

## Impact of Coach Leadership and Leader-Member Exchange on Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Employees

Liu Zhijiang<sup>1</sup>, Jacqueline Tham<sup>2</sup>, Ooi Boon Keat<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD student in Management and Science University, major in Management and Business ; Senior lecture in Guangxi Normal University

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, PhD supervisor in Post Graduate Centre, Management and Science University

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, PhD supervisor in School of Education and Social Science, Management and Science University

### Abstract

This study investigates how Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) affects the connection between coaching leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The LMX theory proposes that leaders establish distinct connections with each individual follower, which may vary from high-quality exchanges characterised by trust and respect to low-quality, transactional interactions. The research demonstrates that strong LMX connections greatly enhance the beneficial influence of coaching leadership on OCB, as workers perceive a greater sense of worth and assistance. In contrast, poor-quality LMX interactions reduce this impact, highlighting the need of cultivating robust leader-follower links to improve leadership effectiveness and encourage organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB).

**Keyword;** Leader change member, coaching leadership style, organizational citizenship behavior

### Introduction

Leadership is essential in shaping employee behaviour and creating a healthy work environment in today's dynamic and competitive organisations. Coaching leadership has gained considerable recognition among the many leadership styles due to its ability to improve employee growth and productivity (Ali Nisar et. al., 2024; Raza, Khan & Hakim, 2024). Coaching leadership is leaders assuming the role of mentors, offering advice, support, and feedback to assist workers in reaching their maximum potential. This leadership strategy not only enhances individual performance but also has the capacity to foster organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB)—voluntary, supplementary actions that enhance organisational success (Sulphey et. al., 2024; Nuryanto Basrowi & Quraysin, 2024; Yusuf et. al., 2024). Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) plays a vital role in ensuring the efficient operation and overall achievement of organisations. Employees that participate in Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) beyond the expectations of their official job roles by assisting their colleagues, willingly taking on extra responsibilities, and demonstrating proactive behaviour. These behaviours are not usually acknowledged by official incentive systems, yet they are crucial for promoting a cooperative and efficient work environment (Vedadi et. al., 2024; Luu, 2024; Lee et. al., 2024)). Although the significance of OCB is acknowledged, the precise methods by which coaching leadership impacts these voluntary

behaviours are not well understood. The notion of leader-member exchange (LMX) offers a significant framework for examining this connection. The LMX hypothesis suggests that leaders establish distinct relationships with each subordinate, which are characterised by different levels of trust, respect, and duty. Strong and trustworthy LMX interactions are linked to several good results, such as greater work satisfaction, improved performance, and better organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Therefore, it is likely that LMX acts as an intermediary between coaching leadership and OCB, facilitating the transmission of the beneficial impacts of coaching leadership (Gu, Tang & Jiang, 2024; Dar, Kundi & Umrani, 2024).

Comprehending the interactions illustrated in the conceptual model, where coaching leadership affects organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) by means of the intermediary function of leader-member exchange (LMX), has important theoretical and practical consequences for organisational behaviour and leadership practices (Chen, Zhao & Cheng, 2024; Tabak et. al., 2024). This study aims to fill a significant need in the current body of research by combining coaching leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX), and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) into a unified model (Liao et. al., 224; Gao, Lin & Lam, 2024). Although there has been much study on the direct impact of leadership styles on employee outcomes, there is still little understanding of the specific ways in which these impacts occur. This research offers a detailed insight into how teaching leadership leads to improved Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) by examining the role of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) as a mediator. It enhances the theoretical framework of leadership studies by providing a more profound understanding of the relational dynamics that support successful leadership and favourable employee behaviours (Wang, Yao & Gao, 2024; Sharif et. al., 2024). This integrated approach enhances the development of ideas about leadership and organisational behaviour, providing a more thorough understanding of the interaction between leadership styles and employee behaviours. The knowledge acquired from this research is very important for leaders in organisations and human resources professionals (Nisar Khattak et. al., 2024). Coaching leadership is a leadership style that may be developed via training and programmes focused on growth and improvement. Recognising that coaching leadership may indirectly promote Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) via strong and positive Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) connections emphasises the need of investing in leadership development programmes. Organisations may establish focused training initiatives to improve leaders' coaching skills, creating a nurturing atmosphere that promotes transparent communication and mutual confidence (Jeong, Kim & Lee, 2024; Mäkelä et. al., 2024; Zhang, Niu & Zhang, 2024).

Furthermore, the research highlights the importance of the quality of the relationship between leaders and their team members. Organisations may increase the leader-follower connection to improve the influence of leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (Celiker & Guzeller, 2024; Sun, Park & Yun, 2024). Implementing strategies such as mentoring programmes, frequent feedback sessions, and chances for professional development may contribute to the development of greater leader-member exchange (LMX), thereby fostering a culture of civic behaviours (Shang et. al., 2024; Ramadhan & Riyanto, 2024). In addition, the use of Enhanced OCB results in several advantages for an organisation, such as enhanced

