The 3 Ps of supervision and coaching (Philosophy, Purpose and Process)

Authors:

Peter Jackson and Tatiana Backkirova
Oxford Brook University

Introduction

In this chapter we outline an approach to developing practice in coaching and supervision aimed at achieving a practice that is congruent with the self of the practitioner. The PPP framework is inspired by an original idea of David Lane's (Lane, 2006), but has been developed further to reflect our particular philosophy of professional development. In the introductory sections that follow, we outline what the PPP framework is, and describe the educational philosophy and logic that sits behind it. In the central section of the chapter, we expand on the three elements of the framework: *philosophy*, *purpose* and *practice*. We reflect on the hurdles practitioners experience in developing their practice model using the framework and report first hand experiences of those who have used it in our supervisor professional development programmes. Finally, recommendations are given for further reading and reflection.

The logic of the model's development: the concept of practising 'from who we are'

In our educational and academic work in relation to coaching over the last 15 years, we have consistently emphasised practitioners' priority to develop a practice of coaching *from who we are* or to put it another way, that the coach is the main *instrument* of coaching (Bachkirova, 2016). Our explanation for such a proposition

comes from the way we see the coaching engagement. However important the knowledge of coaching theories, methodologies and techniques may be, we cannot say that coaching is simply a direct application of this knowledge. Because of the extent of uncertainty, complexity and instability inherent in our work, coaching cannot just rely on rational models of practice, however persuasive they are. Such practice is also not value neutral – it is a very personal experience for our clients and therefore cannot be done mechanically. Recognition of the personal connection at the heart of coaching also implies the importance of the trustworthiness of the coach: their ability to resonate with clients' concerns. Even the use of explicit theoretical models are value-laden in practice, as the coach's choices are so intertwined with their personal values that it is not possible to say which interventions come from theories and which from personal beliefs. Indeed, one can argue that all "interventions are the expression of the coach's life experiences, current worldview, and the stage of his or her personal learning journey" (Bachkirova, 2016, p. 144).

Following the principle that the coach is the main instrument of coaching, our programmes are designed with the main purpose of developing the coach. Education in this case becomes twofold. On the one hand it is an opportunity for the developing coach to become familiar with the knowledge of the trade, not only to assimilate it but also to evaluate it, to be discerning about it. On the other hand, coaches need to grow in terms of personal reflexivity: to understand themselves, to find out their values and principles of change and development in order to build an approach to practice that is congruent with who they are.

In our role as educators for coaches, then, we see professional education being achieved through a programme of developing reflexivity and critical appreciation of the body of knowledge which informs the discipline. In our role as practice supervisors we see this principle from two slightly different perspectives. On the one hand, we see the opportunity to bring that constructive and developmental process into the wider supervisory landscape of normative, formative/developmental and restorative functions (Proctor, 1994; Hawkins *et al.*, 2012). That is to say, to provide the opportunity for the coach to develop themselves through the reflective learning process in supervision. On the other hand, we also see our own obligation to supervise *from who we are*. The same logic of personal professional development

applies to ourselves as it does to our supervisees, as it does to delegates on our professional and academic practitioner programmes. So this principle of developing a personally congruent practice (a practice *from who we are*) applies equally to the coach, the supervisor and the supervisor's developmental work with the coach.

Before going on to explain in this chapter the background, history, structure, logic and the application of the '3Ps of supervision and coaching', we should provide a short description of what it actually is. It is not a method or model of supervision (or coaching) practice in itself, but rather a method or model of modelling practice. More specifically, it is a process of enquiring into and articulating the kind of practice congruent to the self of the practitioner as described above. The 3 Ps suggest three different strands of how the practitioner identifies the way that they practise and can develop their practice. The 3Ps apply equally to coaching and to supervision. We have been formally supporting both coaches and supervisors in exploring their practice in this way for over a decade (and sometimes the same practitioner has ended up looking at both practices at different times). For the purpose of this chapter, however, we discuss how it relates to supervisors.

The 3 Ps represent the following perspectives:
- Philosophy: What is your philosophy of change and support? This may include values, beliefs, theoretical perspectives, main assumptions about human nature, change and influence.
- Purpose: What purpose does your supervision serve? This may include intention, outputs, results of your supervision.
- Process: What process is appropriate to that purpose and philosophy? This may include description of what you do (what happens) when you supervise.

