



ISSN: 2586-6036

JWMAAP website: <http://accesson.kr/jwmap>doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13106/jwmap.2026.vol9.no2.191>

# A Cultural Recontextualization of Korean Coaching Leadership and Peer Coaching Ecosystem

Ho Youn JEONG<sup>1</sup>, Bum Suk LEE<sup>2\*</sup>

1. First Author Ph.D Candidate, Department of Business Administration, Seoul Business School, aSSIST University, Korea. DBA Candidate, Department of Business Administration, SDG Management School, Geneva, Switzerland.

Email: [j-hayoun@hanmail.net](mailto:j-hayoun@hanmail.net)

2. Corresponding Author Department of Business Administration, Adjunct Professor, Seoul Business School, aSSIST University, Korea. Department of Coaching Sciences, Graduate School of Business, Kyung Hee University, Korea. Adjunct Professor.

Email: [bibledrama@naver.com](mailto:bibledrama@naver.com)

Received: February 21, 2026. Revised: February 28, 2026. Accepted: April 13, 2026.

## Abstract

**Purpose:** This study provides a culturally grounded conceptual reinterpretation of Korean coaching leadership by building upon psychometrically validated findings of the Korean Stowell-based Coaching Leadership Scale (K-SCLS) and examines how Korean cultural mechanisms shape leadership dynamics in SME contexts. **Research Method:** A secondary theoretical reinterpretation design grounded in selective literature review was employed. Drawing on a foundational validation study of 300 Korean SME employees (Lee, 2025), this manuscript critically examines the historical formation of Western coaching's non-directive identity and reinterprets the validated bifactor structure of K-SCLS through Korean cultural frameworks. **Results:** Four main findings emerged. First, Western coaching's non-directive principle is a historically contingent construct shaped by humanistic commitment and regulatory reinforcement rather than a universal imperative. Second, bifactor modeling revealed that the general coaching leadership factor accounted for 90.1% of explained common variance ( $ECV = .901$ ), substantially exceeding Reise et al.'s (2013) 70% threshold for essential unidimensionality. Specific factor omega coefficients ( $\omega_S = .044-.157$ ) fell uniformly below the .20 threshold, indicating that subdimension scores contribute negligible unique reliable variance beyond the general factor. Third, Direction Facilitation is reconceptualized as culturally adaptive structure provision operating through uncertainty reduction and collective reframing. Fourth, the near-unidimensional integration pattern provides a theoretically grounded basis for proposing horizontal and vertical peer coaching ecosystems as frameworks for future empirical investigation. **Conclusion:** Korean coaching leadership constitutes a near-unidimensional integrated construct whose subdimensions function as culturally inseparable facets of a holistic leadership orientation. Jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon are proposed as theoretically plausible interpretive lenses for this integration pattern, and peer coaching ecosystems represent theoretically grounded extensions requiring empirical validation.

**Keywords :** coaching leadership, psychological well-being, peer coaching, Korean culture, small and medium-sized enterprises

**JEL Classification Code :** M12, M53, I31, O15, Z13

© Copyright: The Author(s)

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background and Problem Statement

As contemporary organizational management shifts focus from performance control to employee psychological well-being, coaching leadership has emerged as a core leadership competency. However, persistent tensions arise when Western coaching models—particularly those emphasizing strict non-directiveness—are applied to the Korean organizational context. Korean employees often expect leaders to provide clear direction and structural guidance, expectations that appear to conflict with coaching's non-directive ethos. Recent critiques by Joh (2021, 2022, 2024) have brought these tensions to the forefront by questioning the theoretical foundations of Korean coaching leadership research. His analyses demonstrated that a substantial proportion of domestic studies had misattributed conceptual foundations to Stowell (1987), despite the absence of an operational definition or scale in the original work. Most notably, Joh (2024) challenged whether leader-provided direction can legitimately be labeled "coaching" given coaching's philosophical commitment to non-directiveness. Paradoxically, despite these theoretical inconsistencies, empirical studies employing advanced quantitative methodologies have consistently reported positive relationships between coaching leadership and organizational outcomes in Korean contexts. This coexistence of theoretical critique and empirical robustness suggests that prior research may have captured a culturally embedded leadership phenomenon that was theoretically mischaracterized rather than empirically invalid. This paradox motivates the present study. Instead of dismissing Korean coaching leadership research as theoretically flawed, this manuscript adopts a cultural-constructivist perspective to reinterpret validated empirical findings. Specifically, it proposes that behaviors labeled as "Direction Facilitation" in Korean coaching leadership may operate not as controlling mechanisms but as culturally adaptive forms of structure provision that reduce uncertainty-related stress in high uncertainty-avoidance contexts.

### 1.2. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to provide a culturally grounded conceptual reinterpretation of Korean coaching leadership by explicitly clarifying the relationship between prior empirical validation and the present conceptual contribution. This manuscript does not aim to conduct new empirical testing. Instead, it builds upon psychometrically validated findings from a foundational study to address

unresolved theoretical questions regarding non-directiveness, cultural fit, and well-being mechanisms.

The necessity of regulatory frameworks for coaching has been discussed not only in terms of risk prevention but also in terms of protecting coaching's positive functions in professional settings. The regulatory design of coaching must contend with the fundamental challenge that conceptual consensus regarding what constitutes coaching as coaching has not been sufficiently established. Louridas et al. (2021) systematically reviewed coaching research conducted in surgical education and reported that conceptual inconsistency—wherein coaching is frequently conflated with teaching and mentoring even when presented as an independent educational intervention—was confirmed as a consistent pattern across studies. Simultaneously, this review identified core elements constituting coaching, including trust relationships, voluntary participation, self-reflection, goal-setting, action planning, outcome evaluation, coach training, structured models, non-directiveness, and open-ended questions, suggesting that fulfillment of these criteria can serve as benchmarks for determining coaching quality and identity (Louridas et al., 2021). Sherman and Freas (2004) identified low entry barriers, proliferation of private credentials, insufficient outcome measurement validity, and qualitative unevenness of certifications as core structural problems in the executive coaching industry, pointing out that despite rapid growth, the coaching industry lacks unified standards for training, ethics, and effectiveness verification, resulting in structural information asymmetry in which clients cannot readily assess coach competence. Byrnes et al. (2019) qualitatively explored the meaning of coaching experiences among surgeons and reported that coaching can function not merely as a skill improvement tool but as a mechanism for softening the rigidity of existing professional identities and fostering a more open and reflective professional culture, though this qualitative exploration was conducted in the specific context of the surgical profession and requires additional examination for direct application to other occupational or organizational environments.

The legitimacy of coaching professional organizations should be evaluated not by the mere existence of training systems or competency models but by their connection to actual change mechanisms. Passarelli (2015) theoretically proposed that vision-based coaching may be associated with activation of positive affect, expansion of cognitive openness, and facilitation of learning-oriented motivation in leader development processes, conceptualizing coaching's effects as originating from the coaching conversation's function as a psychological resource that activates the coachee's ideal self and triggers autonomous change motivation rather than from the quality of prescriptive advice provided by the coach. Howard (2015) conducted a

field experiment comparing vision-based coaching and coaching to improvement needs during real-time executive coaching sessions, confirming that vision-based coaching showed significant effects on coachee positive affect activation and cognitive flexibility enhancement, while the improvement-needs approach was associated with increased negative affect and defensive responses, experimentally demonstrating that coaching effects can qualitatively differ depending on the specific approach and conversational framing used in the coaching process (Howard, 2015). Even when coaching is institutionalized at the policy level, the prerequisites of qualified coaches, clear goal-setting, and linkage with existing public service systems have been discussed in public health research. Hanly et al. (2022) presented a randomized controlled trial protocol designed to examine whether referral to a population-level telephone-based coaching service contributes to health risk behavior improvement among users experiencing mental health problems, notably designing the coaching service to be accessed through referral pathways within existing mental health service systems rather than operating independently—though as a protocol paper, judgments about the actual effectiveness of this intervention must await subsequent outcome publication (Hanly et al., 2022).

Specifically, this study pursues three objectives. First, it critically examines the historical formation of Western coaching's non-directive identity to relativize its assumed universality. Second, it reinterprets the validated bifactor structure of K-SCLS—characterized by a dominant general factor ( $ECV = .901$ ) and uniformly low specific factor contributions ( $\omega_S = .044-.157$ )—through Korean cultural mechanisms to elucidate potential well-being pathways. Third, it proposes a peer coaching ecosystem as a theoretically coherent conceptual framework for future empirical investigation.

Accordingly, the following research questions guide this study:

**RQ1.** To what extent can the non-directive principle of Western coaching be understood as a historically contingent construct rather than a universal philosophical imperative, and under what theoretical conditions can eclectic approaches be academically justified in Korean organizational contexts?

**RQ2.** How can the near-unidimensional cultural integration observed in the **validated bifactor structure of K-SCLS** ( $ECV = .901$ ) be theoretically interpreted as consistent with Korean cultural mechanisms such as jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon, and what are the implications for psychological well-being pathways in SME contexts?

**RQ3.** Under what organizational conditions can extensions from hierarchical coaching leadership to horizontal and vertical peer coaching be theoretically conceptualized as

aligned with core coaching principles while supporting psychological safety and social support networks?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. The Formation of Western Coaching's Non-Directive Identity

**Coaching as a Distinctive Professional Practice.** Before examining the philosophical and institutional pathways through which non-directiveness became central to coaching identity, it is necessary to establish that coaching constitutes a distinctive professional practice with its own intervention logic, rather than a diminished form of therapy or a loosely defined advisory service. The boundary between coaching and adjacent helping professions remains a site of ongoing scholarly and institutional negotiation. Aboujaoude (2020) discussed how life coaching performs dialogic interventions functionally similar to psychotherapy, yet operates in a regulatory vacuum characterized by the absence of licensing, training, and supervision requirements, suggesting that the boundary between coaching and therapy should be conceptualized as a practical task requiring continuous negotiation according to client functioning level, problem severity, and intervention purpose. Atkinson et al. (2021) conceptualized coaching as a relational practice that facilitates learners' reflection and self-regulation, providing a theoretical framework in which coaching's professional expertise is grounded in structured reflection facilitation capacity rather than prescriptive knowledge transmission. Empirical evidence supporting coaching as an intervention with its own distinctive logic has also been accumulating. Bühner et al. (2025) reported through longitudinal multi-group model analysis that coaching experience significantly influenced the relationship between teacher self-regulation and well-being over time. Dyrbye et al. (2019) verified through a pilot randomized clinical trial that professional coaching intervention produced significant improvements in physician well-being and significant reductions in emotional exhaustion, though the pilot scale necessitates caution in generalization. Kiser et al. (2024) further demonstrated through a randomized controlled trial that peer coaching by trained professionals produced significant reductions in burnout, demonstrating that coaching effects can be realized through systematically trained peer professionals as well as external coaches. Young et al. (2016) provided a theoretical basis for understanding professional boundaries as products of continuous discursive contestation rather than fixed institutional demarcations. These findings collectively establish coaching's identity as a distinctive professional domain—a foundation upon which the following analysis of non-directiveness can be situated.

