University of Reading

Understanding the rise of faculty-student coaching: an academic capitalism perspective

Article

Accepted Version

Final version with title page.pdf

Andrews, H. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3745-6779 and Jones, R. J. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7329-0502 (2019) Understanding the rise of faculty-student coaching: an academic capitalism perspective. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 18 (4). pp. 606-625. ISSN 1944-9585 doi: 10.5465/amle.2017.0200 Available at https://reading-pure-test.eprints-hosting.org/84120/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0200

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

University of Reading

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

UNDERSTANDING THE RISE OF FACULTY-STUDENT COACHING: AN ACADEMIC CAPITALISM PERSPECTIVE

Holly Andrews Ph.D [1] & Rebecca J. Jones* Ph.D [2]

[1] University of Worcester

[2] Henley Business School

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Rebecca J. Jones, Henley Business School, University of Reading, Greenlands Campus, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 3AU. E-mail r.j.jones@henley.ac.uk

UNDERSTANDING THE RISE OF FACULTY-STUDENT COACHING: AN ACADEMIC CAPITALISM PERSPECTIVE

We examine the rise of coaching within management education to support student learning. We question the assumption that faculty-student coaching (FSC) is beneficial and propose that there may be some limitations in the use of FSC that have yet to be adequately acknowledged and discussed in the literature. In particular, we propose that there is currently insufficient evidence to conclude that coaching can produce knowledge acquisition and therefore ask why we persist in the use of FSC when we have limited evidence of its efficacy in delivering a core education outcome. We suggest that the theory of academic capitalism provides a useful, critical lens through which to view the growing trend in FSC, identifying that FSC may be utilized as a method of increasing student satisfaction, perceptions of value for money and as a useful marketing tool for business schools competing for students. However, academic capitalism may also explain the use of coaching via its ability to enhance the skills and attitudes of students, providing outcomes that are valued by students, employers and governments. We conclude our essay by providing recommendations to mitigate these proposed dangers and consequently maximise the effectiveness of coaching as a development tool in management education.

Key words: coaching; academic capitalism; faculty-student relationship; management education pedagogy

UNDERSTANDING THE RISE OF FACULTY-STUDENT COACHING: AN ACADEMIC CAPITALISM PERSPECTIVE

The use of coaching in management education is becoming increasingly common practice (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). The pedagogic literature is replete with discussions of coaching within management education, for example an online search within the individual journals provided 205 returns on the keyword 'coaching' for the Academy of Management Learning and Education; 319 for the Journal of Management Education; and 207 for Management Learning. Coaching in management education is being actively discussed and accepted as common practice by scholars (Parker, Hall & Kram, 2008; Tolhurst, 2010).

Despite the growth in the literature on the effectiveness of coaching (see Athanasopoulou & Dopson, 2018 and Bozer & Jones, 2018 for reviews), there is still a paucity of studies that examine the impact of faculty-student coaching (FSC) on learning outcomes. Given that, traditionally, the focus in management education has been on the development of knowledge, the absence of evidence to indicate that coaching as a learning methodology is impactful at generating new knowledge is particularly problematic. Consequently, we debate the question: why do business schools continue to engage in FSC? The continued use of FSC appears to be based on the assumption that it works. An assumption, we argue, that is perpetuated by the changing nature of management education. We propose that when viewed through the lens of academic capitalism, the growth of FSC, despite the lack of an established evidence-base, can be better understood.

To address this gap, in this essay we discuss why FSC is growing despite the questionable impact. We illustrate our argument with reference to the priority management education institutions place on student satisfaction and the push to increase contact hours with students. We argue that students' positive attitudes towards coaching has meant that FSC has been utilized as a sales tool by business schools. Next, we review the wider literature

on coaching, including providing clarity around how coaching is conceptualized and the literature related to outcomes from coaching in higher education (HE). We highlight some important considerations in relation to the FSC relationship, including whether a coaching relationship between faculty and student is desired and/or achievable. We then review the literature on academic capitalism and explain how this can be a useful lens to understand the growth of FSC, exploring how the changing nature of management education may have encouraged the growth of FSC despite the weak evidence-base. In addition to discussing why this may be problematic, we also present some of the potential benefits of this position. We conclude with our call to research and call to action.

Our essay contributes to the management and education literature in three ways. Firstly, we highlight an area of teaching practice that has gradually grown over time without a critical discussion of this growth. As reflective practitioners, it is imperative that academics and administrators have a critical awareness of the tools and techniques they use within their role as educators. In FSC, we highlight an area where this reflective practice does not appear to have occurred and encourage scholars to consider the appropriateness of their practice. Secondly, we utilize the theoretical construct of academic capitalism as a lens by which we can understand the gradual evolution and continued popularity of FSC. By applying academic capitalism to the topic of FSC, we present a novel approach to understanding why a particular teaching practice has become so prevalent. Finally, our essay contributes to future research and practice by providing a series of calls for action related to the use of FSC in management education. It is our hope that by highlighting some of the implicit and as yet under-debated potential limitations and opportunities of FSC, we can ensure that our teaching practice is both evidence-based and fit for purpose.

The Growth of Coaching in Management Education

There are several factors that serve to influence the application of coaching within business schools. We focus our discussion on UK and US contexts, as the majority of published literature hails from these regions, however, we propose that our arguments equally apply to business schools across the globe, who are experiencing the same issues of deregulation and marketization as in the UK and US (Bolsmann & Uys, 2001; Chan & Mok, 2001; Currie & Vidovich, 2000; Davies, Gottsche & Bansel, 2006; De Siqueira, 2014; Lowrie & Hemsley-Brown, 2011; McKelvey & Holmén, 2009; Mok, 2007; Qiping & White, 1994; Wangenge-Ouma, 2008; Weiler, 2000).

League table positions are a top strategic priority for most, if not all business schools. Student satisfaction and contact hours are two key metrics utilised in league tables (Unistats, n.d.), for example, UK university league tables list student satisfaction, taken from the National Student Survey, as a key indicator of business school performance (The Complete University Guide, 2017; The Guardian News, 2017; The Times, 2016). Many US ranking systems also focus on student satisfaction. For example, twenty-five percent of the Forbes College Rankings are attributable to student satisfaction (Howard, 2016). The literature on workplace coaching consistently demonstrates that an outcome of coaching is high coachee satisfaction with coaching (i.e. Audet & Couteret, 2012; Boyce, Jackson & Neal, 2010; McGuffin & Obonyo, 2010; Ratiu, David & Baban, 2015; Vidal-Salazar, Ferro´n-Vı´lchez, & Cordo´n-Pozo, 2012). We could anticipate that students may be even more satisfied with coaching than employees, as increasing levels of narcissism in students (Westerman, Bergman, Bergman & Daly, 2012), combined with larger, impersonal classes in management education mean that receiving one-to-one coaching may satisfy a need that other teaching methods do not fulfil, which may enhance student satisfaction with coaching.

One-to-one coaching requires significant time investment from the staff delivering the coaching, therefore adding to the contact time a business school offers its students and

consequently boosting this metric within ranking systems. Contact hours and the degree of individual attention given in those hours can also impact upon student satisfaction, retention and perception of value for money (Buckley, Soilemetzidis & Hillman, 2015). Coaching could therefore be used as a method to increase student satisfaction directly as well as through the mediator of increased individualized contact hours.

The use of coaching within management education can also be seen as a sales tool. In business, coaching is often allocated to high potential employees or those occupying critical roles in the organization and therefore carries a certain kudos (Jones, Armour & Potrac, 2002). The prospect of receiving coaching as part of a degree package may therefore be appealing to prospective students and their parents, who are increasingly concerned with value for money gained from management education. Research has shown that students generally have positive attitudes towards teaching approaches like coaching, which emphasise their responsibility as learners and shift control away from teachers, loosely termed student-centred approaches (Lea, Stephenson & Troy, 2003). If we accept that coaching falls within the realm of student-centred teaching, then the literature broadly suggests that students will have favourable attitudes to coaching in management education and such approaches are likely to 'sell' courses (Lea et al., 2003; O'Neill & McMahon, 2005).

Given that there is an increased demand on business schools to achieve high student satisfaction and perceptions of 'value for money' to maintain league table positions and compete for students, the increase in the use of coaching within management education is perhaps not surprising. However, we question whether there are any potential pitfalls in the increased focus on FSC in both undergraduate and graduate populations. We approach the topic of FSC from an academic capitalism lens. When viewed through this lens, the potential

for misemployment of coaching becomes more apparent. We begin our essay by elaborating on our conceptualization of coaching.

Conceptualizing Coaching

Coaching is defined as the "process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (Peterson & Hicks, 1996, p. 41). Coaches generally avoid providing instructional or prescriptive solutions to coachees, often because they are not technical experts in the coachee's occupational area of specialty (McAdam, 2005). The coach and coachee should work collaboratively together on an equal standing to aid the coachee's learning and development. Whilst some argue that there are different types of coaching (Stern, 2004), others suggest that there are fundamental coaching principles that define a multitude of coaching approaches (Bozer & Jones, 2018).

These fundamental coaching principles include the use of reflection: coaching allows the coachee to take a mirror to their life and examine the successes and dissect the failures. Peltier (2009) suggests that raising insight and awareness are goals of coaching and as such coaching involves engaging in a process of self-examination and a focus on generating intrapersonal understanding. A further principle of coaching is that the coaching process is inherently goal-bound, with goals generally forming the starting point of any coaching session giving the coaching session focus and purpose (Grant, Curtayne & Burton, 2009; Grant, Green & Rynsaardt, 2010; Spence, Cavanagh & Grant, 2008). Finally, the outcomes of coaching must be of value to the coachee as this encourages motivation and purpose to persist in a way that is unlikely to be present if outcomes have been dictated by others. Whilst in order to enhance motivation to learn, outcomes of coaching must be of value to the coachee, it is also important to acknowledge the triadic nature of workplace or executive coaching (coach, coachee, organization), therefore, in practice, the outcomes must also be of value to the organization who is paying for the intervention (Bozer & Jones, 2018).

