

## SPORTS COACHES' MENTORSHIP: EXPERIENCE AND A SUGGESTED FUTURE FRAMEWORK

Jake Bailey <sup>1</sup>; Robyn L. Jones <sup>1</sup>; Wayne Allison <sup>2</sup>

1. Cardiff School of Sport and Health Sciences. Cardiff Metropolitan University, United Kingdom.
2. League Managers Association.

---

### ABSTRACT

*Introduction:* Mentoring is widely advocated as an important component of coach learning, both informally and as a constituent feature of coach development programmes. However, despite its ubiquity, there remains a paucity of empirical evidence to support mentoring's use in practice. Consequently, the purpose of this paper is to present an empirical case study of a formalised mentoring programme as experienced by the mentors, and to contribute towards a critical conceptualisation of mentoring in sports coaching. *Materials and methods:* Eight mentors participated in the study, all being employed on a formalised mentoring programme. Data collection occurred over the 18-month duration of the programme to respect the longitudinal nature of the mentoring process. The data were analysed thematically. *Results:* The results emphasised the need for a clearer conceptualisation of mentoring to successfully operationalise practice. Although the relational aspect of the role was deemed crucial, developing reciprocity was challenging. This was because of the limited shared or critical understanding of the role among the participants. *Discussion:* Building on the portrayal of mentoring depicted in the results, we subsequently position mentoring as a relational and contextualized activity. In doing so, we claim a more realistic, coherent and effective pedagogy of mentoring.

**Keywords:** mentoring, sports coaching, coach education, coach learning

## TUTORIZACIÓN DE ENTRENADORES DEPORTIVOS: EXPERIENCIA Y MARCO FUTURO PROPUESTO

### RESUMEN

*Introducción:* La tutorización es ampliamente defendida como un componente importante del aprendizaje de los entrenadores, tanto informalmente, como característica constitutiva de los programas de formación de entrenadores. Sin embargo, a pesar de su desarrollo, sigue habiendo escasez de evidencia empírica para apoyar el uso de la tutorización en la práctica. En consecuencia, el propósito de este trabajo es presentar un estudio de caso empírico, de un programa de tutorización formalizado según la experiencia de los mentores, y contribuir con ello a una conceptualización crítica de la tutorización en el entrenamiento deportivo. *Materiales y métodos:* Ocho mentores participaron en el estudio, todos participantes en un programa formal de tutorización. La recopilación de datos se produjo durante los 18 meses de duración del programa, para respetar la naturaleza longitudinal del proceso de tutoría. Los datos fueron analizados temáticamente. *Resultados:* Los resultados enfatizaron la necesidad de una conceptualización más clara de la tutorización para operacionalizar con éxito la práctica. Aunque el aspecto relacional del rol se consideró crucial, el desarrollo de la reciprocidad fue un desafío. Esto se debió a la comprensión limitada compartida o crítica del papel entre los participantes. *Discusión:* Partiendo de la representación de la tutorización representada en los resultados, posteriormente posicionamos la tutoría como una actividad relacional y contextualizada. Al hacerlo, reclamamos una pedagogía de tutorización más realista, coherente y efectiva.

**Palabras clave:** tutorización, entrenamiento deportivo, educación de entrenadores, aprendizaje de entrenadores

---

### Correspondence:

Jake Bailey

jbailey@cardffmet.ac.uk

Cardiff School of Sport and Health Sciences. Cardiff Metropolitan University, United Kingdom.

Submitted: 09/07/2019

Accepted: 10/12/2019

## INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen mentoring given increasing credence in coach education. This is hardly surprising given that experiential and contextually based learning have consistently been advocated as having greater impact on coaches' development than any means of formal provision (e.g., Irwin *et al.*, 2004; Jones *et al.*, 2012; Nash & Sproule, 2009). The case made has rested on the perceived capacity of mentoring to bridge the gap between theory "and the practical application of that learning to the field" (McQuade *et al.*, 2015, p.318). Despite such advocacy, there remains a paucity of supporting empirical evidence (e.g., Jones *et al.*, 2009; McQuade *et al.*, 2015; Sawiuk *et al.*, 2017; 2018). This, however, is not a particularly novel standpoint as, more than a decade ago, Colley (2003, p. 1) concluded that "existing research evidence scarcely justifies [mentoring's] use on such a massive scale, [while] the movement has not yet developed a sound theoretical base to underpin policy or practice". It appears then, that the rhetorical 'rush to mentoring' continues despite a lack of understanding as to its possible workings; a recipe for continued ineffectiveness. In further developing his critique, Colley (2003) considered most models of mentoring to have been based on a fairly crude and simplistic concept of empowerment. Similarly, Cushion (2015, p. 155) was typically scathing in forwarding the view that mentoring within sports coaching "remains largely unstructured, uneven in terms of quality and outcome, and uncritical in style, serving only to reproduce existing culture and practice".

