

## **Mentor / Mentee Data Sets.**

The data sets were collected between March and May 2106. The aims of the research were to collate evidence exploring the congruence between mentors and mentees with regards to the aims, objectives and scope of mentoring in the development of coaching expertise.

Accordingly, two surveys were designed using online software (Survey Monkey): one to be completed by mentors and the other to be completed by mentee coaches. Although two surveys were developed, both were focused on the same topics with the main difference relating to the wording of each question so that these were phrased appropriately for each group. In line with this, both surveys started with general questions relating to the mentors' and mentees' coaching qualifications, years of coaching experience, and length of time engaged in the FA's formal mentoring programme. In terms of the subsequent, specific topics addressed in the surveys, all questions were based upon the messages in Olsson et al. (2017), as presented in our introduction. More specifically, mentors and mentees were asked to provide responses on a Likert scale to statements on: (i) the markers of expertise; (ii) how expertise is developed; (iii) the nature of interactions with their mentor or mentee; and (iv) their epistemological beliefs. For example, participants were presented with statements and asked to indicate the extent to which they either disagreed or agreed with them, perceived them as important or not important, and experienced or did not experience them. To limit the interaction of demand characteristics (McCambridge, 2015) these statements were phrased in ways that were both consistent and inconsistent with literature on expertise and mentoring. Thus, an effective mentoring program would be evidenced by participants scoring some statements high and other statements low (in terms of agreement, importance, or experience). For example, an effective program would be shown by participants rating the *ability to develop novel and innovative solutions* as essential and the *ability to reproduce the practices of expert coaches* as not important (cf. Nash et al., 2012).