

AFRICAN-AMERICAN COACHES IN COLLEGE FOOTBALL:
AN ACCUMULATED DISADVANTAGE

By

TREVOR BOPP

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2010

© 2010 Trevor Bopp

To my Mom

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my committee chair, Dr. Michael Sagas, for all of his support, patience, and guidance. I thank my committee members, Dr. May Kim, Dr. Dale Pracht, and Dr. Matt Walker, for their suggestions and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	7
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
ABSTRACT.....	9
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	11
The Matthew Effect	13
Accumulated Disadvantage	14
Evidence of Accumulated Disadvantage.....	17
An Accumulated Disadvantage in Intercollegiate Athletics	19
2 AN EXAMINATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN COACHING REPRESENTATION IN MEN'S NCAA SPORTS: 1996-2008.....	23
Review of Pertinent Literature.....	26
Method.....	31
Data Collection Process.....	31
Design and Procedure.....	32
Results	33
Discussion	36
3 RACIAL TASKING AND THE COLLEGE QUARTERBACK: REDEFINING THE STACKING PHENOMENON	44
Review of Pertinent Literature and Theory	46
Centrality	46
Outcome Control Hypothesis	47
Self Segregation and Role Model Theory	48
African Americans in Coaching	50
Hypotheses	51
Methodology.....	51
Procedures and Data Collection	51
Data Analysis.....	53
Results	53
Discussion	55

4	AN EXAMINATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN NCAA FOOTBALL COACHES: A FIVE YEAR UPDATE.....	60
	Review of Pertinent Literature.....	61
	Methodology.....	64
	Data Collection and Analysis	65
	Results	66
	Discussion.....	70
	Conclusion.....	74
5	DISCUSSION.....	82
	Macro-level: Perceptions of African Americans in Collegiate Coaching	83
	Meso-level: African-American Student-Athletes and Future Coaching Opportunities	87
	Micro-level: The Career Paths of African-American Coaches.....	90
	Multilevel Approach.....	92
6	CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	94
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	101
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	107

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>page</u>
2-1	Means and Standard Deviations for African-American Coaching Percentages in Men's Sports Across All NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008.....	41
2-2	Means and Standard Deviations for African-American Coaching Percentages in Football & Men's Basketball Across All NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008.....	42
2-3	Means and Standard Deviations for Mean African-American Coaching Percentages Across the Three NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008	43
3-1	Racial Differences in the Number of Rush and Pass Attempts	58
3-2	Racial Differences in the Percentage of Rush and Pass Attempts	59
4-1	Head Coach, Offensive and Defensive Coordinator, and Assistant Coach Cross Tabulations by Race and Time	77
4-2	Assistant Coaches Positions Coached by Race and Time	78
4-3	Assistant Coaches Positions Played by Race and Time.....	79
4-4	Frequencies of Head Coaches by Prior Coaching Position by Time	80
4-5	Frequencies of Head Coaches by Position as a Player by Time	81

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCA	Black Coaches and Administrators
FBS	Football Bowl Subdivision
ISDF	Institution Staff and Demographic Form
MEP	Minority Enhancement Program
MOIC	Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee
NCAA	National Collegiate Athletic Association
ODI	Office of Diversity and Inclusion
SEC	Southeastern Conference
PWI	Predominantly White Institution

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

AFRICAN-AMERICAN COACHES IN COLLEGE FOOTBALL:
AN ACCUMULATED DISADVANTAGE

By

Trevor Bopp

August 2010

Chair: Michael Sagas

Major: Health and Human Performance

At current, the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Division I- Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) has the greatest number of African-American head coaches in its history. Such progress might suggest current racial and ethnic disparities are decreasing. Such is not the case. Social networks and practices steeped in tradition and history continue to influence and impact intercollegiate athletics. The accrued prejudices faced by Africans Americans facilitate a racial and ethnic divide among coaching opportunities, resources, and treatment. Three distinct, yet interrelated, manuscripts were written to better understand this institutional discrimination and its manifestation as an accumulated disadvantage for African-American college football coaches.

The first manuscript utilized a macro-level approach to determine what, if any, changes have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions over the last 15 years. The second study took a meso-level approach to demonstrate how college football decision makers potentially impact the future prospects of student-athletes prior to entry and progression through their coaching career. The third study employed a micro-level approach, comparing the current representation of coaches in

DI-FBS to African-American coaching representation in 1990 and 2005. Taken together, these three studies helped to reveal the existence and manifestation of an accumulated disadvantage for African Americans in intercollegiate athletics coaching.

The primary findings suggest that there exists an accumulated disadvantage impacting African-American college football coaches, such that their representation on staffs and in leadership roles is negligible. Furthermore, it was revealed that potentially discriminate practices (e.g., racial tasking and homologous reproduction) might continue to prosper in intercollegiate athletics; serving to maintain a hegemonic environment in which African-American coaches experience limited opportunities, capital, and resources. However, recent increases in African-American coaching representation evoke optimism towards minimizing, and possibly eliminating its racially divergent impact. Findings also reveal the possibility of more accepting attitudes among intercollegiate athletics stakeholders (e.g., administration, alumni, fans, and boosters) regarding coaches of more diversified races, ethnicities, experiences and backgrounds. Regardless, an accumulated disadvantage remains and potentially hinders the ability of African-American football coaches to successfully obtain and retain head coaching positions, continuing the underrepresentation of African-American college football coaches.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Sport has long been considered a microcosm of society; a reflection of sociocultural and race relations, demonstrating racial progress in this country (Buffington, 2005; Hawkins, 2002; Loy & Elvogue, 1970; Sack, Singh, & Thiel, 2005; Woodward, 2004). In studying positional and racial segregation in American sport, Loy and Elvogue (1970) declared sport as a means to better help minority groups assimilate into American life. Similarly, McPherson (1976) deemed the acceptance of African-American athletes in sport as a model for the integration of minorities into other social institutions. However, McPherson (1976) was hesitant to celebrate the complete integration of African Americans into sport; instead acknowledging that while African-American athletes had found acceptance and approval in their work role (athletic position in sport), they continued to face discrimination and a lack of acceptance in the dominant, White society. Over 40 years have passed since recognizing the prospective ability of sport to serve as a tool and/or model for minority assimilation into the dominant culture, yet discriminatory practices and consequent negative outcomes still run rampant in many sports leagues and organizations.

Such seems to be the case in intercollegiate athletics, where White males hold the majority of leadership and decision-making positions (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). For the 2007-08 academic year, 89.1% (950) of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) directors of athletics were White; and of those 950 athletics directors, 82% (779) were males. Similarly, males account for 81.8% (872) of all directors of athletics. Lapchick and McMechan (2009) report that 91.2% (330) and 83.4% (290) of Division I-Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institution presidents, athletic directors, and faculty athletic representatives were White and male, respectively, for the 2009-10 academic year. This trend continues down into the coaching ranks in the revenue-generating sports of college football and men's basketball (Bracken & DeHass,

2009). In all of Division I for the 2007-08 college sport year, 70.3% of the men's basketball head coaches were White, while 56.0% of men's basketball assistant coaches were White. Similarly, 85.3% of the head football coaches were White, while 68.1% of assistant football coaches were White. Overall, 83.7% of head coaches in all of the NCAA men's sports were White.

Research has suggested that the student-athletes of a collegiate sport constitute the largest pool of coaching candidates within that sport (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). Given the racial and ethnic make-up of the student-athletes participating in these sports, it would seem there is a potential glass ceiling effect impacting African-American coaches (Cunningham, 2003). Despite having more equitable representation in middle and lower administrative and coaching positions, African Americans continue to face discrimination in obtaining the paramount leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics. Thus, the conjecture that "perhaps nowhere is discrimination and oppression more evident than in Division IA intercollegiate athletics" (Fink & Pastore, 1999, p. 311) continues to find support.

Various explanations and theories have been utilized to help examine the existence and persistence of this phenomenon, yet are limited by their one-dimensional approach (Cunningham, 2010). Organizations are comprised of people, production, policies, practices, and purpose (Slack, 1997). A singular approach to examining and understanding organizations cannot encompass the numerous ways in which these entities interact, and in turn, impact and are impacted by one another. Therefore, to truly account for the complexities inherent within a sport organization, a multilevel (i.e., macro, meso, and micro) approach must be utilized (Cunningham, 2010; Cunningham & Sagas, 2008; Mixon, Jr. & Trevino, 2004). This paper will utilize a multilevel approach to provide evidence of an accumulated disadvantage toward

African-American coaches at the intercollegiate level, and demonstrate its impact on the under-representation of African-American coaches in college football.

The Matthew Effect

“For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.”

Matthew 25:29 (King James Version)

The above quoted Bible verse conveys the crude notion that those who have, will continue to have and have greatly; while those who are with very little, will continue to be with very little and eventually without. In 1968, Robert Merton applied the message of this verse to the misallocation of recognition and credit amongst scientific scholars. In doing so, he coined the term the “Matthew Effect”. The result of which, is a discriminatory practice that over time leads to accrued advantages for those in positions of power and potentially unwarranted impediments to others. Applied to the NCAA Division I men’s sports, the Matthew Effect could help to explain the under-representation of African-American head coaches.

The timeless adage suggests that socially advantaged groups accrue resources to maintain and even augment their status while socially disadvantaged groups struggle for opportunities and access to resources, furthering their subjacent position in society. Merton (1968) dubbed the phrase, the Matthew Effect, to demonstrate the practice in which established scholars were given greater recognition and accolades than their lesser known counterparts who were producing just as credible and equally beneficial work. Presented as an advantageous practice for those in hegemonic positions, the resultant inequalities can serve to unjustifiably limit opportunities and advancement for those in inferior social or employment positions. Thus, discrimination at the institutional-level can be largely held accountable for an industry’s racial and ethnic inequalities.

Such an idea is applicable to college sports in that intercollegiate athletics are dominated by White males. During the 2007-08 college sport year, 85.3% of Division I head football coaches were White, while 68.1% of assistant football coaches were White. In comparison, 13.0% of Division I head football coaches were African American, while 28.6% of assistant football coaches were African American (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). As such, one could make a strong case that White males are indeed the most dominant and influential group in college sport. It has been argued in research that the potential existence of institutional discrimination maintains this hegemonic status quo amongst coaches within intercollegiate athletics (Anderson, 1993; Finch, McDowell, & Sagas, 2010). Reasons that have been used to explain this phenomenon include homologous reproduction (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), positional segregation (Sack et al., 2005), access discrimination (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), and treatment discrimination (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004).

Should the Matthew Effect be present in college sport, one result could be the over-representation of White males and the under-representation of racioethnic and gender minorities in positions of power (e.g., head coach, athletic director, and conference commissioner). As evidenced from the abovementioned numbers, this is what may be taking place in intercollegiate athletics. However, the divergent consequences of the Matthew Effect are not instantaneous; rather, they accrue and are amplified over time. The gradual positive effects for those in positions of power have come to be known as a cumulative advantage. Contrarily, subordinates and those in inferior positions are negatively impacted and face an accumulated disadvantage.

Accumulated Disadvantage

Accumulated disadvantage refers to institutional discrimination from the vantage point of those groups and individuals negatively impacted by its consequences. Conversely, cumulative

advantage refers to institutional discrimination from the vantage point of those groups and individuals who happen to be the beneficiaries of such opposing outcomes. The notion of cumulative advantage suggests that individuals “in structurally advantageous positions as a result of outstanding role performance accrue certain advantages due to attaining these positions” (Clark & Corcoran, 1986, p. 24). While accumulated disadvantage suggests that individuals and groups holding structurally inferior roles experience limited opportunities and resources as a result of those in structurally advantaged positions attempting to maintain their hegemonic dominance.

The notion of an accumulated disadvantage has already been discussed in regards to its impact on coaching sport; however, this divergent impact of the haves and have not's has similarly been referred to in a number of different social settings by a number of different monikers. An accumulation of disaccumulation (Brown & Wellman, 2005) was bestowed upon the racial inequalities that continue in the post-civil rights era in the United States. The phrase cycle of poverty (Piven & Cloward, 1989) has been used when discussing economic disadvantages that may perpetuate poverty by way of political policies. Pacheco and Plutzer (2008) have extended the impact of economic disadvantage to social and civic participation (i.e., voter turnout) calling it the civic/political cycle. Lastly, W. Arthur Lewis's (1979) noncompeting groups hypothesis has been utilized to help explain how intergroup rivalries' struggles for positions of power and influence maintain a hegemonic labor force, whether intentionally or subconsciously (Darity & Mason, 1998).

Regardless of the context, the abovementioned words and phrases all draw upon the notion that over time institutional discrimination leads to and is maintained by accrued advantages for those in positions of power and potentially unwarranted impediments and

disadvantages to others. The principal element of this phenomenon is time. As Brown and Wellman (2005) have pointed out, accumulated disadvantage is a “matter of history” (p. 190). Due to a system of law built on discrimination and despite changes to address those concerns, prejudices have become entrenched in our social structure and inequities towards minorities continue. This idea is the very basis of institutional discrimination. That is, in all aspects of society (e.g., economic, political, educational, and cultural) means have been developed by which control and influence over institutional factors (e.g., salaries, employment, resources, opportunities, information, and human and social capital) is maintained (McCrudden, 1982).