In addition to these defining principles of coaching, there is some emerging consensus that for a one-to-one developmental relationship to be classified as a coaching relationship, it must involve the formation and maintenance of a helping relationship between the coach and coachee (Bono, Purvanova, Towler & Peterson, 2009; Smither 2011). The coaching relationship is one that the coachee enters into for the specific purpose of fulfilling development objectives. It is important to differentiate coaching from other forms of developmental relationships. For example, it may be distinguished from mentoring relationships, in which the mentor is usually an expert in the field and more directive than a coach (see Brockbank & McGill, 2012 for a review). A mentoring relationship is conventionally long-term between a highly experienced mentor and an inexperienced mentee, with the mentor typically providing guidance on career development and networking (Eby et al., 2013). In a coaching relationship, there is no such expectation that the coach has expertise or experience of the coachee's area of work and the term of the relationship is guided by specific objectives.

Conceptualizing Coaching in Management Education

The National Academic Advising Association (2017) define academic coaching in HE as a collaborative relationship where the focus is on the student's personal and professional goals through the development of self-awareness; strength building; academic planning and defining the student's purpose, interests, and values. The ultimate aim of academic coaching is to aid the student in the completion of their degree. Coaching is an intervention or technique that can sit alongside instruction or traditional teaching in management education, however, for a number of reasons, coaching is conceptually different to teaching. Turnball (2009) presents a useful comparison between coaching and teaching that we present here in Table 1. Whilst coaching and teaching share a similar objective of developing the tools, knowledge and opportunities the coachee (or student) needs to develop themselves, become

more effective and ultimately to learn, the process by which this objective is achieved is very different for coaching and teaching.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The features of coaching in HE outlined by Turnball (2009) are illustrated in the HE coaching literature. For example, in most cases, the 'coach' is not a subject expert or not acting in that capacity and instead as outlined by Turnball (2009) are utilizing generic helping skills. For example, Lawrence, Dunn and Weisfeld-Spotler (2018) explicitly state that 'In the role of coach, faculty are not acting as content experts' (p. 642). Alternatively, tutors who teach on subjects other than the one the student takes are recruited as 'external' coaches (Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004) and in some cases graduates and post-graduate students are utilized as coaches (e.g. Capstick, Harrell-Williams, Cockrum & West, 2018; Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Losch, Traut-Mattausch, Mühlberger & Jonas, 2006; Sargent, Allen, Frahm & Morris, 2009; Shojai, Davis & Root, 2007). Sargent at al. (2009) specifically report that the graduate coaches used in their intervention do not have a background in the course where coaching was used. Rather than focusing on subject specific expertise, the coaching programmes supported the development of generic skills such as teamwork (e.g. Bolton, 1999), critical thinking skills (e.g. Chaplin, 2007) and resilience (e.g. Grant, 2008).

As traditionally is the case in coaching, the student takes ownership of the coaching process in most of the interventions described. Most coaches are trained in supporting students to set their own goals (e.g. Franklin & Doran, 2009; Grant, 2008; Losch et al., 2016; McDowall & Butterworth, 2014; Wylde, 2005), which is in direct contrast to traditional teaching where learning outcomes are set by the tutor.

The avoidance of advice giving is specifically highlighted in some studies. For example, Chaplin (2007) reports that when students requested mock exam questions from the coach, the coach suggested that they devise their own exam questions instead. This supports

Turnball's (2009) notion that coaches have the belief that coachees can develop their own answers rather than the coach supplying them. In support of this, O'Neil and Hopkins (2002) describe their coaching intervention as 'co-inquiry' (p.404) rather than the coach teaching the coachee.

The development of the coaching relationship is also mentioned in several studies (e.g. Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; McDowall & Butterworth, 2014; O'Neil & Hopkins, 2002) and many interventions consist of an extended relationship between the coach and coachee over a number of weeks and months (e.g. Franklin & Doran, 2009; Shojai et al., 2007). The supportive but challenging nature of the relationship is specifically referred to by Capstick et al. (2018) who state that their coaching intervention is a '…relational intervention that supports and challenges them [the students]…' (p.11).

Well-established coaching models which use goals as the start-point, such as GROW (Whitmore, 1992) are used in several studies (Franklin & Doran, 2009; Grant, 2008; McDowall & Butterworth, 2014; Short, Kinman & Baker, 2010; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004). The literature also makes reference to the specific coaching skills of active listening (Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004), supporting goal-setting (Franklin & Doran, 2009; Grant, 2008; Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Losch et al., 2009; Sargent et al., 2009; Shojai et al., 2007; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004; Wylde, 2005) and providing feedback (Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Sargent et al., 2009; Wylde, 2005). Sue-Chan and Latham (2004) specifically refer to training coaches in asking general exploratory and stimulating questions, reflecting Turnball's criteria of skill in questioning. Finally, the supportive nature of coaching is mentioned across several studies (e.g. Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Losch et al., 2016).

Whilst the coaching literature is replete with examples of coaching in HE that match the conceptualization of coaching presented here, our review of the literature has also identified a number of studies where the term coaching is applied to instructional activities

that are more closely aligned to Turnball's (2009) conceptualization of teaching. For example, Satzler and Sheu (2002) utilize the term 'coaching' to describe a teaching approach that does not align with Turnball's (2009) conceptualization of coaching or the wider coaching literature. References throughout the paper identify the coach as 'giving them [the students] advice' (p. 75), encouraging students to view the faculty-as-coach as 'the boss' (p. 75) and utilizing a checkpoint system as a critical element of the coaching.

A further example of the use of the term coaching as opposed to instruction is evident in the study by Clegg, Trayhurn and Johnson (2000) who report a case study of 'coaching' styles of male and female IT instructors. The teaching behaviors reported in the study, such as providing instruction and guidance, recording attendance, demonstrating skills and activities and answering questions more accurately sit within teaching as outlined by Turnball (2009) than coaching. More recently, Oreopoulos and Petronijevic (2018) describe a coaching intervention in which final year undergraduate students coach first year students. However, they refer to the coaches giving advice to the coachees, which again is at odds with the widely accepted conceptualization of coaching and more closely resembles teaching or mentoring.

Other papers utilize the term coaching to describe what could more specifically be seen as facilitating a feedback discussion. For example, Hobson, Griffin and Rominger (2014) describe a methodology in which peer coaching is used as an element of the teaching process. However, the process of peer coaching reported focuses on a discussion of strengths and weakness from the peer coach and coachee. Whilst coaching does frequently include an element of feedback discussion (Peltier, 2009; Sherman & Freas, 2004), feedback is just one element of coaching.

This variation in the use of the term 'coaching' across the HE literature is representative of the wider academic and practice-based coaching literature where the use of

the term ‘coaching’ varies widely, with a wide range of labels often utilized with little or no differentiation (Bachkirova & Borrington, 2018). A further complication is that in practice the term ‘coach’ is so loosely used (Rogers, 2016) and that the term ‘coaching’ has become a generic signifier for terms such as ‘soft skills’ and ‘people skills’ (Western, 2012).

Notwithstanding the lack of conceptual clarity, the above discussion illustrates how a range of pedagogic inputs termed coaching, are being regularly applied within HE and discussed in academic journals. Examples range from reports of FSC that closely resemble the conceptualization of coaching that we adopt here, to reports of a range of other teaching techniques being labelled as coaching. We argue that when viewed through the lens of academic capitalism, both widespread use of FSC and the inappropriate labelling of other teaching activities as coaching are potentially problematic. We return to this point later in our essay.

What is the Impact of Coaching in Management Education?

In exploring and debating the impact and appropriateness of the use of FSC in management education, it is important to consider firstly, the purpose of management education generally, as Rubin and Dierdorff (2013) suggest, the quintessential issue in management education that remains to be addressed is ‘the epistemological question of what precisely we are trying to accomplish’ (p. 136) and secondly, whether FSC is a suitable vehicle by which the agreed purpose can be fulfilled. To address these issues, we offer two opposing perspectives. From the first perspective, we assume that the purpose of management education is to enhance student knowledge. From this perspective, we argue that there is limited evidence to indicate that FSC is a suitable teaching methodology to enhance student knowledge. Alternatively, from the second perspective, we propose that whilst knowledge enhancement is one important outcome of management education, business schools also have an obligation to enhance the skills and attitudes of students in order to ensure that they are

equipped with the qualities required to maximise their employability once they enter the marketplace. From this perspective, we argue that there is a stronger body of evidence to indicate that coaching is a suitable methodology to enhance student skills and attitudes, however this perspective also highlights important considerations regarding the faculty-student coaching relationship.

Perspective One: The Purpose of Management Education is Knowledge Acquisition

From our first perspective, to explore the impact of FSC in management education, we first adopt the assumption that the purpose of business schools is knowledge dissemination (Bailey, Ferris, Lewicki & Whetton, 2010). Therefore, if FSC is utilized as a method of curriculum delivery, then the dependent variable of interest becomes knowledge acquisition. There is limited evidence that coaching works at helping students to learn (Bozer, Sarros & Santora, 2013; Chaplin, 2007; Grey, Gabriel & Goregaokar, 2014; Hall, Otazo & Hollenbeck, 1999; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004; Swart & Harcup, 2013; Taie, 2011; Walker-Fraser, 2011; Wasylyshyn, 2003; Wasylyshyn, Gronsky & Haas, 2006). This statement may appear controversial when viewed in the context of the wealth of literature on the topic of coaching in HE; however, very little of this research consists of scientifically robust, empirical studies examining the impact of the use of coaching in HE. Many of these studies suffer from fundamental methodological flaws such as non-random allocation to intervention groups (i.e. Capstick et al., 2019; Chaplin, 2007; Shojai et al., 2014) or no control group for comparison (i.e. Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004), which subsequently mean that we cannot be confident in drawing generalizable conclusions from the findings.