collaboration, decreased employee attrition, and heightened overall efficiency. Employees that exhibit Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) are more inclined to help and support to their colleagues, actively contribute to fostering a healthy work environment, and beyond their prescribed job duties to guarantee the success of the organisation (Ma & Ma, 2024; Mitchell, Gu & Boyle, 2024). By cultivating a leadership approach that encourages Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) via high-quality Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), organisations may attain elevated levels of employee contentment and involvement, eventually resulting in enhanced organisational performance and competitiveness. Gaining a comprehension of these dynamics may provide significant insights for leaders within an organisation and human resources professionals who want to foster a work climate that promotes discretionary behaviours and improves overall organisational performance. This research enhances the theoretical understanding of leadership and organisational behaviour by clarifying the mechanisms via which coaching leadership influences organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) refers to the voluntary actions and behaviours shown by employees that go beyond their formal job requirements and contribute to the overall effectiveness and success of the organisation. In addition, OCB encompasses voluntary actions that go beyond official job requirements and are not explicitly rewarded but play a crucial role in enhancing organisational success (Organ, 1988). Instances of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) include actions such as assisting coworkers, consistently being prompt, and gladly doing extra duties (Kim, Ok & Lee, 2024; Luu, 2024; Lee et. al., 2024). OCB is essential for cultivating a collaborative and efficient work atmosphere. Prior research has found many factors that precede Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), including as work satisfaction, organisational commitment, and leadership styles (Ali Nisar et. al., 2024; Shaya et. al., 2024). The precise mechanisms by which various leadership styles, including coaching leadership, facilitate Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) remain incompletely comprehended, despite thorough investigation. Initiating organizational citizenship behavior, it is believed that organizational citizenship behavior is the voluntary behavior of employees, which stems from voluntary and utilitarian motivation to show behavior in favor of organizations or individuals in organizations that are not within the formal compensation system (Agyabeng-Mensah, Baah & Afum, 2024; Ma, Teng & Yan, 2024). Raza, Khan and Hakim in (2024) believe that the behavior of organizational citizenship in the Chinese context is broader than that in other countries, not only in the workplace, but also in public welfare and ethical standards. At the same time, they put more emphasis on the impact of harmonious coexistence on organizational citizenship behavior, and it is different for employees to be more proactive when faced with work tasks. From the perspective of social difficulties, Agyeiwaah, Bangwayo-Skeete and Opoku in (2024) believed that the behavior of organizational citizenship was a voluntary behavior that had nothing to do with personal interests and was not required

by the organization. Even if the employee did not show such behavior, it did not mean that the employee refused to cooperate with the organization.

### **Leadership via coaching**

Leadership is an important component in the organizational environment, and the quality of the relationship between leadership and subordinates is also an important condition to drive employee behavior. Some researchers used the relationship between the leader and the subordinate as a moderating variable in the research model to investigate how the quality of the relationship between the leader and the subordinate affects other variables and employee behavior. For example, Zhang, Niu & Zhang in (2024), studies found that leadership-subordination quality regulates the relationship between employee safety knowledge and safety performance. Leadership-subordinate relationship quality regulates the relationship between emotional labor and job satisfaction (Anderson et. al., 2024; Braun, Ross-Stewart & Meyer, 2024). Research by Michel and Tews also found a relationship between leadership-subordinate relationship regulation, relationship-oriented leadership behavior, change-oriented leadership behavior, and employee organizational citizenship behavior. Coaching leadership, which involves leaders who actively mentor and encourage their staff, has been more recognised as a good strategy in contemporary organisational environments. Grant in (2012) defines coaching leadership as the process of enhancing workers' abilities, offering valuable feedback, and fostering their professional development. This leadership style is associated with a variety of good results, such as heightened employee motivation, work satisfaction, and performance (Ellinger et al., 2014). The concept of coaching leadership has five key dimensions, including open communication, teamwork, high ambiguity, people-centeredness, and employee development (Mäkelä et. al., 2024; Zhang, Niu & Zhang, 2024). Jansen, Czabanowska, Pagter and Koeijer, in (2024) believes that coach leadership is an effective leadership model that promotes and improves employee learning and performance, with employees, managers, and organizations maximizing benefits from the coach leadership process. Yuin (2024) agrees that coaching leadership is common in management practices, including open communication, one-on-one interaction, teamwork, improved learning, feedback and information sharing, and performance improvement. Although there is no uniform definition of coaching leadership at present, there is consistency in emphasizing coaching leadership to promote positive employee behavior (Lefebvre et. al., 2024; Klar, Huggins & Andreoli, 2024). According to the theory of social exchange, coaching leaders attach importance to the career development of subordinates, provide active career guidance and necessary resource support in their work skills and work ability improvement, and pay attention to developing subordinates' mental model and thinking ability. The more resources subordinates receive from leaders (career guidance, authorization, etc.), as an "exchange," employees will try their best to maintain the harmony of interpersonal relations and maximize organizational interests and efficiency (Szekely et. al., 2024; Butler, 2024). Leadership coaches give employees active guidance and encourage them to develop their own potential. Such coaching behaviors can give employees a sense of internal organization and help them maintain organizational resources through practical actions. Thus, hypothesis 1 developed as.

*H1: Coaching leadership has a significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior.*

### **The Leader-member exchange (LMX)**

The Leader-member exchange (LMX), established by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), examines the calibre of the connection between leaders and their subordinates. LMX theory proposes that leaders establish distinct, one-on-one connections with individual followers, which are defined by different degrees of trust, respect, and duty (Chen, Zhao & Cheng, 2024). LMX relationships characterised by reciprocal support and loyalty result in several good outcomes, including heightened work satisfaction, improved performance, and greater organisational citizenship behaviour (Gu, Tang & Jiang, 2024; Al Bloushi et. al., 2024). On the other hand, poor LMX interactions may lead to decreased employee engagement and performance. Gaining insight into the dynamics of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is essential for promoting successful leadership and enhancing workplace results. The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) offers a significant framework for analysing the dynamics of the connection between a leader and their followers. The LMX theory suggests that leaders establish distinct connections with each subordinate, which are defined by different levels of trust, respect, and mutual duty (Chen, Zhao & Cheng, 2024). LMX connections of superior quality are characterised by robust mutual trust and support, resulting in several favourable consequences, such as heightened work satisfaction, improved performance, and higher organisational citizenship behaviour (Dar, Kundi & Umrani, 2024). Prior studies on Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) as a moderator have yielded useful insights into its impact on different organisational outcomes and the dynamics of leader-follower interactions. A prominent field of research has concentrated on the moderating effect of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) on the association between leadership styles and employee outcomes (Chang et. al., 2024; Liao et. al., 2024). Research has shown that strong LMX connections may boost the efficacy of transformative leadership by intensifying its influence on employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment. In contrast, poor-quality LMX interactions may diminish the beneficial impacts of transformative leadership, underscoring the need of include LMX as a contextual element in leadership studies. Moreover, research has investigated the moderating influence of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) on the connection between leader behaviours and staff performance. Research has shown that strong LMX connections enhance the beneficial impact of supportive leadership behaviours, including as coaching, mentoring, and feedback, on both employee task performance and extra-role behaviours. On the other hand, poor-quality LMX partnerships may weaken the influence of supportive leadership behaviours, highlighting the importance of LMX in promoting successful leader-follower interactions (Birani-Nasraddin, Bogler & Somech, 2024; Tabak et. al., 2024).

