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Abstract

**Purpose:** This study sought to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how managers’ coaching skills can affect individual performance through the mediating role of affective commitment.

**Design/methodology/approach:** The sample included 198 employees from diverse organizations. Based on an online survey, respondents assessed their managers’ coaching skills and reported their own individual performance and affective commitment to their organization.

**Findings:** The findings show that managers’ coaching skills have a positive impact on individual performance and affective commitment, with the latter mediating the relationship between the first two variables.

**Research limitations/implications:** Additional studies with larger samples are needed to understand more fully not only the impact of managers’ coaching skills on individual performance but also other psychosocial variables affecting that relationship.

**Practical implications:** Organizations can increase employees’ affective commitment and individual performance by encouraging managers to integrate more coaching skills into their leadership styles.

**Originality/value:** This study is the first to integrate managers’ coaching skills, affective commitment, and individual performance into a single research model, thereby extending previous research on this topic.

**Keywords:** managers’ coaching skill, affective commitment, individual performance
1. Introduction

Given the current challenging business environments in which competitiveness and pressures are growing stronger, coaching has become a pertinent managerial activity in organizations. Coaching contributes to making individuals and organizations more effective by achieving positive, significant outcomes and changing attitudes, behaviors, thoughts, or emotions (Hagen, 2012; Joo, 2005; Milner et al., 2018; Peltier, 2001; Peterson, 1996). Much of the research on coaching has focused on executive coaching in which an external coach comes into organizations to coach individual executives on how to improve their performance, develop executive behaviors, and enhance their careers (McCarthy and Milner, 2013; Milner et al., 2018; Weer et al., 2015). Less is known about internal coaches who work with employees (McCarthy and Milner, 2013).

Employees’ commitment, performance, and organizational success can be deeply influenced by how well managers coach subordinates. Thus, understanding what managers as coaches should do in organizations is important, including the ways they influence their subordinates and the skills and characteristics these managers need to have. Researchers have proposed that effective coaching has become an essential element of management and a crucial skill when developing sustainable leadership (Boyatzis et al., 2006; Liu and Batt, 2010).

Coaching can be understood as a management philosophy that seeks to change the relationships between managers and employees (Ellinger et al., 2003a). Coaching behaviors epitomizing positive dimensions of leadership should lead to positive performance results (Hagen and Peterson, 2015). Organizations are, therefore, increasingly expecting managers to coach their subordinates since research has confirmed positive correlations between coaching and employee satisfaction, performance, and achievement of organizational goals (Ellinger et al., 2011; Wheeler, 2011). These outcomes constitute relevant reasons why managers need to adopt coaching as part of their practices.

The extensive changes currently taking place in business settings mean managers must assume coaching roles (Ellinger, 2013). However, the role of managers in coaching has been found to be the
most difficult, problematic, and controversial coaching task of all (Bresser, 2011; Cox et al., 2010; She et al., 2019). Despite the popularity of managerial coaching in organizations (Dello Russo et al., 2017), empirical research on this topic is still in its infancy, with only a few studies investigating individual (Agarwal et al., 2009; Hagen, 2010; Huang and Hsieh, 2015; Hsieh and Huang, 2018; Liu and Batt, 2010) and organizational outcomes (Dello Russo et al., 2017; Ellinger, 2013; Hagen, 2010; Zuñiga-Collazos et al., 2020). Research on the relationships between managers’ coaching skills and employees’ attitudes and behaviors is also still scarce (Ellinger, 2013; Gilley et al., 2010; Hagen, 2012; Huang and Hsieh, 2015; Hsieh and Huang, 2018; Tanskanen et al., 2018).

Given this context, the present research’s aim was to examine the association between managers’ coaching skills and employees’ affective commitment to the organization and individual performance. This study’s findings could prove beneficial to managers and organizations, providing insights into the impact of managerial coaching on workers’ affective commitment and explaining how managers’ skills in this area potentially improve employees’ individual performance. Managerial coaching skills as a potential antecedent of affective commitment and individual performance has not been explored so far, therefore, this study contributes to better manage people and organizations. According to Gilley et al. (2010), managerial coaching facilitates organizational development, strategic management of human capital, and improved functioning of organizations.

2. Research Background and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Managers’ coaching skills

During the 1980s and 90s, the application of coaching as a concept and set of techniques to the practice of management expanded quickly (McLean et al., 2005). In 1981, the management consultancy firm, Personnel Decisions International, was the first to offer a coaching program that was both structured and personalized to help companies promote individual change and development. Two empirical studies found that this coaching program produced significant changes that lasted at least two years after personnel finished the program (Peterson, 1996). Other previous research has
focused on subordinates’ perceptions of coaching relationships (Graham et al., 1993) and demonstrated the impact of coaching on important organizational outcomes (e.g., Ellinger, 2013; Gilley et al., 2010; Huang and Hsieh, 2015; Hsieh and Huang, 2018; Tanskanen et al., 2018).