For example, Chaplin (2007) examined the impact of coaching on exam results in a small sample of undergraduate biology students. Chaplin found that coaching by a teacher within an introductory science course led to significantly improved exam performance compared to both students who received no coaching and students who received similar

levels of teacher contact time within a laboratory setting. Whilst this suggests that coaching improves learning outcomes for students, methodological flaws in the study limit confidence in these findings. Students within the coaching group were self-selecting and not randomly allocated to the experimental group. Therefore the 15 students within the experimental group were students who actively sought additional exam support after the first exam, whereas the students in the control group, although matched on first exam performance, did not seek any additional support. Allocating groups in this way means that the counterfactual assumption of causality is violated (Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart & Lalive, 2010). It could be argued that the students in the coaching group were more motivated to improve their exam performance given that they actively sought out support to do so. Consequently, one could safely assume that this group was always destined to perform better in the second exam given the extant literature on motivation to learn and learning performance (Colquitt, LePine & Noe, 2000; Martocchio & Webster, 1992; Quiñones, 1995; Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Shojai et al. (2014) and Capstick et al. (2019) explored the impact of academic coaching programmes for underperforming students. In both studies, students who successfully completed the coaching programme experienced a significant increase in grade point average compared to a control group. However, both studies suffer with the same issues of non-random allocation to groups as the Chaplin (2007) study, as the control groups consisted of students who were referred to or had enrolled in the coaching programmes but did not start or successfully complete the programme.

Elsewhere, Sue-Chan and Latham (2004) also sought to provide support for the impact of coaching on grades. Sue-Chan and Latham (2004) randomly allocated students on an Executive MBA to either a self-coaching, peer coaching or an external coaching group. The results indicated that students who were paired with an external coach had higher grades on the course compared to those who received peer-coaching; however there was no

significant difference between the external coaching and self-coaching group. The absence of a control group who were not coached means that it is not possible to determine the overall effectiveness of coaching on improving grades in this study.

To summarise, the underlying assumption of this first perspective is that the purpose of business schools is knowledge dissemination (Bailey et al., 2010). Therefore, business schools are underpinned by academic rigor, in that teaching and research are viewed as the creation and dissemination of knowledge realized through robust, dispassionate and independent analysis (Chia & Holt, 2008). Even with the changing nature of today's business schools, the focus for the management academic is still related to knowledge: in that they are required to develop new knowledge (rigor) and ensure that this knowledge can be applied (relevance) (Benjamin & O'Reilly, 2011). In management education, the presumption is that the use of representational structures in teaching, produce proper, reliable knowledge that is then transmitted to students. Therefore, in business schools, students are taught how to collect and remember accumulated generalities and test their understanding (Chia & Holt, 2008). Consequently, if this assumed purpose of business schools is accepted as true, then our review of the literature of the impact of coaching on knowledge acquisition would suggest that FSC is not proven to be a suitable method of curriculum delivery by which the assumed purpose can be fulfilled. We acknowledge that the limited evidence-base for the impact of coaching on student learning does not mean that coaching *cannot* effectively produce learning or knowledge acquisition, rather, we wish to highlight that currently there is limited evidence to clearly demonstrate that coaching *does* effectively produce learning or knowledge acquisition. If this perspective to understanding the impact of FSC in management education is adopted, then the next question to be addressed is: in the absence of clear evidence that FSC works, why do we continue to engage in this practice? We will return to this point later in our essay.

Perspective Two: The Purpose of Management Education is to Develop Skills and Attitudes

Our second perspective, presents the argument that whilst knowledge enhancement is one important outcome of management education, business schools also have an obligation to enhance the skills and attitudes of students in order to ensure that they are equipped with the qualities required to enhance their employability once they enter the marketplace. The relevance of management education has been a hot topic for well over a decade, with many scholars arguing that business schools are not equipping their students with the skills necessary to be successful when entering the job market (Benjamin & O'Reilly, 2011; Bennis & O'Toole, 2005; Conger, 2004; Ghoshal, 2005; Mintzberg, 2004; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). Based on this argument, the implicit assumption is that the purpose of management education is not only to develop the subject relevant knowledge, but also to develop the skills and attitudes graduates need to be successful. If this alternative purpose of management education is adopted, in order to assess the impact of FSC, it is appropriate to also review the literature on the impact of coaching on the development of new skills and attitudes.

In a recent review of the coaching literature, Bozer and Jones (2018) identified that affective (which includes attitudinal) and skill-based outcomes were the most frequently explored outcomes within the coaching literature. In a meta-analysis exploring the effectiveness of workplace coaching, Jones, Woods and Guillaume (2016) found positive effects for coaching on both affective (d = 0.51) and skill-based outcomes (d = 0.28). In the context of research into coaching in HE, the operationalization of affective and skill-based outcomes is more prevalent than research on knowledge acquisition.

For example, Sargent et al. (2009) compared the team performance of students who were supported by teaching assistants trained in coaching and assistants who were not trained in coaching. They found that when teaching assistants were trained in coaching, students

reported higher levels of team functioning and productivity, indicating higher levels of team working skills. The allocation of students to conditions was based on their year of study rather than self-selection, which improves the internal validity of the results. Whilst the authors report that there were no other differences in the teaching that students were exposed to, they do not provide details of whether the cohorts were equivalent in other respects (e.g. grade performance, demographics, motivation). The results should therefore be treated tentatively. One study that did utilize random allocation and equivalent groups with students as coachees was Losch et al. (2016). Their study investigated the impact of coaching on procrastination behaviors and compared outcomes from coaching to outcomes from traditional training, self-help and a no treatment control. Losch et al. (2016) found that individual coaching reduced procrastination to a greater extent than no treatment, however, it was not significantly better than group training or self-help. Whilst their study involved small sample sizes (n = 84), the random allocation of participants to conditions gives greater confidence in the impact of coaching in improving skills in comparison to no treatment when the participants are theoretically interchangeable. The results do suggest however, that coaching may not be the only way to achieve such skills improvements.

Qualitative research has also identified improvements in skills because of coaching. For example, Wylde (2005) conducted a qualitative analysis of coaching outcomes as identified by student coachees and found increased time management, planning and organizational skills were identified as outcomes of coaching. The generalizability of these results cannot be established though, as only two students were coached and both were identified as high-performing students. Despite the individual methodological limitations of these studies, collectively they indicate that coaching is being used to develop skills in students that have been identified as desirable in graduates (Andrews & Higson, 2008).

Studies of coaching in HE have also utilized a variety of attitudinal outcomes as dependent variables, many of which are identified as desirable by employers. For example, Grant (2008) implemented life coaching with post-graduate students studying a coaching psychology course. He found that completion of the coaching programme was associated with decreased anxiety, increased goal attainment, increased cognitive hardiness and higher levels of personal insight compared to a cohort who did not receive coaching. A reduction in negative psychological state was also found by Short et al. (2010), who identified that a peer coaching intervention slowed increases in psychological distress in students as they approached examinations compared to students who did not receive coaching. Lefdahl-Davis, Huffman, Stancil and Alayan (2018) report that a minimum of three sessions of coaching resulted in increased self-confidence, awareness of values and alignment with decision-making, connection to life purpose and individual goal-setting and attainment in undergraduate students. However, no specific details of the coaching intervention are provided and there is no control group for comparison. Lawrence et al. (2018) found that one coaching session with a certified faculty coach resulted in increased awareness, reflection, intentional development and pursuit of goal-directed learning opportunities in MBA students. As in the Lefdahl et al. (2018) study, Lawrence and colleagues utilized a pre-test post-test design rather than a control group, so it is not possible to establish whether this development would have occurred naturally as a consequence of participating in the MBA course or whether this was due to coaching. Furthermore, the coaching intervention was accompanied by a series of reflective exercises. It is therefore impossible to establish what development resulted from coaching and what resulted from the completion of the reflective exercises. In a qualitative study, Lancer and Eatough (2018) utilized interpretive phenomenological analysis to explore the experiences of nine students who received six coaching sessions over the course of an academic year. They found that students felt that the coaching sped up their

development, gave them increased control over their work, greater balance and focus, increased their confidence and enabled them to take new perspectives on issues.

The evidence presented above suggests that coaching has a positive impact on affective outcomes, however, not all coaching interventions appear to have the same magnitude of impact. Franklin and Doran (2009) investigated the impact of two different coaching programmes on self-efficacy, resilience, decisional balance, hope, self-compassion and growth mind set in students, as rated by independent observers who were blind to the coaching condition that students experienced. Their results showed that students in both coaching conditions experienced significant increases in self-efficacy and resilience, however, only students in the coaching condition focused on motivation and adaptive learning experienced significant increases in the remainder of the dependent variables. Similarly, McDowall and Butterworth (2014) found that whilst a group, strengths-based coaching intervention did result in increases in self-efficacy and confidence in goal attainment, the increase was not significantly different to a control group who set goals but did not receive coaching. This suggests that whilst coaching can be effective in changing affective variables in students, the results are not uniform for all types of coaching.