Similarly, Darity and Mason (1998) have employed the noncompeting groups hypothesis (Lewis, 1979) to demonstrate how authoritative groups obtain positions of power and influence, and then use those positions to control further access to others by manipulating job requirements and limiting resources and opportunities to meet those requirements; thereby rendering any groups different from those in power (i.e., adversaries) as non-threats. Such actions that were once blatant are now institutionalized in policies and practices, and embedded in the implicit structure of certain industries.

When examining potential explanations for discrimination as functions of the social and economic system and its historically-structured policies, far too often self-interested and self-motivated individuals are found to be at fault, regardless of race or ethnicity (Brown & Wellman, 2005). It can be argued that today’s form of cloaked prejudices (e.g., institutional discrimination) fail to account for historical precedence and view inequalities as a result of an individual’s efforts in life. Explicating the victim as the cause of discrimination evolves from three assumptions: 1) the existence of racial inequalities cannot be explained solely by the actions of different racial and ethnic groups; 2) differences in the labor market (e.g., income, opportunities,

responsibilities) are a result of the individual, since management will reward those who are productive and weed out those with lower merits; and 3) once laws have been implemented, remaining discrepancies are the outcomes from self-selected activities of racial and ethnic minorities (Brown & Wellman, 2005).

However, one's position in society or industry is not solely determined by the outcome of extraneous accumulated events; the individual must be held partly responsible, even if only in the slightest sense. Defense for this rationale can be found in the theory of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy theory postulates that one's cognitive choices and resultant actions will be influenced and impacted by perceptions of their surroundings and experiences. Over time, individuals and groups accrue experiences, and social and human capital that impact future choices and behaviors. With regards to accumulated disadvantage, said future choices and behaviors are impacted negatively, such that information, opportunities, and resources are limited. The following section demonstrates the practical implications of an accumulated disadvantage, regardless of who is at fault.

Evidence of Accumulated Disadvantage

The cumulative effect of education impacts various aspects of one's life (e.g., behavioral, socioeconomic status, psychological, and biological) and are not mutually exclusive (Mirowsky & Ross, 2005). That is, many educational advantages lead to positive lifestyle choices that augment and influence the abovementioned health factors. Conversely, there exists an accumulated disadvantage for individuals with a minimal or lack of education. As such, poor education (e.g., lack of knowledge or information) can lead to unhealthy lifestyle choices that negatively influence and compound one another. Such individuals have limited career and economic opportunities; leading to reduced access to health care and healthy living resources,

subsequently developing more stress initiators and fewer means to handle said stress (Dupre, 2008). Education has also been proposed to impact an individual's understanding and handling of other life events such as employment troubles, personal loss, economic crises, and health and disease concerns (Mirowsky & Ross, 2005).

Within the labor market, salary, occupation, opportunity, and resource disparities have been of particular interest in which to demonstrate how advantages and disadvantages accrue for individuals and groups. Explanations for racial and ethnic inequalities have been linked to differences in treatment (i.e., discrimination) and gaps in group productivity-linked characteristics (human capital) (Darity & Mason, 1998). This can first be witnessed in the hiring process, where decisions about a candidate must be made after only several encounters. Employers are most likely receiving only a projected persona from the candidate and might therefore need to infer from group affiliation (e.g., education, race or ethnicity, social status) the potential employee's abilities (Darity & Mason, 1998). This type of conjecture towards an individual's aptitude and capabilities based on surface level characteristics can lead to a number of differing manifestations of employment discrimination.

Other socioeconomic disparities include the unemployment rate and median annual household income (National Urban League, 2010). Near the conclusion of 2009, the rate of unemployment of African Americans was 16% (6 percentage points higher than the national average) and the average household income was close to \$20,000 less for African Americans than Whites. Furthermore, Drash (2010) revealed that three quarters of White families are home owners compared to less than half of their African-American counterparts, African Americans are three times more likely to live in poverty, and a meager 5% of privately owned businesses belong to African Americans. An accumulated disadvantage can even be found in the penal

system, where African Americans have been reported to be anywhere from 4-6 times more likely to be incarcerated. Evident in these findings are the negative burdens and accumulated disadvantages placed on the social mobility of African Americans.

Gender minorities also face the potential drawbacks of an accumulated disadvantage. Clark and Corcoran (1986) examined decreases in a woman's opportunities and prospects as she progresses through the world of academe. Despite progress in closing the wage gap between men and women in academe, significant differences in pay differentials remain in some academic segments and comparable women continue to receive lower salaries (Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005). This same accumulated disadvantage works even more negatively against African-American female faculty members, particularly at predominantly White institutions (PWIs), where their efforts and knowledge are marginalized to the point of being labeled *maids of academe* (Harley, 2008). In application of their findings, Clark and Corcoran (1986) made this apt generalization regarding women in society: "women may not be blocked out entirely, but their progress is limited to a relatively low level of advancement in male-dominated occupations and societies" (p.25). This sentiment is an ideal summation of the past and current resistances faced by African-American coaches in intercollegiate athletics.

An Accumulated Disadvantage in Intercollegiate Athletics

With all the attention paid to diversity and inclusion at the intercollegiate level of sport, it would appear on the surface that such a racial and ethnic divide is no longer present. However, evidence of such institutionally discriminate tendencies such as homologous reproduction (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), positional segregation (Sack et al., 2005) or stacking (Anderson, 1993; Finch et al., 2010; Hawkins, 2002), access discrimination (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), and treatment discrimination (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004) remain and have been found to often

times negatively impact racial and ethnic minorities. In particular, these prejudiced practices adversely affect African-American coaches. Currently, African Americans are 7.6 times more likely to be seen as a player than as a head coach in college football, and more than twice as likely to face that same bias in college basketball (Cunningham, 2010). Furthermore, African-American coaches potentially face other latent impediments adversely impacting them on an array of varying levels (Cunningham, 2010): career satisfaction (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), career advancement (Anderson, 1993; Finch et al., 2010; Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), career length (Best, 1987; Evans, 1997, Mixon & Trevino, 2004), occupational commitment (Anderson, 1993; Cunningham, Bruening, & Straub, 2006; Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2001), and a lack of human and social capital opportunities (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005).

The purpose of this dissertation is to assess the possibility of an accumulated disadvantage toward African-American coaches at the intercollegiate level, and demonstrate its impact on the under-representation of African-American coaches in collegiate football. As previously established in an effort to examine and understand organizations, one should take a multilevel approach to account for all interacting facets (Cunningham, 2010). With regards to sport organizations, the macro-level factors consist of the political climate within the athletic department and institutionalized policies and practices. The meso-level refers to potential prejudices and prototype biases amongst decision-makers. Lastly, the micro-level contains coaching expectations, intentions, and perceptions. Thus, to assess the extent to which an accumulated disadvantage may or may not impact the current under-representation of African-American coaches in college football, three studies will be utilized; each examining the potential manifestation of institutionalized discrimination at the macro-, meso-, and micro-level of intercollegiate athletics.

The first manuscript takes a macro-level approach to determine what, if any, changes have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions over the last 15 years. To accomplish this aim, a series of analyses were conducted on the percentages of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions in all NCAA sports, and in football and men's basketball in particular, spanning the years 1996-2008. The findings from this study are exploratory and designed to establish evidence for the current rationale explaining an accumulated disadvantage.

The second study takes a meso-level approach to demonstrate how college football decision makers potentially impact the future prospects of student-athletes prior to their actual entry into the coaching field. Advancing findings from Anderson (1993), Hawkins (2002), Sack et al. (2005), and Woodward (2004), this study sought to determine if positional segregation continues to be preserved at the quarterback position through the play of White and African-American athletes in the NCAA's Division I-FBS. The results of this study suggest that the institutionally discriminate practice of positional segregation has diminished for quarterbacks. However, a new manifestation of positional segregation (i.e., racial tasking) may be taking place that preserves the negative impact of segregation on potential coaches.

The purpose of the third study is to examine a potential accumulated disadvantage, at the micro-level, subsequent to (i.e., their playing days) and during one's coaching career. The study will replicate and update Anderson (1993) and Finch et al.'s (2010) studies which examine the under-representation of African-American head coaches in DI-FBS football during the 1990 and 2005 seasons. Examining coaching expectations and intentions by way of playing experience and position currently coached should provide potential insight into the behavior of coaches at the micro-level of an organizational system.

Taken together, these three studies will help to demonstrate the existence and manifestation of an accumulated disadvantage for African Americans in intercollegiate athletics coaching. That is, I sought to examine the potential negative effects of institutional discrimination, manifested through an accumulated disadvantage, that accrue for African Americans as they progress from their playing days and continue into their coaching careers.

CHAPTER 2
AN EXAMINATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN COACHING REPRESENTATION IN
MEN'S NCAA SPORTS: 1996-2008

At the close of the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Bowl Subdivision (NCAA FBS, formerly Division-IA) hiring cycle, a record number of African-American head coaches (13) had been named at Division I-FBS football programs. Despite this increase in representation, the percentage of African-American head football coaches in Division I-FBS remains abysmal at 11% (13 of 121). Furthermore, the rate at which African Americans are hired as head football coaches at the DI-FBS level continues to fall short of expectations. Since 1996, only 7% (16 of 221) of head coaching vacancies have been filled with an African-American coach (Harrison & Yee, 2009). Even less representation can be found in Divisions II and III (Bracken & DeHass, 2009; DeHass, 2004, 2007).

Regardless, strides being made since the inception of the first Black Coaches and Administrators (BCA) Hiring Report Card (HRC) in 2003 cannot be overlooked. Since that time, the NCAA DI-FBS has gone from having three African-American head coaches, the lowest total in 15 years, to 13 (Keith, 2009). However, the concerns from the BCA lie not in who is ultimately brought in to run the football program, but rather the hiring policies, practices, and processes of the athletic department and search committee (Harrison, 2005). Thus, it is the method by which head football coaches are hired that potentially comes into question. A derivative of this examination by the BCA should also draw attention to the manner by which all coaches are hired at the college level. While the under-representation of African-American head coaches in football is the focus of the BCA's analysis, potential discrimination and the under-representation of African Americans might be occurring in any number of NCAA men's sports. Unless otherwise notified, all percentages and figures in this manuscript are calculated with the

exclusion of historically black colleges and universities, for reasons that are explained in the methods section.

In 2009, the BCA released its sixth Hiring Report Card (HRC). The primary objectives of the BCA report card are to encourage accountability and get institutions to look into a more diverse pool of candidates so that the best coach can be chosen, regardless of ethnicity. The BCA's report card examines and grades the search and selection process of institutions over five criteria (communication, the hiring and search committee, candidates interviewed, time frame, and affirmative action) as they look for new head football coaches. In the foreword of the 2004-05 HRC, Richard Lapchick validates the BCA's position for an "open and objective process" suggesting that as institutions begin to adhere to interview and hiring guidelines, the social networks of African-American coaches will expand, thereby helping to automatically increase representation among the coaching ranks (Harrison, 2005, p. iv). Executive Director of the BCA, Keith Floyd (as cited in Harrison, 2005), further supports this outlook with his petition for minority student-athletes to begin considering an institution's inclusion and diversity policies, proposing that as "student-athletes of color start making decisions to 'play where they can eventually coach'; we will start to see a difference" (p. 10).

For the past 20 years, there has been demonstrated concerns and discussion in regards to the lack of African-American coaches among the member institutions of NCAA football and other administrative positions of power. In 1989, in an effort to provide more opportunities for minorities throughout all of intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA implemented the Minority Enhancement Program (MEP); a program aimed at increasing the pool of minority candidates through added internships and scholarships. In 1991, the NCAA formed the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee (MOIC) to help further enhance educational and career

opportunities for women and ethnic minorities in intercollegiate athletics administration and coaching. More recently, under the guidance of the late ex-President Myles Brand, the NCAA created the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) in 2005. At the center of the ODI's mission is the provision of leadership and support to the NCAA as the association progresses in the creation and fostering of diversity and inclusion initiatives (NCAA, 2010a).

It makes sense the representation of African Americans all throughout intercollegiate athletics would be prone to a rise given the implementation of such programs. However, the percentage of African-American head coaches has increased only 1.1 percentage points (1.5 percentage points when HBCU's included) in men's sports from 1996 to 2008, while the representation of African-American athletic department administrators and staff over that same time increased only 0.9 percentage points overall and 1.2 percentage points when HBCU's were included (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). These figures expose the nominal progress being made toward racial equality among intercollegiate coaches and athletic department administrators.

Still, other programs have been initiated by the NCAA over the past few years with the goal of improving racial and ethnic minority presence in coaching candidate pools. The NCAA Men's Coaches Academy, launched in 2003, aids minority football coaches in skill augmentation and social network expansion, while the Future Football Coaches Academy is geared towards the advancement of student-athletes wanting to pursue a career in coaching football (NCAA, 2010b). Since 2005, over half of the African-American head football coaches hired at the Division I FBS and FCS has been participants in the NCAA's diversity and inclusion football programs (NCAA, 2010b). Despite such efforts, the representation of African Americans as head football coaches has shown a minimal increase over the last 20 years.

