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Abstract

The relationships among perceived managerial coaching behavior and employee self-reported affective and performance-related outcomes were examined in this study. Data were collected from 431 employees in a government organization using an electronic survey. Principal component analysis, Cronbach’s alpha, structural equation modeling (SEM), and Sobel tests were used as the methods of analysis. The results of the SEM indicated the hypothesized conceptual model was adequately supported by the sample data. Managerial coaching had a direct impact on employee satisfaction with work and role clarity and an indirect impact on satisfaction with work, career commitment, job performance, and organization commitment. Empirical support for the theoretical frame is presented, as well as the hypothesized conceptual model of managerial coaching outcomes in organizations.
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Managerial coaching is defined as an effective managerial practice that helps employees learn and become effective (Ellinger, Ellinger, Hamlin, & Beattie, 2010; Peterson & Hicks, 1996). During the last two decades, managerial coaching has become increasingly popular in organizations (Park, 2007). Managers and organizations started to recognize it as one of the most desirable behaviors for successful management and leadership and learning organization (Ellinger, Ellinger, & Keller, 2003; Hargrove, 1995). Many books have been written in the area of managerial coaching and related training programs provided by consulting firms have been numerous (Ellinger et al., 2003).

The popularity of managerial coaching appears to be related to rapid changes in organization environments, such as globalization, technology development, and the nature of work. Organizations began to recognize the need for a new management and leadership approach to address the developmental needs of the employees and organizations in an increasingly dynamic work environment. Managers are more and more asked to empower employees to be self-directed and facilitate them to effectively learn and develop themselves, rather than to direct and control employees as traditional managers did in the past (Evered & Selman, 1989). Changes in organization environments have brought about changes in expectations for management and leadership roles. Therefore, managerial coaching is being called a new type of effective management and leadership behavior in organizations.

Coaching is often regarded as an effective organization development (OD) strategy and a successful way to develop next managers and leaders in organizations (McLean, Yang, Kuo, Tolbert, & Larkin, 2005). Recently, coaching, including managerial and executive coaching,
has received more attention in human resource development (HRD) literature in that both coaching and HRD focus on individual and organization effectiveness, performance improvement, behavior change, learning and management, human potential, and personal growth (Hamlin, Ellinger, & Beattie, 2008).

Despite its popularity, there is a paucity of evidence regarding the empirical study of managerial coaching, since managerial coaching is an emerging area of practice and research (Park, 2007). Although managerial coaching has become a frequent topic in management and HRD-related literature during recent years, there is still much exploration needed.

**Problem Statement**

The specific manner in which managerial coaching is practiced in organizations and employee reactions to such coaching are unclear (Ellinger et al., 2003). Ideally, while engaging in managerial coaching, managers who are commonly concerned about their role as a scientific, controlling, and directive manager shift to an emphasis on holistic, collaborative, and participative interaction (Evered & Selman, 1989). Managers and organizations also perceive coaching to be a meaningful, but time consuming activity (Zemke, 1996). The perceived time consuming nature of managerial coaching implies that coaching may not be practiced daily by managers, even though managerial coaching has become popular in organizations (Park, 2007). An absence of managerial coaching and feedback from their manager may lead employees to react with dissatisfaction and decreased organization commitment as well as ineffective performance.

Because there is limited published research on managerial coaching, misunderstandings regarding what managerial coaching is, how it is practiced in organizations, and how it is different from traditional management are present (Hamlin et al., 2008; Wenzel, 2000). To a
larger extent, there is a lack of empirical work in the study of managerial coaching outcomes, although many case studies and practitioner reports considering the potential outcomes have been presented (Ellinger et al., 2003; Park, 2007). Ellinger et al. (2003) conducted one of the first empirical outcome studies on managerial coaching. Recently, Park (2007) examined the relationships between managerial coaching and personal learning, organization commitment, and turnover intention. However, more investigation is still needed in terms of the outcomes of managerial coaching, particularly the relationships between managerial coaching and employee responses in organizations.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among perceived managerial coaching behavior and employee self-reported affective and performance-related outcomes. The endogenous factors (or dependent variables) for the study were identified as perceived employee satisfaction with work, role ambiguity, satisfaction with manager, career commitment, job performance, and organization commitment (to avoid repetitiveness, the term of perceived will be omitted hereafter). In particular, the direct and indirect relationships among manager’s coaching behavior and employee’s outcomes were the focus of this study.