The literature on leadership suggests that coaching is linked to effective management behaviors (Anderson et al., 2009; Hagen, 2010; Kinicki et al., 2011). Managers are increasingly expected to adopt coaching in their leadership practices, namely, to act as coaches focused on producing learning, behavioral change, and growth (Joo, 2005; She et al., 2019). Thus, managers must develop a better understanding of coaching skills and behaviors.

Two approaches appear to be dominant in the coaching literature: a behavioral-based approach (Ellinger et al., 2003), and a skills-based approach (McLean et al., 2005). In the first, managerial coaching is seen exclusively as a behavioral indicator, identified through specific behaviors exhibited by managers (Hagen and Peterson, 2015). The skills-based approach (McLean et al., 2005; Park et al., 2008) conceives managers as coaches if they displayed not only behaviors, but also attitudes or beliefs that support a coaching mentality (Hagen and Peterson, 2015). Skills are more attitudinal, cognitive and affective in nature, and are related to aptitude and ability. Hence, skill-based measures include questions that require personal cognition regarding one’s own, or a supervisor’s tendencies, abilities, and other motivations (Hagen and Peterson, 2015). The present study adopted the later approach to managerial coaching skills conceptualization.

McLean et al. (2005) developed a four-dimensional framework of coaching that defines this as a set of managerial skills. These include effective coaching characteristics in terms of (1) maintaining effective and open communication, (2) focusing on teams, (3) valuing people over tasks, and (4) accepting the ambiguous nature of working environments in order to enhance employees’ development and improve their performance. McLean et al. (2005) also validated a multidimensional measure of managerial coaching skills, later revised by Park et al. (2008), that has been extensively used to analyze managerial coaching skills and its consequents (Hagen and Peterson, 2015).
According to McCarthy and Milner (2013), researchers have identified still other specific coaching behaviors as desirable in leaders. These are cultivating listening skills and communication that involves others, setting clear performance expectations, increasing self-awareness, providing constructive feedback, and having regular conversations between leaders or coaches and subordinates in which individual and organizational goals are discussed (Larsson and Vinberg, 2010; Sparks and Gentry, 2008). Interpersonal effectiveness, empathy, patience, adaptability, and problem solving are also examples of a specific set of skills that managers as coaches must have if they are to be successful in this area (Ladyshewsky, 2010).

In addition, empirical evidence has been found that managers who provide coaching are viewed more positively (Fry et al., 1986). By listening, asking critical questions, and providing performance feedback (Ellinger et al., 2003a), managers who act as coaches generate appreciation in subordinates and improve the quality of relationship with these employees (Hsieh and Huang, 2018). Employees “repay” these efforts by demonstrating work attitudes and behaviors desirable and valuable to their managers and organization, such as affective commitment to the organization and enhanced performance.

2.2 Managers’ coaching skills and employees’ affective commitment

Affective commitment is a component of the organizational commitment construct, which refers to employees’ positive emotional attachment to their organization and which is characterized by an identification and involvement with their workplace (Allen and Meyer, 2000). The literature reveals that affective commitment has desirable impacts for organizations (Meyer et al., 2002), so managers need to be able to develop this attachment in their employees (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001).

Coaching has been found to promote organizational commitment. The principle of reciprocity evoked in social exchange theory (e.g., Blau, 1964) suggests that employees who receive coaching will show their appreciation by developing a sense of attachment to their organization (Onyemah,
Previous studies have confirmed that, when managers coach employees, the latter’s organizational commitment improves (Ellinger et al., 2003a; Kim et al., 2013; Woo, 2017). Managerial coaching can thus be regarded as a form of perceived organization support of workers. This theoretical framework (see Eisenberger et al. [2002]) explains that employees and their organizations reciprocate commitment (Kim, 2014) because managers with coaching skills act as agents of organizations (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988).

Managers who adopt a coaching managerial style have empathy for and trust in others, less need for controlling and directing others, a desire to help others develop, openness to feedback and personalized learning, and a belief that most individuals want to learn (Berg and Karlssen, 2016; Ellinger and Bostrom, 2002a, 2002b). These managers establish trust and build good relationships with their employees and, consequently, enhance subordinates’ positive feelings and work experiences, which, in turn, increase the latter’s affective commitment.

