Women are underrepresented in coaching positions, both at the assistant and head coach levels. The purpose of this study was to examine one reason for this occurrence: gender differences in occupational turnover. The authors provided a review of the literature related to occupational turnover, integrating coaching and organizational psychology literatures. Based on these frameworks, the authors then conducted a meta-analysis of the quantitative research in the area, statistically aggregating results from 10 samples and 2,802 coaches. Results indicated that women intend to leave coaching sooner than do men ($d = .38$). Drawing from the review, the authors then examined potential reasons for the differences. Contrary to expectations, women were younger ($d = −.56$) and had shorter occupational tenures ($d = −.59$) than men, suggesting that other factors, such as their aspirations for advancement or the macro-level barriers they encounter, make coaching an unattractive option. Women had lower aspirations for advancement in the profession ($d = −.74$) and less positive experiences in coaching ($d = −.23$), though organizational experiences did not vary by gender. The results collectively suggest that occupational constraints can limit women’s aspirations and intentions to remain in coaching, even beyond what would be expected based on their age and time in the profession.
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Though sport participation is widely available to women, when it comes to coaching positions, the data tell a different story. Consider the following: in the United States (US) during the 2016–17 academic year, girls and women represented 42% of all interscholastic athletes (2016–17 High School, 2017) and 44% of all intercollegiate athletes (Irick, 2017). Despite these numbers, women represented only 27% of the head coaches at the youth level (Flanagan, 2017), approximately 21% at the interscholastic level (Flanagan, 2017), and 24% at the intercollegiate level (Diversity Research, 2017). Women represent 29.3% of all assistant coaches at the intercollegiate level, including 48.9% of the assistant coaches of women’s teams (Diversity Research, 2017).

The underrepresentation of women in coaching is troubling on a number of fronts. First, the data lend credence to the notion that women face access discrimination, or the process whereby members of a particular social group are denied access to certain jobs or positions (Burton, 2015; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). Thus, women do not enjoy the same opportunities to pursue their professional interests as men do (Burton & Leberman, 2017; Hartzell & Dixon, in press; LaVoi, 2016a). The negative effects of discrimination and mistreatment stretch beyond the direct targets, too. That is, having few women in coaching positions could negatively impact organizational culture and athlete experiences. LaVoi (2016b) demonstrated that women in coaching and leadership roles serve role modeling functions; offer support for other women; bring varied, unique perspectives to the workplace; commonly serve as champions for equality and fairness; and, relative to men, are less likely to engage in abusive relationships with players. She further noted that policies designed to promote gender equality and fairness benefit all people, not just women (LaVoi, 2016b).

A number of authors have attempted to explain the underrepresentation of women in coaching positions through narrative reviews of the literature (Burton, 2015; Kane & LaVoi, 2018; LaVoi, 2016a; LaVoi & Dutove, 2012). The researchers have pointed to possible factors contributing to the underrepresentation of women in coaching, including those at the societal (e.g., stakeholder expectations or norms), interpersonal (e.g., prejudices), and individual (e.g., self-limiting behaviors) levels (see Cunningham, 2019). Because of the myriad constraints women face, researchers have suggested that they enter sport positions at lower rates than men (LaVoi, 2016a). Others have suggested work–family conflict contributes to women leaving the sport industry sooner than men (Bruening & Dixon, 2008).

Over time, small gender differences in career choices, such as turnover, can accumulate to create sizeable effects (Valian, 1996), thereby signaling the importance of understanding the nature and extent of turnover. Although the extant qualitative and empirical evidence remain conclusive, suggesting a variety of factors influence turnover intentions and withdrawal behaviors (Blau, 2007; Burton & Leberman, 2017; Cunningham & Sagas, 2003; Hom & Griffeth, 1991), aggregate information about the degree to which women and men leave coaching is less understood. As such, the purpose of this study was to explore gender differences in turnover among coaches. In doing so, we first draw from the existing management, sport management, and sociology of sport literatures to present a framework for understanding coach turnover. We then examine the available empirical literature on the topic and conduct a meta-analysis of occupational turnover and turnover intention among coaches. Beyond narrative reviews, meta-analyses include a systematic collection and review of the literature (Cooper, 2010), and thus, we offer not only a comprehensive analysis, but also a specification of effect sizes. Finally, we note the gaps in the empirical research and avenues for future examination.

