



Journal of Advanced Research in Technology and Innovation Management

Journal homepage:
<https://karyailham.com.my/index.php/jartim/index>
ISSN: 2811-4744



Coaching First, Mentoring Next: A Clarity - Navigation Model for Leadership Development

Masni Mustafa^{1,*}

¹ European Institute of Management & Technology, Hinterbergstrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 July 2025
Received in revised form 3 September 2025
Accepted 25 September 2025
Available online 21 October 2025

Keywords:

Coaching; mentoring; leadership development;
GASCI; programme design

ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper proposes a sequential Clarity–Navigation model that places structured coaching before mentoring to strengthen leadership development. Using the GASCI framework (Goal, Alternatives, Strategies, Consequences, Implementation), the coaching phase produces clear aims, viable plans and early progress. A formal transition then moves leaders into a mentoring phase focused on navigating organisational context, accountability and sustained behavioural change via a Plan–Act–Review cadence. We synthesise contemporary evidence and derive testable propositions and practical design guidelines. The sequence aims to improve transfer of learning and equity of access while maintaining ethical and governance standards.

1. Introduction

Leadership development is a strategic priority across industries, yet results remain inconsistent. Treating coaching and mentoring as interchangeable can blur objectives, weaken the theory of change, and limit impact. Our simple premise is that sequence matters: begin with coaching to establish clarity around goals, constraints, and behavioural commitments, then follow with mentoring to navigate organisational realities and sustain progress. We call this the Clarity–Navigation model.

In a coaching engagement, the coach employs techniques such as questioning, reflective listening, targeted feedback, and structured exercises to help individuals clarify their aspirations, surface blind spots, and commit to specific behavioural changes. Meta-analyses most notably Theeboom *et al.*, [15] have consistently linked coaching to improvements in self-efficacy, goal attainment, and overall job performance.

By contrast, mentoring is a longer-term relationship in which a more experienced individual guides a less experienced mentee through the nuances of organisational culture, networks, and career pathways. Mentors draw on their own knowledge and influence to sponsor opportunities,

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: masni.mustafa@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.37934/jartim.17.1.111>

offer advice on navigating complex political landscapes, and provide ongoing support as mentees develop professionally. Empirical studies, including the work of Allen, Eby, and Lentz (2006), demonstrate that mentoring relationships are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, improved retention rates, and accelerated career advancement.

2. Methodology (Conceptual Paper)

We position this article as a conceptual, theory-building contribution. Rather than reporting a single empirical study, we synthesise streams of evidence and practice knowledge to articulate a mechanism that links coaching to mentoring through a deliberate transition. The logic of inquiry follows three steps. First, we review convergent findings on what coaching reliably delivers in organisational settings: enhanced goal clarity, solution generation, and commitment to action when the coaching process is structured and time-bound. Second, we interrogate where mentoring is uniquely valuable: opening doors to organisational knowledge, navigating politics, maintaining momentum over longer cycles, and stewarding identity work as roles expand. Third, we specify how a sequential design can reduce the common failure points seen when either approach operates alone.

Our synthesis draws on abductive reasoning. We treat recurring observations from practice (for example, “mentees flounder when aims are fuzzy” or “coachees lose momentum after a programme ends”) as clues that require an explanatory model. We iteratively develop the Clarity–Navigation model by aligning those clues with principles from behaviour change, goal systems theory, and socio-cognitive learning. The GASCI framework—Goal, Alternatives, Strategies, Consequences, Implementation—anchors the coaching phase to ensure that clarity is not merely aspirational, but operationalised into decisions and early actions.

We distinguish between two evidence claims. The first is existence: that a sequential design is feasible and coherent. The second is effectiveness: that the design improves outcomes versus common alternatives (coaching-only, mentoring-only, or unsequenced blends). This article targets the existence claim by specifying constructs, boundary conditions, and propositions that can be tested. Throughout, we report practical design guidance to assist organisations in responsible implementation. This article adopts a theory-building and synthesis approach. We integrate findings from recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses of workplace coaching and mentoring to articulate a sequenced mechanism linking clarity and navigation. We specify boundary conditions and derive propositions for empirical testing. The intent is to present a coherent, evidence-informed framework that can be implemented and evaluated in organisational settings.

