

DIRECTIVE COACHING PREFERENCE AT INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITAS CIPUTRA

Agustiono¹

Universitas of Ciputra Surabaya
INDONESIA

Emails:¹agustiono@ciputra.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Each International Business Management student of Universitas Ciputra must take a series of entrepreneurial project class from semester one until semester seven. In each of those semesters, they were accompanied by a facilitator in doing their business project. Their startup project begins in semester two and three and followed by innovation and expansion in semester four and five. This research will focus on the startup phase of the business. In semester three and four, the students were yet to acquire enough knowledge to run their start up. This research used qualitative research to explore student's preference in directive coaching. Five students were interviewed with a semi structured question and their answers were categorized to find the answer of the research problem. The result showed that the student expect more of informing from facilitator. They expect facilitator to help them identifies the problem and suggest opinions based on facilitator experience. They also expect facilitator to have an experience and give advice based on it which is more of mentoring rather than coaching.

Keywords: coaching, mentoring, project based learning

INTRODUCTION

As Universitas Ciputra vision is creating world class entrepreneur, it emphasize its education using project based learning. Each student must pass entrepreneurship 1-5 (also called E-reboan) where they experience startups and running a business. For International Business Management Program student, they also must pass entrepreneurial project course which stress more on business performance rather than business process. Each group of students who run a startups will be under supervision of a lecturer. The lecturer act as a facilitator where they try to create an active environment that embraces participants' prior knowledge and unique learning style.

Each facilitator may have different approach in guiding students project. Some may choose to approach the student as a mentor and some choose to act a coach for the students. Each approach has its own advantages and disadvantages. Depending on the readiness of the students (in term of knowledge and skill), their motivation and the skill of the facilitator itself.

One of important aspect in guiding the student is the coaching style of the facilitator. Berk (2010) argue that a mismatch in coaching style between coach and coachee's expectation will

put coachee in a stressful situation and worsen their relationship. Without any conducive environment, coachee (the students) will not be eager to pursue their passion.

Greif (2007) reiterates that the main difficulty in coaching is the heterogeneity of problem and goals. Different problem requires different approach in coaching. Cordingley (2004 in Paul Levy and Andrea Rippen 2013), conclude that one the leading cause of failure in coaching in the misunderstanding of the role, responsibility and expectation. This means that different level of students will also requires different approach in coaching. This research will focus on student who were in their start up phase of their business (semester 3 and 4)

To find the ideal coaching style, the first step to do is to know the expectation of the students regarding the coaching style. Although not necessarily what the students prefer were the best coaching style for them but at least with this information, facilitator will have references in developing the coaching style that match the students preference and the learning outcome. This is important in motivating the students to conduct their startups.

Based on the background, the research question is how the preferred directive coaching style at International Business Management Universitas Ciputra. The result of this paper will give input to the lecturer on what the student expect from them. The facilitator might have different opinion but by knowing student's expectation, the lecturer can give explanation on the purpose of choosing a certain coaching style. This will avoid misunderstanding from the student side that they might feel that the lecturer did not have capabilities or experience. This is due to the nature of coaching which focus on questioning to help the student find answer on their own.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Facilitator may choose a mentoring or coaching approach in interacting and guiding the students. Here are a brief comparison between them:

Table 1. Comparison between coaching and mentoring

Mentoring	Coaching
Long term relation. Develop friendship	Short term, stress the importance of openness and honesty
More flexible and informal during meeting	Structured meeting
More specialist, share experience/advise to problems faced	More generalist, not giving answer or advise but helping coachee to find answer on their own

Source: <http://www.brefigroup.co.uk>

From Table 1, we can see that each approach has its own advantages and disadvantages. A better relation and more informal meeting arrangement will make the student feel having a good relation with facilitator (Chepchieng at al., 2006). Chepchieng also conclude that students' interpersonal relation with facilitator greatly impact their aspirations, values, attitudes, beliefs and actions. The problem with mentoring is that it requires expertise of facilitator so that he/she can give advice or share experience.