Previous studies have examined how Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) influences the connection between organisational characteristics and employee outcomes. For instance, research has investigated how Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) reduces the adverse impacts

of organisational stresses, such as unclear job expectations, excessive workload, and disagreements amongst colleagues, on the mental and emotional state of employees and their level of contentment with their work (Di Milia & Jiang, 2024; Gao, Lin & Lam, 2024). Research has shown that strong LMX connections may mitigate the negative impact of stresses inside an organisation. These ties provide social support and resources that assist workers in managing stress more efficiently. In addition, studies have examined the limitations of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) as a moderator, considering variables such as personal characteristics, cultural norms, and specific circumstances (Diebig et. al., 2024; Sunaryo et. al., 2024). Research has investigated how personality qualities, such as agreeableness and extraversion, influence the connection between LMX (leader-member exchange) and employee outcomes. In addition, cross-cultural research has examined the extent to which LMX functions as a moderator, considering cultural variables such as collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. To summarise, prior studies on LMX as a moderator have enhanced our comprehension of the intricate interaction among leader-follower relationships, leadership styles, organisational characteristics, and employee outcomes (Chen, Zhao & Cheng, 2024; Gu, Tang & Jiang, 2024; Al Bloushi et. al., 2024). By including LMX as a contextual variable, academics and practitioners may acquire more profound understanding of the processes that drive successful leadership and devise tactics to foster high-quality relationships inside organisations. Thus, the hypothesis 2 developed as.

H2: Leader-member exchange relationships play a moderating role between coaching leaders and employee organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Research methodology.**

The objective of this research is to investigate how Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) influences the connection between coaching leadership styles and organisational citizenship behaviour. The methodology section provides a detailed explanation of the study design, data collecting methodologies, and analytical approaches used to accomplish the research goals.

### ***Research design.***

This study utilises a quantitative research approach, using a cross-sectional survey technique. A cross-sectional design is used to gather data at a certain moment, enabling the analysis of correlations between variables without being affected by temporal changes.

### ***Population and Sample.***

The scope of this research includes workers and their immediate superiors from several sectors. A multi-stage sampling approach will be used. During the first phase, industries will be chosen by stratified random selection to guarantee a balanced representation across various sectors. During the second phase, organisations within these industries will be chosen by the method of simple random selection. Ultimately, convenience sampling will be used to choose workers and their immediate managers inside each chosen organisation.

**Sample size.**

According to a power analysis conducted using G\*Power software, a minimum sample size of 300 is necessary to identify medium effect sizes with an alpha level of 0.05 and a power of 0.80. The chosen sample size is considered enough to allow reliable statistical analyses and the capacity to apply the results to a larger population.

**Questionnaire design**

Questionnaire adopted for this research come from.

Table 1; Sources of questionnaire

<b>Coach Leadership Measurement Scale</b>		Sources
<b>Question</b>		
<b>1</b>	Leaders work with employees to clarify the organization's expectations for employees and the importance of individual expectations to company goals	Anderson (2013)
<b>2</b>	Leaders often help employees to broaden their horizons	
<b>3</b>	Leaders provided constructive feedback to employees	
<b>4</b>	Leaders seek feedback from employees to ensure that communication between supervisors and employees is beneficial to employees	
<b>5</b>	Leadership provides employees with the necessary resources to enable them to perform their tasks more efficiently	
<b>Leader-member exchange</b>		Hui wt. al., (2008).
<b>Question</b>		
<b>1</b>	I know well whether my immediate supervisor is satisfied with my performance.	
<b>2</b>	My immediate supervisor is aware of my problems and needs.	
<b>3</b>	My immediate supervisor is quite aware of my potential at work.	
<b>4</b>	My immediate supervisor will use his authority to help me solve major problems at work.	

5	My immediate supervisor would sacrifice his personal interests to help me out of my job.	
6	I trust my immediate superior, and even if he's not there, I'll defend and explain his decision	
7	My relationship with my immediate supervisor at work is pretty good	
<b>Organizational citizenship behavior</b>		
<b>Questions</b>		Jiaguo et. al., (2017)
1	Willing to stand up for the company's reputation.	
2	Take the initiative to tell others the good news of the company and clarify their misunderstanding of the company.	
3	Make constructive suggestions to improve the operation of the company.	
4	Participate in company meetings carefully.	
5	Willing to help new colleagues adapt to the work environment.	
6	Willing to help colleagues solve work-related problems.	
7	Willing to share the work of colleagues when needed.	
8	Willingness to communicate and cooperate with colleagues.	
9	Still abide by the company's rules and regulations in the absence of presence or rules.	
10	Serious work, rarely make mistakes.	
11	Willing to challenge or accept new assignments.	
12	To improve the quality of work, hard study.	
13	Often arrive early and be able to work immediately.	
14	Personal influence and interests are more important than interpersonal harmony	
15	I'll use my position to do something good for myself	
16	Don't pay too much attention to the criticism and suggestions of others for your own benefit	



17	I complain about other colleagues behind my boss or colleagues	
8	Do something personal during working hours.	
19	Will use the company's resources (such as phones, photocopiers, computers, cars, etc.) to do their own things.	
20	Sick leave is taken for personal matters.	

#### Procedure.

The surveys will be disseminated electronically using a secure internet platform. Participation will be optional, and we will get informed permission from all responses. The research approach will ensure the preservation of confidentiality and anonymity. The analysis of data will be conducted with SPSS version 26. The following phases delineate the analytical methodologies:

#### *Data screening and cleaning.*

Data screening and cleaning involves doing an initial assessment of the data to identify any missing values, outliers, and to determine whether the data follows a normal distribution. If there is any missing data, it will be addressed using multiple imputation approaches, if required.

#### *Descriptive Statistics:*

The demographic characteristics of the sample and the primary variables of the research will be summarised using descriptive statistics.