Models and frameworks help focus attention on a wider range of 'parts' of any system. A good example is the way that the 7-eyed model (Hawkins and Schwenk, 2011) helps supervisors take notice of aspects of the supervision process and relationship that they might otherwise overlook. By exploring practice from the three perspectives of the 3Ps we aim to bring to light the practitioner's espoused theories, their theories in use, their underpinning assumptions, their preferences and thereby

crucially their blind spots, their neglected backwaters, and their inconsistencies. The aim of this process is not necessarily to get the practice 'right' (not least because we struggle with such a concept – see, Bachkirova and Lawton Smith, 2015) and it is most certainly not to show that the practice is 'wrong'. What we have found is that it allows the practitioner to develop a coherence to their practice, both in terms of its internal consistency, and in terms of its alignment to the *self* of the practitioner.

This framework was originally influenced by the work of David Lane presented at the British Psychological Society's Special Group in Coaching Psychology (SGCP) Conference in 2006 (Lane, 2006). At first, we experimented with Lane's original formulation of the framework, which argued that supervisors needed to have a clear *Purpose*, a framework of underlying *Perspectives* and a respectful *Process* of working. However, we felt constrained by the central logic of Lane's structure and developed a different formulation of the framework: *Philosophy*, *Purpose* and *Process*. In Lane's approach, the leading role was given to the purpose with an apparent assumption of the subservient role of the philosophy in the way practitioners conceptualize their practice. This approach could imply that the only role of philosophy was to justify the aims. Working this way around, the discussion of philosophy could become little more than post-hoc rationalization We believe, however, that it is the system of beliefs and assumptions that define what the aims of practice are going to be and what process is to follow. This revised structure of the framework was consequently adapted for the assessment task in our postgraduate programme in Coaching Supervision, and later for our professional development programme which was derived from it. Reflecting the fact that this structure of the PPP is fully consistent with our educational positions on the role of self in the development of coaching practice it also became part of the requirement for award-bearing programmes in Coaching and Mentoring Practice.

Structure of the model

In this section we describe in more detail the discussions that might take place when viewing practice from the three perspectives represented by the 3Ps. We have presented the 3 Ps in the sequence that seems most logical in order to understand the

process: building from the more foundational to the more visible. Thinking about one's own practice model, however, can move in both directions. We can equally ask, "what does my preference for this technique or approach tell me about my values?" as we can, "what kinds of approaches follow logically from my underpinning beliefs?" It is also worth noting that it is articulating the 'Practice' part that comes most immediately to most practitioners: we have found working with students that people tend to have preferences even if they have not really investigated the rationale for those preferences. So there is no single or correct direction to follow your thinking. Indeed, as a developmental framework, there is some logic as well as a practical attraction in working from the practice backwards: the intuitive choices practitioners make in the immediacy of their practice both offer a more concrete starting point and one which we believe is likely to reflect the practitioner's values and beliefs with less rational filtering.

Philosophy

The very mention of the word 'philosophy' can cause students of coaching and supervision to feel paralysed. It would be useful briefly to demystify the idea of philosophy and to clarify our use of the term here.

Simon Blackburn does a good job of summarising briefly the point of thinking about philosophy:

> … our ideas and concepts can be compared with the lenses through which we see the world. In philosophy the lens is itself the topic of study. Success will be a matter not of how much you know at the end, but of what you can do when the going gets tough: when the seas of argument rise, and confusion breaks out"
>
> (Blackburn, 1999, p. 5)

Studying philosophy provides a vocabulary for exploring the nature of ideas, but we do not need to go so far as to actually *study* philosophy in this chapter. Here we need only to reflect on those "lenses through which we see the world" (Blackburn, 1999, p. 5). Using another metaphor, philosophy in Blackburn's description can be imagined as the keel of a boat. 'Our philosophy' is therefore that thing that tells us what we

should do when we don't know what to do: that keeps us more or less moving in a particular direction. So the task in relation to understanding why we practice the way we practice, is to understand something about that keel and those lenses: where the keel points us, and what the lenses allow us to see, or even where they allow us look in the first place.

