David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching — Source link ↗

Simon Jenkins

Institutions: Leeds Beckett University

Related papers:

- Perspectives on mentoring

- Mentoring: Empowering Your Success

- Mentoring… Really? And Why Not?

- Mentoring: Pros and cons for HRM

- The Management of Mentoring: Policy Issues

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching

Simon Jenkins

Carnegie Faculty of Sport and Education
Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, LS6 3QT, UK
E-mail: S.P.Jenkins@Leedsmet.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

David Clutterbuck is a prolific writer on management and business, who is also a thought leader, advocate and visionary in mentoring. He has distinguished between the traditional US sponsorship-based model of mentoring which emphasizes the use of the mentor's power, influence and authority on behalf of a protégé and the European, development-based model of mentoring which emphasizes the mentor's experience and wisdom to enable the mentee to become self-reliant and to take ownership of their personal and professional development. In order to stimulate commentaries from his peers in the world of mentoring, as well as stakeholders of mentoring in the world of sport, this article presents selected aspects of Clutterbuck's work on mentoring, such as formal vs. informal mentoring, mentoring vs. coaching, conversation, goals, and trends. A theme that runs through the article is the influence of Peter Drucker on Clutterbuck.

Key words: Business Coaching, Case Studies, Developmental Mentoring, Conceptual Framework, Goals, Management Guru, Sponsorship Mentoring

INTRODUCTION

This article is intended to provide a stimulus for David Clutterbuck's peers (both practitioners and academics) in the world of business mentoring/coaching to write commentaries that provide insights and discuss issues related to his work. Clutterbuck is author or co-author of numerous books on mentoring/coaching [1-16]. He has also written books on other areas of management and business, such as corporate governance, employee communication, and work-life balance. Some of his early work on management [17, 18] is considered in this article.

This article will also be a resource and stimulus for stakeholders in sport to consider the utility of Clutterbuck's work on mentoring. With a few exceptions such as Bloom [19], there has been a distinct lack of research on mentoring in sport. In the latest edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, Clutterbuck notes that top athletes may now have a mentor as well as a coach: "Whereas the coach concentrates on technique and motivation, the mentor provides a very different kind of support – one based on reflective learning and something akin to pastoral care" [10, p. 4].

Reviewer: David Clutterbuck (Sheffield Hallam University, UK)

DAVID CLUTTERBUCK

As a student at Westfield College, University of London, Clutterbuck was an author for, and then editor of, *Tattler and Layabout*, the student newspaper. He aspired to become a journalist, but failed to gain a position at Reuters as a trainee journalist when he graduated with an English language and literature degree in 1968 [20, p. 10-11]. After working in the Home Office as an immigration officer, he was Editor of the *Journal of the British Nuclear Energy Society* (1969-1970) and then News Editor (Technology) for *New Scientist* (1970-1973). As Associate Editor of McGraw-Hill's *International Management*, Clutterbuck travelled around the world over a ten-year period from 1973 finding out about good and bad practice in management and eventually became Managing Editor of the journal [21, p. 82].

   In 1981 he started writing books and by 2012 was author/co-author of more than 50 books. The following year he established a company called Item (Publishers) Ltd., a specialist in employee communications, which he sold to the employees in 2004 [21, p. 82]. The following year he formed Clutterbuck Associates, a business issues consultancy, which soon specialised in mentoring. The European Mentoring Centre was founded in 1991, with Clutterbuck as a co-founder and its first director and he has presented workshops at every EMCC European and UK conference. In 2007 he completed his Ph.D. at King's College, University of London, with a thesis entitled, "A Longitudinal Study of the Effectiveness of Developmental Mentoring" [22].

MANAGEMENT GURU

Clutterbuck is author/co-author of a number of books on management, the most influential of which he regards as *The Winning Streak* [17], which he co-authored with Walter Goldsmith, who was Director-General of the Institute of Directors:

> This book has been written at a time of change, in the hope of influencing change. It unashamedly draws for its basic approach on the US book *In Search of Excellence*, but with major adaptations to take account of the very different industrial circumstances, practices and legislative environment in Britain, compared with the United States. [17, p. 1]

In Search of Excellence [23] came out of Tom Peters and Robert Waterman's work with management consultants McKinsey [18, p. 219], and "transformed the management book market virtually overnight" when it was published in 1982 [18, p. 218]. The concluding chapter of Clutterbuck's book with Stuart Crainer on the history of management is entitled, "What makes a management guru?" and quotes Michael Goold of Ashridge Management College:

> 'The emergence of a guru requires the interaction of a topical issue of management concern and an individual with some fresh thinking on that issue.' The fresh thinking may not necessarily be comprehensive. Tom Peters has said that much of what he wrote in the best-selling *In Search of Excellence* can be found in Drucker's *The Practice of Management* published nearly thirty years before. [18, p. 237-238].

Peter Drucker, whose seminal texts have been described as "intellectual spectaculars rather than bestsellers" [24, p. xvii], is one of two "real giants of organisational theory" identified by Clutterbuck and Crainer [18, p. 65] and a major influence on Clutterbuck:

> As a young journalist I developed an acceptive awareness of Peter Drucker as someone whose achievements I would like to emulate. I never took the next step of seeking Drucker out. However, I did develop a friendship with consultant John Humble (of Management by Objectives fame), who had very specifically used Drucker as a role model. [4, p. 44-45]

By "acceptive awareness", Clutterbuck means "identifying from a distance someone who represents the values or achievements you identify with" [4, p. 44]. Drucker remained "firmly rooted in his journalistic background": "'I have a retentive memory for trivia, like a flypaper, plus the journalist's feel for what makes sense and what doesn't'" [18, p. 77]:

> Drucker considers himself as much a journalist as an academic or consultant. ... His autobiography is entitled, *Adventures of a Bystander*, emphasizing his role as a journalistic recorder of trends steering clear of direct involvement. [24, p. 50]

Clutterbuck and Craine quote James O'Toole, professor of management at the University of Southern California that Drucker was "first to advocate mentoring, career planning and executive development as top management tasks." [18, p. 71]:

> Drucker often wrote about the importance of mentorships, not just for the mentee but for the mentor as well. "Just as no one learns as much about a subject as the person who is forced to teach it, no one develops as much as the person who is trying to help others to develop themselves," Drucker noted in his 1973 landmark *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. [25]

There are numerous references to Drucker throughout Clutterbuck and Crainer's *Makers of Management* [18].

MENTORING: CLUTTERBUCK'S CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Clutterbuck published his first book on mentoring in 1985, simultaneous, by coincidence with the publication in the USA of Kathy Kram's book. It was entitled, *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [1], a title which Clutterbuck adapted from an influential article in *Harvard Business Review* entitled, "Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor" [26]. The back cover of Clutterbuck's book stated:

> Formal mentoring programmes are now one of the more widely used management development techniques in the USA. British companies are also experimenting with mentoring, not least because it has proved to be highly effective but also because it reduces management training costs. [1, backcover]

In the third edition of this book, published in 2001, Clutterbuck stated:

> Sixteen years later, much has changed. The traditional US model of mentoring, described by Levinson, Kram and others, emphasises the use of the mentor's *power, influence and authority* on the mentee's behalf. The psychological contract is an exchange of practical help and guidance from the mentor for loyalty and respect from the mentee. Age and elevated position are key components. It was this model that was reflected in the very first edition of this book. However, it soon became

obvious that there was another very different model of mentoring that met the needs of European organisations and individuals much more closely. Developmental mentoring – which is now appearing in some US and Canadian organisations as well – emphasizes helping the mentee become self-reliant and self-resourceful, being able to access multiple sources of support and learning. Here it is *experience and wisdom* that counts more than age and position – while these sometimes go together, it is not universally true! ... This edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor* draws on both models of mentoring, but its sympathies lie unashamedly with the European, developmental model. Hence the US term protégé, with all its overtones of unequal power and hands-on intervention by the mentor, is replaced by mentee, a more neutral (but still pretty horrible) term. [6, p. viii-ix; italics added]

In the first edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [1], Clutterbuck incorporated an acronym, MENTOR, which comes from another source, to indicate that the mentor must: Manage the relationship; Encourage the protégé; Nurture the protégé, Teach the protégé, Offer mutual respect and Respond to the protégé's needs [1, p. 20]. In the third edition of this book, he stated: "While the notion of the mentor managing the relationship still holds favour in some US companies, the wider global expectation is for the mentor to assist the mentee in taking over the management of the relationship" [6, p. 57-58]. Even in the first edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, Clutterbuck indicated that support for mentoring was not universal – for example, General Motors Corporation believed that mentoring is not strictly meritocratic.

Clutterbuck argues that "the vast majority of US literature on mentoring is of minimal value in planning and understanding mentoring in a European context, because it begins from fundamentally different assumptions about the role and nature of mentoring" [6, p. 3]. In the context of sponsorship mentoring, Kram studied a sample of 18 mentoring dyads and identified four stages in the evolution of mentoring relationships: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. Clutterbuck [1, 2] drew on fieldwork to define five stages in the evolution of mentoring relationships in developmental mentoring programmes: rapport building, direction setting, progress making, maturation (winding up of the formal relationship) and moving on [to an informal, ad hoc relationship] [22, p. 26].

Recent reviews of mentoring research have shown the enduring importance of Kram's [27-29] early theoretical work [30, p. 10; 31; 32][1] which viewed mentoring as providing two types of functions to their protégés:

First, mentors may offer *career functions*. Career functions involve a range of behaviours that help protégés "learn the ropes" and prepare them for hierarchical advancement within their organizations. These behaviours include coaching protégés, sponsoring their advancement, increasing their positive exposure and visibility, and offering them protection and challenging assignments. Second, mentors may provide *psychosocial functions*. Psychosocial functions build on trust, intimacy, and interpersonal bonds in the relationship and include behaviours that

---

[1] From a database of 151 business mentoring articles, Ehrich [32] found that 64 out of these 151 articles cited Kram's [29] work: "In many of these business mentoring articles the authors did not really present a theoretical view regarding mentoring; rather they noted the work of Kram [29]. In doing so they tended to describe Kram's conception of mentoring which sees it as comprising two distinct dimensions – a career and psychosocial dimension, both thought to benefit the mentor and mentee" [32, p. 6]. On the other hand, from a database of 159 educational mentoring articles, there was virtually no mention of Kram's [29] work [32, p. 7-8].

enhance the protégé's professional and personal growth, identity, self-worth, and self-efficacy. They include mentoring behaviours such as offering acceptance and confirmation and providing counselling, friendship, and role-modeling. [30, p. 5]

Ragins and Kram [30] draw attention to a number of key insights about mentoring that have emerged from research, including: i) career and psychosocial functions are two relatively independent dimensions of mentoring, and role modelling may represent a third dimension; ii) both career and psychosocial functions predict protégé's job and career satisfaction, but career functions are a stronger predictor of a protégé's compensation and advancement while psychosocial functions have a stronger relationship with a protégé's satisfaction with the relationship; and iii) the range and degree of mentoring functions varies significantly within and across relationships [30, p. 5-6].

Clutterbuck states that "there has been little or no attempt to examine the mentoring process as a whole since Kram's [29] overview" [22, p. 43]. Kram now views mentoring as occurring within the context of developmental networks using social network theory, which provides a framework for understanding "the dimensions of developmental networks, such as the range of sources from which individuals receive developmental help and the emotional closeness and frequency of communication in these relationships" [33, p. 660].

FORMAL VS. INFORMAL MENTORING

Clutterbuck has pointed to a lack of clarity regarding when a mentoring programme is formal or informal [22, p. 5]:

> There are two aspects of context here: the degree, to which the context in which the relationship takes place is planned or formalized; and the level of structure within the relationship itself. On the latter, there is very little data at all. A handful of case studies make passing reference to note-taking, to formal agendas and written contracts between mentor and mentee [8], but the assumption in most writing and research on mentoring is that the relationship itself operates with a high degree of informality, regardless of whether the context is formal or informal. [22, p. 46]

In the literature review for his doctoral thesis, Clutterbuck indicates that in general the sponsorship mentoring literature suggests that formal (supported) mentoring is less effective than informal mentoring and cites Ragins' [34] conclusion that the quality of the mentoring relationship is more significant in terms of efficacy than whether mentoring is formal or informal [22, p. 48].

Clutterbuck notes that supported mentoring "is less widely explored in the literature, but it is a rapidly spreading phenomenon, which may have overtaken informal mentoring in quantity of relationships" [22, p. 36]:

> Getting the best from a mentoring scheme, then, involves building in the best aspects of both formal and informal approaches. A formal structure is essential because it provides meaning and direction for relationships and support where necessary. But individual relationships will flourish best when allowed to operate as informally as possible. Successful formal relationships very frequently go on to become successful informal ones.

An organisation that manages to create a mentoring/coaching culture can increasingly relax the level of formal intervention it imposes. What structures it does provide, in terms of educational materials and training, for example, become regarded as support mechanisms rather than controls. [6, p. 31]

MENTORING VS. COACHING

Megginson and Clutterbuck [3] defined mentoring as "off-line help by one person to another in making significant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking [3, p. 13]. Throughout Clutterbuck's work definitions of mentoring are compared to those of coaching, and other forms of "helping". While his early work often appeared to make sharp distinctions between mentoring and coaching, later definitions become more blurred. In *Learning Alliances* [4], the following distinctions are made. Coaching is concerned with a task, focused on skills and performance, and is often a line manager role; the agenda is set by or with the coaching, there is an emphasis on feedback to the learner, and it typically addresses a short-term need. Mentoring is concerned with implications beyond the task, focused on capability and potential, and it works best off-line; the agenda is set by the learner, there is an emphasis on feedback and reflection by the learner, and it is typically a longer-term relationship [4, p. 18].

In *Implementing Mentoring Schemes* [8], the roles of coaching and mentoring are articulated as follows. Coaching includes: "determining and specifying an individual's learning needs and objectives in relation to work issues; working out how the individual is going to improve performance deficits; helping the individual to explore the problem, develop alternative solutions and decide which one to implement and how; and using appropriate and timely feedback" [8, p. 15]. Mentoring includes: "supporting individuals in discovering and defining their own development needs and setting their own objectives; fostering independent learners; allowing individuals to raise and talk about their issues, occasionally clarifying, reflecting back, and challenging; helping individuals to reflect on their beliefs, feelings, thoughts and behaviours, and to view issues from multiple perspectives; guiding and encouraging individuals in the self-reliant analysis and solution of their problems and opportunities; enabling people to become effective decision-makers; and supporting the solution of issues by embracing an integrated approach" [8, p. 16].

In discussing confusion of definitions, coaching and mentoring are distinguished as follows in *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring* [12]:

> Coaching relates primarily to performance improvement (often over the short term) in a specific skills area. The goals, or at least the intermediate or sub-goals, are typically set with or at the suggestion of the coach. *While the learner has primary ownership of the goal, the coach has primary ownership of the process*. In most cases, coaching involves direct extrinsic feedback (i.e. the coach reports to the coachee what s/he has observed). [12, p. 4; italics added]

> Mentoring relates primarily to the identification and nurturing of potential for the whole person. It can be a long-term process, where the goals may change but are always set by the learner. *The learner owns both the goals and the process*. Feedback comes from within the mentee – the mentor helps them to develop insight and understanding through intrinsic observation (i.e. becoming more aware of their own experiences). [12, p. 4; italics added]

Further clarification is provided in *Making Coaching Work* [11]: "certain types of both

coaching and mentoring are short-term interventions, involving one-way learning and a relatively high degree of directiveness; and certain types are longer term, facilitative relationships of mutual learning" [11, p. 14]:

> Coaching is normally – but not always – associated with some form of performance change, while mentoring is more concerned with career self-management.
> Mentoring may involve the giving of practical advice (but not as a first option) whereas coaching can (in its more managerialist manifestations) involve coachees having priorities and actions set for them.
> Mentoring may involve assistance in enlarging the learner's networks, whereas coaching may focus on the immediate work context. [11, p. 17]

Megginson and Clutterbuck [12] argue that much of the definitional confusion arises because mentoring and coaching skills overlap to some extent:

> Coaches in stimulator style are behaving like a mentor – using their own experience to ask questions that lead learners to their own insights and conclusions, helping to develop their own wisdom...But mentors have a number of other roles to play, which are typically outside the coach's remit. They help the learner to build wider networks, from which to learn and influence; they act as a sounding board and counsellor, responding to the individual's need for emotional support[2]; and they act as adviser and, frequently, role model. Most of these behaviours and roles are not appropriate or relevant for coaching – for example, the professional psychologist, who has no experience of being at the top of a business, would not want to be a role model or sounding board on strategy for a chief executive. Such helpers, with their depth of professional understanding, can often be a much better source of help in focusing on specific behavioural performance improvements than the elder statesman coach who has been there and done it. [12, p. 5]

With regard to "developmental space", Megginson and Clutterbuck identify a number of dimensions beyond the two dimensions of *directiveness*[3] and *need* that Clutterbuck used in earlier work [2]. The five dimensions are directiveness ("where the power lies in the relationship and how it is managed"), need ("whether the relationship focuses primarily on helping the learner with rational or emotional issues"), doing ("achieving change in skills or performance") vs. becoming ("changing one's ambitions, perspectives and sense of identity"), extrinsic vs. intrinsic feedback ("who observes, analyses, interprets and owns an experience"), and future, present and past ("counselling is mainly about dealing with the past, coaching about the present and mentoring about the future") [12, p. 5-6].

Emphasizing the importance of understanding where each role exists within the development space, Megginson and Clutterbuck provide the following guidelines:

---

[2] Clutterbuck states: "It's true that coaches may use similar techniques to counsellors or therapists, but in general they need to be aware of the boundaries that it is dangerous to cross. Coaches who blunder into areas of therapeutic need where they lack specialist expertise have been lambasted in various articles as irresponsible and dangerous" [14, p. 19].

[3] In earlier work, Clutterbuck states; "The directive-indirective dimension...concerns the question of who is in charge of the relationship and its processes. Who sets the learning goals? Who sets the pace? Who suggests the learning tasks or experiments? Who owns the feedback?" [4, p. 30].

"determine the contours of the developmental space in which you operate or wish to operate; call it what you like (but remember you have to be able to communicate the meaning to those people with whom you work and, in the case of the professional coach or mentor, to whoever pays the bill); be consistent with your own definition; and be aware of the role boundaries and the boundaries of your own competence" [12, p. 6].

In comparing developmental and sponsorship mentoring, Clutterbuck views developmental mentoring (where the emphasis is on personal growth and learning) in terms of equal contributions from the "four basic styles of helping"; i.e., coaching, networking, guardian[4] and counselling roles [6, p. 20]; for career-oriented mentoring (having a powerful sponsor), the guardian role is highest, counselling is high, coaching is low, and networking is even lower [6, p. 21-22; 4, p. 9]. The core skill of the mentor involves "having sufficient sensitivity to the mentee's needs to respond with the appropriate behaviours" [6, p. 21].

CONVERSATION

Clutterbuck [35] regards a conversation in mentoring and coaching as having seven layers of increasing depth and impact[5] beyond the level of a transactional conversation (a formalised exchange that is polite but confined to very specific intentions): 1) *social dialogue* – is about developing friendship and providing support/encouragement; 2) *technical dialogue* – meets the mentee's needs for learning about work processes, policies and systems; 3) *tactical dialogue* – helps the mentee work out practical ways of dealing with issues in their work or personal life; 4) *strategic dialogue* – helping the mentee to put problems, opportunities and ambitions into context (e.g., putting together a career development plan) and envision what they want to achieve through the relationship and through their own endeavours; 5) *self-insight dialogue* – enables the mentee to understand their own drives, ambitions, fears and thinking patterns; 6) *behavioural change dialogue* – allows the mentee to meld insight, strategy and tactics into a coherent programme of personal adaptation; and 7) *integrative dialogue* – helps the mentee to develop a clear sense of who they are, what they contribute and how they fit in [35]. A single mentoring session might involve several layers, working generally in the direction of transactional conversations to integrative dialogue [35].

Megginson and Clutterbuck argue that the coaching/mentoring conversations should not be driven by the toolkit (model, process, or theoretical framework), but rather the selection of the tools and techniques should be driven by the conversation [12, p. 4]. As coaches/mentors acquire experience, the GROW model becomes inadequate[6]:

> Among the dangers of this 'one model' approach was that coaching becomes mechanistic, critical clues to the client context are missed or ignored, and, whatever may be claimed to the contrary, the client can easily become manipulated to fit the coach's agenda. This is especially true with regard to goal setting, where we find

---

[4] Clutterbuck identifies four styles of guardian – role model (low directiveness, low intervention), advisor (high directiveness, low intervention), meister (low directiveness, high intervention), and sponsor (high directiveness, high intervention) [4, p. 38-39].

[5] Clutterbuck states: "My own studies of coaching and mentoring focus on the coaching conversation as a learning dialogue, a theme that has been explored by Argyris, Schon, and many others observers of managerial behaviour" [14, p. 28]

6 Clutterbuck states: "Although John Whitmore never promoted the GROW model as a rigid structure for coaching conversations, it is often used as such. Hanging on to SMART goals provides a crutch for less confident coaches and mentors" [13, p. 131].

that fixing upon specific goals at the start of a relationship is primarily for the benefit of the coach or the sponsor, rather than that of the coachee. [13, p. 3]

GOALS

Both Clutterbuck and Megginson have questioned the validity and utility of an excessive or premature focus on goals as the drivers of the learning relationship" [13, p. 130]. Clutterbuck has cited Ordonez et al.'s [36] arguments against the over-prescription of goal-setting (e.g., the short-term goals tend to promote "myopic, short-term behaviour that harms the organisation in the long run") along with Locke and Latham's [37] response. Clutterbuck and Megginson show how SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-specific) goals may turn out to be DIM (Dysfunctional Intervention by Management):

> Consider the example of the sales team incentivised to sell a premium product by offering bulk discounts. The goal was specific and measurable (80% more sales), achievable in the sense that customers were amenable), relevant (it was part of their routine job) and time specific (they were given 5 months to achieve the target). Unfortunately, the capacity of the supplier in China to meet the increased orders was insufficient to meet the demand created, without diverting production from other customers. So customers, whose orders couldn't be fulfilled, became very annoyed. Moreover, sensing that they were now in a seller's market, the Chinese supplier increased prices, turning the premium product into one with much reduced margins. The goal was DIM because it didn't take into account the wider context and because it had no room for adaptability as it worked out. ... This kind of goal management is like pointing a bloodhound at a scent. Its nose goes down, its view of the world narrows and it becomes only marginally aware of what happens around it. This may be a great strategy in business, where the goal is short term, task-driven and relatively simple. But personal development goals and many business goals arise in an environment of uncertainty, complexity and liability to change. They also tend to take longer to achieve and have to fit in between the spaces of more urgent, in-the-moment tasks and objectives. [13, p. 130]

In his doctoral research, which evaluated the effectiveness of developmental mentoring [22, p. 34], Clutterbuck found that neither goal clarity (knowing what mentors and mentees wanted to achieve and why) nor goal commitment (how determined they were to achieve and why) – measured in the early stages of the mentoring relationship – correlated with self-report measures of either relationship quality/satisfaction/commitment or developmental/career/enabling/ emotional outcomes. However, goal alignment (having a shared sense of purpose for the relationship) did correlate with both the relationship and outcome measures. Although the study did not investigate "when, how (or whether) goals emerged" [22, p. 315], it appears that "tying goals tightly down at the beginning is not a recipe for achievement, but maintaining a sense of direction and purpose is" [13, p. 131]. Clutterbuck and Megginson provide the following guidelines for coaches/mentors and for line managers:

1. Don't become addicted to goals.
2. Let (genuine) goals emerge, but steer the emergence process (i.e. keep your eyes on the horizon, but your hands on the steering wheel).

3. When goals do emerge, make sure they are truly owned by those who have to make them happen. [13, p. 132]

Clutterbuck has noted that "SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-specific) have become one of the unquestioned bases of modern management", and that "[i]t all started several decades ago with the rise of MBO and goal theory" [13, p. 130]. Given the influence of Drucker on Clutterbuck, it is worth drawing attention to the fact that Drucker is closely associated with Management by Objectives[7], which has been defined as "a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members" [39, p. 225, citing, 40, p. 55-56]. Clutterbuck and Craine note that Drucker in his classic 1954 text, *The Practice of Management* [41], observed and encapsulated MBO in a way that others could develop [18, p. 62], but he took a "fairly pragmatic view" of it:

> 'MBO is just another tool. It is not the great cure for management inefficiency,' he has said. 'Management by Objectives works if you know the objectives. Ninety percent of the time you don't. The only things that evolve by themselves in an organization are disorder, friction and malperformance.' [18, p. 75]

TRENDS AND FUTURE IN MENTORING

Huczynski [42] states that management gurus have the ability to make accurate predictions based on their knowledge and skill, and (citing [43]) indicated that "Drucker's ability to foretell the future was remarkable" [42, p. 203]. Clutterbuck states:

> I have written a predictive article on mentoring at least once every decade since the 1980s. Some of the themes identified have evolved more slowly than I expected (for example, the increased international collaboration of researchers), but the general pattern has been accurate: continued innovation in the ways mentoring is used and the kind of problems and opportunities it addresses, increased sophistication and professionalization, and a growing list of aspects we don't yet understand sufficiently. [44]

In two recent articles [44, 45], as well as in the latest edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [10], Clutterbuck has indicated current trends – and a glimpse of the future in mentoring:

1. Mentoring tends to flourish within organisations with: "a) support and quality managements from the centre; b) flexibility in delivery in the regions or divisions; and c) a shared definition of mentoring, along with localised cultural adaptation" [45].

---

[7] Waring states: "[Drucker] turned to General Motors and in 1942 the company asked him to study its top management structure. Before finishing his study in 1945, he became acquainted with a managerial tool that seemed to provide at least some of what was needed. Alfred P. Sloan had used something very similar to management by objectives at GM since the 1920s. Donaldson Brown had given the method theoretical expression in a 1927 paper entitled "Decentralized Operations and Responsibilities with Coordinated Control" [38, p. 215].

2. Coaches and mentors become part of "a network of support the organisation encourages, in particular for its talent pool" [45]. "To retain high potential employees, it will become increasingly important to provide both coaching and mentoring" [44].

3. Mentoring is increasingly being regarded as a core skill for leaders [45].

4. E-mentoring is defined as mentoring relationships that are conducted primarily or entirely by e-mail [10, p. 156], but mentoring pairs should be able to communicate using any mutually acceptable combination of technologies, "including face-to-face, e-mail, Skype, telephone and texting, as appropriate" [44].

5. Mentor supervision will increasingly be used in organisational mentoring programmes [44], particularly when "mentoring addresses significant transitions for the mentee in their life journey" and the "greater the potential to encounter sensitive boundaries – and in particular the boundary between mentoring and therapy" [45]: "As in coaching, effective supervision is valuable in ensuring client safety, in helping the mentor gain insights into his or her practice and in focusing attention on the mentor's personal development in the role" [45].

6. More sophisticated matching of mentoring dyads – using information such as values compatibility and learning maturity in order to facilitate the development of rapport between mentor and mentee [45].

7. Group mentoring, where mentees meet together on a regular basis and co-mentor each other. They meet collectively with their mentor once a month [45].

8. Support services for mentor and mentee, ranging from "mentoring champions, who can provide ad hoc advice to mentors, to on-line databases of FAQs" [45].