#### *Reliability and Validity.*

The reliability of the scales will be evaluated by using Cronbach's alpha to examine its internal consistency. The validity of the measurement models will be ensured using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

#### *Correlation Analysis:*

A Pearson correlation analysis will be conducted to investigate the associations between leadership styles, LMX quality, employee performance, and job satisfaction.

#### **Finding**

A total of 300 questionnaires were sent through online methods. Both genders have equal percentage in term of the responding the questionnaire where male score 50% and female score 50%. Majority of the respondent come from the age range 26-35 years old with the score 40% followed by under 25 years old with the score 30%, 36-45 years old with the score 20% and

finally over 46 with the score 10%. For level of education, majority of the respondent score specialty certificate with the score 65%, followed by undergraduate with the score 21.3%, high scoole and below with the score 10.3% and Postgraduate with the score 3.3%. finally for years of service, majority of the respondent have served 5-10 years in the industry, followed by 1 years and below years of service with the score 13%, more than 10 years of service with the score 10% and 2-4 years of service with the score 8.3%.

Table 2 Sample Demographics (N= 120)

Category	Options	Frequency	Percentage	Average	Standard deviation
Gender	Male	150	50.0%	1.5	0.503
	Women	150	50.0%		
Age group	Under 25	90	30%	1.81	0.698
	26-35 Age	120	40%		
	36-45 Age	60	20%		
	Over 46	30	10%		
Level of education	High school and below	31	10.3%	2.78	0.601
	Specialty	195	65%		
	Undergraduate	64	21.3%		
	Postgraduate	10	3.3%		
Years of service	1 year and below	38	13%	2.49	0.888
	2-4 years	25	8.3%		
	5-10 years	207	69%		
	More than 10 years	30	10%		

### Reliability Analysis

Table 3; Reliability Analysis of Coach Leadership Scale

Coach Leadership	Scale Average after	Scale variance	Revised item and total	Squared Multiple	Cloned Bach Alpha	Normalized alpha
------------------	---------------------	----------------	------------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------

	item deletion	after item deletion	correlation	Correlation	after deletion	
CL1	16.1	11.35	0.62	0.444	0.89	0.891
CL2	16.02	9.36	0.756	0.586	0.86	
CL3	15.98	8.866	0.84	0.719	0.839	
CL4	16.22	8.588	0.805	0.693	0.85	
CL5	16	10.969	0.68	0.481	0.879	

The purpose of the reliability and validity study of the scale is to assess its level of consistency and dependability. Scholars often use the internal consistency coefficient, denoted as "a," to assess the dependability of a specified variable. This coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating more reliability. In general, a variable's alpha coefficient is considered dependable if it exceeds 0.7. In this study, the chosen coach leader's alpha value is 0.891, indicating a high level of reliability.

Table 4; Reliability Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

Organizational Citizenship	Scale Average after item deletion	Scale variance after item deletion	Revised item and total correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cloned Bach Alpha after deletion	Normalized alpha
OCB1	66.39	39.106	0.319	0.836	0.602	0.705
OCB2	66.45	38.683	0.379	0.86	0.596	
OCB3	66.79	38.933	0.217	0.872	0.611	
OCB4	66.51	37.366	0.443	0.936	0.585	
OCB5	66.5	40.624	0.142	0.774	0.619	
OCB6	66.54	38.23	0.383	0.905	0.594	
OCB7	66.94	37.295	0.396	0.904	0.588	
OCB8	66.56	37.61	0.388	0.886	0.59	
OCB9	66.43	39.773	0.341	0.86	0.604	
OCB10	66.58	39.483	0.239	0.747	0.609	
OCB11	66.6	38.056	0.352	0.898	0.595	

OCB12	66.27	37.331	0.457	0.85	0.584
OCB13	66.91	36.167	0.492	0.908	0.575
OCB14	67.85	34.956	0.396	0.807	0.58
OCB15	68.23	39.027	0.165	0.863	0.618
OCB16	68.42	38.761	0.099	0.896	0.636
OCB17	68.65	39.569	0.112	0.859	0.627
OCB18	68.56	43.692	-0.175	0.94	0.664
OCB19	68.78	43.64	-0.171	0.915	0.667
OCB20	68.59	41.605	-0.022	0.825	0.643

Farh et al. (1997) categorised organisational citizenship behaviour into five distinct dimensions: company identification, assisting colleagues, taking initiative, maintaining interpersonal harmony, and safeguarding business resources. Based on the reliability study findings provided above, it is evident that the overall standardised reliability coefficient is 0.705. Furthermore, the reliability coefficient decreases when items are removed, resulting in a value lower than the overall coefficient of 0.705. The dependability rating is within the range of 0 to 1, with a higher number indicating greater reliability. The study yielded a score of 0.705, indicating that the dependability of organisational citizenship behaviour in each dimension is satisfactory and fulfils the specified criteria.

Table 5; LMX Reliability Analysis of The Scale

LMX	Scale Average after item deletion	Scale variance after item deletion	Revised item and total correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cloned Bach Alpha after deletion	Normalized alpha
LMX1	22.48	19.531	0.348	0.252	0.885	0.866
LMX2	22.84	15.293	0.731	0.603	0.841	
LMX3	22.71	16.928	0.632	0.461	0.855	
LMX4	22.8	16.308	0.651	0.567	0.853	
LMX5	23.47	15.798	0.674	0.513	0.85	
LMX6	22.6	15.624	0.772	0.689	0.836	
LMX7	22.84	16.035	0.714	0.551	0.844	

The alpha coefficient of the leader-member exchange connection scale was 0.866, and the reliability coefficient of the removed items was lower than that of the whole scale, which was also 0.866. The dependability rating falls within the range of 0 to 1, and a number closer to 0 or 1 indicates higher reliability. The study yielded a value of 0.866, indicating that the scale's dependability is satisfactory and fulfils the necessary criteria.

### *Validity analysis*

Table 6; KMO And Bartlett Tests

<b>KMO Amount of sampling suitability</b>		<b>0.617</b>
Butlett Spherical Examination	Approximate Chi	4739.287
	Degree of Freedom	496
	Saliency	.000

Exploratory factor analysis yielded a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) score of 0.617 ( $P < 0.01$ ), indicating that the questionnaire is appropriate for factor analysis. Based on the importance of the spherical test, it is evident that the significance of this test is very near to 0, leading to the rejection of the initial premise.