The problematic nature of mentoring, when viewed critically, was also highlighted by Sawiuk *et al.* (2018, p.619), who challenged overly formalised mentoring programmes as creating forms of "social control rather than being driven by pedagogical concerns". Bloom (2013) meanwhile, emphasised the haphazard nature of mentoring instigations as simply being 'there at the time', while earlier work by Feldman (1999) cautioned against such unconsidered arrangements as they hold the resulting possibility for ill-matched and, therefore, toxic, dysfunctional relationships. Finally, in this context, Jones *et al.* (2016) found mentoring relationships hindered by an inadequate understanding of scope and role by both mentors and mentees, thus severely hampering their effectiveness. Despite such a critique, evidence exists that mentoring continues to be valued by coaches as part of their educational journey. For example, the coaches interviewed by Nelson *et al.* (2013), whilst not blind to the practical issues associated with its implementation, were generally supportive of the mentoring received on the formal coach development course experienced.

Against this landscape, the purpose of this paper is to add to the empirical picture of mentoring in sports coaching. Here, we aim to do more than simply report the collaborative experiences of those involved in mentoring from a

functionalist perspective. Rather, our purpose lies in constructing a critical analyses of the activity to help further conceptualise it. In so doing, we position mentorship as a relational and contextualized endeavour, whilst offering thoughts regarding the development of a coherent pedagogy of mentoring. In terms of structure, following a description of the methods, the results section presents the experience of mentors on a top-level coach education course provided by a UK National Governing Body. This was particularly in relation to how the mentors both conceptualised and realised their practice. As opposed to allowing an 'open' reading of the data, the discussion tentatively suggests a working framework for future mentoring practice within sports coaching.

## METHOD

### *Setting the context: The course structure and the official role of the mentor*

The coach education course within which the mentoring was framed, was recognised as the highest qualification obtainable within the sport in question. The syllabus was principally constructed by the sport's international federation, although the national governing body possessed a degree of agency and independence in how the recommended components were delivered. The programme was 18 months in duration, with candidates being primarily assessed against a competency framework. An overseas 'group visit' was also built into the course, which involved candidates' observing and deconstructing both top-level coaching practice and sporting performances. Of particular relevance to this study was that each candidate was assigned a mentor (on a ratio of 1:3) whose primary role was to support the former through the programme. The programme itself comprised four key content areas: (1) communication; (2) leadership; (3) management; and (4) business and finance. These, in turn, subsequently divided into seven sequentially spaced modules. Each module, excluding the overseas study, was delivered during three-day 'residential' workshops. The time between the residentials was intended to allow for reflection on received content, and for its practical application in context. The seventh and final module culminated with an expected graduation from the course.

### *Participants and data collection*

The participants (who appear in the next section as pseudonyms) comprised a group of mentors (n=8) employed by the governing body to provide on-course learning support to the candidates. All participants provided informed consent once ethical approval was gained for the project through the institutional research ethics process. The principal research method used within the study comprised focus group interviews. These provided the opportunity for individuals to express and relate their personal understanding

of events, perceptions and context(s) (Krueger & Casey, 2015). The central purpose of the interviews then was to engage in dialogue with the mentors to elicit their descriptions and experiences of the learning that took place on the coaching course, and their role(s) in generating it. In this respect, it was to gain a deeper understanding of the specific contextually defined challenges faced, and how the mentors dealt with them. Being semi-structured in nature, the interviews gave a framework of questions whilst allowing a degree of freedom to probe beyond immediate answers. This offered the flexibility for gaining further information on issues deemed important, enabling both clarification and elaboration to take place (May, 1999). Although focus groups were the main method of data collection, where appropriate (e.g., where mentors were not collectively available), individual interviews were carried out. Specifically, three points of data collection (i.e., focus group interviews) were selectively spaced throughout the duration of the course. Each point comprised two focus group interviews containing, on average, 4 participant mentors apiece. In total, therefore, six focus group interviews took place, which were supported by two individual interviews with those who were unable to attend the group gatherings. In essence, the overall time spent interviewing amounted to circa 10 hours. Once an interview was conducted, it was transcribed verbatim. The text was then thematically analysed, with the primary themes emanating from the data contributing to the construction of the next scheduled interview. In this way, the progressive nature of the longitudinal work was followed and respected.

### *Data analysis*

Inductive procedures were principally used to examine and categorise the data gathered from the focus groups and individual interviews. The purpose here was to identify common themes as related to the aims of the study, whilst also paying heed to any unexpected features (Charmaz, 2006; Seale & Kelly, 1998). Hence, a 'constant comparative method' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was employed to ascertain similarities and differences within the data. More specifically, and in line with Charmaz (2006), a process of focused coding was undertaken where earlier identified codes or signifiers were used to further examine the data, thus refining initial assumptions. These were then used to build more generalizable statements that transcended specific instances and times (Charmaz, 2006). This later phase also coincided with greater attempts to analyse what the data actually meant, emphasizing the interpretive nature of the research. It is also indicative of the broader effort to develop the analysis and engage in what Braun and Clark (2006) refer to as the shift from semantic to latent thematic analysis. The idea of semantic versus latent themes is important in this study as it encapsulates a move beyond a descriptive or literal

account of mentoring practice to a critical examination of underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualizations (Braun & Clark, 2006).

## RESULTS

The following section outlines the key issues from the research. It begins by examining those related to the formalisation of the mentoring role, before going on to discuss what the mentors said about the relationships established with the candidates, and the factors which impacted this particular component of their role. Finally, issues of reciprocity, in terms of their presence and perceived necessity, are considered.