These findings are consistent with prior research on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. That is, mutual respect, good communication, and common goals promote higher quality leader-member relationships (e.g., Illies et al., 2007), and the quality of these relationships influences leaders and subordinates’ attitudes and behaviors (Gerstner and Day, 1997). According to the latter cited authors, exchanges between managers and subordinates influence satisfaction with managers and organizational commitment.

As per social cognitive theory, human functioning is a dynamic system comprising reciprocal relationships among three categories of determinants: behavior, cognition, and performance environment (Bandura, 1986). This theory suggests that leadership style is a critical external factor which does not directly influence individual behavior, yet indirectly influences psychological cognitive factor (Rauniyar et al., 2017).

Therefore, managers with coaching skills help employees grow professionally while establishing good relationships with their subordinates. These leaders adopt a coaching managerial style that includes listening, helping, supporting, developing, removing obstacles, and empowering
others (Berg and Karlsen, 2016), thus promoting more positive work experiences. Consistent with the foregoing research, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H1:** Employees’ perceptions of managers’ coaching skills are positively related to these subordinates’ affective commitment.

### 2.3 Managers’ coaching skills and employees’ individual performance

Employees’ individual performance refers to a set of individual behaviors or actions that are relevant to achieving their organization’s goals (Campbell, 1990). According to Campbell et al. (1993), employees’ performance is the extent to which their job is done well, namely, accomplishing job-related responsibilities to a satisfactory extent or the level expected by their employer.

Coaching has been linked to job performance (Agarwal et al., 2009; Ellinger et al., 2003a; Gilley et al., 2010; Hagen, 2010; Liu and Batt, 2010). Researchers have suggested that coaching improves the performance and/or effectiveness (Styhre, 2008) of both individuals and their organization (Ellinger et al., 2003a; Hunt and Weintraub, 2002; Zuñiga-Collazos et al., 2020). According to Onyemah (2009), coaching has been cited by sales professionals as an important way that sales managers can motivate their employees and enhance their performance (e.g., Rich, 1998). Bowles et al. (2007) also confirmed the impact of coaching on middle managers and their subordinates’ performance within a military recruiting organization.

However, as previously mentioned, few studies have investigated the relationship between managers with coaching skills and employees’ job performance (Huang and Hsieh, 2015; Liu and Batt, 2010). More specifically, empirical research has rarely simultaneously examined the effects of managers’ coaching on employees’ performance via affective attachment as an important driver of workers’ development and achievement.

The current study expected that managers with coaching skills improve their employees’ performance. Managers who adopt coaching as part of their managerial practices truly care about their subordinates and want to help them thrive. According to social exchange theory, employees
have a perceived obligation to reciprocate high quality relationships with managers (Blau, 1964). This encourages employees to check whether they have done things correctly and solved the right problems and to evaluate their successes and failures (Schippers et al., 2007), thereby improving their performance. As per social cognitive theory, employees will positively respond to the external environment by self-regulating their psychological cognitive factor (e.g. self-efficacy), which affects the employee’s behaviors (Rauniyar et al., 2017). This theory highlights that individuals with high self-efficacy will persistently put their effort to address uncertainties and potential challenges and this characteristic motivates employees to apply more efforts in the pursuit of the chosen goal (Rauniyar et al., 2017).

According to Hirst et al. (2004), facilitative leadership behaviors such as promoting the expression of ideas and opinions, stimulating positive interpersonal relationships, and facilitating productive conflict resolution produces a positive environment in which individuals can reflect on their performance. The effects of feedback interventions on performance have been also demonstrated (Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). In fact, the provision of feedback is critical to individuals’ learning and performance improvement in the context of their work (Mulder and Ellinger, 2013). Therefore, the behaviors that are related to a coaching managerial style create an atmosphere in which individual performance is enhanced. Withmore (2017) has demonstrated the relevance of coaching for performance. Many high-profile companies have declared they are getting free of the performance reviews and replacing them with ongoing coaching and feedback (Mueller-Hanson and Pulakos, 2018).

According to Ellinger et al. (2003b), managers’ coaching behaviors improve employee performance at the individual and group levels. Ellinger et al. (2003a) further found that supervisory coaching is positively associated with employees’ job satisfaction and good performance. Thus, managers’ coaching skills help subordinates consider and discover how they might work and behave more effectively to promote better outcomes (Wakefield, 2006). In view of these considerations, the following hypothesis was proposed:
H2: Employees’ perceptions of managers’ coaching skills are positively related to these subordinates’ performance.