As one facilitator may supervise up to 12 businesses, it will be difficult to give advises or share experiences to all group as the facilitator might not be an expert in every business. Coaching focus more on helping students to find answer for their problem. The required expertise on facilitator side is that he/she must be able to develop coaching skill. Although coaching has a more structured approach, it can be "bend" into a more informal approach as in mentoring (Augustine, 2014).

Parsloe (1999) define coaching a a process of learning and developing to improve performance. The main problem in coaching is the heterogeneity in problems and goals so that it requires difference coaching style (Greif 2007). McMagnus (2006) identified two main coaching style: directive and supportive.

Table 2. Coaching Style

Coaching style	Indicator	Remarks
<i>Directive</i>	<i>Prescribing</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Giving inputs and guidance 2. Informing standard behavior 3. Informing what should be done
	<i>Informing</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Giving opinion 2. Explaining the background of an issue 3. Help to understand the background of an issue
	<i>Challenging / Confronting</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Challenge coachee thinking 2. Reiterate coachee commitment and action 3. Identifying coachee weakness 4. Helping coachee not to repeat the same mistake again
<i>Facilitative / Supportive / pulling</i>	<i>Discovering</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-reflection 2. Help coachee to learn independently
	<i>Releasing</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Help coachee to identifies their problems
	<i>Supporting</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raising coachee self confidence 2. Challenge risk taking

Source: department of economic development, Abu Dhabi university knowledge group

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a descriptive qualitative research. This method will explore informant’s opinion to answer research problem (Coghlan and Brannick, 2012). The number of informants for this research are 5 students who complete semester 3 (startup). The informants profile are:

1. Semester 4th students of IBM UC
2. Have conducted start up business

Informants will be interviewed with a semi structured question and the result will be group and analyze.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Student who enroll to International Business Management Universitas Ciputra (IBM-UC) must take entrepreneurship project 1-7. Those are project based learning where student must do startup and run a business under guidance of a facilitator. One facilitator on average supervise 10 group projects with 3-4 different industries. This posed a problem as a facilitator may not has experience in all student's business. Therefore, option to act as coach is more suitable (Parsloe, 1999)

Considering that the student at semester 3-4 still has a limited knowledge in running business, a directive approach is considered more suitable (McMagnus, 2006). As they start to build their expertise, they still need and expect direct advice from facilitator. Supportive coaching is more suitable for coachee with medium knowledge, skill and high motivation (essentialimpact.wordpress.com, 2013)

On the other side, students also has expectation to their facilitator coaching style. A match approach between student's expectation and facilitator style would improve the student's motivation and performance in running their business. By knowing the student's expectation, the facilitator can adjust their coaching style as long as it is in accordance with the instructional design of the entrepreneurial project course than it will be beneficial.

Based on the interview, the student expects more on informing. Informant 1 mention that

“we need help in expanding our market, so we hope that facilitator can share their business network and introduce us to them. It is like opening a door for us to enter an industry as a starting point. From then on, we can do snowball using our network. So we do really need them to open the door for us”.

One of the student with high motivation ask a challenge from facilitator. He felled that challenge will motivate him and make him gain real business experience. The students' experience will bring benefit as he gain lesson outside classroom. Informant 5 claim that

“the good thing about entrepreneurial project is that they were given a heavier burden. Although sometimes it like an impossible task, but seeing other group can achieve them show us that it is achievable and should I fail to do so it means I don't work well enough”.