The non-directive principle in Western coaching emerged from a convergence of philosophical commitment and institutional pressure, and its current form can be understood as the product of both intellectual tradition and regulatory reinforcement rather than as a purely defensive construction or a universally binding philosophical imperative.

**Philosophical Foundations.** The philosophical roots of non-directiveness lie in the humanistic psychology tradition, particularly in the work of Carl Rogers. O'Hara (1995) analyzed Rogers' position within humanistic psychology and reported that Rogers developed the person-centered approach as an alternative to both the mechanistic view of human nature in behaviorism and the directive interpretive mode of psychoanalysis. According to O'Hara (1995), Rogers understood humans as active agents who construct meaning and pursue goals, and he located the primary driver of therapeutic change not in the practitioner's technique but in the quality of the therapeutic relationship. The three facilitative conditions Rogers articulated—congruence, unconditional positive regard, and empathic understanding—were analyzed by O'Hara (1995) as constituting non-directiveness as an intentional and ethical relational attitude designed to activate the client's self-actualizing tendency. Furthermore, O'Hara (1995) noted that the dialogical intersubjectivity derived from Buber's I-Thou relational concept resonated deeply with the normative foundation of non-directiveness regarding mutuality and respect in therapeutic encounters.

Goldfried (2007) examined the legacy that contemporary psychotherapy inherited from Rogers and concluded that the core of the non-directive attitude lies in creating conditions through which clients can discover meaning and make choices for themselves. According to Goldfried (2007), Rogers' empathic attitude and unconditional regard represent not mere technical neutrality but an active, empathic ethical practice that supports the client's safe self-exploration. Goldfried (2007) further noted that the empirical examination of the effectiveness and operating mechanisms of Rogers' "necessary and sufficient conditions" remains an important ongoing research agenda, suggesting that non-directiveness is simultaneously a relationship-centered ethical commitment and an area requiring continued empirical investigation.

**Institutional and Legal Reinforcement.** Upon this philosophical foundation, legal and regulatory pressures contributed to the consolidation of non-directiveness into a more rigid institutional norm. As documented by Nishigaki (2021), who compiled regulatory case histories in a

scholarly monograph on coaching psychology, in 2004 a coach in Colorado who dealt with psychological issues was prosecuted for violating medical practice laws. The coach was acquitted by arguing that the service provided constituted life coaching distinct from the state's licensing domain. This incident triggered heightened emphasis on the boundary between coaching and therapy within the coaching industry. The coaching profession's boundary-setting efforts can be understood, in part, as regulatory responses to preserve practice legitimacy in the face of jurisdictional challenges from licensed mental health professions.

Kyung (2025), in an integrative literature review on meaning coaching, discussed the overlapping territories between coaching and adjacent professions including psychotherapy, counseling, management consulting, and training. Kyung (2025) reported that these overlaps generate boundary struggles regarding scope of practice definitions, ethical responsibilities when clinical referral is necessary, and title protection, and that scholarly literature exhibits a tendency to defend and establish these boundaries through standardization and specialization strategies. This analysis provides a peer-reviewed scholarly foundation for understanding how professional identity formation contributes to the rigidification of non-directiveness.

The International Coach Federation (ICF), since its establishment in 1995, has specified in its code of ethics that coaching is distinguished from therapy, counseling, and consulting (ICF, 2026), and this boundary-setting can be interpreted as having a stronger character of legal defense than professional establishment. Son and Kim (2025) discussed the need for multi-layered regulatory models in coaching professionalization, including minimum ethical and safety standards, voluntary certification and self-regulatory norms, and mandatory supervision and continuing education, suggesting that the regulatory landscape surrounding coaching identity is complex and evolving rather than monolithic. This legal tension has persisted in recent legislative developments. As a recent regulatory illustration, in 2025 the Utah state legislature enacted Senate Bill 48 (Utah S.B. 48, 2025), explicitly prohibiting unlicensed life coaches from engaging in therapeutic activities.<sup>2</sup> The bill was introduced in response to documented cases where practitioners whose therapy licenses were revoked transitioned to life coaching and continued therapeutic practices, leading to provisions prohibiting diagnosis and trauma processing and imposing fines for violations (as reported in practitioner literature: Wholistic Life Coaching, 2025).

---

<sup>2</sup> The specific legislative provisions of Utah S.B. 48 are referenced based on the enacted bill text and supplementary reporting in practitioner outlets. Readers should note that practitioner and media sources are used

here as supplementary documentation of recent regulatory developments that have not yet been addressed in peer-reviewed literature, and should be evaluated accordingly.

Non-Directiveness as an Evolving and Contested Principle. The coaching field's engagement with the non-directive tradition has not remained static but has undergone active reinterpretation. Kyung (2025) reported that the coaching field exhibits a tendency to review existentialism, dialogism, and person-centeredness in parallel when incorporating the non-directive tradition, and that rather than transplanting Rogerian non-directiveness directly, a contemporary current has formed toward reinterpreting it by balancing facilitative dialogue with goal-oriented intervention. Do et al. (2023) analyzed the philosophical foundations of coaching studies and found that non-directiveness in coaching contexts has been reconstructed in combination with the coach's enhanced questioning capacity, relationship management competency, and facilitation skills, functioning in a manner that facilitates the client's autonomous exploration while maintaining balance with organizational contexts and performance-oriented demands. In a complementary vein, García-Galán et al. (2024) examined non-directive team coaching in engineering education and reported that non-directive approaches can effectively strengthen teamwork competencies when implemented within structured educational frameworks. These observations suggest that non-directiveness in coaching should be understood as an evolving and contested principle that is being actively adapted rather than as a fixed doctrinal commitment.

Meanwhile, Kitchin (2023) analyzed practicing coaches' boundary perceptions through Q methodology and found four coexisting types, from conscious practitioners to confident practitioners. Notably, coaches without psychology backgrounds tended to interpret boundaries more flexibly, suggesting that a single, unified coaching identity does not exist in practice.

Taken together, this dual-pathway analysis suggests that the non-directive principle of Western coaching is best understood neither as a purely philosophical imperative nor as a merely defensive institutional artifact, but as a historically layered construct shaped by both humanistic commitment and regulatory reinforcement—one that continues to evolve as the coaching field negotiates its professional boundaries and theoretical foundations.

## 2.2. Academic Legitimacy of Eclecticism

The dynamic equilibrium of conflicting elements presented by Smith and Lewis's (2011) paradox perspective requires an eclectic approach at the practical level. To resolve tensions between theoretical purity and practical effectiveness, eclecticism that selectively integrates various theoretical resources is inevitable and is an academically legitimate methodology.

Academically, eclecticism refers to an attitude or method that attempts to construct new systems or expressions by selecting and fusing heterogeneous or opposing elements from different theories, styles, and traditions (Park, 2006). Rather than adhering to one pure and singular principle, this approach is understood as a practical and methodological stance that selects and combines elements from multiple theories according to their usefulness and fitness for purpose.

### 2.2.1. Eclectic Foundations of Psychotherapy Integration Theory

In psychotherapy, eclecticism has a long academic tradition. Norcross and Goldfried (2005), under the premise that no perfect single theory exists, presented four integration models. Technical eclecticism selects effective techniques regardless of theory, and the common factors approach focuses on universal elements contributing to therapeutic effects such as therapeutic relationship, hope, and insight. Theoretical integration combines two or more theories to construct new integrated systems, and assimilative integration maintains a primary theoretical framework while incorporating techniques from other approaches.

Empirical research on eclecticism has also accumulated in Korean counseling and social welfare fields. Ko (2017) presented a four-stage integration model of exploration, insight, action, and maintenance, arguing how theories such as person-centered, psychodynamic, cognitive-behavioral, and motivational enhancement can be selectively utilized at each stage. Ko (2019) confirmed through consensual qualitative research that six types of counseling hypotheses operate integratively in practice settings.

Taken together, these empirical findings from the Korean counseling and social welfare fields demonstrate that eclectic integration is not a theoretical anomaly but a well-documented professional reality with systematic frameworks. Ko's (2017) four-stage model provides structural legitimacy by articulating how exploration, insight, action, and maintenance phases can each draw selectively from different theoretical traditions without sacrificing coherence. Ko's (2019) subsequent identification of six counseling hypothesis types through consensual qualitative research further substantiates that practitioners engage in theory-integrative reasoning as a standard professional practice rather than as a deviation from orthodoxy. These findings carry particular relevance for coaching leadership research because they establish a precedent within Korean academic traditions for legitimizing eclectic integration as a rigorous, empirically grounded methodology rather than an ad hoc compromise.

### 2.2.2. Eclectic Practice in Coaching Contexts

Research on practitioners who combine counseling and coaching shows that eclectic integration occurs spontaneously in the field. G. R. Kim (2020) derived complementarity as a core experiential theme in a phenomenological study of 20 practitioners who are both counselors and coaches. Participants reported that coaching alone has limitations in deep emotional exploration and counseling alone lacks behavioral execution power, describing practices of flexibly switching between counseling and coaching modes according to client characteristics and situations.

The developmental trajectories of coaching practitioners further illustrate eclectic integration in practice. Kim and Kim (2024) investigated the professional development process of supervisees who experienced coaching supervision using grounded theory methodology and found that coaches progressively integrate multiple theoretical perspectives as they advance through developmental stages, suggesting that eclectic competence constitutes a hallmark of professional maturation in coaching practice.

In organizational contexts, the inevitability of eclectic approaches stems from structural characteristics. Joh (2024) conceptualized coaching leadership as the intersection of coaching and leadership, arguing that organizational contexts demand eclecticism. Organizations have inherent hierarchy, authority, and evaluation relationships, making equal relationships and non-evaluative interactions presupposed by pure coaching structurally difficult to realize. Therefore, coaching in organizational contexts inevitably has an eclectic character, which can be understood as an expression of contextual appropriateness rather than theoretical deficiency. This convergence of evidence from psychotherapy integration theory (Norcross & Goldfried, 2005), Korean counseling practice (Ko, 2017, 2019), and counselor-coach hybrid practitioners (G. R. Kim, 2020) yields a coherent theoretical proposition.