**Occupational Turnover and Coaching**

Scholars have devoted considerable attention to understanding employee turnover. In an early review, Cotton and Tuttle (1986) pointed to the efficacy of a multilevel, systems approach to...
Micro-Level Factors

Micro-level factors are those specific to the individual. Conceptually, age and occupational tenure might hold a positive association with occupational turnover. That is, the closer people are to retirement, the more likely they are to leave. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) observed as much in their analysis, such that age and tenure were positively associated with employee turnover. More recently, however, scholars have not observed such an association (Blau, 2007; Griffith et al., 2000), thereby suggesting the topic warrants further investigation. Applied to the current study, if age and tenure explain gender differences in occupational turnover, then women would be older than men and would have served in the profession a longer period of time.

Race might also intersect with gender to explain opportunities and experiences in coaching—a position consistent with intersectionality (hooks, 2000). As Watson and Scraton (2013) explained, “It moves beyond an additive approach that deals with fixed, static concepts of gender, race, class and looks at inequalities at the intersections and at how they are routed through each other with no single cause” (p. 37). Cunningham (2019), for example, reported that White women constitute a 5 times larger share of the US population than do African American women. However, relative to African American women, White women are 11.2 times more likely to be a head coach of a women’s National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) team, 6.5 times more likely to serve as a head coach of a men’s NCAA team, and 90.5 times more likely to hold the role of athletic director. These findings, coupled with those from other researchers (Borland & Bruning, 2010; McDowell & Carter-Franci, 2017), show how various demographic characteristics can intersect to influence opportunities and experiences in sport, including coaching.

Other identities might influence women’s decision to remain in coaching. A number of researches have shown that women feel compelled to hide portions of their identity, including their sexual orientation (Kamphoff, 2010; Krane & Barber, 2005; Walker & Melton, 2015). Griffin (2012) alluded to as much, too, suggesting that even with possible changes in people’s attitudes toward gay men, sport remains a space that is frequently hostile toward lesbians and bisexual women. Kamphoff’s (2010) qualitative study illustrated these dynamics. One coach noted that, in hiding her identity, she was living a lie—something she hated. She continued:

And I got tired of not being here for my partner. She has to be a ghost. She was Casper. When I had recruits over, she had to leave her own home. And when they left, I would call her and I would say, “You can come home.” That’s no life. That’s not fair. So, it was time that I understood, and I paid attention to that part of my life too. And I needed better balance, and I needed a life, basically. (as cited in Kamphoff, p. 368)

Beyond personal demographics and identities, human capital and social capital investments might influence turnover (Becker, 1993; Coleman, 1986). The former investments refer to playing experience, education, training, and certifications that people have, while the latter reflects the quality and quantity of people’s social networks. Researchers have shown that women frequently have higher human capital investments than do men, but they do not receive the corresponding returns (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002). Others have shown that, in the Australian context, even with excellent human capital, women coaches might not pursue opportunities; men, however, pursue positions even if their capital investments are lacking (Greenhill, Auld, Cuskelly, & Hooper, 2009). With respect to social capital, the “old boy’s network” necessarily limits women, their opportunities, and their ability to be successful in coaching. It privileges men and serves to ensure they maintain power in that context (Kilty, 2006). Social capital can also influence the presence of women in various sports, including serving as coaches of men’s teams (Walker & Bopp, 2010). The differential returns on capital investments suggest that, relative to men, women are not rewarded for staying in the profession and developing their careers. Collectively, differences in human and social capital investments, and the returns for those investments, can influence one’s decision to remain in a profession, including coaching.