**Research Question**

In order to investigate the associations among managerial coaching behavior and employee outcomes, the answer to the following research question was sought:

What are the relationships between and among managerial coaching behavior and employee self-reported affective and performance-related responses?
Potential Outcomes of Managerial Coaching and Related Literature

In this section, the review of literature relevant to the theoretical framework, the conceptual model, and the research hypotheses for the study are presented. First, theoretical framing of the study is provided in the following part.

**Theoretical Framing**

Three theories were utilized to examine and frame the potential outcomes of managerial coaching in organizations for this study. In particular, path-goal leadership, career motivation, and organization support were employed to provide insight to relationships between and among managerial coaching behavior and employee affective and performance-related outcomes (see Figure 1).

First, path-goal leadership theory (House, 1996) was used to identify and frame the potential outcome variables of managerial coaching: employee role ambiguity, satisfaction with work, satisfaction with manager, and job performance. Since path-goal leadership theory is clearly open to the inclusion of other styles of effective management and leadership behaviors (Northouse, 2001), managerial coaching can be considered as an effective management and leadership behavior in the context of path-goal leadership theory. Managerial coaching, as an effective management and leadership behavior, can reduce employee role ambiguity by clarifying goals and paths (House, 1996; Peterson & Hicks, 1996) and in turn, the reduced role ambiguity can increase employee satisfaction with work, satisfaction with manager, and job performance (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). Managerial coaching can also directly influence employee satisfaction with work, satisfaction with manager, and job performance by being supportive, providing resources and information, removing roadblocks and
obstacles, and initiating structure (Ellinger et al., 2003; Hargrove, 1995; Peterson & Hicks, 1996; Zemke, 1996).

Figure 1. Theoretical framework of managerial coaching outcomes.
Career motivation theory (London, 1983) was used to identify and frame the potential outcome variables of managerial coaching in this study: employee satisfaction with work and career commitment. Managerial coaching can be regarded as a means of supervisor and organization support as well as an effective management and leadership behavior for employee career development in the context of career motivation theory. Being supportive, collaborative goal setting and action planning, constructive feedback, and empowering offered by managerial coaching for career development can influence employee immediate satisfaction with work and long-term commitment to career (Aryee & Tan, 1992; Ellinger & Bostrom, 1999; Ellinger et al., 2003; London, 1983).

Organization support theory (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) was used to identify and frame the potential outcome variables of managerial coaching: employee satisfaction with manager and organization commitment. Managerial coaching can be regarded as a form of perceived organization support (POS) as well as an effective management and leadership behavior in the context of organization support theory. Since employees perceive management and leadership supportive behaviors as a sign of organization support (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghhe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002), managerial coaching received by employees can generate employee satisfaction with manager and reciprocate employee commitment to organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2002) in the social exchange view.

**Hypothesized Conceptual Model and Structural Correlations**

Several benefits of managerial coaching outcomes in organizations have been identified. First of all, job performance improvement is almost always recognized as the primary potential outcome of managerial coaching (Ellinger et al., 2003; Evered & Selman, 1989; Zemke, 1996).
Next, employees can develop self-awareness by the systematic feedback from managers (Peterson & Hicks, 1996). This effective feedback can help employees clearly understand their goals and responsibilities and also structure paths toward the established goals (Allenbaugh, 1983; House, 1996). Therefore, reduced role ambiguity may be another primary outcome of managerial coaching. Third, managerial coaching influences employee satisfaction. HRD-related studies support this identified outcome in that effective, participative management and leadership behavior promotes employee satisfaction with work (Ellinger et al., 2003; Lok & Crawford, 2004). Fourth, similarly, the effective management and leadership behavior can increase employee satisfaction with manager (Ellinger & Bostrom, 1999; House, 1996). In other words, managerial coaching, as an effective management and leadership behavior, may likely influence both employee satisfaction with work and satisfaction with manager.