We may actually experience this sense of direction, and how we look, as our values or sometimes as our theories. Grady McGonagill describes her own process of uncovering what drove her practice when, as she describes it, "All too often I had found myself winging it - while of course pretending that I knew exactly what I was doing" (2002, p. 59). She recounts turning to reflection – a term Blackburn uses extensively in his introduction – and reflective practice. She chooses as a specific and vital focus for that reflection, her own "frames for understanding human behaviour" (p. 62).

So the aim here is to discover through reflection what values and assumptions our practice is informed by (or what values we wish it to be informed by if we are designing our model bottom-up), and how that might be expressed through our preferences for ways of working (or 'theories-in-use' - Argyris and Schön, 1974) Following on from that examination, we might then identify contradictions or difficulties between competing priorities.

We can start this process by thinking about values. As practising coaches, supervisors may well have their own favourite values exercises that they use with coaching clients. We tend to favour open-ended processes rather than approaches that involve selecting from lists, as the former seem to encourage more spontaneous and personally meaningful responses. The important thing here is to identify what is *really* important to you; what values would take priority over all else. If we take a different context we can illustrate how these values affect practice. Imagine junior school teachers. Some might feel a strong sense that we have obligations to our society and that it is therefore incredibly important to impress on children the value of hard work as a route to fully realising their potential to contribute. Others might feel that every child is entirely individual, and that their autonomy and self-expression are

to be respected. We can imagine that these different values might suggest different ways of practising in the teaching context.

One way of testing this for your own practice is to ask yourself what actions or behaviours in others you have a strong reaction to. The things that make us angry, and even more so, the things that make us irrationally angry, may well point to some value or other that has been transgressed. The potential trap here is to fall into describing how we would ideally like other people to see us. Not many people would espouse values of unfairness, ignorance and brutality, so claiming to set great store by fairness, wisdom and kindness might not be telling us that much about our characteristic view of the world. There are social and professional norms that we all work within, but what makes you *you*?

The next question is what assumptions we make about people and how they act in the world. We put this question to a research participant once, whose answer was, "I don't make assumptions about people … because everyone is different". So we can see from that exchange that the question is not an easy one to answer. To put the question another way, then, what do you assume to be common to all people? What values? What behaviours? Our research participant, if we had asked a better question, might have been able to say that he deeply respected the individuality and autonomy of every individual (his own values), that people expected that individuality and autonomy to be respected (a theory or assumption about the values of others), and that therefore he and, in fact, everyone should avoid judging the actions of others. This is hypothetical – we did not ask a better question at the time, unfortunately – but is intended to illustrate the difference between our values and our assumptions.

Finally we might ask what theories of practice work best for us. By theories of practice we mean the kind of theories that encompass the values and assumptions described above, such as person-centred, existential, solutions-focused, or Gestalt. You might be exposed to these theories through conference presentations, workshops and events arranged by professional bodies, or through your own reading. With these perspectives you can ask yourself the following questions:

- Who has inspired you?

- What would you like to know more about?

Often the logic and background of these theories are more fully explained in coaching handbooks (eg Cox, Bachkirova and Clutterbuck, 2014) and in supervision handbooks (eg Bachkirova, Jackson and Clutterbuck, 2011). So these sources can be used with questions in mind such as:

- Which theories most influence your practice?
- Which theories can you relate to?
- Which theories present a rationale for the practices you use?
- Which theories are built on values that are similar to yours?

Equally, a sense of these preferences may emerge in less explicit or abstract ways:

- What books are you drawn to?
- Whose writing do you return to repeatedly?
- What films resonate for you?
- What painters attract you?
- What music?

By looking at your values, assumptions and main theoretical influences it is possible to build a strong sense of what keeps your practice on track, to discover what might be added to that practice and what might not fit as well as it used to.