Eclecticism in coaching leadership represents not the absence of theoretical commitment but the presence of contextual intelligence—an adaptive capacity to match interventions to the cultural, relational, and situational demands of organizational life. In Korean organizational settings, where hierarchical structures coexist with relational imperatives, eclectic approaches enable leaders to navigate between directive structure-provision and non-directive developmental facilitation in ways that a single-paradigm model cannot accommodate. This proposition transforms Joh's (2024) observation that coaching leadership occupies the intersection of coaching and leadership from a critique into a theoretical feature, positioning eclecticism as the natural methodology for constructs operating at the confluence of multiple domains. Critically, the empirical structure of K-SCLS reinforces this theoretical proposition. The bifactor evidence from the

foundational validation study (Lee, 2025)—wherein the near-unidimensional integration pattern ( $ECV = .901$ ) indicates that Korean employees perceive coaching leadership not as a composite of separable dimensions but as a culturally fused whole—can itself be interpreted as an empirical signature of eclecticism naturalized into the structure of Korean coaching leadership perception. The four behavioral domains resist empirical differentiation precisely because Korean organizational members do not parse their leaders' behaviors into discrete theoretical categories; they experience them as a unified, eclectic relational resource.

## **2.3. Theoretical Foundations of Psychological Well-being**

### **2.3.1. Concept and Components of Psychological Well-being**

Psychological well-being consists of six dimensions according to Ryff's (1989) multidimensional model: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. This model presents a eudaimonic well-being perspective focused on optimal human functioning and self-actualization, unlike hedonic well-being which simply focuses on experiencing positive emotions and absence of negative emotions. In organizational contexts, psychological well-being is measured through job satisfaction, absence of emotional exhaustion, and work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), directly affecting productivity and turnover intentions.

The fundamental mechanism by which satisfaction of basic psychological needs leads to enhanced psychological well-being has been empirically supported across diverse contexts. Behzadnia and FatahModares (2020) reported that during the COVID-19 pandemic, individuals who participated in activities satisfying autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs showed higher vitality and psychological health levels while simultaneously exhibiting lower perceived stress levels compared to those who did not. Notably, the effects of need satisfaction were not limited to specific organizational environments or task conditions but showed significant positive associations with well-being even at the level of everyday activities (Behzadnia & FatahModares, 2020). Constructing a theoretical pathway connecting coaching leadership and psychological well-being through SDT requires specific evidence regarding how basic psychological needs operate in the work context. Coxen et al. (2021) systematically reviewed diary studies addressing basic psychological needs in work settings and reported as a consistently confirmed pattern across studies that autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs are not

fixed individual traits but can be fluidly satisfied or frustrated depending on daily organizational contexts. Particularly, the repeatedly observed finding was that organizational resources including supervisory supportive behaviors, quality of colleague interactions, and task autonomy significantly influence daily fluctuations in need satisfaction, which in turn is closely connected to daily well-being, engagement, and vitality (Coxen et al., 2021).

### 2.3.2 Theoretical Connection Between Coaching Leadership and Well-being

The pathways through which coaching leadership may contribute to employees' psychological well-being can be explained by two main theoretical frameworks. First, according to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000), humans have three basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—and satisfaction of these needs enhances intrinsic motivation and psychological well-being. Although the near-unidimensional bifactor structure of K-SCLS (ECV = .901) indicates that these four dimensions function as highly integrated facets rather than independent constructs, each dimension can be conceptually associated with distinct basic needs as theoretically grounded interpretive lenses. Competency Development and Performance Evaluation may be particularly associated with competence need satisfaction, negotiated Direction Facilitation with autonomy need satisfaction, and Relationship Building with relatedness need satisfaction. These conceptual associations should be understood as theoretically plausible propositions rather than empirically established independent pathways, given that the near-unity interfactor correlations (.845–.943) suggest that need satisfaction may occur holistically through the integrated coaching leadership experience rather than through dimensionally distinct mechanisms. That autonomy support—one of SDT's core mechanisms—contributes to both psychological health and relationship quality has been reported in interpersonal research. Deci et al. (2006) reported that the experience of giving and receiving autonomy support in close relationships showed significant positive associations with relationship satisfaction and psychological health, noting that autonomy support effects were observed not only for the receiving party but also for the providing party, suggesting that autonomy support is a reciprocal relational process contributing simultaneously to both parties' need satisfaction and well-being (Deci et al., 2006).

Second, the job demands-resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017) explains the potential well-being contribution mechanism of coaching leadership from the perspective of job resources. According to this model, job resources buffer negative effects of job demands, promote

intrinsic motivation, and increase work engagement. The four dimensions of coaching leadership can each be conceptualized as core job resources. Direction Facilitation may reduce role stress through role clarity, Competency Development may provide growth opportunities, Performance Evaluation may promote competence experiences through achievement recognition, and Relationship Building may strengthen social support. One of the theoretical strengths of the JD-R model is that job resources possess a dual pathway—not merely buffering the negative effects of job demands but also independently enhancing engagement and motivation. Hansez and Chmiel (2010) reported that job resources performed a buffering function against the negative effects of job demands while also independently showing positive associations with employee safety behavior and organizational commitment, suggesting that the effects of job resources are not limited to defensive buffering but can also operate through active motivational pathways (Hansez & Chmiel, 2010). The prospective effects of job resources on health outcomes have also been reinforced through longitudinal designs. Thapa et al. (2022) prospectively analyzed the relationships among job demands, job resources, and health outcomes among nursing professionals in Sweden, confirming that job resources such as social support, rewards, and cohesion predicted better self-rated health and lower burnout levels over time—effects that remained significant even after controlling for the influence of job demands (Thapa et al., 2022). The theoretical pathway that coaching leadership as a job resource contributes to well-being can also be reinforced by research longitudinally tracking the relationship between resources and well-being. Marsh et al. (2022) longitudinally analyzed the effects of job demands and job resources on burnout and well-being among school principals, confirming that increases in job resources over time predicted decreases in burnout and improvements in job satisfaction and happiness, with job resource effects remaining significant even after controlling for job demand levels (Marsh et al., 2022).

### 2.4. Korean Cultural Context and Psychological Well-being

Korean organizational culture exhibits characteristics distinctly different from those of Western cultures. Cross-cultural leadership research, including the GLOBE study of 62 societies (House et al., 2004), has demonstrated that cultural values systematically shape leadership expectations and effectiveness perceptions across national contexts. According to Hofstede et al.'s (2010) cultural dimensions model, Korea has a power distance index of 60 points, showing greater acceptance of hierarchical relationships compared to the United States' 40 points. The uncertainty

avoidance index is significantly higher in Korea at 85 points compared to the United States' 46 points, suggesting that Koreans have high anxiety about ambiguity and prefer clear structures and rules. On the individualism-collectivism dimension, Korea scores 18 points in contrast to the United States' 91 points, meaning that in-group harmony and collective identity are emphasized in Korean organizations. Korea also greatly exceeds the United States in long-term orientation index with 100 points compared to 26 points, showing future-oriented and relationship-centered decision-making patterns.

**Table 1:** Comparison of Korean-American Cultural Dimensions

Dimension	Korea	United States	Interpretation
Power Distance	60	40	Higher acceptance of hierarchy
Uncertainty Avoidance	85	46	Preference for structure and rules
Individualism	18	91	Strong collectivism
Long-term Orientation	100	26	Future and relationship emphasis

*Note.* Based on cultural dimension scores from Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010).

#### 2.4.1. Korean Cultural Mechanisms and Well-being Pathways

Connecting cultural mechanisms to the interpretation of leadership structural models requires the theoretical premise that organizational culture functions not as a mere background factor but as a meaning system that substantively shapes members' perceptions and behaviors. Ehrhart et al. (2014) reviewed organizational climate and organizational culture research and discussed that organizational culture—as a system of shared basic assumptions, values, and behavioral norms—structurally participates in the meaning interpretation of leadership, interpersonal expectations, and decision-making styles. According to their analysis, even identical leader behaviors can be interpreted differently as consideration, control, support, or interference depending on the cultural meaning system of the organization and society, and therefore considering cultural context in leadership research was proposed not as a supplementary enhancement but as a theoretical necessity (Ehrhart et al., 2014). This theoretical

premise finds direct support in organizational culture research. Ehrhart et al. (2014) demonstrated that even identical leader behaviors can be interpreted differently—as consideration, control, support, or interference—depending on the cultural meaning system of the organization and society, establishing that cultural context in leadership research functions as a theoretical necessity rather than a supplementary refinement. This insight is directly applicable to the Korean coaching leadership context, where the near-unidimensional bifactor structure ( $ECV = .901$ ) observed in the foundational validation study may itself reflect the operation of a culturally unified meaning system through which Korean SME employees perceive all coaching leadership behaviors as expressions of a single integrated relational orientation.

That hierarchy, authority, and relational orientations embedded in East Asian Confucian cultures substantially participate in organizational leadership behaviors and perceptions has also been reported through qualitative research from adjacent cultural contexts. Su et al. (2012) applied grounded theory methodology to explore Taiwanese hospital nurses' perceptions of leadership style and reported that Confucian authoritarianism and deference norms embedded in Chinese culture were involved in shaping hierarchical leadership patterns in hospital organizations. Participants showed a tendency to accept leaders' directive behaviors without resistance, and this acceptance was interpreted as mediated by culturally structured relational norms rather than personal submission (Su et al., 2012). While this research does not directly address Korean cultural mechanisms, it serves as adjacent cultural evidence showing that relationism and hierarchism can structurally influence leadership interpretation in organizations, providing supplementary support for the present study's theoretical inference that jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon may function as cultural foundations for leadership perception in Korean organizations. The limitations of Korean-specific generalization from the Taiwanese hospital context should, however, be acknowledged.

Korean organizational culture is characterized by three core mechanisms affecting psychological well-being:

Jeong (정, 情) signifies deep emotional connections that transcend formal role boundaries. When leaders provide personal interest and emotional support to members, it can be theorized as strengthening sense of belonging and emotional stability (Choi & Kim, 2020; Lee et al., 2019). This mechanism is proposed to buffer negative effects of stress through social support according to Cohen and Wills's (1985) buffering effect model, potentially protecting emotional well-being.

Uri consciousness (우리 의식) reflects a collective identity orientation, positioning organizational leaders not as individual performance managers but as facilitators of group harmony and collective success (Jung & Lee, 2019). This mechanism provides a foundation where team goals are prioritized over individual goals and leaders' goal-setting can be interpreted as "our direction" rather than unilateral directives. This is proposed to contribute to well-being through satisfaction of relatedness needs and strengthening of sense of belonging.

Chemyon (체면, face) provides norms that performance feedback and evaluation processes should be conducted in ways that do not damage individual dignity, potentially enabling self-esteem protection and developmental feedback acceptance (J.-H. Kim, 2020). Chemyon constitutes a socially embedded norm system in which the evaluator bears an implicit relational responsibility to preserve the evaluated person's social standing and dignity. When applying leadership measurement structures such as K-SCLS in the Korean context, it is necessary to consider not only the formal structure of sub-factors but also how those sub-factors are interpreted and manifested within Korea's cultural meaning system. Suhonen et al. (2012) applied Rasch model analysis to the Individualised Care Scale across six European countries and reported that even formally identical measurement instruments can exhibit differential item difficulty and functioning across cultural contexts, suggesting that formal structural equivalence does not automatically guarantee meaning equivalence across cultures and that relational norms, care expectations, and the meaning of autonomy in each cultural context can systematically participate in item interpretation (Suhonen et al., 2012). This perspective supports the necessity of considering how K-SCLS sub-factors are interpreted within the relational expectations and interaction norms formed by jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon when applying this instrument in Korean organizational contexts.