Therefore, informed by the research and theoretical perspectives outlined above, hypotheses for this study (also see Figure 2) included:

*Hypothesis 1:* There will be a significant positive relationship between managerial coaching behavior and employee job performance.

*Hypothesis 2a:* There will be a significant positive relationship between managerial coaching behavior and employee satisfaction with work.

*Hypothesis 2b:* There will be a significant negative relationship between managerial coaching behavior and employee role ambiguity.

*Hypothesis 2c:* There will be a significant positive relationship between managerial coaching behavior and employee satisfaction with manager.
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**Role ambiguity.** Role ambiguity (Rizzo et al., 1970) is often regarded as a factor to increase job stress in organizations. Based on this role theory, if employees do not know the extent of their authority and what expectations they have from the manager and organization, they cannot be succeeding in their task and relationship with the manager in the organization (Rizzo et al., 1970). Fried, Ben-David, Tiegs, Avital, and Yeverechahu (1998) and Tubre and Collins (2000) reported role ambiguity correlates negatively with job performance. It was also argued that dissatisfaction with work can be caused by a high level of role ambiguity (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Similarly, DeConinck and Stilwell (2004) and House (1996) stated that role ambiguity is also negatively related to satisfaction with supervision of manager. These earlier results led to the following hypotheses related to role ambiguity:

**Hypothesis 3a:** There will be a significant negative relationship between perceived employee role ambiguity and satisfaction with work.

**Hypothesis 3b:** There will be a significant negative relationship between perceived employee role ambiguity and job performance.

**Hypothesis 3c:** There will be a significant negative relationship between perceived employee role ambiguity and satisfaction with manager.

**Satisfaction with work.** Satisfaction with work refers to employee affective reactions to a job. Vroom (1964) argued that employee satisfaction with work is positively related to his or her job performance. George and Jones (1997) and Riketta (2008) reported that their meta-analysis indicates a positive relationship between satisfaction with work and job performance. It was also reported that there is a positive relationship between satisfaction with work and career commitment (Carless & Bernath, 2007; Goulet & Singh, 2002). Blau and Boal (1987) and Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that satisfaction with work correlates positively with
organization commitment as well. Informed by these earlier studies, hypotheses related to satisfaction with work included:

*Hypothesis 4a:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with work and career commitment.

*Hypothesis 4b:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with work and job performance.

*Hypothesis 4c:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with work and organization commitment.

**Satisfaction with manager.** Satisfaction with manager is defined as employee satisfaction with his or her immediate manager (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). Leadership theorists argued that an effective management and leadership behavior affects employee job performance, organization commitment, and career development (Northouse, 2001). Organizational researchers reported that satisfactory manager-employee relationship is one of the primary predictors of employee career commitment (Blau, 1985; Goulet & Singh, 2002). House (1996) and Harris, Kacmar, and Zivnuska (2007) supported the positive relationship between satisfaction with manager and job performance. Lastly, Blau and Boal (1987) and Hackett, Bycio, and Hausdorf (1994) reported that satisfaction with supervision is positively related to organization commitment. Therefore, hypotheses related to satisfaction with manager included:

*Hypothesis 5a:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with manager and career commitment.

*Hypothesis 5b:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with manager and job performance.
Hypothesis 5c: There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee satisfaction with manager and organization commitment.

**Career commitment.** Career commitment is defined as the strength of individual “motivation to work in a chosen career role” (Hall, 1976, p.59). This is one of the most under-researched areas in work-related commitments. Somers and Birnbaum (1998) tested the relationship between career commitment and job performance and found that career commitment is positively related to overall performance effectiveness. Aryee and Tan (1992) also reported the same result on the study of career commitment. Therefore, a related hypothesis was:

*Hypothesis 6:* There will be a positive relationship between perceived employee career commitment and job performance.