### *Mentor role clarity*

Throughout the course and the associated project, the participants reiterated a desire for greater professional development and consensus in readiness for their engagement in, and with, the mentorship role (for example; "our staff development as a group is critical, absolutely critical" [John]; "coach educators need to be up-skilled more" [Andy]; "I don't think everybody understands it [the role]" [George]). Hence, it was a job for which they obviously felt underprepared. Such findings support previous work (e.g., Marshall, 2001), identifying the need for clearly defined roles within a strategic approach for any pedagogical practice to function as intended. Given the seemingly ad hoc nature of their appointment, it was unsurprising that most of the mentors were unclear about the job they were undertaking. Consequently, their initial practice in particular was merely based on previous assumptions related to the position and what they perceived it meant to be a mentor. This perceived lack of clarity was especially apparent during the first half of the course, where participants claimed not "to have a clear idea of what I'm doing at all" (Clive) and of the need for "a clear understanding of what the role is" (George). A lack of 'preparedness' was a heartfelt cause of concern, with other participants forwarding the view that "there should have been more information...we should have been better informed as to what our role was" (Tom) and others questioning "what am I supposed to be doing here? I don't really know" (Wilf).

By the time of the final focus group, greater role clarity among the cohort was apparent; for example, Tom identified that, "I think our understanding around the job is stronger now". This improvement, however, appeared a result of incidental or experiential learning rather than a consequence of systematic development. This improved role intelligibility was principally informed by (1) the informal sharing of practice between the mentors; and (2) the coaches' (i.e., mentees) assessment being structured around the given competency framework. In terms of the first, this was expressed through learning about,

and subsequently sharing, personal practice. In the words of two: "I've rung up people, and tried to meet them [and asked] 'Tell me what you've done in this situation'" (Andy) and "we learn as much from each other doing this stuff, chatting through these bits" (Sam). Some expressed that this process could be better facilitated with a degree of formalisation, because "a little bit of prior knowledge would have been good" (Nick). Here, the mentors conveyed a desire to meet as a group, so that practice (and solutions) could be pooled and somewhat borrowed, because, as pithily captured by one, "I just don't know what you lot are doing" (Percy). The second source that provided the mentors with a degree of security and confidence about their role execution was the given competency framework, against which the course candidates were assessed. Although the competency framework was considered somewhat problematic (a point discussed in more depth later), it nevertheless served as a point of reference for the mentorship role; that is, the mentors understood and structured their role in relation to the framework. In this regard, mentors made statement such as, "I definitely think the competency framework has helped shape my relationships [with the coaches]" (Clive). What gave mentors reassurance here was their instrumental role in helping candidates deal with demonstrating the competencies (and related evidence gathering). Where the mentors did feel they had clarity then, was in terms of helping the candidates meet the competencies' criteria, with mentors feeling "more comfortable doing that" (John) and in being able to respond to the question "how do I get [them] to the finish line?" (Nick). Having said that, statements such as "I don't have a working knowledge of [the course]" (Percy) and "I just don't know enough about the course" (George) indicate that the mentors still lacked a depth of understanding regarding the course content itself and, hence, the related competencies, which made their grasp of this task relatively ambiguous. Consequently, despite welcoming the structure given by the competency framework, some of the mentors appeared uncertain as to what counted as 'evidence' (in relation to the competencies), which made them further doubt their worth, leaving them "feeling a bit lacking in confidence" (Andy). Nevertheless, as the mentors reached a better understanding of the competencies this situation improved.

Although greater understanding of the mentoring role was evident by the end of course, the role continued to be troublesome for a few who were subsequently unsure if they were performing well as mentors. In the words of three: "I'm not sure whether I'm actually a very good mentor" (Sam); "...sometimes I just never feel as if I'm in the right place" (George); and "I actually don't think I've done that good a job overall" (Clive). Similarly, although diminishing over the course, some mentors still harboured doubts about their suitability and expertise for the role. An anxiety stemming from the fact that

some of them, like Nick, had not been head coaches at the same level as the candidates (“... bloody hell, they’ve been in the job longer than me...I feel uncomfortable in that respect”). Such reflections are, perhaps, given credence by certain conceptualisations of the role that position the mentor as a person of greater rank, or experience, in any given profession (e.g., Alleman *et al.*, 1984; Merriam, 1983). It was a conceptualisation certainly in evidence among the group under study.

Given the above, it is not surprising that the perception existed that the coaching course needed greater structure to assist the mentoring role. This stemmed from some of the mentors being (initially at least) unsure of the course’s aims and objectives, and consequently how to behave in their roles. In this regard, one suggested that “there seems little planning, learning outcomes, objectives...so we can’t track that. That has to be set...so you know what they’re trying to get out of it” (Sam). Thus, during the early stages of the process, the mentors were ‘feeling’ their way through the experience, with no clear parameters to guide them, with one suggesting that “we need to get an element of forward planning in” (John). Whereas the residential weeks could have helped in this regard, there was instead the perception among the mentors that the content and structure of the sessions were not helpful in supporting the development of their role. Thus, many considered that the information given to the candidates had to be more work-place relevant, with one going as far as to say “there’s no connection” (Andy). In this regard, the mentors were critical of the lack of transference between the more formal sessions the coaches were introduced to during the residentials and what they were supposed to follow up with and on in practice.