Purpose

The articulation of purpose in this framework is about what one as a supervisor aims to achieve with and for the client, the client system, or wider stakeholders. Different supervisors will have different commitments to all these different parties and systems. So not only is it important to do this to establish an explicit concept of what we want to achieve in order to evaluate whether we have done a good job or not, but it is an important aspect of individualising – perhaps the right word would be 'personalising' – our practice and its principles. Of course, one might say that the coach one is supervising can be the final judge of how satisfied they are, but relying on this criterion alone is insufficient. Coaches may feel satisfied for various reasons, which

might include not being disturbed too much, or feeling comfortable rather then learning. Clarifying your own image of what constitutes a good job, as well as what you believe your supervision should look like and feel like, allows you to scrutinise your practice and continue challenging yourself even when the feedback from the coaches is positive.

However, to identify the purpose of supervision (as well as for coaching) is not that easy. The first challenge we could consider comes from the statement by Kegan (1982, p.295) who argued that, "amongst the many things from which a practitioner's clients need protection is the practitioner's hopes for the client's future, however benign and sympathetic these hopes may be". How can we define an aim of supervision that does not include hopes for the client's future – a vision of what is good for him/her? And without such a vision we are left with the aim that is defined only by the client and thus we become completely dependent on their feedback.

Another challenge comes from the potential confusion between the ends and means when we aim to define the purpose of our work. For example, if your purpose of practice is to provide a reflective space for the coach it may sound reasonable, but this purpose is more about the process rather than the outcome that you wish to achieve. In order to extract a purpose from this process you may benefit from asking yourself: "what is this reflective space for?" The answer will be more about what you are trying to achieve as an end of providing reflective space. Although some may argue that ends and means are inseparable, in the exercise of creating your framework it is important not to stop the inquiry prematurely but to continue to drill down to a better understanding of what you are hoping to achieve.

At the same time, it is important to recognise that the ultimate purpose of your professional practice, however you articulate it, should not completely overshadow the real coach in front of you in the supervision session. If, for example, you have a personal commitment to serving the profession or humanity as a whole, this ultimate purpose has to be translated into something more concrete which allows you and the coach you work with to have reasonably clear expectations of what the progress or lack of it would look like.

Here are some specific questions that you may want to consider when thinking about the second P of your framework:

- When contracting with a coach how would you know that you could add value to their practice?
- What would tell you that your supervision session was a good one?
- What would tell you that your long-term supervision of a coach has been successful or at least worthwhile?
- On what basis would you say that a session was a waste of time?
- On what basis would you stop supervising someone?
- What sort of feedback from the coach would make you change your model of supervision?

Practice

Thinking about the 'practice' element of the 3Ps probably requires the least explanation. Models of the process of sessions such as GROW (Whitmore, 2002) and CLEAR (Hawkins and Smith, 2013) are often our very first guide to practice as coaches. We become familiar with these models, use them on a day to day basis, and we have found that most practitioners we have worked with on developing their own practice model find it easier to think about this level of their model than the deeper, less explicit influences we have discussed in the previous two sections. The challenge here may be less about the abstract thinking involved and more about finding a way of looking at our practices with fresh eyes.

In a small scale research project, we found that the coaches we interviewed tended to adopt practices according to preferences that are predicted by Bandura's 'self-efficacy theory' (Bandura, 1977). That is to say that coaches seemed to adopt practices most readily, using Bandura's terms, in the following order of priority: as a consequence of "performance accomplishments" (i.e. they had experienced success using the technique); "vicarious experience" (they had witnessed the technique working); and finally "verbal persuasion" (someone with credibility had told them to use it or that it works). These findings certainly appear to have face validity and interestingly it also reflects how trainers might structure a learning event.

Importantly for the current discussion, this suggests that we may have built up practices based on quite immediate experiences *at a particular time in our development*. These practices may not thereafter come under a great deal of overt scrutiny. The pattern for most people is more likely to be that our initial experience has a very strong impact, and then we gradually evolve our practices in ways that are comfortable for us. They may no longer reflect the practice we wish to build.

We therefore need to ask ourselves the following questions about the practices we adopt:

- What appeals to me about this approach/method/tool?
- Where does it work well, who for?
- How do we know it works?
- Where has it not worked well?
- When we think of it working well, to what *purpose* does it contribute?
- In what ways does it fit our *philosophy*?
- What does using this method tell our clients about our philosophy and purpose?