**Organization commitment.** Organization commitment is defined as the psychological attachment that an individual feels for the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen found that organization commitment, particularly affective organization commitment, is positively related to job performance as well as satisfaction with work and satisfaction with manager. This predictive relationship of organization commitment to job performance was also supported by several employee attitude studies (Riketta, 2002, 2008). Therefore, the hypothesis was:

*Hypothesis 7:* There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived employee organization commitment and job performance.

**Job performance.** Lastly, Ellinger et al. (2003) reported employee job performance correlates positively with managerial coaching. In this section, the authors described key outcome variables of managerial coaching and accordingly, proposed hypotheses with rationales. Based on the aforementioned literature, Figure 2 provides the hypothesized directionality of each
interaction within the hypothesized conceptual model—key references for each hypothesis are also noted.

**Methods**

Included in this section is a brief description of the population of the study, the sample of the study and demographic composition, the instruments utilized to collect data, the procedures employed for the data collection, and finally the data analysis strategy.
Figure 2. Hypothesized conceptual model of managerial coaching outcomes. Key references associated with each study variable and/or relationships between study variables are included. H = Hypothesis.
Population

For the current study, a government organization was selected as the participating organization that has 1,399 employees and is internationally recognized as one of the largest providers of workforce training in the United States and abroad. No study of managerial coaching outcomes was conducted in the government organization context, although there were a few studies conducted in business organizations (Ellinger et al., 2003; Hagen, 2008; Park, 2007).

Study Sample

A sample of 431 complete cases was used for the current study. This exceeded the sample size (302) suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) to appropriately represent the selected population (1,399). The item-respondent ratio employed for the analyses was 1:14 (31:431) (c.f. The item-respondent ratio for the initial 36 items was 12:1), and also exceeded the recommended ratio of 1:5 (Bentler & Chou, 1987) and even 1:10.

Demographic Characteristics

Among the 431 participants, male respondents \(n = 279, 64.7\%\) outnumbered female respondents \(n = 149, 34.6\%\). The sample represented a variety of age groups from less than 21 years to more than 65 years. The majority of the respondent ethnicity was Caucasian \(n = 362, 84\%\), although there existed several other ethnic groups. More than half of the respondents had an undergraduate or a higher degree of education \(n = 225, 52.9\%\).

Instrumentation

Consistent with the conceptual model and structural correlation hypotheses being tested, the survey for the current study included seven assessment instruments. They were managerial coaching behavior—8 items (Ellinger et al., 2003), satisfaction with work—3 items (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983), role ambiguity—6 items (Rizzo et al., 1970), satisfaction with
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Manager—3 items (Hackman & Oldham, 1974), career commitment—5 items (Blau, 1989), job performance—5 items (Carden, 2007), and organization commitment—6 items (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The instruments employed in the survey had a total of 36 items. Although the validity and reliability of the seven instruments have been established in previous studies, we estimated the construct validity and reliability to cross-validate and reconfirm instrument reliability using the aforementioned sample. Each item was presented as a seven-point Likert-type scale with 1, being “strongly disagree” to 7, being “strongly agree.”

Data Collection Procedure

An electronic survey was utilized to collect data. Three rounds of email invitation with the survey link were sent to 1,399 employees in the organization using their organization email accounts. Among the population of 1,399 employees, 508 (36.31%) entered the survey. Thirty-six cases (out of 508) were identified as inadmissible and 41 cases (out of 472) were incomplete; hence, they were removed from the final sample size by list-wise deletion, to keep the same number of cases in all analyses. The final sample of 431 complete cases was used for this study.

Data Screening

Prior to running the main data analyses, data were screened to investigate accuracy, missing data, multivariate and univariate normality, outliers, linearity, and multicollinearity and singularity (Kline, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) in the study. Results of data screening indicated that no transformation or special treatment was necessary for the collected data.