### *Correlation Analysis*

Correlation analysis examines if there is a statistical relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient is a numerical number that ranges from -1 to 1. The plus or negative sign of the coefficient reflects the direction of the relationship between the variables. A greater correlation between variables is indicated by a value closer to 1. The table below illustrates:

Table 7; Correlation Table of Each Research Variable N=98

	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age group</b>	<b>Highest degree</b>	<b>Years of service</b>	<b>Coach Leadership</b>	<b>Organizational Citizenship</b>	<b>LMX</b>
Gender	1						
Age group	0.103	1					

Highest degree	0	-.375**	1				
Years of service	0.023	.504**	-.275**	1			
Coach Leadership	-0.069	-0.013	0.021	-0.021	1		
Organizational Citizenship	-0.097	-0.066	-0.115	0.019	.548**	1	
LMX	-0.12	-0.023	-0.008	0.042	.866**	.576**	1

The table shows a strong positive correlation between coach-type leaders and the organisational citizenship behaviour of employees ( $r=0.548$ ,  $P<0.01$ ), as well as between coach-type leaders and LMX ( $r=0.866$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). Additionally, there is a significant positive correlation between organisational citizenship behaviour and LMX ( $r=0.576$ ,  $P<0.01$ ), which supports the initial hypothesis.

### *Moderating effect test*

Table 8; Model Inspection

Model Summary c										
Model	R	Party R	Adjusted R Party	Errors in standard estimates	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square change	F Variation	DOF 1	DOF 2	Significant F change	
1	.584a	0.341	0.327	5.386	0.341	24.571	2	95	0	
2	.613b	0.376	0.356	5.269	0.035	5.256	1	94	0.024	1.626

a Predictors: Constants, LMX, Coach Leadership

b Predictors: Constant, LMX, Coach Leader, Interaction1

c Dependent variable: Organizational citizenship behavior

By doing correlation analysis, we established a positive correlation between variables. Subsequently, we used regression analysis to ascertain the presence of a causal link between the variables. A regression analysis was conducted to examine Hypothesis 2, which states that LMX moderates the association between coaching leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. In regression analysis, the dependent variable is organisational citizenship behaviour, and we establish Interaction Item 1 as a predictor. Model 1 investigates the influence of a centralised coaching leadership style on organisational citizenship behaviour. Model 2 is constructed to examine the impact of coach leadership and LMX on organisational citizenship behaviour. The study findings indicate that the adjusted R square of model one is 0.327, while the adjusted R square of model two is 0.356, showing a noticeable difference. Additionally, the significance of model two is 0.024, which is lower than the threshold of 0.05.

Table 9; Regulating Effect Test

Model		Unnormalized Factor		Normalized coefficient	t	Saliency
		B	Standard error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	48.962	3.167		15.461	0.000
	Coach Leadership	0.334	0.283	0.197	1.183	0.240
	LMX	0.567	0.233	0.405	2.436	0.017
2	(Constant)	18.134	13.799		1.314	0.192
	Coach Leadership	1.921	0.745	1.131	2.577	0.012
	LMX	2.127	0.718	1.520	2.964	0.004
	Interactive Item 1	-0.077	0.034	1.988	2.293	0.024

The unstandardized coefficient of Interactive Item 1 is -0.077, and the p-value is 0.024, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. This suggests that LMX has a significant moderate influence in the model of coaching leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. The findings indicate that both Hypotheses 1 and 2 are substantiated.

## Discussion

Coaching leadership plays a crucial role in promoting Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) by focusing on personal growth, establishing supportive relationships, and empowering colleagues. These factors together motivate people to go beyond their statutory job responsibilities. Leadership coaches prioritise the task of directing and advising their subordinates, equipping them with the necessary abilities and self-assurance to thrive in their positions (Liu & Liu, 2024; Al Bloushi et. al., 2024; AlHammadi & Abu Elanain, 2024). This leadership style fosters a culture characterised by trust and mutual respect, which are essential for the flourishing of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Coaching leadership is significant in fostering Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) because it emphasizes personal development, supportive interactions, and empowerment, which collectively encourage employees to go beyond their formal job requirements (Lee et. al., 2024; Tabak et. al., 2024; Albdareen, 2024). Coaching leaders focus on guiding and mentoring their employees, providing them with the skills and confidence needed to excel in their roles. This leadership style promotes a culture of trust and mutual respect, which are crucial for OCB to thrive.

One key reason coaching leadership enhances OCB is that it builds strong interpersonal relationships between leaders and employees. These relationships are characterized by open communication, personalized feedback, and genuine concern for employees' well-being (Sharma & Kaur, 2024; Nie et. al., 2024; Gu, Tang & Jiang, 2024). When employees feel valued and supported, they are more likely to exhibit discretionary behaviors that benefit the organization, such as helping colleagues, taking initiative, and showing loyalty. Furthermore, coaching leadership aligns with the principles of empowerment and autonomy. By fostering an environment where employees are encouraged to take ownership of their tasks and make decisions, coaching leaders inspire a sense of responsibility and commitment (Siddiq et. al., 2024; Taamneh et. al., 2024). This sense of ownership often translates into proactive behaviors that go beyond the job description, which are the essence of OCB. Additionally, coaching leadership promotes continuous learning and development. Leaders who invest in their employees' growth create a workforce that is adaptable, skilled, and motivated. Employees who feel that their organization is invested in their personal and professional development are more likely to reciprocate with positive behaviors that contribute to the overall success of the organization (James, 2024; Gao, Lin & Lam, 2024).