The process is not just about pruning out dead wood, though. We also have the opportunity both to understand our own practice more clearly and to grow our own toolkit in ways that are appropriate to that understanding. Consequently there are two further questions to ask:

- What approaches do I feel antipathy towards and why?
- What new methods would embody my understanding of my philosophy and purpose now?

Integrating the model

Unsurprisingly, carrying through the whole process of investigating one's own model may be more difficult in practice than it might appear on paper. As we have the same assumptions, beliefs and perceptual lenses when practising as we do when reviewing our practice, it is easy to miss things. Some of the struggles we have witnessed include the following:

An over-concentration on the practice element: as a natural consequence of our coaching practice being an applied discipline there is a tendency to think only in practical terms. Some practitioners' training may further have focused on the 'how' more than the 'why'. Whether this is the case for an individual or not, it is much easier to think in those terms about practice and we have a ready vocabulary for doing so.

It is sometimes difficult to align different elements: in thinking about the 3Ps, we are shifting perspectives and thinking about an issue from many angles at once. This is not a familiar exercise for everyone, and it is quite natural to try to resolve problems *within* each frame. Looking *across* frames is like comparing apples and oranges. We need to consider carefully how elements at each level of the resulting model connect to those at different levels of the model. Where there are mismatches there may be unresolved incongruences within the practitioner's own belief system which could ultimately result in conflicts in practice.

The use of eclecticism as a rationale in itself: various writers on coaching argue persuasively for strongly practically-oriented criteria of 'fitness for purpose' that is manifested in the use of multiple theories, instruments and styles of practice (Clutterbuck and Megginson, 2009; Cox, 2013). However, it is easy for such eclecticism as it is often termed, and its legitimate pragmatic foundations, to be used carelessly as a surrogate for proper investigation. While a practitioner may well fruitfully draw influences from many traditions, the principle of practice reflecting the *self* demands some form of integration. The PPP framework is attempting to make that integration explicit and reflexive.

There are therefore some useful questions about alignment. It may be easier to explore these with a 'critical friend' (perhaps even a coach or supervisor):

- In what way are your Ps aligned?
- Are there any elements of practice that don't have a rationale in your philosophy?

- Are there any principles in your philosophy that have not materialised in action?

Case Studies: Personal Experiences of using the PPP Model.

In this section we would like the process, as far as possible to 'speak for itself'. Here we present two accounts from coaching supervisors with whom we have worked through the Advanced Professional Certificate in Coaching Supervision.

James

Dr James Pritchard came to the process as he says after, "coaching for 25 years … it was time to learn more." In part wanting to formalise and integrate his extensive experience in both coaching and supervision, he also wanted a process that would push his learning. The following is reproduced with permission.

Clearing space to think and write is always a struggle for me, so many activities are more seductive than a blank page! But in this case, I was fortunate to be able to borrow an apartment in the Swiss Alps for a few days and this proved a wonderful opportunity. Armed with a laptop, internet connection and a couple of indispensable books, I established a routine of working for a few hours and then walking in the mountains until hunger got the better of me. It was between seasons, so everything was shut for maintenance, adding to the air of tranquillity.

The brief was to develop and explore a model based on the three components of Philosophy, Purpose and Process. We were also offered a list of areas to be assessed, giving a welcome structure to what would have been a self-indulgent ramble. The exercise encouraged me to link a strand of thinking, coming from mindfulness practices in yoga and Buddhism to what I actually do as a coach or supervisor. All too often we may express a particular belief, but not ask the question; 'If I really believed that, how would it change what I do?'. My starting point was how different elements of an individual human being interact to generate and articulate an issue for coaching. This is loosely

drawn from the idea of sheaths underlying much of yoga and ayurveda. The complexity increases when, as supervisors, we include the coach as part of the system and the supervisor him/herself. As well as passing the external validation, I was keen to meet my own 'so what test'. I wanted a model to support the supervisor towards a next step, rather than simply provide a way of organising what he/she already knows. So, this model needed an algorithmic property.