Data Analysis Strategy

The main data analyses in the study included principal component analysis (PCA) with a direct oblimin rotation, Cronbach’s alpha estimates for reliability, two-step modeling techniques for structural equation modeling (SEM), and Sobel tests for mediation effects. In particular, SEM
was utilized to examine if the hypothesized conceptual model and structural relationships at the conceptualization stage were supported by the empirical data of the study sample (Kline, 2005). The statistical software SPSS 16.0 was used for descriptive statistics, construct validity, and reliability estimation, while AMOS 16.0 was used for the SEM analysis. The Sobel calculator was used to examine mediating effects.

**Results**

The sample data in this study included 431 respondents. The means ($M$) for *managerial coaching behavior* (MCB), *satisfaction with work* (SW), *role ambiguity* (RA), *satisfaction with manager* (SM), *career commitment* (CC), *job performance* (JP), and *organization commitment* (OC) items were 5.30, 4.94, 5.58, 5.05, 5.13, 5.43, and 4.96, respectively. The standard deviation ($SD$) ranged from 1.05 to 1.89. In this section, the PCA, reliability analysis, SEM, and Sobel tests are reported.

**Results of Principal Component Analysis**

Factor analysis was conducted to uncover the latent factor structure of the survey combined of the seven instruments and to validate the instrument by demonstrating items loading on the same factor (Gorsuch, 1983). The PCA was chosen to extract factors from the 36 items in the current study. All estimated communality coefficients, except one (.38), were greater than .50 ($> .30$, Falk & Miller, 1992). This indicated that all 36 items were well represented in the factor space since their estimated communalities were reported as above .30. The PCA with a direct oblimin technique resulted in 31 items ($\geq .60$, Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) loading on six factors. Factor analytic findings also indicated that common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) was not a concern for the reported sample, since a single factor solution was not obtained. The PCA pattern matrix is provided in Table 1.
Table 1

*Principal Component Analysis: Pattern Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCB1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB5</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB6</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB7</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB8</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP1 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP2 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP3 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the common characteristics of the items, the six factors were labeled:

- **managerial coaching (MC)**
- **job performance (JP)**
- **career commitment (CC)**
- **role clarity (RC)**
- **organization commitment (OC)**
- **satisfaction with work (SW)**

Satisfaction with manager was incorporated into the new, hybrid factor of managerial coaching. Five (of 36) survey items (RA5, RA6, CC2, CC3, OC1) did not load (< .60) on any factor; hence, they were not included in further analyses.

**Estimates of Reliability**

Reliability estimation was conducted for the obtained six factors using Cronbach’s alpha technique. The results of the reliability analysis are provided in Table 2.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial Coaching</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with Work</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Clarity</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Commitment</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Performance</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Commitment</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 2, the six factors were found to be reliable. Cronbach’s alpha for all factors exceeded .85 (> .70, Kline, 2005). The Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted was computed to determine if there existed a bad item causing a significant decrease in the internal consistency among each of the six factors. All six factors had Cronbach’s alpha values of .74 or above (> .70, Kline, 2005) when any one item was deleted from the factor. Therefore, the estimates of reliability demonstrated that the 31 items were good items contributing to strong internal consistency and the items for each of the obtained six factors had excellent reliability.

**Results of Structural Equation Modeling**

The SEM analysis was conducted to investigate the hypothesized conceptual model and structural relationships. *Two-step modeling* (Anderson & Gerbing, 1998) was conducted: 1) to validate the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) measurement model and then, 2) to determine the goodness-of-fit of the structural model. A relative chi-square ($\chi^2/df$, $CMIN/DF$ in the AMOS outputs) value of 3 or less ($\leq 3$), a comparative fit index (CFI) score greater than .90 ($> .90$), an incremental fit index (IFI) score greater than .90 ($> .90$), and a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) score of .08 or less ($\leq .08$) were used to indicate the acceptable goodness-of-fit of the hypothesized conceptual model to the sample data (Bollen, 1989; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998; Kline, 2005).