The underlying assumption of this second perspective presents the argument that whilst knowledge enhancement is one important outcome of management education, business schools also have an obligation to enhance the skills and attitudes of students in order to ensure that they are equipped with the qualities required to enhance their employability once they enter the marketplace. From this perspective, the use of coaching may be an appropriate way in which business schools can respond to calls to emphasise other important forms of learning, rather than a sole focus on knowledge acquisition (Rubin & Dierdorff, 2013) and utilize the most appropriate methods to achieve these learning outcomes (Ford, Kraiger, & Merritt, 2010). Our literature review illustrates that the study of skill-based and affective

outcomes from coaching is more prevalent than knowledge acquisition and, whilst there are some methodological flaws evident in a number of these studies, given the wider workplace and HE coaching literatures combined, one can be more confident that coaching is likely to have a positive impact on both skills and attitudes. However, generalizing evidence from the wider coaching literature to FSC may not be always be appropriate. We propose that the existing relationship between faculty and students may create a barrier to the formation of a coaching relationship that is necessary to facilitate change in the coachee, an issue we turn to next in our essay.

The Faculty-Student Coaching Relationship

An important area of consideration when exploring the rise of FSC is the faculty-student coaching relationship. The importance of a supportive relationship in coaching is seen as an essential element in enabling coaching effectiveness (Boyce et al., 2010; Carter, Blackman & Hicks, 2014; Rekalde, Landeta & Albizu, 2015). However, evidence from the wider coaching literature may not be directly applicable to the management education context due to the unique relationship between faculty and students. Despite this, as with the absence of substantial evidence on the ability of coaching to produce knowledge acquisition, coaching continues to be used in management education.

In the context of HE, Hunt and Weintraub (2004) argue that the benefit to a student of working with a coach is that the coach becomes a connection point, which can reduce possible effects of student alienation particularly in large classes. Bolton (1999) argues that coaching in HE involves helping students interpret their unique reactions to taught content and provides personalized guidance, with a key strength in coaching being the unique relationship between coach and coachee, or in a management education context: faculty and student. O'Neil and Hopkins (2002) advocate the importance of the faculty-student relationship in coaching even more clearly. They propose that coaching should be a key

behavior for educators and that the teacher as coach should establish a relationship with the student. They argue that it is the intimacy of one-on-one coaching between faculty and student that can make the student amenable to asking questions and consequently facilitating the students' learning. This closeness also allows the student to get to know the teacher as a coach from a perspective different to that of an authority figure: 'they get to know us and we get to know them' (O'Neil & Hopkins, 2002, p.404). However, it is exactly this close personal relationship that is the topic of debate for Chory and Offstein (2016) who highlight some of the risks for faculty in pursuing close personal bonds with students. These risks include sexual harassment claims and legal risks when faculty advise students on issues outside of their area of competence. Whilst Chory and Offstein's (2016) exploration of faculty-student relationships focused on non-academic interactions, many of their concerns are important to consider in the context of FSC relationships.

O'Neil and Hopkins (2002) stance on the importance of the close relationship in FSC is based on the expansive literature in the wider coaching field on the importance of the coaching relationship in ensuring coaching effectiveness. Within the context of management education, we question whether this relationship is desired and/or achievable. Earlier, we explained how the use of FSC continues to prevail despite the absence of compelling evidence that coaching impacts on knowledge acquisition because of the drive for business schools to enhance student satisfaction. Similarly, we suggest that when viewed through the academic capitalism lens, business schools continue to encourage the use of FSC as a teaching approach, even though it may not be possible to create the conditions required for an effective coaching relationship. We expand this point and firstly discuss whether students and faculty desire a close relationship, as is required in coaching, secondly we explore the impact of role conflict in the faculty-student coaching relationship and finally, we examine the impact of these relationship barriers on coaching outcomes.

Student and Faculty Desire to Engage in Close Relationships

Chory and Offstein (2016) pose the question 'Do students want more engaged relationships with their professors?' Their conclusion is that students may care less about a 'truly' engaging relationship with faculty and instead prefer a more transactional experience, dominated by grades and coursework. For example, research has shown that students rate professionalism within their teachers and desire a relationship with a greater degree of personal distance than that they would enjoy with friends (Chen, 2000; DiVerniero & Hosek, 2011; Holmes, Rupert, Ross, & Shapera, 1999). Building a coaching relationship may therefore build too great a personal connection between the students and faculty than either party desire. This resonates with the work of Molesworth et al. (2009) who suggested that the priority for students is to '*have a* degree' rather than to '*be* learners' (p. 278). From an academic capitalism perspective, the student as consumer is seeking to pursue outcomes that are valuable to them, namely the acquisition of a degree that will afford them access to the job market, rather than the development of a genuinely close relationship with faculty. We explore this argument in greater detail later in our essay. The motivations of faculty acting as coaches must also be considered. Given the pressures of faculty to 'perform' (Emery, Kramer & Tien, 2003) they too may prioritize objective outcomes, such as student grades and satisfaction levels, rather than a 'truly' close and engaging relationship.

Role Conflict for Faculty as Coach

Role conflict is an important ethical consideration in coaching. For example, Lowman (2016) provides a discussion of coaching ethics and highlights that in order to abide by ethical codes of conduct, coaches should ensure that wherever possible they avoid or effectively manage multiple relationships and at the least, identify and manage conflicts of interest. We propose that in the context of FSC, avoiding role conflict is particularly

challenging. We further divide this discussion into two key areas: existing relationships and ability to be non-judgmental.

Existing Relationships. The existing relationship between student and faculty may negatively impact upon the coaching success. The coaching relationship shares many parallels with the relationship developed in Rogerian therapeutic settings (Wasylyshyn, 2003) and as such, the coach must display unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1961). This notion conflicts with the established relationship between students and faculty, where faculty are responsible for assessing and grading students. The degree to which students as coachees trust their teachers to keep information confidential and to not consider it in other contexts must also be questioned. Lack of trust in confidentiality has been identified as an issue when managers are used as coaches in organizations (Bluckert, 2005; Wasylyshyn, 2003) and the importance of trust in the coaching relationship is frequently cited in the workplace coaching research (Bozer & Jones, 2018; Gyllensten & Palmer, 2007; Rekalde et al., 2015; Salomaa, 2015). Students may feel that they do not want to reveal personal information on goals and issues they face to faculty who may also teach them in other subjects or may teach them in the future. This lack of trust may undermine the ability of coaching to produce desired outcomes.

Ability to be Non-Judgmental. A fundamental assumption of coaching is that the coach (or in this context faculty) are non-judgemental (Costa & Garmston, 1992). The reality of the faculty-as-coach is that faculty have repeated experiences of the student in a variety of contexts. Faculty may have expectations of students based on their experiences of them in the classroom, such as the level of attendance and engagement in classroom activities that the student has demonstrated. Faculty are responsible for marking and grading work, providing formative feedback and facilitating group work. Regardless of the motivations of teachers, it is arguably impossible for a teacher to eliminate the pre-conceptions about the student that

will be generated through these interactions. This existing relationship may influence the coach's ability to provide a genuine and supportive relationship. In another management education context, Saunders and Davis (1998) found that in supervisor-dissertation student relationships, the quality of the relationship may be colored by the teacher's knowledge of the student's previous performance. In a coaching context, faculty may feel more positively towards those students they believe to be 'good' students and subconsciously transmit this in coaching interactions. This could result in a situation where faculty are more or less willing to coach students based on their performance in the classroom and/or they may engage less when coaching students of whom they have formed a negative view.

Impact of Relationship Role Conflict on Coaching Outcomes

The above discussion suggests that the student and faculty may not truly engage in a meaningful coaching relationship involving high levels of trust and a non-judgemental position on the part of the coach. The lack of a truly close relationship between faculty and students within the coaching relationship is likely to limit the potential impact of FSC, given that the relationship is argued to be a critical factor to coaching success (Boyce et al., 2010; Carter et al., 2014; Rekalde et al., 2015). If this is the case, it therefore undermines the ability of FSC to produce positive outcomes beyond coachee satisfaction (Bluckert, 2005; Wasylyshyn, 2003). This lack of coaching relationship may also limit the extent to which findings from the wider coaching literature can be applied to FSC. This point returns us to our earlier debate regarding the application of coaching in the absence of strong empirical evidence. Economically, the use of coaching is a rational decision within business schools to increase satisfaction and consequently league table positions and enhance student recruitment. Ethically, the use of a practice we anticipate may have a limited impact on desired outcomes in students due to barriers that inhibit the formation of essential trust and

non-judgmental coaching relationships, can be considered as morally at odds to the goals of management education.

Coaching and Academic Capitalism

So far in our essay we have presented a series of arguments regarding the potential implications for the rise of FSC. Next we utilize academic capitalism theory to explain why FSC appears to be so prevalent in business schools.

It is well documented that the nature of the academic profession is changing, with scholars arguing that HE is moving towards values and behaviors characteristic of the free market (Gonzales, Martinez & Ordu, 2014; Kirp, 2003). In a capitalistic free market, the actions of employees, organizations and consumers are motivated or driven by the potential benefits that these entities derive from their actions that in turn, influences their behavior.[1] Accordingly, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) propose that the concept of academic capitalism can explain the behavior of certain groups of resource dependant academics and emerged as a consequence of the application of neoliberalism to HE policies (Giroux, 2002). The term academic capitalism is often used to compare the increasing struggle for excellence in a globalized academic world with the fierce competition in boundless economic markets (Münch, 2014; Schneickert & Lenger, 2016; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) suggest that academic behavior is triggered by two external influences: firstly, market contraction and increased competition and secondly the privatization, commercialization and deregulation of HE which creates opportunities for collaboration with industry. Therefore, according to academic capitalism, business schools have become increasingly market-oriented organizations that aggressively compete for income (Cantwell, 2015), breaking the traditional philosophy of education as a public good to benefit all citizens (Somers, Davis, Fry, Jasinski, & Lee, 2018).

