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Any Questions & Comments?
Women's Status in Athletic Career

- Athletic Administration
  - 20% Female Athletic Directors (9% in Division I)
- Coaching
  - 43% Female Coaches in Women’s Teams

(Ascanio & Carpenter, 2012)

How do collegiate coaches advance their careers? How do the processes differ between women and men?

Intention as a Predictor of Career Advancement

- Intention identified as a best predictor of many behaviors
- Intention can also be predictive of one's career advancement

Women have shown fewer intentions to advance their careers to leadership positions

(Grant et al., 2001, 2007; Goldsmith et al., 2018; and Grant et al., 2010)

Purposes of the Study

The present study examined:

- Facilitating and inhibiting factors of career advancement for female and male collegiate coaches, having intention as a proximate predictor of career advancement.
- Possible gender differences in the process.
Women's Status in Athletic Career

- Athletic Administration
  - 20% Female Athletic Directors (9% in Division I)
- Coaching
  - 43% Female Coaches in Women's Teams

(Acosta & Carpenter, 2012)
How do collegiate coaches advance their careers?
How do the processes differ between women and men?
Intention as a Predictor of Career Advancement

- Intention identified as a best predictor of many behaviors
  - Intention can also be predictive of one's career advancement

(Ajzen, 1991; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Gordin & Kok, 1996)

- Women have shown fewer intentions to advance their careers to leadership positions

(Cunningham et al., 2003, 2007; Greenhill et al., 2009; van Vianen & Keizer, 1996)
Intention as a Predictor of Career Advancement

- Intention identified as a best predictor of many behaviors
  - Intention can also be predictive of one's career advancement

(Ajzen, 1991; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Gordin & Kok, 1996)
Women have shown fewer intentions to advance their careers to leadership positions.

(Cunningham et al., 2003, 2007; Greenhill et al., 2009; van Vianen & Keizer, 1996)
Purposes of the Study

The present study examined:

- Facilitating and inhibiting factors of career advancement for female and male collegiate coaches, having intention as a proximate predictor of career advancement.
- Possible gender differences in the process.
Antecedents of Career Intentions (Facilitating)

- Leader Competency
- Motivation to Lead
- Leader Self-Efficacy
- Outcome Expectancy
- Developmental Experiences
  - Developmental Challenges
  - Feedback
  - Support & Mentoring
- Learning Orientation

Antecedents of Career Intentions (Inhibiting)

- Work-Family & Family-Work Conflicts
- Perception of Gender Discrimination

(Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Netemeyer et al., 1998)
Antecedents of Career Intentions (Facilitating)

- Leader Competency
- Motivation to Lead
- Leader Self-Efficacy
- Outcome Expectancy
- Developmental Experiences
  - Developmental Challenges
  - Feedback
  - Support & Mentoring
- Learning Orientation

(Bandura, 1997; Betz & Voyten, 1997; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Dweck, 1975; McCauley et al., 1994; Mumford et al., 2007; Van Velsor et al., 2010)
Antecedents of Career Intentions (Inhibiting)

• Work-Family & Family-Work Conflicts
• Perception of Gender Discrimination

(Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Netemeyer et al., 1996)
Participants
Recruited from women’s collegiate athletic teams
- 674 assistant coaches (63% female, 37% male)
- 245 head coaches (52% female, 48% male)

Procedure
- An approval was obtained from
  Institutional Review Board
- Online survey sent to assistant coaches
- $5 Starbucks Card was given for completing the survey
- Assistant coaches provided their head coaches’ names and contact information
- Head coaches were contacted to evaluate their assistant coaches’ leader competency

Analyses
- Two Phases
  - Structural equation modeling (SEM) on the whole sample of assistant coaches (N = 674)
  - Path analyses on the sub-sample of assistant coaches (N = 245) using composite scores of the factors confirmed in the first phase
- Gender differences were examined using MIMIC (Multiple-Indicators Multiple-Causes) models and multiple group analyses

Measures
Assistant Coaches
- Motivation to Lead Measure
- Leader Self-Efficacy measure
- Outcome Expectancy measure
- Developmental Challenges Profile
- Feedback Quality measure
- Workplace Support Scale
- Mentoring Relationship Quality and Learning measure
- Work-Family and Family-Work Conflicts
- Perceived Gender Discrimination Scale
Head Coaches
- Leader Competency Scale
Participants

Recruited from women's collegiate athletic teams
- 674 assistant coaches (63% female, 37% male)
- 245 head coaches (52% female, 48% male)
Measures

Assistant Coaches

- Motivation to Lead Measure
- Leader Self-Efficacy measure
- Outcome Expectancy measure
- Developmental Challenges Profile
- Feedback Quality measure
- Workplace Support Scale
- Mentoring Relationship Quality and Learning measure
- Work-Family and Family-Work Conflicts
- Perceived Gender Discrimination Scale

Head Coaches

- Leader Competency Scale

(Allen & Eby, 2003; Betz & Voyten, 1997; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Foley et al., 2005; Haynes et al., 2003; McCauley et al., 1999; Mumford et al., 2007; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Newstrom et al., 1974; VandeWalle, 1997)
Procedure