#### *A relational activity: Issues of reciprocity*

At the outset of the study, there was uniform agreement among the mentors for the need to establish positive working relationships with the candidates. What helped was the ‘study visit’ to another country where the mentors generally agreed that “the relationships formed with everybody there were first class” (Andy). The development of a ‘close’ relationship was considered vital for the mentoring relationship to succeed (e.g., “now I’ve got to know them a bit better I can help them through the journey” [Tom]). This viewpoint was consistent throughout, with mentors reiterating that establishing functional relationships with the candidates was crucial to success in their role: “it’s the relationship thing...it’s about people” (Nick). As another mentor went on to say, “you were better able to understand their needs and wants from the relationships built” (Sam). What was vital in this development was trying to engage in frequent informal conversations with the candidates which involved arranging recurrent visits to their work places. There was wide

agreement about this, with mentors saying things like: "meeting up with the guys widened my understanding of the role" (Nick); "we went out to see them a lot more" (Percy); and, "what was most effective for me was definitely going to see the lads working" (Andy). Hence, where mentors were able to observe the candidates in their working environments, they were able to gain a greater sense of their contextually specific learning needs.

Whilst the mentors were cognizant of the importance of observing and working with the coaches in context, they also understood that such visits were often difficult to organise and time consuming. In this regard, the busy nature of both candidates' and mentors' work (i.e., other duties) posed challenges to such relationship building and, hence, the mentors' role in candidate learning (e.g., George: "time is the biggest [obstacle]"). Subsequently, the infrequency of meetings (often done through phone contact), suggested that the tasks given on the course to be completed in the interim periods between the residentials had low priority for the coaching candidates in the wider scheme of things. This was a point of frustration for most of the mentors, who felt that the candidates needed to take a greater 'ownership' for their own learning and prioritise the work of the course to a greater degree to gain the full benefit. Here, the mentors did not consider that the candidates were engaging in the process in a way that met their (i.e., the mentors') expectations. Conversely, the problem of busy workloads also applied to the mentors themselves, hence, they were not always able to give as much as they wanted. For such reasons, it was sometimes perceived as difficult to adequately fulfil the relationship-building mentoring role.

Throughout the project, the role of mentoring tended to be viewed in terms of responding to candidates' needs (largely concerning the competency framework); that is, the role was seen as responsive in nature rather than initiatory. In some ways, this was reflective of mentors' relative uncertainty within the position; it being functionally easier to respond to candidates' perceived needs (i.e., requests) than decide on those needs. In the words of three: "I've felt the responsibility to support more, and I've been more comfortable doing it" (Nick); "...it depends on the candidate, and what they want" (Tom); and, "...we've done it this way to suit the candidates" (Sam). Some candidates then, received much more support than others largely depending on how much they asked, and the extent to which they and their mentor had time to spend. Thus, the stated mantra of 'helping them as much as they need' only seemed to stretch to "how much they asked". Building on this idea, the mentors considered themselves very reactive in nature; for example, Sam stated; "I'm getting better at fire-fighting, while Clive claimed "I think we are just feeding off what they are saying, rather than mentoring them". Whilst initiatory thinking was rare, a couple of the mentors did assume more pro-active roles, as



exemplified by Tom ("it's also about introducing new ideas and concepts, planting new seeds") and Percy ("it should be more than just getting them through the course work"). There seemed then, to be a variety of role conceptualisations, which impacted on the nature of the reciprocity experienced within the mentoring relationship and how the mentors were 'used' by the coaches.

In order to maximise the usefulness of candidate site visits (where mentors visited the candidates in their 'home' clubs), which in turn were not easy to organise, mentors felt they needed a firmer grasp of their role and the course-required competencies. This was, however, seen to develop as the course progressed, and was perceived as being predominantly linked to a growing urgency among the coaches to complete and evidence the said competencies; a development which gave the mentors a sense of "now they need us". The competency framework then, was simultaneously used to secure relationship development and impart a feeling of usefulness among the mentors, while also somewhat proving a barrier to such relationships in terms of the mentors being seen as enforcers of more-than-often 'irrelevant' material. Consequently, although efforts were made to help candidates use the given knowledge in practice, the nature of the competencies and their perceived (ir)relevance by candidates (over and above what was needed to 'pass' the assessment) was deemed problematic.

#### DISCUSSION

Having problematized and deconstructed the mentoring process from the case investigated, we now proceed to suggest ways forward. Consequently, drawing on the study presented, in addition to extant literature, we propose a framework for progressive structured practice. Naturally, we are not presenting a grand theory of mentoring here, a one-size-fits all model to unproblematically follow. Rather, what we advocate is a considered scaffold that takes account of the 'living, breathing world in question' (Blumer, 1969); a framework which presupposes that the essence of mentoring lies in facilitating mentee learning within a complex and non-linear process. Such learning necessarily occurs in a particular socio-pedagogical arena with a crucial function of the mentor being to help the mentee develop an understanding of (structural) context and their imaginative agency within it.

