COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO COACHING MODELS
General Theory of Coaching by Dr. Leonardo Ravier and Coaching as a Self-Regulated Learning Method by Wolfgang Hoffmann M.

The world of coaching is going through grim times. It has been hijacked by repetition, empty forms, hybrid codes, a lack of ethics, and the intrusion into areas as delicate as psychotherapy.
In this sense, for many coaches, it is more important to climb the hierarchical ladder that their institutions have created than to delve into rigorous research, evidence-based practices, and sharing field experiences with their peers. Ranks and titles provide prestige; knowledge does not. There is no time for that. There is only time for marketing, for making a name for oneself, and for building a successful professional image the size of an ocean, albeit with three centimeters of depth.
On the other hand, we have reached the irrational point of turning coaching into a battleground. More than coaches, many seem like religious fanatics shouting at the top of their lungs: "Only this coaching saves, the rest will burn in hell as anathemas." A sad reality!
I believe in the following actions and attitudes:

- **Analyze and learn:** I believe we can sit down to analyze and learn from each other. There is only one absolute truth: there are no absolute truths!
- **Promote research:** Coaching and its leaders, rather than creating spaces of power, need to promote research, and a nourishing, respectful, and critical discussion. Of course, this is difficult because you cannot give what you do not have. It is easier to maintain the Status Quo.
- **Denounce the pirates:** We must isolate and denounce the pirates of coaching. I am referring to those who, having a certification, a few years of experience giving courses, good marketing, and a giant ego, go out to the market of the blind, declaring themselves experts. Of course, this is difficult; there is no time for that. It is better to continue like the ostrich with its head buried in the sand.
- **A serious approach:** Coaching is something very serious and delicate. When you are in front of a human being, there must not only be respect and empathy but also solid knowledge of how to relate and accompany them so that they can cross their own limitations and translate their potential into effective and adaptive behaviors.

From this perspective, I am writing this introductory comparative analysis. I have chosen the work of Dr. Ravier because I consider it a great contribution to coaching. I do not care if we have differences in our perspectives. What interests me is that this scholar is providing ideas with a basis. He did not invent them or pull them out of a hat. Instead of staying in superficial and selfish criticism or supine ignorance, the invitation is to open our capacity to

understand, integrate, and adapt to ideas that are not like our own. This intellectual exercise will not only be good for coaching but also for your mental and emotional health.

On the other hand, I was interested in comparing Dr. Ravier's approach with that of my most recent book, What Makes Coaching Work, When It Works…, published in 2022. In it, I integrate different models to try to explain what the internal variables of the individual who coaches are and what makes success in their goals, adaptation to change, self-regulation, and consistency in the time of their change processes possible.

My intention is not to offer absolute and exclusive truths. My interest is to take a small step to explain the coaching process from theoretical models and rigorous research. It is to leave behind naive coaching and migrate to intelligent, critical, and evidence-based coaching. The goal is to learn and share what the areas of coincidence and divergence are and what contributions these two proposals offer to coaching.

There is a lot of resistance to this due to mediocrity, economic interests, and the inability to leave the comfort zone. As Thomas Kuhn stated, the scientific community is intrinsically reluctant to radical change due to its deep commitment to the dominant paradigm. This process, which is more like a "conversion" than a persuasion based on evidence, can involve the death of the old paradigm's opponents and the emergence of a new generation that embraces it. This culminates in a scientific revolution and the institutionalization of a new scientific truth.

Comparison between Wolfgang Hoffmann's Coaching as a Self-Regulated Learning Method and Leonardo Ravier's General Theory of Coaching

Dimension	Hoffmann's Model (2022)	Ravier's General Theory of Coaching (2021)	Similarities	Differences
Definition and Essence of Coaching	Coaching as a self-regulated learning method (SRLM), a flexibly structured process that catalyzes change through autonomous reflection, action, observation, listening, and questions. Focused on "what works," based on empirical evidence (social psychology, neuroscience, organizational learning), avoiding vague definitions.	Coaching as a unique scientific-professional, non-directive methodology that catalyzes tacit knowledge (Polanyi) to achieve autonomous goals. It is an art of "discovering the science of being," centered on the client without transferring judgments.	Both reject vague definitions, seeking a scientific and philosophical basis. We prioritize the client's autonomy as the center of the process. Coaching as a vehicle for autonomous learning.	My model is pragmatic and evidence-based, integrating empirical models. Ravier's is axiomatic-philosophical, centered on the ontological essence (influences of Aristotle, Socrates, existentialism).
Process Structure	A temporal process with phases: zero point (no awareness), Articulate: Reconstruct and reflect on the experience. Unlearn dysfunctional patterns. Relearn adaptive strategies and autonomous action. Includes tools such as reflection journals and self-regulation cycles (planning, execution, self-evaluation). Conscious Experience: Self-observation, mental, emotional, behavioral and contextual self-regulation.	A temporal, non-directive helping relationship: (1) Voluntary start; (2) Dynamic without transference; (3) Dynamic structure (conversations from "being" to "should be"); (4) Autonomous end. Based on humanistic psychology (Rogers) and phenomenology.	A temporal process centered on autonomy, with active listening and questions as key tools. Emphasis on autonomous learning.	My proposal offers a structured roadmap with explicit phases (articulate, unlearn, relearn, conscious experience) and metrics; Ravier's is fluid, axiomatic, avoiding prescriptions to maintain non-directivity.
Role of the Coach and Client	Coach as a neutral mediator (inspired by Feuerstein) that facilitates learning without direct advice, integrating evidence (Bandura's self-efficacy). The client decides and acts, building knowledge.	Coach as a non-transferential catalyst, abstaining from judgments; the client is the absolute protagonist, activating their tacit "personal coefficient" for self-management.	The coach is a neutral facilitator, not a counselor; the client is empowered for self-determination.	Hoffmann allows selective integration of external evidence; Ravier prohibits any transference, prioritizing ethical purity.