[1] We wish to thank an anonymous reviewer for clarifying this argument.

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) suggest that academic capitalism provides a theoretical basis to explain irregular moves toward the market by public research universities and as such, the influence of academic capitalism is frequently discussed in the context of changing research agendas. It can be argued, that academic capitalism threatens the core tenets of academic freedom: a founding principle that ensured an investment in pure research to advance the interests of society (Somers et al., 2018). As yet, the impact of academic capitalism on teaching practices has been less extensively explored, with the exception of the deployment of disruptive innovation, such as the introduction of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), to allow business schools to remain competitive and attract new sets of customers (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Somers et al., 2018). We extend the existing theorizing on academic capitalism, by suggesting that academic capitalism can also provide an explanation for the growth in the use of FSC as a teaching practice within management education.

Earlier, we presented the literature to illustrate that there is limited evidence to suggest that coaching is an effective tool at enhancing knowledge acquisition. Given the absence of substantive evidence that coaching 'works' in delivering a core outcome of management education, why does it continue to be so prevalent across business schools? We propose that academic capitalism can provide two potential answers to this question.

Firstly, the concept of academic capitalism positions the student as the consumer (Peters, 2007; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Increasingly, business schools have found themselves competing for students and financial resources (Holtz, Deutschmann & Dobewall, 2017). A consequence of this competition is the marketing practices, rankings, accreditations and branding that characterize the new type of academic institution (Alajoutsijarvi, Juusola & Siltaoja, 2015), with ranking lists powerfully modifying the social reality and practices of academia (Paasi, 2015). Somers et al. (2018) go as far as suggesting that the singular goal of

the striving business school is to advance in the rankings and increase institutional prestige, as public rankings have become a new tool for marketing.

In the marketization of business school education, students have become consumers who can dictate to educational institutions by choosing the service providers that please them the most (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2011). Given that business school league table rankings are reliant on business school performance in relation to student satisfaction (Howard, 2016), satisfaction is a key metric upon which students are basing their choice. Consequently, business schools are motivated to employ teaching practices that enhance satisfaction. Given the evidence clearly linking high levels of satisfaction to coaching (i.e. Audet & Couteret, 2012; Boyce et al., 2010; McGuffin & Obonyo, 2010; Ratiu et al., 2015; Vidal-Salazar et al., 2012), the rise in the use of coaching in management education appears to prevail, despite, at best, mediocre evidence regarding the impact on knowledge acquisition, because of the positive impact on student satisfaction, which leads to higher league table rankings and subsequently enhances the competitiveness of the business school to meet recruitment targets.

Secondly, Holtz et al. (2017) argue that as part of the general trend toward more competition in academia, self-marketing has increasingly become the inherent logic of academic writing. Moore, Neylon, Eve, O'Donnell and Pattinson (2017) note that there has been a marked rise in the use of advertising language in scientific publications, thought to be due to increased pressure to publish. We propose that this self-marketing language is now common-place in the marketization of business school courses to students (Alajoutsijarvi et al., 2015). For example, at the extreme end, Jessop (2018) describes how academic capitalism can result in efforts to seek advantage that rely on political or other forms of extra-economic coercion, such as false prospectuses. Earlier, we detailed some examples of how feedback or instructional teaching practices were being described as coaching, despite bearing little resemblance to how coaching has been conceptualized in the literature (Clegg et al., 2000;

Hobson et al., 2014; Satzler & Sheu, 2002). Academic capitalism can explain this practice when we understand that coaching is often positioned as an executive 'perk' to reward top performers in the corporate world (McCauley & Hezlett, 2002). Therefore the widespread, potentially inappropriate use of the term coaching, could be viewed as a marketing gimmick to enhance student recruitment.

The marketization of HE has been seen by some commentators as morally opposed to the values of education (Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006). Molesworth, Nixon and Scullion (2009) succinctly present the consequences of the marketization of HE; the value of education for its own sake and in transforming the lives and understanding of its students has been replaced by the value of education in providing access to the job market and a qualification that will give students a competitive advantage in that market. They argue that universities, particularly ones offering vocational courses such as business, management, marketing and advertising, are so deeply embedded in the consumer culture that presently dominates Western society, they have lost the capacity to be critical of this culture. The result is that students are given what they want as consumers without raising awareness of the potential criticisms of these desires. Starkey and Tiratsoo (2007) note that an alarming consequence of the rise of academic capitalism is that looking good may matter more than doing things well. For these reasons, the use of coaching in management education (or the labelling of other teaching practices as coaching) continues to be popular because coaching enhances student satisfaction which positively impacts on league table rankings and recruitment and is viewed as a useful marketing tool in selling academic courses to consumers. Furthermore, this argument that looking good may matter more than doing things well (Starkey & Tiratsoo 2007), may explain why the potential issues that we raised in the previous section regarding the ability of faculty to effectively form a coaching relationship with their students have been largely ignored. As coaching students may enhance student

satisfaction, the rise in the use of coaching in management education appears to prevail regardless of whether the correct conditions for an effective coaching relationship necessary for achieving the desired outcomes can be formed.

Whilst we have presented here a series of negative consequences of the rise of academic capitalism in relation to coaching in management education, Hoffman (2011) argues that we should not treat this market-orientation as necessarily negative or as a fait accompli. Indeed, Newfield (2008) comments that opponents of academic capitalism often defend the classic liberal university, whilst failing to acknowledge the exclusion of women and less privileged men from the precincts of the classic liberal university, the colonial expansion of HE in the service of the empire and the unacknowledged positionality that infuses standards of supposedly value-free science within these institutions (Ferree & Zippel, 2015).

The preceding discussion of the negative consequences of coaching and academic capitalism may be ignoring the impact of coaching on skill-based and attitudinal outcomes. As discussed previously, there is more evidence that coaching can positively impact on both skill-based and attitudinal outcomes (e.g. Franklin & Doran, 2009; Grant, 2008; Losch et al., 2016; Sargent et al, 2009; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004). The focus on the development of expertise aside from traditional knowledge is important as graduates face increasingly limited prospects to secure full-time employment (Somers et al., 2018). Martins (2008) highlights how, historically, the employment crisis has placed additional pressure on management education to produce graduates with skills for the workforce, reinforcing a model of academic capitalism within business schools. From this perspective, the rise in academic capitalism has meant that awareness has been raised around the need to provide students with the skills and attitudes components of the KSA framework, enabling educators to move away from the traditional paradigm that urges faculty to blindly link all educational activities to knowledge

acquisition. The literature indicates that coaching is one potential teaching approach that may effectively target the development of skills and attitudes. We return to this point in our call to action.

Recommendations and Conclusion

We conclude our essay with recommendations in relation to ensuring that the potential dangers highlighted here in relation to FSC are mitigated. We structure these suggestions around a call for research and a call for action.

Call for Research

In order to better understand the benefits and limitations of FSC, we propose that future research should focus on three key areas: robust examination of knowledge acquisition, skills and attitudinal outcomes from coaching in management education, examination of the relative impact of different types of coaches and exploration of student and faculty views of the coaching relationship in management education.

Firstly we suggest that coaching and pedagogy scholars should address the significant gap in the literature in relation to the impact of coaching students in management education on desired learning outcomes and in particular knowledge acquisition. As explored in our discussion, the research examining knowledge acquisition is limited in comparison to other outcomes of coaching and furthermore, many of these studies are methodologically flawed (i.e. Capstick et al., 2019; Chaplin, 2007; Shojai et al., 2014; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004). Whilst studies examining the impact of coaching on skills and attitudes of students are more numerous, similar methodological flaws limit the confidence one can also have in these findings (i.e. Lawrence et al., 2018; Lefdahl-Davis et al., 2018; Sargent et al., 2009). Considered from the academic capitalism perspective, robust research into the impact of coaching students is needed in order to ensure that coaching is an appropriate methodology to achieve the purpose of management education (whether that is knowledge acquisition and/or

to develop skills and attitudes) as without this, the role of coaching in management education may remain primarily as a form of enhancing student satisfaction. We therefore suggest that studies in which large numbers of students are randomly assigned to coaching groups with matched control groups are needed so that the assumption of causality is not violated (Antonakis et al., 2010). Detailed descriptions of the coaching intervention used are also necessary, in order for studies to be transparent and reproducible. Future research should consider how to best assess the outcome variables of interest. Coaching studies in general suffer from a lack independently observed or objective outcome measures (see Athanasopoulou & Dopson, 2018). This is similarly the case in coaching studies in HE, where self-report data are frequently used. Whilst this may be a valid mechanism to address changes in attitudinal outcome variables, knowledge acquisition and skills-based outcomes would be better assessed via objective measures (e.g. assessments, observer skill ratings, assessment centres) (Bozer & Jones, 2018).

A variety of individuals play the role of 'coach' in the studies reviewed in this paper, including not only faculty but external coaches (i.e. Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004), peers (i.e. Hobson et al., 2014; Oreopoulos & Petronijevic, 2018), alumni and post graduate students (i.e. Capstick et al., 2018; Hunt & Weintraub, 2004; Losch et al., 2006; Sargent et al., 2009; Shojai et al., 2007). As discussed, issues of role conflict in the faculty-student relationship make the development of a genuine helping relationship between the coach and the coachee more difficult to achieve in FSC than in other contexts. This means that not only is generalization of the wider coaching literature to FSC questionable, but the generalization of studies within HE where individuals other than faculty take the role of coach may be questionable too. From an academic capitalism perspective, this is problematic as the lack of a coaching relationship may limit the anticipated impact of coaching in relation to the desired outcomes for management education, consequently bringing the forces driving the use of

coaching in management education into question. As such, robust evidence is needed to clearly establish the generalizable results of coaching on learning, skills and attitudes in the context of management education when faculty specifically act as coaches and the comparable impact of coaching from other 'types' of coaches, such as peer and external coaches. The likelihood of this anticipated differential impact based on the type of coach is supported by research outside of management education that has indicated that the type of coach (i.e. internal to the organization versus external to the organization) has an impact on the type of outcomes that can be expected from coaching and furthermore, interacts with other factors such as coachee job complexity (Jones, Woods & Zhou, 2018). Such studies would elucidate who in management education is best placed to deliver coaching to students.