Organizations, such as the NCAA and BCA, have taken a firm stance on rectifying the under-representation of African-American and other minority coaches on intercollegiate coaching staffs. The aforementioned NCAA coaching programs and the BCA's hiring report card are demonstrative of such efforts. The purpose of this study was to determine what, if any, changes have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions. To accomplish this aim, I conducted a series of analyses on the percentages of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions in all NCAA sports, and in football and men's basketball in particular, spanning the years 1996-2008.

Review of Pertinent Literature

Despite the minimal increases of African Americans in collegiate coaching positions, intercollegiate athletics management and administration are still dominated by White males, and these percentages hardly resemble the diversity of the student-athletes (Bracken & DeHass, 2009; DeHass, 2009). It is apparent from the under-representation of African Americans holding head and assistant coaching positions that discrimination likely exists within intercollegiate athletics (Anderson, 1993; Cunningham, 2003; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Sagas & Cunningham, 2005). Researchers have demonstrated a variety of manners in which this discrimination is manifested.

Anderson (1993) suggests the pipeline to a head coaching position traditionally begins with assistant coaches, and since being an assistant coach can lead to becoming a coordinator, which is often a prerequisite for becoming a head coach, ethnicity may function as a negative factor in keeping African Americans from entering the head coaching pool. As a result of the lack of African Americans currently holding head coaching and coordinator positions, future

coaches and student-athletes may negatively view coaching as a good career path (Cunningham, 2003; Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2001); thus, further perpetuating the under-representation of African Americans in the college coaching ranks.

Another possible implication associated with ethnicity can be traced back to the positions coaches played in college. Anderson (1993) found a significant correlation between ethnicity of the player and the centrality (high interaction) of his position. More specifically, results show that White assistant coaches were more than twice as likely to have played a central position (i.e., quarterback or offensive line); positions played by 45% and 36% of head coaches and coordinators, respectively. Given a coach's ethnicity, coupled with the coaching career path certain playing positions seem relegated to, it is evident how ethnicity helps sustain the under-representation of African-American head football coaches.

Similarly, Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) posit that the potential candidate pool for a coaching position will prominently be filled with athletes, in this case student-athletes, of that sport. As such, a potential problem exists in intercollegiate athletics. This disconnect can be seen here in the proportion of student-athletes to racially similar coaches. In 2007-08, 34.4% of all football student-athletes were African American (DeHass, 2009) compared to only 9.8% and 21.9% of African-American head and assistant coaches, respectively (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). Similarly in 2008, 18.5% of all male student-athletes were African American (DeHass, 2009), yet only 9.1% of men's teams head coaches were African American (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). In accordance with Everhart and Chelladurai's (1998) claim, it is safe to assume the number of coaches in the NCAA should be representative of the number of racially similar student-athletes. If these proportions are significantly different, the presence of access discrimination is probable (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005).

It can be argued that the differential opportunities African-American coaches endure stem from the possible lack of human capital (experience and training) and/or social capital (referent and peer networks) the coaches possess (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005). An aim of African-American college coaches would then seem to be building and expanding upon current social networks. Not only should stronger ties and larger networks lead to greater career outcomes, but these aspects of social capital should also grant greater access to information, resources, and influence (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005; Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). However, past social networks have hindered this development and have almost certainly had a negative impact on the “career advancement, upward mobility, and career aspirations among American ethnic minorities” (Anderson, 1993, p.66).

The effects of social networking are still present within intercollegiate athletics and profoundly influential in the make-up of today’s athletic departments (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005). Commonly referred to as the “good old boys” network, these associations perpetuate the dominance of White males in collegiate leadership and management positions (Heilman, 2001; Lovett & Lowry, 1994). The results of such anti-outgroup networks can be seen in the composition of athletic directors, of which 73.1% are White males compared to 7.0% African-American males (Bracken & DeHass, 2009), and other highly regarded positions or power such as school presidents and conference commissioners. At the opening of the 2007-08 academic year, 92.5% of institution presidents, 90.0% of athletic directors (in Division I), and 100% of conference commissioners in the NCAA FBS were White (Lapchick, Little, Lerner, and Mathew, 2009).

Another manifestation of discrimination lies in the treatment of employees. Over time, the effects of treatment discrimination may lead to decreases in the number of opportunities for

minority coaches, limiting their success in occupying positions of leadership, education/training, mobility, and power (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). This in turn could impact one's commitment. Cunningham et al. (2001) reveal that a coach's intention to leave (turnover) is inversely associated with his feelings of commitment towards the coaching profession, and that this feeling of commitment is impacted by his professional socialization. Despite the lack of opportunity in entering the coaching field, once a coaching position is received, African Americans are given more chances to succeed than their White counterparts (Mixon & Trevino, 2004).

Research has found that as an individual moves up the coaching ranks s/he are given the power and authority to present opportunities for advancement to others (e.g., assistant coaches, support staff, interns, etc.), and that those others will be individuals who look and act most like them (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). Cunningham and Sagas (2005) found support for this prediction as head coaches in their study, regardless of ethnicity, were more likely to have racially similar assistant coaches. In applying the concept of "race uplift" (Perkins, 1983), as the representation of African-American coaches increases, their social networks should integrate with those already in place within intercollegiate athletics, leading to more opportunities for all African-American coaches. If this were to hold true, the development of social capital among African-American coaches could result in a positive breakthrough into the predominantly White established social network of coaches. Interestingly, Day and McDonald (2010) found that African Americans tend to benefit more from the inclusion of diverse coaches in their social network than do their White counterparts.

It is apparent from previous research that African Americans face many hurdles in obtaining and sustaining a presence among intercollegiate coaches and administrators. Cunningham and Sagas (2005) examined the existence of access discrimination on men's

basketball coaching staffs, finding that African-American and White head coaches were more likely to staff ethnically similar assistant coaches. If true of all NCAA sports, this discrimination can have a profound effect on the already low numbers of African-American coaches, particularly in football, where only 9.8% of head coaches are African American (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). Similarly, institutional discrimination as a result of centrality has been addressed as a determinant for the under-representation of African-American coaches in intercollegiate football (Anderson, 1993). As expressed earlier, given a coach's ethnicity, coupled with the coaching career path certain playing positions seem relegated to; it is evident how ethnicity helps sustain the under-representation of African-American head football coaches.

Racial barriers such as these two types of discrimination can lead to low occupational commitment (Cunningham et al., 2001) and vast differences in the social networking and human capital (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005; Seibert et al., 2001; Lovett & Lowery, 1994) of African-American coaches. Further efforts have been committed, although not always with acknowledgement, through the implementation of diversity initiatives devised by the NCAA and athletic conferences, as well as at the institutional level at many campuses. However, are these progressive policies and programs effective in advancing African-American representation among the coaching ranks?

The purpose of the study was to determine what, if any, changes have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions, with a particular focus on the revenue generating sports of football and men's basketball. The following research questions were developed to meet the aims of this study and thus to determine, what, if any, changes have occurred and to what extent these

changes indicate a positive or negative shift in the current and future status of African-American intercollegiate coaches.

Research Question 1: Has there been a change in the overall representation of African-American head coaches over the past 12 years within all men's NCAA sports?

Research Question 2: Has there been a change in the overall representation of African-American assistant coaches over the past 12 years within all of men's NCAA sports?

Research Question 3: Do these changes (or lack thereof) vary across the revenue generating sports of football and men's basketball?

Research Question 4: Do these changes (or lack thereof) vary across the three NCAA divisions?

Method

Data Collection Process

The NCAA has been conducting a biennial study concerning the ethnic and gender makeup of athletics personnel demographics at member institutions since the early 1990's (Bracken & DeHass, 2009; DeHass, 2003, 2004, 2007; Stiener, 2000). Data collected for this study begins with the 1995-96 season, the first in which the NCAA utilized the Institution Staff Demographic Form (ISDF). The ethnicity and gender demographic surveys are given to all NCAA member institutions to complete and return, with personnel percentages being based on the number of surveys collected. The ISDF asks institutions to provide information on the ethnicity and gender of all athletic department administrators, as well as head and assistant coaches (full-time, part-time, and volunteers). Data are further broken down by overall and divisional percentages, with specific minority figures on African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans. The NCAA report presents percentages of African-American coaches and athletics personnel with both the inclusion and exclusion of HBCU's.

The racial demographics of HBCU coaching staffs were excluded for two primary reasons. In 2008, coaches at HBCU's represented a large percentage of the African-American coaches in all of the NCAA's male sports. Of the 8.8% of African-American head coaches in all NCAA men's programs, 40% were employed by HBCU's. Second, there is a greater disparity in these numbers when analyzing football, the focus of this study, as well as the sport currently synonymous with the under-representation of African-American coaches' dilemma. HBCU's account for 68% of the 9.9% of African-American head football coaches in the entire NCAA.

The research questions guiding this study were based on examining possible changes in the representation of African Americans among all NCAA divisions of the coaching profession at the intercollegiate level. Data on the overall representation of African-American head and assistant coaches among all men's NCAA sports (baseball, basketball, bowling, cross country, fencing, field hockey, football, golf, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, rifle, rowing, skiing, soccer, swimming, tennis, track [indoor and outdoor], volleyball, water polo, wrestling, other [sports with a low institutional response rates]) were recorded for six different years covering a twelve year span: 1996, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008. In regards to the representation of African-American head and assistant coaches in each of the revenue generating sports (football and men's basketball), data was collected for the same six time periods: 1996, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008. Only the overall percentages of head and assistant coaches in 1998 could be found, rendering the data incomplete. Therefore, data for the year 1998 was neither recorded nor examined in this study.

Design and Procedure

Data were first analyzed through an analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing possible changes among the representation of African-American coaches for the following coaching

positions: head coaches in all NCAA men's sports offered (Research Question 1), assistant coaches in all NCAA men's sports offered (Research Question 2), head football coaches, head men's basketball coaches, assistant football coaches, and assistant men's basketball coaches (Research Question 3). As clarified above, I excluded the racial demographics of HBCU coaching staffs. The years in which data were collected served as the independent variable while the percentages of African-American coaches in the aforementioned positions acted as the dependent variables in this set of analyses. Percentages of African-American coaches of the three NCAA divisions for Research Question 4 were pooled so as to adequately provide standard deviations for proper statistical analysis. Again, the year of 1998 was left out due to incomplete data.

A multi-analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run in order to compare possible African-American coaching representation differences between the three NCAA divisions. For this analysis, data from the various years were pooled in order to provide adequate means and standard deviations. The years 1996 and 2000 were pooled into time period one, the years 2002 and 2004 into time period two, and the years 2006 and 2008 into time period three. The percentages of African-American coaches, both head and assistant, in the revenue generating sports of football and men's basketball were also analyzed with this treatment of the data to assess differences between the three NCAA divisions by sport. The time periods and NCAA divisions served as the independent variable, while the percentages of African-American coaches acted as the dependant variable.

Results

The first two research questions assessed whether there has been significant change in the overall representation of African-American head and assistant coaches within all men's NCAA

sanctioned sports from the years 1996-2008. While the findings demonstrate a positive shift in the overall percentages of African-American head and assistant coaches (1.1 and 0.5 percentage points, respectively) across all men's NCAA sports, neither increase was large enough to be supported statistically. Means and standard deviations answering question one are displayed in [Table 2-1](#). Results from the ANOVA revealed no significant differences between the six years under study $F(5,18) = 0.20, p > .05$. Further, no significant percentage differences between the six years were found on overall African-American assistant coaches $F(5,18) = 0.06, p > .05$, head football coaches $F(5,18) = 0.54, p > .05$, assistant football coaches $F(5,18) = 0.24, p > .05$, head men's basketball coaches $F(5,18) = 0.04, p > .05$, and assistant men's basketball coaches $F(5,18) = 0.15, p > .05$, answering question two.

Findings from the third research question provide a more in-depth examination into possible differences in African-American head and assistant coaches among the revenue generating sports of football and men's basketball. Again, a positive shift in the representation of these coaches was found; however, none were large enough to warrant any significance. Means and standard deviations for the percentage of African-American head and assistant coaches in football and men's basketball are displayed in [Table 2-2](#).

Though not statistically significant, it is of interest to note the overall percentage of African-American head coaches in all men's sports in intercollegiate athletics has increased since 1996. These percentage findings are true of the overall representation of African-American assistant coaches as well. Overall African-American representation of football head coaches and assistant coaches is also slightly on the rise, as are men's basketball head and assistant coaches.

Differences in African-American coaching representation across the three NCAA divisions were examined in the fourth and final research question. Results revealed significant

interactions between time and division for overall African-American head coaches $F(4,12) = 3.60, p = .05, \eta^2 = .62$ as well as African-American head football coaches $F(4,12) = 3.82, p < .05, \eta^2 = .63$.