**Results of CFA measurement modeling.** In the first step modeling, the CFA measurement model was identified by the study sample. The CFA model had a relative chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) greater than 3 ($\chi^2 = 1,406.43; df = 419; p = .00; \chi^2/df = 3.36$). Although the relative chi-square did not indicate the adequate goodness-of-fit ($\chi^2/df \leq 3$, Kline, 2005) of the CFA measurement model to the data, these results were not pervasive in the study since chi-square ($\chi^2$) relevant fit indexes are sensitive to the large sample sizes (Tabachnick & Fidell,
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To make a holistic evaluation of the CFA measurement model fit, three other fit indexes (CFI, IFI, and RMSEA) were examined. This holistic fit examination indicated that the CFA measurement model had an acceptable fit; CFI was .91 (> .90); IFI was .91 (> .90); and RMSEA was .07 (≤ .08) (Bollen, 1989; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998; Kline, 2005). Therefore, the CFA measurement model was sufficiently supported by the empirical data in the study.

**Results of structural modeling.** The structural model was found to have a relative chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) greater than 3 ($\chi^2 = 1,497.38; df = 424; p = .00; \chi^2/df = 3.53$). Although the relative chi-square did not exceed the highest desired threshold ($\chi^2/df$ < 3, Kline, 2005), the other three fit indexes revealed that the structural measurement model had an acceptable fit; CFI was .91 (> .90); IFI was .91 (> .90); and RMSEA was .08 (≤ .08) (Bollen, 1989; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998; Kline, 2005). Therefore, the holistic fit evaluation identified the structural model with an acceptable model fit. The structural model was adequately supported by the empirical data of the study sample.

To further investigate the predictability of the exogenous factor (or independent variable) in the hypothesized model, regression estimates were examined (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). A $p$-value of less than .05 (< .05) was used as the criterion statistic to determine if the degree of prediction was significant. Several of these estimates were significant even at the < .001 level. *Managerial coaching* was not found to be a significant predictor of *job performance*. Hence, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. *Managerial coaching* was found to be a significant predictor of *satisfaction with work* ($\beta = .48, p < .001$); Hypothesis 2a was supported. *Managerial coaching* was found to be a significant predictor of *role clarity* ($\beta = .71, p < .001$); Hypothesis 2b was supported. Next, *role clarity* was found to be a significant predictor of *satisfaction with work* ($\beta = .
= .32, p < .001); Hypothesis 3a was supported. Role clarity was found to be a significant predictor of job performance (β = .19, p < .05); Hypothesis 3b was supported. And, satisfaction with work was found to be a significant predictor of career commitment (β = .54, p < .001); Hypothesis 4a was supported. Satisfaction with work was not found to be a significant predictor of job performance. Hence, Hypothesis 4b was not supported. Satisfaction with work was found to be a significant predictor of organization commitment (β = .67, p < .001); Hypothesis 4c was supported. Career commitment was not found to be a significant predictor of job performance. Hence, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. Organization commitment was not found to be a significant predictor of job performance. Hence, Hypothesis 7 was not supported. In this six factor model, initial hypotheses 2c, 3c, 5a, 5b, 5c were not examined, since the research model regarding the obtained factors and items did not identify satisfaction with manager as an independent factor. The schematic representation of the hypothesized structural equation model analysis is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Schematic representation of hypothesized SEM. Standardized estimates are presented. ——> significant path. ——> non-significant path. *p < .05. **p < .001.
Test for Mediation Effects

To test the seven mediation effects in the hypothesized model, the Sobel test (for two-tailed) was conducted. A *p*-value of less than .05 (< .05) was used as the criterion statistic to determine if the mediation effect was significant. The Sobel test scores confirmed four mediating effects in the hypothesized model, *role clarity on satisfaction with work* (5.03, *p* < .05), *role clarity on job performance* (2.31, *p* < .05), *satisfaction with work on career commitment* (6.43, *p* < .05), and *satisfaction with work on organization commitment* (6.52, *p* < .05). Therefore, it was supported that *managerial coaching* had an indirect effect on *satisfaction with work, career commitment, job performance, and organization commitment*.