9. Education and accreditation of mentoring programme coordinators, who require "substantial skills of administration, participant support and stakeholder management" [44].

10. Collecting data from multiple perspectives to troubleshoot relationships, improve management of mentoring programmes, and to demonstrate values for money [45].

11. Multiple mentoring - an individual having several simultaneous mentors who focus on a different aspect of his/her life (multiple mentoring) [44].

12. Sequential mentoring - moving from one mentor to another in a planned manner [44].

13. Cascade mentoring - an individual being both a mentor and mentee [44] - "for example, young graduates or junior managers might be mentored by a senior manager. After a few months of mentoring, the mentee becomes mentor to a person outside the organisation – perhaps a young person at risk, or an ex-offender – or someone more junior inside the organisation" [45].

14. Integration of human resources (HR) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, with cascade mentoring increasingly becoming part of this integration [44].

15. Mentoring relationships that are deliberately status-free are becoming increasingly common. Reverse mentoring occurs when the mentor is more junior than the mentee. It is "a practical means of promoting diversity/equal opportunity agendas" [44]. Peer mentoring is a non-hierarchical relationship in which a peer can be a critical friend [10, p. 102].

16. Professionalisation - "In Poland, for example, there is a Mentoring Academy, which provides accreditation for retired senior executives, who wish to practise as mentors, and to have recognition, not just of their business experience, but of their

mentoring competence. The programme includes skills and awareness in behaviour change, the psychology of mentoring and ethical issues" [44].

17. Accreditation of mentoring programmes - Clutterbuck is advisory chair of the International Standards for Mentoring Programmes in Employment (ISMPE), which was launched in 2003 as an international benchmark of mentoring programme quality after consultation with scheme co-ordinators and other observers of good practice [10, 44].

18. In Europe, some "very senior managers in more macho, task-driven cultures" may adopt directive sponsorship behaviours, despite training in use of developmental mentoring [45].

19. A more balanced research agenda in mentoring and coaching – most mentoring research has been quantitative and positivist, providing evidence of mentoring efficacy; most coaching research has been qualitative and experiential, providing understanding of relationship dynamics in coaching [44].

CONCLUSION

The pen portrait of David Clutterbuck in the first edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [1] states that he is "a management writer and broadcaster". It might be more accurate to describe him now as a thought leader (i.e., "one of the foremost authorities in selected areas of specialization, resulting in being the go-to individual or organization for said expertise" [46]) and even a management guru.

Clutterbuck is an advocate of mentoring and also a visionary leader. In the latest edition of his book *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [10], he states:

> My vision of ultimate mentoring is that everyone will have an opportunity to participate in and benefit from mentoring throughout their lives – that it will become a natural substitute for the extended family of village communities in previous centuries. I was gratified to hear recently of a school which had eliminated bullying by making every senior form responsible by mentoring pupils in junior forms, the cascade effect is very powerful. [10, p. 173]

In producing an appealing and easy-to-understand conceptual framework for mentoring, based on a dichotomy between US and European approaches, Clutterbuck applies understanding about management gurus from his book *Makers of Management*:

> A director of the Urwick Management Centre, Rodney Morton, expressed it: 'One thing all the gurus have is an easily understood *conceptual framework* addressing a current problem. They make people feel strongly about it. Their wisdom sounds like common sense.' Similarly, Ashridge's Valerie Hammond concludes: 'Gurus are people who encapsulate in a few words something you know to be true. They set down a complete philosophy which makes sense to others both in business and the man in the street.' [18, p. 238-239; italics added].

Much of Clutterbuck's written work on mentoring is based around case studies – indeed he notes that much of the literature on the European model of mentoring is composed of "pragmatic observation rather than empirical analysis [22, p. 18-19]. Flyvbjerg [47] has championed the use of case studies in social science, following Kuhn [48] in emphasizing that "a discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline

without systematic exemplars[8], and that a discipline without exemplars is an ineffective one"
[47, p. 432]. Furthermore:

> In a teaching situation, well-chosen case studies can help the student achieve
> competence, while context-independent facts and rules will bring the student just to
> the beginner's level. Only a few institutions of higher learning have taken the
> consequence of this. Harvard University is one of them. Here both teaching and
> research in the professional schools are modelled to a wide extent on the
> understanding that case knowledge is central to human learning...
> [47, p. 421-422]

The first edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor* [1] features five case studies, including the
formal mentoring programme implemented by Merrill Lynch in 1980 called the Management
Readiness Programme which had he following aims: 1) To identify managers with potential
and groom them for senior management positions; 2) To broaden young employees' career
knowledge so that they are aware of the alternatives open to them; 3) To assist mentors and
protégés to build networks in the organization; and 4) To promote women in the company [1,
p. 75-76]. With regard to the fourth aim, it is worth noting that Clutterbuck has been a
tremendous advocate of diversity:

> When I first wrote *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, the concept of using mentoring as a
> vehicle for promoting equal opportunity was still fairly new. The handful of
> programmes there were tended to focus on high-potential women. [6, p. 124]

Clutterbuck co-authored a book entitled *Mentoring and Diversity: An International
Perspective* [7] with Belle Rose Ragins, a female, American academic, and this year he
published a second book in this area [16]. In a recent article, he asked "If succession planning
and talent management, work, why – in spite of so much effort to bring about change – is the
diversity at the bottom of organisations not reflected at higher levels?" [50].

Clutterbuck work on mentoring has extended beyond business. Having a son with
combined Down's syndrome and autism, he founded a charity that uses coaching and
mentoring approaches to promote social inclusion for your people with learning difficulties
or autistic spectrum disorders.

REFERENCES

1. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: How to Foster Talent Within the Organization*, Institute of Personnel Management, London, 1985.

2. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: How to Foster Talent Within the Organization*, 2nd edn., Institute of Personnel Management, London, 1991.

3. Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Mentoring in Action: A Practical Guide for Managers*, Kogan Page, London, 1995.

4. Clutterbuck, D., *Learning Alliances: Tapping into Talent*, Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 1998.

---

[8] In the debate about what Kuhn [48] meant by 'paradigm', Putnam stated that "a paradigm is simply a scientific
theory together with an example of a successful and striking application. It is important that the application – say, a
successful explanation of some fact, or a successful and novel prediction – be striking; what this means is that the
success is sufficiently impressive that scientists – especially young scientists choosing a career – are led to try to
emulate that success by seeking further explanations, predictions, or whatever on the same model" [49, p. 69].

5.   Clutterbuck, D. and Megginson, D., *Mentoring Executives and Directors*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1999.

6.   Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: Fostering Talent at Work*, 3rd edn., Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 2001.

7.   Clutterbuck, D. and Ragins, B.R., *Mentoring and Diversity: An International Perspective*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2001.

8.   Klasen, N. and Clutterbuck, D., *Implementing Mentoring Schemes: A Practical Guide to Successful Programs*, ButterworthHeinemann, Oxford, 2002.

9.   Clutterbuck, D. and Lane, G., *The Situational Mentor*, Gower, Aldershot, 2004.

10. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: Fostering Talent at Work*, 4th edn., Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 2004.

11. Clutterbuck, D. and Megginson, D., *Making Coaching Work: Creating a Coaching Culture*, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 2005.

12. Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2005.

13. Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Further Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2009.

14. Clutterbuck, D., *Coaching the Team at Work*, Nicholas Brealey International, London, 2007.

15. Clutterbuck, D. and Hussain, Z., eds., *Virtual Coach, Virtual Mentor*, Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC, 2010.

16. Clutterbuck, D., Poulsen, K.M. and Kochan, F., *Developing Successful Diversity Mentoring Programmes: An International Case Book*, Open University Press, Maidenhead, UK, 2012.

17. Goldsmith, W. and Clutterbuck, D., *The Winning Streak: Britain's Top Companies Reveal Their Formulas for Success*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1984.

18. Clutterbuck, D. and Crainer, S., *Makers of Management: Men and Women Who Changed the Business World*, Guild Publishing, London, 1990.

19. Bloom, G.A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R.J. and Salmela, J.H., The Importance of Mentoring in the Development of Coaches and Athletes, *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1998, 29, 267-281.

20. Nettle, S., The Skills of Talk-Talk, *Quad*, 2007, Spring, 10-11.

21. Clutterbuck, D., How I Got Where I Am Today, *People Management*, 2007, April, 82.

22. Clutterbuck, D.A., *A Longitudinal Study of the Effectiveness of Developmental Mentoring*, Doctoral Dissertation, King's College, University of London, 2007.

23. Peters, T.J. and Watermn, R.H., *In Search of Excellence*, New York, Harper and Row, 1982.

24. Crainer, S., *The Ultimate Guide to Business Gurus: 50 Thinkers Who Made Management*, Capstone, Oxford, 1998.

25. Lawlor, B., Archivist's Pick: The Real Meaning of Mentoring, *Http://thedx.druckerinstitute.com/2012/06/the-real-meaning-of-mentoring/*

26. Collins, E.G., ed., Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor: Interviews with F.J. Lunding, G.L. Clements, D.S. Perkins, *Harvard Business Review*, 1978, July-August, 56(2), 89-101.

27. Kram, K., Phases of the Mentor Relationship, *Academy of Management Journal*, 1983, 26(4), 608-625.

28. Kram, K., Mentoring Processes at Work: Developmental Relationships in Managerial Careers, Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, 1980.

29. Kram, K.E., *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, Scott Foreman, Glenview, IL, 1985.

30. Ragins, B.R. and Kram, K.E., The Roots and Meaning of Mentoring, in: Ragins, B.R. and Kram, K.E., *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Sage, Los Angeles, CA, 2007, 3-15.

31.   Bozeman, B. and Feeney, M.K., Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique, *Administration & Society*, 2007, 39(6), 719-739.

32.   Ehrich, L.C., Hansford, B. and Tennet, L., Closing the Divide: Theory and Practice in Mentoring, Paper for ANZAM 2001 Conference, 'Closing the Divide', Auckland, New Zealand, 5-7 December, 2001.

33.   Kram, K.E. and Ragins, B.R., The Landscape of Mentoring in the 21st Century, in: Ragins, B.R. and Kram, K.E., The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice, Sage, Los Angeles, CA, 2007, 659-692.

34.   Ragins, B.R., Cotton, J.L. and Miller, J.S., Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes, *Academy of Management Journal*, 2000, 43(6), 1117-1194.

35.   Clutterbuck, D., The Seven Layers of Mentoring, 2010, Unpublished Paper.

36.   Ordonez, L.D., Schweitzer, M.E., Galinsky, A.E. and Bazerman, M.H., Goals Gone Wild: The Systemic Side Effects of Overprescribing Goal Setting, Working Paper, 09-083, Harvard Business School, 2009.

37.   Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P., Has Goal Setting Gone Wild, or Have its Attackers Abandoned Good Scholarship?, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 2009, 17-23.

38.   Waring, S.P., Peter Drucker, MBO, and the Corporatist Critique of Scientific Management, in: Nelson, D., ed., *A Mental Revolution: Scientific Management Since Taylor*, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, OH, 1992, 205-236.

39.   Greenwood, R.G., Management by Objectives: As Developed by Peter Drucker, Assisted by Harold Smiddy, *Academy of Management Review*, 1981, 6(2), 225-230.

40.   Odiorne, G., *Management by Objectives: A System of Managerial Leadership*, Pitman, New York, 1965.

41.   Drucker, P., *The Practice of Management*, Harper & Row, New York, 1954.

42.   Huczynski, A.A., *Management Gurus: What Makes Them and How to Become One*, Routledge, London, 1993.

43.   Kantrow, A., The Strategy-Technology Connection, *Harvard Business Review*, 1980, 85(4), 6-21.

44.   Clutterbuck, D., The Future of Mentoring, Unpublished Paper.

45.   Clutterbuck, D., The Next Decade in Mentoring: A Personal Perspective from David Clutterbuck, Unpublished Paper, 2010.

46.   Forbes, What is a Thought Leader?, *Http://www.forbes.com/sites/russprince/2012/03/16/what-is-a-thought-leader/*

47.   Flyvbjerg, B., Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2006, 12(2), 219-245.

48.   Kuhn, T., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edn., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1970.

49.   Putnam, H., The 'Corroboration' of Theories, in: Hacking, I., ed., *Scientific Revolutions*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1981, 60-79.

50.   Smith, F., Talent Spotters Usually Get it Wrong, *Http://www.afr.com/p/national/work_space/talent_spotting_gets_it_wrong_most_CMb1HfIkM4vMpRbeGRlvWK*

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Jo Gray
Principal Consultant
Clutterbuck Associates
Grenville Court, Britwell Road,
Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8DF, UK
E-mail: jgray@gpstrategies.com

INTRODUCTION

Having worked closely with David Clutterbuck for over five years what is very clear, and which is highlighted in this article, is his ability to read the trends and predict the future in the mentoring space. Many years ago, David was very keen to start using Twitter at a time when it was not the force to be reckoned with that it is now. David quickly recognised the power of new media as a potential resource for delivering content and sharing information.

This commentary will therefore look in more detail at the future for mentoring that David has written about and predicted over the past years and how we at Clutterbuck Associates (CA) have seen these and other ideas take form.

MENTORING PROGRAMMES

What we have noticed at CA is that organisational sophistication in the coaching and mentoring space has increased. Many have run mentoring programmes and have had some success with this. However, the focus now is how they build on this and improve the quality of the programme and the mentoring that takes place within it. David has recently written about "Second Wave Mentoring", where organisations are looking to develop their mentoring programmes. In this article he mentions that at a recent round table event with Career Innovations "more than two thirds of HR professionals responsible for mentoring programmes indicated they were, to a greater or lesser extent, dissatisfied with either the management of their mentoring programme or the outcomes from it" [1].

This dissatisfaction is leading organisations to look at improving and developing programmes and we are seeing them starting to think more carefully around the purpose of their mentoring programme and the impact they would like to see from this. This means we are seeing programmes that focus on:

- supporting women return to the workplace after maternity leave
- knowledge transfer as key people in the organisation are reaching retirement age
- embedding other learning initiatives so that these do not remain as one-off interventions, but are supported and developed through a mentoring relationship

COACHING VERSUS MENTORING

We are also noticing the further blurring of lines between coaching and mentoring and the acceptance that they have more similarities than differences. David has recently written a piece on this ongoing debate and reflects that "both coaching and mentoring are at root about open learning dialogue" [2]. There has also been the recent announcement that the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC - of which David is a founder member), the Association for Coaching, and the International Coach Federation (ICF) have got together to create the Global Coaching and Mentoring Alliance with a view to advancing the industry as a whole. This will hopefully be another step in bringing the two disciplines more closely aligned.

The International Standards for Mentoring Programmes in Employment (ISMPE), although launched by David Clutterbuck, have recently been taken on by a global board of mentoring experts who will continue to fine tune what good practice within mentoring programmes look likes and enable more organisations to benchmark their programmes against good practice and receive accreditation. This focus on the quality of the programme as much as the mentors and mentees within it will be integral in the further promotion of mentoring programmes.

MENTORING SUPERVISION

We have seen some development in supervision in mentoring, although in our experience it is a programme element that many organisations decide not to implement which does impact on programme success. Clearly there needs to be some support offered to mentors not only to aid their development, but support good practice within any programme. David Clutterbuck recognised that there is a need for "some form of mutual support mechanism by which mentors can meet from time to time to share experience and receive further advice" [3]. This idea has been further developed by Merrick and Stokes in their work on this topic where they offered a conceptual schema for mentor development and supervision based on their experience in the field [4]. Their model is useful in focusing thinking around what level your mentors are at and using that to then support what level of support or "supervision" they might need. They define four levels of:

- Novice Mentor
- Developing Mentor
- Reflective Mentor
- Reflexive Mentor

The first two identified levels can clearly be managed through less structured support, however to really develop as a mentor it is clear that access to a more experienced mentor or supervisor is essential in moving to a more reflective and then reflexive space.

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Something we expect to see more of is mentoring being used as part of the Employee Engagement agenda. Employee engagement is a current hot topic with the Engage for Success movement leading the way and identifying that two thirds of the UK work force is failing to reach its full potential. One of the common objectives of any mentoring programme is increased capability of individuals and the growth of their potential.

At a recent event discussing this issue with various organisations, many highlighted the fact that the one key issue for them is keeping employees engaged and supported in times of

great change. There will certainly be a model of mentoring that will emerge to support this more fully.

CONCLUSION

CA has always held that at its core, mentoring is about a great conversation that helps someone with the quality of their thinking. David Clutterbuck's latest book "The Talent Wave" [5] reflects this point with its focus on connected leaders and some key attributes of a great leader identified as that they:

- Engage themselves with the organisation, at all levels, in particular through two-way learning activities, such as coaching and mentoring
- Are role models for learning
- See their role as asking the right questions and helping others find the right answers

Not only has David's skill been in making concepts and ideas easy to understand, he has always managed to blend his academic work and practical experience on mentoring and it is this mixture of theory and practice which enables him to not only predict the future but to see that future become a reality and this is the great legacy he leaves with Clutterbuck Associates.

REFERENCES

1. Clutterbuck, D., Second Wave Mentoring, *Talent Management Magazine*, 2012, December.

2. Clutterbuck, D. One More Time: That Coaching v Mentoring Debate, Unpublished Paper, 2012.

3. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, 4th edn., Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 2004.

4. Merrick, L. and Stokes P., (2003) Mentor Development and Supervision: A Passionate Joint Enquiry, *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 2003, 1(1),

5. Clutterbuck, D., *The Talent Wave*, Kogan Page, London, 2012.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Jim McKenna

Research Institute for Sport, Physical Activity and Leisure
Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, LS6 3QS, UK
E-mail: J.McKenna@leedsmet.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

The stimulus article provided by Simon Jenkins underlines Clutterbuck's immense contribution to the improvement of workplace learning and development. It also shows the importance of his contributions and just how prodigious a writer – and thinker – he continues to be. He personifies someone whose work makes a difference, not least because he readily emphasises the shortcomings of what can quickly become the catholicons of daily working life. Crucially, unlike many of his counterparts, his work crosses from imitation to innovation.

I will draw on themes underpinned by the idea of the workplace as a learning environment. Therefore, the learning workplace - and coaches and mentors within them – must all focus on developing and amplifying employees' positive characteristics and skills. Notwithstanding that only few organisations meet any such characterisation, these issues are important; they will help to develop the much needed internal alignment – 'cross-functional efficiency' [1] – recommended for 21st century excellence.

ENGAGEMENT

At the same time, it is salutary to reflect on how many major public disasters occur in workplaces endorsing seemingly acceptable, but actually faulty, procedures and practices. This is akin to error blindness [2] and reinforces the need to develop managers and colleagues who create learning environments that actively build engagement. Importantly, engagement also supports caring about how well work is done and this helps to reduce the likelihood of the different forms of error blindness that influence progress at, and in, work. To do the opposite is to endorse employee indifference and, therefore, poor performance.

RELATIONSHIPS

Crucially, in mentoring and coaching the importance of relationships shines through. This sits well with my experience and resonates powerfully with my own interests in neurobiology, counselling and Positive Psychology. A phrase I recently encountered – but disappointingly, I failed to record its origin - sums it well; 'the relationship is the intervention'. Importantly, not least because I work in UK Higher Education, where recent funding cuts have bitten deeply to produce substantial dislocations between staff and managers [3], this serves as a mantra for anyone involved with leading, managing, coaching or mentoring in this environment.

EMPLOYEE 'DOMINATION'

To link to the work that Clutterbuck addressed so perceptively, it is helpful to think of employee (dis)engagement as a relationship issue. Given the scale of employee disengagement, which Bauman [4] describes as the product of domination, it is clear that urgent action is needed as this risks characterising the 21st century employee. In Bauman's understanding, globalisation has undermined every organisation's power to influence outcomes, leaving employees lost, wondering how to get things done and no longer believing that their employers – or their processes - offer viable 'answers'. If Bauman is correct, then the importance of effective coaching and mentoring as a means of restoring employees' sense of agency can hardly be overstated and I would like to suggest that centres on employee learning.

EMPLOYEE LEARNING

I was also impressed by how well Clutterbuck's contribution aligns with the emerging understanding of why learning does not happen, despite well-intentioned interventions and people. Learning theory also confirms that there are substantial consequences for getting relationships wrong; in many workplaces this may be best exemplified by providing 'training' or educational programmes for disaffected staff. Project Zero (*http://www.pz.harvard.edu*) has identified three key elements required to make thinking happen well and to organise the ways in which we think. Drawing on what is analogous to error blindness [2], Project Zero highlights the importance of being alert, since alertness is a precursor to events being either affirmed or questioned. Once any individual is engaged enough to care, this is amplified by then deploying thinking to create solutions/ways forward. Thus, in terms of development, ability *follows* attention and engagement. This provides an important order of business for meetings and developmental programmes.

This pattern occurred irrespective of traditional measures of intelligence, such as IQ, which itself was not linked to seeing better options to given problems. Another important finding from Project Zero is the need to more explicitly point out how learning occurs; the questions 'What's going on here?' and 'What do you see that helps you say that?' each offer insights into learning-enhancing techniques that mentors can easily deploy. Further, to avoid the butting of heads that may result from suggesting changes that are too difficult, it is also important to consider dispositions, which can be taken to indicate an individual's preference to response to specific circumstances in particular ways. This work is well developed in the canon of Dweck [5], who characterises dispositional approaches that favour either a fixed (judging) or an incremental (learning) mindset.

Therefore, given the ubiquity of employee disengagement, I would add 'addressing the consequences of creating dysfunctional relationships' to his list of suggestions for further work. As a counter to the contemporary preoccupation about the costs of employee absenteeism and so on, I would especially like to see estimates of the equivalent costs resulting from the disaffection that poor management/coaching brings. In a recession, this would add a sense of urgency to those employees who have the greatest need for facilitating the development of others. In a climate with a proclivity for initiating programmes of change – many of which will certainly fail [6] - I would also endorse considering the various roles that might be played by the five V-A-D-E-P (Valence, Appropriateness, Discrepancy, Efficacy and Principal support) 'sentiments' for actively resisting change in an organisation [7].

GOAL SETTING

Jenkins also highlighted that Clutterbuck recognised both the deep shortcomings associated with enforced goal-setting (p. 147-148) and the risks that headlong pursuit of this approach can create. This approach now features strongly in many organisations through their annual review processes, and I suggest, this enforcement approach adds further to the fracture of relationships between managers and employees. Supporting an opposite approach, Pentland and Herrin [8] highlight the lockstep of workplace informality and better employee performance; it may be that informality is an important facet of prolonging attention through the working day. In the absence of positive working relationships between employees and people assigned to undertake annual reviews, it may be more effective – and efficient – to undertake less formal processes based around informal coaching/mentoring relationships.

Notwithstanding, the widespread deployment of goal setting and the 15 different goal setting meta-analyses published since the 1980s that all point to positive performance effects [9, p. 175], it is not universally successful. Indeed, the parsimony suggested by this broad sweep of evidence may undermine our need to continually refine how goal setting is undertaken. Crucially, a closer look at the empirical evidence cautions against anticipating a universally positive impact; highly variable outcomes and fundamental gaps in understanding remain and Clutterbuck was wise to this even before the formal evidence was available.

It is timely to remind ourselves about the shortfalls around goal-setting and to consider how even a lay appreciation of these issues will fundamentally subvert the positivity that well developed goal setting will produce [10]. A first problem is that goal setting does not perform well for complex tasks and when it is it adopted, undemanding goals are often set. Enforcing goal-setting on employees who know their work for its complexity may well be the first wedge being driven into a relationship. Second, there are questions about the relevance of individually-set goals to situations requiring group-based working; another wedge?

Third, it is unclear how long different types of goals 'work' and how different forms of support alter these effects. These comments reflect some of the issues listed in Clutterbuck's proposals for trends in mentoring (p. 148-150). Finally, and this is highly relevant to the current economic situation, there is little certainty over what happens when demanding goals are achieved or even exceeded (which meets intrinsic motivations) but where valued extrinsic rewards – such as pay rises or promotions - cannot be met. Within programmes emphasising sequential goal setting, continually revising goals to suit changing circumstances (viz. "keep your eyes on the horizon, but your hands on the steering wheel") (p. 147) reminds us that goal setting often plays second fiddle to many contextual factors. With this in mind it is wise that more managers – and the processes they endorse – are presented more as 'guides on the side' than as all-knowing 'sages on the stage'. Yet, in this context, it is time to aver that while this qualifies as common sense, it is not common practice.

CONCLUSION

In responding to Jenkins' stimulus article, I have attempted to link Clutterbuck's contributions to coaching and mentoring to my own experiences and understanding. A case has been made for a pathway beginning with attention, then moving to engagement, caring and ending with learning, and attempted to contextualise that pathway to the cloying, undermining effects that globalisation is having on every employee and their sense of agency. Informal coaching/mentoring may be more effective and efficient than the formalised, enforced goal-setting typically seen in annual reviews, possibly because of the

functionality of such relationships. In particular, I have linked the problems of error blindness that often emerge through error indifference associated with employee disengagement, to problems rooted in relationships and to thetic deployment of goal setting.

REFERENCES

1. Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H., *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*, New York: HarperCollins. 2004.

2. Van Hecke, M.L., *Blind Spots: Why Smart People Do Dumb Things*, Prometheus, New York, 2011.

3. Bolden, R., Gosling, J., O'Brien, A., Peters, K., Ryan, M. and Haslam, A., *Academic Leadership: Changing Conceptions, Identities and Experiences in UK Higher Education*, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, London, 2012.

4. Bauman, Z., *Does Ethics Have a Chance in a World of Consumers?,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2008.

5. Dweck, C., *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*, Random House, New York, 2006.

6. Hamlin, R. G. and Stewart, J. D., What is HRD? A Definitional Review and Synthesis of the HRD Domain, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 2011, 34(3), 199-220.

7. Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G., Cole, M.S., Fillmer, J.L. and Self, D.R., A Top Management Team's Reactions to Organizational Transformation: The Diagnostic Benefits of Five Key Change Sentiments, *Journal of Change Management*, 2007, 7(3), 273-90.

8. Pentland, A. and Herrin, A., The New Science of Building Great Teams: Analytics for Success, *Harvard Business Review*, April, 2012.

9. Miner, J.B., *Organisational Behaviour 1: Essential Theories of Motivation and Leadership*, Sharpe Inc, New York, 2005.

10. Locke, G.P., *Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2007.

David Clutterbuck,Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Ann Rolfe
Mentoring Works
20 Mountain Ash Way
Umina Beach, NSW, Australia 2257
E-mail: ann@mentoring-works.com

INTRODUCTION

This commentary is written from a practitioner perspective. Regrettably, I am not an academic and I am honoured to be included in this publication. I speak from thirty or so years experience in adult learning, twenty-six years employed in my own business and sixteen years specialising, almost exclusively, in mentoring.

I have worked on mentoring programs with more than a hundred organisations in Australia. I have written a dozen books on mentoring, for mentors, mentorees and people developing and running mentoring programs, and I've contributed chapters to two international publications on mentoring, including David Clutterbuck's latest one.

My ongoing self-education in mentoring has included attending and presenting at the International Mentoring Association conferences in five of the last seven years. I attended the European Mentoring and Coaching Council's Conference in 2008. I've been fortunate to attend workshops in Australia, run by Margo Murray during the 1990's and more recently, some sessions run by David Clutterbuck. My webinars and online network allow me to interact with practitioners around the world and my bookshelves groan with a personal library of books by the European and North American luminaries, as well as the handful of Australian practitioners, of mentoring and related fields.