Further statistical results revealed significant main effect differences in the mean percentage of African Americans between the three divisions for overall head coaches $F(2,6) = 51.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .92$, overall assistant coaches $F(2,6) = 180.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .98$, football head coaches $F(2,6) = 15.47, p = .001, \eta^2 = .78$, football assistant coaches $F(2,6) = 89.32, p < .001, \eta^2 = .95$, basketball head coaches $F(2,6) = 231.17, p < .001, \eta^2 = .98$, and basketball assistant coaches $F(2,6) = 122.24, p < .001, \eta^2 = .96$ (Table 2-3).

More specifically, the overall representation of African-American head coaches in NCAA men's Divisions I (+2.3%), II (+.1%) and III (+0.9%) sports has risen from 1996 to 2008. Likewise, percentages rose for the overall presence of African-American assistant coaches in Divisions I (+2.2%) and II (+2.9%), while Division III stayed the same. Further breaking these categories down, it was discovered that African-American head and assistant coaching percentages rose for all football categories except Division II head coaches. Similarly, all African-American head men's basketball coaching percentages rose except for head coaches at the Division III level.

There were only two decreases among the African-American coaching categories analyzed: head football coaches at the Division II level (-0.8%), and men's basketball head coaches at the Division III level (-2.0%). The overall percentage of African-American assistant coaches at the Division III level did not change from over the two time periods analyzed. A statistical analysis was not undertaken due to a lack of means and standard deviations. Rather, data were analyzed by manner of visual examination.

The largest increase of African-American head coaches was seen in Division I with a rise of 2.3%, while 2.9% was the largest increase for assistant coaches, having occurred at the Division II level. The most positive changes for football head and assistant coaches occurred in Division III (+1.6%) and Division I (+5.8%), respectively. With regards to basketball, Division I men's basketball showed the greatest rise in both categories with head coaches increasing 5.5% and assistant coaches 8.2%.

Despite numerous increases in percentages over the past 12 years, several coaching categories saw decreases from 2006 to 2008. Overall African-American head coaches decreased in Divisions I (-0.2%) and III (-0.1%), while African-American football head coaches in Division I (-1.0%) witnessed a decline. Lastly, representation of African-American basketball head coaches decreased in Divisions I (-2.3%) and III (-1.4%).

Discussion

The findings reveal that while increases in African-American head and assistant coaches have taken place within men's NCAA sports, the rate at which representation is rising is minimal. It appears as though the trend in intercollegiate athletics, in regards to the representation of African-American coaches of men's NCAA sports, is very slowly taking on a positive shift. Granted, there have been strides made to raise African-American coaching percentages, but the limited increases can be somewhat disappointing given the recent attention and concern expressed towards increasing diversity amongst the coaching staffs of NCAA men's sports, particularly football.

Another finding of the study revealed that Division I institutions employ significantly larger percentages of African-American coaches than do Divisions II and III. Which bears the question, given the popularity and exposure of Division I athletics, in particular football and

men's basketball, could the personnel in these sports be a catalyst for change? Furthermore, it is possible that as African-American coaching percentages continue to gravitate towards emulation of the African-American population of student-athletes at the Division I level, this shift will be more socially accepted and promoted by all NCAA member institutions. It is hoped that the findings of Anderson (1993) will diminish as diversity found among players at all positions, both central and peripheral, increases. Finch et al. (2010) conducted a 15 year update of Anderson's 1993 work and found that while the number of African-American assistant coaches has increased, their representation in head coaching and coordinator positions has seen minimal expansion. This would seem to suggest the existence of a glass ceiling (Cunningham, 2003), or other types of institutional discrimination.

The increase of African-American representation among assistant coaches in men's basketball and football was greater than the percentages of African-American coaches throughout all NCAA men's sports (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). This is a positive sign given that a larger portion of student-athletes in these two sports are African American. According to Everhart and Chelladurai (1998), diversity among student-athletes should present the coaching field with a more diverse candidate pool in future years. As more African-American student-athletes and graduate assistants enter the coaching field, the representation among assistant coaches should increase, possibly manifesting itself in the increase of African-American head coaches (Anderson, 1993). This claim was not validated for football coaches throughout the last 12 years, as Finch et al. (2010) found evidence suggesting the continuance of institutional discrimination is present in men's NCAA sports.

As described earlier, the current social network among head coaches and athletic directors in NCAA football and men's basketball is dominated by White men (Lapchick, 2007;

Lovett & Lowry, 1994), possibly reducing opportunities for minority members' career advancement. As a likely result of this established network, African-American coaches have struggled to find their way into head coaching positions. To possibly eliminate this type of discrimination might require African-American head coaches and other minorities to assist in increasing minority coaching representation through the integration of their networks with the "White" networks (i.e., good old boys club) of athletic departments.

The NCAA has conducted the ethnic and gender demographics study for over 15 years. Despite the obvious under-representation of African-American coaches demonstrated in the NCAA's findings (Bracken & DeHass, 2009), the shift in intercollegiate athletics to be more diversified and inclusive has been nominal. However, the positive shifts in African-American coaching percentages witnessed in this study are somewhat encouraging. It is hoped that as the NCAA and member institutions grow more socially aware and concerned with this under-representation and minimal increase of African-American coaches found in this study, the diversification of coaching staffs, especially at the head coach position, will increase.

In the 2008-09 BCA Hiring Report Card, Dr. Lapchick calls for a civil rights movement, fearing that the onset of new open and objective hiring processes was not resulting in the expectant head coaching opportunities for African Americans. Consequently, future legal and social ramifications against the NCAA could be seen. However, it is also the responsibility of the NCAA member institutions to focus on implementing improved hiring practices, educating athletic departments on the importance of coaching staff diversity, and fostering positive attitudes and behaviors regarding fair and impartial hiring practices for the future. Therefore, the BCA has been persistent in their continued push for the NCAA to adopt the Eddie Robinson Rule, an interview mandate similar to that of the NFL's Rooney Rule. In fact, the state of Oregon

imposed such a rule for its state colleges and universities (Harrison & Yee, 2009). It is hoped that the NCAA's recent acceptance of hiring guidelines will facilitate the results of their commitment to diverse coaching opportunities and representation (Lapchick, 2007).

This study sought to determine what, if any, changes have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions. The results indicate there have been changes, albeit minimal. Regardless, the increases in African-American representation on all levels of the coaching staff indicate a positive development. It helps prove that NCAA coaching academies, diversity programs, hiring guidelines, and studies and reports are having an effect on rectifying current coaching inequalities at the intercollegiate level.

Despite a record setting hiring season of African-American head coaches, the nominal representation remains emblematic of the social issues existent in NCAA football and other intercollegiate sports. Concerns surrounding the current lack of hiring guidelines in college athletics fuel the push for mandated racial and ethnic minority candidates. Regardless of the individual hired or the intentions behind mandatory minority candidate interviews, there are benefits to be had.

One such benefit is a medium by which a minority candidate would be able to present his/her personality, character, and coaching credentials to individuals with whom s/he may not otherwise get to speak. A possible result of these interactions is social network expansion. As African-American coaches become more entrenched in the predominantly White social networks governing intercollegiate athletics, concurrently increasing their social capital, the increase of African-American representation in head coaching positions should become a natural occurrence (Harrison, 2005; Sagas & Cunningham, 2005). Similarly, as more African-American candidates

are interviewed and hired, the measures against which coaches are currently compared should diversify and expand, ceasing to perpetuate the coaching profession as a homogenous field.

Table 2-1. Means and Standard Deviations for African-American Coaching Percentages in Men's Sports Across All NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008

Years	M	SD
Head Coaches		
1996	4.40	1.14
2000	4.40	1.39
2002	4.97	2.02
2004	5.07	2.31
2006	5.30	1.82
2008	5.50	1.61
Total	4.94	1.54
Assistant Coaches		
1996	11.70	3.62
2000	11.80	4.25
2002	11.90	5.20
2004	12.77	4.92
2006	12.47	4.66
2008	13.40	4.75
Total	12.34	3.91

Table 2-2. Means and Standard Deviations for African-American Coaching Percentages in Football and Men's Basketball Across All NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008

Years	M	SD
Head Football Coaches		
1996	2.80	2.17
2000	1.70	1.08
2002	1.70	1.54
2004	1.37	1.19
2006	2.93	2.76
2008	3.17	1.68
Total	2.28	1.70
Assistant Football Coaches		
1996	13.43	4.18
2000	12.30	7.02
2002	14.63	7.27
2004	16.40	7.55
2006	15.87	6.46
2008	17.27	6.65
Total	14.98	5.83
Head Basketball Coaches		
1996	11.33	5.27
2000	13.07	7.54
2002	12.90	8.87
2004	12.80	9.17
2006	14.23	9.61
2008	13.57	8.62
Total	12.98	7.04
Assistant Basketball Coaches		
1996	22.07	8.63
2000	23.13	8.75
2002	22.80	9.63
2004	25.00	10.26
2006	23.93	10.48
2008	28.07	10.70
Total	24.17	8.46

Table 2-3. Means and Standard Deviations for Mean African-American Coaching Percentages Across the Three NCAA Divisions, 1996-2008

Divisions	M	SD
Overall Head Coaches		
Division I	6.75	1.08
Division II	4.28	0.82
Division III	3.78	0.39
Total	4.94	1.54
Overall Assistant Coaches		
Division I	17.27	0.99
Division II	11.47	1.51
Division III	8.33	0.21
Total	12.34	3.91
Head Football Coaches		
Division I	3.877	1.69
Division II	1.20	1.26
Division III	1.77	0.82
Total	2.28	1.70
Head Basketball Coaches		
Division I	22.20	2.62
Division II	10.03	1.09
Division III	6.72	0.89
Total	12.98	7.04
Assistant Football Coaches		
Division I	22.03	2.40
Division II	13.40	3.28
Division III	9.52	0.80
Total	14.98	5.83
Assistant Basketball Coaches		
Division I	34.80	2.93
Division II	21.93	2.52
Division III	15.77	1.45
Total	24.17	8.46

CHAPTER 3

RACIAL TASKING AND THE COLLEGE QUARTERBACK: REDEFINING THE STACKING PHENOMENON

Before leading his team to a victory in Super Bowl XXII and earning the game's Most Valuable Player accolade, Washington Redskins quarterback Doug Williams was presented with a number of race related questions, including "Doug, obviously you've been a black quarterback your whole life. When did race begin to matter to people?" (Mikkelson & Mikkelson, 2005). In 2003, Rush Limbaugh criticized the media for overrating Philadelphia Eagles quarterback, Donovan McNabb, claiming his praise stems from their yearning for a successful African-American quarterback. More recently, Tennessee Titans quarterback, Vince Young, claimed he will be the next "black quarterback" to win the Super Bowl. Incidents such as these serve as a reminder that race continues to be a prevalent issue in sports and that African-American athletes in the most-scrutinized of playing positions, the quarterback, still find themselves at the center of racially motivated deliberations. Regardless of their merits, race has seemed to marginalize the efforts and on-field successes of African-American quarterbacks; a practice found all too common in the media's portrayal of African-American athletes (Dufur & Feinberg, 2009). Such racially driven inquiries and declarations seem to elicit a stigma that is attached to being a Black quarterback; a stigma that is absent from any other athlete playing the position.

One of the manners in which racial discrimination is manifested on the field of play is through positional segregation, commonly referred to as stacking. Stacking is the segregation and designation of athletes into certain positions as a result of assumptions made concerning a link between athletic ability and race; leading to the overrepresentation of minorities in some playing positions and the under-representation in others (Sack, Singh, & Thiel, 2005). Positional segregation, manifested through the phenomenon of stacking in sport, seems to have evolved

from the errant assumption that African-American athletes have naturally superior talents and are more individualistically driven than their White counterparts, who conversely, are mentally superior, harder workers, and maintain more of a team attitude (Anshel, 1990; Buffington, 2005).

This fallible mind-body dualism approach to athletic superiority and mental inferiority, and vice versa, nevertheless endures today through media depictions and treatment of athletes. Woodward (2004) found that African-American amateur athletes were more likely to be described in terms of their physical attributes rather than their mental skills by professional NFL scouts. Similarly, Dufur (1997) exposed the discrepancy in portrayals of African-American and White athletes in advertising. African-American athletes were portrayed to owe their successes to an innate physical ability while their White counterparts were portrayed to have earned their achievements through hard work, intelligence, and strong leadership behaviors.

In Major League Baseball (MLB), it has been found that African Americans are overrepresented in the more peripheral and less interactive positions of outfielders and underrepresented in the more central positions of the infield, pitcher, and catcher (Grusky, 1963; see Sack et al., 2005). Similarly, it has been found that Latinos are overrepresented in the central positions of shortstop and second base (Gonzalez, 1996). Country of origin has also been found to be a key determinant of a MLB player's playing position (Sosa & Sagas, 2008). In football, both the National Football League (NFL) and at the intercollegiate level, African Americans have historically been relegated to the peripheral positions of running back, wide receiver, and defensive back while being largely ignored for the most central position in all of sport: the quarterback (Anderson, 1993; Finch et al., 2010; Hawkins, 2002; Woodward, 2004).