Leadership coaches prioritise the task of directing and advising their subordinates, equipping them with the necessary abilities and self-assurance to thrive in their positions. This leadership style fosters a culture characterised by trust and mutual respect, which are essential for the flourishing of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) (Assefa et. al., 2024; Yadav & Dhar, 2024). Coaching leadership is significant in fostering Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) because it emphasizes personal development, supportive interactions, and empowerment, which collectively encourage employees to go beyond their formal job requirements. Coaching leaders focus on guiding and mentoring their employees, providing them with the skills and confidence needed to excel in their roles (Luu, 2024; Malik, 2024). This leadership style promotes a culture of trust and mutual respect, which are crucial for OCB to thrive. One key reason coaching leadership enhances OCB is that it builds strong interpersonal relationships between leaders and employees. These relationships are characterized by open communication, personalized feedback, and genuine concern for employees' well-being. When employees feel valued and supported, they are more likely to exhibit discretionary behaviors that benefit the organization, such as helping colleagues, taking initiative, and showing loyalty (Kim & Jo, 2024; Sharif et. al., 2024; Choi, 2024).



Furthermore, coaching leadership aligns with the principles of empowerment and autonomy. By fostering an environment where employees are encouraged to take ownership of their tasks and make decisions, coaching leaders inspire a sense of responsibility and commitment. This sense of ownership often translates into proactive behaviors that go beyond the job description, which are the essence of OCB. Additionally, coaching leadership promotes continuous learning and development. Leaders who invest in their employees' growth create a workforce that is adaptable, skilled, and motivated. Employees who feel that their organization is invested in their personal and professional development are more likely to reciprocate with positive behaviors that contribute to the overall success of the organization. For moderation effect, The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) plays a crucial role as a moderator in the connection between coaching leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) by influencing the quality and efficacy of the interactions between leaders and their followers. The LMX theory suggests that leaders establish distinct and personalised connections with each subordinate, which may vary from high-quality interactions characterised by trust and mutual respect to low-quality interactions characterised by formal and transactional exchanges. Strong LMX connections amplify the influence of coaching leadership on OCB by creating an environment of trust and assistance (Liu & Liu, 2024; Al Bloushi et. al., 2024; AlHammadi & Abu Elanain, 2024). When leaders and workers have robust and pleasant connections, the coaching efforts of leaders are more likely to be seen as authentic and advantageous. Employees who have high-quality leader-member exchange (LMX) connections have a sense of being respected and understood, which increases their willingness to receive coaching and their motivation to participate in organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). This heightened drive manifests in actions such as assisting colleagues, willingly taking on more responsibilities, and displaying proactive behaviour, all of which together contribute to the achievement of organisational success (Lee et. al., 2024; Tabak et. al., 2024; Albdareen, 2024). In contrast, in low-quality leader-member exchange (LMX) interactions, the efficacy of teaching leadership is reduced. Employees may see coaching attempts as lacking sincerity or being done only as a formality, which might decrease their motivation to exceed their job responsibilities. The absence of trust and personal rapport might impede the favourable results often linked to coaching leadership, such as heightened involvement and proactive conduct. Moreover, LMX, serving as a moderator, emphasises the need of personalised attention in leadership methodologies. Leaders that acknowledge and foster meaningful interactions with their workers are more capable of customising their coaching to address individual requirements, thereby improving the overall efficacy of their leadership (Sharma & Kaur, 2024; Nie et. al., 2024; Gu, Tang & Jiang, 2024).

## Conclusion

The relationship between coaching leadership, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is a critical focus of organisational research that provides valuable insights into improving employee engagement, performance, and overall organisational success. This research has emphasised the crucial significance of teaching leadership in promoting Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), along with the moderating impact of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) on this association. Nevertheless, there are certain constraints within the existing study framework that need more investigation to enhance our comprehension and authenticate the results. Coaching leadership is seen as an essential method that fosters employee growth, independence, and work contentment. Coaching leaders provide an atmosphere that promotes personal development and offers

ongoing support, which in turn motivates workers to go beyond their official job duties and engage in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). This leadership style fosters a culture of trust and mutual respect, which is crucial for promoting discretionary behaviours that contribute to the success of the organisation. The efficacy of coaching leadership is enhanced by the moderating influence of LMX. LMX connections of superior quality, which are distinguished by trust, respect, and open communication, augment the influence of coaching leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Employees who have excellent leader-member exchange (LMX) connections are more likely to see coaching efforts as authentic and advantageous, which in turn increases their inclination to participate in organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). On the other hand, poor-quality LMX interactions may weaken the beneficial impacts of coaching leadership, highlighting the need of fostering robust leader-follower ties. However, the study's use of self-reported data and its cross-sectional design restrict the capacity to apply the results to a broader population and establish a cause-and-effect relationship. To overcome these constraints, future research should use longitudinal designs and apply strategies for collecting data from several sources. Moreover, broadening the range of organisational settings and investigating possible moderating and mediating factors would provide a more thorough comprehension of these processes. Qualitative research techniques, such as interviews and case studies, provide a more profound understanding of the intricacies of these connections. By investigating the effects of digital transformation and remote work, future research may stay relevant in the ever-changing workplace of today. To summarise, while the present study provides useful insights on organisational behaviour, it is crucial to overcome its weaknesses via thorough future research. By using this approach, we may cultivate more efficient leadership tactics that not only improve Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) but also promote long-term success in diverse organisational settings. This comprehensive strategy will eventually result in a staff that is more involved, efficient, and dedicated, since it aligns individual ambitions with the objectives of the organisation.

## Reference

Ali Nisar, Q., Haider, S., Waqas, A., Khan, W. A., & Selem, K. M. (2024). Cost of organizational citizenship behaviors: serial mediation model of citizenship fatigue. *Management Research Review*.

Al Bloushi, B., Mehmood, K., Jabeen, F., & Alharmoodi, A. (2024). The nexus between epistemic curiosity and innovative work behavior: role of leader-member exchange and work engagement. *Personnel Review*.

Anderson, S. N., Harenberg, S., Nieto, M., & Vosloo, J. (2024). Exploring the Multidimensional Model of Leadership Through the Lens of Coaches: An Examination of the Relationship Between Personality, Leader Behaviors, and the Coach–Athlete Relationship. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 1(aop), 1-11.

Assefa, Y., Moges, B. T., Tilwani, S. A., & Shah, M. A. (2024). The mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX) in the structural relationship between organizational justice and employee voice behaviour in higher education. *Heliyon*.