I trust my thoughts can contribute to a conversation that creates insight and practical wisdom to advance what I know as one of the most important strategies in the development of people and the betterment of all our lives, mentoring.

MENTORING: CONCEPTUAL MODELS

My background is in adult learning and career development. In the 1990's, Mentoring was not the buzz-word it is today. I first spoke to my workshop participants about mentoring, almost in passing, as a strategy for their self-development. Then a client then asked me to prepare a workshop specifically about it and my research led to the works of Margo Murray [1], Linda Phillips-Jones [2], Gordon Shea [3], Brian Caldwell and Earl Carter [4], and of course, David Clutterbuck [5].

I was immediately struck with a problem, in terms of defining mentoring. The American model included an emphasis on power, and the mentor making useful introductions that opened doors:

> … mentors are influential, experienced people who personally help you reach your life goals. They have the power – through who or what they know – to promote your welfare. [2, p. 22]

The sponsorship angle was reduced but still evident in the British work of that time:

> The protégé must believe that his mentor has enough power in the organization to make a tangible difference to his career. [5, p. 44]

In Australia at that time and since, equity has been a major workplace issue, particularly in the government agencies. Unfair advantage, the "old boy network" and nepotism were anathema. Such definitions were also at odds with my training as a career counselor and facilitator of adult learning, where empowerment of the person and self-directed goal-setting and development were key.

It's not surprising that power-based and paternalistic models of mentoring featured in the early implementation. Mentoring has evolved, after all, from Homer's ancient story that features Mentor as the wise guide, charged with grooming the son of Odysseus to become king in his father's absence (the goddess Athena also played a pivotal role, assuming the guise of Mentor to encourage the boy). So it's possible that an 'heir to the throne' mentality still persists at some level, even here in Australia. One thinks of Australia's Packer and Murdoch families, where grooming the next generation for power in their media empires has relied heavily on mentoring by senior people, other than their parents.

My observation of mentoring in the Americas is that it spans a broad spectrum, where a paternal interest for disadvantaged youth may be no bad thing and affirmative action that includes quotas and perhaps, positive discrimination in the workplace, is acceptable. However, in Australian workplaces, developmental mentoring that enables the mentoree to develop their ability to expand and progress their career on their own merits has been the trend. In government agencies, there is a strong emphasis on equity, but no advantage, in programs for women, Indigenous people, those with English as a second language and the disabled. There is more freedom to actively advance target groups in private enterprise, where mentoring of "High Potentials" and "Emerging Leaders" is more common. However, in both the public and private sector, the role of mentors [6] usually includes: confidentiality – non-disclosure of the content of conversations to any third party; catalyst – eliciting the mentoree's thoughts and feelings for greater self-awareness and insight; sounding board – providing objective feedback on the mentoree's ideas and proposed actions; link – pointing out available resources and information; role-model – exemplifying values and behavior conducive to success; coach – when asked and qualified to do so, teaching and honing the mentoree's career-related skills; adviser – answering questions, offering opinions; and guide – assisting the mentoree to find their way.

While pairing with a more senior person is still the most common conception of mentoring, other models are gaining popularity. Mastermind groups [7] have experienced a renaissance, particularly amongst business people, since Napolean Hill described their power back in 1938.

> … a group of brains, co-ordinated (or connected) in a spirit of harmony, will provide more thought energy than a single brain, just as a group of electric batteries will provide more energy than a single battery…. The increased energy created by that alliance becomes available to every brain in the group. [7, p. 235]

Reciprocal mentoring allows individuals to mentor and be mentored within the one relationship and reverse mentoring, where a younger or less senior person who is, for example, a 'digital native' – born into the world of online technology - mentors an executive less familiar with internet media, are gaining prevalence. Informal peer mentoring, without being labeled as such, is used extensively by graduates, young professionals and other job-seekers who use social media extensively to share opinions about prospective employers [8]. So called 'mummy bloggers' are one of a myriad of special interest groups who have created online forums for mutual support, problem-solving and information-sharing. So, in practical terms, the conceptual model of mentoring is now very broad indeed.

INFORMAL VERSUS FORMAL
Margo Murray visited Australia, sponsored by Paul Stevens of Worklife in the 1990s and her work informed much of the implementation of structured mentoring programs here. Mentoring has become a buzz-word and despite its increasing popularity, my observation is that the strategic value of mentoring is under-utilized. Too few Australian organisations implement mentoring that is properly planned with links to strategic corporate goals, they invest too little in preparing and supporting mentoring. Indeed, some 'mentoring programs' exist in name only, merely introducing a mentor and mentoree to each other then leaving them to it. This means that the efficacy of mentoring is totally dependent upon the initiative and skills of the participants and they make it up as they go along.

Formal mentoring programs that are strategic, planned and supported properly, provide a framework for mentoring partnerships that enables the pairs to negotiate how their relationships will operate. Such schemes provide guidelines that define the roles and responsibilities. They suggest frequency of contact and topics of conversation and other logistical considerations, but allow individuals freedom and autonomy to manage their mentoring. Thus a structured program serves organizational objectives and the needs of individuals.

MENTORING VERSUS COACHING
In Australia, the emergence of a counseling and coaching industry, possibly in response to the recession in the early 1990s, has impacted on the distinctions between mentoring and coaching as defined by Megginson and Clutterbuck [9]. The career transition pioneer and prolific author, Paul Stevens founded Worklife in 1979 and trained career counselors and managers as career coaches. Other enterprises trained executive, personal and business coaches and various universities introduced courses in coaching. The term 'life coaching' appeared. Although accreditation for coaches is increasing, no regulation exists and anyone can set up as any kind of coach or mentor. Most of the coach training, and certainly the career counselor training that I completed, emphasises empowerment of the client and resembled Clutterbuck's 'developmental mentoring'. Thus, the definition of coaching has moved away from a skills and performance focus. In the last couple of years I have been working with some clients, training managers as mentors and the role description is aligned to the Meginson and Clutterbuck definition of coaching because it is concerned with performance and skill development. Distinctions between mentoring and coaching are still sought by many and my own webpage on this topic has more hits than any other on my website. Argument and turf wars can become quite vehement between various 'schools of thought'.

David Clutterbuck is indeed a 'thought leader' in now emphasizing the similarities rather than differences between coaching and mentoring. In my view, it matters little what a developmental relationship is labeled. What matters is, in a formal program, there is a

definition of the roles and responsibilities of both parties and within the partnership, both are clear about their purpose and how they will work together to achieve it.

CONVERSATION

Typically, when I survey participants pre-workshop, they ask for tools, techniques and tips. A framework for their conversation gives them confidence. I actually use a metaphor of the framework of a house to introduce the model of the mentoring conversation [10] so that they understand the freedom and flexibility they have in choosing how to 'build', 'finish' and 'live' in the structure. I recommend a mentoring conversation based on action learning, a cycle where, over time, participants are encouraged to reflect on experience, make informed decisions, plan strategies and take action. This is framed by the questions: where are you now, where do you want to be, how might you get there and, once actions are implemented, how is it going? In workshops we focus on listening skills, communication styles and exploring values. Mentors practice these techniques on each other, working with a real issue, decision or goal, then the group debriefs to elicit insights from using the process. Participants are usually surprised at the depth the conversation reaches in a short time, the possibilities it opens up and the difficulty of maintaining a facilitative style instead of jumping in with solutions. This technique gives mentors both some ability and confidence to facilitate the mentoring conversation, yet avoids the limitations of the 'one model' as highlighted by Megginson and Clutterbuck. I agree that approaches such as GROW or SMART can fail to elicit real issues, obtain superficial goals or aims not really owned by the individual. Slavish fascination with these acronyms can be counterproductive.

GOALS

Management by Objectives is a *management* tool and as such is not particularly useful in mentoring conversations. The focus on achieving goals through mentoring is made necessary because expenditure on mentoring has to be justified. Organisations do not spend on programs without the probability of return on investment. The legacy of Management by Objectives is an emphasis on outcomes and evaluation. While this is useful in terms of creating mentoring programs that contribute strategic value, it presents a problem for participants.

   Mentoring is promoted as being good for personal, professional and career development and therefore attracts people with such aspirations. However, in my experience, their initial goals are general rather than specific and this is how it should be. The whole point of a mentoring conversation is to enable participants to explore perceptions, feelings, values, abilities and potential *before* they commit to goals and action plans.

   Mentors are often managers and objective setting is known territory, facilitating a conversation about perceptions and feelings, is not. As Clutterbuck and Megginson point out, mentors do gain a sense of comfort on the familiar ground of goal setting but pushing mentorees toward hasty goals is less than useful.

   Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (SMART) is a widely accepted formula for goal setting. However, Mark Murphy [11] suggests that SMART goals:

> … too often they act as impediments to, not enablers of, bold action and actually encourage mediocre and poor performance. [14, p. 1]

Based on his research he proposes setting HARD goals – Heartfelt, Animated, Required and Difficult. However, regardless of the acronym used, the problem remains the same - goals

need time to emerge. A mentoring relationship allows the time for exploration and discovery, through conversations that go deeper than the dogma of SMART goals. Clutterbuck and Megginson's [12] approach encourages mentors to facilitate a process that takes the pressure of quick goal setting and enables goals that the mentoree truly owns, to emerge.

MENTORING IN SPORTS

Workshop participants with a history of sports participation, often share their experiences of coaches who were also mentors, providing life lessons and guidance beyond the sport in question. However, my own (limited) experience of setting up mentoring in a professional football team revealed difficulties above and beyond those encountered in other types of organisations. In hindsight, the program was overly ambitious in its scope as a cascading program where elite players were mentored by business CEOs with a view to future career transition, these players were to mentor younger players who, in turn, would mentor disadvantaged kids. The program was under resourced and under supported. The timing was wrong, the team was at the bottom of the league and was in the media for off-field misbehavior. In fact, that was probably the worst year on record for media exposure, court cases and allegations detrimental to the reputation of their entire code. Players, coaches and officials had other priorities! Fortunately, there are other more positive experiences of mentoring in sport in Australia.

Mentoring is promoted by the Australian Government [13] as an opportunity for sports coaches and officials to learn and develop. The Australian Sports Commission National Officiating Scholarship Program [14] links recipients with mentors and the 2012 Australian Olympic team took mentors to the London games [15].

Described as "the team behind the team" Athlete-liaison Officers (ALOs) were on-hand to mentor the Aussie athletes in London. Each mentor was chosen by the Australian Olympic Committee because they had achieved greatness in their own sporting career and were an inspiration to the team. Led by Laurie Lawrence, official Team Mentor, the role of the mentors was to guide and support the Australian Olympians as they faced the highs and lows, excitement and distraction, passion and pain of the greatest competition in the world.

The mentors worked within the Head Coaches' programs and with their guidance. Their job was to help the athletes have the best Olympic experience possible, promote fellowship within the team, and share information to enable athletes to stay focused and maximize performance.

The entire team was guided by a set of clearly spelled out values captured in the acronym ASPIRE: Attitude, Sportsmanship, Pride, Individual responsibility, Respect, Express opinions with thought and consideration.

Three of the mentors were not Olympians themselves, but legendary achievers in their sport. Steve Waugh and John Eales captained Australian teams in cricket and rugby union, respectively. Layne Beachley is a seven-time world champion surfer. Kieren Perkins won two gold and two silver Olympic medals for swimming. Laurie Lawrence has represented Australia in rugby union, is a champion swim coach and has been at eight Olympic Games. This was his fourth as the Team Mentor.

TRENDS

During the early 1990s, mentoring was a strategy for career transition and development. Mid-decade it was used in striving for equity, as the New South Wales Premier set targets for representation of women in senior ranks of the public service. By the early 2000s the "war for talent" [16] was a prime mover and talk of skills shortages, though dampened by the

global financial crisis, is a driver currently. The Australian Federal Government is investing heavily in mentoring of apprentices to increase retention and completion of trades training. Equity still motivates mentoring, with programs for women and Indigenous people on the rise. Social and community responsibilities have been the purpose of more programs recently. I am currently working with employees in homeless shelters and people who work with refugees.

In terms of the mentoring process, the influence of positive psychology [17] and neuroscience [18] has emphasized the developmental and empowerment focus of mentoring. David Rock's SCARF model [19] describes five social domains that trigger threat or reward responses: status, certainty, autonomy, relatedness and fairness, which, in my mind, reinforce the need to reduce the power and sponsorship aspects of mentoring and increase autonomy. Appreciative Inquiry [20] with its reliance on questioning, listening and insight, as tools for coaching and strengths–based development [21] have created an exciting environment for mentoring.

In terms of Clutterbuck's predictions, my observations, in the Australian context, are:

1. Mentoring does indeed flourish with support and good management, but it also needs proper planning that links it to strategic organizational outcomes and identified individual needs. Programs must be designed to fit the environment. Further, a communication strategy that conveys the right messages about mentoring throughout the organization is vital.

2. Every successful program that sets up mentoring pairs and supports them properly, also spawns increased networking, informal mentoring and access to resources. Attracting, retaining and developing talent has been, and continues to be, a major driver for mentoring in Australia. For example, organisations that invest in recruiting graduates, also invest in on-boarding processes and increasingly look to mentoring as part of that. The under-utilisation of talented women has been recognized by influential CEOs [22] and this has prompted mentoring programs aimed at increasing women in leadership positions. Government agencies are focusing on developing Indigenous people and providing opportunities for them to gain skills to move up.

3. I have run several workshops in the last couple of years on mentoring for managers. It's a different style of mentoring from the mentoring Clutterbuck defines as "off-line assistance" [23] and is more concerned with tasks, skills and performance as well as team development.

4. A far broader definition of E-mentoring is emerging as tech-savvy younger workers and organisations seeking cost-effective communication over time and distance use it. Webinars, Skype, Google+ and other forms of video conferencing are becoming more common forms of communication for groups and pairs. Online tutorials, e-mailed courses and tips are used to build knowledge and skills. Online communities and resource centres provide ongoing support. YouTube is a growing source of legitimate, educational material. Almost every employee uses a home computer, TV, tablet or smart phone (or all of them) to access the internet. The challenge for organisations is to come to grips with policy and practice regarding employee use of the internet at work and balance security with access – some clients are unable to access my webinars or download online resources without the assistance of their IT department to clear firewalls, or using their private/home equipment.

5. Supervision of mentors in Australian organisations is usually left to program coordinators. Some programs have champions, or mentors-of-mentors charged with assisting mentors. Most mentors want peer support and forums to discuss challenges and techniques. Facilitating discussion and Q&A through structured webinars can be a convenient way of delivering this.

6. Identifying mentors and matching them with participants remains time consuming. In my view, more emphasis on selecting potential mentors and developing their skills and *less* emphasis on matching is a solution. Teaching people to value and work with difference is highly beneficial. Participants want input to choosing their mentor, so educating them in what to look for and providing access to a pool of ready, willing and able candidates is my strategy of choice and easily done online. With the increased recognition of the value of mentoring skills for leaders and managers, their training and participation in mentoring programs is a win=win all round.

7. Group mentoring is very popular among business people who form their own mastermind groups for peer mentoring. There are some organisations using this model, but it does raise issues about how candid employees will be in front of peers who may also be competitors for promotion.

8. Support services for mentors and mentorees are increasing. Participants want them but budget constraints inhibit their provision as organisations contend with global financial crisis considerations (which Australia has not escaped).

9. Many tertiary and industry courses have units on mentoring. Some universities offer post-graduate courses devoted to coaching and mentoring, but there is little accreditation of program coordinators other than that offered by Clutterbuck affiliates in Australia.

10. Evaluation of mentoring programs is not thorough. Troubleshooting is usually left to the program coordinator.

11. Multiple mentoring occurs through informal networks.

12. Likewise, sequential mentoring happens as individuals become more proactive in self-management of career and professional development. It is, in most cases, self-initiated and informal.

13. I have not observed a lot of cascading mentoring deliberately fostered.

14. I have worked on two projects this year integrating human resources (HR) and social responsibility, but they have been government and community based rather than corporate.

15. The status-free nature of mentoring is gaining ground as mentors frequently report the value they gain from mentoring and volunteer for self-development as well as altruistic reasons. Discussion of mentoring values and the implications of status, based on neuroscience [24] promote this concept.

16. I've seen no evidence of the professionalization of mentoring in Australia other than a growing trend for experts in given fields to 'mentor' others for a fee.

17. There are few accredited mentoring programs in Australia.

18. It is difficult for some managers to move away from a directive approach to mentoring. This is why careful selection and screening of potential mentors, experiential learning and coordinator follow-up and monitoring is essential.

19. Quantitative research that shows mentoring program results reassures investors; qualitative research that illuminates what makes developmental relationships work helps to equip participants for success. So both are necessary and useful.

CONCLUSION

David Clutterbuck is indeed a thought leader in the field of mentoring. Successive editions of *Everyone Needs A Mentor* show the evolution of mentoring. The case studies and fieldwork he shares provide examples of the ways mentoring can be used. His ideas offer guidance and his prolific authorship make them accessible.

Early divergence between mentoring and coaching seem to be moving to convergence and, through Clutterbuck's leadership in this area, it's easy to conclude that arguing about distinctions is less useful than finding ways of working together. There may never be accord on definitions, but the common ground unites those of us dedicated to fostering developmental relationships that involve being of assistance, developing capability and improving quality of lives.

REFERENCES

1.   Murray, M., *Beyond The Myths and Magic of Mentoring: How To Facilitate an Effective Mentoring Program*, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1991.

2.   Phillips-Jones, P., *The New Mentors & Proteges: How to Succeed with the New Mentoring Partnership,* Coalition of Counseling Centres, California, 1993.

3.   Shea, G., *Mentoring: A Guide To The Basics,* Crisp Publications Inc., California, 1992.

4.   Caldwel, B.J. and Carter, E.M.A., eds., *The Return of the Mentor: Strategies for Workplace Learning,* The Falmer Press, London 1993.

5.   Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs A Mentor: Fostering Talent At Work,* 2nd edn., Institute of Personnel Management, London, 1991.

6.   Rolfe, A., *Mentoring Mindset, Skills and Tools,* Mentoring Works, Sydney, 2012.

7.   Hill, N., *Think and Grow Rich*,The Ralston Society, Meriden 1938 (Classic Books, 2005).

8.   Australian Association of Graduate Employers, Candidate Survey, 2010.

9.   Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Mentoring in Action: A Practical Guide for Managers*, Kogan Page, London, 1995.

10.   Rolfe, A., *The Mentoring Conversation*, Mentoring Works, Sydney 2007.

11.   Murphy, M. *Are SMART Goals Dumb?,* Leadership IQ, *Http://www.leadershipiq.com/materials/LeadershipIQ-AreSmartGoalsDumb.pdf*

12.   Megginson, D and Clutterbuck, D*., Further Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinman, Oxford, 2009.

13.   *Http://www.ausport.gov.au/participating/coachofficial/presenter/mentor*

14.   Phillips, S., Mentoring Moments Make the Difference for Officials, *Sports Official*, 2007, 6(2), *Http://www.ausport.gov/sportsofficialmag/mentoring/networking_moments_make_the_difference_for_officials*

15.   Australian Olympic Committee, Team Behind The Team, *Http://www.london2012.olympics.com.au/athletes/team-behind-the-team*

16.   Micheals, E., Handfield-Jones, H. and Axelrod, *The War For Talent*, Harvard Business Press, Cambridge, MA, 2001.

17.   Seligman, M., *Authentic Happiness*, Simon & Schuster, New York. 2002.

18.   Rock, D. and Page, L., *Coaching With The Brain In Mind*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2009.

19.   Rock, D., *Managing With The Brain In Mind*, Strategy + Business, 2009, Issue 56, Autumn.

20.   Orem, S., Binkert, J. and Clancy, A., *Appreciative Coaching: A Positive Process for Change*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 2007.

21.   Buckingham, M. and Clifton, *Now Discover Your Strengths*, The Free Press, New York, 2001.

22.   Australian Human Rights Commission, *Male Champions of Change Our Experiences in Elevating the Representation of Women in Leadership – A Letter from Business Leaders,* 2011, *Http://humanrights.gov.au/sex_discrimination/publication/mcc/index.html*

23.   Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Mentoring in Action: A Practical Guide for Managers*, Kogan Page, London, 1995.

24.   Rock, D., SCARF: A Brain-Based Model for Collaborating With and Influencing Others, *NeuroLeadership Journal*, Issue One, 2008.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Gunnela Westlander
Vanadisvägen 22A
SE-113 46 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: gunnela.westlander@mailbox.tele2.se

INTRODUCTION

In the stimulus article by Simon Jenkins, David Clutterbuck's rich production of texts, articles and books is 'contextualised' in his earlier achievements as a writer in editorial positions of journals and as a business consultant. Clutterbook's work in mentoring is clearly path-grounding.

EUROPEAN VERSUS AMERICAN APPROACHES TO MENTORING

As invited to give some commentaries to Dr. Jenkins analyses and reflections, I would like to mention David Clutterbuck's distinction between mentoring as it appears in UK and other Northern European countries and mentoring in the USA. Having spent considerable time in the last six years studying international literature on mentoring, I got the feeling rather early that there were differences in theory as well as in practice between European and North-American approaches. My intuition was confirmed in reading the Clutterbuck's chapter, "An International Perspective in Mentoring" in the *Handbook of Mentoring at Work* [1]. One chapter section concerns the difference between developmental mentoring (the European line) and sponsorship mentoring (mostly applied in the USA). Clutterbuck penetrates to the bottom of this issue, and tries to find the roots in cultural conditions. His clarifying analysis is based on a – probably conscious – polarization of the two directions. His international experience as advisor to creators of mentoring programs may have contributed to this considerable insight into the importance of the cultural framework, for instance the 'power distance'. We are encouraged to be attentive to mentoring authors' cultural origins. I have not come across any other author treating this kind of national difference in the same penetrating way.

DEFINITIONS OF MENTORING

Jenkins offers an exposé of mentoring definitions suggested by Clutterbuck in a period of two decades. He picks them from books published in different years of publication and he succeeds in producing a more-or-less trend description. It is difficult to see if Jenkins criticizes or makes ironical remarks. Does he find it permissible for the content of definitions to vary over time or does he see it as a signifying a lack of consistency? Here we touch the question of the importance of practice for theory development. My impression of David Clutterbuck's writings is that he is extremely aware of what mentoring practices offer and is willing to adapt and reformulate his thinking.

CONCLUSION

I would say that David Clutterbuck is a theory constructor rather than a thought leader. He continuously collects experiences of mentoring practices, makes distinctions, suggests concepts, applies them on new practices, and reformulates definitions. Accordingly, concept definitions are tools rather than eternal truths.

REFERENCES

1.   Clutterbuck, D., An International Perspective on Mentoring in: Ragins, B.R. and Kram, K.E., eds., *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2007, 633-657.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Stacey L. Connaughton
Associate Professor, Director of Graduate Studies
The Brian Lamb School of Communication
Purdue University
100 N, University Street,
West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA
E-mail: sconnaug@purdue.edu

INTRODUCTION

The opportunity to write a commentary on Dr. Jenkins' article is a welcomed one. Dr. Clutterbuck's work contributes greatly to research on and the practice of mentoring and coaching, and Jenkins does a fine job articulating those contributions. Jenkins' piece also provides the opportunity to reflect on what mentoring is and importantly, what it *should* be; it prompts one to consider where research and practice in this area has been and where it *should* go in the future. Jenkins' article motivated me to reflect more on several aspects of mentoring and coaching. In so doing, it reminded me that how we talk *about* mentoring as well as the talk *of* mentoring are of consequence.

DEFINITIONS OF MENTORNIG

Indeed, how we, as researchers and practitioners, talk about mentoring matters. This seemingly straightforward notion is one that Clutterbuck's work, as Jenkins articulates, encourages us to think about. Divergent conceptualizations of mentoring are at the heart of the distinction Clutterbuck makes (as articulated by Jenkins) between a U.S.-based and a European-based view of mentoring. Those definitional starting points – how we define mentoring in the first place – have consequence for how a professional practices mentoring (either as a mentor or mentee) and how a researcher examines it. As any particular definition is reified through interaction, it becomes the norm, the dominant way of thinking about mentoring in a given organization (i.e., for-profit, non-profit, university) and it may take on a life of its own. For that very reason, each of us must carefully consider how we define mentoring, how we put that definition into practice, and importantly, the consequences of those choices.

LEADERSHIP AND MENTORING

As I considered Clutterbuck's distinction (as expressed in Jenkins' article) between a U.S.-model of mentoring which he argues focuses on the mentor's authority and power to help a mentee (in exchange for the mentee's respect and loyalty), and a European-view of mentoring which he posits centers on developing the mentee to become self-reliant and seek out mutual sources of guidance, I could not help but think of similar kinds of discussions that have taken

place in the field of leadership. Consider "great man" or "trait" views of leadership in which individuals are thought to be born with leadership potential and/or holders of certain innate abilities to lead. Implied in these models are notions that leadership is positional, something held by few, and that leadership is uni-directional – that is, leaders direct followers. More recent views of leadership, however, purport otherwise. These views consider the relationship between leaders and followers as just that, a relationship, and one that is co-constructed among leaders and followers through interaction (see [1]). In the mentoring literature, I am heartened to see work that notes how mentors themselves develop along with mentees, both contributing to each other's growth (see the notion of spiritual mentoring as discussed by Buzzanell [2]). Jenkins points out that mentoring is a key leadership skill. Yet we are perhaps only just beginning to empirically examine and understand the relationship between leadership and mentoring. As we examine this relationship, in sports contexts or others, let us be mindful of how we frame and talk about mentoring.

COMMUNICATION IN MENTORING

If we are to envision mentoring to be a relational and long-term activity, as Clutterbuck and Jenkins underscore, then we must also consider how the nature of communication comes to define and constitute mentoring relationships. Such a relational view would ask researchers and practitioners to attend to not only the formal aspects of mentoring roles (those of a mentor and a mentee) nor solely to formal mentoring programs themselves, but also would focus on the more routine, every day practices of mentoring. These everyday practices are often spontaneous and informal. They happen in the moment, in hallway conversations and in other less structured settings. Much can be learned from these everyday mentoring moments. And much should be gleaned from them, both in terms of research and practice.

If we were to consider mentoring as communicatively-based, we might also broaden the conceptualization of communication in mentoring research and practice so that it incorporates more than how often a mentor talks with his/her mentee (communication frequency). Indeed, the nature of mentoring interactions, the nature of the talk and messages themselves, can tell us a lot about the quality of a mentoring relationship and perhaps what makes it more or less effective. When Jenkins refers to the various kinds of dialogues that Clutterbuck articulates (i.e., social dialogue, technical dialogue), he starts to get at this communicative constitution. We should also take care that in enacting these different dialogues in practice, or conceptualizing and operationalizing them in research, that we treat them as dialogues, not as one-way conversations. Doing so requires that we drill down into the nature of the interactions between mentor and mentee and embrace the relational metaphor to its fullest.

A communication-focused, relational model of mentoring can also speak to another future trend that Jenkins alludes to – developing a mentoring culture within organizations. Organizational cultures are constituted by communication [3]. The nature of interaction and communication in general therefore must be central to discussions, among both researchers and practitioners, about cultures of mentoring. For a culture of mentoring to permeate throughout an organization, organizational leaders must champion and demonstrate these behaviors and embrace these values.

