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Abstract

This study investigates the effectiveness of coaching leadership in the education area. The study is to construct the sub-dimensions (direction, accountability, relationship) of coaching leadership, job satisfaction, organization commitment, and turnover intention. To accomplish the purpose of this study, we conducted a questionnaire survey of 200 working members of the school in Gyeongnam province and Pusan in Korea, and collected 185 cases and verified the hypotheses through SPSS and AMOS analysis with final data of 163. As a result, coaching leadership that constructs sub-dimensions of development, evaluation and relationship are positively linked with satisfaction and organization commitment. However, job satisfaction is not linked with turnover intention. Organizational commitment has a negative influence on turnover intention. These results suggested that coaching is a new and effective leadership style that influence members of a school’s attitude or organization performance. Therefore, this paper provided practical implications for CEOs and managers of organizations including schools.
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1. Introduction

Organizational leaders including school also need new leadership as the development of their capacity to perform their tasks quickly and effectively in unpredictable and difficult situations. Leadership in education often get attention, mostly due to increasing responsibilities for school leaders and the accountability-driven context they work in [1].

School principals have much influence over the organizations they lead. Sometimes, school leaders are the sole decision-makers concerning teachers and student prospects [2]. Accordingly, the principal’s leadership has a significant impact on student performance through indirect effects on teachers, the academic process, and the educational environment [3].

Recently, coaching leadership gets attention from academic and practical areas. Coaching leadership is attracting attention as a solution for the development of organizational members because it requires the development-oriented role of leaders and managers. Therefore, coaching leadership has been identified as an effective way for organization managers to
develop their capabilities and improve their organizational performance based on trusting relationships with members. Especially, principal leadership is the vital factor to influence members’ attitudes and behavior of the school the organizational performance.

This study is to investigate the effectiveness of the coaching leadership that constructs sub-dimensions of development, accountability, and relationship that influences job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention in school settings.

2. Literature review

2.1. Coaching leadership

Leadership research has demonstrated various approaches to explain the leadership effectiveness in different industrial [4], Gray emphasized that one of the most significant approach of coaching is the professional development of managers and members in organizations. Based on his research, at least 59 percent of major companies currently operates coaching program to improve personal and organizational performance, and 70 percent of organizations prefer coaching as one essential method of the leadership development [5].

For these reasons, coaching leadership attracts attention from academics and practitioners. Coaching leadership is a new and effective leadership style that influences members of an organization's attitude or behavior, and organization performance [6].

Leaders have the responsibility for creating and leading the culture of an organization, which communicates values and expectations to the follower [7]. Leaders’ communication with followers is a very essential element of leaders' abilities. Besides, through dialogue with the other, the four components of coaching, such as direction presentation, performance evaluation, competency development, and relationship formation, are processes that reveal specific action [8]. Therefore, this paper aims to examine the relationships between coaching leadership, satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intention.

Meanwhile, Seo Jae-Hyun and Dae-Ho (2017 studied the effects of leader coaching on the surface and internal behaviors of emotional employees, focusing on resilience. As a sub-dimension of coaching behavior, it consists of three elements: trust formation, problem-solving support, and competency support through learning. As a result of the study, they confirmed that the coaching behavior of the leader had a positive effect on promoting the internal behavior of the emotional employees and reducing the surface behavior of the negative worker through the resilience. In other words, the leader empirically verifies that the emotional resilience, which is the ability to adapt and cope with any stressful situation, is enhanced by coaching behaviors [9]. The study suggests that the active participation of leaders through coaching can have a significant impact on internal behavior of the employees.

2.2. Job satisfaction

Spector states that job satisfaction refers to positive and negative emotional preferences for a job by assessing the job or the experience gained through the job. In presenting various measures of job satisfaction [10], Ali conceptualizes that the concept of job satisfaction is linked with the psychology of the individual as well as the physiological enjoyment of the job performed by the individual [11]. Thus, job satisfaction is shown in the context of the general attitudes of members of the organization to the internal and external environment of the job and the positive or negative evaluation of various aspects of the job environment [12]. Lee described job satisfaction is a positive condition that an individual can feel in general at work,
and this is an emotional state in which the members of each organization can achieve the best work performance in the process of their job according to the interaction of internal and external factors [13]. It is defined as a relatively subjective present and past concept in which members of the organization express on the base of personal values, ideologies, vocations, and dispositions, and compared according to their position in the organization. Additionally, Lim states job satisfaction has been found to have a significant correlation with the intrinsic job motivation of workers and is one of the most useful predictions for predicting individual and organizational performance. Managerial support, wages, performance appraisal, compensation system, physical working environment, social support, and job characteristics were found to have a high correlation with job satisfaction. The organizational atmosphere, such as back management, communication, and compensation management, was also found to affect job [14]. For these reasons, job satisfaction is affected by managerial support or leadership style and job characteristics.

Specifically, job satisfaction is the outcomes factor influenced by the leadership style of organizational and coaching behaviors of leaders [15][16]. Huang and Hsieh stated that manager coaching influences active career behavior (individual intentional behavior to realize and achieve career goals) [17]. Im and Lee shows that the director's coaching leadership has a direct impact on teachers' job satisfaction [18].

2.3. Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment is a long-standing research topic in the area of management especially, organizational behavior research and is believed to play a significant role in explaining the attitudes, behaviors, and organizational effectiveness of members [19]. Organizational commitment is one of the major job attitudes along with job satisfaction and job commitment, and has been the subject of research by many scholars. Looking at the previous research on organizational commitment, Choi and Kim regarded organizational commitment as identifying and committing themselves to the organization, including working with colleagues, and defined organizational commitment as trying to meet the organization's goals [20]. Besides, Luthans define organization commitment as the strong willingness to stay, willingness to hard work and to accept the values and goals of the organization [21].