Other informant basically have the same opinion. They feel that facilitator should help them to “jump start” their business. At least they want facilitator to help them to understand any issue behind their problem and give input / opinion. They also need help in market information of their business. The summary of the student's respond on the directive coaching style can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3. Interview Summary

Directive Coaching Style					
Indicator	Informant 1	Informant 2	Informant 3	Informant 4	Informant 5
prescribing			Facilitator should explain what are expected from the students. The students should know the target of the current semester		Facilitator should consider the target assign to the student whether they are achievable or not considering all the students activity and assignment from other course
informing	Facilitator should focus more the process rther than just the profit. They should help us to introduce to their network as we need it to open new market. Facilitator should be someone who has the resources to help students business	Facilitator should share their experience so student's business can run better. It will also avoid unnecessary mistake that might cost the students money	Facilitator should share experience and give solution to the student's business problem. Do not just explain the theory but give real solution	Facilitor should not focus only on the business performance but also to improve students ability to face challenges. Don't just look at the number but also the progress of the students managerial skill	Facilitator should share information needed to do business such as market opportunity, market research and network opportunity so it can improve students success in business

<p>challenging</p>	<p>Facilitator must also help to improve student's managerial skill. It is not just a knowledge but a skill so it will be better if facilitator can share the experience in handling a case or problem so we can learn from actual event rather than theory in the book</p>			<p>Coachee action should be the focus rather than business report. Afterall, that's what count rather than just business report. Tell what the coachee did right and wrong</p>	<p>There should be enough challenge to motivate coachee. Coachee should be push and challenge to raise motivation.</p>
---------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

Source: interview data

In project based learning, the facilitator (coach) will help to brings out the best potential of a student. They do that by asking leading and open-ended questions. It is expected that the student will explore the situation and develop their critical thinking. It will also help students to reflect on their experiences. By doing reflection, the student will self develops their professional skill (Schon, 1987) and also their improves problem solving (Kimbell et al.,1991)

From table 3, we can see that students still expect a lot of help from facilitator in the form of informing. This shows that the student, either aware or not, still have tendencies toward mentoring. This pose a challenge for facilitator. Should they miss understood the purpose of a facilitator applying a coaching approach and why they will gain more benefit from it, they will feel disappointed because they felt gaining nothing from facilitator.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the student did still expect a lot of guidance from facilitator. This is due to their early startups and required more time to build knowledge and skill in running a business. They need help in information/issues processing and still need convincing when they suggest plan of action to deal with them (informing). Facilitator need to explain regarding the benefit of coaching and how it should be done. This is important to avoid misunderstanding. As the student progress to higher semester, facilitator should emphasize more on developing student's ability to explore and find answer to their problems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer would like to express gratitude to Dirjen DIKTI which partially support the funding of this research. This research is part of Hibah DIKTI 2017.

REFERENCES

Agustiono. 2014. Mentoring and Coaching in Project Based Learning. The third International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Business Management

Cook, Marchall J and Poole, Laura. 2011. *Effective Coaching*. USA. McGraw Hill Companies, Inc

Crane, Thomas G. 2010. *The Heart of Coaching: Using Transformational Coaching to Create a High Performance Coaching Culture*. USA. FTA Press.

Coghlan & Brannick. 2012. in S Sarosa, *Penelitian Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Indeks

Greif, S. (2007). Advances in research on coaching outcomes. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2(3), 222-247.

Hofstede center survey (<http://geert-hofstede.com/indonesia.html>)

http://www.brefigroup.co.uk/coaching/coaching_and_mentoring.html#sthash.JI0w2tTR.dpuf

<https://essentialimpact.wordpress.com/2013/02/14/directive-or-non-directive-coaching-whats-the-best-approach/> (access 15 July 2016)

Kimbell, R., K Stables, T. Wheeler, A, Wosniak and V. Kelly (1991). *The Assessment of Performance in Design and Technology*. National Examination and Assessment Council, Newcombe House, London.

McManus, Patty. 2006. *Coaching People*. Harvard Business School Press

Parsloe, Eric. 1999. *The Manager as Coach and Mentor*. Institute of Personnel & Development

Paul Levy dan Andrea Rippen 2013. *Reaching your goal, Improving your future*

Renton, Jane. 2009. *Coaching and Mentoring: What they are and how to make the most of them*. London. Profile books Ltd.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.