CONCLUSION

How we talk *about* mentoring matters. The talk *of* mentoring, both formal and informal, structured and un-structured, matters. Clutterbuck's work and Jenkins' article stimulating conversation about it demand that researchers and practitioners wrestle with both.

REFERENCES

1. Fairhurst, G. T., *Discursive Leadership: In Conversation with Leadership Psychology*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2007.

2. Buzzanell, P. M., Spiritual Mentoring: Embracing the Mentor-Mentee Relational Process, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2009, 120, 17-24.

3. Eisenberg, E. M. and Riley, P., Organizational Culture, in:Jablin, F.M. and Putnam, L.L., eds., *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, 2001, 291-321.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

David Megginson
Emeritus Professor of HRD,
Sheffield Hallam University
City Campus, Howard Street,
Sheffield, S1 1WB, UK
E-mail: D.F.Megginson@shu.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

David Clutterbuck and I have been long-term collaborators in research, writing and action. So, it is not surprising that I find myself agreeing with much that is written about or by him. However, there is one area where I think we differ – at least in degree, and I will concentrate here on this difference. The issue is about the relationship between coaching and mentoring. I have two concerns here. One is the nominal fallacy – just because we can name something, it doesn't mean that it reliably exists in some way distinct from things with other names. The other concern is with the long-term tendency in David's thinking to boost mentoring by criticising coaching. It is important to me to acknowledge that David has moved on from the position described below and I will outline what that move means for coaching and mentoring and for his thinking.

NOMINAL FALLACY

David's thinking often leads him to talk about mentoring as if it were a discrete phenomenon that can be identified and named and differentiated from other phenomena. My take on this cast of mind is that it leads to what Habermas [1] calls "misplaced concreteness". There are a number of social processes that go on in organisations which are intended to help one of the parties. Some of these are called by some people 'mentoring'. There is no uniformity about the characteristics of the processes that are called 'mentoring' and no features which differentiate 'mentoring' from processes that some people call 'coaching'. So definitions (including the ones that David and I have cooked up), are flagrant exercises in power. We are inviting the world to abide by our definition. Much of the world, of course, ignores our attempt.

REGULARITIES IN USE OF TERMS

Nonetheless, there are some regularities in the use of the terms and thus 'mentoring' can be described as a label used by particular communities for their own purposes. In Europe, one-to-one development is called 'mentoring' more often in the north – especially the Nordic countries, and more often 'coaching' in the centre and south of Europe. Some people in these different parts of the continent mean different things by 'mentoring' and 'coaching', but others mean the same thing. And yet others mean the reverse of what others think. I realised

this most graphically when I was doing some work in two large Swiss banks. In one bank, coaching was the great development process for high flyers and mentoring was the first stage in the disciplinary process. In the other bank, these two processes were recognised, but the names used were the opposite – coaching was the process for correcting poor performance and mentoring was the development process for top talent. In these circumstances it seems prudent to be open to the slipperiness of the relationship between signs and signifiers.

REGULARITIES IN RESEARCH

An interesting pair of communities where there are some regularities are researchers in mentoring and coaching. Mentoring researchers have a very different set of practices about methodology, sample size, position of the researcher, focus of the study and so on. These are described systematically in Garvey et al. [2, chapter 2]. Mentoring researchers, typically, are positivist, using questionnaire surveys with a large number of respondents, uninterested in the process in the mentoring dyad, and using statistical analysis to discern patterns. Coaching researchers – markedly, up to ten years ago; less so more recently – have focused on case studies, insider accounts, small samples and vivid stories. Recently, however, these clear distinctions have become blurred. This temporal instability adds to the ambiguity of naming and differentiating. The claims that researchers and writers can make about their favoured topic need to be more cautious and less dogmatic than they often are. But as Simon Jenkins' article says, David's power in creating clear distinctions and dualistic judgements is part of what is helpful and engaging about his writing.

MENTORING VERSUS COACHING

Boosting mentoring by criticising coaching comes through in many of the quotations from David's writing (including lots of things we have authored jointly, it has to be said). Many of these quotes while in Simon's article are old quotes from writing by David stretching back into the 1980s. He has said that:

- Coaching is about developing a specific skill – so to is narrow and shallow; mentoring is about deeper and wider issues
- The coaching agenda is set by bosses or HR; mentoring's comes from the client
- Coaching is short-term; mentoring's long-term
- Coaching is a line manager function – so has a performative focus on the boss's agenda; mentoring is off-line
- Coaching addresses deficits; mentoring comes from an abundance orientation
- Coaching is about performance improvement; mentoring is about nurturing potential
- Coach owns the process while coachee owns the goal; mentee owns both goal and process
- Coachee has priorities and actions set for them; mentees decide for themselves
- Coaching focuses on the present; mentoring addresses the future

All these characteristics of coaching would be hotly contested by experienced and by qualified coaches. It seems to me, reading this list that I have extracted from the quotations in Simon's article, David in the past set up a straw man of a narrowly managerialist line manager coaching approach, and then attacked it. As early as 1979 Tom Boydell and I published a book called *A Manager's Guide to Coaching* [3], which was advocating that even line-manager coaching should have the emancipatory qualities of the type ascribed to mentoring in the above list.

The Achilles' heel of mentoring in David's early account is the recognition that it involves giving advice in a way that some types of coaching do not. The weight of evidence against the efficacy of advice-giving means that this feature of mentoring needs to be down-played or contextualised as part of the wider agenda that mentoring is able to address. Needless to say, it is an area focused upon by the advocates of coaching who are seeking to do the opposite of what David did and boost coaching by contrasting it with what they see as the much more primitive and limited approach of mentoring.

A final strategy that David uses to limit the range of coaching and to boost mentoring by comparison is to describe coaching as just one form of mentoring – see Clutterbuck [4, p. 88] where coaching is classified as an intellectual (as opposed to emotional) and directive (as opposed to non-directive) form of mentoring.

More recently David has focused on a matrix of limited and of open coaching and mentoring. He has suggested that sponsorship mentoring had many features that limited its efficacy and that there is a contemporary alternative called developmental mentoring, that has the benefits that he has long identified. However, currently he sees coaching having followed a similar route – moving from traditional coaching – the managerialist version outlined above – to developmental coaching, which has many of the positive qualities that are also held by developmental mentoring. This account provides valuable guidance for those wanting to understand and use developmental mentoring or developmental coaching.

CONCLUSION

David has made a huge contribution to the field of coaching and mentoring – and the clarity of his writing and the felicity of his thinking have informed and delighted generations of developers in this field. If we as readers get off the philosophically realist bandwagon and turn our attention from his earlier formulations to his more recent views, more coaching academics, practitioners and authors would find him embracing a rich and inclusive vision of one to one development.

REFERENCES

1.   Habermas, J., *Theory and Practice*, Heinemann, London, 1974.

2.   Garvey, R., Stokes, P. and Megginson, D., *Coaching and Mentoring: Theory and Practice,* Sage, London, 2009.

3.   Megginson, D. and Boydell, T., *A Manager's Guide to Coaching*. BACIE, London, 1979.

4.   Clutterbuck, D., 1998 *Learning Alliances*, IPD, London, 1998.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Ellen A. Ensher
Professor of Human Resources Management
Loyola Marymount University
College of Business
One LMU Drive, MS 8385
Los Angeles, CA 9005, USA
E-mail:eensher@lmu.edu

INTRODUCTION

Consider the following quotation, attributed to Frederick Buechner: "Vocation is where your deepest passion meets the world's greatest need." What strikes me the most when I reflect on the work of David Clutterbuck so thoughtfully reviewed by Simon Jenkins is David's passion for mentoring. David is not only highly influential as a thought leader in mentoring and prolific as an author, but also possesses a deep expertise in implementing his ideas as a consultant. Indeed, the world needs mentoring, not only to develop leaders in for-profit organizations, but also to address society's greatest challenges. It is my great pleasure to write a commentary on David Clutterbuck's contributions to mentoring as his work has served as a source of inspiration for me over many years.

In this commentary, I will provide a reflection on several of David's ideas about trends in mentoring. I am hopeful my questions and thoughts inspired by these trends will inspire others to engage in further dialogue.

CAN WE ALL GET ALONG?

This question was famously posed by Rodney King in response to the 1992 Los Angeles riots that were incited as a result of racial injustice.[1] The question, "Can we all get along?" and the occurrence of the LA riots invited me into the practice of mentoring. This question echoed for me again as I reflected upon several of the trends identified in Clutterbuck's body of work. In response to the riots, in 1993 *The Los Angeles Times* created a summer jobs training program for high potential, at-risk urban youth. As a doctoral student, I was asked to provide advice regarding setting up a mentoring program and specifically address whether

---

[1] King's excessive beating by Los Angeles police officers was unofficially video-taped. Rodney King was African-American and the police officers were White. The tape was widely disseminated and became a flashpoint for the simmering racial tensions in Los Angeles. In March 1993, the responsible police officers were judged in court to be "not guilty" of using excessive force on Rodney King. This perceived lack of justice amidst the police and judicial system led to an outcry of public sentiment and the eruption of widespread riots in Los Angeles. Approximately 50 people died and several thousand people were injured as a result of the March 1992 Los Angeles riots. It is important to note that King's quotation is often misquoted as "Can't we all just get along?" In fact, "can we all get along?" is the correct quotation.

race mattered in pairing high-school student protégés with their professional mentors at *The Los Angeles Times*. More specifically, I was asked to research and recommend whether student protégés should be paired with same or different race mentors. This research resulted in one of my earliest academic publications [1] and more importantly enabled me to discover my own calling to learn about mentoring that continues to this day.

The question, can we all get along? resonated for me again when I reflected upon the following trends identified by Clutterbuck in Jenkins' article which I have paraphrased below:

> (2) To retain high potential employees, it will become increasingly necessary to provide both coaching and mentoring.
> (9) The education and accreditation of mentoring program coordinators will become increasingly necessary.
> (16) The professionalization of mentoring, such as a mentoring academy, for those who wish to practice as mentors will be more important.
> (17) The accreditation of mentoring programs will continue to evolve. It is important to note that Clutterbuck has served as the advisory chair for the International Standards for Mentoring Programmes in Employment (p. 148-150).

As I reflect on the importance of both mentoring and coaching to a professional's development, I wonder why can't scholars and practitioners in mentoring and coaching get along? In other words, there have been volumes written about both mentoring and coaching and there is general agreement that these functions are both similar and quite different from one another. Yet, I believe there is much to be gained if there were greater collaboration between experts in these two areas where the similarities and synergies could be explored. For example, there is a great deal to be learned from the professionalization of coaching that could apply nicely to mentoring. Coaching provides formal education through institutes, certifications, and widely accepted standards of practice. However, as a frequent consultant to U.S. organizations to develop mentoring programs, I am often struck by the lack of formal education, standards, or certifications that exist for those who mentor. It should be noted that David Clutterbuck has made significant strides towards developing these sets of standards in Europe, but we are woefully behind in the United States.

Moreover it would beneficial for organizations to have formal, universally accepted mechanisms to share mentoring best practices and avoid duplicative efforts. I often wonder if the prevalence of bad mentoring and failed formal mentoring programs are perhaps due in part to the lack of standards for mentoring. In fact, there is a robust and growing body of research on toxic mentoring and poor mentoring practices [2, 3]. There are some basic standards and practices that everyone should agree on with mentoring, particularly with regard to youth. Sadly, consider the recent cases of the Boy Scouts of America that failed to implement basic screening and standards for pedophiles who served as scout masters and preyed upon the youth they were supposed to be mentoring. Indeed, much organizational trauma and private unhappiness for individuals could be avoided with better education, accreditations, and standards of mentoring practices. Executive coaches gain cachet with adherence to certifications and standards—perhaps mentors need to do the same.

In the same sense, the question, can we get along? also resonates as we consider the lack of collaboration among experts in mentoring from different fields such as business and education. I was struck by footnote one (p. 142) in Jenkins' article citing Ehrich's literature review who noted that while Kathy Kram's work on mentoring is pervasive in the mentoring

business literature, her work on mentoring is virtually non-existent in the educational mentoring literature. Often mentoring researchers in business and education ask parallel questions and yet we do not frequently cross the divide by exploring each other's work. In fact, when I began my own work in e-mentoring at the turn of the 21st century, the business literature on technology and mentoring basically did not exist. In contrast, the educational literature provided me with rich ideas and inspiration that I used to develop ideas about e-mentoring in business [4-6].

CONCLUSION

There is a great deal of valuable future work to be done that can benefit individuals and organizations if we can indeed get along and work together. First, I recommend that future researchers would be well advised to review the synergies between mentoring and coaching so that unnecessary duplicative work could be avoided. Second, a set of mentoring best practices and standards could be developed and shared among formal mentoring program providers who might belong to a network of organizations. Like coaching, we need to cross the divide between academics and researchers and develop a set of best practices. Third, I recommend that an integrative review of the literature be conducted exploring the commonalities and best practices in mentoring and coaching across disciplines such as education and business. Fourth, there are many professions that have well developed mentoring approaches and standards. Sharing these across learning boundaries such as those between teaching and nursing would be highly beneficial. Finally, we need greater opportunities for disseminating best practices, approaches, standards, and synergies globally as well. Along those lines, I will end with my sincere appreciation for this opportunity to engage globally and I look forward to more opportunities to "get along" together in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Ensher, E. A. and Murphy, S. E., Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity and Contact on Mentoring Relationships, *Journal of Vocational Behavior,*1997, 50, 460–481.

2. Eby, L., Durley, J. Evans, S.C. and Ragins, B. R., Mentor's Perceptions of Negative Mentoring Experiences: Scale Development and Nomological Validation, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 2008, 93(2),358-373.

3. Eby, L., The Protégé's Role in Negative Mentoring Experiences, *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 2004, 65(2), 255-272.

4. De Janasz, S., Ensher, E. A. and Heun, C., Virtual Relationships and Real Benefits: Using E-Mentoring to Connect Business Students with Practicing Managers, *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 2008, 16(4), 394-411.

5. Ensher, E. A., Heun, C. and Blanchard, A., Online Mentoring and Computer-Mediated Communication: New Directions in Research, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 2003, 63, 264–288.

6. Ensher, E. A. and Murphy, S. E., E-Mentoring: Next Generation Research Strategies and Suggestions, in: Ragins, B. R. and Kram, K. E., eds., *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research and Practice*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2007, 299-323.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Lise Lewis
Bluesky International
6 Stanmer House
Lypiatt Road, Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire, GL50 2QJ, UK
E-mail: emcc.president@emccouncil.org

INTRODUCTION

In this article comparing two approaches to mentoring based on US and European models and drawing on aspects of formal vs. informal mentoring, mentoring vs. coaching, conversations, goals and trends, this commentary focuses on 'blurred' in the statement in mentoring vs. coaching, "While his early work often appeared to make sharp distinctions between mentoring and coaching, later definitions become more blurred."

COACHING VERSUS MENTORING

This concept of 'blurred' is timely when looking at the emerging professions of mentoring and coaching and the following invites expansion on its reference to consider a stronger link between what is distinguished as either mentoring or coaching as the article develops.

Observations shared here are based on being an author of the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC) Competency Framework for demonstrating capability in mentoring and coaching and experience as an adviser/assessor on coach development and accreditation for organisations such as EMCC and Worldwide Association of Business Coaches (WABC).

The article quotes the five stages in the evolution of mentoring relationships in developmental mentoring programmes being identified as: rapport building, direction setting, progress making, maturation and moving on. Comparing these stages with the eight competences of the EMCC framework suggests overlap:

- Rapport building = Building the Relationship
- Direction setting and Progress making = Enabling Insight and Learning/Outcome and Action Orientation
- Maturation and Moving On = Managing the Contract / Evaluation

Making reference to observations from advisory and assessment work for coaches working towards Master Coach recognition and applying for the EMCC's European Individual Accreditation (EIA) [2] at four levels of coaching / mentoring strongly indicates that coaching has moved on from the line management function and the analogy with sports coaching. The view from *Implementing Mentoring Schemes* [3] that the role of coaching is

performance management gives us one perspective. What is increasingly evident is that clients of coaches are also addressing the activities that are listed for mentors. Clients of coaches are "defining their own development needs and setting their own objectives". Coaches are encouraging clients to be responsible for their development, talk about their issues and through reflecting and focused questioning, challenging their clients to identify their own solutions and make effective decisions.

Similarly, the further reference in *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring* [4] that "coaching relates primarily to performance improvement in a specific skills area with goals being suggested by or with the coach who has primary ownership of the process" takes no account that the activities subsequently attributed to mentoring can equally relate to coaching through demonstrating equivalence with EMCC competences. These are identification and nurturing of potential for the whole person, where goals may change and reflection on self is elicited from the client through precision questioning by the coach. I agree that in coaching the client may not always own the goals where coaching has been sponsored by another stakeholder and suggest that this may also occur in mentoring.

Furthermore, coaches as well as mentors may also identify with being concerned with career self-management especially those who, as career coaches, encourage their clients to reflect on values-based organisational fit, the areas of work which attracts their energy and so on.

As stated in Jenkins' article, it is possible the confusion around defining coaching and mentoring arises because of this apparent overlap in the skills. This is certainly the premise of the Competence Framework as part of the EIA, although this process is yet to be tested with an application from a mentor.

Distinguishers between coach and mentor may be as the article states the ability of the mentor to help the learner build wider networks, act as a sounding board and counsellor, offer emotional support, act as adviser and possibly a role model. However, mentors may not necessarily possess this knowledge, these skills and attributes.

Taking the view that there is sufficient 'blurring' to accept coaching and mentoring have the same fundamental skills with different applications (as suggested in the 'need to be consistent with your own definition of what you offer as a coach or mentor') perhaps clarity does emerge from being more specific about these definitions.

Having defined individual practice and the benefits to clients, perhaps coaches will take the challenge to consider reducing different types of coaching to the generic descriptor of coach as we generally have with the descriptor mentor. This may well reduce the confusion in the market of, for example, determining the difference between an executive, leadership and business coach. Perhaps professional bodies have a role in working with their members to encourage clarification as part of their remit for raising standards in their efforts to professionalise mentoring and coaching.

CONCLUSION

When considering the blurring of the roles of mentor and coach, there is growing empirical evidence in the processes offered by international mentoring and coaching accreditation bodies that suggests common practice in the skills set and provision of these services.

A temptation and perhaps blasphemous suggestion is to merge the two and create a new descriptor to define this marriage of mentoring and coaching. Coach/mentor seems an obvious option to absorb all ascribed elements of the coaching and mentoring continuum. This may also overcome the apparent difficulty in agreeing a universal definition for both despite the abundance of suggestions in available coaching and mentoring literature. This

does not, of course, take into account whether the use of coaching and mentoring is demand or supply led and how this offers space in the market for both. The final decision rests with the buyer deciding their preference of coach or mentor whatever the underpinning service is.

If both practices are sustainable, perhaps a more pragmatic next step in their evolution is for individuals to adopt the generic descriptor of coach or mentor and as suggested underpin these with their unique sub-set of offerings. This will avoid further confusion in the marketplace if mentors increasingly adopt nomenclatures in the same way as coaches are defining themselves; for example, career mentor, network mentor, business mentor.

Two final points come to mind. Firstly, an extension to this work is a real opportunity to engage in a global dialogue between the mature markets of coaching and mentoring in the US and Europe on which this article is based and the emerging markets of coaching in Eastern Europe and Asia Pacific where forms of mentoring are culturally embedded. Secondly, the results of 'Putting the 'M' back in the EMCC', a project to raise the profile of mentoring suggests a belief that both coaching and mentoring can co-exist.

REFERENCES

1.   EMCC Competence Framework, *Http://www.emccouncil.org*

2.   EMCC European Individual Accreditation (EIA), *Http:// www.emccouncil.org*

3.   Klasen, N. and Clutterbuck, D., *Implementing Mentoring Schemes: A Practical Guide to Successful Programs*, Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford, 2002.

4.   Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2005.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Adrian Furnham
UCL, Psychology,
26 Bedford Way, London, WC1H 0AP, UK
E-mail: a.furnham@ucl.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

Leaders have to bring out the best in their people. They need to know how to help others achieve their full potential. There are certainly many ways of helping people at work to flourish, grow and achieve their ambitions.

HELPING PEOPLE AT WORK

But what to do? Consider the options classified by three letters:

'C' WORDS

Coach: Private Tutor. One who instructs or trains a performer or sports player. To train intensively by instructions, demonstration and practice.

Confessor: A person who gives evidence of religious faith. A priest who hears confession is one's regular spiritual guide.

Confidant: One to whom secrets are entrusted.

Consultant: An expert who gives professional advice or services.

Counsellor: A person who gives professional, personal and perspicacious advice.

'T 'WORDS

Teacher: One who teaches or instructs.

Therapist: A person trained in methods of treatment and rehabilitative methods other than the use of drugs or surgery.

Trainer: Someone who helps a performer to prepare for a test or contest and to bring a desired degree of proficiency in a specified activity and skill.

'M' WORDS

Mentoring: One who provides disinterested, wise support.

Moral Tutor: An upstanding, disinteresting referee.

Master Class: A series of seminars in the old master and apprentice tradition.

MBA: A very expensive and time consuming quest for a certificate that ensures a handsome pay-back.

MENTORING

One of the most cost effective and beneficial things any good interpersonal manager, leader or supervisor can do is to offer mentoring. The word comes from Homer's Odyssey where *Mentor* was a tutor to Odysseus' son Telemachus. Mentor was a 'wise and trusted advisor'. The concept of mentoring is pretty straightforward, but there are various different definitions and should/shouldn't lists of things that mentor and mentee/protégé need to do.

The idea is that (young) new people in an organisation need help, advice and nurturing. Mentoring is about education, support and encouragement. The plan is quite simply that mentor and protégé meet regularly to discuss business issues so that the latter learns to perform at the maximum of their potential as quickly as possible. Some organisations facilitate and support (even demand) mentoring. They make employee development a priority and offer formal rewards to those who engage in mentoring.

The mentoring process is where an experienced, more senior supervisor/leader is committed to providing developmental assistance, guidance and support to a less experienced protégé. Mentors can (and should) provide protégés with coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, protection and sponsorship.

Different people have come up with different recommendations about the 'rules of engagement' when it comes to mentoring. Thus they should: first establish the goals, and rules to play by; they need to model all desirable behaviours; they need to be as impartial and non-judgemental as possible. Their task is to build awareness and confidence, extend analytic skills and deepen, strengthen and expand networks within and outside the organisation.

But it is *not* their job to become a personal therapist and try to sort out the mentee's psychological problems and personal relationships. It is not their primary task to get the mentee promoted. They are not there to be directive, prescriptive or proscriptive. Or, for that matter, to give business advice.

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF MENTORING

There are benefits to the mentor as well as the mentee. They have 'step children' in the organisation. They stay in touch with another generation and they learn from them. They grow their influence base from below. Mentees develop feelings of accomplishment, a sense of competence in addition to new perspectives and knowledge. Mentors too acquire new (often technological) skills, support and an ally in their mentee. Mentors often talk of feelings of 'quasi immortality' watching their protégés grow and succeed.

There are costs if the relationship turns sour. Mentors have talked of exploitation and back-stabbing. Others perceive the time and effort as not worth it. Some mentors have also been accused of nepotism by jealous non-mentored people.

However, there is evidence to suggest if the programme is voluntary on both sides, the two are well matched, the mentor is trained and there is management support for the whole process then they can be a great success.

A central question is how an organisation chooses and trains potential mentors among senior staff and how they get matched up to their mentees. Not everyone is 'cut-out' to be a good mentor. Nearly all need some training in basic skills.

One question is how mentor and mentee are paired. What is the criterion? Who makes the decision: a learning and development specialist, the mentor, the mentee, the mentee's boss? Should there be some sort of speed dating exercise to have a good 'sniff around' one another? How does one ensure the process is standardised across the organisation. Should it be voluntary or compulsory?

So is mentoring a cost-effective development process that allows organisations to monitor and control the training they give to their young people? Is it preferable to the idea of external coaches of all shapes and sizes swarming in, over and around organisations with their massive invoices? Often: but it is important to get the process right. And there is always the problem of who mentors the senior mentors.

DOES IT WORK?

The most important question is does coaching/mentoring work? Various studies have yielded similar responses.

First, client factors. It is in short; more important to know who (what kind of person) has the problem than what the problem is. This accounts for 40% of the effect. It's called readiness for coaching. It is a mixture of willing and able to learn, to change, to embrace challenge. The coach/mentor needs to activate readiness, remove barriers and resistance or move on. Further he or she needs to respond to the client's preferences. Some, internalisers want insight. Others, externalisers want symptom focused approaches. Clients from organisations and families provide different levels of support and challenge. They do make a difference to coaching outcomes.

There is a bit of a paradox here. If 40% of the success of coaching/mentoring comes from client dispositions then coaches can at most, take only 60% of the credit for the magic they do. So it's dangerous for the coach to become hubristic. The client makes the magic and the meaning.

Second, is the quality of the relationship. The coach can explore and exploit the 'therapeutic alliance'. It's about collaboration, consensus and support. It's the effective and affective bond. Again, this has to be tailored to the client. It is about building and maintaining a positive, open, productive and hopefully transformative alliance. However, it should be pointed out that it is the client and not the coach's explanation of the alliance that is important: Coaches need to check this fact regularly with their clients. The distracted, fatigued or unprepared coach is a 'post coach'. The alliance is usually based on set and agreed goals, tasks and bonds.

The third ingredient that buys you 15% of the active ingredients is that old-fashioned quality sometimes called hope, now called expectations. It is about expectation of improvement, finding new paths to goals and 'agency thinking': The belief that one can if one tries. Coaches and mentors speak and leak the message that successful change or progress is possible. They actuate hope by building credibility at the beginning of the relationship. Clients can detect loss of faith in the project by the coach.

The fourth ingredient is the application of a theory and 'therapy'; the application of 'healing' myths and rituals. The background of the coach influences their focus. While some look at organisational competition, conflict, dominance and power, others may look at self awareness and encourage 'personal swots'. Theories organise observation. Some coaches share them, others don't. But clearly the good coach needs to know what works for whom? Coaches need to know about the business world and the dilemma of conflict of interests between the client and the organisation. Coaches really have to be business savvy. They need to read the FT not Freud; the Economist not Erikson.

The client-coach mission and relationship is a bit like the patient-therapist one, but there are differences. Typically patients have more serious problems and poorer adjustment than business clients. Therapists work at a deeper emotional level than a coach. Therapists see more of the patient and contact is nearly always face-to-face. Coaches focus on the work-place, therapists on all aspects of functioning.

Patients often seek personal growth and alleviation of suffering, coaching clients seek

enhanced work performance. Coaching clients seek to enhance their emotional intelligence, political prowess and their understanding of cultural difference.

CONCLUSION

So there we have it. Coaching and mentoring only works if the client is able, ready and willing. It works well if the bond is good and if the coach/mentor instils hope for change.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Mike Munro Turner
Jericho Partners
3 Manby Road, Malvern,
Worcestershire, WR14 3BD, UK
E-mail: mike@jerichopartners.co.uk

INTRODUCTION

I first met David Clutterbuck over 35 years ago in the PR Department of the PA Consulting Group. He was advising on marketing and I was a junior IT consultant. Neither he nor I knew that we would both end up in the same line of business - nor that David would become one of the leading figures in the area.