In my own practice, I use this model in four different ways:

1. *This philosophy has become embedded in how I work, so in one sense I can't not apply the thinking, but it is largely unconscious and just pops up occasionally as a conscious connection.*
2. *Less commonly, I base my enquiry quite deliberately on the model, without sharing the model itself with the client, much in the way a coach might use GROW to inform their questions.*
3. *Occasionally, I discuss the model with the coach/client and engage in a shared enquiry of how it might shed light on the case and how we could proceed.*
4. *In some cases, where there is explicit permission, I have been able to act out the model, through physical yoga practice, linking back to the model elements.*

Both the model itself and application in practice are work in progress, but provide a helpful focus for reflection on how to intervene fruitfully in the coach/client system. Without the discipline of researching and writing, I may continue doing what I have always done and miss out on what I already know.
- (James Pritchard, personal communication, 14th June, 2017)

James' account describes an interesting balance of discipline and patience to allow a full understanding to emerge. James has given an account of how the PPP process encouraged him to connect his supervision practice with other practices and beliefs which already constituted his professional world. He has also emphasised a personal pragmatism in the process of making his philosophy meaningful. We may not all

have the opportunity to create such a reflective space as James was able to in his mountain retreat, but it demonstrates the necessity of time and space.

Natalia

In a second account, Natalia de Estevan-Ubeda illustrates a very different way of interacting with the model.

What does it take to develop a supervision model and what happens in the process?

After the training week was completed, I had a sense that 'things' were falling into place in as much as I had had the theoretical input, the practice 'runs' and the supervision feedback on my supervision during a very enriching week, full of experiential learning. I was faced with the challenge of making it all my own, and by this I mean, understanding how my values, my background, my own experiences, were shaping 'me' as a supervisor in the making.

The process of understanding who I am in the context of my learning was invaluable, and not easy. It took months of reflection and introspection, endless trips from a micro-level where I would go through detail, to a meta-perspective taking me where bigger themes came together. For instance, that was when I put together how values and beliefs are linked to my model, which in turn is underpinned by theory, congruent with who I am and how I practice.

Once I had the building blocks, it was a matter of testing that my model was indeed 'showing' up in my practice. This was another invaluable part of the process because it helped me to examine my practice from another dimension, one which allowed me to reconcile what I thought my model was all about and the evidence that was coming back through analysing my practice, which was telling me there were aspects I hadn't noticed before. Examining one's practice through recordings and feedback is perhaps something we have all gone through to some extent, however, what has been fundamentally different

this time is what, in my view, gives this process of accreditation the value-add as a true transformational learning process. And the difference has been that I have had to evaluate my own practice, decide what was a good session and a session which I wouldn't be too happy with and be able to put my arguments forward and check them against my model in first instance.

I have had to articulate my model and discuss my practice with the Faculty, through an extremely helpful process of enquiry which was, without a doubt, one of the richest moments of learning I have experienced. This process has allowed me to become more aware of my habits when supervising, my comfort areas, my tendency to default to certain functions of supervision and the most valuable learning of all for me at the time, and still to this day, 'meeting my client where my client is'.

Thinking about my practice in this way is different from what I have done before because it has given me the opportunity to firstly, take the time to consolidate my learning and revisit my supervision model through a period of time. This has not been a process of dreaming up a plausible model and put it aside, instead, this has truly given me the opportunity to capture my model at a point in time, test it, revisit it, evolve it, find its core and its edges, it has made my model alive. The impact of my practice is such that I am now much more able to stay with the client and not be drawn towards displaying all the competences, because even when you do, it can still fall short of being a good session. The most challenging part of the process for me has been the part that relates to time. A supervision model is not born out of a training course, it is borne out of a process of reflection, enquiry, dialogue, and time … time to practice.

- (Natalia de Estevan-Ubeda,, personal communication, 30th June 2017).

Natalia gives a flavour of how she moved from the conceptual side of building a model, to practice, and back again. She talks about the process of "developing, testing and evolving my supervision model". Although her problem-solving style, as it emerges in the way she addresses the exercise, is very different from James' approach, she similarly highlights how the model challenges her to integrate her

practice with her sense of self, even extending to re-evaluating previously held assumptions.