Theoretical Foundations	Constructivism (Piaget, Vygotsky), Cognitive Structural Modification and Mediated Learning (Feuerstein), self-regulation (Zimmerman), Social Learning Theory and self-efficacy (Bandura). Empirical evidence (e.g., organizational meta-analyses) validates the model.	Historical-evolutionary analysis (Socrates to Rogers) + logical deduction. Postulates: methodological dualism, subjectivism, tacit knowledge (Polanyi). It resolves disparate methodological amalgams.	Search for scientific and philosophical roots to legitimize coaching. Emphasis on autonomous learning and subjectivity.	My coaching model as a self-regulated learning method is empirical-practical, integrative (cognitive, social psychology); Ravier's is philosophical-systematic, purist, avoiding external "contamination."
Effectiveness Evaluation	Measured by observable results (e.g., increased self-efficacy, behavioral changes) via self-regulation and mediated learning cycles. Focused on practical factors (thematic clarity, action).	Intrinsic effectiveness in catalyzing tacit knowledge; ethical if non-directive, resolving inefficiencies through methodological contamination.	Results focused on client autonomy and ethics.	My proposal accepts measuring with empirical metrics (self-efficacy scales); Ravier evaluates by ontological coherence and axioms (learning by doing).

Coincident Aspects

- **Professionalism and Ethics:** Both proposals diagnose a crisis in coaching (ambiguous definitions, methodological contamination, lack of scientific rigor). They propose frameworks to elevate it to a rigorous discipline, prioritizing client autonomy and avoiding directive approaches (consulting, therapeutic models, NLP, among others). Both proposals reject "vagueness" and seek to legitimize coaching as a profession.

- **Client-Centered and Autonomous Learning:** Coaching is a vehicle for learning, with the client as the protagonist. My proposal explicitly defines it as a self-regulated learning method (Chapter 2), while Ravier sees it as a catalyst for tacit knowledge (Polanyi). Both proposals use active listening, Socratic questions, and temporal processes.

- **Historical and Philosophical Roots:** Both authors recognize influences from Socrates (questions), humanism (Rogers), and constructivism (subjectivity). Both proposals see coaching as a means for profound human change.
- **Broad Applicability:** The method is useful and applicable in various contexts of human endeavor.

Divergent Aspects

- **Methodological Approach:** The proposal of Coaching as a Self-Regulated Learning Method is pragmatic and integrative, combining empirical evidence (cognitive psychology, neuroscience, organizational learning) with practical tools. Ravier, on the other hand, is a purist and axiomatic, rejecting any "adulteration" by external tools to preserve the non-directive essence of coaching.
- **Level of Abstraction:** My proposal offers an accessible and practical model, with clear protocols (stimulating reflection, working with limiting beliefs, self-regulation cycles, self-observation). Ravier's is theoretical-academic, ideal for researchers and ethical training. Although it also presents steps within the coaching process.
- **Theoretical Sources:** My proposal is based on constructivism (Piaget, Vygotsky), Cognitive Structural Modification and Mediated Learning (Feuerstein), self-regulation (Zimmerman), and self-efficacy (Bandura), integrating organizational meta-analyses. Dr. Ravier prioritizes philosophical axioms (Aristotle, Polanyi), phenomenology, and humanism, avoiding cognitive tools if they imply directivity.
- **Process Structure:** The model decomposes the process into explicit phases: zero point (no awareness), articulate, describe the experience/reflection, unlearn, explore what limits, relearn adaptive strategies, and autonomous action, plan (What can I do differently?), and conscious experience (self-observation and self-regulation based on the plan). It uses tools such as reflection journals, inspired by Feuerstein and Bandura. Ravier proposes a fluid dynamic (from "being" to "should be") without prescriptions, to maintain absolute non-directivity.

Contributions to the Practice of Coaching

From Wolfgang Hoffmann's Proposed Model: It is a bridge between theory and action, offering a practical roadmap for coaches. Defining coaching as a self-regulated learning method allows sessions to be designed as mediated learning experiences (Feuerstein), measuring progress in self-efficacy (Bandura) or behavioral changes (Zimmerman). From my perspective, it provides clarity, evidence-based tools, and applicability in the general practice of coaching. Its integration of constructivism and self-efficacy makes coaching measurable and ethical, reducing vagueness.

From Dr. Leonardo Ravier's General Theory of Coaching: It provides the first complete scientific systematization of coaching (doctoral thesis, UAM), resolving ethical and methodological crises with a "binding tradition." Its emphasis on tacit knowledge and absolute non-directivity guarantees profound changes without external contamination. It provides a dynamic structure for ethical conversations (axiom of human action), ideal for coach training and non-directive environments (personal development).

Complementarity: The Coaching as a Self-Regulated Learning Method model offers practical and evidence-based tools for daily implementation; Ravier anchors coaching on an ontological basis, ensuring ethical coherence. From my humble perspective, both proposals balance pragmatism with philosophical depth, strengthening human change in diverse contexts (organizational, personal, leadership).

Conclusion

This has been an attempt to study, integrate, and analyze two proposals with absolute respect, recognizing similarities and differences. I will not enter into the useless judgment of which is better than the other. My intention, as I have explained in previous lines, is to focus on the integration of a model with an empirical and structured approach that provides a practical framework, based on constructivism, Feuerstein, Bandura, and self-regulation, for coaches who seek measurable results, with another of philosophical rigor, where coaching is legitimized as a scientific discipline, prioritizing non-directivity and tacit knowledge. The integration of both can shorten the path to resolving the identity crisis of coaching.

Wolfgang Hoffmann M.
September 2025