Twenty years ago, my first job working in one-to-one leadership development was as a mentor. I was employed by a small consultancy working in one of the retail banks who believed that helping managers lead organisational change required a combination of coaching and intensive psychological change, a combination they termed 'mentoring'. Having branded myself a coach up to this point, this relabelling caused me to wonder about what precisely coaching and mentoring were, how they were similar and how they were different.

COACHING VERSUS MENTORING

At the same time, there had been an on-going debate in the psychotherapy and counselling worlds as to whether these two areas were different and, if so, what were the significant differences. The stalemate that resulted was eventually resolved by deciding that, while there were differences in emphasis within the two fields, there was more that united them than divided them and both terms would continue to be used. Thus, for example, the British Association of Counselling (BAC) became the British Association of Counselling & Psychotherapy (BACP). Something similar has happened with coaching and mentoring, with the terms often being used interchangeably. However, there are differences in emphasis which are worth exploring, if only to understand better the various purposes behind the interventions.

One approach is to look at the origins of the words 'coaching' and 'mentoring'. Etymologically, the word "coach" appeared in English in the 1556, being derived from the French "coche" (also meaning coach), which in turn was derived from the name of the Hungarian "kocsi (szekér)" meaning "(wagon) from Kocs", Kocs being a town in Hungary. The term was first used to mean an instructor or trainer in 1848 as Oxford University slang for a tutor who 'transports' a student through an exam [1].

When we speak of mentoring - however we define it, we usually assume that our role model is Homer's Mentor who, in the epic poem *The Odyssey*, is left by Odysseus (or

Ulysses as he was known in Roman myths) to take care of his household and son, Telemachus, while he was away fighting the Trojan War. However, *The Odyssey* relates that Mentor largely failed in his duties, neither taking care of Odysseus' household (which was overrun by suitors of his wife Penelope) nor of Telemachus (who set off without Mentor to find his father). It was the goddess Pallas Athene (goddess of War and of Wisdom) who actually helped Telemachus, appearing throughout *The Odyssey* in a variety of human and animal forms, including that of Mentor himself. As Mentor she acted as a wise and trusted advisor and counsellor to her favourite Telemachus, helping him grow in experience, maturity and courage so that he became a credible ally for Odysseus on his eventual return from Troy.

However, Homer's Mentor (whether as himself or as the embodiment of Pallas Athene) is not the model for modern mentors. The word actually didn't feature in the English language until 1750 [1]. Its appearance resulted from the story "Les Aventures de Tálámaque" by the 17th century French writer Fenelon published in 1699 in which Mentor was the main character. "Les Aventures de Tálámaque" went on to become the most reprinted book of the 18th century and led to the word mentor being resurrected after a gap of nearly three millennia. It is Fenelon's Mentor, not Homer's, that forms the basis for modern usage of the word.

The word mentor soon came to mean "a wise and responsible tutor" - an experienced person who advises, guides, teaches, inspires, challenges, corrects, and serves as a role model, often to a younger person. More recently, as described in the main article, two distinct views of mentoring have emerged. One is the sponsorship view preferred in North America; the other the development-focused view of mentoring prevalent in Europe. One way of thinking about how these two types of mentoring relate both to coaching and to psychotherapy and counselling is whether the intervention is future or past/present oriented and whether it is learning, development and growth or performance and behaviour oriented:

- *Psychotherapy and counselling* deal with problems that are psychological in nature and arise because of unresolved or uncompleted episodes from the past, often in early childhood. The focus is on resolving these past issues by enabling shifts in the client's inner world which will enable the client to become a fully functioning adult. (Past + Development)
- *Protégé mentoring* focuses on imparting help, experience and guidance. Again the focus is on the past but this time in the sense that the mentee is expected to take on the existing views and beliefs of the mentor. While this may lead to changes in the mentee, the overall effect is to more fully align them with the prevailing culture and values. (Past + Performance)
- *Coaching* focuses on evoking from their coachees their own skills, understanding and insights to create change. Coaching is future-focused and directed at the outer world of changing behaviour and improving performance. (Future + Performance)
- *Developmental mentoring* focuses less on imparting specific knowledge and advice, and more on supporting the mentee in their journey of self-realisation. Unlike protégé mentors who will often be from the same organisation or sector as the mentee, a developmental mentor is more likely to be an outsider. Their expertise lies not in any particular sector, but in the processes of learning and growth. Developmental mentoring is future-focused and explores the inner shifts necessary for the mentee to realise their longer term potential. (Future + Development)

These distinctions have been sharpened to clarify them, but in reality the boundaries are much less clear with any coach, mentor, psychotherapist or counsellor making interventions from across the space mapped, though they will have a predominant style.

CONCLUSION

While it is useful to make these distinctions, it is important not to get bogged down in religious arguments about the meaning of the labels we use, as the psychotherapists and counsellors did in the 80s and 90s. What is more helpful is to use models like this to prompt us to think about the different ways in which we might intervene with our clients. We can be clear about whether the purpose of a particular intervention is to help resolve the past or create the future; whether it is about challenging the wider status quo or aligning with it; and whether the shift needed is internal or external.

REFERENCES

1.   *Oxford English Dictionary*, *Http://www.oed.com* (Accessed 12 December 2012)

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Grace McCarthy
Sydney Business School
University of Wollongong
Wollongong
NSW 2522, Australia
E-mail: gracemc@uow.edu.au

INTRODUCTION

David Clutterbuck has made tremendous contributions to both coaching and mentoring theory and practice over the past three decades. One of the pleasures of reading David Clutterbuck's work is that he communicates clearly without jargon, a tribute perhaps to his journalistic background. He captures what is known or believed about a topic at the time and is not afraid to say that things have changed or that his predictions have not yet come to pass. By articulating the conceptions of coaching and mentoring at a particular point in time, Clutterbuck allows us to recognise the changes that take place over time as well as the changes in different contexts, changes that can be almost imperceptible unless someone draws our attention to them. In this commentary, I will focus on the evolving definitions of mentoring that are explicit in Clutterbuck's work and consider the distinction between coaching and mentoring.

AMERICAN VERSUS EUROPEAN APPROACHES

It is perfectly possible for people to have an engaging conversation about mentoring, without realising that they are talking about very different processes with different applications and purposes. Clutterbuck highlights key differences between the American and European approach. There is the sponsorship model of mentoring popular in North America where mentors open doors and use their influence to help their protégés. Then there is the European version, which is now also appearing in America, where mentors help their mentees reflect and make choices about the future. On the other hand, one of the emerging trends Clutterbuck notes is that in some 'macho, task-driven cultures', senior managers in Europe may adopt the American-style sponsorship style of mentoring. Organisations wishing to promote mentoring need to have an open conversation about what they wish to achieve through mentoring and then to consider how best to achieve it; e.g., what combination and form of mentoring and coaching might offer the best fit.

MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

As with coaching, it is the relationship that is the greatest predictor of success in mentoring. Interestingly Clutterbuck's research found that informal mentoring was more effective than formal. This may be because mentors are usually assigned in formal schemes and the

matching may or may not work, whereas the choice of mentor in informal relationships enhances the relationship itself. A mentoring relationship is usually longer than a coaching relationship and evolves over time, in other words the relationship is not a static one and should be reviewed periodically to decide whether to continue, to change to a different mentor or to have more than one mentor at a time.

MENTORING VERSUS COACHING

As Simon Jenkins notes from Clutterbuck and Megginson's work, the distinction between coaching has become blurred, because many of the same skills are used by coaches and mentors. Line managers may alternate between coaching and mentoring in the same conversation – and also take on a directive role where needed. The distinction in the abstract may not be that important. However, as Garvey [1] warns, it is important to be clear on how we use the terms in a particular setting. This allows us to communicate with those we work with and those who pay the bill. As Clutterbuck highlights in emerging trends, this shared definition should not preclude adaptation to particular contexts.

COACHING MODELS

One area of difference between coaching and mentoring which does not come out clearly in Clutterbuck's work is the proliferation of coaching models in recent times, see for example Cox et al. [2]. While many of these approaches such as narrative or appreciative inquiry can be used in mentoring also, mentoring research tends to discuss mentoring as a unified single process, rather than discuss different flavours of mentoring. Perhaps this is because coaching is a more commercial activity and coaches need to differentiate themselves more than mentors do, or because purchasers of coaching services ask providers to articulate their coaching philosophy.

CONCLUSION

In the end, though, it is not the model or framework that the coach uses that leads to successful outcomes but the relationship [3, 4] – another factor in common between coaching and mentoring.

REFERENCES

1.   Garvey, R., The Mentoring/Counselling/Coaching Debate: Call a Rose by Any Other Name and Perhaps it's a Bramble? *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 2004, 18(2), 6-8.

2.   Cox, E., Bachkirova, T. and Clutterbuck, D., eds. *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, Sage, London, 2010.

3.   de Haan, E., *Relational Coaching*, Wiley, Chichester, 2008.

4.   Critchley, B., Relational Coaching: Taking the Coaching High Road, *Journal of Management Development*, 2010, 29(10), 851-863.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Alison Hardingham
Yellow Dog Consulting
The Rocks, High Street,
Drayton St. Leonard,
Oxfordshire, OX10 7BQ, UK
E-mail: Alison@yellowdogconsulting.ltd.uk

INTRODUCTION

I designed the Henley Certificate in Coaching – with Patricia Bossons – some eight years ago. Early in the programme, we felt it important that delegates should have some clarity about what coaching is but we didn't want to provide a definition. In our view, a definition would just be our way of understanding what coaching is, and it would not help our students towards their own way of understanding, which they could articulate and discuss with coachees, budget holders, and indeed with each other. More importantly, it would not help them to manage the complex and dynamic boundaries around a coaching intervention.

COACHING VERSUS MENTORING

We decided to ask them instead to compare and contrast 'coaching' with other, related 'helping' activities, and so develop their understanding of it. One of the pairs which we routinely ask them to consider is 'coaching and mentoring'. What are the similarities and differences between these two?

Most groups of students feel that whereas both activities require similar skill sets (rapport building, contracting, challenging, supporting, and so on), mentoring is generally delivered by a person who has already 'been there, and done that'. In other words, the starting point is an appreciation of the roles a mentor can play which the coach does not, typically: as Jenkins puts it, drawing on Megginson and Clutterbuck's work [1], the roles of adviser and role model.

This early distinction – early in the development of our coaches, and interestingly also apparently early in the development of Clutterbuck's concept of mentoring where he focused on its occurring within an organisation – is a useful foundation on which to begin to build the coach's sense of 'what he is up to.' As he tries to hold back his own views and elicit more understanding and insight from his coachee ('coach'), and notices when he has experience of relevance which he could share ('mentor'), he begins to develop his own mindfulness of the dance between roles which characterises all good coaching and mentoring.

ROLE BOUNDARIES

But what Simon Jenkins' article drew my attention to was Clutterbuck's invaluable work in deepening our understanding of the distinction. I was struck by the meaningfulness of the

boundary between coaching and mentoring in navigating one's way around and through a coaching/ mentoring relationship. How much is concealed by Megginson and Clutterbuck's exhortation [1] to 'be aware of the role boundaries and the boundaries of your own competence'!

For in the moment of coaching, coachees often do not draw a distinction between the immediate short term performance goals and the longer term career goals. My conversations with coachees regularly sit on the boundary between managing a particular issue and checking how the behavioural change required fits with the values and sense of identity (and future career prospects) of the person. I have one coachee, for example, who arrived recently with a request from her CEO to manage her people differently. The conversation soon worked its way round to 'How do I want to be in this business? What is sustainable for me? And, what price career development?' It is essential that I am mindful of the different role I have then, from the one I have when enabling her to think differently about the management challenge. With the management challenge, technical coaching skill may suffice. With the related but much broader question, who I am will speak louder than any words I use.

CONCLUSION

Clutterbuck, it seems to me, deserves the title of 'guru'. For he has thought about a core distinction and expressed it in a way which develops the mindfulness of others. I for one intend to add to the list of questions I regularly ask myself this one: Am I coaching or mentoring now?

REFERENCES

1.   Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2005.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Richard R. Kilburg
RRK Coaching and Executive Development
5 Barrow Court, Towson, MD 21204, USA
E-mail: dickkilburg@comcast.net

INTRODUCTION

Jenkins' review of Clutterbuck provides an interesting overview of many aspects of these extensive publications. Anchored in the innovations of Peter Drucker, Clutterbuck was an early explorer of developmental mentoring in organizations. Over time, his work incorporated coaching methods and concepts. Jenkins presents his review in a succinct, uplifting, and articulate fashion. In this invited commentary, an effort will be made to address the limitations of classification systems that have been used to delineate various forms of helping methods, describe issues and approaches that connect virtually all forms of behavioral intervention, and describe briefly some political characteristics of organizations that increase the complexity of all human development programs.

CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Wilber [1] made an extensive effort to organize and critically summarize an overarching conceptualization of most of the complexities of pathways to human development. In his final chapter, he compressed centuries of intellectual work into twenty-one charts that graphically depicted stage and phase models, issues, themes, problems, and conceptual explanations of individual, family, social, tribal, cultural, species, and trans species development across physical, psychological, social, and spiritual domains. Wilber's efforts were stunningly eclectic and included many schools of thought and scholarly efforts that have been made to address these phenomena. When compared to Wilber's summary, Jenkins' description of Clutterbuck's efforts to formulate meaningful distinctions between differing approaches to mentoring practiced in the United States and Europe and his later efforts to critically address boundary issues involved in various approaches to coaching and mentoring while both interesting and important, appear to this author detached from many of the extensive and hard-edged realities of making such arguments. Kuhn's [2] admonitions about the limits of classification and conceptual paradigms should give us substantial pause about whether Clutterbuck's distinctions will provide science and practice with any truly meaningful long-term guidance or utility.

In addition, Kegan [3] delineated five orders of human mind based on the contributions of Piaget [4] and his colleagues. The cognitive skills of classification emerge early in children at approximately five years of age. They intensify in pre-adolescence with the ability to perform the four fundamental logical operations which combine to create the human capacity to compare and contrast phenomena across categories. Piaget [4] called this

cognitive structure and ability formal operations. Kegan called it third-order mind and suggested that most of adult humanity approached all of the tasks of life with and through this foundation. Kegan also delineated the characteristics of fourth and fifth order minds as being able to operate systemically (seeing and building wholes and parts and being able to move back and forth readily between them) and trans systemically (being able to understand why systems are created, what they leave out and why, and to create such systems for various purposes). When viewed through these lenses, Clutterbuck's efforts appear to be laudable attempts at providing a third-order mind view of various approaches and efforts to facilitate human development in organizational settings. They follow a long line of efforts by other practitioners and scholars to use reductionist and modernist concepts to bring some measure of order and comprehension to extraordinarily complex phenomena. In Jenkins' summary, he suggests that Clutterbuck and his colleagues have made the customary efforts to distinguish their classifications and descriptions from those of others but provides no hint of efforts to delineate entire developmental systems yet alone describe the purposes for which such systems were constructed and advocated other than trying to describe a differentiated Euro-centric viewpoint and to advance the practices of mentoring and then coaching. The material provided appears descriptive, enlightening, and simultaneously self-serving as it avoids these larger considerations in favor of what is ultimately experienced by the end of the paper as a kind of sampler of a life's work. While it is impossible to summarize a life's work in a short paper, I believe that greater utility may have been provided by at least some effort to deconstruct some of Clutterbuck's ideas systematically rather than accurately describing them. This leads me to my second reaction to the paper.

BOUNDARIES AND APPROACHES TO ENABLING HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

In many articles and books describing approaches to help humans get better at performing a huge array of behavioral competencies, there are nearly always efforts to define those methods and concepts to clarify what they are and are not. Many attempts are quite explicit in their demarcations stating that supervision is this, mentoring is that, coaching another thing, while counseling and psychotherapy belonging to completely different realms. The confidence with which such boundary declarations are expressed has always stunned me. Such pronouncements often produce spirited dialogues between groups of practitioners. However, in practice, the meaning of such exchanges often evaporates as one person tries to help another improve performance. Ericcson [5] eloquently summarized the performance improvement literature emphasizing two very consistent findings over time and across domains of activity. First, performance improves with sustained efforts – repeated trials over time. Second, timely, useful, repeated, and appropriate feedback on how to do something significantly increases knowledge and skill. Systematic efforts sustained over time periods of a decade or more by talented individuals can lead to truly world class levels of recognized performance.

While many other approaches have been studied and deployed in efforts to help others resolve problems, develop new skills, and turn deficits into strengths, none of them seem to have as significant an impact as the repetitions and feedback results. In light of these scientific results reported over six decades, Clutterbuck's efforts described by Jenkins in the end seem less useful. Regardless of how one defines the type of helping relationship one person has with another, efforts made to assist someone improve blur concepts and methods very quickly. Supervisors mentor and coach. Mentors often supervise when mentees threaten to derail. Coaches can supervise and mentor when a client's boss fails to do a

reasonable job. In reality, anything a supervisor, mentor, or coach does or says or doesn't do or say can have profound therapeutic impact or value for an individual without it being experienced as psychotherapy. Concepts and methods for effective work by helpers are widely available and simultaneously extraordinarily challenging to implement. This brings me to my third reaction to Jenkins' paper.

POLITICS AND HUMAN LIBERATION

2400 years ago, Aristotle suggested that humans were first and foremost political animals. I believe, discerning the political environment in and through which anyone works is the most important single step one can take to help another person. Lasswell's [6] definition of politics as a process involving who gets what, when, and how in any community or enterprise provides an important pathway to understanding how to support and guide someone's development. Insufficient knowledge about or skill in maneuvering in politically motivated landscapes can land someone in very well motivated trouble quite quickly. Jenkins' paper does not cover the topic in any detail. Clutterbuck's explicit critique of the approach of the US model as emphasizing the mentor's power, influence, and authority in favor of developmental mentoring based on experience and wisdom as described by Jenkins appears to minimize the political zeitgeist in which both mentor and mentee operate.

CONCLUSION

In four plus decades of professional work as a leader, consultant, coach, psychotherapist, and scholar, with every person with whom I have worked, I have consistently strived to engender and support efforts toward the following: liberation of human talent and spirit, improvements in awareness (self, other, family, group, organization, environment/situation), testing the essence and limits of the realities one faces, and progressively moving toward living and leading a virtuous life regardless of the role being played. Whether engaged in such efforts in one's own life or assisting others, development professionals must constantly search their environments for real evidence of what is happening politically, retain a systematic sensitivity to means and ends as they are expressed in human enterprises and relationships, and possess a sophisticated compliment of knowledge, skills, abilities, and experiences that can be used as needed. Jenkins' summary of Clutterbuck's work reminds all of us of many, but not nearly all of the domains comprising such expertise.

REFERENCES
1. Wilber, K., *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy,* Shambhala, Boston, 2000.

2. Kuhn, T. S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970.

3. Kegan, R., *In Over our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1994.

4. Piaget, J., *Biology and Knowledge: An Essay on the Relations Between Organic Regulations and Cognitive Processes*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1971.

5. Ericsson, K. A., ed., *The Road to Excellence: The Acquisition of Expert Performance in the Arts and Sciences, Sports and Games*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, 1996.

6. Lasswell, H., *Politics: Who Gets What, When How,* Meridian Books, New York, 1958.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Japera Johnson and Barry Bozeman
University of Georgia
Dept. of Public Administration and Policy
201 Baldwin Hall, Athens, GA 30602, USA
E-mail: japera@uga.edu

INTRODUCTION

Aptly described in the stimulus article by Simon Jenkins as a thought leader, David Clutterbuck's work moves the mentoring conversation in very interesting directions. Since Jenkins' excellent article is essentially an overview and a merited appreciation of Clutteruck's work, we focus here more on the Clutterbuck contribution than Jenkins' assessment of it. We feel that Jenkins has done an admirable job of describing Clutterbuck's contributions; we provide a few caveats. In doing so, we take the liberty of drawing a bit from our own research, but also our own mentoring relationship.

FORMAL VERSUS INFORMAL MENTORING

Doubtless, Clutterbuck's work is pioneering. During the same year (1985) that Kathy Kram published her seminal work, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life* [1] in the US, Clutterbuck published *Everyone Needs a Mentor: How to Foster Talent Within the Organization* [2] in the UK. As we will demonstrate in this critique, Clutterbuck's [3] definition of mentoring establishes the importance of identifying the contextual environment in which mentoring relationships flourish. Notably, his work is an early representation of informal mentoring as the counterfactual argument to the formal mentoring models that were most often studied in the literature.

RESEARCH VERSUS MANAGERIAL PRACTICE

In the most recent edition of *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, Clutterbuck [3] provides great detail about the benefits of the mentoring relationship for both the mentee and mentor. While this work is certainly influential, as with any scholarship, there are limitations that should be addressed. We feel that the author's mentoring definition proves problematic, *especially for those interested in empirical research on mentoring*, a particular focus of ours. We argue that it does not provide sufficient boundaries for the mentoring relationship, nor does it adequately differentiate mentoring from other types of support one might receive in various relationships. These criticisms are likely less important to managers or other workers seeking to develop mentoring relationships, but they are important to developing rigorous knowledge of mentoring. We agree with Jenkins' characterization linking Clutterbuck to Peter Drucker, another highly influential thinker whose work proves more problematic in research applications than in its application to managerial practice.

OFF-LINE HELP

Clutterbuck's definition of mentoring broadly describes the nature of the relationship, but fails to adequately establish the true meaning of the mentoring concept. The author defines mentoring as, "off-line help from one person to another in making significant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking" [3. p. 13]. Like many works on mentoring, this definition does not provide useful boundaries of the mentoring concept nor does it separate it from other varieties of knowledge (for a listing of mentoring concepts and definitions in the literature, see Bozeman and Feeney [4]). For researchers working to explain the empirical dynamics of mentoring, it would be useful if Clutterbuck's and other mentoring definitions provide answers, at least implicit ones, to these questions: *What qualifies a person to be a mentor? Where does the mentoring relationship temporally begin and end and what are the indicators of change in status? What types of helping behaviors are included or excluded? How should one define 'significant' transitions in knowledge, work or thinking?*

Clutterbuck attempts to establish a boundary of the relationship by requiring that it happen 'off-line', arguing that this allows for transparency between mentor and mentee as it removes the threat of intimidation stemming from a hierarchal relationship. Also, off-line mentoring is clearly distinguished from formal job related training and coaching. Thus, a partial boundary for mentoring is offered by this definition, but because it lacks detail, it is not clear how any other non-hierarchical relationship could be disqualified as a mentoring relationship. Clutterbuck might argue that by denoting that mentoring is *off-line help* specific to s*ignificant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking,* that other non-hierarchical relationships are excluded. Nevertheless, pastors, counselors and friends often help people make transitions in thinking and various types of knowledge. These people, though influential, provide a necessary socio-emotional function, but possibly are not realistic definitions of mentors. Thus, Clutterbuck's vague definition of mentoring suggests that nearly anyone providing off-line socio-emotional help is a mentor. While we agree that everyone needs a mentor, everyone is not a mentor. As we note elsewhere "[t]he lexical meaning of ambiguity is 'multiple meanings' and if everything is mentoring then nothing is" [4, p. 731]. By being so sweeping and all encompassing, the definition risks losing the saliency and relative importance that mentoring authors have fought so hard to demonstrate.

The one clear-cut diagnostic criterion for Clutterbuck's mentoring concept seems to us wrongheaded. His sharp demarcation between "off-line" and all other interactions provides an artificial distinction, one that many persons involved in a mentoring relationship would have a hard time understanding. Let us consider the case of your two authors of this commentary, one mentor and the other mentee. We meet at the office, where we discuss work issues, but also social issues, personal issues, and news of the world. We meet at non-work venues (for example, restaurants, coffee houses, and at the mentor's home) where we discuss work issues, but also social issues, personal issues, and news of the world. The activities and the discussions are largely seamless and the venue is different only in the sense that the background noise is different. Yes, we realize that academic work and the academic workplace is not the same as most businesses. But that relates to our underlying approach, the need for a generalizable, theoretical notion of mentoring, one that fits the academic world, business, nonprofits and government agencies.

HIERARCHICAL RELATIONSHIP

Again using our relationship as a guidepost, our relationship is more hierarchal than perhaps Clutterbuck would expect from a mentoring relationship. This is to some extent unavoidable inasmuch as it is both a mentor-mentee relationship and a dissertation advisor-advisee

relationship and there is a three generation age gap between the two of us. Moreover, the person offering 'helpful hints' and even in some case socio-emotional support is also the person who will have to decide whether the work produced in a dissertation is sufficient to permit the mentee to receive a doctoral degree, a requirement for the career path chosen by the mentee. Interestingly, although in our relationship the mentor has considerable authority over the mentee, transparency in communication remains. The dialogue remains particularly candid because we have done a great deal to establish rapport and trust within the relationship.   For example, we share stories of our childhood experiences finding commonalities and discussing differences. Additionally, we genuinely get along because our expectations of the relationship are congruent. In short, our relationship is an organic social exchange in which we both have expectations, preferences and endowments that we share. Johnson would not be a good protégé for all faculty and Bozeman would not be a good mentor for all graduate students.   'Good mentoring' is contingent.   In line with our experience, the Goodness of Fit mentoring model was developed to demonstrate that mentoring happens between dyadic partners, both with a responsibility to the relationship and expectations for its outcomes [5]. As in any partnership, the mentoring relationship fails without both participants working harmoniously toward a common goal. We agree with Clutterbuck that the "interaction between the mentor and mentee is a self-reinforcing system – each party's behavior influences the behavior of the other" [3, p.14]. Our relationship corroborates his idea and at the same time provides anecdotal evidence that hierarchal relationships can in fact work, but the nature of the relationship is predicated on a variety of situational factors and, especially, the match between the mentor and mentee's preferences, incentives and valuations.

GUARDIAN VERSUS ENABLER
Although we do not agree that mentoring should be limited to off-line relationships, we recognize the merit of Clutterbuck's weariness about formalized mentoring. A reoccurring thesis of Clutterbuck's work is that hierarchy and formalism diminish the development of the mentee's self-efficacy, limits two-way learning, and perpetuates the mentor acting as a guardian rather than enabler. Further, formalized mentoring can be contentious and even conflictual when there is a mismatch between putative mentors and mentees who have never come together more organically. These concerns seem to us reasonable, if perhaps a bit overstated. Our own research shows mentee satisfaction and mentoring effectiveness are not well predicted according to whether the relationship began informally or as part of a formal mentoring program [6]. Still, it seems plausible that formal mentoring could be more contentious. Alternatively, as we consider the case for minorities, women and other members of historically marginalized groups in need of access to territories in which they have been excluded, the social capital that is stored in hierarchal mentoring relationships can prove invaluable [7]. Clutterbuck takes issue with these key aspects of formal mentoring: i) influence is central to the relationship; and ii) the mentee, or protégé, is protected [3]. We would argue that for vulnerable groups, the mentor's influence and protection might in fact be essential. Powerful mentors, with credibility can influence the behaviors of others by demonstrating respect for members of these groups, thus shifting the norms of inclusion in these environments.

MUTUALITY OF LEARNING
As a remedy to the presumed ills of formal mentoring, Clutterbuck offers developmental mentoring, where the experience gap between the mentor and mentee is what establishes the

need for the relationship [3]. The developmental mentoring model emphasizes mutuality of learning and is oriented to empower and encourage the mentee to do things for himself or herself. While we feel that developmental mentoring can occur in either a formal or informal context, we agree that mentoring works best when there is mutual learning as opposed to having an authority figure impart presumed lessons in a one-way communication model. Clutterbuck was well ahead of his time in arguing that formal mentoring does not capture the range of relationships best viewed as mentoring. Most of today's research recognizes his lesson that mentoring is a social relationship in which both parties have an opportunity to benefit (and both may bear aspects of negative outcomes as well).