Finally, aspirations for career advancement might influence occupational turnover. From a social cognitive career theory perspective (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), people are likely to pursue or continue with career paths when they foresee opportunities and the ability to advance. When such expectations are low, people will likely follow other options. In an examination of student persistence, for example, Kahn and Nauta (2001) found that college students were more likely to continue in their degree path when they believed doing so would allow them to achieve their career goals.

Griffith et al. (2000), in their meta-analysis of turnover, found that employees were likely to leave when they believed they had better options elsewhere, and Blau (2007) observed a similar pattern in his meta-analysis of occupational turnover. Likewise, Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that advancement opportunities and the rate of ascension in the workplace were both negatively associated with turnover. The latter two studies included samples from a variety of industries. Within the coaching context, LaVoi and Dutove (2012), in their ecological model of barriers and support for women in coaching, also recognized the importance of opportunities and advancement aspirations. They noted that various barriers could serve to limit the perceived opportunities and, ultimately, advancement aspirations of women in coaching, thereby serving to limit women in the coaching profession.

Meso-Level Factors

Meso-level factors are those operating at the group and organizational levels. Researchers have traditionally focused on the association between meso-level factors and organizational turnover. However, Blau (2007) showed that experiences and opportunities at the organizational level can and do influence people’s attitudes and decisions related to their careers. Various sport management researchers have demonstrated this linkage in their studies of
intercollegiate coaches, too (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). In explaining the conceptual linkage between organizational and occupational constructs, Cunningham and Sagas (2004) wrote, “It is possible that individuals generalize their poor (or good) work experiences within an organization as indicative of how work is experienced in other organizations throughout the occupation” (p. 239). As such, we include meso-level factors in our current framework of occupational turnover.

LaVoi and Dutove (2012) noted that meso-level factors can take on properties that support or serve as barriers for women in coaching. With respect to the former, supportive and inclusive organizational policies are key to retaining employees, and the same is true for coaches. Inglis, Danylchuk, and Pastore (1996) identified employment factors that might serve to retain administrators and coaches. For example, the authors found that work-life balance, recognition and organizational support, and inclusivity played a significant role in motivating coaches and administrators to stay in the sport workplace. The research group later compared the importance and fulfillment of each retention factor, finding that coaches and administrators had a similar pattern of ratings (Pastore, Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1996). Bruening and Dixon (2008), in their study of coaching mothers, also observed the importance of supportive workplace climates and administrators. Support took the form of administrators who had an understanding and consideration of the multiple roles coaching mothers held, the allowance of workplace flexibility, and staffing to support the inclusive workplace.

Organizational policies can also serve to support women in sport. Adriaanse (2017), for example, focused on gender-focused policies related to hiring. Some took the form of targets, while others were quotas. The former policies are aspirational in nature and lack repercussions for failure to achieve them. The latter are grounded in legislation or regulatory requirements, and they are commonly in the organization’s bylaws or constitution, thereby adding to their legitimacy and force. Adriaanse persuasively illustrated the manner in which gender-focused policies lacked effectiveness in increasing the proportion of women in sport, largely because policies are voluntary in nature. Quotas, on the other hand, might serve as a persuasive tool. She noted, “The limited progress made so far suggests that the use of gender quotas warrants consideration as a strategy to accelerate women’s representation in sport governance” (p. 95).

Just as meso-level factors can serve to support women in coaching, they can also take the form of barriers (LaVoi & Dutove, 2012). Organizational cultures represent one such factor (Burton, 2015). According to Schein (2004), culture is “a pattern of shared basic assumptions … that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct ways to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 17). In many sport organizations, the culture is one in which women are marginalized and subjugated (Cunningham, 2008).

Though slight variations may have occurred, these cultures have been maintained over time and, consequently, have become taken-for-granted in nature. The cultures are largely institutionalized, such that people within sport may not question or critique the values, structures, and processes privileging men and subjugating women (Cunningham, 2019). As a result, outcomes, such as women leaving sport sooner than men, do not change.