The SDT-based well-being pathway that combines with Korean cultural mechanisms requires evidence regarding whether the relationship between basic psychological need satisfaction and well-being holds in collectivistic or non-Western cultural contexts. Tang et al. (2021) examined through a cross-cultural comparison design with older adults in China and France the pathway by which basic psychological need satisfaction contributes to psychological well-being through autonomous motivation, reporting significant positive associations between need satisfaction and psychological well-being in both cultural contexts. Notably, while the basic relational structure between need satisfaction and well-being was observed similarly across cultural contexts, cultural differences emerged in the specific pathways through which needs were satisfied and in

the mediating strength of autonomous motivation (Tang et al., 2021). These results support the universal tendency of basic psychological need satisfaction to contribute to well-being while suggesting that the manner and intensity of satisfaction can be modulated by cultural context—a finding theoretically consistent with the present study's approach of conceptualizing jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon as cultural moderating factors of need satisfaction pathways.

## 2.5. Peer Coaching and Social Support Systems

Peer coaching is defined as a structured collaborative relationship where peers in equal positions improve professionalism and performance through mutual observation, feedback, and dialogue (Park, 2008). Parker et al. (2008) conceptualized peer coaching as a relational process that accelerates career learning, presenting horizontality, reciprocity, and non-evaluative relationships as core characteristics. Horizontality means equal relationship structures excluding hierarchy, reciprocity means bidirectional exchange of help and learning, and non-evaluative relationships mean developmental interactions separated from performance evaluation.

The theoretical foundations of peer coaching can be found in shared leadership, zone of proximal development, and learning organization theories. Pearce and Conger's (2003) shared leadership theory explains a state where leadership functions are not concentrated in one formal leader but distributed and shared among team members. Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development theory provides another theoretical foundation explaining the learning effects of peer coaching.

Empirical research on peer coaching has accumulated across diverse professional and cultural contexts. Zwart et al. (2009) investigated which characteristics of reciprocal peer coaching contexts affect teacher learning as perceived by both teachers and their students, contributing to understanding of the structural conditions—including voluntary participation, mutual trust, and shared goal orientation—that facilitate effective peer coaching interactions. Jao (2013) examined peer coaching as a model for professional development, demonstrating its capacity to foster collaborative learning among practitioners through structured observation and reflective dialogue. Aderibigbe and Ajasa (2013) explored perceptions of peer coaching as an institutionalized professional development tool, providing evidence that formalized peer coaching structures can enhance professional competencies within educational organizations.

Notably, research beyond Western cultural contexts has begun to emerge. Sider (2019) explored peer coaching implementation in a school in Cairo, Egypt, extending the evidence base to non-Western settings and suggesting that

peer coaching principles possess cross-cultural adaptability when implementation frameworks account for local relational norms. In organizational management contexts, Kotlyar et al. (2015) examined career communities as sources of external peer coaching for leadership development, demonstrating that peer coaching benefits extend beyond immediate within-organization dyads to encompass broader professional networks. Collectively, these studies support the theoretical proposition that peer coaching serves as a robust developmental mechanism adaptable across institutional, professional, and cultural boundaries—a finding particularly relevant to the Korean SME context where formalized coaching infrastructure may be limited.

From a psychological well-being perspective, peer coaching can be conceptualized as a structured mechanism satisfying the three basic needs of self-determination theory: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Edmondson's (1999) concept of psychological safety explains that the non-evaluative, non-hierarchical characteristics of peer coaching can create high psychological safety, promoting learning behaviors and well-being.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research Design and Relationship to Prior Empirical Work

This study adopts a secondary theoretical reinterpretation design grounded in a selective literature review (Snyder, 2019). The scholarly contribution of conceptual papers resides not in the collection of empirical data but in the clarification, reconstruction, and systematic reorganization of concepts and their interrelationships. Kedrick et al. (2024) demonstrated through large-scale bibliometric analysis that scientific knowledge growth is driven not only by empirical accumulation but also by the refinement and reorganization of conceptual structure. Within the coaching field, Passmore and Evans-Krimme (2021) exemplified this contribution mode by conceptually mapping the coaching industry's trajectory from personal craft to scientific process. The validity of such conceptual contributions should be evaluated by their coherence, explanatory power, and heuristic value for subsequent research—specifically, the

capacity to guide meaningful questions and productive research directions (Peh et al., 2021; Radwin & Fawcett, 2002)—rather than by the presence of new empirical data. The present study follows this established tradition by selectively integrating literature across coaching theory, cultural psychology, and organizational behavior to construct an interpretive framework that reorganizes existing knowledge around the culturally specific mechanisms operating within Korean coaching leadership.<sup>3</sup> To ensure transparency regarding the origin of each claim, this manuscript employs a consistent system of epistemic signposting. Statements prefaced by "In the foundational validation study" refer to empirical findings originating exclusively from Lee (2025). Statements introduced by "The present reinterpretation suggests" or "This study interprets" denote interpretive insights developed in the current manuscript by applying cultural psychology and organizational behavior frameworks to previously established findings. Statements marked by "This study advances the proposition that" or "This study proposes" indicate new conceptual contributions that extend beyond both the prior empirical findings and existing theoretical literature. This tripartite distinction is maintained throughout the Theoretical Analysis and Discussion sections to enable readers to evaluate each claim according to its appropriate evidential status. To further clarify the epistemic structure of the manuscript, Table 2 presents a classification of the major claims advanced in this study according to their evidential basis.

**Table 2:** Classification of Claims by Evidential Status

Claim Type	Evidential Basis	Examples
Empirical findings (cited from Lee, 2025)	Statistically validated	CFA model fit (CFI = 1.000, RMSEA = .008), ECV = .901, $\omega_S = .044-.157$ , bifactor general and specific factor loadings
Theoretical reinterpretations (core contribution of the present study)	Literature-based interpretive inference	Cultural mechanism-sub-factor linkages, Direction Facilitation reconceptualization
Conceptual propositions (future research framework)	Theoretical hypothesis level	H-PCLS, V-PCLS, peer coaching ecosystem

<sup>3</sup> For additional methodological precedents supporting conceptual paper designs across diverse disciplines, see Browne (1993) on concept clarification in nursing; Germain et al. (2021) on domain-specific conceptual model development; Guillén and Feltz (2011) on

conceptual model construction in sport psychology; Larkin et al. (2007) on selective integrative concept evaluation; Lassi et al. (2014) on theory adaptation procedures; and Mistry et al. (2016) on integrated conceptual frameworks for fragmented research domains.

The foundational validation study employed confirmatory factor analysis and hierarchical modeling to establish the reliability and structural validity of K-SCLS. Importantly, common method bias concerns identified through Harman's single-factor test were rigorously addressed using an Equal-loadings Unmeasured Latent Method Construct (ULMC) model, which substantially reduced method variance while maintaining excellent model fit. All statistical results referenced in the present manuscript originate from this bias-controlled empirical framework and are cited solely for theoretical recontextualization purposes. For full methodological details regarding participants, data collection procedures, instrument development, and validation stages, readers are referred to Lee (2025).

Accordingly, the present study does not seek to revalidate K-SCLS or to test new hypotheses empirically. Instead, it reinterprets the established measurement structure through cultural psychology, organizational behavior, and well-being theories to clarify the cultural meanings and functional implications of Korean coaching leadership. The analysis proceeds across three conceptual levels: (a) historical constructivist examination of Western coaching identity, (b) cultural-theoretical interpretation of validated K-SCLS dimensions, and (c) conceptual extension toward a multi-layered peer coaching ecosystem.

### 3.2. Literature Selection Criteria

This study employed a selective literature review targeting five interconnected scholarly domains. The selection process prioritized works examining the legal and institutional contexts of coaching identity formation, which enabled critical examination of Western coaching's non-directive principle. Literature addressing the academic legitimacy of eclectic approaches in psychotherapy and counseling provided methodological justification for the study's theoretical stance. Cultural psychology research linking Korean cultural characteristics with organizational behavior facilitated contextualized interpretation of coaching leadership mechanisms. Additionally, theoretical works on peer coaching and shared leadership supplied conceptual foundations for the proposed ecosystem models, while studies connecting psychological well-being with organizational contexts established the theoretical pathways through which coaching leadership may contribute to employee outcomes. These domains were selected based on their capacity to address the study's research questions while maintaining theoretical coherence across historical, cultural, and practical analytical dimensions.

### 3.3. Summary of Foundational Study Design

Data for K-SCLS validation were collected from 300 employees of Korean SMEs (Lee, 2025). Selecting SMEs as research subjects was based on theoretical and practical grounds. Due to structural characteristics of physical proximity and frequent interactions, SMEs can more directly manifest coaching leadership effects (Park, 2008), and fewer hierarchical levels compared to large corporations provide environmental conditions that can increase frequency and quality of leader-member coaching interactions. The final K-SCLS consists of 16 items distributed across four conceptually specified subdimensions—Direction Facilitation, Competency Development, Performance Evaluation, and Relationship Building—each comprising four items. These subdimensions are retained as conceptual organizers for content coverage and training design purposes; however, bifactor analysis confirmed that they function empirically as highly integrated facets of a single general coaching leadership construct ( $ECV = .901$ ) rather than as psychometrically independent dimensions. Dimension-level scores should therefore be interpreted with considerable caution, and the K-SCLS total score is the recommended operational metric for research and practice applications. The structural verification protocol prioritized mathematical feasibility before theoretical interpretation. Hierarchical CFA specification produced an inadmissible solution, with the Direction Setting factor exhibiting a standardized higher-order loading of 1.013—a Heywood case indicating that interfactor correlations were sufficiently high to cause mathematical saturation of the hierarchical specification. Consequently, the correlated four-factor model and the bifactor model were adopted as the primary analytical frameworks. The bifactor model converged without inadmissible solutions ( $CFI = 1.000$ ,  $RMSEA = .023$ , zero negative residual variances), and its variance decomposition indices provided the most precise characterization of the integration–differentiation structure (see Lee, 2025, for full methodological details).