3. Conceptual Foundations

Coaching and mentoring share a family resemblance while performing distinct developmental jobs. Coaching, especially when structured around brief cycles, excels at sharpening the immediate task environment: generating well-formed goals, surfacing options, selecting strategies, anticipating consequences, and setting up implementation supports. Mentoring, by contrast, functions as a medium-to-long-horizon relationship embedded within an organisational context; it helps a developing leader interpret the landscape, broker connections, and persevere through setbacks. When these modes are blurred, participants can become over-mentored before they are ready or over-coached without subsequent sponsorship. Two conceptual threads motivate a sequential design. The first is the principle of progress begets engagement. Early evidence of movement, however small, boosts self-efficacy, which in turn strengthens the quality of subsequent social learning with a mentor. The second is fit before access. Mentoring provides access to context,

networks, and tacit norms. Access is most developmental when the mentee arrives with a clear sense of direction, decision criteria, and a draft plan that can be stress-tested. A GASCI-based coaching phase furnishes this readiness by requiring the coachee to specify outcomes (Goal), generate and contrast options (Alternatives), choose a play (Strategies), consider trade-offs (Consequences), and begin to act (Implementation).

We also note boundary conditions. The sequence is particularly suitable for (a) early-career leaders moving into broader roles, (b) high-potential professionals who need traction on role redesign or innovation, and (c) teams seeking a shared language for decision making. It may be less suitable when (i) urgent remediation is required (where coaching and mentoring may need to run in parallel for risk management), or (ii) the organisation lacks mentors with sufficient proximity to influence systems. In such cases, the coaching phase can still deliver clarity, but the subsequent navigation work may require a sponsor rather than a mentor.

2.1 Coaching and Mentoring: Related, not the Same

In contemporary organisational practice, coaching is typically time-bound, goal-oriented and led by a process expert, while mentoring is relationship-centred, longer-term and led by a content/context expert. Coaching partners with a client to facilitate progress against self-defined aims using structured dialogue and accountability; mentoring supplements this with sponsor-like functions - sense-making, network access and political navigation. Conflating the two invites design drift. A practice-based perspective recognises overlap (e. g., reflective inquiry), yet preserves boundary conditions: coaches avoid directing content; mentors may share advice and open doors, within ethical guidelines.

2.2 Evidence Base and Implications for Sequence

Recent systematic reviews of workplace coaching report moderate, positive effects on individual performance, skill acquisition, and attitudinal outcomes across a variety of delivery modalities. For instance, Theeboom *et al.*, [15] found that one-to-one and group coaching interventions yield improvements in goal attainment and self-efficacy, while Cannon-Bowers *et al.*, [5] documented similar gains in a meta-analysis covering both virtual and face-to-face formats. More recent evidence from Hu *et al.*, [9] highlights that coaching for healthcare managers enhances clinical leadership behaviours, suggesting that contextual factors such as sector and role specificity moderate effectiveness. Despite this robust evidence base, scholars caution that effect sizes vary and that methodological heterogeneity particularly in outcome measures and follow-up durations can obscure true impact [8,11].

Leadership development research similarly affirms the promise of structured programmes but emphasises a persistent “transfer gap” between training contexts and real-world application. Day [6] demonstrated in a longitudinal study that clarity gained during leadership coaching often decays if not reinforced by organisational systems. Geerts [8] and CIPD (2023) both recommend embedding application exercises, action learning sets, and sponsor engagement to ensure managers apply new behaviours on the job. Mullen and Noe [10] argue for multilevel integration linking individual coaching plans to team goals and organisational metrics to solidify behavioural change. Without these design elements, leadership development initiatives may produce short-lived gains that fail to translate into sustained performance improvements.

A parallel body of mentoring research underscores the psychosocial and contextual benefits that emerge from dyadic and triadic mentoring relationships. Allen *et al.*, [2] and Allen *et al.*, [3] reported that high-quality mentoring correlates with mentees’ increased job satisfaction, career resilience,

and organisational commitment. More recent studies by Prummer *et al.*, [12] show that mentoring interventions significantly develop emotional intelligence and identity work, especially when mentors are systematically matched and supported by programme coordinators. Yang *et al.*, (2024) further found that mentoring fosters proactive behaviour among new employees by expanding their network of sponsors and removing organisational barriers. Collectively, these findings indicate that mentoring excels at providing contextual guidance, emotional support, and opportunity structures that facilitate long-term career advancement.