These cases illustrate not just a process of explaining a pre-existing practice, but developing that practice, and particularly developing its integration with the practitioner's sense of self, through the process of an analytical and reflexive articulation.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have explained the derivation of our PPP framework from David Lane's earlier work, the rationale for adapting that framework to one which orients more clearly to the development of a personally congruent model of practice, and how we have put the framework into effect with coaches and supervisors. While thinking about the philosophy, purpose and practice of one's practice model may take some effort (and time and space) to achieve, we fervently believe that it takes practitioners' ethics, performance and professionalism beyond what can be specified through a skills or competency approach. The accounts generously provided by James and Natalia illustrate all this and, further, the personal satisfaction derived from the process.

We hope that, in the course of our explanations, we have also given enough practical guidance to create sufficient opportunity for readers to explore this framework for thinking about their own practice model. Supervision, coaching, groupwork and whatever facilitates your own thinking are of enormous assistance here.

Practice Points

List six important practice points.

1. You can start from where you are comfortable; the process is cyclical and iterative, so as long as you stay open to change it doesn't matter where you take the first step.

2. When you reflect on practice, include a prompt to connect your reflections to *purpose* and *philosophy*.

3. Notice when your work feels congruent.

4. Engage with new ideas, especially those that you might normally dismiss. When you look from an appreciative stance, what now works for you (or still doesn't)?

5. Use values exercises.

6. Reflect on PPP in supervision.

Discussion points

1. In what situations or with which clients are you least comfortable working? Explore where these situations present challenges for your different aspects of your model.

2. Take no more than 5 minutes to bullet point what you know about your own *Philosophy, Purpose* and *Practice.* Now expand just one of them.

3. Whose practice excites your curiosity? Explore why.

4. Explore what gives you strength and energy when you are practicing.

Suggested reading

Bachkirova, T., Jackson, P. and Clutterbuck, D. (2011) *Coaching And Mentoring Supervision*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Lennard, D. (2010) *Coaching models: a cultural perspective : a guide to model development for practitioners and students of coaching*. London: Routledge.

McGonagill, G. (2002) 'The Coach as Reflective Practitioner:
Notes from a Journey Without End', in Catherine Fitzgerald and Jennifer Garvey Berger (ends), *Executive Coaching: Practices and Perspectives*, Palo Alto: Davies Black.

Rowan, J. and Jacobs, M. (2002) *The Therapist's Use of Self,* Buckingham: Open University Press.

References

Argyris, C. and Schön, D. A. (1974) *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness.* San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bachkirova, T. (2016) The Self of the Coach: Conceptualization, Issues, and Opportunities for Practitioner Development, *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 68(2), pp. 143-156.

Bachkirova, T., Jackson, P. and Clutterbuck, D. (2011) *Coaching And Mentoring Supervision*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Bachkirova, T. and Lawton Smith, C. (2015) 'From competencies to capabilities in the assessment and accreditation of coaches', *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring*, 13(2), pp. 123–140.

Bandura, A. (1977) 'Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.', *Psychological review*, 84(2), p. 191.

Blackburn, S. (1999) *Think: A compelling introduction to philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clutterbuck, D. and Megginson, D. (2009) *Further techniques for coaching and mentoring.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Cox, E. (2013) *Coaching Understood: A pragmatic enquiry into the coaching process*. London: SAGE.

Cox, E., Bachkirova, T. and Clutterbuck, D. (eds) (2014) *The complete handbook of coaching*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

Hawkins, P. *et al.* (2012) *Supervision in the helping professions*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Hawkins, P. and Schwenk, G. (2011) 'The Seven-Eyed Model of Coaching Supervision', in Bachkirova, T., Jackson, P., and Clutterbuck, D. (eds) *Coaching & Mentoring Supervision: Theory and practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hawkins, P. and Smith, N. (2013) *Coaching, mentoring and organizational consultancy: Supervision, skills and development*. 2nd edn. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development.* London: Harvard University Press.

Lane, D. (2006) The Emergence of Supervision Models. *Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Special Group in Coaching Psychology of the BPS*, (unpublished).

McGonagill, G. (2002) 'The coach as reflective practitioner: Notes from a journey without end', in Fitzgerald, C. and Berger, J. G., *Executive coaching: practices and perspectives*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing, pp. 59–88.

Proctor, B. (1994) 'Supervision-competence, confidence, accountability.', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 22(3), pp. 309–319.

Whitmore, S. J. (2002) *Coaching for performance: GROWing human potential and performance.* 3rd edn. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.