Finally, we propose that scholars should seek to explore student and faculty views on the appropriateness of the coaching relationship in management education (Chory & Offstein, 2016). We have used academic capitalism to highlight that students may not desire the close relationship between themselves and faculty that is necessary for coaching to be effective, instead students may be more concerned with pursuing outcomes that are of value to them and less interested in the process of being a learner (Molesworth et al., 2009). Research in this area could therefore seek to explore both student and faculty views on the relationship that is formed as part of providing one-to-one coaching, in particular whether students (and faculty) value this close relationship, which elements of the relationship in particular are of value and the benefits or negative consequences of these relationships.

Call for Action

In this essay we have identified that FSC provides proven results in improving student satisfaction and metrics such as contact time and probable, although not unequivocally established, benefits for skills and attitudes. However, we have also identified that the dual nature of being both teacher and coach may undermine the efficacy of coaching and that

students may not wish to have faculty coach them or to develop a close relationship with faculty. So what is the answer? We could make conservative suggestions regarding how to boost the effectiveness of coaching within the curriculum in combination with other forms of pedagogical approaches. This includes employing dedicated coaches to work with students who sit outside of the normal teaching roles. This solution would overcome many of the relationship issues we detail in our earlier discussion. For example, the close caring relationship necessary for coaching effectiveness would be formed between the coach and student rather than the faculty and student, the lack of teaching responsibility of coaches would facilitate trust in the relationship and coaches would have no prior experiences of students to bias their views.

We believe however, that many of the issues that we have identified in our essay are created precisely because coaching is used alongside traditional teaching methods. An alternative call for action is to position all faculty as coaches, with coaching (as opposed to teaching) as the standard delivery mode for all courses. Given that we have positioned this essay as an examination of the possible limitations of FSC, this suggestion may appear counter-intuitive, however, based on this position many of the dangers identified are nullified. The issue of faculty holding dual roles would be reduced, if not totally eliminated, as faculty would no longer have experiences of students in other educational contexts. Through anonymous marking, faculty may not have a perception of student attainment that would color their view of the student as a coachee. We would predict that student attitudes to coaching would also be highly positive in this scenario as, due to attraction-selection-attrition theory (Schneider, Smith & Goldstein, 2000), we would expect to see only students with a positive attitude to coaching choosing a course where coaching was the only instructional method.

The above argument identifies how using coaching alone (rather than teaching and coaching combined) can address the majority of the faculty and student based issues raised in our essay and would improve the likelihood of the positive skills-based and attitudinal outcomes seen in the workplace coaching literature (Jones et al., 2016) also being found within coaching in HE. One unanswered question remains however on the impact of coaching on learning. We have identified that presently, there is insufficient empirical evidence to conclusively state that coaching leads to acquisition of knowledge. This raises the question of why we would promote the use of a pedagogy that may not lead to traditional learning outcomes. Our answer is to question whether, in the current social and technological climate, the role of a university is still to deliver 'knowledge' as it once was. As we have identified in this essay, within contemporary business and management based courses, scholars have argued that the role of the business school should now be less focused on providing traditional, academic knowledge and instead be more focused on developing skills relevant to the business world (Bennis & O'Toole, 2005; Butler, Johnson & Forbes, 2008), including teaching students to become reflective learners and engage in 'meta-learning' (Biggs, 1995; Jackson, 2004). The 'Google era' we now live in can be described as a knowledge saturated world, where huge quantities of information are available at the click of a mouse or swipe of a screen. Star and Hammer (2008) identify that in this context, the role of teaching within business schools has shifted from providing *content* to emphasising *process* (i.e. what graduates can do with the information they acquire). There is ample evidence to support the efficacy of coaching in developing skills, self-awareness and the ability to learn (see Jones et al., 2016). We could therefore be content that whilst we may not be imparting knowledge to students as coachees, this information is readily available to them and instead, the purpose of a university education is to ensure students learn how to use this information and grow their own capabilities, consequently acquiring the skills to become life-

long learners. In support of this argument Huijser, Kimmins and Galligan (2008) identify the importance of one-to-one consultations with learning advisors for students, identifying that these one-to-one sessions help students to process and conceptualize material they have been presented with and develop key skills as learners. These outcomes are not at odds with the traditional mission of management education in producing critical and reflective individuals who can contribute to society (Molesworth et al., 2009). It also meets the demands of employers, who consistently identify that graduates do not possess the appropriate skills for the workplace, including self-awareness, self-management and a life-long learning orientation. Finally, this use of coaching alone fits within the neo-liberal, marketized business school offering that is geared towards providing a product that is attractive to the student-as-consumer. The one-to-one attention afforded by coaching and the development of skills that are attractive to employers meet the demands of the student marketplace. Such a novel approach would afford a course a genuinely unique selling point in a crowded marketplace.

Concluding Comments

In this essay we have sought to open the debate around the appropriateness of the rise of FSC in management education. It is not our intention to devalue the use of coaching; indeed, we are strong advocates of coaching as a developmental approach. However, it is the implementation of coaching by faculty alongside teaching without appropriate consideration of the possible limitations of FSC that is our concern and that we believe warrants further debate. We have posed a number of questions in relation to the efficacy of coaching. We have addressed these issues from an academic capitalism perspective whereby students are viewed as consumers and faculty as service providers, and question whether, when viewed from this perspective, there may be the opportunity for the misuse of coaching as a marketing tool. We have also questioned whether the kind of relationship necessary for effective coaching can be formed between students and faculty and the appropriateness of such a relationship between

the two parties. Finally, we have concluded our essay with a call for research and a call for action. Whilst our call for action may appear radical, we propose that the management education system is undergoing a period of radical transformation and as such, perhaps it is wise to consider that the traditional methodology used in management education needs to go through a similarly radical transformation in order to remain fit for purpose. We hope that by posing the questions raised in our essay, some of the issues highlighted here may be explored further in order to ensure the appropriate and effective use of coaching within management education.

References

Andrews, J., & Higson, H. (2008). Graduate employability, 'soft skills' versus 'hard' business knowledge: A European study. *Higher Education in Europe, 33,* 411-422.doi: 10.1080/03797720802522627

Alajoutsijärvi, K., Juusola, K., & Siltaoja, M. (2015). The legitimacy paradox of business schools: losing by gaining? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *14*, 277-291. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2013.0106

Athanasopoulou, A., & Dopson, S. (2018). A systematic review of executive coaching outcomes: Is it the journey or the destination that matters the most? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*, 70-88. doi: org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.11.004

Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2010). On making causal claims: A review and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21,* 1086-1120. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.010

Audet , J., & Couteret, P. (2012). Coaching the entrepreneur: Features and success factors. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 19,* 515-531. doi: 10.1108/14626001211250207

Bachkirova, T., & Borrington, S. (2018). Old wine in new bottles: Exploring pragmatism as a philosophical framework for the discipline of coaching. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, doi: 10.5465/amle.2017.0268

Bailey, J. R., Ferris, W. P., Lewicki, R. J., & Whetton, D. A. (2010). Design and development: A narrative of the founding launch, and early history of the Academy of Management Learning & Education. In C. Wankel and R. DeFillippi (Eds.), *Being and becoming a management education scholar,* 43–58. Information Age Publishing.

Benjamin, B., & O'Reilly, C. (2011). Becoming a leader: Early career challenges faced by MBA graduates. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*, 452-472. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2011.0002

Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, *83*, 96–104.

Biggs, J. (1995) 'The role of metalearning in study processes' *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 55,* 185-212. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1985.tb02625.x

Bluckert, P. (2005). Critical factors in executive coaching–the coaching relationship. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 37,* 336-340. doi:10.1108/00197850510626785

Bolsmann, C., & Uys, T. (2001). Pre-empting the challenges of transformation and marketisation of higher education: a case study of the Rand Afrikaans University. *Society in Transition, 32,* 173-185. doi: 10.1080/21528586.2001.10419041

Bolton, M. K. (1999). The role of coaching in student teams: A "just-in-time" approach to learning. *Journal of Management Education, 23,* 233-250. doi: 10.1177%2F105256299902300302

Bono, J. E., Purvanova, R. K., Towler, A. J., & Peterson, D. B. (2009). A survey of executive coaching practices. *Personnel Psychology, 62,* 361-404. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01142.x

Boyce, L. A., Jackson, J. R., & Neal, L. J. (2010). Building successful leadership coaching relationships: Examining impact of matching criteria in a leadership coaching program. *Journal of Management Development, 29,* 914-931. doi: 10.1108/02621711011084231

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,* 342-361. doi: org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1446946

Bozer, G., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2013). Academic background and credibility in executive coaching effectiveness *Personnel Review, 43,* 881-897. doi: 10.1108/PR-10-2013-0171

Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (2012). *Facilitating Reflective Learning: Coaching, Mentoring and Supervision.* London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Buckley, A., Soilemetzidis, I., & Hillman, N. (2015). *The 2015 student academic experience survey*. York: The Higher Education Policy Institute and Higher Education Academy. Available from: http://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/AS-PRINTED-HEA_HEPI_report_print4.pdf (last accessed 22/01/18).