Synthesising insights from coaching and mentoring literatures reveals a complementary logic: coaching is ideally suited to clarify personal objectives, generate implementation intentions, and build initial self-efficacy, whereas mentoring excels at navigating contextual frictions and embedding new behaviours within organisational systems. Stokes *et al.*, [14] describe coaching as “clarity work” and mentoring as “context work,” emphasising that each process addresses distinct developmental needs. Ellinger *et al.*, [7] likewise argue for an integrated approach, noting that combining coaching’s action-orientation with mentoring’s relational support maximizes developmental impact. Empirical propositions from Stern and Proserpio [13] suggest that leadership learning transfers more effectively when clarity and commitment generated through coaching are followed by contextual navigation via mentoring.

Based on this synthesis, a sequenced approach coaching first, mentoring next should raise the probability that leadership development efforts translate into lasting behavioural change. Initial coaching engagements using structured frameworks (e. g., GASCI: Goal, Alternatives, Strategies, Consequences, Implementation) create clear, personalized action plans and strengthen commitment [6,15]. Subsequently, a six- to nine-month mentoring phase can help leaders apply those plans, navigate organisational politics, and sustain momentum [1,12]. Designing programmes with a formal transition protocol, sponsor involvement, and integrated progress metrics promises to bridge the transfer gap and deliver robust leadership outcomes. Future research should empirically compare staged versus concurrent models to validate this sequencing effect and refine best practices for inclusive leadership development.

2.3 GASCI as a Clarity Mechanism

GASCI - Goal, Alternatives, Strategies, Consequences, Implementation - is a structured, solution-focused sequence for coaching conversations. It clarifies the desired state, surfaces options, architects strategies, anticipates trade-offs and commits to implementation. We position GASCI as the front-end ‘engine’ that generates cognitive clarity, implementation intentions and self-efficacy, thereby creating readiness for mentoring to convert plans into situated action.

3. The Clarity–Navigation Model

The model unfolds in two phases with a formal hand-over protocol. Phase 1: Clarity via GASCI (coach-led, time-bound). The coaching engagement runs for a defined number of sessions (for example, four to six). Each conversation uses the GASCI scaffold:

- Goal: Specify observable outcomes and decision criteria; align with role mandate and organisational priorities.
- Alternatives: Map feasible routes; include low-cost probes as well as bolder plays.
- Strategies: Select a path; specify resources, interdependencies, and scope boundaries.
- Consequences: Anticipate trade-offs, stakeholder reactions, and opportunity costs; identify metrics and thresholds.
- Implementation: Initiate a first action within a short window; set up a Plan–Act–Review cadence.

Artifacts produced include a one-page logic of change, a risk/assumption register, and a two-cycle action plan. Ethical safeguards cover confidentiality, voluntary participation, and escalation pathways for wellbeing concerns. Transition protocol (Clarity → Navigation). The coach and client co-author a concise transition brief summarising aims, choices, early learning, and open questions. With consent, this brief is shared with the assigned mentor. A three-way “handover” meeting confirms expectations, cadence (for example, monthly), and the boundaries between coaching and mentoring roles. The coaching relationship then steps back or concludes. Phase 2: Navigation (mentor-led, relationship-based). The mentor’s work is to help the mentee interpret and influence context: mapping stakeholders, rehearsing political tactics with integrity, sequencing bets, and maintaining momentum. The mentor uses the same Plan–Act–Review cadence but at a broader timescale. Mentoring conversations explicitly revisit assumptions surfaced during coaching, updating them as new information arrives. Where needed, the mentor brokers introductions, opens doors to data, and provides challenge and encouragement.

Governance is provided by a programme sponsor who monitors aggregate progress and equity of access, without intruding on confidential content. The sponsor ensures that mentors are supported, trained, and recognised, and that the programme’s evaluation generates learning for the organisation.

3.1 Phase 1 (Clarity): Coaching with GASCI Model

- Goal: Define leadership outcomes (e. g., role transition success metrics, stakeholder shifts).
- Alternatives: Generate options (behavioural tactics, learning pathways, decision rules).
- Strategies: Select and sequence actions; assign owners and support systems.
- Consequences: Stress-test strategies for risks, ethics, inclusion and unintended effects.
- Implementation: Lock commitments (who, what, when, evidence) and accountability. Outputs include sharpened goals, prioritised actions, risk-aware plans and explicit measures of progress. Psychological mechanisms include enhanced self-efficacy, implementation intentions and attentional control.