Discussion

In this section, the study results are discussed and compared with the literature. First, we address results of the PCA. The finding of having six factors, not seven, was unexpected. A possible interpretation of this result is that managerial coaching behavior is very closely related with an effective managerial and leadership behavior, which can directly satisfy their employees in organizations. Another possible interpretation is that managerial coaching behavior and satisfaction with manager are known to be theoretically or conceptually different constructs but they share common aspects in reality, at least their empirical measures. Hence, these two item sets were examined collectively. A potential overlap of similar language usage between the two sets was identified. Three other experts in HRD reviewed the two item sets and expressed a possible difficulty in distinguishing one from the other. Therefore, it was reasoned that these two measures likely had undifferentiated face validity for a majority of study participants.
The hypothesized conceptual model and structural relationships were tested and supported by the empirical data of the study sample. The hypothesized model provided clear and comprehensive illustrations of how managerial coaching affects work and organization-related variables. Most of all, since there is no widely accepted theory or model for managerial coaching outcomes, the current hypothesized model has the potential to make a foundational contribution to managerial coaching research. In specific, Hypotheses 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4c were fully supported by the empirical data in this study. These findings are consistent with anticipated results and are in line with similar earlier studies (also see Figure 2). Current study findings demonstrated that managerial coaching had a direct impact on employee satisfaction with work and role clarity and an indirect impact on satisfaction with work, career commitment, job performance, and organization commitment.

Findings associated with Hypotheses 1, 4b, 6, and 7 were not anticipated or were contradictory to the majority of the earlier literature. Most coaching literature identified job performance improvement as a direct outcome of managerial coaching (Hypothesis 1). However, the result of regression analysis in the current study indicated that job performance was not a direct outcome of managerial coaching. Alternatively, role clarity, as a direct outcome of managerial coaching, influenced job performance—such mediation was consistent with the hypothesized model for the study. This might be because, in the current study, job performance was self-reported rather than “other-reported.” Self-rated job performance tends to be not accurate enough or to be more highly scored than manager or peer-rated job performance does (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004).

Traditionally, it had been shown that satisfaction with work has a significant positive relationship to job performance (Hypothesis 4b), although the previously established relationship
is weak. However, in this study self-reported employee satisfaction was not tied clearly to reported on-the-job performance. Pressure for producing goods or services might concurrently decrease satisfaction with work and increase productivity, thus moderating the relationship between the two (Triandis, 1959). Another key reason for this conflicting finding may be the work and organization context employed for the current study (Perry & Rainey, 1988). Stagnant bureaucracies tend not to provide employees with sufficient flexibility and performance-related support to improve their job performance (Posner & Schmidt, 1996). At the same time, government employees are often more security oriented so that they may be very satisfied with their level of job security (Khojasteh, 1993). Thus, the work and organization context might alter the relationship between satisfaction with work and job performance.

The current study findings indicated that career commitment did not have a significant positive relationship with job performance, and added a non-traditional notion to the area of career commitment (Hypothesis 6). It may be that job performance is not always a significant result of career commitment, but, rather, a result of one’s knowledge and skills. Also, as in the findings of Hypothesis 4b, the type of organization (Perry & Rainey, 1988) may be a factor here, too. Government employees may be committed to their career because of stability and performance may be less of a factor because of lack of upward mobility and constraints that government organizations place on individual employees (Khojasteh, 1993). Moreover, in some government organizations promotion is still based on seniority and length of service (Selby Smith, 1993). Thus, the type of organization may moderate the relationship between career commitment and job performance in the current study.

These study findings indicated that organization commitment was not a significant predictor of job performance (Hypothesis 7). Perhaps, there are boundary conditions to consider
as earlier researchers suggested: the work and organization-related variables may be associated with status hierarchies, such as occupational level and competency and organization position rank and tenure, or possible moderator variables (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Wright and Bonett (2002) reported that the correlation between organization commitment and job performance was strongest among new employees and declined exponentially over time. Also, same as the above, a government organization context may yield different results in employee affective and performance-related outcomes. In their study, Balfour and Wechsler (1991) reported that although government employee organization commitment had a significant positive relationship with their desire to stay in the organization, their commitment to the organization was found not to have a significant relationship to their willingness to put forth extra effort for the organization. Therefore, increased organization commitment may not necessarily result in improved job performance in government organizations. Further investigations examining public-private organization distinctions are warranted.