CONTEXTUAL ENVIRONMENT

One of the strengths of Clutterbuck's developmental mentoring model, as it has thus far been provided, is also a weakness. The model is based almost entirely on illustrations, unsystematic case studies and anecdotes, ones providing a strong sense of context. The disadvantage, of course, is that an approach relying so much on context gives little basis for confidence-inspiring generalizations about mentoring. However, this is the role of (aggregating) research-based knowledge, sacrificing at least some context for some linkages among circumstances of time, person and place. The two can complement one another, but it seems clear that Clutterbuck's contribution has been more in the realm of the specific and the unverified. That is to say, his work has some limitations for scholars but can and does have strong appeal for person's wanting practical insights about mentoring.

CONCLUSION

In our view, mentoring is a multifaceted complex activity, and particularly hard to pin down. Clutterbuck certainly works toward clarification. His special contribution, at least for scholars, is in providing a wealth of implicit hypotheses for us to test. But it is not all about hypothesis generation. The co-authors' own mentoring relationship is about mutual learning and developmental mentoring, very much like the beneficial notion advanced by Clutterbuck.

REFERENCES

1. Kram, K.E., Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life, *Sloan Management Review*, 1985, 26(3), 85.

2. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: How to Foster Talent Within the Organization*, Institute of Personnel Management, London, 1985.

3. Clutterbuck, D., *Everyone Needs a Mentor: Fostering Talent in Your Organisation*, 4th edn., Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London, 2004.

4. Bozeman, B. and Feeney, M. K., Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique, *Administration & Society*, 2007, 39(6), 719-739.

5. Bozeman, B. and Feeney, M. K., Mentor Matching: A "Goodness of Fit" Model, *Administration & Society*, 2008, 40(5), 465-482.

6. Bozeman, B. and Feeney, M. K., Public Management Mentoring: What Affects Outcomes?, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2009, 19(2), 427-452.

7. Johnson, J and Bozeman, B., Perspective: Adopting an Asset Bundles Model to Support and Advance Minority Students' Careers in Academic Medicine and the Scientific Pipeline, *Academic Medicine*, 2012, doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e31826d5a8d

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Simon Robinson
Leeds Metropolitan University
The Rose Bowl, Leeds, LS1 3HE, UK
E-mail: s.j.robinson@leedsmet.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

I really enjoyed Simon Jenkins article on Clutterbuck and mentoring. It has sparked a number of thoughts to bring to the conversation, both from the perspective of spirituality and of dialogue.

THE NEED FOR DIALOGUE

I want to begin with the wonderful assertion that everyone needs a mentor. In a sense this cuts to the heart of the issue. We can spend a lot of time trying to distinguish coaching from mentoring, but the key point is that everyone needs dialogue. An old academic friend of mine suggested a little while ago that this is not the case. All we need is internal reflection. But as Riceour [1] and others argue such reflection is dialogue with the self. Moreover, such dialogue is always more than dyadic, involving engaging many different narratives that go to make up the self [2]. But dialogue does also need another outside the self, for at least two reasons. First, giving an account to the other enables the person both to clarify thoughts and feelings; and second, this enables the growth of responsibility, and the location of the self in the wider social environment. The question then becomes where and how in professions and work do we get the experience that enables this kind of dialogue.

SERENDIPITY

It is not surprising that much of the work around mentoring wants to clarify the relational contract, which in turn demands some idea of intention and outcome. However, as Jenkins notes there is something in this relationship that is about grace or gift, not contract. Contract focuses on the specifics of the relationship, including outcomes and targets, but gift or covenant [3] focuses on the relationship. The result is greater openness to possibilities and learning that is more around serendipity than intentional learning outcomes. Lederach [4] captures this well in the dialogue of peace building, reminding us that the term serendipity was coined by Walpole, in a letter of 1754, based on the story of the three princess of Serendip, who on their travels learned through 'accidents and good fortune, of things they were not in quest of'.

This very striking image suggests several things that might inform the practice of mentoring. First, the task is focused on journey, not simply on immediate tasks [5]. It is the journey of the person in relation to the practice which can be accessed and which becomes the focus of meaning, which includes the seven 'dialogues' mentioned by Clutterbuck.

Second, it can be argued that 'sagacity' is something that emerges in relation to the reflection as we travel on the journey. In other words, it is the reflection itself and travel that develops such sagacity. Sagacity, of course, refers to wisdom. But the etymology reveals much more. The Latin *sagire* means to be astute. Sagaciousness was also used of keen perception (even at one point of the pack of hounds), foresight, and the ability to make good judgements. This is something key to awareness and responsiveness to the social and physical, as we make the journey. This links well to Aquinas's view of wisdom (*prudential*), partly involving awareness of the past, present and future.

Third, it is striking how the different dialogues relate to the intellectual virtues of Aristotle- *phronesis* (reflection on the good in one's context), *techne* (technical capacity), *nous* (more intuitive wisdom), *episteme* (more empirical wisdom), and *sophia* (logical or theoretical thinking). This suggests that the learning process involves making connections, a more holistic reflection. Fourth, this kind of reflection can enable a perspective which distinguishes the overall journey of the person and the immediate tasks in hand. The person is not then 'defined' by those tasks, but is able to understand the self in relation to those tasks. This is central to the idea of autonomy.

Finally, the need for the other. Much of Bohm's [6] work suggests that meaning making can only 'take wing' through dialogue. This is partly about enabling a critical perspective. Of course, the word critical, for many, is suffused with threat. This is partly because it is associated with critique of performance, outcomes and so on. Our identification with those outcomes can involve dependency on them for our sense of worth, and to have them critiqued can then become a threat. The presence of another who enables the wider focus on journey precisely takes us away from that and enables a fuller sense of well-being. By definition, such another has to be outside the meaning structure of performance (the domain of the coach or the line manager), and even the sponsor (who I guess will have a particular view of the direction of the journey).

COMPANION

In the realm of spirituality and health [7], the other is often seen as companion. That feels right for a mentor. The companion joins you on the journey, and stays with you for a while, returning when it seems right. In health, of course, the journey may be precipitous and you may need to lean upon the companion. In sport or wider work the companion helps you re-mind the past and the future journey and see everyday targets in the light of this, enabling you to hold together the perspectives of covenant and contract. Perhaps above all the companion helps you to realise that you are on a journey, and the significance that this journey has to you and others. The companion is not someone who is necessarily 'successful', but someone who is wise [8], who is part of your profession, but who does not define you by it, who helps you test established meaning. Hence, the companion doesn't just listen but shares wisdom as an idea and as a lived and relational experience. In other words (s)he models wisdom not as a discrete performance to point to, but in and through the dialogue.

CONCLUSION

The three princes of Serendip knew a thing or two about all this. They never travelled alone and were indeed sagacious.

REFERENCES

1.   Riceour, P., *The Self as Another*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.

2.   Taylor, C., *Sources of the Self,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

3.   May, W., Code and Covenant or Philanthropy, in: Lammers, S. and Verhey, ?, eds., *On Moral Medicine*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1987.

4.   Lederach, J.P., *The Moral Imagination*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

5.   Robinson, S., The Spiritual Journey, in: Parry, J., Robinson, S., Watson, N. and Nesti M., *Sport and Spirituality*, Routledge, London, 2007, 38-58.

6.   Bohm, D., *On Dialogue*, Routledge, London, 2004.

7.   Robinson, S. Kendrick, K. and Brown, A., *Spirituality and the Practice of Healthcare*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2003.

8.   Rooney, D. and McKenna, B., Wisdom in Organizations, *Social Epistemology*, 2007, 21(2), 113-138.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Danny Mielke
College of Education and Business
Eastern Oregon University
One University Boulevard,
La Grande, OR 97850, USA
E-mail: dmielke@eou.edu

INTRODUCTION

A successful mentor/coach is someone who is willing to share time and experience in such a way as to assist the mentee/coachee to develop the necessary values, confidence and knowledge to enable them to be successful in their chosen professional pursuits. When considering that values are a component of mentoring, I have chosen to focus my commentary on the concept of spiritual mentoring.

SPIRITUALITY

Spirituality and religion are not synonymous [1]. Palmer [2] defines spirituality as the eternal human yearning to be connected with something larger than our own egos. Harlos [3] suggests that definitions of spirituality contain a common element, values. English [4] identifies spirituality as a force that causes one to reach beyond self and share an interdependence with the larger world. Parks [5] acknowledges that there is more to life than what we see or touch, and we possess a spiritual sensibility that contains our intimate thoughts and feelings. For me, spirituality is a guidepost that determines the values we adhere to, and that drives the choices we make and the interpersonal connections we foster.

SPIRITUAL MENTORING

The process of mentoring has certain spiritual aspects where the mentee is viewed as a disciple of the mentor. The dialogue that takes place between the mentor and mentee/disciple shapes the behaviors and provides greater insight about the environment in which the mentee works. This communal relationship between the two fosters friendship, learning, and adaptations necessary to succeed in the work situation. The true vocation in spiritual mentoring is the ongoing reciprocal guidance that the mentor/mentee give each other and it may resemble a friendship model of teaching, advising and co-learning. [6]

The spiritual mentor possesses and shares a common set of values with the mentee. These may be religiously connected, but need not be so. Spiritual mentoring embraces values such as humility, compassion and simplicity. Harlos describes humility as unpretentiousness; compassion as a deep concern for others through kind and helpful actions; and simplicity – communicating in simple rather than complex ways [3, p. 617-619].

Spiritual mentoring may not always be a physical relationship between two people present

in the same time. It is possible to be mentored through sacred texts that serve as a guide for the individual mentee. Through the reading of sacred text, the individual can "return to times of deeper spiritual insight than [their] own to recollect truths that [their] culture obscures, to have companions on the spiritual journey who, though long dead, may be more alive spiritually than many who are with [them] now" [7]. Reading inspirational literature can serve as a surrogate to a physically present mentor.

When spiritual mentoring is a person-to-person relationship, the spiritual mentor guides the mentee in their personal awareness, communication and intimacy with their high power [8].

LEADERSHIP AND SPIRITUAL MENTORING

An important component of leadership is the ability to mentor. A great leader seeks to make those he/she serves better, causing a ripple through the organization of constant improvement. This type of cascade mentoring is where the organization is built around a chain of mentors from top to bottom. Everyone in the organization is mentoring and being mentored simultaneously. Building an organization for success requires creating a culture that will live through succeeding generations [9].

Mentoring is not an activity bound by time – indeed, a true mentor/mentee relationship is for life and both proceed on their joint journey together. The chief function of a spiritual mentor is to monitor the spiritual experiences throughout this journey. Such things as faith, hope and display of charity, will impact the effectiveness of the mentoring concepts shared in a spiritual connection [10].

However, when considering a spiritually based mentoring situation (or any mentoring situation), the relationship should not intersect with line management or performance accountability [11].

CONCLUSION

Spiritual mentoring is a form of mentoring that involves a strong connection with a value orientation between the mentor and the mentee. Spiritual mentoring embraces a relationship built upon principles that may not be commonplace in the work environment. Spiritual mentoring extends beyond a mentor relationship that merely directs a mentee's activities related to work and assists in the development of character traits that influence both the individual's quality of leadership and their own personal ethical principles and behaviors.

REFERENCES

1.   Seaward, B.L., *Health of the Human Spirit: Spiritual Dimensions for Personal Health*, Benjamin Cummings, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

2.   Parker, P.J., Teaching with Heart and Soul: Reflections on Spirituality in Teacher Education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2003, 54, 376-385

3.   Harlos K. P., Toward a Spiritual Pedagogy: Meaning, Practice, and Applications in Management Education, *Journal of Management Education*, 2000, 24, 612-627

4.   English, L.M., Spiritual Dimensions of Informal Learning, *New Directions For Adult and Continuing Education*, 2000, 85, 29-38

5.   Parks, S.D., Leadership, Spirituality, and the College as a Mentoring Environment, *Journal of College and Character*, 2008, 10, 2, 1-9.

6.   Buzzanell, P.M. Spiritual Mentoring: Embracing the Mentor-Mentee Relational Process, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2009, 120, 17-24.

7.   Palmer, P.J., *To Know As We Are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey*, Harper, San Francisco, CA, 1993

8.   Maddix, M.A., Online Learning Communities: The Heart of Online Learning, *Common Ground Journal*, 2010, 7, 2, 10-15.

9.   Dungy, T. and Whitaker, N., *The Mentor Leader : Secrets to Building People and Teams that Win Consistently*, Tyndale House Publishing, Carol Stream, IL, 2010.

10.   Dunne, T., Spiritual Mentoring, 1991, *Http://users.wowway.com/~tdunne5273/SpMent.pdf*

11.   Ratima, M. and Grant, B., Thinking About Difference Across and Within Mentoring, *MAI Review*, 2007, 3, *Http://review.mai.ac.nz*

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Gordon Bloom,
McGill University,
Dept. of Kinesiology and Physical Education,
475 Pine Avenue West, Montreal, Quebec,
H2W IS4, Canada
E-mail: gordon.bloom@mcgill.ca

INTRODUCTION

Simon Jenkins has provided an interesting, unique, and practical examination of the work of David Clutterbuck in relation to mentoring and coaching. Clutterbuck is widely regarded as a leading world figure on mentoring in management and business. Presently, there is a lack of empirical research on mentoring in sport, despite the many possible outlets for it (e.g., athlete-athlete, coach-athlete, coach-coach). Thus, articles of this sort are worthwhile and have the potential to impact best practices. This commentary will examine mentoring in sport from the perspective of the coach, and particularly whether it is the most effective and practical method for acquiring coaching knowledge and ultimately helping coaches prosper in this competitive profession.

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SPORTS COACHES

Despite the development of coach education in countries like Canada, Australia, and the UK, and their efforts to integrate mentoring into the training and development of their coaches, there is still a long way to go before mentoring becomes integrated for coaches in the same manner that it does for teachers, doctors, and many other business professionals. In fact, coaching science researchers over the last two decades have found that coaches' knowledge and career progression have been influenced through a variety of different means including coaches' athletic experiences [1-3], interactions with other coaches [4-6] and mentoring [7-9].

Many coaches started as athletes, thereby gaining exposure to years of coaching strategies and techniques in what has been referred to as an "informal apprenticeship of prolonged observation" [10, p. 88]. This informal apprenticeship seems to be typical of most sport coaches [6, 11]. More precisely, Gilbert et al. [12] found that successful high-school and elite coaches accumulated over 4,600 hours as athletes. It is not known if this pre-coaching experience was correlated with future coaching competency [12]. However, Schinke et al. [6] examined the career stages of six elite basketball coaches and found that these coaches adopted training exercises and tactics that were learned from individuals who coached them while they were athletes. Similar results were found by Lemyre et al. [13] who suggested that youth hockey coaches' previous experiences as players allowed them to develop sport-specific knowledge as well as opportunities to socialize with other coaches. While these

athletic experiences were undoubtedly helpful in many ways, the opportunity to choose and learn from a competent coach is likely out of control of most athletes.

Coaches have repeatedly cited the importance of direct coaching experience and observation of other coaches as another primary source of knowledge acquisition [4, 11]. Specifically, interactions among coaching staff members and other coaches can provide important learning situations in which they discuss coaching issues and develop, experiment with, and evaluate strategies to resolve issues [14, 15]. For example, Gould et al. [4] surveyed 130 elite coaches in the United States and asked them to identify factors contributing to their knowledge development. Results revealed that the technical aspects of coaching were often acquired though observing and listening to more experienced coaches. Moreover, Saury and Durand [11] identified experience and other coaches as significant factors in shaping the development of coaching knowledge and how it was applied within the coaching process.

Mentoring is a third learning source for coaches' growth and development. In an investigation of training methods of expert coaches, formalized and structured mentoring programs were considered by participants to be the most important factor in their development [8]. Moreover, Bloom et al. [8] noted that mentor coaches not only taught "them the technical, tactical, and physical skills, but also shared philosophies, beliefs, and values about coaching" (p. 273). Jones et al. [9] further emphasized that learning from other coaches was central to the development of soccer coaches' knowledge and coaching philosophies.

To summarize, there is a general agreement that learning opportunities stemming from playing experience, discussions and observations of other coaches, and mentoring play a significant role in the development of coaching knowledge, practice, and progression.

MENTORING

Of these three areas, mentoring seems to have the greatest potential. It involves more of a personal investment of time by an experienced coach who will often take great care and pride in guiding his/her young protégé in both their personal and professional lives. Despite its potential and intuitive appeal, it is probably the least occurring learning source of the three. The reasons for this are inconclusive, yet some suggestions are worth forwarding: i) *funding* (all components of a mentoring program require funding from the training of the mentors to the compensation required for their time and effort; most sport organizations are run on very tight budgets), ii) *time* (coaching is not a 9 to 5 job and many of the potential mentors do not have much extra time to devote to mentoring), iii) *standardized program* (there is no clearly defined and widely-accepted sport mentoring program to follow), and iv) *matching of mentors and mentees* (care and effort needs to be given to matching the mentors and mentees related to coaching styles and practices.

CONCLUSION

Despite the difficulties and challenges that are present with the creation and maintenance of a formalized coach mentoring program, the potential long-term benefits that have arisen in business and management programs suggest that it is worth pursuing in the sporting domain. As Clutterbuck and other researchers have noted, having a mentor can improve a protégé's confidence and competence, can provide them with a positive role model, and can promote them and introduce them to others who might be able to help with their career progression. A good starting point would be empirical research on coach mentoring with academics working in partnership with sport governing bodies in various countries to design, implement, and evaluate coach mentoring programs.

REFERENCES

1.   Cregan, K., Bloom, G. A. and Reid, G., Career Evolution and Knowledge of Elite Coaches of Swimmers with a Physical Disability, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 2007, 78, 339-350.

2.   Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M. and Jones, R. L., Coach Education and Continuing Professional Development: Experience and Learning to Coach, *Quest,* 2003, 55, 215-230.

3.   Hardin, B., Coaching Expertise in High School Athletics: Characteristics of Expert High School Coaches, *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual,* 2000, 15, 24-38.

4.   Gould, D., Giannini, J., Krane, V. and Hodge, K., Educational Needs of Elite U.S. National Team, Pan American, and Olympic Coaches, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 1990, 9, 332-344.

5.   Fleurance, P. and Cotteaux, V., Construction de L'Expertise Chez les Entraîneurs Sportifs d'Athelès de Haut-Niveau Français [Development of Expertise in Elite Athletics Coaches in France], *Avante,* 1999, 5, 54-68.

6.   Schinke, R. J., Bloom, G. A. and Salmela, J. H., The Career Stages of Elite Canadian Basketball Coaches, *Avante,* 1995, 1, 48-62.

7.   Bertz, S. and Purdy, L., Coach Education in Ireland: Observations and Considerations for High Performance, *Journal of Coaching Education,* 2011, 4, 29-43.

8.   Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J. and Salmela, J. H., The Importance of Mentoring in the Development of Coaches and Athletes, *International Journal of Sport Psychology,* 1998, 29, 267-281.

9.   Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M. and Portrac, P., Constructing Expert Knowledge: A Case Study of a Top-Level Professional Soccer Coach, *Sport, Education and Society,* 2003, 8, 213-229.

10.   Sage, G. H., Becoming a High School Coach: From Playing Sports to Coaching, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1989, 60, 81-92.

11.   Saury, J. and Durand, M., (1998). Practical Knowledge in Expert Coaches: On Site Study of Coaching in Sailing, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1998, 69, 254-266.

12.   Gilbert, W. D., Côté, J. and Mallett, C., Developmental Paths and Activities of Successful Sport Coaches, *International Journal of Sports Sciences and Coaching,* 2006, 1, 69-76.

13.   Lemyre, F., Trudel, P. and Durand-Bush, N., How Youth-Sport Coaches Learn to Coach, *The Sport Psychologist,* 2007, 21, 191-209.

14.   Gilbert, W. D. and Trudel, P., Learning to Coach through Experience: Reflection in Model Youth Sport Coaches, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 2001, 21, 16-34.

15.   Wright, T., Trudel, P. and Culver, D., Learning How to Coach: The Different Learning Situations Reported by Youth Ice Hockey Coaches, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,* 2007, 12, 127-144.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Steven Rynne

The University of Queensland
School of Human Movement Studies, St. Lucia,
Brisbane, Queensland, 4072 Australia
Email: srynne@hms.uq.edu.au

INTRODUCTION

As intimated in the stimulus article, there is a great deal of conceptual ambiguity regarding the notion of mentoring. Indeed, the origin of the term 'mentor' in Greek mythology is often forgotten in current discussions. Mentor was a guardian, teacher, advisor and role model for the King of Ithaca's son, fostering his development so that he would attain the qualities and attributes essential for succeeding his father as king [1]. Modern-day mentoring programs are so far removed from this conceptualisation that they are barely comparable with respect to their nature, focus and outcomes [2].

MENTORING AS GUIDANCE

It is necessary to persist with this discussion despite the divergence from its historical roots, because the term 'mentoring' has gained much ascendancy in discussions of education and professional development in a range of fields including high-performance sports coaching [3]. Nevertheless, its popularity as a term has not aided conceptual clarity. In their review of mentoring in a variety of fields, Jones et al. [4] make reference to at least five differing, but somewhat related, definitions. Their conclusion, in keeping with that of Cassidy et al. [5], is that no matter the definition, the common component is the emphasis placed upon the guidance function.

BARRIERS TO MENTORING IN AUSTRALIAN SPORTS COACHING

In research conducted in a variety of Australian high-performance coaching contexts (e.g., Australian Institute of Sport, Queensland Academy of Sport, Australian Rules Football), clear examples of mentoring, as alluded to above and as defined by Meginson and Clutterbuck [6], were largely absent [e.g., 7-10]. Many of the barriers to mentoring identified by previous scholars appeared to be at play including most notably, lack of time (mentor and mentee), lack of capable and respected mentors, and the perceived threat of exposing areas of deficit to others in the highly competitive environment of sports coaching. Instead, and somewhat in line with points 11 and 12 identified in the 'current trends and future glimpses' portion of the stimulus article (p. 149), the high-performance coaches appeared to have a shifting array of confidantes with whom they engaged over the period of their careers.

SPORTS COACHING LEARNING

While the learning of these high performance sport coaches was found to be supported through a variety of means (e.g., learning on the job, tertiary study, learning as an athlete), the coaches periodically engaged with a dynamic and evolving informal network – what has previously been referred to as a Dynamic Social Network (DSN) [7, 8]. The social network tended to be dynamic in that the high-performance coaches would seek the counsel of confidantes to assist them in solving problems they encountered. The confidantes were highly trusted (i.e., could be counted upon to keep discussions private) and were well respected (i.e., were viewed as being able to meaningfully contribute to the learning of the coach). Even in the formalised mentoring structure found in the Australian Institute of Sport's National Coaching Scholarship Program, the individual designated as 'mentor coach' often made far fewer contributions to the scholarship coach's learning than did their evolving network of confidantes (including others such as assistant coaches, sports science personnel and fellow scholarship coaches) [11]. A potential benefit of the DSN, which would most likely be shared by the multiple and sequential forms of mentoring mentioned in the stimulus article (p. 149), was that having more than one confidante (or mentor) may have helped avoid the uncritical reproduction of practice noted by Cushion et al. [12] as a major limitation of many mentoring approaches.

CONCLUSION

So while the notion of mentoring remains conceptually problematic and practically elusive in high-performance coaching contexts, there is still a high value placed on learning from other coaches [e.g., 1, 5, 12-17]. For this reason, sporting bodies will no doubt continue their drive to support, formalise and recognise mentoring in their formal coach development structures. It might be argued that this may be a largely unachievable task, but their efforts may be improved through continued research in high performance settings and also through the varied contributions of David Clutterbuck – especially regarding conceptual clarity and the insights he brings from his vast experiences.

REFERENCES

1.   Reid, H., *Mentor as Anything!*, Womensport Australia, Canberra, 1999.

2.   Ehrich, L.C., Hansford, B. and Tennent, L., Formal Mentoring Programs in Education and Other Professions: A Review of the Literature, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2004, 40(4), 518-540.

3.   Cushion, C.J. et al., *Coach Learning and Development: A Review of Literature*, Sports Coach UK, Leeds, 2010.

4.   Jones, R.L., Harris, R. and Miles, A., Mentoring in Sports Coaching: A Review of the Literature, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 2009, 14(3), 267-284.

5.   Cassidy, T., Jones, R.L. and Potrac, P., *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice*, Routledge, London, 2004.

6.   Meginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D., *Techniques for Coaching and Mentoring*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2005.

7.   Mallett, C.J., Rossi, T. and Tinning, R., *Coaching Knowledge, Learning and Mentoring in the AFL,* Report to the Australian Football League, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 2007.

8.   Occhino, J., Mallett, C.J. and Rynne, S.B., Dynamic Social Networks in High Performance Football Coaching, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 2013,18(1), 90-102.

9.   Rynne, S.B., Mallett, C.J. and Tinning, R., Workplace Learning of High Performance Sports Coaches*, Sport, Education and Society*, 2010,15(3), 315-330.

10. Rynne, S.B. and Mallett, C.J., Understanding the Work and Learning of High Performance Coaches, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 2012,17(5), 507-523.

11. Rynne, S.B. and Mallett, C.J., *Learning and Mentoring in High Performance Sports Coaching*, Report to the Australian Sports Commission, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, 2010.

12. Cushion, C.J., Armour, K.M. and Jones, R.L., Coach Education and Continuing Professional Development: Experience and Learning to Coach, *Quest*, 2003,55, 215-230.

13. Bloom, G.A. et al., The Importance of Mentoring in the Development of Coaches and Athletes, *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1998,29, 267-281.

14. Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P., Constructing Expert Knowledge: A Case Study of a Top-Level Professional Soccer Coach, *Sport , Education and Society*, 2003, 8(2), 213-229.

15. Layton, R., *Making Mentors*, Australian Sports Commission, Canberra, 2002.

16. Trudel, P. and Gilbert, W., Coaching and Coach Education, in: Kirk, D., Macdonald, D. and O'Sullivan, M., eds., *The Handbook of Physical Education*, Sage, London, 2006, 516-539.

17. Erickson, K. et al., Gaining Insight into Actual and Preferred Sources of Coaching Knowledge, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2008, 3(4), 527-538.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Tony Rossi
The University of Queensland
School of Human Movement Studies, St. Lucia,
Brisbane, Queensland, 4072 Australia
E-mail: arossi@hms.uq.edu.au

INTRODUCTION

Simon Jenkins, in his stimulus piece on David Clutterbuck amply demonstrates just how prolific Clutterbuck has been over a working lifetime. Generally accepted as the person who introduced supported mentoring into Europe, Clutterbuck has written widely on matters that relate to relationships, processes, evidence (and its capacity or otherwise to influence practice), procedures, complexity, management, supervision, guidance (of one kind or another); the list goes on. It is an impressive vita indeed and yet, Clutterbuck's influence on the world of sports and more specifically, sports coaching; remains relatively modest. Of course this is the purpose of Jenkins' piece, to stimulate our thought processes such that our attention can be drawn to the possible impact Clutterbuck might have in sport, sports coaching, and athlete and coach mentoring. If nothing else, this is an admirable challenge that Jenkins has set himself.