3.2 Transition Protocol: From Coaching to Mentoring

Key deliverables are:

- Implementation Charter (A1)
- 90-Day Plan (A2)
- Stakeholder and Network Map (A3)
- Risks and Ethics Log (A4)
- Data Plan (A5)

The transition unfolds in three stages:

T1 - Closure

T2 - Handover

T3 - Triadic Kick-off Meeting (including the line manager)

3.3 Phase 2 (Navigation): Structured Mentoring to Embed and Extend

Mentoring is delivered through a disciplined framework that converts plans into situated action while expanding opportunity structures. Cadence and duration: 6–9 months; meetings every 2–4 weeks;

optional ad-hoc 'office hours'. Cycle: Plan → Act → Review (PAR) against the Implementation Charter and 90-Day Plan. A typical session covers evidence review, barrier busting, practice/rehearsal, commitments and reflection. Deliverables and checkpoints span months 1–6+, with governance and boundaries clarified in a Mentoring Compact. Measurement integrates self- and 360-ratings, objective KPIs and network analytics.

3.4 Theory of Change (Textual Model)

GASCI-based coaching builds clarity; defining precise goals, credible plans, and self-efficacy which then flows through a formal transition protocol (A1–A5; T1–T3) into a structured mentoring phase guided by a Plan-Action-Review cycle, clear agendas, and concrete deliverables; this, in turn, enables effective navigation of access, timing, and adaptation, ultimately driving sustained behavioural change and positive stakeholder outcomes.

5. Propositions for Empirical Testing

We propose the following testable statements to guide research:

Proposition 1 (Clarity): Coaching structured around the GASCI model will generate greater goal clarity, stronger implementation intentions, and higher self-efficacy than unstructured development efforts.

Proposition 2 (Transfer): Beginning with coaching will lead to more substantial on-the-job behavioural change than starting with mentoring or running coaching and mentoring concurrently.

Proposition 3 (Navigation): Following GASCI-based coaching with a structured mentoring phase will expand leaders' networks more broadly and boost their political skills more than coaching alone.

Proposition 4 (Performance): Over a six- to twelve-month period, the two-phase (coaching + mentoring) approach will deliver higher leadership performance ratings and better stakeholder outcomes than any single-modality intervention.

Proposition 5 (Boundary Conditions): The sequential advantage will be most evident during highly uncertain role transitions and in cultures with high power distance, where navigating organisational dynamics is especially challenging.

Proposition 6 (Mechanisms): The benefits of the two-phase sequence will operate through two key mechanisms: clarity (e. g., goal specificity and plan quality) and navigation (e. g., strength of network ties and mentoring quality).

Proposition 7 (Equity): When mentoring is intentionally inclusive, the coaching-then-mentoring sequence will more effectively close access gaps for under-represented leaders than ad-hoc mentoring alone.

6. Design implications for organisations

Programme architecture. Begin with a short, high-intensity coaching sprint (for example, 6–8 weeks) culminating in a transition brief. Schedule a triadic handover (coach–mentee–mentor), then shift to a mentoring cadence (for example, monthly) for six to nine months. Use standard artefacts (brief template, risk register, review log) to lighten administrative burden.

Selection and matching

Select mentees based on readiness and role opportunity rather than seniority. Match mentors for contextual reach and developmental stance, not merely technical similarity. Offer mentors a compact toolkit that includes questioning strategies, escalation routes, and guardrails for boundaries.

Equity and access

Publish the programme intent and criteria. Invite self-nominations with manager endorsement. Monitor participation data to identify bottlenecks and address inadvertent exclusion. Provide alternative pathways (for example, group mentoring) where supply of mentors is thin.

Capability building

Train coaches on the practical use of GASCI, especially the “Consequences” step, which often receives less attention yet prevents downstream friction. Prepare mentors to work with the transition brief rather than re-running the coaching work. Provide supervision or a community of practice for both roles.

Measurement

Combine leading indicators (clarity ratings, plan quality, first action taken) with lagging indicators (role performance, stakeholder feedback, retention). Use a small number of meaningful metrics and review them at programme checkpoints. Where possible, build a quasi-experimental evaluation (for example, phased rollout with matched comparisons).

Intake and Matching

Conduct a coaching-readiness assessment and engage certified coaches for Phase 1 alongside domain-expert mentors for Phase 2. Match mentees with mentors based on their goals, organisational context knowledge, and shared values.