Albdareen, R. (2024). An analysis of the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The effect of emotional intelligence as a mediating role. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 12(2), 1041-1052.

AlHammadi, A., & Abu Elanain, H. M. (2024). Enhancing organizational citizenship behavior in a non-western context of the UAE: the role of organizational justice, leadership and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*.

Al Bloushi, B., Mehmood, K., Jabeen, F., & Alharmoodi, A. (2024). The nexus between epistemic curiosity and innovative work behavior: role of leader-member exchange and work engagement. *Personnel Review*.

Agyeiwaah, E., Bangwayo-Skeete, P., & Opoku, E. K. (2024). The impact of migrant workers' inclusion on subjective well-being, organizational identification, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Tourism Review*, 79(1), 250-265.

Abisoluwa Abraham Odutola. 2021. "Modeling the Intricate Association Between Sustainable Service Quality and Supply Chain Performance With Mediating Role of Blockchain Technology in America". *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies* 4 (07):01-17.

Agyabeng-Mensah, Y., Baah, C., & Afum, E. (2024). Do the roles of green supply chain learning, green employee creativity, and green organizational citizenship behavior really matter in circular supply chain performance? *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 67(3), 609-631.

Birani-Nasraddin, D., Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2024). Translating team-member exchange relationships to school outcomes: the mediating role of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 62(3), 293-308.

Braun, L., Ross-Stewart, L., & MEYER, B. B. (2024). The Relationship Between Athlete Perceptions of Coaching Leadership Behaviors and Athlete Grit. *International Journal of Exercise Science*, 17(5), 13-24.

Butler, P. (2024). Building a Coaching Culture in Irish Schools; Challenges and Opportunities: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Societies*, 14(1), 10.

Chen, Y., Zhao, G., & Cheng, M. Y. (2024). Longitudinal associations between the rates of change in family to work enrichment, leader-member exchange, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 150, 103986.

Chang, C. C., Zhuang, W. L., Hung, C. W., & Huan, T. C. (2024). Investigating the influence of thriving at work on hotel employees' service performance with the moderating effect of leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 119, 103736.

Celiker, N., & Guzeller, C. O. (2024). Predicting organizational citizenship behaviour in hospitality businesses with decision tree method. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 25(2), 436-474.

Choi, Y. (2024). The moderating effect of leader-member exchange on the relationship between technostress and organizational commitment. *Management Research Review*.

Chen, Y., Zhao, G., & Cheng, M. Y. (2024). Longitudinal associations between the rates of change in family to work enrichment, leader-member exchange, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 150, 103986.

Di Milia, L., & Jiang, Z. (2024). Linking leader-member exchange and work–nonwork balance: the mediating role of thriving at work and the moderating role of gender. *Personnel Review*, 53(1), 155-172.

Dar, N., Kundi, Y. M., & Umrani, W. A. (2024). Leader-member exchange and discretionary work behaviors: the mediating role of perceived psychological safety. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Diebig, M., Gritzka, S., Angerer, P., Erschens, R., Gast, M., Gündel, H., ... & Klasmeier, K. N. (2024). Leader-member exchange differentiation and followers' psychological strain: exploring relations on the individual and on the team-level. *Current Psychology*, 1-15.

Gao, S., Lin, X., & Lam, L. W. (2024). How learning-goal-oriented newcomers develop leader-member exchange (LMX): From agentic and communal behavior perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 176, 114569.

Gu, Q., Tang, T. L. P., & Jiang, W. (2024). Does moral leadership enhance employee creativity? Employee identification with the leader and leader-member exchange (LMX) as two mediators: Discovery from China's emergent market. In *Monetary Wisdom* (pp. 277-294). Academic Press.

Hui, C., Law, K. S., Yi Feng Chen, N., & Tjosvold, D. (2008). The role of co-operation and competition on leader—member exchange and extra-role performance in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 46(2), 133-152.

James, A. (2024). The Intersection of Leader-Follower Trade (LFT) and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) in Alleviating Work-Family Conflict (WFC). *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 17(1), 16.

Jansen, E., Czabanowska, K., Pagter, A. P. J., & Koeijer, R. J. (2024). A climate for coaching: the barriers and facilitators to implementing coaching interventions for healthcare professionals in the European Union. *Int J Health Plann Mgmt*.

Jeong, J., Kim, B. J., & Lee, J. (2024). Navigating AI transitions: how coaching leadership buffers against job stress and protects employee physical health. *Frontiers in public health*, 12, 1343932.

Jiaguo, L., Yuanyuan, Z., & Qianwen, S. (2017). Research on negative outcomes of organizational citizenship behavior: Based on generalized exchange, impression management and evolutionary psychology. *Management Review*, 29(4), 163.

Klar, H. W., Huggins, K. S., & Andreoli, P. M. (2024). Coaching, professional community, and continuous improvement: Rural school leader and coach development in a research-practice partnership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 27(2), 332-359.

Kim, M. Y., Ok, C. M., & Lee, C. K. (2024). Leaders' political skills and subordinates' service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(3), e2664.

Kim, S. M., & Jo, S. J. (2024). An examination of the effects of job insecurity on counterproductive work behavior through organizational cynicism: moderating roles of perceived organizational support and quality of leader-member exchange. *Psychological Reports*, 127(2), 957-993.

Lee, M. C. C., Lin, M. H., Srinivasan, P. M., & Carr, S. C. (2024). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: new mediating roles for trustworthiness and trust in team leaders. *Current Psychology*, 43(11), 9567-9582.

Lefebvre, J. S., Kelly, A. L., Côté, J., & Turnidge, J. (2024). Transformational Coaching: Developing a Global Rating Scale to Observe Coach Leadership Behaviours. In *Talent Identification and Development in Youth Soccer* (pp. 183-196). Routledge.

Liu, Z., & Liu, Q. (2024). Does Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Ambivalence Influence Employees' Constructive Deviance? *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(1), 70.

Liao, G., Li, M., Li, Y., & Yin, J. (2024). How does knowledge hiding play a role in the relationship between leader–member exchange differentiation and employee creativity? A cross-level model. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 28(1), 69-84.