2.4 Affective commitment and individual performance

The results of empirical studies measuring organizational commitment indicate that affective commitment repeatedly correlates more strongly with consequences such as turnover and performance (e.g., Solinger et al., 2008; Stazyk et al., 2011). For example, Solinger et al. (2008) confirmed previous meta-analyses’ findings (Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran, 2005; Meyer et al., 2002) that affective commitment correlates more directly with performance than do other components of organizational commitment. Employees who have a high level of affective commitment have a strong sense of identification and belonging within their organization. Thus, affectively committed workers tend to exhibit higher levels of satisfaction and better performance, in addition to lower rates of absenteeism and turnover intentions (Meyer et al., 2002; Ribeiro et al., 2020).

According to Lages and Piercy (2012, p. 4), employees who possess high levels of affective commitment are more willing to “go beyond job specification, [and] to share solutions to problems with coworkers, encouraging them to contribute with suggestions and ideas for service improvements.” In other words, affective commitment predicts organizational citizenship behaviors (Liu, 2009; Meyer et al., 2002; Vandenabeele, 2009). These behaviors are valuable to organizations because this conduct is associated with improved employee performance and more effective organizations (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

In a more recent article, Delić et al. (2017) report that empirically robust research has found that affectively committed employees have a predisposition to achieve better performance. Ribeiro et al. (2018) have confirmed this predisposition. Therefore, the present study expected that a similar relationship would reveal itself in this research, which suggested the following hypothesis:

H3: Employees’ affective commitment is positively related to their performance.
2.5 Affective commitment’s mediation of the relationship between managers’ coaching skills and individual performance

Ribeiro et al. (2018) found that transformational leaders promote employees’ affective commitment which, in turn, increases their individual performance. This leadership style includes managerial coaching skills and behaviors discussed in the literature. On the other wise, House (1996, p. 327) defines supportive leadership as “behavior directed toward the satisfaction of subordinates’ needs and preferences, such as displaying concern for subordinates’ welfare and creating a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment.” This kind of behavior is parallel to a coaching managerial style, which involves listening, asking critical questions, providing performance feedback (Ellinger et al., 2003a), focusing on teamwork, and valuing people over tasks. In addition, managers with coaching skills understand that the more ambiguous qualities of workplaces can contribute to employee development (McLean et al., 2005) and create a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment (House, 1996; Kuo et al., 2017). Their employees’ perceptions of being valued and cared for influence their emotional attachment to the organization (Allen et al., 2003; Battistelli et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016; Sharma and Dhar, 2016). In turn, affectively committed workers tend to improve their performance (Leroy et al., 2012; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Ribeiro et al., 2018; Riketta, 2002).

Managers who function as coaches foster appreciation in their employees and improve the quality of leader-follower relationships by building them around confidence in workers’ capabilities (Ladyshewsky, 2010). This thus promotes higher quality leader-follower relationships (e.g., Illies et al., 2007; Hsieh and Huang, 2018), to which employees respond by demonstrating affective commitment. Consequently, affectively committed employees are predisposed to achieving better performance (Delić et al., 2017; Ribeiro et al., 2018).

In other words, if employees are stimulated by managers with coaching skills to be affectively committed to their organization, this contributes positively to enhancing their performance. Based on the above findings, the following hypothesis was proposed:
**H4:** Affective commitment mediates the relationship between employees’ perceptions of managers’ coaching skills and these subordinates’ performance.

The research model is depicted in Figure 1.

*Please insert Figure 1 here.*

3. **Methods**

3.1 **Procedures and sample**

To test the research hypotheses, a self-report survey was administered to a non-probabilistic, convenience sample. A Google Docs-based survey was sent via e-mail and LinkedIn to individuals working in different organizations in Portugal. Information on research goals, the confidentiality of the data collected, and respondents’ anonymity was provided in the questionnaire.

The final sample included 197 employees from various organizations, of which 59% were females. The respondents were quite mature, with nearly 78% between 36 and 55 years old. The surveyed individuals’ level of education was as follows: 2.6% with nine years of schooling or less, 12.2% with 12 years, and 85.2% with a higher education degree. Regarding job tenure, 16.3% of the respondents had been employed in their organizations for less than one year, 34.7% from one to three years, 14.3% from four to six years, 20.9% from seven to ten years, and 13.8% more than ten years. The average contact time employees had had with their managers was slightly shorter on average, with 26% having less than one year, 41.3% from one to three years, 13.3% from four to six years, 13.3% from seven to ten years, and 6.2% more than ten years.

3.2 **Measures**

The constructs were measured with validated scales adapted from the relevant literature. Using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = “Does not apply at all”; 7 = “Applies completely”), employees were asked to indicate to what extent each statement presented applied to them (i.e., affective commitment and individual performance) or to their managers (i.e., perceptions of managerial coaching skills).

