'Human Resource Development'. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(1), 13-38.
- Ho, Y. F., & Turner, J. J. (2019). 'Entrepreneurial Learning'– The Role of University Led Business Incubators and Mentors in Equipping Graduates with The Necessary Skills Set for Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 4(30), 283-298.
- Janssen, S., van Vuuren, M., & de Jong, M. D. T. (2016). Informal Mentoring at Work: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 498-517. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12069
- Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Guillaume, Y. R. F. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 249-277. doi:10.1111/joop.12119
- Kamovich, U., & Foss, L. (2017). In Search of Alignment: A Review of Impact Studies in Entrepreneurship Education. *Education Research International*, 2017, 1-15. doi:10.1155/2017/1450102
- Kuhn, L. (2018). *Berufs-, Studien- und Laufbahnberatung goes digital*. (Master), ZHAW, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Zurich, Switzerland.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of social issues*, 2(4), 34-46.
- Lilischkis, S., Vokmann, C., Gruenhagen, M., Bischoff, K., & Halbfas, B. (2015). *Supporting the entrepreneurial potential of higher education*. Retrieved from
- Naia, A., Baptista, R., Januário, C., & Trigo, V. (2014). A Systematization of the Literature on Entrepreneurship Education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 28(2), 79-96. doi:10.5367/ihe.2014.0196
- Narayanda, D., & Moldoveanu, M. (2019). The Future of Leadership Development. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(4), 40-48.
- Pardo-del-Val, M. (2010). Services supporting female entrepreneurs. *The Service Industries Journal*, 30(9), 1479-1498. doi:10.1080/02642060802626840

- Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assessing: a practical guide to developing competence (Revised ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- QAA. (2018). *Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers*. Retrieved from Gloucester, UK:
- Salter, T. (2014). Mentor and coach: Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* (Special Issue No. 8), 1-8.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217-226.
- Westhead, P., & Solesvik, M. Z. (2015). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: Do female students benefit? *International Small Business Journal*. doi:10.1177/0266242615612534

APPENDIX A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE COACHES

- 1 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding participants? That the participant receives Expertise or that the participant Starts thinking?

Expertise

Start thinking

0 0 0 0 0

- 2 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That the participant is Controlled, or that the participant is Cheered on?

Control

Cheer

0 0 0 0 0

- 3 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That the participant grows Personally or that the participant can grow a Company?

Personal growth

Company growth

0 0 0 0 0

- 4 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That the participant has a Jolly time (making sure the participant enjoys what he/she is doing) or that the participant receives Instructions?

Jolly time

Instruction

0 0 0 0 0

- 5 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That the participant gains Experience or that the participant Develops thoughts (forces the participant to think)?

Experience

Develop thoughts

0 0 0 0 0

6 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That you Teach or that a Discussion takes place (between you and the participant)?

Teaching

Discussion

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

7 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding participants? On the Personal relations of the participant or that the participant can make Strategic choices (for the future)?

Personal relations

Strategic choices

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

8 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding participants? On Reflecting (by the participant) in the conversations or on Assisting the participant?

Reflecting

Assistance

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

9 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? Learning Specific (business) skills or developing the Intellectual and social qualities of the participant?

Specific skills

Intellectual and
social qualities

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

10 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? That you Act as a CEO (director/expert/boss) or as a Parent (educator/supporter)?

Act as CEO

Parental

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

11 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants?

Developing Self-efficacy or Providing knowledge to the participant?

Self-efficacy

Providing knowledge

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

12 As a coach what do you focus on in guiding participants? Delegating matters to the participant or Monitor the participant's activities?

Delegation

Monitor

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

13 What do you, as a coach, focus on in guiding the participants?

Solving Problems or developing Teambuilding with the participant (and stakeholders)?

Solving problems

Teambuilding

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

14 What do you as a coach focus on in guiding the participants? Training the participant or Cheering the participant?

Training

Cheer

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

APPENDIX B QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE COACHEES

- 1 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That you gain Expertise or that you Start thinking?

Expertise

Start thinking

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

- 2 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That you are Controlled, or that you are Cheered?

Control

Cheer

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

- 3 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That you grow Personally or that you can make a Company grow?

Personal growth

Company growth

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

- 4 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That you have a Jolly time (making sure you enjoy what you are doing) or that you receive Instructions?

Jolly time

Instruction

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

- 5 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That you gain Experience or that you Develop thoughts (force you to think)?

Experience

Develop thoughts

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

- 6 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That the coach Teaches (gives instruction) or that there is Discussion (between you and the coach)?

Teaching

Discussion

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

7 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? On your Personal relationships or on enabling you to make Strategic choices (for the future)?

Personal relations

Strategic choices

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

8 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? On Reflecting (by you) in the conversations or on Assisting you?

Reflecting

Assistance

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

9 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? On learning Specific (business) skills or on developing Intellectual and social qualities in you?

Specific skills

Intellectual and social qualities

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

10 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? That he/she behaves as a CEO (director/expert/boss) or as a Parent (educator/supporter)?

Act as CEO

Parental

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

11 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? Developing Self-efficacy or Providing knowledge to you?

Self-efficacy

Providing knowledge

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

12 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? Delegating things to you or Monitoring your work?

Delegation

Monitor

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? Solving problems or developing Teambuilding with you (and the stakeholders)?

Solving problems

Teambuilding

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

14 What does the coach focus on when coaching you? Training you or cheering you?

Training

Cheer

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Ruud Koopman (03-10-1960, Tubbergen) is a lecturer and researcher at Saxion UAS. He was involved at the start of the small business & retail management school of Saxion. His research interests lie in entrepreneurship education. Coaching and mentoring entrepreneurs are the basis of his research. The entrepreneur is the central element in his research and teaching.

ISBN: 978-90-365-5280-6

DOI: 10.3990/1.9789036552806