## 4. Theoretical Analysis and Conceptual Reinterpretation

### 4.1. Summary of Foundational Psychometric Evidence

In the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025), confirmatory factor analysis of the correlated four-factor model demonstrated excellent fit ( $CFI = 1.000$ ,  $TLI = 1.000$ ,  $RMSEA = .008$  [90% CI: .000, .032],  $SRMR = .019$ ), substantially exceeding the recommended thresholds of Hu and Bentler (1999). Reliability analyses demonstrated high internal consistency, with Cronbach's  $\alpha$  ranging from .938

to .949 and McDonald's  $\omega$  ranging from .936 to .942 across subdimensions. Average variance extracted (AVE = .822–.843) and composite reliability (CR = .948–.956) provided strong evidence of convergent validity, with all standardized factor loadings ranging from .879 to .952 (see Appendix A for detailed statistics).

In the foundational validation study, common method bias was assessed through multiple complementary approaches. Harman's single-factor test indicated that 76.1% of total variance was explained by the first unrotated component, substantially exceeding the 50% concern threshold (Podsakoff et al., 2003). An Equal-loadings Unmeasured Latent Method Construct (ULMC) model (Williams et al., 2010) was subsequently applied, reducing the estimated method variance to 43.0% while maintaining excellent model fit (CFI = .993, RMSEA = .038). Although method variance remained elevated after ULMC application, the ULMC-controlled four-factor structure was preserved, and the high Harman's percentage is partly attributable to the genuinely near-unidimensional structure of the construct itself. These findings necessitate conservative interpretation and underscore the importance of multi-source replication. The ULMC-controlled four-factor structure was preserved with excellent model fit, suggesting that the observed covariation pattern reflects substantive rather than purely methodological relationships. Future research should enhance methodological rigor by integrating multi-source data—including supervisor self-reports, peer ratings, and objective behavioral indicators—within structural equation modeling frameworks.

## 4.2. Cultural Reinterpretation of the Hierarchical Structure

### 4.2.1. Structural Evidence from the Foundational Study

In the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025), structural analyses proceeded through systematic mathematical verification. The hierarchical CFA specification produced an inadmissible solution—the Direction Setting factor exhibited a standardized higher-order loading of 1.013, a Heywood case indicating mathematical saturation consistent with near-unity interfactor correlations (.845–.943). Consequently, the correlated four-factor model and the bifactor model were adopted as the primary analytical frameworks. The bifactor model converged without inadmissible solutions (CFI = 1.000, RMSEA = .023, zero negative residual variances), and its variance decomposition indices provided the most precise characterization of the integration structure (see Appendix A for detailed indices). In the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025), bifactor modeling revealed that the general coaching leadership factor accounted for 90.1% of

explained common variance (ECV = .901)—a value that substantially exceeds Reise et al.'s (2013) 70% threshold at which a construct is recommended to be treated as essentially unidimensional, leaving only 9.9% of common variance attributable to specific factors. The omega hierarchical coefficient ( $\omega_H$  = .754) confirmed that 75.4% of total score variance is attributable to the general factor, supporting the use of a K-SCLS total score as the psychometrically appropriate operational metric. The present conceptual analysis reinterprets this pattern as consistent with the proposition that Korean coaching leadership operates as a near-unidimensional integrated construct in Korean SME contexts, with the four subdimensions functioning as culturally inseparable facets of a holistic leadership orientation rather than as psychometrically distinguishable components. This interpretation represents a theoretically informed inference rather than a direct empirical demonstration of cultural integration; the statistical structure provides a necessary but not sufficient condition for the cultural interpretation advanced here, and future research employing cultural priming paradigms or cross-cultural comparative designs would be needed to establish the proposed linkage more definitively.

Bifactor modeling confirmed that all 16 items loaded strongly on the general coaching leadership factor ( $\lambda_G$  = .801–.923), while specific factor loadings were substantially weaker ( $\lambda_S$  = .075–.416). Specific factor omega coefficients ( $\omega_S$ ) were uniformly low across all four dimensions (Direction Setting:  $\omega_S$  = .060; Performance Evaluation:  $\omega_S$  = .070; Capability Development:  $\omega_S$  = .044; Relationship Building:  $\omega_S$  = .157), falling well below the .20 threshold recommended by Reise et al. (2013) for meaningful subscale interpretation. The Relationship Building specific factor retained the most distinctive variance (ECV\_RB = .809), while Capability Development showed the highest absorption into the general factor (ECV\_CD = .948). These findings indicate that the four subdimensions function as highly integrated facets of a unified coaching leadership construct, with dimension-level scores contributing negligible unique reliable variance beyond the total score. Importantly, indicating mathematical saturation consistent with near-unity interfactor correlations (.845–.943) rather than a theoretically interpretable higher-order structure.

Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) analysis revealed that all six dimension pairs exceeded the conservative .85 threshold (HTMT range = .843–.933; bootstrap 95% CI upper bounds = .901–.976), indicating that conventional discriminant validity was not achieved. Rather than constituting a psychometric deficiency, this finding is interpreted—consistent with the foundational validation study—as the

central empirical signature of coaching leadership's near-unidimensional structure in Korean SME contexts.

#### 4.2.2. Cultural Meanings of Sub-factors and Proposed Well-being Contribution Mechanisms

Although the bifactor structure confirms that the four subdimensions of K-SCLS are empirically near-inseparable ( $ECV = .901$ ;  $\omega S = .044-.157$ ), the present study advances culturally grounded interpretations of each subdimension as theoretically distinct facets of a holistic coaching leadership orientation. These interpretations should be understood as conceptual lenses for understanding why Korean organizational members perceive coaching leadership behaviors as holistically integrated rather than dimensionally differentiated—not as evidence of independent causal pathways. The Relationship Building subdimension, retaining the most specific variance ( $\omega S = .157$ ;  $ECV_{RB} = .809$ ), may most plausibly be examined as a distinct construct in future multi-source research. These interpretations represent theoretically grounded inferences requiring future empirical verification rather than established findings.

The present study proposes that Direction Facilitation contributes to psychological stability through a two-step cultural mechanism, operating as a culturally contextualized implementation of Karasek's (1979) job demands-control model. First, Korea's high uncertainty avoidance (UAI = 85; Hofstede et al., 2010) generates culturally intensified demands for structural clarity. While employees in any organizational setting may benefit from reduced role ambiguity, the magnitude of uncertainty-related psychological strain is theoretically amplified in high uncertainty-avoidance cultures, making structural guidance a particularly salient well-being resource. Second, uri consciousness reframes leader-provided direction as "our direction" rather than unilateral instruction (Jung & Lee, 2019), transforming what might otherwise function as a controlling mechanism into a collectively endorsed navigational resource. This collective reframing is proposed to represent a distinctively Korean cultural process through which the meaning of directive behavior is altered at the relational level. Consequently, leaders' clear Direction Facilitation can be interpreted not as controlling behavior but as culturally adaptive structural support that may mitigate uncertainty-induced psychological strain. It should be acknowledged, however, that this cultural specificity argument remains an interpretive inference; future cross-cultural comparative research examining whether the same structural pattern operates differently in other high uncertainty-avoidance cultures such as Japan or Greece would be needed to empirically adjudicate the proposed cultural mechanism.

This mechanism is proposed to serve as a culturally appropriate psychological safety net, aligning with Korean employees' preference for explicit organizational structures over ambiguous role expectations, thereby potentially enhancing both performance effectiveness and subjective well-being.

The present study proposes that Competency Development enhances well-being through competence need satisfaction and growth experiences. In Korea's long-term oriented culture, leaders' Competency Development support can be theorized as perceived as relational investment beyond simple skill training, which may combine with the jeong mechanism to make members' growth experiences more meaningful.

The present study proposes that Performance Evaluation contributes to well-being through self-esteem protection and developmental feedback acceptance. The chemyon mechanism can be theorized as operating not merely as a general preference for diplomatic feedback observable across cultures but as a culturally institutionalized relational obligation in Korean organizational contexts. Chemyon constitutes a socially embedded norm system in which the evaluator bears an implicit relational responsibility to preserve the evaluated person's social standing and dignity (J.-H. Kim, 2020). This cultural obligation can be understood as shaping the evaluative encounter itself, transforming performance feedback from a primarily informational transaction into a relationally negotiated process. K-SCLS's Performance Evaluation dimension can thus be interpreted as reflecting a distinctively Korean evaluative practice in which assessment is intertwined with relational consideration, potentially enabling members to accept feedback less defensively and thereby supporting psychological well-being.

The present study proposes that Relationship Building contributes to well-being through satisfaction of relatedness needs and strengthening of emotional stability. Through the jeong mechanism, leaders' personal interest and emotional support can be theorized as transcending formal role boundaries, creating deep interpersonal connections that may buffer negative effects of organizational stress (Choi & Kim, 2020; Lee et al., 2019). This mechanism aligns with Cohen and Wills's (1985) buffering effect model, wherein social support functions as a protective resource against work-related psychological strain.

### 4.3. Conceptual Propositions

#### 4.3.1. Guidance as a Compass: A Reconceptualization of Direction Facilitation

The reinterpretation of Direction Facilitation requires a conceptual framework that reconciles its structure-

providing function with coaching's developmental orientation. Based on self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), this study advances the new conceptual proposition of *guidance as a compass* to redefine Korean-style Direction Facilitation. This reconceptualization represents an original contribution of the present manuscript that extends beyond both the psychometric findings of the foundational validation study and existing theoretical treatments of Direction Facilitation. Unlike unilateral directives that constrain member autonomy, guidance as a compass provides orientation while preserving freedom of navigation. This concept is predicated upon three essential conditions that distinguish it from controlling direction-giving.

The first condition requires that goals be established through mutual consultation rather than unilateral imposition. In Korean organizational contexts, where *uri* consciousness frames collective goal-setting as "our direction" rather than "the leader's instruction" (Jung & Lee, 2019), mutually negotiated goals may carry greater psychological ownership and reduced resistance. The second condition guarantees autonomy in goal achievement processes, ensuring that members retain decision-making latitude regarding methods, timelines, and resource allocation within the agreed-upon directional framework. The third condition maintains open feedback loops through which goals can be modified, refined, or recalibrated based on emerging information and member input, preventing initial direction from calcifying into rigid prescriptions.

In this reconceptualization, Direction Facilitation in Korean contexts is proposed to function as structural support rather than as a control mechanism. By reducing uncertainty and role ambiguity, negotiated directional guidance may decrease stress and enhance members' psychological well-being. Within Korea's high uncertainty avoidance cultural framework (Hofstede et al., 2010), role ambiguity represents a particularly salient organizational stressor, and clear directional guidance can be theorized as serving as a culturally appropriate psychological safety net. This redefinition presents a model of negotiated direction that may operate effectively within Korea's high power distance and uncertainty avoidance culture precisely because it satisfies employees' preference for explicit organizational structures while simultaneously honoring coaching's developmental ethos through the three conditions articulated above.