Luu, T. T. (2024). How and when to activate hospitality employees' organizational citizenship behavior for the environment in South Korea and Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 32(1), 151-183.

Liao, G., Li, M., Li, Y., & Yin, J. (2024). How does knowledge hiding play a role in the relationship between leader–member exchange differentiation and employee creativity? A cross-level model. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 28(1), 69-84.

Luu, T. T. (2024). How and when to activate hospitality employees' organizational citizenship behavior for the environment in South Korea and Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 32(1), 151-183.

Ma, Y., Teng, Y., & Yan, B. (2024). Bring more than green? The impact of green human resource management on hospitality employees' organizational citizenship

behaviors. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(3), 2537-2556.

Ma, Y., & Ma, Q. (2024). Influence mechanism of environmentally transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: A moderated mediation model. *Current Psychology*, 43(11), 9540-9552.

Mäkelä, L., Kangas, H., Korkiakangas, E., & Laitinen, J. (2024). Coaching leadership as a link between individual-and team-level strength use at work. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2293469.

Malik, P. (2024). Individual-focused transformational leadership and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: mediating and moderating mechanisms of job crafting and employee resilience. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 11(1), 90-113.

Mitchell, R., Gu, J., & Boyle, B. (2024). The impact of leader member exchange quality and differentiation on counterproductive and citizenship behavior in health care teams. *Health Care Management Review*, 49(2), 86-93.

Nisar Khattak, M., Al-Taie, M. Z., Ahmed, I., & Muhammad, N. (2024). Interplay between servant leadership, leader-member-exchange and perceived organizational support: a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 11(2), 237-261.

Nie, Q., Peng, J., Cheng, Y., & Chen, X. (2024). Prototypical implicit followership theories, leader support, and follower organizational citizenship behavior. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 1-14.

Nuryanto, U., Basrowi, B., & Quraysin, I. (2024). Big data and IoT adoption in shaping organizational citizenship behavior: The role of innovation organizational predictor in the chemical manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 8(1), 225-268.

Olatunji Akinyeye, Abisoluwa Abraham Odutola, Damilola Badejo "assessing the impact of iso 28000:2022 security management systems on supply chain resilience and risk mitigation" international journal of management, social sciences, peace and conflict studies 7 (01);

Raza, S. A., Khan, K. A., & Hakim, F. (2024). Whether organizational citizenship behavior is triggered by employee CSR perception and spiritual values: the moderating role of Islamic work ethics. *Management Research Review*, 47(3), 353-373.

Ramadhan, A., & Riyanto, S. (2024). The Influence of Leader Member Exchange and Perceived Organizational Support on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Indonesian Business Review*, 3(1), 9-22.

Shaya, N., Mohebi, L., Pillai, R., & Abukhait, R. (2024). Illegitimate Tasks, Negative Affectivity, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Private School Teachers: A Mediated–Moderated Model. *Sustainability*, 16(2), 733.

Sharif, S., Tongkachok, K., Akbar, M., Iqbal, K., & Lodhi, R. N. (2024). Transformational leadership and innovative work behavior in three-star hotels: mediating role of leader-member exchange, knowledge sharing and voice behavior. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 54(1), 1-21.

Sharma, R. K., & Kaur, S. (2024). Analysing the mediating role of organisational citizenship behaviour between transformational leadership and education 4.0 using PLS-SEM approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Shang, K. C., Kuo, S. Y., Hsu, S. W., Lai, P. L., & Ye, K. D. (2024). Leader-member exchange, team-member exchange, employee satisfaction, and service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in the international logistics industry: The moderating effect of the service climate. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 52, 101072.

Sulphey, M. M., AlKahtani, N. S., Senan, N. A. M., & Adow, A. H. E. (2024). A bibliometric study on organization citizenship behavior for the environment. *Global Journal of Environmental Science and Management*, 10(2), 891-906.

Sun, U. Y., Park, H., & Yun, S. (2024). Ethically treated yet closely monitored: Ethical leadership, leaders' close monitoring, employees' uncertainty, and employees' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Sunaryo, S., Rahardian, R., Risgiyanti, Suyono, J., & Ekowati, D. (2024). Leader-member exchange and glass ceiling: the effects on career satisfaction and work engagement. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2336285.

Siddiq, A., Bibi, P., Akbar, N., ud Din, R., Ahmad, A., & Rahman, H. (2024). Moderating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Associated Factors: A Perspective from University Teachers in Peshawar, Pakistan. *Migration Letters*, 21(S4), 412-425.

Szekely, V., Whiley, L. A., Pontes, H., & McDowall, A. (2024). Tying leaders' identity work and executive coaching research together: an overview of systematic reviews and agenda for research. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*.

Tabak, F., Shkoler, O., Lebron, M., & Rabenu, E. (2024). Team-member and leader-member exchange, engagement, and turnover intentions: implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International*, 27(2), 169-194.

Taamneh, M., Aljawarneh, N., Al-Okaily, M., Taamneh, A., & Al-Oqaily, A. (2024). The impact of ethical leadership on organizational citizenship behavior in higher education: the contingent role of organizational justice. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2294834. Vedadi, A., Warkentin, M., Straub, D. W., & Shropshire, J. (2024). Fostering

Information Security Compliance as Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Information & Management*, 103968.

Wang, C., Yao, J., & Gao, L. (2024). How do leaders' positive emotions improve employees' psychological safety in China? The moderating effect of leader-member exchange. *Heliyon*, 10(3).

Yadav, A., & Dhar, R. L. (2024). Effect of job crafting on hotel frontline employees' work role performance: the role of work engagement and leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 25(2), 359-381.

Yusuf, Z., Yusuf, F., Nuryanto, U., & Basrowi, B. (2024). Assessing organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in ensuring the smoothness of the supply chain for medical hospital needs towards a green hospital: Evidence from Indonesia. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 12(1), 181-194.

Yu, Q. (2024). Coaching Leadership on Team Culture of Basketball Coaches. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 7(2), 235-242.

Zhang, R., Niu, X., & Zhang, B. (2024). Workplace ostracism and turnover intention: A moderated mediation model of job insecurity and coaching leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 41(1), 109-122.