*Managerial coaching skills (predictor variable).* This variable was measured with 20 items
adapted from McLean et al.’s (2005) work. The cited authors validated a multi-dimensional measure of managerial coaching skills with four dimensions: open communication, team approach, value given to people, and acceptance of ambiguity. This was adapted for measuring employees’ perceptions of their managers’ skills, which includes not only behaviors, but also attitudes and beliefs that support a coaching mentality (Hagen and Peterson, 2015).

The items were translated from English into Portuguese by one translator and then independently back-translated into English by another translator (Brislin, 1970). The translators discussed any discrepancies between the original and back-translated versions. The final version was examined once again by the translators and two bilingual Portuguese scholars.

**Affective commitment (mediator variable).** Three items adapted from Rego et al. (2011) were used to measure affective commitment.

**Individual performance (criterion variable).** We used four items developed by Staples et al. (1999) and used widely by other authors such as Rego and Cunha (2008), who have translated it into Portuguese, to access employees’ individual performance. Thus, research used a self-rated measure and not an objective one. Although there are speculations that self-report measures have the susceptibility to inflate research outcomes, several authors, including Alzghoul et al. (2018) and Karatepe and Uludag (2008), argue that variables such as job performance can be measured using self-report since using a self-report measure does not inevitably result in systematic bias.

**Demographic variables.** We collected the information on respondents’ demographics, such as age, gender, qualifications, and tenure as measured by years employed in the organization, and the contact time (years) with their managers.

4. **Results**

SPSS version 25 and AMOS version 25 software was used to carry out factor analyses and test the hypotheses. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was conducted to examine the mediation relationship. The use of SPSS and AMOS facilitated testing both direct and indirect relationships simultaneously. To test the hypotheses, a bootstrapping procedure with 500 re-samples was applied
(Chin, 1998).

4.1 Preliminarily analysis to the measurement instruments

Before conducting the confirmatory factor analysis, sampling adequacy was analyzed by looking at the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic. The value obtained for this statistic is 0.87, which is higher than the recommended cut-off point of 0.6. The significance of Barlett’s test of sphericity further confirmed that the sample variances are equal to the population (Snedecor and Cochran, 1989). Normality was checked using skewness and kurtosis values. The observed skewness and kurtosis statistics are less than the cut-off value of 3.29, so the sample was considered to have a normal distribution.

In this study, the data were collected using a single source method, raising concerns about potential common-method variance (CMV). To assess the threat of this bias, Harman’s single factor test was first conducted, showing that the first factor only accounted for 33.4% of the 67.4% explained variance of all items. We, second, added a common latent factor in our estimation and the squared unstandardized coefficients indicated a common variance of 8.4%, which together suggesting that CMV is not a serious problem (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986; Podsakoff et al., 2003; Eichhorn, 2014).

4.2 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to the measurement instruments

To test the structural model, individual CFA models were developed for each measurement. A higher order CFA model was also run for managerial coaching skills. In the first step, CFA models based on the existing and validated variables were developed and then modified to ensure the models’ goodness of fit. While all the models exhibited a good fit with the data, the acceptance of ambiguity first order CFA model did not show good convergent validity since the average variance extracted (AVE) was less than the recommended cut-off point of 0.5. Thus, the item “… considers conflict in the workplace stimulating” which had the lowest loading coefficient, was removed. The re-run CFA model’s results demonstrated a good fit, as shown in Table 1 below.
In the remaining first order CFA models, all items were kept because first these had already been validated by their authors and second, these models estimation showed a good fit with the data. For instance, all four items of the individual performance factor have loadings greater than 0.6 and the fit indices are in accepted range (Hair et al., 2010). The higher order CFA model for managerial coaching skills was developed by combining four latent variables (i.e., dimensions). The CFA analyses are summarized in Table 1.

Regarding the models’ goodness of fit, the factor loadings are all greater than 0.5, indicating good measures for the factors included in this study. In addition, as summarized in Table 1, the obtained fit indices of the six first order CFAs (i.e., comparative fit index [CFI], normed fit index [NFI], and root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA]) all indicated that the models fit well with the data. The higher order CFA model also shows a good fit ($\chi^2 = 145.036; \text{df} = 126; p = 0.118; \text{CFI} = 0.990; \text{NFI} = 0.990; \text{and RMSEA} = 0.028$).

### 4.3 Reliability, validity and correlations analysis

Convergent validity was assessed using AVE values, which show the amount of variance that is captured by constructs in relation to the amount of variance due to measurement error. The present study’s models have AVE values above the cut-off point of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2010), indicating adequate convergence (see Table 2).