#### 4.3.2. Conceptual Propositions for Future Empirical Investigation: Peer Coaching Extensions

The extension from hierarchical coaching leadership to peer coaching models is grounded in the near-unidimensional integration pattern confirmed in the

foundational validation study (Lee, 2025). The general coaching leadership factor accounted for 90.1% of explained common variance ( $ECV = .901$ ), with specific factor omega values ( $\omega S = .044-.157$ ) falling uniformly below the meaningful subscale interpretation threshold of .20 (Reise et al., 2013). Notwithstanding this near-unidimensional structure, the Relationship Building dimension retained the most meaningful—albeit modest—specific variance ( $\omega S = .157$ ;  $ECV_{RB} = .809$ ), suggesting a functional differentiation that provides a conceptual basis for extending coaching functions beyond formal leader-member relationships. If the general coaching orientation and its most differentiated component can be theoretically disentangled, then coaching functions may be redistributable across peer relational configurations while preserving developmental intent. The following peer coaching models represent theoretically grounded propositions rather than empirically validated frameworks, and should be understood as a research agenda for future investigation.

**Conceptual Limitations of Network Modeling.** While this study conceptually envisions the four K-SCLS dimensions as an interconnected system, translating this into empirical network analysis faces fundamental constraints. Network theory demonstrates that reliable centrality differentiation requires substantially larger configurations, typically involving eight to ten or more nodes (Costantini et al., 2015). Therefore, the H-PCLS and V-PCLS models represent theoretical frameworks for future empirical investigation rather than empirically validated network structures. Future research employing expanded network configurations with 16 or more nodes would be needed to test the structural propositions advanced here.

Conceptualizing peer coaching as a core component of the proposed ecosystem requires conceptual clarification regarding how peer coaching is distinguished from informal collegial advice. Myrberg et al. (2025) qualitatively explored the contribution of peer coaching to physicians' development as clinical supervisors, conceptualizing peer coaching as reciprocal direct observation and discussion occurring among equal colleagues, and specifying its primary purpose as the facilitation of mutual learning. Notably, this study emphasized psychological safety as a critical prerequisite for effective peer coaching. Participants reported being able to openly reflect on their practice and exchange feedback within relationships with trusted colleagues, suggesting that peer coaching possesses the character of a safe learning infrastructure rather than simple interpersonal support (Myrberg et al., 2025). This conceptualization supports the present study's theoretical premise that the proposed Peer Coaching Ecosystem must operate on a foundation of structurally guaranteed psychological safety rather than relational intimacy alone.

For the proposed Peer Coaching Ecosystem to possess the character of a designed system rather than merely designating spontaneous collegial exchange, evidence regarding what components effective coaching requires must be presented. Richter et al. (2021) conducted a systematic review and classification of positive psychological coaching tools and techniques, identifying as consistently confirmed core elements of effective coaching across studies: voluntary participation, self-reflection, goal-setting, structured processes, non-directive approaches, open-ended questions, and coach training. This review demonstrated that coaching functions as a systematic intervention facilitating learning and change when specific structural and relational conditions are met, rather than as unregulated conversation (Richter et al., 2021). These criteria provide evidence for the present study's proposition that the Peer Coaching Ecosystem should be designed as a structured system incorporating trained participants, iterative interactions, feedback protocols, and evaluability. The function of peer coaching can be understood from the perspective of transfer of learning, which provides important justification for the Peer Coaching Ecosystem. Waddell and Dunn (2005) discussed peer coaching as a core strategy for staff development, proposing that its primary contribution lies in connecting knowledge and skills acquired through formal training to actual field practice. According to their discussion, peer coaching functions as a mechanism supporting the process through which practitioners returning to the field after training attempt new behaviors, refine those behaviors through colleague observation and feedback, and settle them into sustained practice, suggesting that the value of peer coaching lies in a cyclical support mechanism that iteratively narrows the gap between learning and practice (Waddell & Dunn, 2005). For the "ecosystem" concept in Peer Coaching Ecosystem to secure theoretical legitimacy beyond rhetorical expression, concrete cases demonstrating how peer coaching operates when connected to multilayered organizational structures beyond individual dyads are needed. Williamson et al. (2021) reported on the design process of the PeerCally program for neurosurgery residents, discussing that this program was formed through an iterative design process involving not only individual peer coaching relationships but also the joint participation of peer coaches, mental health professionals, and departmental leadership. Notably, the core operating principles of this program included relationship-based support, flexible structure, individualized goal-setting, and linkage to higher-level support systems when needed (Williamson et al., 2021). This case suggests that peer coaching is more accurately described as a multilayered system when connected with training, organizational culture, and institutional support rather than as an isolated technique.

The conceptual framework of "ecosystem" in the Peer Coaching Ecosystem is also supported by similar theoretical developments in mentoring research. Krishna et al. (2025) systematically reviewed the impact of mentoring relationships on professional identity formation in medical education and presented, as a consistently confirmed pattern across studies, that the process through which mentoring supports identity formation, socialization, and role transitions is not sufficiently explained by single mentor-mentee relationships alone, requiring understanding from a mentoring ecosystem or complex adaptive system perspective encompassing program structure, organizational culture, long-term interactions, and multi-actor connections (Krishna et al., 2025). The possibility that the Peer Coaching Ecosystem can be designed as a multilayered structure in which training-support-recoaching proceeds in cascading fashion is also supported by peer-based coaching dissemination research in low-resource settings. Lee et al. (2022) developed and implemented a Parent Peer Coaching Program for parents of children with autism in Mongolia, applying a cascading intervention design in which parents trained by professionals coach other parents. Results confirmed that parent coaches who received appropriate training and higher-level support significantly improved other parents' parenting skills and child engagement through peer coaching, experimentally demonstrating that peer-based coaching can function as a scalable and sustainable capacity-building mechanism without depending solely on professional coaches (Lee et al., 2022)—though the highly specific context of Mongolian families of children with autism necessitates cautious interpretation regarding direct generalization to organizational peer coaching contexts. Horizontal Peer Coaching (H-PCLS). The core logic of transforming K-SCLS into the Horizontal Peer Coaching Leadership Scale (H-PCLS) lies in recovering coaching purity through removal of hierarchical constraints. In peer relationships where authority is equal, Direction Facilitation is reconceptualized as collaborative direction-setting, structurally resolving directivity concerns.

**Table 3:** Comparison of K-SCLS and H-PCLS Sub-factors (Proposed Conceptual Framework)

K-SCLS Factor	K-SCLS Definition	H-PCLS Factor	H-PCLS Definition
Direction Facilitation	Clear goal and expectation presentation	Collaborative Direction-Setting	Exploring and agreeing on goals together
Competency Development	Member growth and learning support	Mutual Competency Development	Facilitating each other's learning and growth

K-SCLS Factor	K-SCLS Definition	H-PCLS Factor	H-PCLS Definition
Performance Evaluation	Performance feedback and recognition	Mutual Feedback	Bidirectional exchange of constructive feedback
Relationship Building	Personal interest and emotional support	Mutual Relationship Building	Bidirectional formation of trust and emotional support

Vertical Peer Coaching (V-PCLS). Vertical peer coaching raises the core conceptual challenge of how essential peer coaching characteristics can be maintained in hierarchical relationships. This study proposes "temporary suspension of power distance" as the core premise. This means supervisors and subordinates secure functional horizontality through psychological contracts within specific spatiotemporal contexts of coaching sessions.

This role transformation resembles Goffman's (1959) concept of "frame switching." Coaching sessions are established as separate interaction frames where supervisors participate as learning partners rather than evaluators. The study proposes coaching leadership culture as a key prerequisite for effective vertical peer coaching.

Multi-Source Coaching Ecosystem. Integrating horizontal peer coaching (H-PCLS) and vertical peer coaching (V-PCLS), a multi-source coaching ecosystem expanding concentrically around individuals can be envisioned as a conceptual framework for future empirical investigation. This ecosystem is proposed to prevent excessive dependence on specific relationships through diverse support sources, strengthen resilience, and expand social capital.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Summary of Findings

Building upon the empirical results established in the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025), the present theoretical reinterpretation yields four main conceptual findings.

First, Western coaching's non-directive principle can be reconceptualized as a historically and institutionally contingent construct, rather than a universally binding philosophical imperative. Second, bifactor modeling in the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025) revealed that the general factor accounted for 90.1% of explained common variance ( $ECV = .901$ ), with omega hierarchical of .754 confirming that total scores predominantly reflect the general factor. Specific factor omega values ( $\omega_S$

$= .044-.157$ ) indicated negligible unique reliable variance at the subdimension level. This near-unidimensional structure, combined with HTMT ratios of .843-.933 and interfactor correlations of .845-.943, is interpreted in the present analysis as consistent with substantial cultural integration within Korean organizational contexts—reframing the Korean coaching leadership measurement paradox as a substantively meaningful structural phenomenon rather than a psychometric deficiency. Third, Direction Facilitation can be reinterpreted as a culturally adaptive form of structure provision rather than as a controlling behavior. Finally, the observed integration–differentiation pattern provides a conceptual basis for proposing a multi-layered peer coaching ecosystem as a framework for future empirical investigation.

### 5.2. Theoretical Implications

This section advances four interrelated theoretical implications by reframing prior critiques, extending indigenous leadership theorizing, reconceptualizing directive coaching behaviors, and proposing new relational configurations for coaching practice.

First, as developed in Section 2.1, Western coaching's non-directive principle can be understood as a historically layered construct shaped by both philosophical commitment and regulatory reinforcement. This reinterpretation reframes Joh's (2024) critique by distinguishing between coaching as a pure dyadic helping relationship and coaching leadership as an organizationally embedded practice operating under hierarchical and cultural constraints.

Second, the bifactor structure validated in the foundational study (Lee, 2025) indicates extreme cultural integration, with  $ECV = .901$  demonstrating that Korean coaching leadership is primarily perceived as a near-unidimensional construct. It is important to note that this integration does not imply complete functional redundancy, but the specific factor omega values ( $\omega_S = .044-.157$ ) are substantially lower than previously indicated, suggesting that dimension-level interpretation should be treated with considerable caution. The Relationship Building dimension retains the most meaningful specific variance ( $\omega_S = .157$ ;  $ECV_{RB} = .809$ ) and may represent the most culturally distinct component of Korean coaching leadership, consistent with the centrality of jeong-based relational dynamics in Korean organizational life.