Structure and Dosage

Phase 1 (Coaching): 3–6 sessions over 8–12 weeks, concluding with an Implementation Charter and a 90-Day Action Plan. Phase 2 (Mentoring): Bi-monthly meetings over 6–9 months, following a Plan-Act-Review cycle.

Governance and Ethics

Define clear role boundaries—coaches as process experts, mentors as content and context guides. Uphold confidentiality, manage conflicts of interest, and observe sponsorship ethics.

Inclusion

Maintain a diverse mentor bench, track engagement and outcomes by demographic segment, and treat mentoring as a standard development opportunity rather than a remedial measure.

Measurement

Establish indicators at multiple levels:

- Individual - behavioural change, self-efficacy
- Team - climate, engagement
- Organisation - retention, performance

Transfer Scaffolds

After each coaching session, record specific commitments. In mentoring, review progress against the 90-Day Plan and help secure resources as needed.

Table 1

GASCI coaching sequence and outputs

GASCI Step	Coaching Focus	Typical Outputs
Goal	Define desired leadership outcomes and success metrics	Specific goals; KPIs; stakeholder map
Alternatives	Generate options and pathways	Option list; quick-wins; learning targets
Strategies	Select and sequence actions	90-Day Plan; owners; resources
Consequences	Anticipate risks, ethics and inclusion	Risk log; mitigations; decision rules
Implementation	Commit and track progress	Implementation Charter; evidence plan; review cadence

Table 2

Structured mentoring framework (6–9 months)

Month	Focus	Key Activities	Deliverables
0	Handover	Triadic kick-off; review A1–A5; confirm cadence	Mentoring Compact; meeting calendar
1	Early execution	Barrier busting; first stakeholder meetings; rehearsal	Two actions complete; evidence logged
2	Experimentation	Contextual experiments; introductions; visibility opportunities	Decision log started; sponsor touchpoint
3	Mid-point review	Update 90-Day Plan; refine risks; network check	Mid-point report; adjusted plan
4–5	Expansion	Stretch assignments; political timing; sponsorship	Documented opportunities; stakeholder feedback
6+	Consolidation/closure	Outcome review; capture learning; decide on continuation	Outcome report; continuation/closure plan

7. Research Agenda and Methods

(A) Process studies. Use longitudinal designs to track how clarity develops during coaching and how it travels into mentoring. Collect artefacts (goals, options, strategies) and code for specificity and decision-usefulness. Analyse how the transition brief is used in early mentoring conversations.

(B) Comparative effectiveness. Compare sequential vs coaching-only vs mentoring-only arms. Use matched samples or stepped-wedge rollout to strengthen causal inference where randomisation is impractical. Outcome variables include clarity indices, time to first win, persistence of behaviour change, and multi-source performance ratings.

(C) Boundary conditions. Test moderation by role complexity, organisational turbulence, and mentor proximity to decision networks. Explore differential effects for under-represented groups to evaluate the equity proposition.

Method choices should prioritise feasibility and ethical care. Mixed methods are recommended: brief validated scales, structured document review, and qualitative analysis of conversations (with consent). Reporting should include intervention fidelity (for example, whether GASCI steps were completed) and exposure to mentoring (for example, number and length of sessions).

To evaluate the model robustly, set up three study conditions:

Coaching first, followed by structured mentoring

Mentoring first, then coaching

Coaching and mentoring delivered concurrently

Use a mixed-methods design with multiple data sources collected at baseline, 3, 6, and 12 months. Include longitudinal behavioural metrics, social network analysis, and experience-sampling methods. Finally, test for moderating effects of factors like role level, organisational culture, and gender, and explore mediators such as clarity and social capital.

8. Limitations

This article is conceptual and does not present new empirical data. The sequence we propose may not address acute performance risks where immediate oversight is required. Mentor availability and organisational sponsorship vary widely and can constrain programme quality. Finally, while GASCI offers a robust scaffold for coaching, other models may be preferred in some contexts; the sequential logic can still apply if the coaching phase achieves the same clarity outcomes.

The model presumes access to skilled coaches and mentors and to organisations that support transfer; small firms may require external consortia. Ethical sponsorship must be resourced. Sequencing advantages may attenuate for expert leaders with established networks or in very flat contexts where navigation costs are low.