It can be argued that the role of quarterback has become more multidimensional; with an emphasis placed more on running the ball than on passing (Buffington, 2005; Hawkins, 2002).

Thus, in accordance with the mind-body dualism approach, African-American athletes would increasingly occupy the role of quarterback as the need for cognitive aptitude is truncated by physical abilities. This study sought to demonstrate the validity of such contentious convictions and explain if positional segregation continues to be preserved at the quarterback position through the play of White and African-American athletes in the NCAA's Division I-Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). I also propose a new manifestation of positional segregation; one I have labeled as racial tasking.

Review of Pertinent Literature and Theory

A number of various theories have been used to examine discrimination in sports. The following theories have been used to frame this study as they address the issues of positional segregation (i.e., stacking) and its resultant inequities.

Centrality

In his seminal piece on organizational centrality, Grusky (1963) identified the formal structure of an organization as the environment in which roles and positions are created, concomitant responsibilities are defined, and constituent behaviors are revealed; all of which are instrumental aspects of an organization's norms and culture. Roles and expectations within this formal structure can be central or peripheral; the designation of which is determined by (1) spatial location (one's position in relation to others), (2) the nature of the task (independent or dependant), and (3) the frequency of one's interpersonal interactions with others in the organization (Grusky, 1963). Loy and Elvogue (1970) applied this theory to sport demonstrating how positional segregation in football and baseball is a function of race and the athlete's spatial location to other team members on the field, his level of interaction with other members of the team, and the dependency of the task for which he is responsible. This examination found that

African-American athletes were scarcely placed in central positions, resulting in a lack of interaction with teammates and coaches.

An athlete's level of interaction can be influential on his/her development of knowledge and skills relative to the sport. High interactors should be more likely to learn cooperative social skills and develop a strong commitment to the welfare of the organization, while low interactors should be more likely to focus on individualistic rather than team values and tend to be psychologically distant or aloof (Grusky, 1963). This would seem to suggest that as athletes are placed in more peripheral positions, their skills and knowledge are marginalized, their resources limited, and expectations outside of their positional responsibilities are lowered. All of which may hinder their social and human capital (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), as well as their prospects and aspirations of entering into coaching or other leadership roles. Despite recent increases in the representation of African-American players in central positions, specifically quarterback, there is still concern regarding the progress being made towards quelling positional segregation in the sport and its negative antecedents (Buffington, 2005; Finch et al., 2010).

Outcome Control Hypothesis

Though not as outwardly evident as other racial assumptions, the mind-body dualism approach posits athletes typically have cognitive capabilities in lieu of athletic abilities and vice versa (Buffington, 2005). More specifically, proponents of this approach have historically held that African-American athletes are physically superior to White athletes who, in contrast, have greater mental capacities (see Buffington, 2005). This prejudicial attitude towards White and African-American athletes is manifested in football with the overrepresentation of African-American players in peripheral (reactionary) positions and their under-representation in central (decision-making) positions (Dufur & Feinberg, 2009; Woodward, 2004). Madison and Landers

(1976) even suggest that due to existing stereotypes of African-American and White athletes' abilities in central and peripheral roles, coaches may have a predisposition to encourage players to play certain positions. Previous studies on racial stereotyping in football have found portrayals of African-American players to reference physical characteristics, trustworthiness, and high personal motivation; conversely, descriptions of White players focus more on their reliability, concern for team success, and mental abilities (see Anshel, 1990). For those coaches believing in such a mind-body dynamic of human ability, their motives for stacking players in certain positions may be due to their lack of trust in African Americans to make decisions that will lead to a successful outcome: winning.

The outcome control hypothesis maintains that it is not the position's centrality in a sport, but rather the position's impact on controlling the outcome of the game, argues Edwards (1973), that determines the resultant positional segregation between White and African-American players (as cited in Johnson & Johnson, 1995). For example, positions of quarterback and kicker have a direct and observable impact on the game, and according to the outcome control hypothesis would thus demonstrate an under-representation of African Americans. In relation to stacking and in accordance with the outcome control hypothesis, Johnson & Johnson (1995) conclude that minority athletes' performance must be greater than that of their White counterparts. As such, African-American athletes placed in positions of control and influence will be expected to outperform their White counterparts lest they can afford decreased opportunities for current and future racially similar athletes.

Self Segregation and Role Model Theory

Sport and athletic skills are a valued commodity in the African-American community, often times inappropriately portrayed as a viable and attainable option for social and economic

upward mobility (Edwards, 2000). More so than their White counterparts, African-American athletes have been found to idolize and emulate athletes with whom they can identify (Hawkins, 2002; McPherson, 1975). Given that African-American athletes have historically been positioned in peripheral playing roles such as wide receiver and defensive back, the self segregation hypothesis posits that younger African-American athletes will view current all-stars as role models and gravitate towards playing similar positions. The success and ascendancy of African-American role models in these positions at the professional and collegiate levels furthers the notion that such distal positions are the most viable path for a successful career in the sport.

This perception impacts the socialization process of young African-American athletes resulting in self-induced imitative learning that subsequently encourages specific playing positions (McPherson, 1976). Accordingly, African-American athletes are denied the development of certain knowledge and skills acquired from playing central, leadership and decision-making positions (Evans, 1997). This concern is cyclical in nature and maintains a lack of opportunities for African-American athletes to learn valuable skills and knowledge, contributing to the under-representation of African Americans in central positions such as quarterback. Furthermore, this under-representation negatively impacts the number of visible role models and mentors for current and future players.

In a way, the manners in which self segregation and role model theories apply to African-American athletes and in sports can be construed as cultural capital. That is, the field of sport offers a set of social norms, attitudes, practices, and values that help to determine if someone is an accepted or rejected member, as well as the status level of members (Eitle & Eitle, 2002; Holt, 1998). Thus, success in sports and participation at certain playing positions may be seen as

providing greater cultural capital; subsequently, facilitating the play of African Americans in peripheral positions.

African Americans in Coaching

Despite the increase of diverse players occupying the quarterback position, some research suggests is the position itself that is changing and not the attitudes of the coaches and team staff towards African-American players and their decision-making abilities (Buffington, 2005; Hawkins, 2002). Speculation is that the increase of African-Americans playing quarterback is due primarily to fundamental shifts in the sport, requiring that athletes in the position to possess a more reactive skill set rather than cognitive abilities (Buffington, 2005). In his 2002 manuscript examining a thirty-three year period of positional segregation patterns of football programs in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Southeastern Conference (SEC), Hawkins seems optimistic, suggesting the more we continue to see African Americans in central roles the closer we are to ending positional segregation. It stands to reason that as positional segregation diminishes, African-American players will observe increases in their social and human capital, which should in turn augment their representation among the coaching ranks and in leadership roles.

As previously mentioned, centrality appears to play an important role in the knowledge obtained and skills developed as a football player; knowledge and skills crucial to obtaining a coaching position. Anderson (1993) found that the more central a playing position (i.e., quarterback), as well as a coaching position, the greater chance that player or coach had at becoming a head coach. Despite increases in African-American players in central football positions, similar increases are not being found on coaching staffs. In a 15 year update of Anderson's (1993) piece on potential institutional discrimination against African America

football coaches, Finch et al. (2010) found that the efforts of African-American players and coaches continue to be marginalized as minimal increases in head coaching representation have occurred. Recent findings also suggest that management may continue to hire Whites over African Americans for head coaching positions, thereby perpetuating their under-representation the leadership positions (Cunningham, Bruening, & Straub, 2006). However, just prior to the completion of the 2009-10 recruiting period, there were 13 African-American head coaches in DI-FBS. What remains to be seen is if this egalitarian trend continues or if it is merely a reaction to the pressures from the Black Coaches and Administrators (BCA).

Hypotheses

This study will examine a new manifestation of positional segregation through possible racial differences in the number and percentage of passing and rushing attempts for White and African-American quarterbacks at the NCAA Division I-FBS level. I propose the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Race will have an effect on which plays (i.e., rushing or passing) are carried out by White and African-American quarterbacks at the NCAA Division I-FBS level, such that African-American quarterbacks will have more rushing and less passing attempts than their White counterparts.

Hypothesis 2: The percentage of rushing attempts for African-American quarterbacks will be significantly greater and the percentage of passing attempts significantly lower than the percentages of rushing versus passing attempts of their White counterparts.

Methodology

Procedures and Data Collection

Data from the 2008 intercollegiate football season were collected from each of the 120 institutions playing at the NCAA Division I-FBS level. Data were pulled from the athletic department's official team web site. Statistics were collected for each quarterback having lined up in said position for at least one play during the season. While it is recognized that other players may have lined up at the quarterback position throughout the season, the focus of this study is on the quarterback, and data were collected solely on players listed as such in the team's official media guide. The variables for which data were collected on each player were as follows: race, pass attempts, passing yards, passing touchdowns, rush attempts, rushing yards, rushing touchdowns, the number of times the player was sacked and the resultant yards lost. Similarly, team data were collected on the following control variables: conference, win-loss record, points, touchdowns, time of possession per game, pass attempts, passing yards, passing touchdowns, rush attempts, rushing yards, and rushing touchdowns.

Data were collected for all quarterbacks, as listed so in official team media guides, which fielded the position at least once during the 2008 season. This resulted in a total of 324 players. Player bios were then examined to determine the race of the players. When race could not be visually determined by the primary coder, a second, independent coder was used. Players were categorized as either African American (n=82), White (n=237), or other (n=5). The primary focus of stacking literature regarding the quarterback position centers on African-American and White players; therefore, those players designated to the "other" racial category were not used in the study. This resulted in a total of 319 quarterbacks. Players were further eliminated if they had not attempted at least 36 passes or rushes during the season (an average of three pass or rush attempts per game in a regular 12-game season). This resulted in a total of 200 quarterbacks, of which 53 were African American and 147 were White.

Data Analysis

Data were first analyzed through a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) testing possible differences in the types of plays (i.e., run or pass) executed by African-American and White quarterbacks. A second MANOVA was computed to determine any possible percentage differences of Whites and African Americans' rushing and passing attempts. To determine possible differences in the plays carried out by African-American and White quarterbacks as well as any possible percentage differences in the rushing and passing attempts made by White and African-American quarterbacks, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was utilized. To account for potential differences in team offenses (e.g., spread, option, west coast), the quarterback's team passing attempts, team rushing attempts, and the time of possession per game were all controlled for in the MANCOVA computation. The results of this analysis were used to answer the hypotheses.

Results

The resultant tally of NCAA DI-FBS quarterbacks analyzed in this study was 200, of which 26.5% were African American and 73.5% White. In testing for possible differences between the plays executed by African-American and White quarterbacks, it was found that African-American quarterbacks averaged 72 rush attempts and 204 pass attempts on the season, while White quarterbacks averaged 41 rush attempts on the season and 230 pass attempts (Table 3-1). The race of the quarterback was found to significantly impact the number of rushing attempts he had on the season $F(1,198) = 20.64$, $p < .000$, $\eta^2 = .09$. However, the quarterback's race was found to have no significant impact on the number of passing attempts $F(1,198) = 1.15$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Table 3-2 reports the findings on possible percentage differences in the rushing and passing attempts made White and African-American quarterbacks. Significant differences were found between the percentages of rush attempts versus the percentage of pass attempts for the racially different quarterbacks $F(1,198) = 33.52, p < .000, \eta^2 = .15$. White quarterbacks ran the ball only 16.2% ($SD=.14$) of the time as opposed to passing the ball 83.8% ($SD = .14$) of the time. Conversely, African-American quarterbacks ran the ball 31.1% ($SD = .21$) of the time compared to passing the ball only 68.9% ($SD = .21$) of the time.

Differences in the plays carried out by African-American and White quarterbacks as well as percentage differences in the rushing and passing attempts executed by White and African-American quarterbacks are displayed in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Controlling for the quarterback's team passing attempts, team rushing attempts, and the time of possession per game, race was found to significantly impact the quarterback's number of rushing attempts $F(1, 195) = 18.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$. However, the quarterback's race was found to have no significant impact on the number of passing attempts $F(1,195) = 0.14, p > .05, \eta^2 = .001$. Controlling for the aforementioned variables, African-American quarterbacks had more rushing attempts ($EMM = 69.09, SE = 5.40$) and passed the ball fewer times ($EMM = 217.29, SE = 18.40$) than did their White counterparts (for rushing attempts, $EMM = 42.16, SE = 3.23$; for passing attempts, $EMM = 225.18, SE = 11.00$). Likewise, a greater percentage of African-American quarterbacks' attempts were rushes ($EMM = .29, SE = .02$) when compared to White quarterbacks ($EMM = .17, SE = .01$). In contrast, a greater percentage of White quarterbacks' attempts were passes ($EMM = .83, SE = .01$) compared to the African-American quarterbacks' ($EMM = .71, SE = .02$). These differences between the mean percentage of rush attempts versus

pass attempts for the racially different quarterbacks was significant $F(1,195 = 33.86, p < .000, \eta^2 = .15$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether or not positional segregation (i.e., stacking) continues at the quarterback position in college football. To determine its existence, the play of White and African-American athletes was examined. Analyses of rushing and passing statistics from all quarterbacks during the 2008 NCAA DI-FBS season revealed a distinction between the average number of pass and rush attempts for racially diverse quarterbacks. Partial support for Hypothesis 1 was found as African-American quarterbacks rushed the ball a significantly greater number of times than their White counterparts and had fewer pass attempts on average. Hypothesis 2 was also supported as significant differences were found in the percentage of rush vs. pass attempts, with the percentage of rush attempts made by African Americans nearly doubling that of White quarterbacks. Conversely, White quarterbacks passed the ball approximately 15% more often than their African-American counterparts. These results may suggest that the possible discriminatory practices found at the quarterback position in the NCAA's DI-FBS can be attributed to race.