**Implications for HRD Research, Theory, and Practice**

The study findings have several implications for HRD researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners. First, these study results provide empirical support to the potential but unexamined advantages of managerial coaching. Although extant practitioner reports, editorials, and conceptual literature have implied potential positive outcomes of managerial coaching, few empirical studies were reported to examine these claims more closely. The hypothesized model of managerial coaching outcomes in this study was sufficiently supported by the empirical data of the study sample. Therefore, this study provides comprehensive empirical support to the proposed benefits of managerial coaching in organizations.
Second, the current study provides further support for related theories—path-goal leadership, career motivation, and organization support. The findings from the current study indicated that managerial coaching influences these identified variables of employee affective and performance-related outcomes, as informed by a priori selected theories. Managerial coaching, as an effective management and leadership behavior, a means of supervisor and organization support, and a form of POS in each of these theories, motivates and satisfies employees and improves their commitment and performance toward designated goal achievement. Therefore, these theories provided insight to the current study and in turn, the current study enhances the selected theories by offering additional empirical support to them.

Third, the current study presents a clearer picture of managerial coaching practice in organizations. The hypothesized model of managerial coaching outcomes in the study illustrated how managerial coaching affects employee work and organization-related outcome variables, including satisfaction with work, role clarity, career commitment, job performance, and organization commitment. Findings of the current study may not only assist managers and leaders to understand how their managerial action affects employee cognition, attitude, and behavior, but also identify and focus on specific coaching behaviors to maximize their management and leadership effectiveness in organizations. Furthermore, organizations can use this coaching competency for hiring and developing effective managers and leaders as coach.

**Limitations of the Study**

While the current study provides important findings and implications, it also includes limitations. First, self-reported data is a limitation of the current study. As with any self-report measure, there exists a possibility of difference between the respondent perception and actual performance. And, the potential for nonresponse bias is another limitation in the current study.
Since nonresponse bias may lead to a misrepresentation of the population parameter, it may weaken conclusions based on study findings or mask the true relationships between two or more variables among the population (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). Last, a single type of organization leaves uncertainties about generalizability of the findings in the current study. As evidenced by increasing comparative studies in management and public administration literature, there may exist distinctions between the private and public organizations and their employee responses (Perry & Rainey, 1988).

**Recommendations and Directions for Future Research**

Future research is needed to confirm and extend the current studies on managerial coaching. Although the hypothesized model was adequately supported by the current study data, further study and use of additional research contexts may extend the efficacy of this managerial coaching model. To check the invariance of the hypothesized model among various sample groups, this model needs to be tested with multiple samples. In particular, another organization type, such as profit or non-for-profit organization, can be employed to test if the model operates the same across organization types in future research.

Construct validity of managerial coaching also needs to be further established. Since managerial coaching is an emerging research area, concepts, processes, and competencies of managerial coaching are still evolving (Hamlin et al., 2008). In this study, managerial coaching survey items unexpectedly loaded together with satisfaction with manager. More studies are needed to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of a managerial coaching construct. In addition, the outcome variable, satisfaction with manager, needs to be further examined.

Future researchers can employ other correlates or outcomes. Leader-member exchange is a potential correlate of managerial coaching (Joo, 2007) and employee turnover is another likely
outcome (Park, 2007). Organization citizenship behavior appears to be a potential outcome of managerial coaching, since organization citizenship behavior is closely related with management and leadership, work environment support, job satisfaction, and organization commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Northouse, 2001; Spector, 1997).

Lastly, it is highly suggested that researchers further examine relationships between coaching and HRD, more broadly. Hamlin et al. (2008) initiated comprehensive reviews of coaching-and-HRD research, theory, and practice toward the development of stronger links between the two. Since coaching is an emerging and fast growing industry and has recently emerged as a critical contemporary method of HRD (Hamlin et al., 2008; McLean et al., 2005), HRD researchers need to further establish and illuminate coaching, both managerial coaching and executive coaching, in the context of HRD.
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