Third, as elaborated in Section 4.3.1, Direction Facilitation can be interpreted within this integrated configuration not as a violation of coaching principles but as a culturally adaptive form of structure provision that may reduce ambiguity-related stress in Korea's high uncertainty-avoidance context. The near-uniform general factor loadings across all 16 items ( $\lambda_G = .801-.923$ ) observed in the bifactor model provide

the structural basis for this reinterpretation, indicating that direction-providing behaviors are perceived by Korean SME employees as fully integrated with relational, evaluative, and developmental behaviors rather than as a distinct directive function. Fourth, the study proposes horizontal and vertical peer coaching as theoretically grounded conceptual frameworks extending culturally integrated coaching leadership. Although the near-unidimensional structure ( $ECV = .901$ ) indicates that dimensional specificity is limited overall, the Relationship Building dimension's relatively greater specific variance ( $\omega_S = .157$ ;  $ECV_{RB} = .809$ ) provides the most defensible conceptual foothold for envisioning coaching functions redistributable across peer relational configurations. This proposal should be understood as a theoretically informed hypothesis requiring empirical validation rather than a structurally robust premise, given the uniformly low  $\omega_S$  values across all four dimensions. These proposals represent theoretical hypotheses requiring future empirical validation rather than established models.

### 5.3. Implications for Well-being Management and Human Resource Development

Findings from the foundational validation study, when theoretically reinterpreted in the present analysis, suggest that coaching leadership may be meaningfully associated with employee psychological well-being in ways that are consistent with culturally embedded pathways rather than through universally assumed mechanisms. Within the Job Demands–Resources framework, all four dimensions of K-SCLS can be interpreted as job resources that potentially buffer stress and support motivation, particularly in Korean SME contexts characterized by high uncertainty and relational interdependence.

Direction Facilitation appears to play a distinctive role by potentially mitigating uncertainty-related stress through role clarity and structural guidance. In high uncertainty-avoidance environments, such guidance may reduce psychological strain and support well-being when implemented as negotiated orientation rather than unilateral control. Competency Development and Performance Evaluation may contribute to well-being by supporting competence experiences and dignity-preserving feedback processes, while Relationship Building aligns with jeong-based social support mechanisms that can be theorized as enhancing emotional stability.

These theoretical interpretations receive partial empirical support from the foundational validation study. In the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025), exploratory analyses of predictive validity were not conducted due to the absence of external criterion variables within the single-source dataset. The near-unidimensional structure

confirmed through bifactor modeling ( $ECV = .901$ ,  $\omega_H = .754$ ) suggests that the K-SCLS total score, computed as the mean of all 16 items, represents the psychometrically appropriate operational metric for future criterion-validity investigations. Full scalar measurement invariance across gender groups was achieved (scalar  $\Delta CFI = .000$ ), supporting the use of combined-gender norms and enabling direct cross-gender mean comparisons without psychometric adjustment. Future longitudinal multi-source research should prioritize the K-SCLS total score as the primary predictor variable when examining associations with employee psychological well-being and organizational outcomes.

The proposed peer coaching ecosystem further extends these implications by offering a conceptual framework for a multi-source support structure for well-being management. Horizontal peer coaching is proposed to distribute developmental support across peer networks, potentially reducing over-reliance on a single leader and enhancing relational resilience. Vertical peer coaching, when implemented with appropriate safeguards, may complement formal leadership by creating bounded spaces for mutual learning and psychological safety.

For SMEs with limited HRD resources, this ecosystem approach represents a potentially sustainable strategy for fostering well-being by leveraging existing relational capital rather than relying exclusively on external interventions. The conceptual integration of coaching leadership and peer coaching suggests a pathway toward embedding well-being support within everyday organizational interactions, though empirical verification of these proposed mechanisms remains necessary.

### 5.4. Practical Implications

From a practical perspective, the findings underscore the importance of using culturally validated instruments such as K-SCLS rather than directly importing Western coaching frameworks. The validated structure of K-SCLS suggests that Korean employees interpret coaching leadership behaviors through an integrated cultural lens, and leadership development programs should reflect this holistic perception.

Practitioners should approach Direction Facilitation not as directive control but as structured guidance that reduces uncertainty while preserving autonomy in execution. Training programs can emphasize goal negotiation, flexible implementation, and ongoing dialogue to align direction-giving with coaching principles.

The proposed peer coaching ecosystem offers preliminary guidance for organizational implementation, contingent upon future empirical validation. Horizontal peer coaching may be introduced through voluntary participation, clear

contracting, and structured but non-evaluative processes. Vertical peer coaching would require additional safeguards, including explicit role-switching protocols, reciprocity guarantees, and strict separation from performance evaluation systems. Future research should examine implementation sequences such as preparatory training in role transformation concepts, explicit boundary setting delineating temporal and procedural parameters distinct from routine supervisory interactions, institutionalization of reciprocity guarantees enabling upward feedback, and robust separation of coaching content from personnel evaluation processes. Prerequisites warranting empirical investigation include restricting pilot implementations to dyads with demonstrably strong leader-member exchange foundations, establishing minimum K-SCLS proficiency thresholds for participating leaders, and implementing explicit psychological safety contracts including formal non-retaliation agreements.

Overall, these practical implications highlight that culturally integrated coaching leadership is not a diluted form of Western coaching but a contextually intelligent adaptation that may be capable of supporting both performance and psychological well-being in Korean SMEs.

### 5.5. Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several methodological limitations warrant explicit acknowledgment and should inform priorities for future research.

**Critical Limitations.** A primary concern is common method bias. Harman's single-factor test showed that 76.1% of the variance was explained by the first unrotated component—well above the 50% threshold typically considered problematic. Although applying the ULMC model reduced estimated method variance to 43.0% while preserving excellent model fit, this residual level remains higher than is commonly reported in leadership research using ULMC controls. Importantly, the elevated Harman's percentage partly reflects the construct's genuinely near-unidimensional structure, as single-factor extraction naturally captures a large proportion of variance when a construct approaches essential unidimensionality ( $ECV = .901$ ). Nevertheless, future research should employ multi-source data collection—including supervisor self-reports, peer ratings, and objective behavioral indicators—to disentangle substantive integration from method-driven covariation. Second, the network analysis constraints inherent to the four-node conceptual framework limit the reliability of hub differentiation and centrality interpretations. Network theory demonstrates that meaningful structural differentiation requires substantially larger configurations. The H-PCLS and V-PCLS models

therefore represent conceptual proposals requiring validation through expanded network analyses.

Third, the cross-sectional design of the K-SCLS validation study limits causal inference capabilities. The relationships between coaching leadership dimensions and well-being outcomes cannot be interpreted as causal effects without temporal separation and appropriate controls.

Fourth, the sample was limited to Korean SME employees, and generalizability to large corporations, public sector organizations, or other cultural contexts remains to be established.

Fifth, the cultural mechanism interpretations advanced in this study—linking jeong, uri consciousness, and chemyon to specific K-SCLS dimensions and well-being pathways—remain at the level of theoretically informed inference. The statistical structure identified in the foundational study provides a necessary but not sufficient condition for these cultural interpretations, and future research employing cultural priming paradigms, cross-cultural comparative designs, or qualitative exploration of employee meaning-making would be needed to establish these proposed linkages more definitively.

**Future Research Priorities.** Several priorities emerge from these limitations. Longitudinal validation with temporal separation between predictor and outcome measurements would strengthen causal inference. Multi-source data collection would address common method bias concerns. Expanded network analysis involving 16 or more nodes would enable reliable hub identification and centrality differentiation. Cross-cultural validation in comparable collectivistic cultures such as Japan, China, or other East Asian contexts would test the boundaries of the cultural recontextualization framework. Empirical development and validation of H-PCLS and V-PCLS scales would transform the conceptual proposals advanced here into measurement instruments suitable for organizational application. Finally, qualitative research exploring how Korean employees actually interpret and experience the four dimensions of coaching leadership in their daily organizational lives would provide an important complement to the quantitative structural evidence, enabling triangulation of the cultural interpretations proposed in this study.

## 6. Conclusions

This study provides an academic response to critiques regarding the theoretical foundations of Korean coaching leadership research raised by Joh (2021, 2022, 2024) and argues for cultural legitimacy of Korean coaching leadership from an eclectic perspective. By presenting evidence that Western non-directiveness can be understood as a historically layered construct shaped by both philosophical

commitment and regulatory reinforcement, and by reinterpreting the validated structure of K-SCLS through Korean cultural mechanisms, this research proposes a reconceptualization of Direction Facilitation as a culturally adaptive form of structure provision.

The proposed peer coaching ecosystem offers a conceptual framework for SMEs to pursue sustainable human resource development and well-being management, enabling balanced pursuit of performance and psychological safety. These proposals should be understood as theoretically grounded frameworks requiring future empirical validation rather than as established models. The core contribution lies in reframing tensions between theoretical purity and cultural fit as paradoxes to be embraced rather than problems to be eliminated, thereby offering new directions for Korean coaching leadership research.

Future research should empirically develop and validate H-PCLS and V-PCLS scales, experimentally examine peer coaching effects, and conduct cross-cultural comparisons to further test and refine the theoretical proposals advanced here.

The transparent acknowledgment of limitations, including common method bias concerns, network analysis constraints, and the interpretive nature of cultural mechanism linkages, contributes to the scientific integrity of these theoretical proposals. By openly addressing these methodological boundaries, this study provides a foundation for future empirical research to build upon while maintaining appropriate epistemic humility regarding the provisional nature of conceptual contributions.

Building on the empirically validated structure of K-SCLS, the proposed horizontal and vertical peer coaching models should be understood as theoretical extensions rather than empirically validated measurement instruments. These models translate culturally integrated coaching leadership into a multi-layered peer coaching ecosystem that is proposed to support sustainable leadership, psychological well-being, and human resource development in SMEs.