Furthermore, the institutionally discriminant practice of positional segregation has diminished for quarterbacks. However, a new manifestation of positional segregation seems to be occurring through possible racial tasking. The focus of this study was not the playing positions of racially different athletes, but rather the plays carried out by those in the quarterback position to determine if they coincided with stereotypes concerning the mental and physical abilities of African-American and White athletes. It was found that African-American quarterbacks carry the

ball more often while White quarterbacks are more prone to execute passing plays. I propose one possible explanation for this phenomenon can be defined as racial tasking.

Similar to outcome control hypothesis (Edwards, 1973) and centrality (Grusky, 1963), I contend that racial tasking in sport is a function of one's prejudice towards a minority athlete's capability, both mental and physical, to perform. According to the aforementioned theories, racial stacking occurs to decrease the impact of minorities on the result of a game (outcome control hypothesis) or to remove minorities from vital decision-making positions on the field or during play (centrality). Racial tasking on the other hand is a practice in which positional segregation does not occur. Rather, the tasks athletes are asked to perform are dependent upon the athlete's race and vary despite holding the same playing position. Thus for quarterbacks, the plays they are asked to carry out (i.e., run or pass) are contingent on their race.

Further validating this notion is the racial percentages of quarterbacks in certain statistical categories. Of the quarterbacks with the most rush attempts, 20 (50%) of the top 40 and 8 (40%) of the top 20 were African American. Conversely, of the quarterbacks with the most pass attempts, only 7 (17.5%) of the top 40 and 2 (10%) of the top 20 were African American. These findings may suggest that coaches still manage, perhaps implicitly, under a discriminatory assertion towards the passing and mental abilities of African-American quarterbacks. If play calling is not contingent on the quarterback's race, one could argue that the ratio of plays called for African-American and White quarterbacks in the top 40 of each category would be similar to the ratio of African-American and White quarterbacks in the DI-FBS. However, this presumption would fail to account for the team's style of play and success, as well as the athletic abilities of the quarterback.

Furthermore, this deduction does not account for the expanding offensive expectations at the quarterback position. When examining the overall percentages of rush attempts versus pass attempts (1:5), it is apparent that multidimensional quarterbacks are a part of college football now more than ever. In 2008, of the 65 DI-FBS teams in BCS conferences, 32 claimed a quarterback as one of their top three rushers and 19 of those 32 quarterback's were one of their team's top two rushers (Forde, 2009).

The increase of African-American quarterbacks seems to signify an end to the negative propositions of the outcome control hypothesis and centrality theory. Through the quarterback position, African Americans are able to have a more direct impact on the outcome of a game as well as play in the most vital of decision making positions. However, the increase in rushing attempts for quarterbacks coinciding with the increase of African-American quarterbacks provides fodder to centrality theorists; reinforcing negative stereotypes about the mental and physical capabilities of African Americans to play the position. As suggested, I contend that a new form of discrimination and positional segregation, racial tasking, may be present in this context. While this assertion is speculative, additional research on the presence of any bias or prejudice that leads to differential roles and expectations with a sport position is merited. Further, continued examination and understanding of the outcomes of play calling and positional segregation in college football is particularly important.

Table 3-1. Racial Differences in the Number of Rush and Pass Attempts

Quarterback Race	Pass Attempts		Rush Attempts	
	M	SD	M	SD
African-American	204.3	133.45	71.5	45.05
White	229.9	153.60	41.3	40.14

Table 3-2. Racial Differences in the Percentage of Rush and Pass Attempts

Quarterback Race	% of Pass Attempts		% of Rush Attempts	
	M	SD	M	SD
African-American	68.9	20.78	31.1	20.78
White	83.8	14.00	16.2	14.00

Note: % = represents the percentage of rush/pass attempts in comparison to the player's total attempts per the 2008 season.

CHAPTER 4 AN EXAMINATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN NCAA FOOTBALL COACHES: A FIVE YEAR UPADATE

When the dust settled at the close of the 2010 FBS hiring cycle for head coaches, an historic 13 African Americans were at the helm of programs participating at the elite level of college football: Ron English of Eastern Michigan, Turner Gill of Kansas, Mike Haywood of Miami (Ohio), Mike Locksley of New Mexico, Mike London of Virginia, Ruffin McNeil of East Carolina, Larry Porter of Memphis, Joker Phillips of Kentucky, Randy Shannon of Miami, Charlie Strong of Louisville, Kevin Sumlin of Houston, Willie Taggart of Western Kentucky, and DeWayne Walker of New Mexico State (McKindra, 2010). The significant increase to 13 African-American head coaches demonstrates a beginning to the positive steps being taken towards equality and an end to potential institutional and access discrimination in intercollegiate football.

Based on a previous research suggestion that the candidate pool for a coaching position should be heavily occupied by former athletes of that sport (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998), it is reasonable to expect the racial composition of football coaching staffs to emulate the racial composition of football student-athletes. Such is not the case at the elite level of college football. In 2007-08 at the Division I level of football, 46.4% of all student-athletes were African American (DeHass, 2009) compared to only 5.1% and 23.8% of African-American head and assistant coaches, respectively (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). Such racial and ethnic inequalities between the players and coaches of a sport can lead to biased expectations and assumptions regarding participants. This is witnessed in college football where it was found that African Americans are 7.6 times more likely to be seen as a player than as a head coach in college football (Cunningham, 2010).

The scarcity of African-American head coaches and the dissonance between the racial composition of student-athletes and coaching staffs, as well as other leadership positions, provides validation for inquiries into potential and various forms of discrimination. Positional segregation, or stacking as it is more commonly referred to in the sports realm, has been researched as one potential cause for discrimination in college sports (Sack, Singh, & Thiel, 2005); as have homologous reproduction (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), access discrimination (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), and treatment discrimination (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004) to name a few.

In 1993, Anderson addressed the potential existence of institutional discrimination in college football and its negative outcomes on coaches. Fifteen years later, Finch et al. (2010) replicated his study to determine if a more equitable racial representation had taken place among college football coaching staffs. Both studies concluded that institutional and access discrimination, attributable partly to coaching career paths, remains a potential deterrent in achieving a more diverse and equal representation of racial minority coaches. With the significant increase in representation of African-American college football coaches in 2010, this study seeks to examine the career paths of all DI-FBS coaches and compare them to those of the coaches examined in Anderson (1993) and Finch et al.'s (2010) studies.

Review of Pertinent Literature

In any industry or field of work, there exists a path by which most employees travel to establish a career or reach the upper echelons of employment. Dependent upon the business conducted within the industry or field of work, that path may be paved through experience, education, apprenticeship, etc. For coaches in the field of sport, this path usually takes one from player to graduate assistant to assistant coach to coordinator and finally head coach. However,

the hierarchy of the positions within the coaching staff is usually dependent upon the sport, with football coaches seeming to have a longer (e.g., more coaching positions) path to take (Anderson, 1993). The career path of a college football coach usually begins with his playing days, which then lead to a graduate assistantship or role as an assistant coach at, in all likelihood, the position he played at the college or professional level. He should then progress through the hierarchical coaching ladder to a higher assistant or coordinator role. Eventually, his coaching career path should reach the pinnacle of the coaching ladder as the head coach.

Anderson (1993) speculated that this coaching career path may unintentionally work against African Americans. It was found from his results that the majority (66.6%) of head coaches in 1990 had played either quarterback or along the offensive line. Similarly, 68.9% of offensive coordinators were listed as having played in either of the two positions. This is an important factor in examining coaching and playing experience for the reason that these highly central positions have historically and primarily been occupied by White athletes. Fifteen years later, Finch et al. (2010) found that the percentage of head coaches having played quarterback or along the offensive line decreased to 45.4%; more specifically, one third of all head coaches had played quarterback. Thus, the prejudiced practice of stacking remains influential, adversely so for African Americans, on the outcomes of players in regards to their coaching careers.

Researchers have suggested a bevy of explanations regarding the potential existence of discrimination towards African-American coaches in intercollegiate athletics.

Cunningham and Sagas (2005) examined the practice of homologous reproduction to explain negative impacts on African Americans' access into the coaching field, finding same-race hiring practices to be prevalent in intercollegiate athletics. This remains a cause for concern given that 89.1% (950) of NCAA director of athletics, the decisive figure in the coach hiring

process, in the 2007-08 academic year were White (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). This would suggest that the hiring of racially similar head football coaches facilitates the “good old boys” network, in turn, maintaining the hegemony of White males in collegiate leadership and management positions (Heilman, 2001; Lovett & Lowry, 1994). As such, there continues to be a lack of role models with whom African-American athletes and coaches can emulate and identify, potentially limiting the intentions of players and assistants to become a head coach (Hawkins, 2002; Sagas, Cunningham, & Pastore, 2006).

Role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) has been suggested to convey potential prejudices that exist due to latent stereotyped characteristics of African-American coaches that are incongruent with what individuals perceive to be the attributes necessary to hold a head coaching position; in this case, White. Consequently, racial minority coaches have been found to be viewed as less qualified than their White counterparts for head coaching positions (Sartore & Cunningham, 2006). This perceived “lack of fit” (Burgess & Borgida, 1999) further perpetuates discrimination and unequal coaching opportunities for African Americans. Again, African Americans are 7.6 times more likely to be seen as a player than as a head coach in college football (Cunningham, 2010). Research has found that discrepancies in media portrayals of African-American athletes and coaches have furthered stigmas and stereotypes that detrimentally impact their coaching chances (Buffington, 2005; Cunningham & Bopp, 2010; Dufur & Feinberg, 2009; Woodward, 2004).

The resultant impact of these theories in practice is a lack of human, capital, and social capital for African-American coaches. More specifically, as African Americans are cast away to the peripheral positions of wide receivers, running backs, and defensive backs, the skills and knowledge they learn and develop are designed to enhance play at said specific positions;

positions that historically have not led to head coaching roles (Anderson, 1993; Finch et al., 2010). Similarly, the social networks and capital of coaches and players holding these positions might struggle to extend beyond the boundaries of said positions. Such disparities in human and social capital among coaches in college football have been found to lead to lower levels of career success, career satisfaction, and upward mobility (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005). Thus, the social networks and human capital of African Americans, impacted negatively by institutional discrimination, seems to have hindered the “career advancement, upward mobility, and career aspirations among American ethnic minorities” (Anderson, 1993, p.66).

However, with recent support from the NCAA and urges from organizations such as the BCA, the representation of African-American college football coaches is steadily, albeit slowly, increasing. The purpose of this study is to identify the potential gains made by African-American coaches in DI-FBS football. A secondary aim of this study is to determine in what ways, if any, African-American coaches are impacted by the coaching career paths of current head coaches and coordinators. Providing an update to, and expansion of Finch et al.’s (2010) 2005 data should help to identify changes in coaching representation of African Americans. The following research questions will guide this study towards that aim.

Research Question 1: What is the proportion of African-American and White head and assistant coaches in DI-FBS in 2010, and do these proportions differ from those published by Finch et al. (2010) and Anderson (1993)?

Research Question 2: Will White head coaches have more White assistant coaches on their staff than African-American head coaches, and conversely, will African-American head coaches have more African-American assistant coaches on their staff than White head coaches?

Methodology

Data Collection and Analysis

Data on football coaches were collected prior to, during and immediately following the 2010 spring practices of all DI-FBS programs. Detailed biographical information can frequently be found on the profile pages of a football teams' official athletic department website. Data were collected regarding race, current position coached, and position played in college for all head and assistant coaches, as well as offensive and defensive coordinators. Additional data were collected regarding the position coached for all head coaches and offensive and defensive coordinators prior to their obtaining a position at or above the coordinator level. Part-time coaches, strength and conditioning coaches, graduate assistants, directors of football operations, and other football staff members were not included in the data collection.

Data regarding current coaching positions and the positions played in college were grouped and coded similarly to Finch et al.'s (2010) study: quarterback, offensive lineman, running back or wide receiver (including tight end), defensive lineman or linebacker, cornerback or safety, and did not play collegiate football (for the positions played analysis). In addition, kickers, punters, and special team unit members were grouped as special teams. As it was organized in Finch et al.'s (2010) study, the data coding was slightly different from Anderson's (1993) study with the combination of defensive lineman and linebacker into the same category.