Within our developed perspective, the mentor is not attempting to make the learner independent. Indeed, the idea of independence is at odds with viewing the mentee as working within social networks, where collaboration, obligation and dependency are normal features of coaches' working practices. Rather, the mentor should focus on building the mentee's capacity to operate within social systems and linkages, whilst helping the latter take responsibility

for learning and actions (and the consequences of such actions). Thus, emphasis is given to the relational, as opposed to the individual (Crossley, 2011). Additionally, credence is given to considered theoretical (pedagogical-coaching) frameworks (e.g., Jones, 2019) to both explore and develop coaches' agency within the complex social landscape and the inevitable power dynamics at play. In this respect, a suggestive re-construction of mentoring practice is advocated, where an element of disequilibrium and insecurity is considered as a catalyst for subsequent learning.

*Towards an ontology of mentoring: Developing understanding, agency and responsibility within a complex socio-pedagogic context*

Similar to the mentors in our study, Armour (2015, p. 19) identified "the potential for problems [in the mentoring relationship] where the nature and purpose of the activity are not wholly clear to all participants". This is not, however, to imply that easily articulated, (often superficial) understandings of the mentoring process should be promoted. On the contrary, attempts to overly sanitise and simplify the relationship are likely to lead to frustration and dysfunctionality between the actors involved. This is because mentoring is inherently difficult, and to treat it otherwise is likely to create cognitive dissonance. Consequently, as Chambers (2015) claimed, there is a need to undertake the uncomfortable act of standing back to reflect on the unpredictable and chaotic nature of mentoring, where consistent process and results are rarely, if ever, attainable. Failure to adequately engage with this complexity leads to the adoption of under formed reflexive frameworks that diminish the sense-making capacity of those involved. No doubt then, both mentor and mentee require the time, space and intellectual attributes to develop a (somewhat) shared, conceptual understanding of the process with which they are engaged (Armour, 2015). Clearly, the standardised, universal approach that has often been adopted by those developing mentoring programmes is not the answer (Chambers *et al.*, 2014). Alternatively, both the mentor and mentee need to develop and negotiate a shared sense of what mentoring is and is not; an understanding that is necessarily built on strong ontological foundations. This, however, does not mean that 'anything goes'; a decision left up to the vagaries of context. Rather, there are important and relatively consistent features of the process that must be taken into account.

A key component of our argument rests on what the term 'ontological foundation' is taken to mean. In this respect, it is perhaps useful to first provide an example of where ontological agreement is not satisfactorily achieved, and the consequences for those involved. In the data reported earlier in this article, the mentors were no doubt searching for a degree of security in their role, a feature consistent with related previous work (e.g., Jones *et al.*, 2016; Sandford

*et al.*, 2010). Here, to alleviate some of the insecurity and feelings of resultant inadequacy, it was common for the mentors to default to the competency framework given by the National Governing Body to operationalise their work. There was, however, a sense that both mentees and mentors found this unsatisfactory. This was principally due to the perceived irrelevancy of the given tasks particularly from the former group; tasks based on a crude behaviourism, which reduced complex and ambiguous activities to a set of observable actions. Thus we argue that the ontological abyss between the competency requirement and the everyday reality of the coaches was a factor that frustrated the engagement of the mentees.

This is not to say that under such conditions the mentoring process is always devoid of value. As Armour (2015) highlights, even when mentoring is directed to a predefined end, there is still space for individual agency where useful learning may occur. It is, however, obvious that a generic competency framework or assessment criteria is not a substitute for a coherent and critical ontological understanding (of both coaching and mentoring) to guide practice; that is, there has to be some intersubjective agreement between those involved in mentoring about the nature of the activity and its purpose in relation to the context in which it takes place.

Armour (2015) identified mentoring as definitively linked to the social conditions in which it occurs. In the neo-liberal, performative culture this means that the mentee is likely to be considered as someone to be 'guided' within the given managerialist and accountability structures. Such a situation creates challenges in the way mentoring is conceptualised because, whilst there are similarities in the processes and relational components evident, the overall focus is directed as much towards audit compliance as learning (Sawiuk *et al.*, 2018). Such, a conceptualisation of mentoring is at odds, ontologically, with what we are advocating. Rather than reducing the mentee's agency, we support Maier and Seligman's (1976) idea that a mentor should develop and encourage the learner in understanding and developing their agency, consequently helping them take greater responsibility for both actions and learning. Additionally, and further building on Chambers *et al.*'s (2015) work, we propose that a key aspect of the mentor role is to help the mentee apprehend the social structures within which he or she operates in order to understand the possibilities (and limits) of action. It is a perspective that places both the mentor and the mentee into a social landscape, necessitating that a key function of the mentor is to help the mentee understand and navigate the inherent contextual power structures and relations at play, in order that intended outcomes are better achieved.

*Developing praxis through the use of ontologically consistent conceptual frameworks*

Whilst it may seem simplistic to say that learning should always be at the heart of the mentoring process, this understanding has important implications. If learning is conceived as a complex, non-linear phenomenon that occurs within a particular social and cultural context, it creates a clear ontological foundation on which related practice can be built (e.g., Bowes & Jones, 2006; Cassidy *et al.*, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978). Indeed, it is imperative that such practice be explicitly grounded in and consistent with the nature of the activity (an alignment that was absent in the data reported in this study).