9. Conclusion

Sequencing coaching before mentoring is a pragmatic way to align individual growth with organisational value. By using GASCI to produce clarity, documenting that clarity in a brief, and handing over to a mentor who can navigate context, organisations can improve transfer, sustainment

and equity. We encourage practitioners to adopt the model, evaluate it rigorously, and refine it with local learning.

Coaching and mentoring are complementary. When sequenced deliberately, coaching generates clarity and commitment; mentoring navigates context to embed and extend change. The Clarity–Navigation model, operationalised through GASCI, a formal transition protocol and a structured mentoring framework, offers a theory-led, practice-ready pathway for leadership development.

Acknowledgement

This research was not funded by any grant.

Declarations

Conflict of interest

The author declares no competing interests.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethical approval

This article is a conceptual paper and did not involve participation from individuals or organisations.

Data availability

No datasets were generated or analysed for this study.

Author contributions

Sole author: conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, writing – original draft, and writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks colleagues and reviewers for their constructive feedback.

References

- [1] Allen, Tammy D., Lillian T. Eby, Kimberly E. O'Brien, and Elizabeth Lentz. "The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications." *Journal of vocational behavior* 73, no. 3 (2008): 343-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.004>
- [2] Allen, Tammy D., Lillian T. Eby, and Elizabeth Lentz. "Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: closing the gap between research and practice." *Journal of applied psychology* 91, no. 3 (2006): 567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.004>
- [3] Allen, Tammy D., Lillian T. Eby, Kimberly E. O'Brien, and Elizabeth Lentz. "The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications." *Journal of vocational behavior* 73, no. 3 (2008): 343-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.004>
- [4] Allen, Tammy D., Lillian T. Eby, and Elizabeth Lentz. "Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: closing the gap between research and practice." *Journal of applied psychology* 91, no. 3 (2006): 567. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.567>
- [5] Cannon-Bowers, Janis A., Clint A. Bowers, Catherine E. Carlson, Shannon L. Doherty, Jocelyne Evans, and Julie Hall. "Workplace coaching: a meta-analysis and recommendations for advancing the science of coaching." *Frontiers in psychology* 14 (2023): 1204166. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1204166>
- [6] Day, D. V. (. 2022. "The role of clarity in leadership coaching: Results from a quantitative study. , (3), 347–360
- [7] Ellinger, A. D., Hamlin, R. G. and Beattie, R. S. (. 2020. "A tribute to the future: Toward a theory of integrated coaching and mentoring. , (1), 45–68

- [8] Geerts, Jaason M. "Maximizing the impact and ROI of leadership development: A theory-and evidence-informed framework." *Behavioral Sciences* 14, no. 10 (2024): 955. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100955>
- [9] Hu, Shuang, Maritta Välimäki, Siying Liu, Xianhong Li, Batool Shumaila, Wenqiu Huang, Xincen Liu et al. "Coaching to develop leadership of healthcare managers: a mixed-methods systematic review." *BMC medical education* 24, no. 1 (2024): 1083. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06081-y>
- [10] Mullen, C. A. and Noe, R. A. (. 2021. "Integrating coaching and mentoring in organizations: A multilevel perspective. , (5), 264–282
- [11] Nicolau, Andreea, Octav Sorin Candel, Ticu Constantin, and Ad Kleingeld. "The effects of executive coaching on behaviors, attitudes, and personal characteristics: A meta-analysis of randomized control trial studies." *Frontiers in psychology* 14 (2023): 1089797. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1089797>
- [12] Prummer, Katharina, Salomé Human-Vogel, Marien Alet Graham, and Daniel Pittich. "The role of mentoring in developing leaders' emotional intelligence: exploring mentoring types, emotional intelligence, organizational factors, and gender." In *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 9, p. 1393660. Frontiers Media SA, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1393660>
- [13] Stern, L. R. and Proserpio, L. (. 2023. "Sequence matters: The effects of coaching-first versus mentoring-first development interventions. , (2), 101592
- [14] Stokes, Paul, Pauline Fatien Diochon, and Ken Otter. "'Two sides of the same coin?' Coaching and mentoring and the agentic role of context." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1483, no. 1 (2021): 142-152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14316>
- [15] Theeboom, Tim, Bianca Beersma, and Annelies EM Van Vianen. "Does coaching work? A meta-analysis on the effects of coaching on individual level outcomes in an organizational context." *The journal of positive psychology* 9, no. 1 (2014): 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.837499>