Finally, biases among decision makers represent another meso-level factor. Biases can take the form of stereotypes, prejudice, or discrimination (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008). Common stereotypes in sport link leadership with men and masculinity (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruening, 2009; Hovden, 2010), and people frequently use masculine pronouns when describing ideal leaders in sport (Knoppers & Anthonissen, 2008). Sexism—a form of prejudice—can also limit women’s full participation in the coaching profession. Sexism negatively affects the experiences and opportunities of all people in sport organizations (Fink, 2015) and can increase their desire to leave the workplace (Spoor & Hoye, 2014). This form of prejudice can also influence how decision makers think about diversity-focused initiatives and the need to pursue socially just initiatives (Fielding-Lloyd & Meân, 2008). Discrimination, the third form of bias, also negatively affects women in coaching (Kilty, 2006). As Kane and LaVoi (2018) have shown, the discrimination can be explicit or implicit in nature, but both forms negatively affect women and their full participation in the coaching profession.

Macro-Level Factors

Finally, macro-level factors operate at the societal level. They take the form of laws, cultural expectations, systemic forms of bias, and the expectations of key constituents, among others. Title IX represents one of the most influential macro-level factors impacting women in coaching. As explained by Lopiano (2000):

A federal antidiscrimination law, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, mandated nondiscrimination in admissions, access, and treatment in all educational programs offered by institutions that were the recipients of federal funds. Title IX also covered school-sponsored extracurricular activities, including intramurals, club sports, and varsity athletics, in which the participation of women was almost nonexistent and certainly underfunded.

Since the passage of Title IX, women’s participation in sport and physical activity as well as the quality of that sport have dramatically increased (see Diversity Research, 2017; Flanagan, 2017; Irik, 2017; Kilty, 2006; Whisenant, Pederson & Obenour, 2002). Under the law, institutions are required to ensure gender equity through athletic and educational programs. As such, Title IX brought legitimacy to women’s sport, and many thought that the rise in women’s participation would be followed with a parallel increase in coaching opportunities for women (Zimbalist, 1999). This, however, has not been the case, with women’s coaching numbers continuing to lag behind those of participants, and in some cases declining since Title IX (Reade, Rodgers, & Norman, 2009).

Several scholars argued that while the enactment of Title IX in the US helped level the playing field in sport participation, it likely led to men taking over the leadership of both men’s and women’s sport, and more male dominance within college sport, which likely impacted the career opportunities for women coaches (Whisenant et al., 2002; Zimbalist, 1999). As LaVoi and Dutove (2012) noted, the minority status of women in athletics may lead to their intentions to enter or leave the profession due to the limited advancements and multiple barriers that they encounter.

Clearly, additional factors are contributing to this decline. At a cultural level, a number of scholars have suggested that hegemonic masculinity is a powerful macro-level influence on women in sport (for reviews see Burton, 2015; Hartzell & Dixon, in press). Masculine hegemony essentially involves the creation and perpetuation of men’s power over women, or the placement of women’s status below that of men’s (Whisenant et al., 2002). Thus, sport as a traditionally masculine domain creates a context where men have the opportunity to exert their dominance over women. This can create an environment where women feel their career advancement
opportunities are restricted, leading to dissatisfaction and potential career exit (Hartzell & Dixon, in press).

In addition, systemic sexism negatively influences women, their experiences, and their opportunities in sport (Knoppers, 1987). Ideas about gender and the appropriate roles at home and at work for women and men are deeply embedded in a given culture (Duncan, 1993; Norman, 2010). Over time, they can become enmeshed into society’s institutions and systems, including religion, politics, criminal justice, and sport, among others. Institutionalized forms of sexism can influence how people think, the attitudes they adopt, and their behaviors.

In the employment context, institutionalized sexism can influence jobs perceived as appropriate for women and for men. Shaw and Slack (2002), for example, found that some men were hesitant to pursue certain roles (regional development officer) in sport because the activities represented women predominantly held the position. A study participant noted, “maybe men think it’s a bit of a wimpy job” (p. 93). The opposite can also occur, such that people may come to believe the particular roles (e.g., head coach) or professions (e.g., coaching) are better suited for men than for women. Taylor and Hardin (2016), for example, found that deeply embedded socio-cultural ideas about gender and who should serve in leadership roles served to limit the representation of women. Taylor and Hardin (2016), for example, found that deeply embedded socio-cultural ideas about gender and who should serve in leadership roles served to limit the representation of women. Knoppers (1992) and Walker and Sartore-Baldwin (2013) have advanced similar arguments for women in coaching.