A range of theoretical lenses have been adopted in the coaching literature over recent years; theories that have enabled both academics and practitioners to make-sense of the activity (Cassidy *et al.*, 2015). Whilst we do not advocate one particular theoretical perspective, taking into account coaching's social essence (e.g., Jones *et al.*, 2011), the sense making framework employed should align with such (interpretive) foundations. Subsequently, the decided upon affiliated coaching theory should be selected from those considered contextually appropriate to both further and respond to the mentee's learning needs. Whilst a key part of the mentor's role then, should be to select relevant knowledge sources that can help support the mentees' learning, this on its own is not enough. Mentors must demonstrate the quality of mind to deal with the vagaries of practice. This would include, for example, their capacity to facilitate the mentees emergent and developing understanding of theory to the requisite level to enable it to be of use in ways that are contextually relevant (see Hemmestad *et al.*, 2010). Whilst this framing asks a lot of mentors in terms of both knowledge and skills, given the complexity of the mentoring task as advocated, and the assumed professionalism of those who might undertake it, such high expectations seem reasonable.

A challenge for mentors and those constructing mentoring programmes is to develop role clarity and confidence within the relationship thus allowing mentors to act as described above. For many of the mentors whose experiences were described in this paper, an important manifestation of their role insecurity was a reluctance to take the initiative within the learning process. They alternatively preferred to stay on safer ground responding to the learning needs claimed (or assumed) by the candidates. Whilst clearly there is a role for mentees to identify their own needs, there is also a danger that this limits their learning to slow incremental change, simply revisiting what they already know through experience. Rather, we support others' views that a mentor should take a pivotal role in helping a mentee make significant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking (Clutterbuck, 1991; Clutterbuck & Megginson 1999). This offers a particular challenge, because, as was raised by Jones *et al.*

(2015, p.153) most of the mentees seemed more interested in knowledge that “they could easily relate to.... a wish for a general re-affirmation or incremental development of existing beliefs as opposed to any conceptual shift in thinking”. As such, added importance is given to Armour *et al.*'s (2013) redefinition of mentors in teaching and coaching as lead learners; a term that reflects the primacy of mentors in shaping the learning process for mentees.

The concept of phronesis is of relevance to discussions of mentoring, in terms of understanding both the landscape in which the learning occurs, and the related outcomes that should be prized (Flyvbjerg, 2001; for a review of phronesis and its application to coaching see Hemmestad *et al.*, 2010, and Jones & Hemmestad, 2019). This is because the act of mentoring should look beyond technical rationality, towards “a reflective analysis on personal-value judgements in relation to (contextually appropriate) future actions” (Hemmestad *et al.*, 2010, p. 450). This action orientation is crucial, as the purpose of mentoring is not (only) to help mentees develop theoretical knowledge, but to contribute to their practical wisdom (that is, the judiciously considered use of that knowledge). This is a view that is ontologically aligned with the complex and contingent positioning of coaching, and thus is highly relevant to the mentoring process for coaches. Here, the central constructs of phronesis could be used by mentors to guide their interventions. For example, mentors might usefully consider how their actions can be informed through adopting a position that conceptualises coaching (1) as a ‘geneology’ (Foucault, 1971), (2) as contextualist (not relativist) in nature, (3) as being imbedded in the minutiae of action, (4) as ethical practice, (5) as emergent in nature, and (6) as requiring situational literacy (Jones & Hemmestad, 2019). What we are essentially arguing for here is greater recognition of intellectual (prudent, judicious) work by coaching mentors, thus conceptualising such work as a cerebral as opposed to a technical activity. It is work that also demands the mentor accepts the guiding responsibility of the role as a ‘more knowledgeable other’ (Vygotsky, 1978) in suggesting ways forward while simultaneously being able to judiciously read the unfolding contextual landscape before deciding on the most appropriate course of action (Jones & Hemmestad, 2019).

#### *Valuing security and insecurity: A critical feature for a pedagogy of mentoring*

A highly risk-averse culture will inevitably influence both mentors' and mentees' understandings of acceptable levels of challenge in a mentoring relationship (Armour, 2015). Here, we support Cushion's (2015, p. 160) assertion that mentors should “systematically challenge coaches with the intention of forcing them to constantly evaluate their whole understanding of the coaching role and their position within it”. This, however, is not sufficient in and of itself. Rather, and as alluded to above, there is a need for forward, or

inferential, thinking that creates the possibility for new, and creative, actions (both on behalf of mentors and also for mentees/coaches) (Jones, 2019). Through engagement in such challenges, coaches' knowing and practice is deconstructed before being reconstructed. This chimes with the work of Heaney (1995), who identified transformative learning as being more likely to take place in the dynamic and chaotic spaces when learners are 'on the edge' of their current knowledge bases. This concept of being 'on the edge' might usefully be characterised as relating to the new (something not yet perceptible, understood, engaged with or acted upon), and the oft accompanying uncertainty. In this way, the idea of inference again asserts its relevance; the call (or need) for forward thinking and action by mentors that aims for possibilities not yet invoked by mentees. It is a strategy of experimentation with ideas and practice; an attempt to realise what is suggested or imagined (Jones, 2019).