Discriminant validity was checked by examining the correlations between factors. The correlations between the constructs included are not overly high (see Table 2 above) and less than the square root of AVE, suggesting discriminant validity is present (Hair et al., 2010). All the scales were found to be reliable, with composite reliabilities varying from 0.86 to 0.96, which are above the cut-off point of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2010). The Cronbach’s alpha values also range from 0.78 to 0.94, indicating the scales’ reliability (Kline, 2011; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994) (see Table 2 above).
Regarding the correlation matrices for variables used in the hypotheses testing, the results show that managerial coaching skills, affective commitment and individual performance are positively correlated with each other (Table 2 above). All correlations are significant at the 1% level. None of the sociodemographic variables correlate significantly with individual performance, so none of these variables were included in subsequent analyses.

4.4 Hypothesis testing

The estimation of direct and mediating effects is presented in Table 3. The results show that managerial coaching skills positively influences affective commitment and individual performance. These relationships are statistically significant (p < 0.01) (see Model 1 and Model 2 in Table 3). Therefore, the hypotheses 1 and 2 were confirmed.

*Please insert Table 3 here.*

Regarding the relationship between affective commitment and individual performance, the results reveal a statistically significant positive link (p < 0.001), so hypothesis 3 was also supported by the results. In addition, the fit of all direct effect models was confirmed as acceptable.

A test was also conducted using SEM analysis of the mediation effect of affective commitment on the relationship between managerial coaching skills and individual performance. As shown in Figure 2, managerial coaching influences individual performance ($\beta = 0.130$). Managerial coaching skills, in turn, have a significantly positive relationship with affective commitment (i.e., the mediator), and affective commitment influences individual performance. In addition, the results show a change in the path coefficient from 0.130 to 0.081, thus indicating a mediation effect (MacKinnon et al., 2007).

*Please insert Figure 2*

Our results further reveal a higher R squared effect-size for the mediation model (0.124) than for the direct model (0.042), implying that the mediation model can explain more of the variance in the criterion variable. In other words, the increase in R squared confirms the presence of a mediation
effect of affective commitment on the relationship between managerial coaching skills and individual performance. In addition, this is a partial mediation effect because the direct and indirect effects are all significant. We tested the significance of this partial mediation effect using the bootstrapping technique, which provided evidence of a significant mediation effect (p = 0.001). The mediation model’s fit indices also demonstrate a good fit. These results taken together confirm hypothesis 4.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 Main findings

The results indicate that employees’ perceptions of their managers’ coaching skills stimulate these workers’ affective commitment to their organization. LMX theory and social cognitive theory offer some insights into how coaching can have an impact on attitudes such as affective commitment (Onyemah, 2009). Managers who adopt a coaching managerial style help subordinates grow professionally, as well as establishing and developing relationships built on trust with their subordinates (Hsieh and Huang, 2018). Consequently, employees experience enhanced positive feelings and work experiences, which, in turn, increase their affective commitment.

The present results also show that employees’ positive perceptions of managers’ coaching skills promote these subordinates’ individual performance. This finding coincides with Ellinger et al.’s (2003b) conclusion, that managers’ coaching behaviors improve employee performance. According to the principle of reciprocity and social exchange theory (e.g., Blau, 1964), and social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), workers who perceive their managers’ coaching skills as good develop more effective behaviors that promote better outcomes (Wakefield, 2006), thereby improving these employees’ performance.

The current results further confirm that affective commitment explains employees’ individual performance, suggesting that, when workers have an affective attachment to their organization, they develop a stronger focus on achieving objectives, tend to perform their jobs better and become more productive (Delić et al., 2017; Leroy et al., 2012; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002;
Finally, the present study’s results suggest that the relationship between employees’ perceptions of their managers’ coaching skills and their own individual performance is mediated by affective commitment. In other words, managerial coaching promotes affective commitment, which in turn, increases workers’ individual performance. This effect may occur because managers with coaching skills build trust relationships with their employees and believe in their capabilities (Ladyshewsky, 2010; Hsieh and Huang, 2018). Therefore, managerial coaching skills contribute to friendly, supportive workplaces, and employees’ perceptions of being valued and cared for influence their emotional attachment to their organization (Battistelli et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016; Sharma and Dhar, 2016). In turn, affectively committed employees tend to “repay” managerial coaching by improving their performance (Leroy et al., 2012; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Ribeiro et al., 2018; Riketta, 2002).