Butler, D., Johnson, L., & Forbes, B. (2008). An examination of a skills-based leadership coaching course in an MBA program. *Journal of Education for Business, 83,* 227-232. doi: 10.3200/JOEB.83.4.227-232

Cantwell, B. (2015). Are international students cash cows? Examining the relationship between new international undergraduate enrolments and institutional revenue at public colleges and universities in the US. *Journal of International Students, 5*, 512-525.

Capstick, M. K., Harrell-Williams, L. M., Cockrum, C. D., & West, S. L. (2018). Exploring the effectiveness of academic coaching for academically at-risk college students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 1-13. doi: 10.1007/s10755-019-9459-1

Carter, A., Blackman, A., & Hicks, B. (2014). *Barriers to successful outcomes from coaching.* Paper presented at the European Mentoring and Coaching Conference, Paris.

Chan, D., & Mok, K. H. (2001). Educational reforms and coping strategies under the tidal wave of marketisation: A comparative study of Hong Kong and the mainland. *Comparative Education, 37*, 21-41. doi: 10.1080/03050060020020417

Chaplin, S. (2007). A model of student success: Coaching students to develop critical thinking skills in introductory biology courses. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *1*, 10. doi: 10.20429/ijsotl.2007.010210

Chen, Z. (2000). The impact of teacher-student relationships on college students' learning: Exploring organizational cultures in the classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, *1*, 76-83.

Chia, R., & Holt, R. (2008). The nature of knowledge in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*, 471-486. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2008.35882188

Chory, R. M., & Offstein, E. H. (2016). "Your professor will know you as a person": Evaluating and rethinking the relational boundaries between faculty and students. *Journal of Management Education. 41*, 9-38. doi: 10.1177/1052562916647986

Christensen, C., & Eyrin, H. J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Clegg, S. U. E., Trayhurn, D., & Johnson, A. (2000). Not just for men : A case study of the teaching and learning of information technology in higher education. *Higher Education*, *40*, 123–145. doi: 10.1023/A:1004093116051

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: a meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 678-707. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.678

Conger, J. A. 2004. Developing leadership capability: What's inside the black box? *Academy of Management Perspectives, 18*, 136-139. doi: org/10.5465/ame.2004.14776188

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1992). Cognitive coaching: A strategy for reflective teaching. *Journal for Supervision and Curriculum Improvement. California ASCD*. Spring.

Currie, J., & Vidovich, L. (2000). Privatization and competition policies for Australian universities. *International Journal of Educational Development, 20*, 135-151. doi: 10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00065-6

Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P. (2006). The rise and fall of the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education, 41,* 305-319. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3435.2006.00261.x

De Siqueira, A. C. (2014). Higher education reform in Brazil: reinforcing marketization. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 7*, 169-191.

DiVerniero, R. A., & Hosek, A. M. (2011). Students' perceptions and communicative management of instructors' online self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly, 59*, 428-449. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2011.597275

Eby, L. T. D. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., & Evans, S. C. (2013). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of protégé perceptions of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(2), 441-476. doi: 10.1037/a0029279.

Emery, C. R., Kramer, T. R., & Tian, R. G. (2003). Return to academic standards: a critique of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. *Quality Assurance in Education, 11,* 37-46. doi: 10.1108/09684880310462074

Feldman, D. C. & Lankau, M. J. (2005). Executive Coaching: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management, 31,* 829-848. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279599

Ferree, M. M., & Zippel, K. (2015). Gender equality in the age of academic capitalism: Cassandra and Pollyanna interpret university restructuring. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, *22*, *561-584. doi: org/10.1093/sp/jxv039*

Ford, J. K., Kraiger, K., & Merritt, S. M. (2010). An updated review of the multidimensionality of training outcomes: New directions for training evaluation research. In S. W. J. Kozlowski & E. Salas (Eds.), *Learning, Training, and Development in Organizations* (pp. 3 - 64). New York: Routledge.

Franklin, J., & Doran, J. (2009). Does all coaching enhance objective performance independently evaluated by blind assessors? The importance of the coaching model and content. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 4*, 128-144. ISSN: 1750-2764.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4*, 75-91. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2005.16132558

Giroux, H. A. 2002. Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The University as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*, 425–464. doi: org/10.17763/haer.72.4.0515nr62324n71p1

Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu. C. (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*, 1097-1115. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2013.777401

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*, 54-70. doi:10.1080/17521880701878141

Grant, A. M., Curtayne, L., & Burton, G. (2009). Executive coaching enhances goal attainment, resilience and workplace well-being: A randomised controlled study. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*(5), 396-407. doi: 10.1080/17439760902992456

Grant, A. M., Green, L. S., & Rynsaardt, J. (2010). Developmental coaching for high school teachers: Executive coaching goes to school. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(3), 151-168. doi: 10.1037/a0019212

Grey, D. E., Gabriel, Y., & Goregaokar, H. (2014). Coaching unemployed managers and professionals through the trauma of unemployment: Derailed or undaunted? *Management Learning, 46,* 1-18. doi: 10.1177/1350507614532752

Gyllensten, K., & Palmer, S. (2007). The coaching relationship: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 2*, 168-177.

Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics, 27*, 39-53. doi: 10.1016/S0090-2616(99)90020-7

Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19*, 316-338. doi: 10.1108/09513550610669176

Hobson, C. J., Griffin, A., & Rominger, A. S. (2014). Teaching MBA Students Teamwork And Team Leadership Skills: An Empirical Evaluation Of A Classroom Educational Program. *American Journal Of Business Education – Third Quarter, 7*, 191–212.

Hoffman, S.G. (2011). The new tools of the science trade: contested knowledge production and the conceptual vocabularies of academic capitalism. *Social Anthropology, 19,* 439–462. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8676.2011.00180.x

Holmes, D. L., Rupert, P. A., Ross, S. A., & Shapera, W. E. (1999). Student perceptions of dual relationships between faculty and students. *Ethics & Behavior, 9,* 79-107. doi: 10.1207/s15327019eb0902_1

Holtz, P., Deutschmann, E., & Dobewall, H. (2017). Cross-Cultural Psychology and the Rise of Academic Capitalism: Linguistic Changes in CCR and JCCP Articles, 1970-2014. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48,* 1410-1431. doi: abs/10.1177/0022022117724902

Howard, C. (2016). *Top Colleges Ranking 2016: The Full Methodology*. Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/carolinehoward/2016/07/06/top-colleges-ranking-2016-the-full-methodology/#1eea73ef5b82 (last accessed 21/05/17)

Hunt, J. M., & Weintraub J. R. (2004). Learning developmental coaching. *Journal of Management Education, 28,* 39–61. doi: 10.1177%2F1052562903252649

Huijser, H., Kimmins, L., & Galligan, L. (2008). Evaluating individual teaching on the road to embedding academic skills. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning, 2,* 23-38.

Jackson, N. (2004). Developing the concept of metalearning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International 41,* 391-404. doi: 10.1080/1470329042000276995

Jessop, B. (2018). On academic capitalism, *Critical Policy Studies, 12*, 104-109, doi: 10.1080/19460171.2017.1403342

Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: A framework for social analysis. *Quest, 54,* 34-48. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2002.10491765

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*, 249-227. doi: 10.1111/joop.12119

Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Zhou, Y. (2018). Boundary conditions of workplace coaching outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 33*(7/8), 475-496, https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2017-0390

Kirp, D.L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the bottom line.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lancer, N., & Eatough, V. (2018). One-to-one coaching as a catalyst for personal development: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of coaching undergraduates at a UK university. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 13*(1), 72-88. ISSN 1750-2764

Lawrence, E., Dunn, M. W., & Weisfeld-Spolter, S. (2018). Developing leadership potential in graduate students with assessment, self-awareness, reflection and coaching. *Journal of Management Development, 37*(8), 634-651. doi: 10.1108/JMD-11-2017-0390

Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D., & Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centred learning: beyond educational bulimia? *Studies in Higher Education, 28,* 321-334. doi: 10.1080/03075070309293

Lefdahl-Davis, E. M., Huffman, L., Stancil, J., & Alayan, A. J. (2018). The impact of life coaching on undergraduate students: A multiyear analysis of coaching outcomes. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 16*(2), 69-83. ISSN: 1741-8305

Losch, S., Traut-Mattausch, E., Mühlberger, M. D., & Jonas, E. (2016). Comparing the effectiveness of individual coaching, self-coaching, and group training: How leadership makes the difference. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* 629. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00629

Lowman, R. L. (2016). Coaching Ethics. In J. Passmore, D. B. Peterson, & T. Freire (eds). *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons

Lowrie, A., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2011). This thing called marketization. *Journal of Marketing Management, 27,* 11-12. doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2011.614733

Martins, A. L. (2008). A marcha do "capitalismo universitário". *Avaliação: Revista da Avaliação da Educação Superior, 13,* 733-743.

Martocchio, J. J., & Webster, J. (1992). Effects of feedback and cognitive playfulness on performance in microcomputer software training. *Personnel Psychology, 45,* 553-578. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00860.x

McAdam, S. (2005). *Executive Coaching*. London: Thorogood.

McCauley, C. D., & Hezlett, S. A. (2002). Individual development in the workplace. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology: Personnel Psychology,* 1 (pp. 313–335). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McDowall, A., & Butterworth, L. (2014). How does a brief strengths-based group coaching intervention work? *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 7,* 152-163. doi: 10.1080/17521882.2014.953560

McGuffin, A. A., & Obonyo, E. (2010). Enhancing performance: A case study of the effects of employee coaching in construction practice. *Construction Management and Economics, 28,* 141-149. doi: 10.1080/01446190903460672

McKelvey, M., & Holmén, M. (2009). *Learning to compete in European Universities: From social institution to knowledge business.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs*. London, New York: Prentice Hall.