It is possible for coaches to be involved with the tutoring of multiple positions. When coaches were listed as having multiple responsibilities, the position first listed in the coach's bio was coded and used. For example, a coach serving as the quarterbacks and running backs coach was coded into the quarterback category. This was to ensure coaches would only be counted once in the study.

The race of the coaches analyzed was determined by use of his head shot on the athletic department web site. Coaches were coded as White, African America, or Other. A potential drawback of this method is the subjectivity that is involved with coding race by surface-level characteristics. To help strengthen rater reliability of a coach's race, three football programs were randomly selected and codified by two independent raters, separate from the principle researcher. The coding of the coaches was matched 100% by each of the three raters, suggesting reliability of the principle investigator's coding. If data (i.e., race, current position coached, position played, and prior coaching position) could not be found on a certain coach, he was removed from the particular analysis of the study. Furthermore, if the race of a coach could not be determined or if he was not coded as being either White or African American, he was removed from the sample.

A series of Chi-square analyses were utilized to determine potential differences over time in the racial demographics and playing and coaching positions of all current coaches. To answer Research Question 1, a Chi-square analysis determined potential differences in the current proportion of African-American and White head coaches, offensive and defensive coordinators, and assistant coaches compared to those published by Finch et al. (2010) and Anderson (1993). Furthermore, Chi-square analyses were run on playing and coaching experience of all assistant coaches and head coaches to determine in possible differences from past time frames. A Chi-square analysis was also run the racial make-up of African-American and White head coaches' coaching staffs to determine if any differences exist.

Results

All but one football program had their 2010 coaching staffs posted online at the time of data collection, resulting in an analysis of 119 of the 120 DI-FBS teams. The resultant tally of

coaches was 1,148; of which, 71.3% (n = 818) were White and 28.7% (n = 330) were African American. Coaches coded as other were dropped from the analysis. This was not significantly different than the coaching demographics of 2005, where 74.6% (n = 812) of the coaches were White and 25.4% (n = 276) were African American. However, the decrease in the gap between African-American and White coaches alters the proportion of racially diverse coaches to a more expectant level (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). Providing a closer examination into the racial proportion of Whites and African Americans in particular coaching positions, significant differences were found for changes in coaching representation among head coaches, defensive coordinators, and assistant coaches (Table 4-1).

With the record number of African-American head coaches at the helm of DI-FBS programs, it was no surprise to find significant differences in the coaching representation of African-American and White head coaches from 1990 to 2005 to 2010, $\chi^2(2, N = 319) = 9.05, p = .01$. A significant linear-by-linear association between the three years was also found, $\chi^2(1, N = 319) = 6.03, p = .01$, as African Americans represented 11.2% (n = 13) of all head coaches. Likewise, a significant difference, $\chi^2(2, N = 326) = 7.21, p < .05$ and linear-by-linear association $\chi^2(1, N = 326) = 6.08, p = .01$, were found for defensive coordinators as African-American representation increased to 17.2% (n = 22). Similarly, a significant difference, $\chi^2(2, N = 2114) = 36.26, p < .000$ and linear-by-linear association $\chi^2(1, N = 2114) = 32.18, p < .000$, were found among assistant coaches as African-American representation increased to 36.4% (n = 286). Thus, significant positive trends were witnessed among African-American coaching representation among the critical positions of head coach and defensive coordinator, as well as among the various assistant coaching positions.

Four distinct cross tabulations were used to further analyze potential significant changes amongst assistant coaches. The first two cross tabulations examined potential representation differences in the race of assistant coaches by his coaching position from 2005 to 2010. A significant difference was found for White assistant coaches $\chi^2(5, N = 1005) = 46.26, p < .000$ but not for African Americans $\chi^2(5, N = 538) = 10.13, p > .05$. The percentage of White assistant coaches decreased or remained the same in each coaching position except for running back and wide receiver coach, where the percentage increased from 29.2% (n = 148) in 2005 to 30.9% (n = 154) in 2010. Decreases in the percentage of White assistant coaches were found in the remaining coaching positions: quarterbacks, 10.1% (n = 51) in 2005 to 7.0% (n = 35) in 2010; offensive line, 21.2% (n = 107) in 2005 to 21.2% (n = 106) in 2010; defensive line and linebackers, 25.5% (n = 129) in 2005 to 22.8% (n = 114) in 2010; and defensive backs and safeties, 14.0% (n = 71) in 2005 to 10.2% (n = 51) in 2010. The greatest decrease among White assistant coaches was witnessed in their departure from coaching the defensive backs and safeties position. African-American assistant coaching percentages increased in only one position, defensive back and safeties coach, 18.7% (n = 47) in 2005 to 24.8% (n = 71) in 2010. Conversely, the percentage for African Americans coaching the quarterback, 0.8% (n = 2) in 2005 to 0.7% (n = 2) in 2010; offensive line, 2.4% (n = 6) in 2005 to 1.7% (n = 5) in 2010; running back and wide receiver, 45.6% (n = 115) in 2005 to 42.7% (n = 122) in 2010; and defensive line and linebacker, 32.5% (n = 82) in 2005 to 27.6% (n = 79) in 2010. The greatest decrease among African-American assistant coaches was witnessed in their departure from coaching the defensive line and linebackers position. The addition of the special teams coach potentially skewed the data between the 2005 and 2010 seasons. Complete results from the data

analysis of potential representation differences in the race of assistant coaches by their coaching position from 2005 to 2010 can be found on [Table 4-2](#).

The next set of cross tabulations examined potential representation differences in the race of the assistant coach by his playing position from 2005 to 2010. Again, the addition of the special teams coach potentially skewed the data between the 2005 and 2010 seasons. Similar to prior analyses, when the playing position of an assistant coach could not be found, he was removed from the study or coded under Did Not Play. Complete results from the data analysis can be found on [Table 4-3](#). No significant differences were found for White, $\chi^2(6, N = 965) = 8.26, p > .05$, and African-American assistant coaches, $\chi^2(6, N = 530) = 6.28, p > .05$. However, percentage increases in playing positions for Whites were found for running back and wide receiver, 12.8% (n = 65) in 2005 to 15.0% (n = 69) in 2010; defensive line and linebacker, 21.5% (n = 109) in 2005 to 21.8% (n = 100) in 2010; and special teams, 0% (n = 0) in 2005 to 0.7% (n = 3) in 2010. Conversely, percentage decreases in playing positions among White assistant coaches were found at the quarterback, 18.6% (n = 94) in 2005 to 18.3% (n = 84) in 2010; offensive line 24.5% (n = 124) in 2005 to 22.7% (n = 104) in 2010; and the defensive back and safety positions, 15.8% (n = 80) in 2005 to 12.4% (n = 57) in 2010.

Percentage increases in playing positions for African Americans were found for quarterback, 4.4% (n = 11) in 2005 to 8.6% (n = 24) in 2010; offensive line 3.2% (n = 8) in 2005 to 4.3% (n = 12) in 2010; and defensive back and safeties, 25.0% (n = 63) in 2005 to 25.9% (n = 72) in 2010. Percentage decreases in playing positions for African Americans were found for running back and wide receiver, 36.1% (n = 91) in 2005 to 32.0% (n = 89) in 2010; and defensive line and linebackers, 30.6% (n = 77) in 2005 to 27.3% (n = 76) in 2010. The largest

increase among the playing positions of African-American assistant coaches was at quarterback, where the coaches having played that position more than doubled from 11 to 24.

The position of head coach was also further analyzed by running cross tabulations on their playing positions as well as the coaching positions they held prior to becoming a coordinator or head coach. As Finch et al. (2010) discovered, it is common for head coaches to have been an offensive or defensive coordinator prior to becoming a head coach. Therefore, I examined the coaching experience of head coaches prior to obtaining one of those three positions (i.e., head coach, offensive coordinator, or defensive coordinator). There were no significant differences found between 2005 and 2010 in the coaching positions head coaches held prior to becoming a coordinator or head coach, $\chi^2(4, N = 205) = 3.19, p > .05$. Complete results can be found on [Table 4-4](#). Similarly, there were no significant differences between the playing positions of head coaches in 2005 and 2010, $\chi^2(5, N = 214) = 2.29, p > .05$. However, complete results can be seen on [Table 4-5](#).

Research Question 2 statistically addressed the potential impact a White or African-American head coach might have on the racial make-up of his coaching staff. Significant differences were found, $\chi^2(2, N = 1024) = 7.52, p < .05$, such that White head coaches were more likely to have White assistant coaches than African-American assistant coaches and vice versa. Nearly sixty-nine percent ($n = 624$) of White head coaches' staffs were made up of White assistant coaches, with 28.7% ($n = 261$) of their staffs being African American. African-American head coaches had more diverse coaching staffs, with 58.6% ($n = 68$) of their assistant coaches being White and 40.5% ($n = 47$) being African American.

Discussion

The overall shift in the representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS college football reveals a positive and long awaited trend. Despite a slight decrease in representation at the offensive coordinator position (from 12 to 9), African-American coaches showed significant increases in two of the three most prominent and influential positions in college football. The largest, and perhaps most inspiring change occurred at the head coaching position. Where only three programs were under the guise of African Americans (2.6%) in 2005, 13 African-American men (11.2%) now hold the highest of coaching positions. Likewise, a significant increase was seen in the attainment of defensive coordinator positions; where African American representation rose from 8.1% to 17.2%. Lastly, significant changes occurred among assistant coaches, among who there were 34 more African American and 7 less White coaches. These findings alone seem to suggest that African Americans are finding greater acceptance and achievements in the college football coaching field. Deeper analyses revealed even more changes in African-American representation that suggest further promise for equality in the coaching ranks.

Finch et al. (2010) concluded the distribution of African-American coaches into non-central coaching positions (e.g., running backs and wide receivers) contributed to potential institutional racism, subsequently marginalizing their efforts, abilities, and opportunities. The representation of African Americans as running back and wide receiver coaches has declined since 2005, falling from 45.8% to 42.7%. However, in the similarly non-central coaching position of defensive backs and safeties, African-American representation witnessed a steep rise from 2005 (18.7%) to 2010 (24.8%). Concurrently, African-American coaches have seen a decline in their representation at the quarterback and offensive line coaching positions, 0.1% and 0.7% respectively. Keep in mind that as coaches find themselves in more peripheral positions,

their skills and knowledge can be marginalized, their resources limited, and expectations often lowered (Anderson, 1993; Grusky, 1963; Sack et al., 2005). This can in turn hinder their social and human capital (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), as well as their aspirations to persist towards head coaching or other leadership roles (Cunningham, Bruening, & Straub, 2006). Thus, the aforementioned numbers would seemingly give credence to Finch et al.'s (2010) claim that African Americans continue to be "pushed out" into more peripheral (i.e., non-central) coaching positions, and as a result, remain severely underrepresented in the most prestigious and visible of roles.

However, a trend favoring the decline in the overrepresentation of African Americans in peripheral positions is the coaching history of current head coaches. From 2005 to 2010, a shift in the coaching positions held by head coaches prior to obtaining their leadership role occurred. Historically, head coaches emerged from the White-dominated coaching positions of quarterback and offensive line. Despite African Americans' critical under-representation in the two coaching positions, half of all head coaches in 2010 previously coached the non-central positions of running backs, wide receivers, and defensive backs. This trend bodes well for African Americans as they currently hold 54.4% of said coaching positions.

Similarly, a shift in more positive and accepting attitudes toward head coaches with diverse career backgrounds can be postulated by examining the former playing positions of head coaches. Recall that Anderson (1993) demonstrated a significant association between a player's race and the centrality of his position. More specifically, it was discovered that White assistant coaches were more than twice as likely to have played a central position (quarterback or offensive line); positions played by 66% of the head coaches in 1990. This is a critical association to recognize as the current data reveals a positive trend towards parity in head

coaches' playing experiences. A 4.6% *decrease* in head coaches playing quarterback and a 6.5% *increase* in head coaches having played defensive back (positions traditionally dominated by White and African Americans, respectively) was witnessed from 2005 to 2010. Furthermore, 40% of current head coaches played quarterback or along the offensive line, a 5.6% decrease from 2005 and a 26.6% decrease from 1990. Conversely, 37.4% of current head coaches were former running backs, wide receivers, or defensive backs, an increase of 6% from 2005 and a 20% increase since 1990. These findings exemplify the continued positive inclination for athletic departments to opt for coaches with diverse playing careers, such as the predominantly African-American occupied positions of running back/wide receiver (15.7%) and defensive back (21.7%).

This inference is supported in the playing experience of current assistant coaches. In said coaching career pipeline, it appears common practice that rookie coaches instruct the position they played. In the past, this practice may have helped to maintain the marginalization of African-American coaches. All the same, there has been an increase, 7.6% in 2005 to 12.9% in 2010, of African Americans playing the positions (i.e., quarterback and offensive line) from which head coach and coordinator positions are traditionally earned. This trend is helping to rectify a concern expressed by Finch et al. (2010). It was determined that the backgrounds of head coaches in 2005 were prevalent with former playing and coaching experiences that should facilitate the advancement of African Americans into prestigious coaching positions, yet there were no significant increases in African-American head coaches or offensive and defensive coordinators. Such is not the case from 2005 to 2010. As already expressed, significant increases were found in the representation of African Americans among head coaches and defensive

coordinators. Furthermore, 44% of 2010 head coaches and offensive/defensive coordinators were former quarterbacks (22%) or defensive backs (22%).