These findings are consistent with research on transformational leadership which core focus is development. For instance, Ribeiro et al. (2018) found that transformational leaders promote employees’ affective commitment which, in turn, increases their individual performance. The traditional conceptualization of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) associated a “moral” significance with this style of leadership, because leaders are responsible for their employees’ growth and the ethical dimension strongly characterizes a coaching-managerial style, so that a “leader-coach” acts according to moral principles (Dello Russo et al., 2017). As such, the quality of relationships between managers and subordinates may play an important role in the extent to which employees develop positive attitudes and behaviors. According to the results of the present study, managerial coaching has also emerged as an integral element for the success of an organization (Ellinger et al., 2011). In sum, a meaningful coaching culture has the potential to transform the relationship between organizations and employees and to put both on the path to long-term success (Withmore, 2017).

5.2 Theoretical contributions and implications for management
The findings of this study have practical implications for the business world and can contribute to the development of the theory of coaching at the workplace.

The existing literature reports that managers are increasingly expected to coach their employees (McCarthy and Milner, 2013) but research on the relationship between managers’ coaching skills and employees’ attitudes and behaviors remains scarce (Hsieh and Huang, 2018; Tanskanen et al., 2018).

The current study’s findings are consistent with theoretical research on transformational leadership which core focus is development, as well as situational leadership where one of the leaders’ behavior is coaching, thus these findings contribute to the development of managerial theory. This research answered the call for empirical research from those who have argued that more empirical studies need to be done on the links between managers’ coaching behaviors and employees’ attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Dello Russo et al., 2017; Ellinger et al., 2003a; Huang and Hsieh, 2015; Hsieh and Huang, 2018; Tanskanen et al., 2018). Tanskanen et al. (2018) report that the relationships between managers and employees do not yet feature strongly in studies of managerial coaching. Therefore, from a theoretical perspective, the present study is innovative, contributing to a deeper understanding of the psychosocial mechanisms through which managers’ coaching skills influence employees’ outcomes, specifically individual performance in the business context. This study also expanded the understanding of managerial coaching practices through the LMX theory, social exchange theory and social cognitive theory.

From a practical perspective, this study’s findings provide potential benefits to managers and organizations through insights into the impact of managerial coaching on employees’ affective commitment and the ways these two factors can increase their individual performance. Therefore, managers should develop coaching skills such as maintaining open communication, adopting a team approach, giving value to people, and accepting ambiguity. More specifically, managerial coaching includes listening, asking critical questions, setting clear performance expectations, cultivating self-
awareness, giving constructive feedback, solving problems, and being empathetic, patient, and flexible.

From the perspective of human resource (HR) management, this study’s findings also suggest that organizations need to focus on selecting managers with skills that facilitate the development of coaching skills. Organizations should implement appropriate training activities, executive coaching, and mentoring programs for managers to strengthen their coaching skills. For instance, the HR department could design managerial training programs to spread the coaching managerial style throughout the organization and provide executive coaching sessions that prepare managers at different positions to adopt the role of coach toward their subordinates. The establishment of a supportive climate to managerial coaching in the organization is important to foster managers’ feelings of personal accomplishment and prevent their’ feelings of role overload (She et al., 2019), thus facilitating the adherence to this managerial style. This will have a positive impact on managers’ relationships with employees and, ultimately, employees’ performance at work.

5.2 Limitations and future research

The present study’s limitations indicate that further research is needed to understand better the impact of managers’ coaching skills on employees’ responses. The first limitation is convenience sampling, which, among other factors, limits the generalizability of the findings.

Second, the data were collected at a single moment in time and through the same source, which may imply bias due to CMV (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Certain preventative procedures were undertaken, as suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003), and Harman’s test (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986) was also performed, and the results suggest that common-method bias is not a serious problem for the data collected and thus not an important threat to the present findings’ validity. Nonetheless, future studies could avoid cross-sectional designs and collect data at different points in time or via a double-source method. For example, employees’ performance could be reported by their managers or measured using performance appraisal records.
In addition, the study’s cross-sectional design further limits solid conclusions about the causality nexus between the variables here analyzed. While the model tested received support, there is no way to be sure that the temporal explanation explains the true relationship between these variables and alternative explanations might exist. Future studies can use longitudinal design to scrutinize possible causal relationships amongst variables.