Finally, external stakeholders might influence the representation of women in coaching and their desire to remain in the profession. Stakeholders are key constituents and can be internal or external to the organization (Clarkson, 1995), and for the purposes of this section, we focus on external stakeholders. Sport organization stakeholders frequently hold views and expectations that serve to reify gendered stereotypes and the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions (Staurowsky, Zonder, & Riemer, 2017). Illustrative of these dynamics, Hoeber (2007, 2008) collected data from stakeholders of Canadian university athletics and found that some denied gender inequalities existed, while others rationalized the injustices. In both cases, the stakeholders’ actions and attitudes perpetuated gender inequalities. Stakeholders might also influence the individuals hired for positions (Schull, Shaw, & Kihl, 2013), and in doing so, play a role in limiting the opportunities for women in sport.

Summary and Current Study

Our review suggests that multiple factors can influence the underrepresentation of women in coaching, and specifically, their desire to leave coaching. Though we have presented the factors separately, scholars have shown that factors at various levels can and do influence one another (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). For example, gendered stakeholder expectations about who should serve in leadership roles (a macro-level factor) might influence prejudicial decision making among athletic directors (a meso-level factor). Over time, the differential opportunities and experiences reinforced through meso- and macro-level factors might signal to women that coaching is not a work context in which they have a bright future. As a result, they might limit their aspirations or choose to leave coaching all together (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007).

Our review and multilevel model also offer a framework by which we can examine occupational turnover via meta-analysis. The model offers a way of organizing the data and exploring in which areas, if any, gender differences exist. Therein lies a key benefit of meta-analysis – the ability to statistically aggregate empirical data and arrive at an overall effect size, while considering statistical and methodological artifacts. Such a distinction is important because, unlike narrative reviews, meta-analysis allows researchers to determine the size of the differences between groups (Cooper, 2010). Drawing from our review, we examined the following research questions:

- Research Question 1: Are there gender differences in the occupational turnover of coaches?
- Research Question 2: Are there gender differences in micro-level factors associated with the occupational turnover of coaches?
- Research Question 3: Are there gender differences in meso-level factors associated with the occupational turnover of coaches?
- Research Question 4: Are there gender differences in macro-level factors associated with the occupational turnover of coaches?

Method

Literature Search

The first step in employing a meta-analysis is to conduct a systematic literature review to identify all possible studies. We did so by following the procedures recommended by meta-analysts Cooper (2010) and Lispey and Wilson (2001). We established several inclusion and exclusion criteria when deciding which peer-reviewed articles, theses, and dissertations to retain. First, as meta-analyses statistically aggregate information from quantitative studies (Cooper, 2010; Lispey & Wilson, 2001), we excluded conceptual papers and qualitative studies. Second, as our focus was on occupational turnover, we did not include research where the authors examined organizational turnover—a sizeable number of studies but nevertheless not germane to our work. We also excluded studies that did not include a comparison of the occupational turnover among members of underrepresented groups. Fourth, we also limited our work to those studies in which the authors focused on coaches. Doing so meant excluding several studies where the researchers collected data from others working in sport, such as administrators or journalists. Fifth, statistical aggregation of information requires that necessary information be available in the document, including zero-order correlations, chi-square values or counts, effect size statistics, means and standard deviations, F values, or t statistics. If the document did not include the information needed to calculate an effect size estimate, we necessarily excluded the study from the analysis. We completed the following:

1. A search of electronic databases: PsychINFO, Google Scholar, and SPORTDiscus. We used a variety of search terms to have a broad reach. The terms included: “occupational turnover and sport,” “leave and sport,” “turnover and sport,” and “migration and sport.”