MENTORING AS SITUATIONAL, RELATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL

Although Clutterbuck's work is located predominantly in the world of business or large (and some not so large) public sector organisations (as with his greatest influence, Peter Drucker), there are some recognizable features that sports based research is also confirming as important. At a general level, it is clear that there is no *one* model of mentoring. As a consequence, mentoring can be best understood as both situational and relational – this clearly features in Clutterbuck's later work. Indeed given his emphasis on mentoring as a reflexive learning process that borders on pastoral care (many former school teachers will find high resonance with this term) we can take it as read that a formulaic approach to mentoring is not something advocated by Clutterbuck.

Another central theme in Clutterbuck's work is the idea of mentoring as developmental. This is an important connection to mentoring as a reflexive process (in much the same vein as Giddens' [1] notion of the self as a reflexive project). The importance of this cannot be overstated since Clutterbuck distanced himself somewhat from the protégé or apprentice idea of the mentoring relationship more prevalent in America.

HIERARCHY/POWER VERSUS SELF-RELIANCE/PERSONAL GROWTH

Clutterbuck seems not at all interested in power relationships or hierarchies, but is more committed to the idea of self-reliance, developmental processes, personal growth and liberty to decide. These are the points where I think significant crossover into the world of sport are easily recognized. I was struck for example by the alignment of the lineage of Peter Drucker and Clutterbuck, and the work over a 30-year period of Terry Orlick [2]. Remember Orlick started out when sports psychology (if anyone took any notice of it at that time) was tantamount to quackery. However, Orlick has maintained his commitment to the idea of personal growth through relationships as the basis for elite performance.

MENTORING, COACHING AND COUNSELING

Jenkins also points to how Clutterbuck was compelled to distinguish between mentoring, coaching and counseling. This aspect of Clutterbuck's work is clearly important principally because there is an erroneous blurring of the lines between these and yet they seek different outcomes and require different skills on the part of the practitioner. As Jenkins points out, Clutterbuck remained sceptical as to whether any one individual should attempt all three. In sport I suspect, this position would be widely supported.

CONCLUSION

Clutterbuck's work clearly has potential across all high performance and inclusion settings, and in this he would be continuing the legacy of his main inspiration Peter Drucker who did much of his work free of charge for disadvantaged groups including charity organizations and Native American Associations. Jenkins points out at the end of his stimulus article (p. 151) that Clutterbuck is deeply interested in and committed to diversity. Clutterbuck continues to live out Drucker's legacy in his contemporary work though his institutions and university-based research. There is clearly much we can learn from David Clutterbuck.

REFERENCES

1.   Giddens, A., *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991.

2.   Orlick, T., *In Pursuit of Excellence: How to Win in Sport and Life Through Mental Training*, 4th edn., Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL, 2008. (First published in 1980 under the same publisher.)

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Mark Griffiths
School of Sport and Exercise Sciences
University of Birmingham,
Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK
E-mail: m.griffiths@bham.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

David Clutterbuck's work in mentoring is significant because he offers a rich and detailed account from which to consider the application of mentoring to professional practice. In the context of sport coaching, professional educators have enthusiastically borrowed and referenced this work in the construction of continuous professional development (CPD) programmes. Indeed, in the performative culture of sport coaching, mentoring is treated by some as a panacea for *all* professional development. Mentoring, as a result, appears to be promoted as the answer to an improbable range of concerns about training, education, development and support. This commentary is therefore a welcome opportunity to consider the efficacy of mentoring for coaches, particularly where the ends of professional development are clearly articulated (e.g., effective decision-making), yet the means to achieve them are not. I will primarily focus on Clutterbuck's observation of the Trends and Future of Mentoring, and in particular, his identification of 'localised cultural adaptation', 'matching', and 'network of support'. Similar to Clutterbuck, I believe these are important areas for consideration in the construction of a robust and sustainable mentoring model.

LOCALISED CULTURAL ADAPTATION

It is important to make clear that I see mentoring as a dynamic learning tool (as opposed to passive notions of an information transfer role). In this way, learning through mentoring is an example of learning situated in context. For instance, recent mentoring literature [1, 2] has framed mentoring through a situated learning perspective, and positioned within a Community of Practice (CoP) model. The implication from these studies is that mentoring outcomes are a blend of the individual, process and context. It is interesting to note that Clutterbuck suggests that mentoring should "flourish within organisations" and acknowledges the impact of context in the term 'localised cultural adaption'. This point is critical because the context in which mentoring is situated sets the tone towards learning through the social practices of that particular group. Formalized mentoring always operates within the specific and multidimensional context of its setting. Let me illustrate.

In a study of formalised mentoring with volunteer sport coaches [3], our research suggested that participants' experiences of formalized mentoring were conditions of three dimensions: personal interplay, context (e.g., volunteerism), and learning culture. Drawing on a theory of cultural learning [4], we observed that learning was a consequence of

participants' engagement in mentoring practices, shaped by the culture in which such practices were situated. As a result, coach educators should focus on not only individuals, but the cultural setting and its impact on how mentoring is perceived, actioned and engaged in by participants. This is a critical point because as Zachary illustrates: "Mentoring programs enjoy sustainability over time when mentoring is embedded in an organisational culture that values continuous learning" [5, p. 167]. Where the prevailing performative culture of some sports are instinctively suspicious and insular, and coaches practices an outcome of entrenched philosophies about the 'correct way' to do things [6], the importance of cultural 'buy in' from sports organisations to any form of systematic professional development programme cannot be overstated.

MATCHING IN MENTORING

Clutterbuck's comment about developing more 'sophisticated matching of mentoring dyads' lies at the heart of any applied mentoring programme. In formalised mentoring programmes, the practice of *assigning* a mentor is problematic. As previous research has acknowledged [3], the interpersonal relationship in terms of compatibility between mentor and coach is critical. Yet pragmatically, and where sport coaching lacks the depth of mentoring resources (e.g., financial, human), how can compatibility be facilitated? There is a danger that formalized mentoring simply adds another layer to an already crowded network of existing mutual support. As we know from existing research, adult learners will identify a mentor(s) as required at different stages of their careers [7]. *Found* mentors are most likely to be those who support, rather than challenge, a mentee's philosophies and practices. This becomes problematic, however, because the potential of learning through mentoring is an outcome of participants willing to share/present knowledge, and then open it up to critical examination. There is a danger that in the *found* mentoring relationship the act of reflection simply becomes a process of rationalising and reconfirming pre-conceived ideas. Only from this understanding could we hope that mentees would seek out challenging and critical mentors, yet this seems less rather than more likely in a highly performative culture. It is interesting to consider, therefore, Clutterbuck's observation that an effective formalised mentoring programme is situated in an active community of reciprocal mentoring support between all participants, and where mentees have a role in selecting their mentor. These features are important to consider in understanding participants' motivations and learner dispositions that underpin decisions to engage (or not) in any mentoring activity.

NETWORK OF SUPPORT

My final comment draws on Clutterbuck's observation about positioning mentoring within a 'network of support'. Consensus in the mentoring research literature, as illustrated by Colley, suggests that mentoring is "a practice that remains ill-defined, poorly conceptualised and weakly theorized" [8, p. 13]. This lack of conceptual clarity is not surprising; mentoring is a complex social and psychological activity. Contemporary learning theories, however, offer a promising way of addressing Colley's concerns. Under the learning banner 'knowing in action' (e.g., communities of practice, activity theory, professional learning networks), research has acknowledged the importance of constructing and sharing knowledge through social interaction. Learning is seen as the product of participation *in social practice*. Yet in the highly competitive environment of sport coaching, and as previously eluded too, sharing can be a challenge. Changing established coaching practice can be problematic, particularly as coaches are more likely to be seen sticking with 'safer', 'tried and tested', traditional methods of delivery [6]. Where educators are challenged with making professional development

programmes contextually authentic**,** mentoring in a community framework (e.g., peer mentoring, network mentoring) offers opportunities for a more sustainable model; A community has an identity that, in turn, shapes the identities of its members. As Armour [9] has suggested, perhaps a more promising and realistic way of seeing mentoring is learning with and among professional learning colleagues. In this way, learning through mentoring relationships might be located in an honest, provocative yet supportive learning culture.

CONCLUSION

In our research on mentoring, we have observed programmes that were well intentioned but arguably over-optimistic. They have tended to lack a strong theoretical or evidence base in the design phase, resulting in a design where mentees seemingly welcome challenge and critique. Mentoring does indeed have the capacity to address some of the common critiques of traditional CPD by offering *in-situ* and sustained professional and personal support. Yet the theory of learning and theory of change that should underpin a mentoring programme appear to be missing. Despite Clutterbuck's observation that multi-directional mentoring is the ideal, uni-directional mentoring (from the experienced to the novice) is the norm in sport coaching. This seems to challenge claims that organisations are developing, or are capable of developing, a 'learning culture' to support the development of autonomous professionals [9]. What is urgently needed is more empirical research in the context of sport coaching, together with a research literate coaching workforce that is able to borrow cautiously from other domains where mentoring is enthusiastically consumed.

REFERENCES

1. Paré, A. and Le Maistre, C., Distributed Mentoring in Communities of Practice, in: Tynjälä, P. Välimaa, J. and Boulton-Lewis, G., eds., *Higher Education and Working Life: Collaborations, Confrontations and Challenges*, Elsevier, New York, NY, 2006, 129-141.

2. Patton, K., Pagnano, K. and Griffin, L. L., Navigating the Mentoring Process in a Research-Based Teacher Development Project: A Situated Learning Perspective, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2005, 24(4), 302–325.

3. Griffiths, M. and Armour, K.M., Mentoring as a Formalised Learning Strategy with Community Sports Volunteers, *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 2012, 20(1), 151-173.

4. Hodkinson, P. Biesta, G. and James, D., Understanding Learning Culturally: Overcoming the Dualism Between Social and Individual Views of Learning, *Vocations and Learning*, 2008, 1(1), 27-47

5. Zachary, L.J., *The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

6. Lyle, J. and Cushion, C., *Sports Coaching: Professionalisation and Practice*, Churchill Livingston, Edinburgh, 2010.

7. Sandford, R., Armour, K.M. and Stanton, D.J., Volunteer Mentors as Informal Educators in a Youth Physical Activity Programme, *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 2010, 18(2), 135-153.

8. Colley, H., Engagement Mentoring for 'Disaffected' Youth: A New Model of Mentoring for Social Inclusion, *British Educational Research Journal*, 2003, 29(4), 521-542.

9. Armour, K.M., Professions and the Mentoring Imperative, Unpublished Paper Presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, December 2-6, 2012, University of Sydney, Australia.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching

A Commentary

Edward A. Ibarguen
PGA Master Professional
Duke University Golf Club
Durham, NC 27705, USA
E-mail: ibarguen@duke.edu

INTRODUCTION

Mentoring and Coaching, although largely undefined, has been evolving since ancient times covering the entire spectrum from casual, consistent life encounters to formal apprenticeships. Humans, because of an inherent need for personal development, have typically relied on some form of guidance from others with more knowledge and experience to satisfy that inner desire.

David Clutterbuck has concluded that mentoring could bring larger benefits to society in the future and that everyone can benefit from mentoring throughout their lives. Over a number of publications and research studies, Clutterbuck has been able to define his conceptual model of mentoring. In that work, one can find the elements of practical application in designing an effective mentor/protégé relationship. Dr. Jenkins' stimulus article has provided an opportunity to compare and contrast mentoring concepts and programs within various professions.

TEACHING AND COACHING IN THE GAME OF GOLF

For the vast majority of participants, the game of golf is recreation. Recreation by definition should be *fun*. Therefore, the elemental responsibility of a PGA (Professional Golf Association) teacher/coach is to facilitate student enjoyment during the learning process of skill acquisition. After teaching skill acquisition, the PGA professional will coach the student to successfully transfer those skills to the golf course where they will ultimately enjoy the 'fruits of their labor' having *fun* playing the game.

Sport shares a long history in the storied and often complex player/teacher and/or player/coach relationship. Elite athletes in all sports have regularly credited their coaches for successfully mentoring them through the extensive training and their ultimate game evolution. Upon winning a championship, these same athletes reflect on the important role their coaches have served in their achievement. The game of golf is no exception.

MENTORING WITHIN THE PROFESSIONAL GOLF ASSOCIATIONS

The non-golfer may have difficulty understanding why the game of golf would yield a natural opportunity for the mentor/protégé relationship aside from the teacher-coach/student relationship previously discussed. Separate from the professional golf tours, there is an entire

sub-culture that resides within the group of individuals who operate the thousands of facilities where the game is played. A large portion of these game managers belong to their respective country's PGA.

PGAs throughout the world are collegial groups founded upon the mission to promote the enjoyment and growth of the game of golf as well as to elevate the standards of the professional golfer's vocation. These associations are comprised of members who typically are excellent players and teachers. These 'experts' of the game deem their purpose as that of 'sharing Golf' with their respective members, guests, and clients in a common effort to protect and grow the game of golf.

Further, PGA members are collectively pledged to share their experience and skill set in order to ensure the future success of those who follow in the association. While not devised as a method to develop leadership, grow the game or to provide an avenue through which the traditions of the game can be passed from generation to generation; the PGA mentoring 'system' has provided all of those to Golf. Over decades of natural development as an unspoken yet, understood membership privilege that the more experienced generation of professionals will nourish the growth of their association and the game of golf by mentoring the younger generation of professionals.

The PGA fraternal mentoring paradigm is planted in the common denominator of PGA members building dedicated professional careers within the business of golf because they *love* the game of golf.

PGA APPRENTICESHIP

The 'apprenticeship' can begin as soon as a person has attained full-time employment at a PGA recognized golf facility working under a verified PGA Class 'A' member. Averaging approximately three years, the apprentice will pass several levels of test driven PGA education along with extensive hands-on training in order to achieve the coveted PGA Class 'A' member standing. The shared bonding that takes place within the structure of the PGA's education system is further strengthened through competitive play among fellow professionals. A benchmark of the apprenticeship will be to prove one's golfing skill by passing a 36-hole playing ability test with a target score commensurate to the golf course difficulty. Playing the game competitively creates mentoring opportunities among the participants. Throughout their professional career, members compete regularly in golf tournaments against other professionals. These playing opportunities create strong interpersonal bonds that develop into lifelong friendships as well as mentoring relationships.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL MENTORING

The connections created through playing and business relationships, strengthened through a common apprentice entry structure, is largely responsible for the informal yet robust mentoring system within the PGAs of the world. When applied correctly, the Apprentice/PGA Member mentoring relationship carries the best characteristics of the mentoring schemes of both the formal and informal approaches that provide meaning, direction, and support when necessary. The educational materials and training become regarded as support mechanisms rather than controls. For example, it is quite common for teaching professionals to observe their mentor while they are teaching a series of golf lessons. Typically, this mentoring occasion will include extensive note-taking or video taping wherein the observer details the mentor's communication and teaching style (timing, terminology, physical movements, use of technology, drills, teaching aids, and lesson structure). These formal note-taking sessions will be followed by informal and often lengthy

question/answer sessions where one might obtain deeper insight directly from the mentor to better understand their work on the lesson tee.

'PAYING IT FORWARD'

Within the PGA, as is the ideal in most professions, the 'best' become the leaders and the leaders become the role models for others to follow and even emulate. What has perpetuated the success of the PGA mentoring 'system' decade after decade has been the keen personal stake that the leaders have consistently taken in mentoring others to learn better and succeed faster. In Europe, PGA teachers such as the legendary John Jacobs have set the standard for 'paying it forward' by devoting hundreds of hours to mentoring fellow professionals. Here in the United States there has been a constant stream of top-rank PGA professionals who have mentored at the Jacobs level of dedicated volunteerism to helping other PGA members. I was fortunate to have been mentored by some of the best (Dr. Gary Wiren, Davis Love Jr., and Bill Strausbaugh to name a few, see [1]), and I would wager that every PGA member has a similar story to share. Generationally, PGA professionals have been fully impacted to reflect upon their own personal growth opportunities through mentoring relationships and in turn, continue to 'pay it forward' when their time arrives.

THE FUTURE OF MENTORING IN THE PGA OF AMERICA

Over the last ten years, the PGA of America has taken a more active role in this area. They have invited experts in the field of mentoring to aid them in compiling information for distribution about effective mentoring and coaching. They have developed seminars for members that are specifically designed to 'train the trainer' and provide PGA members with the tools to give them a broader mentoring skill set. The new PGA Master Professional program has instituted a PGA master professional mentor for every candidate that enters the program to help them through completion of their goal.

CONCLUSION

David Clutterbuck's vision is a noble one - to give the uninitiated the opportunity to participate and benefit from mentoring throughout their lives. I imagine that Clutterbuck's work will inspire readers in all fields of expertise to reflect upon their own mentoring philosophy and methodology. I applaud Dr. Simon Jenkins for presenting his work and in particular using Clutterbuck's study of the past to make a better path in the future.

REFERENCE
1.   Ibarguen, E., Accreditation of PGA Master Coaches: A Commentary, *Annual Review of Golf Coaching (A Supplement of the International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching)*, 2011, 57-62.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Ian Reade

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation,
E-471 Van Vliet Centre, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2H9, Canada
E-mail: ian.reade@ualberta.ca

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Jenkins' source article is a thoughtful combination of historical overview and evolution of thought for the concept of mentorship, and current thinking. Both are very relevant to firming the grip on the ideas and controversies associated with mentorship.

This commentary will present a brief case study of mentorship within a high performance sport work environment (specifically within one Canadian Interuniversity Sport program). The case study is written from the perspective of an academic staff member of an educational institution where mentorship is a part of the multi-sport culture, and where coaching contracts require coaches to mentor other coaches as part of their daily work assignments.

From our experience, the process of mentorship is meant to evolve as the relationship evolves. Likely the greatest degree of consensus in regards to the definition of the mentorship process would be the intended outcome, which is the education and progressive development of the mentee. As well, we cannot overemphasize our support for the salient point made by Drucker of the importance of the process for the mentor: "no one learns as much about a subject as the person who is forced to teach it [and] no one develops as much as the person who is trying to help others to develop themselves" (p. 141).

FORMAL AND INFORMAL MENTORING

Some discussion is needed regarding formal versus informal mentoring. In our organization, the thinking has been that an important part of being in a work environment is the informal mentoring that takes place on a daily basis. While we recognize the existence of informal mentoring, the very lack of formality creates great difficulty in having a valuable and productive discussion of the topic. Informality removes or blurs boundaries, resulting in many types of casual relationships becoming part of the discussion of mentorship. When informal mentorship is accepted as the organization's status quo, responsibility and accountability tend to fade because virtually all relationships qualify. It has been our experience that formal mentoring where an organization purposefully plans for mentor/mentee relationships and monitors both the process and the outcomes are, at least in our work environment, more effective and productive. We agree "that the quality of the mentoring relationship is more significant in terms of efficacy than whether mentoring is formal or informal" (p. 143), but we do not agree that a mentor relationship should operate with a "high degree of informality" (p. 143). Of course, this does beg the question of what

we mean by informality, but if it means the relationship is meant to meander along with no stated goals or defined process, and no structure, then we don't believe it is desirable.

MENTORSHIP AND COACHING

We completely agree with the blurred boundaries between mentorship and coaching as discussed in this article. The coaches in our interuniversity sport organization are expected to take on the role of "mentor coach", whereby coaches use mentoring techniques and most certainly apply their coaching knowledge and practice to the mentorship of both young athletes and young coaches. It is not the broad definition of the mentor that is at issue, but the much more narrow definition of coaching that some people use, as presented in the Jenkins article. The idea that coaching in sport relates primarily to performance improvement is true in some cases, but the coaching process is much more diverse, dynamic and complex than we believe is inferred in this comparison. The comparison is interesting, and we can see the need for presenting it. However, coaching (at least at the higher levels) involves mentorship, and mentorship certainly involves coaching. If anything, high performance coaches might be more mentor than coach. The overlap between the two exists, and will likely not disappear.

The most common question in our sport organization is: "What is expected of a mentor coach"? The question is referenced to a degree in the Jenkins article, but the answer is always "It depends" and there is some that believe the process is driven by the mentee (if we choose to agree with the idea that the mentee drives the learning process). We recognize the arguments suggesting that the mentorship process relies on the mentee defining their learning needs, but it seems unreasonable to assume the mentee can fully know what they need to learn. In our experience, the process needs to be negotiated (and periodically revisited) between the mentor and the mentee. Having the mentee determine what needs to be learned, and how it is to be learned, would put undue pressure on the mentor and we would argue it would devalue the mentor's role in the relationship.

GOALS

In reference to the section that discusses "an excessive or premature focus on goals" (p. 147) in mentorship, our experience in nurturing mentor relationships in our interuniversity sport organization has been that mentors require goals to function. The inference that mentors can aimlessly wander through the process and the relationship hoping to stumble on learning has not been an acceptable strategy in our organization. As well, the idea that goal alignment would correlate (the source article infers a positive relationship, but does not explicitly state it) with the relationship and outcome measures, while goal clarity and goal commitment did *not* is hard to envision. How any relationship could have goal alignment without goal clarity and commitment is logically difficult to understand. However, we would agree with the three points (don't become addicted to goals, let goals emerge and owning goals) by Clutterbuck and Megginson as being good, practical advice for mentors.

CONCLUSION

The challenges in employing mentorship in sport organizations are rooted in the transfer of theory to practice. Certainly, in our sport organization, we continue to grapple with many questions central to the ongoing development of a mentorship process. How do we evaluate the effectiveness of a mentor, and the outcome of a mentorship relationship? In our sport organization, we have tracked the number of mentees that have graduated from our organization and gone on to the types of careers they had hoped for. When should mentorship

begin? We have employed the idea that mentorship is needed as soon as the mentee has sufficient foundational knowledge to be able to use experiential learning (through mentorship) to build their own knowledge. Other questions do remain to be answered, such as how do we know when the relationship is, or should be, finished? What happens when the mentee moves beyond their boundaries? Should mentors be compensated? Can mentorship become part of the expectations for a coach, in an overworked environment? How are mentors identified? Are mentees being trained to take the job of the mentor, and is this a threat to the mentor? Many questions remain, but Jenkins has provided an outstanding base for pondering future questions.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Commentary

Yuri Hanin

KIHU-Research Institute for Olympic Sports,
Rautpohjankatu 6, Jyvaskyla 40700, Finland
E-mail: juri.hanin@kihu.fi

INTRODUCTION

Simon Jenkins's article presents selected aspects of David Clutterbuck's extensive work on mentoring/coaching. The topic of the target article is highly relevant and timely for numerous high-achievement settings including top sport and especially expert performers such as national and international level coaches and athletes.

MENTORING AND COACHING

In high achievement sport as a results-oriented setting, a coach is usually expected to deal mainly with the task execution process and with enhancement of learning and re-learning of performance skills. High quality coaching by definition provides the top level athletes with skills enabling them to train hard and smart and to compete effectively up to their own potential. A mentor, on the other hand, is expected to focus on helping the mentee's personal development by processing current experiences for enhancement of future performance and the life quality. Thus a coach and a mentor are working on processing and using performance-related experiences to the advantage of the mentee through optimization of these experiences to the task demands and mentee's resources.

DOES EVERYONE NEED A MENTOR?

It is true that experience can be passed on more effectively one-to-one, but mentoring is not limited only to passing on experience. It is first of all helping to process and develop new ways of using own experience by supporting the mentee's major activity and personal life. In many cases, top sport and civil life are not easily separated and actually do not need to be separated. Mentoring involves processing and developing new patterns of experience. In other words, mentoring is about effective change. Therefore in mentoring it is important to evaluate how the change process progresses from one stage to the other (for instance, from "denial", to "resistance", to "exploration", and to "commitment" stages) and to make sure that the most effective strategies are used at each stage.

MENTORING AS EXPERIENCE CATEGORY

In psychology, experience is a relevant a construct to understand better person-environment interactions because it reflects a person's attitude towards different aspects of the environment and the meaning of the environment for the person. A working definition of experience includes the totality of past and present characteristics that determines the

particular quality of a person's performance [1]. In the sport context, there are three interrelated types of performance related experiences: state-like experiences or emotional states as a component of situational, multimodal, and dynamic manifestations of total human functioning; trait-like experiences or relatively stable emotion patterns (emotionality, dispositions, qualities) reflecting a repeated nature of athletic activity; and meta-experiences (awareness, attitudes, preferences/rejections of one's experiences) which are lessons learned or reflected experiences in successful and less-than-successful performances [2, 3].

In contrast to situational states and repeated patterns of experience, meta-experiences reflect how an athlete feels about his or her past, present, or anticipated emotional experiences and the perceived effects of these emotional experiences on performance or general well-being. For instance, athletes may feel nervous prior to a competition which characterizes their situational emotional state as triggered by a specific meaning of the particular situation. On the other hand, feeling nervous can be a typical (repeated) pattern of the athlete's emotional response in similar situations. Therefore, trait-like experience would indicate how often the athlete feels this way prior to or during competition. An athlete's meta-experience (attitude to experiencing a high level of competition anxiety and awareness of its helpful or harmful effects on performance) is even more important to estimate. Meta-experiences are formed when athletes (and coaches) spontaneously and deliberately reflect on the conditions leading to their successful, and less-than-successful, performances. Meta-experiences determine an athlete's perception and choice of coping and self-regulation strategies, and therefore should be a major target of interventions. And it is a mentor who helps the athlete to see the typical performance situation in a new way and find personally useful information. Mentoring is often examined as a trait-like experience with such outcomes as personality development, talent fostering, or developing of performance and life skills. However, there is a need to assess the situational (state-like) effectiveness of mentoring outcomes. The "Four A's" framework provides such an opportunity (see [4] for details).

THE 'FOUR A'S' FRAMEWORK

The Four A's include Awareness (A-1) – Acceptance (A-2) – Action (A-3) – Achievement (A-4). This is a framework to assess four factors that can explain successful (or unsuccessful) attempts to change in different domains. Apparently, no change can be initiated without sufficient self-awareness (conceptual and physical) about a skill or procedure. The mentor's efforts initially are focused on helping the mentee to assess how much the mentee is aware of already and whether this information is sufficient. A recent study showed that even Olympic shooters are not always aware of their successful patterns (emotions and actions). The special program and individual emotion profiling were used to enhance their awareness prior to any attempts at self-regulation [5]. However, being aware (A-1) still does not guarantee successful change outcome.

Acceptance (A-2) is positive and active attitude (or meta-experience) to a change process. For instance, a belief that high anxiety can be helpful motivationally and as an energizing factor is an example of acceptance. The mentor helps the athlete to realize that pre-competitive anxiety can be used to enhance performance or can be tolerated, if not useful. Most effective interventions focus on re-structuring (re-framing) the old less effective pattern and substituting it with a new and more effective one. A positive attitude can be often instrumental in avoiding a relapse to the old way.

Interestingly, the athlete can know a lot about the new skill or a habit; she can also be very positive about it and still fail to adapt it into her daily training or in competitions because the

additional condition (Action; A-3) has not been practiced well enough. Procedural knowledge and action-skills are of crucial importance for successful change process. If the athlete does not know how to deal with anxiety, then that also could slow down the progress.