A necessary precursor for inference is reflexivity. Whilst in coaching there is clearly a need not to be limited by what has gone before, decisions and actions must be grounded in a deep and intuitive understanding of the self, of coaching, and context. Thus, reflexivity is a necessary step that must be coupled with coaches' use of (new) knowledge and ideas to create opportunities for acts of innovation and creativity. Through careful, reflexive grounding of such inferences, and the decisions and actions that follow, in the history of the wider structures in which they are situated, criticism of crude relativism can be rebuffed.

The linked processes of reflexivity and inference, as outlined above, should be highly valued by mentors and actively fostered through their practices, despite the uncertainty and difficulties coaches might experience as a consequence. As earlier noted by Cushion (2015) such engagement with uncertainty must occur within a supportive framework, where the mentee feels a level of security with the mentor, understanding and accepting that the mentor's actions are undertaken in their best interests. This point is central; the intentionality of mentoring is both to support and challenge the learning of coaches. It is a dual function painfully absent from the examples outlined in the results of this paper, where both parties' absence of role and task understanding made it very difficult to accept, let alone actively seek, the important learning experiences desired when learners are 'on the edge' (Heaney, 1995). Through engagement with the ideas expressed in this section of this paper, it may be possible to develop the level of security experienced by mentors (and mentees) to the point that they can push boundaries, offer challenge, and even engage in conflict, which may be most useful for mentees' learning and development, despite the likely discomfort caused.

When considering how this can be achieved at the micro-level, a useful departure point could be Vygotsky's (1978, p. 86) zone of proximal development (ZPD) defined as "the distance between the actual development level [of a child] as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers". In searching how to better conceptualise and structure action in this respect, Jones and Thomas (2016) located the notion of pedagogical scaffolding within a ZPD. Interestingly, they chose to consider the ZPD as a 'zone of uncertainty' with scaffolding being the means through which order could be placed upon this uncertainty of learning. There are lessons to be learned here for mentoring, as learning (in both coaching and mentoring) is presupposed to be a social, non-linear process characterised by complexity and ambiguity (Jones *et al.*, 2010). From this perspective, the mentor must provide sufficient supports (scaffolds) to encourage the mentee to attempt new challenges (as related to a particular intention) where learning may be experienced and internalised. As Jones and Thomas (2016, p. 68) continued, this level of adaptation highlights and confirms "the relationship between contingency, challenge, teacher response and student learning". Clearly, the idea of the ZPD as a zone of uncertainty helps both mentor and mentee accept that both challenge and discomfort are a normal and necessary part of the learning process, whilst the idea of scaffolding provides a metaphor that can help to inform the process of mediating learning within this pedagogical zone.

### *Closing remarks*

Throughout this paper, the relational nature of the mentoring process has been positioned centrally, where mentors must both support and challenge mentees to see their practice anew and engage in creative future actions. All the while, coaches must be encouraged to know and respect the social landscape in which they operate without foregoing their agency to shape it in desired ways. To indulge in some forward thinking of our own, one way which these ideas could be further developed is through an examination of the mentoring relationship in terms of trust. Here, Meyer and Ward's (2009, p.3) definition seems a good fit, where trust is described as "the optimistic acceptance of a vulnerable situation which is based on positive expectations of the intentions of the trusted individual or institution". Such an idea may be a useful departure point for future research, focusing, as it does, on the interaction between the relationships of the individuals involved and how perceptions of intentions shape the tendency to take an element of risk; a component that we see as a fundamental in any useful mentoring partnership. The future task then, is to experiment with such a notion, and the general framework advocated in this

paper, in practice; the next step in reconstructing realistic, useful mentoring practice for coaches.

## REFERENCES

- Armour, K. (2015). 'Mentoring' and professional development. In Chambers, F.C. (ed.) *Mentoring in physical education and sports coaching*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797687-3>
- Armour, K.M., Chambers, F.C. & Makopoulou, K. (2013). Conceptualising teaching as learning: The challenge for teacher education. In Capel, S. & Whitehead, M. (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education*. London: Routledge, pp. 205-219.
- Alleman, E., Cochran, J. Doverspike, J. & Newman, I. (1984). Enriching mentoring relationships. *The Personnel Guidance Journal*, 62, 329-332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2164-4918.1984.tb00217.x>
- Bowes, I. & Jones, R. L. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 235-245. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.20.2.235>
- Bloom, G.A. (2013). Mentoring for sport coaches. In Potrac P., Gilbert, W. & Denison, J. (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Sport Coaching*. London: Routledge, pp. 476-485. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203132623.ch38>
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA; University of California Press.
- Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Cassidy, T., Jones, R. & Potrac, P. (2015). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203797952>
- Chambers, F. (2015). The mentor pedagogy toolbox: An ecological systems perspective. In Chambers, F.C. (ed.) *Mentoring in physical education and sports coaching*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 191-203. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797687-21>
- Chambers, F.C., Luttrell, S., Armour, K., Bleakley, W.E., Brennan, D.A. & Herald, F.A. (2015). The pedagogy of mentoring. In Chambers, F.C. (ed.) *Mentoring in physical education and sports coaching*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797687-4>
- Chambers, F.C., Armour, K., Herold, F.A., McFlynn, P. Brennan, D.A. & Bleakley, E.W. (2014). Mentoring as a profession-building process in physical education teacher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 31, 345-362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2012.710061>



- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers/v86n0.825>
- Clutterbuck, D. (1991). *Everyone needs a mentor: Fostering talent in your organisation* (3rd ed). London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Clutterbuck, D. & Megginson, D. (1999). *Mentoring executives and directors*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Colley, H. (2003). *Mentoring for social inclusion: A critical approach to nurturing mentor relationships*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203458310>
- Crossley, N. (2011). *Towards relational sociology*. Routledge: Oxon. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887066>
- Cushion, C. (2015). Mentoring for success in sports coaching. In Chambers, F.C. (ed.) *Mentoring in physical education and sports coaching*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 155-162. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797687-17>
- Feldman, D. (1999). Toxic mentors or toxic protégés? A critical re-examination of dysfunctional mentoring. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(3), 247-278. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822\(99\)00021-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(99)00021-2)
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511810503>
- Foucault, M. (1971). *Nietzsche, genealogy, history*. In *Hommage a Jean Hyppolite* (pp. 145-172). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Heaney, T. (1995). 'Learning to control democratically: Ethical questions in situated adult education'. *Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Adult Education Research Conference*, May 19-21, 1995. Edmonton, Alberta, pp. 147-152.
- Hemmetstad, L.B. (2013). *Balansekunst - Ledelse, læring og makt i håndballandslaget kvinner senior [The art of balance: Leadership, learning and power in senior women's handball]*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Norwegian School of Sports Sciences, Oslo, Norway.
- Hemmetstad, L.B., Jones, R.L. & Standal, Ø. F. (2010). Phronetic social science: A means of better researching and analysing coaching? *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(4), 447-459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2010.514745>
- Irwin, G., Hanton, S. & Kerwin, D.G. (2004). Reflective practice and the origins of elite coaching knowledge. *Reflective Practice*, 5(3), 426-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1462394042000270718>

- Jones, R.L. & Hemmestad, L.B. (2019). Reclaiming the 'competent' practitioner: Furthering the case for the practically wise coach. *Sports Coaching Review* (manuscript under submission).
- Jones, R.L. (2019). *Studies in sport coaching*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jones, R.L., Potrac, P., Cushion, C., & Ronglan, L.T. (2011). *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*. Oxon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203865545>
- Jones, R.L., Allison, W. & Bailey, J. (2016). Candidates' experiences of elite coach education: tracking the journey. In W. Allison, A. Abraham & A. Cale (eds.) *Advances in Coach Education and Development: From Research to Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 149-160. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657486>
- Jones, R. L., Bowes, I. & Kingston, K. (2010). Complex practice in coaching: Studying the chaotic nature of coach-athlete interactions. In Lyle, J. & Cushion, C. (eds.) *Sports Coaching: Professionalism and Practice*. London: Elsevier, pp. 15-26.
- Jones, R.L., Harris, R.A. & Miles, A. (2009). Mentoring in sports coaching: A review of the literature. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14(3), 267-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980801976569>
- Jones, R.L., Morgan, K. & Harris, K. (2012). Developing coaching pedagogy: seeking a better integration of theory and practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17(3), 313-329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.608936>
- Jones, R.L. & Thomas, G.L. (2015). Coaching as 'scaffolded' practice: further insights into sport pedagogy, *Sports Coaching Review*, 4(2), 65-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2016.1157321>
- Krueger, R.A. & Casey, M.A. (2015) *Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research* (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Maier, S.F. & Seligman, M.E.P (1976). Learned helplessness: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 105, 3-46. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.105.1.3>
- Marshall, D. (2001). Mentoring as a developmental tool for women coaches. *Canadian Journal for Women in Coaching*, 2, 1-10.
- May, T. (1999). *Social research: Issues, methods and process*. Buckingham: Open.
- McQuade, S., Davis, L. & Nash, C. (2015). Positioning mentoring as a coach development tool: Recommendations for future practice and research. *Quest*, 67(3), 317-329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2015.1048810>
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161-73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171368303300304>
- Meyer, S. & Ward, P.R. (2009). Reworking the sociology of trust: Making a semantic distinction between trust and dependence. *The Australian*

- Sociological Association Annual Conference Proceedings*. Canberra: The Australasian Sociological Association.
- Nash, C.S. & Sproule, J. (2009). Career Development of Expert Coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 4(1), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.4.1.121>
- Nelson, L., Cushion, C. & Potrac, P. (2013). Enhancing the provision of coach education: The recommendations of UK coaching practitioners. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(2), 204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2011.649725>
- Sandford, R., Armour, K.M., & Stanton, D.J. (2010). Volunteer mentors as informal educators in a youth physical activity programme. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(2), 135-153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611261003678887>
- Sawiuk, R., Taylor, W.G. & Groom, R. (2018). Exploring formalized elite coach mentoring programmes in the UK: 'We've had to play the game'. *Sport, Education and Society*, 23(6), 619-631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1248386>
- Sawiuk, R., Taylor, W.G. & Groom, R. (2017). An analysis of the value of multiple mentors in formalised elite coach mentoring programmes, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 22(4), 403-413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2016.1268587>
- Seale, C. & Kelly, M. (1998). Coding and analyzing data, In C. Seale (ed.), *Researching society and culture* (pp.146-163). London: Sage.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.