2. A search of ProQuest Dissertations and Theses to identify any studies on the topic that authors had not published in a peer-reviewed journal.

4. The use of “ancestry methods” such that we examined the reference lists of retrieved documents to determine if there were other studies we had not previously identified.

**Coding and Analyses**

We used a coding form (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001) during the information gathering stage. Two members of the research team independently recorded the statistical information for each study. We also collected additional information in each study and categorized the data as a micro-, meso-, and macro-level factor. In analyzing the data, we also considered issues related to the independence of effects. Consistent with expert recommendations (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003; Arthur, Bennett, & Huffcutt, 2001), when data from a single study were reflective of the same category within a specific level (e.g., multiple dimensions of organizational commitment), we averaged the data to represent a single data point. Conversely, if authors reported antecedents from multiple levels, we considered the data independent.

We analyzed the data following Cooper’s (2010) guidelines. As the research questions were concerned with differences between groups, we computed the d-index and then corrected for the sample size. We reported the corrected d-index, as well as the 95% CI, the latter of which points to the statistical significance of the effects. We also followed Cohen (1988) in assessing the practical significance: small ($d = .02$), moderate ($d = .05$), and large ($d = .08$).

**Findings and Discussion**

Our systematic search, coupled with the process for inclusion and exclusion of studies, resulted in 10 studies for analysis. We list the studies in the Reference section, each denoted by an asterisk. We also include a brief overview of each study in Table 1. For each study, we had full information on the effect size and moderators. From these studies, we analyzed effect sizes from 2,802 coaches in the US, Canada, and Germany. We present a summary in Table 2.

**Research Question 1: Occupational Turnover**

With our first research question, we asked: are there gender differences in the occupational turnover of coaches? We identified 10 studies to include in the analysis, and the overall effect size was .38 (95% CI: .29 to .46; see Table 2). As the 95% CI did not include zero, the effect was statistically significant (Cooper, 2010), and drawing from Cohen’s (1988) convention, the effect size is small to moderate. The results suggest that women do have higher occupational turnover and turnover intentions than do men.

The findings support previous narrative reviews on women in coaching (Burton, 2015; LaVoi & Dutove, 2012), suggesting that women leave the profession sooner than men do. Over time, the differences have meaningful, cumulative effects. Valian (1996), for instance, has shown that even small gender differences in the entry into or exit from a profession can, over time, result in exponential variations in the representation of women and men. These dynamics are present in the coaching context, as gender differences in occupational turnover have created a supply-side shortage of women in coaching. The effects of this shortfall are far-reaching, negatively impacting the women who leave, athletes, other coaches, and the athletic departments as a whole (Hartzell & Dixon, in press; LaVoi, 2016b).

**Research Question 2: Micro-Level Explanations**

With our second research question, we asked: are there gender differences in micro-level factors associated with the occupational turnover of coaches? We identified three micro-level factors: age, tenure, and head coaching aspirations, and we present the results in Table 2.

Conceptually, age and occupational tenure should be positively associated with occupational turnover. Thus, *ceteris paribus*, if women plan on leaving coaching sooner than men, they should also be older and have worked in coaching longer. As seen in Table 2, this was not the case. Results indicate that women were younger than men ($d = −.56$, 95% CI: −.66 to −.45) and also worked in coaching for a shorter period of time ($d = −.59$, 95% CI: −.76 to −.42). Both effects were statistically significant and moderate in size. These findings suggest that other factors, such as their aspirations for advancement or the macro-level barriers they encounter, make coaching an unattractive option. That is, there are push factors that serve to influence women’s turnover at an earlier age than we would otherwise expect.

We found a similar pattern for aspirations to be a head coach. As seen in Table 2, women expressed fewer intentions to seek head coaching positions, relative to men ($d = −.74$, 95% CI: −.93 to −.56). The d-index was statistically significant and large in size, according to Cohen’s (1988) conventions.