One of the critical conditions for successful change process is Achievement (A-4) of anticipated results (usually better than earlier results). The absence of results and underperformance can influence negatively the process of change (doubts in planned change, procedure) that can trigger the reversal to a negative attitude to the whole idea of change. The Four A's framework has proved to be as a useful practical tool in mentoring with top athletes and coaches across different sports.

CONCLUSION
I concur with Simon Jenkins that David Clutterbuck's work on mentoring has already extended beyond business. Different forms of mentoring can be introduced in different contexts and their use in sport is one of the promising areas of application for expert performers.

REFERENCES
1. Hanin, Y. L., Performance Related Emotional States in Sport: A Qualitative Analysis, *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-Line Journal], 2003, 4(1), *Http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-03/1-03hanin-e.htm*

2. Hanin, Y.L., (2004). Emotions in Sport: An Individualized Approach, in: Spielberger, C.D., ed., *Encyclopaedia of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 1, Elsevier Academic Press, Oxford, 2004, 739-750.

3. Nieuwenhuys, A., Vos, L., Pijpstra, S. and Bakker, F., Meta Experiences and Coping Effectiveness in Sport, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2011, 12, 135-143

4. Nieuwenhuys, A., Hanin, Y. and Bakker, F., Performance Related Experiences and Coping during Races: A Case of an Elite Sailor, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2008, 9(1), 61-76.

5. Bortoli, L., Bertollo, M., Hanin, Y. and Robazza, C., Striving for Excellence: A Multiple-Action Plan Intervention Model for Shooters, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2012, 13, 693-701.

David Clutterbuck, Mentoring and Coaching:

A Response to Commentaries

Simon Jenkins
Carnegie Faculty of Sport and Education
Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, LS6 3QT, UK
E-mail: S.P.Jenkins@Leedsmet.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

I would like to thank colleagues for providing insightful commentaries on the target article. The commentators, listed by country, are: Grace McCarthy, Anne Rolfe, Tony Rossi, Steven Rynne (Australia), Gordon Bloom, Ian Reade (Canada), Yuri Hanin (Finland), Gunnela Westlander (Sweden), Adrian Furnham, Jo Gray, Mark Griffiths, Alison Hardingham, Lise Lewis, Jim McKenna, David Megginson, Simon Robinson, Mike Munro Turner (UK), Stacey Connaughton, Ellen Ensher, Ed Ibarguen, Japera Johnson, Barry Bozeman, Richard Kilburg, and Danny Mielke (USA).

The influence of David Clutterbuck's work on mentoring is clear from the commentaries. For example, Jo Gray and Jim McKenna each highlight the role that mentoring might play in employee engagement. Gray states: "Employee engagement is a current hot topic with the Engage for Success movement leading the way and identifying that two thirds of the UK work force is failing to reach its potential. One of the common objectives of any mentoring programme is increased capability of individuals and the growth of their potential" (p. 156). McKenna suggests: "Informal coaching/mentoring may be more effective and efficient than the formalised, enforced goal-setting that is typically seen in annual reviews, possibly because of the functionality of such relationships" (p. 162).

Anne Rolfe applies Clutterbuck's statements on trends and the future in mentoring by presenting her observations from the Australian context (p. 168-169). Gunnela Westlander pays homage to Clutterbuck's "international experience as advisor to creators of mentoring programs [which] may have contributed to his considerable insight into the importance of the cultural framework, for instance the power distance" (p. 173). Picking up on what Clutterbuck articulates about dialogue, Stacey Connaughton advocates a "communication-focused, relational model of mentoring" (p. 176). David Megginson points to how Clutterbuck has tended "to boost mentoring by criticising coaching", but that he now embraces "a rich and inclusive vision of one-to-one-development" recognising that "developmental coaching" (as opposed to "traditional coaching") has "many of the positive qualities that are also held by developmental mentoring" (p. 181). Ellen Ensher points to the "lack of formal education, standards, or certifications that exist for those who mentor [in the USA]" (p. 184). Japera Johnson and Barry Bozeman provide an insightful critique of Clutterbuck's definition of mentoring, especially with regard to hierarchy, and acknowledge that "Clutterbuck was well ahead of his time in arguing that formal mentoring does not capture the range of relationships best viewed as mentoring" (p. 210). Richard Kilburg calls

for a conceptual framework of mentoring that is more eclectic and notes that "Clutterbuck's explicit critique of the approach of the US model as emphasizing the mentor's power, influence and authority in favor of developmental mentoring based on experience and wisdom...appears to minimize the political zeitgeist in which both mentor and mentee operate" (p. 205). With regard to one of the trends that Clutterbuck identifies, Danny Mielke refers to "cascade mentoring" in the context of leadership and spiritual mentoring (p. 216).

In the world of professional golf, Ed Ibarguen indicates how "PGA teachers such as the legendary John Jacobs have set the standard for 'paying it forward' by devoting hundreds of hours to mentoring fellow professionals" (p. 235). Ibarguen himself was actually recipient in 1995 of the Bill Strausbaugh Award which "is presented to a PGA professional who by their day-to-day efforts has distinguished themselves by mentoring their fellow PGA professionals in improving their employment situations and through service to the community" [1]. In focusing on the mentoring relationship, Simon Robinson considers how learning may occur "more around serendipity than intentional learning outcomes" (p. 211). The following passage from MentorNet, an internet site about mentoring, shows how notions of 'paying it forward' and serendipity can be brought together:

> A rigid calculus of costs vs. benefits may limit some mentors from the more serendipitous outcomes of mentoring, and those one cannot predict. At a deep level, a strong human characteristic that helps us all consider what makes for the greater good – altruism – is at work. When we've asked MentorNet mentors why they have volunteered, they typically don't cite any of [the] benefits, or even speak to what they hope to get from the relationship. Instead, frequently they say either, "I have great mentoring, and want others to be able to benefit," or "I didn't have good mentoring, and I want to change that for the better for those coming behind me." These motivations speak to a desire to keep good things going, and to improve current practice, not for personal gain, but for others, and the world as a whole. The 2000 book and movie "Pay It Forward" captured an age-old manifestation of altruism coupled with a new terminology – one that works well for mentoring. Those who believe in the goodness of human nature often want to find ways to change the world for the better. Trevor, the 12-year-old hero of "Pay It Forward," describes his idea this way: "You see, I do something real good for three people. And then when they ask how they can pay it back, I say they have to Pay It Forward. To three more people. Each. So nine people get helped. Then those people have to do twenty-seven." Mentoring can be like that. [2]

'Paying it forward' has recently been investigated in experimental psychology. In a series of five experiments in which participants received greedy, equal or generous divisions of money or labour from an anonymous person before dividing additional resources with a different anonymous person, Gray et al. [3] showed that "people pay forward behavior in the sorts of fleeting, anonymous situations that increasingly typify people's day-to-day interactions" [3, p. 6] such that equal treatment was paid forward in kind, but greedy treatment was paid forward more than generosity.

The remainder of this response-to-commentaries will focus on the following three issues/themes raised in the commentaries: coaching versus mentoring; mentoring in sports coaching; and reflexivity.

COACHING VERSUS MENTORING

Anne Rolfe indicates that her webpage on distinctions between mentoring and coaching has more hits than any other on her website (p. 165). While some commentators emphasize the blurring of a distinction between coaching and mentoring, others make a sharper distinction or emphasize the boundaries between coaching and mentoring. Adrian Furnham distinguishes not only between coach and mentor, but also confessor, confidant, consultant, counsellor, teacher, therapist, trainer, moral tutor, master class and MBA. Furnham provides the following definition of mentoring:

> The mentoring process is where an experienced, more senior supervisor/leader is committed to providing developmental assistance, guidance and support to a less experienced protégé. Mentors can (and should) provide protégés with coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, protection and sponsorship. (p. 192)

A recent book by Elaine Cox makes a sharp distinction between coaching, mentoring and counselling in a number of ways, such as in terms of critical thinking:

> We can see how the coach, through encouraging critical thinking, tends more towards being a self-directed learning specialist, which is in contrast to common definitions of a mentor as a knowledgeable expert, and a counsellor as someone who helps clients understand their current situation, rather than transform it. Critical thinking may be encouraged by the mentor, but it is often enhanced by the vicarious experience and judgment of the mentor, rather than being generated by the client. Critical thinking in the counselling literature is discussed only in relation to developing criticality for the counsellor, rather than for the client... [4, p. 102]

For Cox, "coaching is not an everyday two-way communication" [4, p. 157], but rather "a facilitated, dialogic, reflective learning process" [4, p. 1] in which "there is an element of soliloquy in the response from the client" [4, p. 157] and "the client has total ownership of the content and agenda"; i.e., "[c]oaching generates a dialogue by the client with him/herself" [4, p. 158].

Richard Kilburg states: "Supervisors mentor and coach. Mentors often supervise when mentees threaten to derail. Coaches can supervise and mentor when a client's boss fails to do a reasonable job" (p. 204). Alison Hardingham highlights "the meaningfulness of the boundary between coaching and mentoring in navigating one's way around and through a coaching/mentoring relationship":

> For in the moment of coaching, coaches often do not draw a distinction between the immediate short term performance goals and the longer term career goals. My conversations with coaches regularly sit on the boundary between managing a particular issue and checking how the behavioural change required fits the values and sense of identity (and future career prospects) of the person. (p. 202)

In noting that the terms coaching and mentoring are now often used interchangeably, Mike Munro Turner recalls the debate about differences between psychotherapy and counselling with the British Association of Counselling (BAC) becoming the British Association of Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP) (p. 195). With regard to the "blurring of the roles of mentor and coach", Lise Lewis concludes that there is "common practice in the skills set and

provision of [their] services" (p. 188). Lewis is President of the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC). David Megginson argues that there is "no uniformity about the characteristics of the processes that are called 'mentoring' and no features which differentiate 'mentoring' from process that some people call 'coaching'" (p. 179). In response to Megginson's commentary, David Clutterbuck has provided a list of similarities and differences between mentoring and coaching that is a "map of praxis [that] may look very different in (say) five years' time" [Personal Communication with Author, February 2013] (see Table 1).

Table 1. Similarities and Differences between Mentoring and Coaching [David Clutterbuck, Personal Communication with the Author, February 2013]

Similarities	Differences
• Focus on the quality of the learner's thinking	• Mentors more likely to make introductions, help develop networks
• Coach/mentor uses their experience to craft powerful questions	• Mentors more likely to help explain politics of a particular organization or profession
• Advice-giving is permissible, but not as a first resort and only in specific circumstances. (A common complaint about ineffective coaches is their over-rigid adherence to never giving advice.)	• Coaches (in the workplace context of line manager to direct report) more likely to give feedback
• Much of the learning occurs in the reflections of the coachee/mentee between or long after sessions	• Coaching tends to be a short- or medium-term assignment or activity focused on performance in a defined field or role
• Coach and mentor both have a duty of care towards the coachee/ mentee	• Mentoring tends to be a medium- to long-term relationship focused on career or on more holistic, less well-defined issues
	• Coaching more often a paid arrangement
	… Or not, depending on context!

Nevertheless, he argues, "there are some regularities in the use of the terms and thus 'mentoring' can be described as a label used by particular communities for their own purposes" (p. 179).

Jo Gray notes that the European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC), the Association for Coaching, and the International Coach Federation (ICF) have recently jointly created the Global Coaching and Mentoring Alliance. A convergence between 'mentoring' and 'coaching' would certainly be beneficial for individuals and organisations with a vested interest in education, training and certification of mentors/coaches. According to Grace McCarthy, there has been a "proliferation of coaching models", but "mentoring research tends to discuss mentoring as a unified single process":

> Perhaps this is because coaching is a more commercial activity and coaches need to differentiate themselves more than mentors do, or because purchasers of coaching services ask providers to articulate their coaching philosophy. (p. 200)

MENTORING IN SPORT

According to Tony Rossi, in sport there would be support for the position that mentoring, coaching and counselling each "seek different outcomes and require different skills on the part of the practitioner" (p. 228). A sports coach may take on mentoring roles not only with

other sports coaches, but also with athletes.

MENTORING OF SPORTS COACHES

Gordon Bloom identified mentoring as the learning opportunity with greatest potential for sports coaches: mentor coaches in sport not only teach their mentees about "technical, tactical, and physical skills, but also shared philosophies, beliefs, and values about coaching" (p. 220, citing [5, p. 273]). Bloom [6] stated that "the recent creation of mentoring programs in Canada and Australia are a good first step in moving coaching mentoring programs forward" [6, p. 19]. However, Steven Rynne indicates that research in Australia has found that high performance coaches in sport appear to have "a shifting array of confidantes with whom they engaged over the period of their careers" (p. 223); in other words, "a dynamic and evolving informal network (DSN)":

> Even in the formalised mentoring structure found in the Australian Institute of Sport's National Coaching Scholarship Program, the individual designated as 'mentor coach' often made far fewer contributions to the scholarship coach's learning than did their evolving network of confidantes (including others such as assistant coaches, sports science personnel and fellow scholarship coaches). (p. 224)

Rynne identifies a link between the DSN and "the multiple and sequential forms of mentoring mentioned in the stimulus article" (see p. 224). Mark Griffiths notes that while there are opportunities for coaches to learn through mentoring, the "suspicious and insular" nature of some sports cultures makes the sharing of knowledge rather challenging (p. 230-231).

MENTORING OF ATHLETES

Bloom et al. [5] found that coaches mentor their athletes:

> Aside from teaching sport-related skills, it was found that an inherent coaching responsibility is to prepare athletes for life outside of sport. Being aware of and sensitive to athletes' personal needs and interest can notably enhance their learning experiences. Furthermore, mentors themselves can derive lessons and satisfaction from their mentoring relationships. [5, p. 276]

In a study of athletes' perceptions and experiences of 'great coaches', Becker [7] found that such coaches mentor their athletes. Furthermore, in a study of top lacrosse coaches, Leidl [8] found that "lacrosse is a medium through which these coaches inspire young athletes to become better people, which in turn inspires the coaches to keep coaching" [8, p. 167].

Anne Rolfe provides an insight into the mentoring of Australian athletes in the recent London Olympic Games; i.e., a team of Athlete-Liaison Officers (mainly former Australian Olympians) led by a Team Mentor (four-time Olympian, Laurie Lawrence) (p. 167).

REFLEXIVITY

In his commentary, Tony Rossi draws attention to "mentoring as a reflexive process (in much the same vein as Giddens' [9] notion of the self as a reflexive project)" (p. 227). Anthony Giddens' notions regarding self have been applied to coaching by Stelter [10] who used the following quotation from Giddens [9]:

> The reflexivity of modernity extends into the core of the self. Put in another way, in

the context of a post-traditional order, the self becomes a reflexive project. ... Modernity, it might be said, breaks down the protective framework of the small community and of tradition, replacing these with much larger, impersonal organizations. The individual feels bereft and alone in a world in which she or he lacks the psychological supports and the sense of security provided by more traditional settings. [9, p. 32-33]

On the basis of Giddens's analysis, Stelter advocates "a reflective space where coach and coachee have time for self-reflection; such a thoughtful pause might, in the end, allow for new ways of acting in specific and sometimes challenging situations" [10]. Stelter does not distinguish clearly between 'reflection' and 'reflexivity'.

Giddens' approach to reflexivity has been criticised, especially from Margaret Archer, who argues that Giddens and his co-authors such as Ulrich Beck [11] elide structure with agency in a way that is fundamentally incompatible with reflexivity [12, p. 6]:

> ...[structures, cultures and agents] each has emergent and irreducible properties and powers – and explains every social outcome as the product of their interplay. Outcomes, which can be broadly reproductory or largely transformatory, depend upon the intertwining of structure, culture, and agency, but not by rendering them inseparable, as in the "central conflation" [13] of Giddens, Bourdieu, and Beck, which makes for an amalgam precluding the examination of their interplay. [14, p. 274]

MARGARET ARCHER'S THEORY OF REFLEXIVITY

For Archer, reflexivity is "the regular exercise of mental ability, shared by all normal people, to consider themselves in relation to their (social) contexts and vice versa" [15, p. 4]. It involves internal conversation (self-talk, inner dialogue) through which conscious deliberations take place [15, p. 3]. The imperative to engage in these deliberations derives "from the absence of social guidelines indicating what to do in novel situations" [16, p. 1-2]. People are aware of being reflexive as reflexivity is a self-conscious process [15, p. 90]: "reflexivity involves a subject considering an object in relation to itself, bending that object back upon itself in a process that includes the self being able to consider itself as its own object" [15, p. 72]. In line with Vygotsky [17], internal conversation is "substantially contracted compared with external speech" [15, p. 68], but is not 'internalised' external speech. The capacity for internal conversation is a "personal emergent property (PEP) which is dependent upon, though irreducible to, a neurological base" [15, p. 63]. Archer proposes a "Three-Stage Model":

1. Structural and cultural [emergent] properties [(SEPs and CEPs)] *objectively* shape the situations that agents confront involuntarily, and *inter alia* possess generative powers of constraint and enablement in relation to
2. Subjects' own constellations of concerns, as *subjectively* defined in relation to the three orders of natural reality, nature, practice and the social.
3. Courses of action are produced through the *reflexive deliberations* of subjects who *subjectively* determine their practical projects in relation to their *objective* circumstances. [15, p. 17; italics original]

Reflexive internal conversation (PEP) "is responsible for *mediating* the impact of SEPs and CEPs because it is the subjects' objectives and internal deliberations about their external

feasibility that determines *how* they confront the structural and cultural circumstances whose presence they cannot avoid" [15, p. 65; italics original]:

> If our reflexive deliberations indeed play this mediatory role, then the outcomes will correspond neither to the endurance of stable social reproduction, nor to extreme social volatility, produced by unbridled narrative inventiveness. [15, p. 61]

When a subject converts her life 'concerns' (i.e., what she cares about and is important to her) into practical 'projects', where "a project stands for any course of action intentionally engaged upon by a human being" [15, p. 7], "she has good reason for giving her conscious assent to their pursuit because she has (fallibly) examined herself, surveyed the social contexts accessible to her and decided upon a feasible combination" [15, p. 97]:

> The goal of defining and ordering our concerns, through what is effectively a life-long conversation, is to arrive at a satisfying and sustainable *modus videndi*. ... Through such a *modus vivendi* a subject's personal identity is aligned with her social identity. Arriving at this alignment is a dialectical process, generally requiring adjustment and accommodation between the personal and the social. It is rarely optimal, it is frequently revisable, but it is always reflexive in nature. [15, p. 87-88]

For the most part, people are 'active agents', "who are responsible, through the projects they pursue, for activitating the causal powers of emergent social properties" rather than 'passive agents' who are "subject to the pushes and pulls of social hydraulics" [15, p. 96]:

> ...we are active rather passive subjects because we adjust our projects to those practices that we believe we can realise. Subjects regularly evaluate their social situations in light of their personal concerns and assess their projects in the light of their situations. [15, p. 22]

Archer argues that human reflexivity should be regarded not as homogenous, but rather "as assuming different modes that are differentially dependent upon internal conversation being shared in external conversation" [15, p. 84]. These modes of reflexivity are not personality types [15, p. 133], but are "relational properties deriving from different combinations of the interplay between 'contexts' and 'concerns', but cannot be reduced to either" [15, p. 269].

Archer aims "to vindicate the claim that there is a relationship between patterns of social mobility and the different modes of reflexivity practised by various groups of subjects" [15, p. 86]:

> ...practising a particular kind of internal conversation – the one most common to somebody – has consequences for his or her life history. The likelihood is that it will foster a pattern of social mobility, according to the mode of reflexivity that predominates; stability, upward mobility or volatility. [15, p. 269]

From exploratory, qualitative investigation (interviews with 20 undergraduate students at the University of Warwick, UK), Archer [18] identified four modes of reflexivity: communicative, autonomous, meta-reflexive, and fractured.

Archer [15] further developed her work empirically on modes of reflexivity through analysis of interviews with 128 people from the town of Coventry, UK [15, p. 326-336].

COMMUNICATIVE REFLEXIVITY

A person who has communicative reflexivity as their dominant mode has a pattern of internal conversation characterised by a need to share their thoughts with others in order to bring a conclusion to their deliberations; i.e., "confirmation from another before a subject deems that a train of thought constitutes a satisfactory basis for action" [15, p. 102]. It is not that communicative reflexives are incapable of carrying out reflexive internal conversation when alone, but that their need to "supplement intra-subjectivity with inter-subjectivity (or internal with external conversation) is much greater than for those who are dominant in other modes of reflexivity [15, p. 102]. Communicative reflexives are deeply connected to their natal social context, thus having 'contextual continuity' in their lives; e.g., geographical stability, continuous local social network, stable family relationships, availability of occupational outlets in their local vicinity [15, p. 145]:

> Trust has to be earned, which is why it seems to emerge naturally from amongst 'familiars', when these are people amongst whom a subject has grown up.... Encountering a like-minded friend, early on in one's training, or finding a spouse who is also a dialogical partner, means that these footings can be dug and common experiences can then accumulate on that basis. What seems most difficult of all is literally to go out in search of an interlocutor (under a subject's own description) because familiarly and similarity cannot be fabricated, yet the intimate trust required by the communicative reflexive means an attempt to build upon sand without them. [15, p. 165]

AUTONOMOUS REFLEXIVITY

With autonomous reflexivity as the dominant mode, a person tends to start their own internal conversations, conduct lone deliberations in which they consider all angles, do not seek completion or confirmation of their train of thoughts from others, and take sole responsibility for the conclusions they arrive at [15, p. 114]. The most important condition for autonomous reflexivity is 'contextual discontinuity', which is "partly imposed on the subject by circumstances beyond his control and is partly promoted by him" [15, p. 194]:

> Precisely because lone inner dialogue is predicated upon a firm distinction between the private and the public domains, then to reflect upon oneself in relation to one's circumstances is to exercise reflexivity *across* this boundary. The self is seen as discontinuous from its environment, not inseparable from it; one's concrete singularity marks differences from others, not similarity and familiarity; one's potentialities and liabilities are differentiated from the properties and powers of the context confronted, not conflated with them. [15, p. 193]

> Fundamentally, the subject must somehow find himself acquiring new experiences and confronting novel situations for which his natal context provides no guidelines. Indeed, it may also be precisely this context that presents him with problems but without solutions. He thus has to learn to rely upon his own resources if he is to make out in such situations, because no interlocutor could fully enter into this position. Furthermore, subjects also need to have developed sufficient self-confidence to marshal their own resources to meet situations for which the natal context provides no scripted responses or normative regulation. The experience of discontinuities and the confidence to handle them are mutually reinforcing; together

they generate self-reliance. [15, p. 194].

Autonomous reflexives adopt "a strategic stance towards constraints and enablements, ...seek[ing] to avoid society's 'snakes' and to climb its 'ladders'" [15, p. 98]. They seek to improve their social positioning and are task-oriented, wanting to "'be in control' of the work process" [15, p. 291]. Autonomous reflexives are capable of engaging in communicative reflexivity and it should also be noted that all people engage in some degree of autonomous reflexivity.

META-REFLEXIVITY
When meta-reflexivity is the dominant mode, people tend to "engage in self evaluation (about being the person they seek to be) and display social awareness (about circumstances advancing or hindering the realisation of their ideals)" [15, p. 95]. Like autonomous reflexives, their internal conversations are conducted alone [15, p. 301] but more expansively in terms of mental activities [15, p. 128]. Thus the meta-reflexive is value-oriented and preoccupied with moral issues [15, p. 130]. There is a clash "between the cultural values of the subject and the social context he or she inhabits [15, p. 155]. This is where they contrast starkly to communicative reflexives:

> Meta-reflexives are 'contextually incongruous' and also contextually unsettled. They are subversive towards social constraints and enablements, because of their willingness to pay the price of the former and to forfeit the benefits of the latter in the attempt to live out their ideal. Their difficulty in locating a suitable context together with their willingness to foot the bill in searching for a better one tends to generate a pattern of social volatility. [15, p. 98]

Meta-reflexives seek "a vocation in which they wish to invest themselves" [15, p. 303] and they tend to gravitate towards working in the non-profit sector [15, p. 253].

FRACTURED REFLEXIVITY
When fractured reflexivity is the dominant mode, "internal conversations cannot lead to purposeful courses of action" [12, p. 8] and "it produces the 'passive agent' whose internal conversation serves only to intensify their personal distress and social disorientation, without enabling them to determine upon a purposeful course of action to alleviate or resolve their problems" [15, p. 96].

CONCLUSION
Two of the most frequently asked questions that Archer raises about reflexivity are: 'Do or can people change their dominant mode of reflexivity over their life courses?' and 'Can 'fractured reflexives' recover and regain some governance over their lives?' [16, p. 7]. These questions beg the further question about the role that coaching, mentoring and other forms of helping might play in bringing about change in dominant mode of reflexivity. In this respect, there are some clues in Archer's work:

> 'Communicativity' implies trust of and concern for those who are regularly consulted (usually significant others) and respect for those acting as consultants on an irregular basis (for their skills, professional expertise or personal characteristics). [15, p. 94]

> [In the autonomous mode] practitioners display confidence in relying upon their own mental resources and, when these require supplementing, generally prefer expert advice or a search for independent information, such as reference books or the Internet. [15, p. 95]

In his commentary, Simon Robinson argued: "We spend a lot of time trying to distinguish coaching from mentoring, but the key point is that everyone needs dialogue" (p. 211). From the perspective of Archer's theory of reflexivity, the quantity and quality of dialogue – including whether it is internal or external – will vary according to the mode of reflexivity.

REFERENCES

1.   PGA Media Guide, PGA of America Awards, *Http://www.pgamediaguide.com/awards_detail.cfm?awardid= 11*

2.   MentorNet.net Staff, On Mentoring and Altruism: "Paying It Forward" in 2008, *Http://news.mentornet.net/content/mentoring-and-altruism-ndash-paying-it-forward-2...*

3.   Gray, K., Ward, A.F. and Norton, M.I., Paying It Forward: Generalized Reciprocity and the Limits of Generosity, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2012, doi: 10.1037/a0031047.

4.   Cox, E., *Coaching Understood: A Pragmatic Inquiry into the Coaching Process*, Sage, London, 2013.

5.   Bloom, G.A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R.J. and Salmela, J.H., The Importance of Mentoring in the Development of Coaches and Athletes, *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1998, 29, 267-281.

6.   Bloom, G.A., Mentoring for Sport Coaches, in: Potrac, P., Gilbert, W. And Denison, J., eds., *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching*, Routledge, London, In Press.

7.   Becker, A.J., It's Not What They Do, It's How They Do It: Athlete Experiences of Great Coaching, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2009, 4(1), 93-119.

8.   Leidl, D., Motivation in Sport: Bridging Historical and Contemporary Theory Through a Qualitative Approach, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2009, 4(2), 155-175.

9.   Giddens, A., *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991.

10. Stelter, R., Coaching as a Reflective Space in a Society of Growing Diversity: Towards a Narrative, Postmodern Paradigm, *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2009, 4, 2, 207-217.

11. Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S., *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994.

12. Archer, M., Reflexivity, Sociopedia.isa, 2010, 1-13, *Http://www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/reflexivity.pdf*

13. Archer, M.S., *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

14. Archer, M.S., Routine, Reflexivity, and Realism, *Sociological Theory*, 2010, 28(3), 272-303.

15. Archer, M.S., *Making our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

16. Archer, M.S., *The Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

17. Vygotsky, L.S., Thought and Language, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1964 (orig: 1934).

18. Archer, M.S., *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.