- An approval was obtained from Institutional Review Board
- Online survey sent to assistant coaches
- $5 Starbucks Card was given for completing the survey
- Assistant coaches provided their head coaches' names and contact information
- Head coaches were contacted to evaluate their assistant coaches' leader competency
Analyses

- Two Phases
  - Structural equation modeling (SEM) on the whole sample of assistant coaches (N = 674)
  - Path analyses on the sub-sample of assistant coaches (N = 245) using composite scores of the factors confirmed in the first phase
- Gender differences were examined using MIMIC (Multiple-Indicators Multiple-Causes) models and multiple group analyses
Results

Model Fit (N = 245)
Chi-square = 273.66 (df = 102)
CFI = .89
TLI = .85
RMSEA = .08

Gender Differences

There were no significant gender differences in the relationships between factors:
- Except for the relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency
  - This relationship was significant after accounting for the effects of gender

There were significant gender differences in the magnitudes of the factors:
- Females showed higher motivation to lead and outcome expectancy
- Males showed higher engagement in developmentally challenging job assignments, leader self-efficacy, and career intention
Motivation to Lead → Leader Competency
0.05

Leader Competency → Intention to Advance Career
-0.03

0.22***
Gender Differences

There were no significant gender differences in the relationships between factors:
  • Except for the relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency
    • This relationship was significant after accounting for the effects of gender
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  • Females showed higher motivation to lead and outcome expectancy
  • Males showed higher engagement in developmentally challenging job assignments, leader self-efficacy, and career intention
Gender Differences

There were no significant gender differences in the relationships between factors:

- Except for the relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency
- This relationship was significant after accounting for the effects of gender
There were significant gender differences in the magnitudes of the factors:

- Females showed higher motivation to lead and outcome expectancy
- Males showed higher engagement in developmentally challenging job assignments, leader self-efficacy, and career intention
Facilitating Factors

- There were positive effects of leader self-efficacy and outcomes expectancy on career intentions through motivation to lead.
- Leader competency did not have a direct effect on career intentions.
- Developmental experiences may be a source of leader self-efficacy.
- There was a positive effect of learning orientation on engagement in developmental experiences.

Inhibiting Factors

- Family-work conflict was directly and negatively related to motivation to lead.
- Perceptions of gender discrimination were negatively related to motivation to lead through outcome expectancy.

Gender Differences

- The relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency was significant after accounting for gender.
- Though women showed higher outcome expectancy and motivation to lead, women showed lower engagement in developmentally challenging assignments, leader self-efficacy, and career intention as compared to men.

Theoretical and Research Implications
Facilitating Factors

- There were separate effects of leader self-efficacy and outcome expectancy on career intentions through motivation to lead.
  - Leader competency did not have a direct effect on career intention.

- Developmental experiences may be sources of leader self-efficacy.

- There was a positive effect of learning orientation on engagement in developmental experiences.
Facilitating Factors

- There were separate effects of leader self-efficacy and outcome expectancy on career intentions through motivation to lead.
- Leader competency did not have a direct effect on career intention.
• Developmental experiences may be sources of leader self-efficacy.
• There was a positive effect of learning orientation on engagement in developmental experiences.
Inhibiting Factors

- Family-work conflict was directly and negatively related to motivation to lead.

- Perception of gender discrimination was negatively related to motivation to lead through outcome expectancy
• Family-work conflict was directly and negatively related to motivation to lead.
• Perception of gender discrimination was negatively related to motivation to lead through outcome expectancy
Gender Differences

The relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency was significant after accounting for gender.

Though women showed higher outcome expectancy and motivation to lead, women showed lower engagement in developmentally challenging assignment, leader self-efficacy, and career intention as compared to men.
Gender Differences

The relationship between feedback, support, and mentoring and leader competency was significant after accounting for gender.
Though women showed higher outcome expectancy and motivation to lead, women showed lower engagement in developmentally challenging assignment, leader self-efficacy, and career intention as compared to men.
Study Limitations & Practical Implications

- Not measuring actual career advancement
- Cross-sectional nature of the study
- Discrimination, which may affect their outcome expectancy and their motivation
Study Limitations

- Limited participation from head coaches

- Unexamined factors that may influence leaders’ career advancement.

- Not measuring actual career advancement

- Cross-sectional nature of the study
Study Limitations

- Limited participation from head coaches
• Unexamined factors that may influence leaders' career advancement.
• Not measuring actual career advancement

• Cross-sectional nature of the study
Practical Implications

- Important to help assistant coaches to believe in their abilities (especially females) to maintain their motivation and intention to advance their careers.
  - Provide the best quality developmental experiences
  - Foster learning orientation

- Critical to alleviate challenges such as family-work conflict and gender discrimination, which may affect their outcome expectancy and their motivation
• Important to help assistant coaches to believe in their abilities (especially females) to maintain their motivation and intention to advance their careers.
  • Provide the best quality developmental experiences
  • Foster learning orientation
• Critical to alleviate challenges such as family-work conflict and gender discrimination, which may affect their outcome expectancy and their motivation
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