Collectively, these findings point to the salience of micro-level factors in explaining gender differences in occupational turnover. Women, relative to men, are younger, have been in coaching for fewer years, but also express less desire to pursue head coaching opportunities. One could draw from these findings to point the finger at women, blaming them for their underrepresented status. But, such conclusions ignore the influence of factors at other levels of analysis. Various theories (Dixon & Warner, 2010; Knoppers, 1987; Lent et al., 1994; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986), qualitative studies (see our review, as well as those from Burton, 2015, and LaVoi and Dutove, 2012), and, as shown in the subsequent sections, empirical studies, all point to the influence of meso- and macro-level factors in shaping people’s attitudes and behaviors related to coaching. People do not live their lives in a vacuum; instead, their social worlds help shape who they are and the activities they pursue, including their careers (see also Dixon & Bruening, 2007).

As a final note about the micro-level factors, scholars either did not empirically pursue or did not report on a number of individual factors that might influence turnover. For example, even though the authors routinely noted the racial diversity of their sample, we did not identify any researchers who reported occupational turnover data based on race and gender, together. Thus, we could not statistically analyze the role of intersectionality. The same applies to other identities, such as sexual orientation or social class. As a result, we encourage future researchers to offer more robust descriptions and/or analyses of their samples.

**Research Question 3: Meso-Level Explanations**

With our third research question, we asked: are there gender differences in meso-level factors associated with the occupational turnover of coaches? As shown in Table 2, we identified three samples where the authors focused on variables we broadly categorized as organizational inclusiveness. Results indicate that gender differences did not exist at a statistically significant level ($d = −.09$, 95% CI: −.24 to −.06), as the 95% CI included zero. The effect size was small.
These findings suggest that organizational factors might not play a major role in helping to explain gender differences in occupational turnover. Of course, our findings do not minimize the importance of organizational characteristics and inclusiveness in other areas of a coach’s life. Inclusive workplaces are attractive to job seekers (Madera, Dawson, & Neal, 2018) and are linked with physical well-being, psychological well-being, and performance among employees (Bidee et al., 2017; Cunningham, Buzuvis, & Mosier, 2018; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2009; Rogers, Crossway, & Aronson, 2018). As coaches are likely to value these outcomes and, thus, remain in professions that allow for them to manifest, we suspect the influence organizational inclusiveness on occupational turnover is likely indirect in nature.

Research Question 4: Macro-Level Explanations
With our fourth research question, we asked: are there gender differences in macro-level factors associated with the occupational
turnover of coaches? As shown in Table 2, the macro-level factors took the form of barriers coaches interpreted in the broader coaching environment. Results show evidence of gender differences, as women identified more barriers than did men ($d = .23$, 95% CI: .01 to .37). The 95% CI did not contain zero, suggesting the $d$-index was statistically significant. The effect size was small (Cohen, 1988). The presence of gender differences is consistent with previous narrative reviews (Burton, 2015; LaVoi & Dutove, 2012) and theory related to factors influencing people’s career and work-related choices (Lent et al., 1994; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). As with the other factors, we were struck by what we found (as previously noted) and what data were not available from empirical analyses. It is possible that researchers who employ quantitative approaches focus on individual and organizational variables, and Cunningham’s (2016) review of theoretical frameworks used in the study of women in coaching supports this rationale. On the other hand, our review suggests that qualitatively-oriented scholars are more likely to uncover the role of macro-level factors (e.g., Dixon & Bruening, 2007; Dixon & Warner, 2010; Hoeber, 2007, 2008; Lewis, Roberts, & Andrews, 2018; Shaw & Allen, 2009; Shaw & Slack, 2002; Walker & Sartore-Baldwin, 2013). We suspect the differences might be a function of (a) the difficulty in assessing macro-level factors with quantitative approaches; (b) scholars using qualitative methods being better able to uncover the intricacies and nuances of macro-level influences; (c) the higher likelihood of qualitative researchers drawing from sociological theories—frameworks well-positioned to address the role of society, institutional biases, and cultural expectations; or (d) a combination thereof.