Given that research on managerial coaching skills outcomes at the employee level is still scarce, various possible avenues are available for future research. For instance, other mediation variables (e.g., affective wellbeing, empowerment, and work engagement) could be included in additional studies to analyze the impact of managers’ coaching skills on employees’ responses. Also, subordinates’ characteristics and preferences (e.g. need for achievement) might be examined as potential moderators of coaching skills’ effect on job performance. In addition, also contextual variables could be considered in future research to assess the conditions where managerial coaching skills can better promote employee’s development and improved performance (e.g. learning organization culture, innovation culture).
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Table 1: Factor analysis and goodness of fit for one-dimensional measurement models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items in factor analysis</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McLean et al., 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked to share feelings, my manager feels free to do so.</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In difficult job-related situations, my manager reveals his/her opinions openly and frankly.</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When talking to other people, my manager shares his/her feelings openly.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When developing relationships, my manager openly shares his/her personal values.</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When questioned about his/her professional experiences, my manager willingly shares details.</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2 = 4.754$, $p = 0.191$, CFI = 0.996, NFI = 0.988, RMSEA = 0.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Team approach           |          |
| (McLean et al., 2005)   |          |
| When asked to volunteer for work-related projects, my manager chooses to do these with teams. | 0.801 |
| In general, my manager enjoys performing tasks in which my manager works with others. | 0.840 |
| As part of a working group, my manager prefers to foster group consensus. | 0.841 |
| When a decision has to be made, my manager prefers to consult other people. | 0.743 |
| When my manager thinks of ways to achieve goals, my manager seeks information from other people. | 0.834 |
| Fit indexes             |          |
| $\chi^2 = 3.446$, $p = 0.179$, CFI = 0.997, NFI = 0.993, RMSEA = 0.061 |          |

<p>| Value given to people   |          |
| In decision-making processes, my manager overcomes | 0.506 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(McLean et al., 2005)</th>
<th>feelings with logic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In discussions with others, my manager focuses on the individual needs of each person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When my manager seeks to make work meetings dynamic, my manager still allows time for building relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the workplace, my manager finds ways to establish links with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At work, my manager tends to focus more on people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indexes</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 5.634, \ p = 0.131, \ CFI = 0.994, \ NFI = 0.987, \ RMSEA = 0.067$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of ambiguity</td>
<td>When others are making career decisions, my manager emphasizes risk-taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(McLean et al., 2005) When my manager is looking for solutions to problems, my manager may want to try new solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager views conflict as constructive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When my manager works with others, my manager poses questions with many possible answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indexes</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 0.283, \ p = 0.868, \ CFI = 1.000, \ NFI = 0.998, \ RMSEA = 0.0001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial coaching skills</td>
<td>Open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McLean et al., 2005)</td>
<td>Value given to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indexes</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 145.036, \ p = 0.118, \ CFI = 0.990, \ NFI = 0.931, \ RMSEA = 0.024$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance</td>
<td>I'm an effective employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My colleagues see me as a very productive employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rego and Cunha,</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the quality of my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indexes</td>
<td>My superior sees me as an effective employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008; Staples *et al.*, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indexes</th>
<th>χ² = 0.002, p = 0.962, CFI = 1.000, NFI = 1.000, RMSEA = 0.0001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Affective Commitment** *(Rego *et al.*, 2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indexes</th>
<th>I am proud to tell other people that I am part of this organization.</th>
<th>0.928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel “part of the family” in my organization.</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a strong bond of sympathy for this organization.</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indexes</th>
<th>χ² = 0.1, p = 0.919, CFI = 1.000, NFI = 1.000, RMSEA = 0.0001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Table 2: Reliability, validity, descriptive statistics, and correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual performance</td>
<td>5.228</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>(0.765)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.173</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
<td>(0.943)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Managerial coaching skills</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>(0.825)</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SD = standard deviation; ** p < 0.01; square root of AVE in parenthesis; CR = composite reliability.
Table 3: Test results for direct and mediation effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Mediation effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesized paths**

Managerial coaching skills $\Rightarrow$ Affective commitment

- $0.426^{***}$
- –
- –
- $0.411^{***}$

Managerial coaching skills $\Rightarrow$ Individual performance

- –
- $0.130^{**}$
- –
- $0.081$

Affective commitment $\Rightarrow$ Individual performance

- –
- –
- $0.158^{***}$
- $0.139^{***}$

**R squared**

- $0.11$
- $0.042$
- $0.112$
- $0.124$

**Goodness of fit statistics**

- $\chi^2$: 196.818, 215.393, 15.956, 279.459
- df: 181, 189, 9, 249
- p-value: 0.200, 0.091, 0.068, 0.009
- CFI: 0.994, 0.988, 0.992, 0.989
- TLI: 0.992, 0.984, 0.981, 0.986
- IFI: 0.994, 0.899, 0.992, 0.99
- RMSEA: 0.021, 0.027, 0.063, 0.025

Note: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, and *** p < 0.001; IFI = incremental fit index.