## References

- Aboujaoude, E. (2020). Where life coaching ends and therapy begins: Toward a less confusing treatment landscape. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(4), 973–977. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620904962>
- Aderibigbe, S., & Ajasa, F. (2013). Peer coaching as an institutionalised tool for professional development: The perceptions of tutors in a Nigerian college. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 25(2), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621311299807>
- Atkinson, A., Watling, C., & Brand, P. (2021). Feedback and coaching. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 181, 441–446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-021-04118-8>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Behzadnia, B., & FatahModares, S. (2020). Basic psychological need-satisfying activities during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 12(4), 1234–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12228>
- Bührer, Z., Wolfgramm, C., Berweger, S., Frei, A. K., & Buschor, C. B. (2025). Why coaching matters: Exploring the interplay of teacher self-regulation and well-being with a longitudinal multigroup model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1647838>
- Byrnes, M., Engler, T. A., Greenberg, C., Fry, B. T., Dombrowski, J. C., & Dimick, J. (2019). Coaching as a mechanism to challenge surgical professional identities. *Annals of Surgery*, 274(2), 319–323. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000003707>
- Choi, J.-S., & Kim, H.-J. (2020). Cultural values and team performance in Korean organizations: The mediating role of collective efficacy. *Asian Business & Management*, 19(1), 85–106. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-019-00074-6>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
- Costantini, G., Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., Perugini, M., Mõttus, R., Waldorp, L. J., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2015). State of the art personality research: A tutorial on network analysis of personality data in R. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 54, 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.07.003>
- Coxen, L., van der Vaart, L., van den Broeck, A., & Rothmann, S. (2021). Basic psychological needs in the work context: A systematic literature review of diary studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 698526. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.698526>
- Deci, E. L., La Guardia, J. G., Moller, A. C., Scheiner, M. J., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). On the benefits of giving as well as receiving autonomy support: Mutuality in close friendships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(3), 313–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205282148>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Do, M. H., Yong, H. K., & Jung, J. W. (2023). An exploratory study on the academic theory and philosophy of coaching science. *The Korean Journal of Coaching Research*, 16(3), 185–204.
- Dyrbye, L., Shanafelt, T., Gill, P. R., Satele, D., & West, C. (2019). Effect of a professional coaching intervention on the well-being and distress of physicians: A pilot

- randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 179(10), 1406–1414. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.2425>
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2014). Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 361–388. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809>
- García-Galán, R., Ortiz-Marcos, I., & Molina-Sánchez, R. (2024). Non-directive team coaching in engineering education to strengthen teamwork competencies. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2023-0034>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- Goldfried, M. R. (2007). What has psychotherapy inherited from Carl Rogers? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 44(3), 249–252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.44.3.249>
- Hanly, G., Campbell, E., Bartlem, K., Dray, J., Fehily, C., Bradley, T., Murray, S. R., Lecathelinais, C., Wiggers, J., Wolfenden, L., Reid, K., Reynolds, T., & Bowman, J. (2022). Effectiveness of referral to a population-level telephone coaching service for improving health risk behaviours in people with a mental health condition: Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials*, 23, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-021-05971-6>
- Hansez, I., & Chmiel, N. (2010). Safety behavior: Job demands, job resources, and perceived management commitment to safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019528>
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. SAGE Publications.
- Howard, A. R. (2015). Coaching to vision versus coaching to improvement needs: A preliminary investigation on the differential impacts of fostering positive and negative emotion during real-time executive coaching sessions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 455. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00455>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- International Coach Federation. (2026). ICF history and core competencies. Retrieved February 25, 2026, from <https://coachingfederation.org/about/history>
- Jao, L. (2013). Peer coaching as a model for professional development in the elementary mathematics context: Teacher perceptions of the impact on professional practice. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(3), 290–298. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2013.11.3.290>
- Joh, S. J. (2021). An exploratory study on the components and scales of coaching leadership: Focusing on academic journals in Korea (2011–2020). *Journal of the Korea Convergence Society*, 12(11), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.15207/JKCS.2021.12.11.335>
- Joh, S. J. (2022). A critical review on domestic coaching leadership research. *Journal of Convergence Coaching*, 1(2), 5–33.
- Joh, S. J. (2024). Interrelationships and differences between coaching, coaching behaviors, and coaching leadership. *Journal of Convergence Coaching*, 3(1), 5–23.
- Jung, H.-S., & Lee, K.-Y. (2019). Collective orientation and team performance in Korean organizations: The role of leader–member exchange. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1341–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1284881>
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285–308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
- Kedrick, K., Levitskaya, E., & Funk, R. J. (2024). Conceptual structure and the growth of scientific knowledge. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8, 1915–1923. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01957-x>
- Kim, G. R. (2020). A phenomenological study on the experience of integrative approach between counseling and coaching. *The Korean Journal of Coaching Research*, 13(3), 55–77.
- Kim, J.-H. (2020). Face and dignity in Korean organizations: Implications for performance management. *Asian Business & Management*, 19(1), 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-019-00083-5>
- Kim, M. S., & Kim, Y. G. (2024). The professional development process of supervisees who experienced coaching supervision: Based on grounded theory. *The Korean Journal of Coaching Research*, 17(2), 29–54.
- Kiser, S. B., Sterns, J. D., Lai, P. Y., Horick, N. K., & Palamara, K. (2024). Physician coaching by professionally trained peers for burnout and well-being. *JAMA Network Open*, 7(4), e245645. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.5645>
- Kitchin, D. (2023). Executive coaches' perceptions of the boundary and overlap between coaching and psychotherapy/counseling. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*. Advance online publication.
- Ko, G. H. (2017). Integrative eclectic four-level model of social work counseling practice stage: Facilitating exploration–insight–action–maintenance. *Journal of Welfare Counseling and Education*, 6(1), 105–143.
- Ko, S. H. (2019). Consensual qualitative research on the types of eclectic-integrative counseling hypotheses. *Journal of Welfare Counseling and Education*, 8(2), 283–313.
- Kotlyar, I., Richardson, J., & Karakowsky, L. (2015). Learning to lead from outsiders: The value of career communities as a source of external peer coaching. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1262–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-05-2015-0076>
- Krishna, L., Ravindran, N., Kwok, H. Y. F., Tan, X. Y., Soh, J.,

Leong, E. Y. M., et al. (2025). The impact of mentoring relationships on professional identity formation in medical education: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 25, 349. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07158-y>

Kyung, C. H. (2025). An integrative literature review on the application of meaning coaching. *Asia Counseling and Coaching Review*, 7(2), 117–134.

Lee, B. S. (2025). A practical guide to the Korean Stowell-based coaching leadership scale: Leadership measurement and development reflecting cultural context [Seminar proceedings]. Awakening Coaching Institute.

Lee, J. D., Meadan, H., & Oyunbaatar, E. (2022). Parent peer coaching program: A cascading intervention for parents of children with autism in Mongolia. *Autism*, 26(8), 1999–2014. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613211070636>

Lee, S.-M., Park, J.-H., & Kim, Y.-J. (2019). Cultural sensitivity in performance feedback: A Korean perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 19(3), 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595819862596>

Louridas, M., Sachdeva, A. K., Yuen, A., Blair, P., & Macrae, H. (2021). Coaching in surgical education. *Annals of Surgery*, 275(1), 80–84. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000004910>

Marsh, H. W., Dicke, T., Riley, P., Parker, P. D., Guo, J., Basarkod, G., & Martin, A. J. (2022). School principals’ mental health and well-being under threat: A longitudinal analysis of workplace demands, resources, burnout, and well-being. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 14(3), 901–922. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12423>

Myrberg, E., Henningsson, M., Tennerhed, C., Wahlqvist, M., & Liljedahl, M. (2025). How peer coaching can contribute to doctors’ development as clinical supervisors: An interview study. *BMC Medical Education*, 25, 376. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07660-3>

Nishigaki, E. (2021). *Introduction to coaching psychology*. Pakyoungsa.

Norcross, J. C., & Goldfried, M. R. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of psychotherapy integration* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

O’Hara, M. (1995). Carl Rogers: Scientist and mystic. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 35, 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00221678950354004>

**Appendix A: Detailed Psychometric Statistics from the Foundational Validation Study**

The following tables present detailed statistical results from the foundational validation study (Lee, 2025). These are provided as supplementary reference to support the theoretical reinterpretations advanced in the main text.

**Table A1:** K-SCLS First-Order CFA Model Fit Indices

Index	Criterion	Value	Evaluation
CFI	≥ .95	1.000	Excellent
TLI	≥ .95	1.000	Excellent
RMSEA	≤ .06	.008	Excellent
SRMR	≤ .08	.019	Excellent

Note. Fit criteria based on Hu and Bentler (1999). N = 300.  $\chi^2(98) = 100.000$ . 90% CI for RMSEA = [.000, .032]. Estimation method: WLSMV (ordinal indicators).

**Table A2:** K-SCLS Bifactor Model Fit Indices and Variance Decomposition

Index	Value	Criterion / Interpretation
CFI	1.000	Excellent (≥ .95)
TLI	1.000	Excellent (≥ .95)
RMSEA	.023	Excellent (≤ .06)
SRMR	.020	Excellent (≤ .08)
ECV (total)	.901	> .70: essentially unidimensional
ωH (general)	.754	> .50: total score reliable
ωS (Direction Setting)	.060	< .20: negligible specific variance
ωS (Performance Evaluation)	.070	< .20: negligible specific variance
ωS (Capability Development)	.044	< .20: negligible specific variance
ωS (Relationship Building)	.157	< .20: negligible specific variance

Note.  $\chi^2(88) = 102.125$ . 90% CI for RMSEA = [.000, .041]. Heywood case detected in hierarchical CFA (Direction Setting  $\gamma =$

1.013); bifactor model adopted as primary structural framework. (Reise et al., 2013). All values from Lee (2025).  
 ECV = explained common variance (Rodriguez et al., 2016).  $\omega_H$  =  
 omega hierarchical (Zinbarg et al., 2006).  $\omega_S$  = omega subscale

**Table A3:** Reliability and Convergent Validity Statistics for the 16-Item K-SCLS

Dimension	Items	$\alpha$	$\omega$	AVE	CR	Mean $\lambda$
Direction Setting	DS1, DS2, DS3, DS5	.943	.938	.832	.952	.912
Performance Evaluation	PE1, PE2, PE4, PE5	.949	.942	.843	.956	.918
Capability Development	CD1, CD2, CD3, CD5	.946	.940	.834	.953	.913
Relationship Building	RB1, RB3, RB4, RB7	.938	.936	.822	.948	.906

*Note.* N = 300. All values from Lee (2025).  $\alpha$  = Cronbach's alpha;  $\omega$  = McDonald's omega; AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability;  $\lambda$  = standardized factor loading from WLSMV estimation. All indices exceed recommended thresholds:  $\alpha > .70$  (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994); AVE > .50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981); CR > .70 (Hair et al., 2019).

**Table A4:** Bifactor General and Specific Factor Loadings (16-Item K-SCLS)

Item	Dimension	$\lambda_G$	$\lambda_S$	ECV (item)
DS1	Direction Setting	.890	.249	.928
DS2	Direction Setting	.844	.298	.889
DS3	Direction Setting	.865	.222	.939
DS5	Direction Setting	.923	.200	.955
PE1	Performance Evaluation	.874	.260	.919
PE2	Performance Evaluation	.909	.205	.952
PE4	Performance Evaluation	.858	.292	.897
PE5	Performance Evaluation	.882	.294	.900
CD1	Capability Development	.881	.291	.902
CD2	Capability Development	.863	.247	.924
CD3	Capability Development	.922	.075	.993
CD5	Capability Development	.908	.159	.970
RB1	Relationship Building	.835	.395	.817
RB3	Relationship Building	.802	.406	.796
RB4	Relationship Building	.824	.416	.797
RB7	Relationship Building	.801	.364	.828

*Note.* N = 300.  $\lambda_G$  = standardized loading on the general coaching leadership factor;  $\lambda_S$  = standardized loading on the orthogonal specific factor.  $ECV(\text{item}) = \lambda_G^2 / (\lambda_G^2 + \lambda_S^2)$ . Total ECV = .901;  $\omega_H = .754$ . Hierarchical CFA produced Heywood case (Direction Setting  $\gamma = 1.013$ ); bifactor model adopted as primary framework. All values from Lee (20