**Contributions, Implications, and Future Directions**

This study advances work in understanding the underrepresentation of women in coaching by presenting not only a systematic literature review of the multilevel factors that could impact coaching turnover in women, but also a meta-analysis of all the relevant studies to date. While researchers identified numerous factors across micro-, meso-, and macro-levels that link to entry and exit of women coaches (Blau, 2007; Griffith et al., 2000), the degree to which gender differences in turnover exist because of these factors remained unanswered. To fill this gap, we aggregated quantitative data and corrected statistical artifacts to address the comprehensive understanding of turnover among women coaches. The use of meta-analysis helps increase the precise estimate of an effect from single studies and can help identify patterns in data across studies based in different contexts and with varying sample sizes (Cooper, 2010). By employing meta-analysis, we were able to examine effects across head and assistant coaches from three different countries, and both college and elite sport coaches. This helps confirm that the issue of gender differences in occupational turnover are likely embedded in the coaching profession, and not limited to a particular organization or context. Findings from our meta-analysis, thus, provide an integrated theoretical and empirical picture of and address gender differences in occupational turnover across the studies.

While many of the studies included in the meta-analysis used a single level of analysis, we reviewed and presented multiple factors, such as human capital (micro-level factors) and social capital (meso- and macro-level factors), in a collective model. Although each of the factors seems to separately impact intention to leave the coaching profession, researchers suggest that such factors at various levels can affect one another (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). While this is troubling, it does point to the likelihood that solutions lie perhaps not just in meso-level policies and practices enacted at the organizational level, but in macro-level cultural assumptions surrounding gender norms and systemic discrimination. Until women’s contributions to coaching are highly valued and until gendered barriers are removed, discrepancies in turnover are likely to persist. Thus, our study with the multilevel approach highlights the combined efforts and makes a meaningful contribution towards the understanding of gender differences in turnover decisions among coaches.

As well as our contributions and theoretical implications described previously, the findings have a number of important implications for practice. Our findings support existing literature contending that women coaches have higher occupational turnover and intention to exit earlier than do men. Specifically, micro-level factors (i.e., age, tenure, and head coaching aspirations) presented moderate to large magnitudes of gender differences in turnover. This finding indicates that, when girls and young women coaches see potential barriers to career paths and receive lower level of mentoring or networking, they might not pursue the coaching profession. Additionally, while small effects from meso- and macro-level factors might not play a role in explaining gender differences in turnover, individual attitudes and behaviors influence these factors to shape systems, cultures, and norms as well. As seen as the unintended consequences of Title IX, the underrepresentation of women in coaching might negatively influence societial norms and beliefs about gender and leadership in coaching. Thus, sport managers are encouraged to consider implementing mentorship trainings that can benefit women coaches and creating a more equitable and motivating work environment to retain them.
Finally, we note a number of areas for future scholarly activity to enhance our meta-analytic understanding of gender differences in turnover among coaches. First, this study included existing empirical research regarding coaches and turnover. It is likely that similar occupational turnover patterns exist among other sport positions such as administration or front office personnel. As such, future meta-analyses could explore such sport positions and examine any patterns that may differ from coaching. In addition, the existing data is largely drawn from samples of US coaches; there is a clear need to further study this occupation across global contexts. Third, as mentioned earlier, there was a clear lack of intersectionality included in existing studies. Importantly, different forms of discrimination can overlap and potentially interact such that individuals could experience multiple forms of discrimination at the same time (Crenshaw, 1989). In sport, a number of scholars have argued how multiple identities such as race and gender can work in concert to exacerbate discrimination (see Carter-Francique & Flowers, 2013 for an overview). More studies need to include intersectionality perspectives in their analysis, such that patterns of discrimination can be discovered and resolved. Lastly, although we focused the current study on a meta-analytic and multilevel approach, future researchers could also consider conducting systematic narrative reviews to expand the current knowledge on turnover. In doing so, future studies using qualitative approaches would allow for more robust descriptions on cultural and societal influences (macro-level factors) on women coaches’ decisions to remain or leave coaching.
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