Meanwhile, Shahab and Nisa proposed that work satisfaction is associated with organizational commitment and work performance [22].

These results proved the effectiveness of coaching carried out in the field and insisted that both the scientific basis for the coaching effect and the justification for the introduction of coaching in public institutions.

2.4. Turnover intention

Turnover means a temporary or permanent break in the employment relationship by the employee leaving his or her organization and includes natural attrition, layoff and discharge of the workforce [23]. The concept of turnover is, in a broad sense, the opposite of job tenure, which means quitting one's current job and moving to another job or organization [24].

Regarding turnover intentions, Lingard, Hayes et al. suggests that it is very difficult to measure actual turnover behavior, but it is an antecedent of actual turnover behavior, and turnover intention is a direct prognostic factor to actual turnover behavior [25].

Meanwhile, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were the most important variables to influence turnover intention [26][27][28].
3. Methodology

3.1. Conceptual model

In this study, four variables including “coaching leadership that consists of three sub-dimensions of direction, accountability, and relationship, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention were identified.

This study is to examine the effectiveness of coaching leadership in the education section. So, the conceptual model of the relationships among coaching leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention are presented as shown in [Figure 1].

Based on the previous studies, we set the hypotheses among coaching leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention.

H1: Coaching leadership influences positively job satisfaction.
H2: Coaching leadership influences positively on organizational commitment.
H3: Job satisfaction influences negatively on turnover intention.
H4: Organizational commitment influences negatively on turnover intention.

3.2. Samples

A survey was conducted to collect data from teachers who have worked at some schools in Gyeongnam province and Pusan in Korea. When sending out the 200 questionnaires, we delete 15 unfaithful and invalid replies. We get 185 respondents through the process of data purification, the number of final data for analysis gets 163 valid cases at the end.

4. Results

4.1. Result of confirmatory analysis

[Table 1] showed the CFA results. The reliability (Cronbach’s a) of each construct is more than 0.6, composite reliability of all indicators were above thresholds, which exceeds the acceptable level suggested by Murphy and Davidshofer [29] and by Nunnally and Bernstein.
The questions remaining below this level were removed from the analysis. Accordingly, 22 questions in total were included in the analysis.

So, all factor loadings were statistically significant and reliabilities were above 0.7. The average variation extracted (AVE) values for all factors were above 0.5. The results of CFA supported discriminant validity due to all indicators fitted. The CFA model indicated a good fit to data.

Table 1. Results of confirmatory factor analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Cronbach’α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>20.842</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>18.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>12.535**</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>33.763**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>X7</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>17.014**</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>21.337**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X13</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>22.973**</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X14</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>20.049***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X15</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>17.013**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X16</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>21.284**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X18</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>18.402**</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X19</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>18.980**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X20</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>20.440***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X21</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>X22</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X23</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>15.464**</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X24</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>14.692**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X25</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>15.992**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²/df=302428/(187), p=0.000, CMIN/DF=1.616, GFI=0.860, IFI=0.974, TLI=0.968, CFI=0.974, RMSEA=0.062

Significant value at ***p=0.001

4.2. Result of correlations analysis.

[Table 2] reported the results of the correlations identified. The analysis verified discriminant validity, the square root of AVE of each factor was larger than the correlation coefficients between the factors (off-diagonal elements) [31]. So the discriminant validity of all measurements used can be verified.
Table 2. Results of the correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>0.296*</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>0.167*</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization commitment</td>
<td>0.195*</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.180*</td>
<td>0.322**</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Significant value at *p=.05, **p=.001

4.3. Results of path analysis

As shown in [Table 3], all hypotheses in the path analysis are supported except for the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. Coaching leadership is positively related to job satisfaction ($\beta=.822, p=.001$) and organization commitment ($\beta=-.905, p=.000$), supporting H1 and H2, respectively. Additionally, organization commitment has a negative effect on turnover intention ($\beta=-.337, p=.05$). However, job satisfaction is not supported to turnover intention ($\beta=-.337, p=.05$). The results of path analyses are as follow.

Table 3. Results of path analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Coaching leadership $\rightarrow$ Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>12.602***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Coaching leadership $\rightarrow$ Organization commitment</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>12.814***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Job satisfaction $\rightarrow$ Turnover intention</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-1.133</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Organization commitment $\rightarrow$ Turnover intention</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>-2.079**</td>
<td>0.038**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$/df=435.839(235), p=.000, CMIN/DF=1.855, GFI=0.822, IFI=0.960, TLI=0.953, CFI=0.960, RMSEA=0.073

Significant value at **p=.05, ***p=.000

5. Conclusions

This paper examined to identify the coaching leadership according to the three dimensions and the relationship among coaching leadership, job satisfaction, organization commitment and turnover intention in the education sector. The results showed that coaching leadership is positively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, job satisfaction was not linked with turnover intention. Organization commitment negatively influences turnover intention. Namely, organizational commitment increased, the intention to turnover decreased.

According to these results, the clear direction of the principal as the organization manager, career development and friendly relationship of trust with the members increases the organizational commitment of the members. Moreover, employees with high levels of...
organizational commitment are less likely to leave their organizations. According to findings that correlate the job satisfaction with organizational performance, job satisfaction has the effect of reducing the turnover rate and absenteeism rate of organizational members. The low turnover rate and absenteeism rate of organizational members have positive effects on organizational productivity and ultimately improve organizational performance.

Consequently, we suggested that coaching leadership is an effective factor to influence members of attitude and behavior such as satisfaction, commitment. The particular, it is considered that school principals need to develop and exercise leadership using coaching skills such as direction, development, feedback, and relationships to induce positive attitudes and behaviors of members of the organization. Therefore, this paper suggests practical implications for organization managers and school principals including CEOs from the management perspective.
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