Mok, K. H. (2007). Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 433-454. doi: 10.1177/1028315306291945

Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: the marketization of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*, 277-287. doi: 10.1080/13562510902898841

Moore, S., Neylon, C., Eve, M. P., O'Donnell, D. P., & Pattinson, D. (2017). Excellence R us: University research and the fetishisation of excellence. *Palgrave Communications 3*, Article number: 16105. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/palcomms2016105

Münch, R. (2014). *Academic capitalism: Universities in the global struggle for excellence*. New York, NY: Routledge.

National Academic Advising Association (2017). *Academic Coaching Advising Community*. Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Community/Advising-communities/Academic-Coaching.aspx

Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

O'Neil, D. A., & Hopkins, M. M. (2002). The teacher as coach approach: Pedagogical choices for management educators. *Journal of Management Education, 26*, 402-414. doi: 10.1177%2F105256290202600406

O'Neill, G., & McMahon, T. (2005). Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers. In *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching*. O'Neill, G., Moore, S., McMullin, B. (Eds). Dublin:AISHE.

Oreopoulos, P., & Petronijevic, U. (2018). Student coaching: How far can technology go?. *Journal of Human Resources, 53*(2), 299-329. doi: 10.3368/jhr.53.2.1216-8439R

Parker, P., Hall, D. T., & Kram, K. E. (2008). Peer coaching: A relational process for accelerating career learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7,* 487-503. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2008.35882189

Paasi, A. (2015). Academic capitalism and the geopolitics of knowledge. *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to political geography*, 509-523.

Peltier, B. (2009). *The Psychology of Executive Coaching: Theory and Application.* New York: Routledge

Peters, M. A. (2007). *Knowledge economy, development and the future of higher education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Peterson, D. B., & Hicks, M. D. (1996). *Leader as coach: Strategies for coaching and developing others.* Minneapolis, MN: Personnel Decisions International.

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 1*, 78-95. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2002.7373679

Quiñones, M. A. (1995). Pretraining context effects: Training assignment as feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 226-238. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.80.2.226

Qiping, Y., & White, G. (1994). The 'marketisation' of Chinese higher education: A critical assessment. *Comparative Education, 30,* 217-221. doi: 10.1080/0305006940300305

Ratiu, L., David, O. A., & Baban, A. (2015). Developing managerial skills through coaching: Efficacy of a cognitive-behavioral coaching program. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 34,* 1-23. doi: 10.1007/s10942-015-0225-8

Rekalde, I., Landeta, J., & Albizu, E. (2015). Determining factors in the effectiveness of executive coaching as a management development tool. *Management Decision, 53*, 1677-1697. doi: 10.1108/MD-12-2014-0666

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: a therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, J. (2016). *Coaching skills: The definitive guide to being a coach.* Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press

Rubin, R. S., & Dierdorff, E. C. (2013). Building a better MBA: From a decade of critique toward a decennium of creation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12,* 125-141. doi: org/10.5465/amle.2012.0217

Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52,* 471-499. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.471

Salomaa, R. (2015). Expatriate coaching: Factors impacting coaching success. *Journal of Global Mobility, 3*, 216-243. doi: 10.1108/JGM-10-2014-0050

Sargent, L. D., Allen, B. C., Frahm, J. A., & Morris, G. (2009). Enhancing the experience of student teams in large classes: Training teaching assistants to be coaches. *Journal of Management Education, 33,* 526-552. doi: 10.1177/1052562909334092

Satzler, L., & Sheu, C. (2002). Facilitating learning in large operations management classes using integrated Lego projects. *Production and Inventory Management, 43*, 72–77.

Saunders, M. N., & Davis, S. M. (1998). The use of assessment criteria to ensure consistency of marking: some implications for good practice. *Quality Assurance in Education, 6,* 162-171. doi: 10.1108/09684889810220465

Schneickert, C., & Lenger, A. (2016). Studentische Arbeitskraftunternehmer*innen: Projektbasierter Kapitalismus im wissenschaftlichen Feld [Student assistants as entrepreneurs: Project-based capitalism in the academic field]. In A. Vester-Lange & T. Sander (Eds.), *Soziale Ungleichheiten, Milieus und Habitus im Hochschulstudium* [Social inequalities, milieus, and habitus in higher education] (pp. 265-285). Weinheim, Germany: Beltz Juventa.

Schneider, B., Smith, D. B., & Goldstein, H. W. (2000). *Attraction–selection–attrition: Toward a person–environment psychology of organizations.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Sherman, S., & Freas, A. (2004). The wild west of executive coaching. *Harvard Business Review, November,* 82-90.

Short, E., Kinman, G., & Baker, S. (2010). Evaluating the impact of a peer coaching intervention on well-being amongst psychology undergraduate students. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 5,* 27-35. ISSN: 1750-2764.

Shojai, S., Davis, W. J., & Root, P. S. (2014). Developmental Relationship Programs: An Empirical Study of the Impact of Peer-Mentoring Programs. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 7,* 31-38.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smither, J. W. (2011). Can psychotherapy research serve as a guide for research about executive coaching? An agenda for the next decade. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26,* 135-145. doi: 10.1007/s10869-011-9216-7

Somers, P., Davis, C., Fry, J., Jasinski, L., & Lee, E. (2018). Academic capitalism and the entrepreneurial university: some perspectives from the Americas. *Roteiro, 43,* 21-42.

Spence, G. B., Cavanagh, M. J., & Grant, A. M. (2008). The integration of mindfulness training and health coaching: An exploratory study. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 1*, 145-163.

Star, C., & Hammer, S. (2008). Teaching generic skills: eroding the higher purpose of universities, or an opportunity for renewal? *Oxford Review of Education, 34,* 237-251. doi: 10.1080/03054980701672232

Starkey, K., & Tiratsoo, N. (2007). *The business school and the bottom line.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Stern, L. R. (2004). Executive coaching: A working definition. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56,* 154-162. doi: org/10.1037/1065-9293.56.3.154

Sue-Chan, C., & Latham, G. P. (2004). The relative effectiveness of external, peer, and self-coaches. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53,* 260–278. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00171.x

Swart, J., & Harcup, J. (2013). 'If I learn do we learn?' The link between executive coaching and organizational learning. *Management Learning, 44,* 337-354. doi: 10.1177/1350507612447916

Taie, E. S. (2011). Coaching as an approach to enhance performance. *Journal for Quality and Participation, 34,* 34-38.

The Complete University Guide (2017). *The Complete University Guide*. Available from: https://www.thecompleteuniversityguide.co.uk (last accessed 21/05/17).

The Guardian News (2017). *University League Tables 2017*. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/education/ng-interactive/2016/may/23/university-league-tables-2017 (last accessed 21/05/17).

The Times (2016). *Top by Subject*. Available from: https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/top-by-subject-mgbnm672r (last accessed 21/05/17).

Tolhurst, J. (2010). *The essential guide to coaching and mentoring.* Harlow: Longman Pearson Education.

Turnball, J. (2009). *Coaching for Learning*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Unistats (n.d.). *About Unistats; Key Information Set (KIS).* Available from: https://unistats.direct.gov.uk/find-out-more/key-information-set/ (last accessed 21/05/17).

Vidal-Salazar, M. a. D., Ferro´n-Vı´lchez, V., & Cordo´n-Pozo , E. (2012). Coaching: An effective practice for business competitiveness. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal, 22*, 423-433. doi: 10.1108/10595421211266302

Walker-Fraser, A. (2011). An HR perspective on executive coaching for organisational learning. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 9,* 67-79

Wangenge-Ouma, G. (2008). Higher education marketisation and its discontents: the case of quality in Kenya. *Higher Education, 56*, 457-471. doi: 10.1007/s10734-007-9104-2

Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2003). Executive coaching: An outcome study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 55,* 94. doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.55.2.94

Wasylyshyn, K. M., Gronsky, B., & Haas, J. W. (2006). Tigers, stripes and behaviour change: Survey results of a commissioned coaching program. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 58,* 65-81. doi: 10.1037/1065-9293.58.2.65

Weiler, H. N. (2000). States, markets and university funding: New paradigms for the reform of higher education in Europe. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 30,* 333-339. doi: 10.1080/713657469

Westerman, J. W., Bergman, J. Z., Bergman, S. M., & Daly, J. P. (2012). Are universities creating millennial narcissistic employees? An empirical examination of narcissism in business students and its implications. *Journal of Management Education, 36,* 5-32. doi: 10.1177/1052562911408097

Western, S. (2012). *Coaching and mentoring: A critical text*. London: SAGE Publications

Whitmore, J. (1992). *Coaching for performance*. London: Nicholas Brealey.

Wylde, A. (2005). Improved goals, action plans, planning ahead and reflection: students' self-assessment of coaching. *Investigations in university teaching and learning, 2*, 54-58. ISSN 1740-5106.

TABLES

Table 1: Comparison of coaching and teaching, taken from Turnball (2009) (p. 41)

Teaching	Coaching
Subject-specific expertise	Generic helping skills that can be applied to different contexts
Relationship of different status between teacher and student	Depends upon creating a sharing trustful relationship
Gives advice	Avoids giving advice
Offers answers from their own 'expert' position	Maintains a belief that people can find their own answers
High level of knowledge in their area of expertise	High level of skills in precision questioning and reflecting
Gives guidance on the acquisition of subject knowledge and skills	Coachee has ownership of change and development
Provides a blend of support with advice	Provides a blend of support with high challenge
Takes a focus on specific subject knowledge and skills	Takes the perspective of the whole person in order to focus on solutions