As previously discussed, 2010 was a record year for the representation of African-American head coaches with 13 men running DI-FBS football programs. In 2005, Cunningham and Sagas found support for potential access discrimination among basketball coaches, where African Americans were significantly underrepresented on White head coaches' coaching staffs. Cunningham (2010) adds that if access discrimination is indeed a contributor to the dearth of African-American coaches, then the coaching staffs of Whites and African Americans will be racially divergent. Thus, another aim of this study was to determine if such discrimination might exist in college football.

It was found that on average, African Americans were represented at a ratio of 2:3 on African-American head coaches' staffs while being represented at a ratio of 3:7 on White head coaches' staffs. These findings add support to Cunningham and Sagas' (2005) claim that with regards to advantageous social networks, it might be better said "who you know who is racially similar" (p.157). Despite this sustaining practice of access discrimination, optimism was still provided. In fact, Day and McDonald (2010) found that social networks including high ranking and heterogeneous contacts proved more profitable for the social mobility of African-American coaches than their White counterparts. However, as African-American coaches have obtained more positions of leadership and influence, it has allowed for a "racial uplift" (Perkins, 1983) and a continued decrease in the racial divide among current coaches. Should the findings of Day and McDonald (2010) hold true and a racial uplift be taking place, this offers confidence for continuing racial equality among college football coaches.

Conclusion

In 1993, Anderson suggested a career pipeline existed in college football (i.e., players becoming assistant coaches, who then become coordinators, capped off as a head coach) that might have negatively impacted minority coaches, and in particular African Americans. He deemed this institutionalized discrimination to evolve from the peripheral positions coaches had played while in college; given that the primary playing positions from which coaches, particularly head coaches, emerged were those dominated by White athletes. Fifteen years later, Finch et al. (2010) argued that intentional treatment and access discrimination were more so guilty for the under-representation of African-American coaches in college football than the institution. Despite the discrimination, they found reason for optimism as more parity was being discovered among the playing and coaching backgrounds of coaches, and in particular head coaches. I too find confidence in the numbers, but maintain that institutionalized practices and social networks continue to marginalize African-American coaching efforts, particularly at the head coach and coordinator positions. However, the under-representation of African-American coaches appears to be dissipating and becoming more equitable. This positive trend towards a more equal racial representation of coaches was found to be continuing in the 2010 DI-FBS coaching field.

Increases in both the number and proportion of African-American coaches took place among head coaches, defensive coordinators, and all assistant coaches. Greater parity was also found in the coaching and playing backgrounds of all coaching categories. Thus, the coaching career paths of current head coaches and coordinators appear to be paving a more equitable path for assistant and future coaches. Thereby, potentially increasing (head) coaching intentions and more positive career opportunities of African Americans. While the trends noted in this study suggest positive change is occurring, the existence of both institutional and access discrimination

cannot be denied. These forms of biased hiring and promotion practices facilitate and maintain an under-representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS football. However, with the increase in success and acceptance of coaches with diverse racial, playing, and coaching backgrounds a positive shift towards a balanced racial representation among coaches perseveres.

Table 4-1. Head Coach, Offensive and Defensive Coordinator, and Assistant Coach Cross Tabulations by Race and Time

Race	Positions Coached											
	Head Coaches			Offensive Coordinator			Defensive Coordinator			Assistant Coaches		
	1990	2005	2010	1990	2005	2010	1990	2005	2010	1990	2005	2010
	n = 86	n = 117	n = 116	n = 83	n = 102	n = 119	n = 87	n = 111	n = 128	n = 571	n = 758	n = 785
White	83 (96.5%)	114 (97.4%)	103 (88.8%)	77 (92.8%)	90 (88.2%)	110 (92.4%)	81 (93.1%)	102 (91.9%)	106 (82.8%)	448 (78.5%)	506 (66.8%)	499 (63.6%)
Black	3 (3.5%)	3 (2.6%)	13 (11.2%)	6 (7.2%)	12 (11.8%)	9 (7.6%)	6 (6.9%)	9 (8.1%)	22 (17.2%)	123 (21.5%)	252 (33.2%)	286 (36.4%)

Notes: Head Coaches: $\chi^2(2, N = 319) = 9.05, p = .01$; Offensive Coordinators: $\chi^2(2, N = 304) = 1.58, p > .05$; Defensive Coordinators: $\chi^2(2, N = 326) = 7.21, p < .05$; Assistant Coaches: $\chi^2(2, N = 2114) = 36.26, p < .000$.

Table 4-2. Assistant Coaches Position Coached by Race and Time

Position Coached	Assistant Coach Race											
	1990		2005				2010					
	White (n = 448)		Black (n = 123)		White (n = 506)		Black (n = 252)		White (n = 499)		Black (n = 286)	
Quarterbacks	43	9.6%	4	3.3%	51	10.1%	2	0.8%	35	7.0%	2	0.7%
Offensive Line	119	26.6%	10	8.1%	107	21.1%	6	2.4%	106	21.2%	5	1.7%
Running Backs/ Wide Receiver	75	16.7%	60	48.8%	148	29.2%	115	45.8%	154	30.9%	122	42.7%
Defensive Line/ Linebacker	155	34.6%	39	31.7%	129	25.5%	82	32.5%	114	22.8%	79	27.6%
Defensive Backs	56	12.5%	10	8.1%	71	14.0%	47	18.7%	51	10.2%	71	24.8%
Special Teams	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		39	7.8%	7	2.4%

Notes: White Assistant Coaches: $\chi^2(5, N = 1005) = 46.26, p < .000$; African-American Assistant Coaches: $\chi^2(5, N = 538) = 10.13, p > .05$.

Table 4-3. Assistant Coaches Position Played by Race and Time

Position Played	Assistant Coach Race											
	1990		2005				2010					
	White (n = 319)		Black (n = 105)		White (n = 506)		Black (n = 252)		White (n = 459)		Black (n = 278)	
Did Not Play	N/A		N/A		34	6.7%	2	0.8%	42	9.2%	5	1.8%
Quarterbacks	52	16.3%	8	7.6%	94	18.6%	11	4.4%	84	18.3%	24	8.6%
Offensive Line	101	31.7%	11	10.5%	124	24.5%	8	3.2%	104	22.7%	12	4.3%
Running Backs/ Wide Receiver	45	14.1%	32	30.5%	65	12.8%	91	36.1%	69	15.0%	89	32.0%
Defensive Line/ Linebacker	80	25.1%	31	29.5%	109	21.5%	77	30.6%	100	21.8%	76	27.3%
Defensive Backs	41	12.9%	23	21.6%	80	15.8%	63	25.0%	57	12.4%	72	25.9%
Special Teams	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		3	0.7%	0	0.0%

Notes: White Assistant Coaches: $\chi^2(6, N = 965) = 8.26, p > .05$; African-American Assistant Coaches: $\chi^2(6, N = 530) = 6.28, p > .05$.

Table 4-4. Frequencies of Head Coaches by Prior Coaching Position by Time

Prior Position Coached	2005 (n = 99)		2010 (n = 106)	
Quarterback	22	22.2%	20	18.9%
Offensive Lineman	13	13.1%	10	9.4%
Running Back/Receiver	23	23.2%	35	33.0%
Defensive Line/Linebacker	26	26.3%	23	21.7%
Defensive Back	15	15.2%	18	17.0%

Notes: Head Coaches: $\chi^2(4, N = 205) = 3.19, p > .05$

Table 4-5. Frequencies of Head Coaches by Position as a Player by Time

Former Position Played	1990 (n = 69)		2005 (n = 99)		2010 (n = 115)	
Did Not Play	N/A		4	4.0%	7	6.1%
Quarterback	31	44.9%	33	33.3%	33	28.7%
Offensive Lineman	15	21.7%	12	12.1%	13	11.3%
Running Back/Receiver	6	8.7%	16	16.2%	18	15.7%
Defensive Line/Linebacker	11	15.9%	19	19.2%	19	16.5%
Defensive Back	6	8.7%	15	15.2%	25	21.7%
Special Teams	N/A		N/A		0	0.0%

Notes: Head Coaches: $\chi^2 (5, N = 214) = 2.29, p > .05$

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to assess the possible existence of an accumulated disadvantage toward African-American coaches at the intercollegiate level; and to specifically demonstrate its potential impact on the under-representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS football. Given the numerous stakeholders involved in the decision-making process at the intercollegiate athletics level, it was deemed appropriate to take a multilevel organizational model approach to reach this aim. Using a multilevel perspective (Cunningham, 2010; Dixon & Cunningham, 2006), three distinct but interrelated studies were conducted, each representing a varying level (i.e., macro, meso, and micro) of the organizational system that is college football. Taken together, the cumulative findings reveal a positive, yet somewhat slow and resistant, shift in opportunities, resources, and capital (i.e., human, social, and cultural) for African-American coaches.

This discussion consists of the findings from each study and demonstrates how they contribute to our understanding of African-American coaches' experiences with accumulated disadvantage at each of the systematic levels. First, I will discuss this potential discrimination from a macro-level perspective by examining the changes that have taken place within NCAA men's sports concerning the representation of African Americans in head and assistant coaching positions over the last 15 years. This is followed by a meso-level approach discussing the potential impact college football decision makers (i.e., coaches) have on the prospects of student-athletes prior to and upon their entry into the coaching field. Lastly, I look at the current racial make-up of DI-FBS coaching staffs, including the coaches' playing and coaching experiences, in order to analyze the possible impact of an accumulated disadvantage from the micro-level

perspective. Again, a multilevel approach allows potential relationships between the numerous contributing variables to be examined, as well as discuss these factors individually and from various levels of analysis (Dixon & Cunningham, 2006).

Macro-level: Perceptions of African Americans in Collegiate Coaching

When examining the representation of African-American coaches in intercollegiate athletics, particularly football, it is important to be cognizant of the influential factors that exist outside the athletic department and institution. Cunningham (2010) claimed the most prevailing of these macro-level factors to be institutionalized practices, political climate, and stakeholder expectations. Findings from Study 1 suggest that changes in these three factors might be taking a positive shift, albeit slowly, towards the acceptance of African-American coaches and away from past discriminant perceptions. While encouraging strides have been made, the limited increases can be somewhat disappointing given the recent attention and concern expressed towards increasing diversity amongst the coaching staffs of NCAA men's sports, and in particular football. What follows is a closer examination into how the abovementioned factors have been impacted by and will continue to impact African-American coaching representation.

Institutionalized practices refer to those policies, practices, and procedures that have over time become commonplace in a particular field or industry. These activities oftentimes act as a means by which control and influence over institutional factors (e.g., salaries, employment, resources, opportunities, information, and human and social capital) is maintained (McCrudden, 1982). It has been argued that with regards to race and coaching, such institutionalized activities have created a caste system that sends the message African Americans “are good enough to play but not to coach” (Agyemang & DeLorme, 2010, p. 38). It would be difficult to rebuke such a claim given the discrepancy between African-American student-athletes and coaches. In 2007-

08, 34.4% of all football student-athletes were African American (DeHass, 2009) compared to only 9.8% and 21.9% of African-American head and assistant coaches, respectively (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). Similarly, 18.5% of all male student-athletes were African American (DeHass, 2009), yet only 9.1% of men's teams head coaches were African American (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). However, the increase of African-American representation among assistant coaches in men's basketball and football was greater than the percentages of African-American coaches throughout all NCAA men's sports (Bracken & DeHass, 2009). Given the magnitude and breadth of influence these two revenue-generating sports garner in intercollegiate athletics, there is hope that institutional discrimination is on the decline.

Further support for the existence of institutionalized practices that are potentially discriminant was found when examining coaching representation between different men's sports. Having already demonstrated the dearth of African-American coaches in football, it is important to take a look at Division I basketball, baseball, and outdoor track (Bracken & DeHass, 2009; DeHass, 2009). There is a large discrepancy in basketball, where 28.5% of the head coaches are African American compared to 60.4% of the student-athletes. However, in the smaller sports, more equality is witnessed. In baseball, the percentage of African-American coaches is actually greater than that of the student-athletes, 5.2% compared to 4.4%. Twenty-seven and a half percent of outdoor track student-athletes are African American, with 19.9% of the outdoor track head coaches being racially similar. Other Division I sports such as tennis, golf, and gymnastics show similar percentages of African-American representation among head coaches and student-athletes. Thus, it can be argued that the acceptance or disregard of African Americans as player and/or coach has to some extent become institutionalized in certain college sports. If this is the

case, such racial biases and prejudices have most likely evolved over time and become ingrained within intercollegiate athletics by way of common policies, practices, and procedures.

Consequently, the political climate in intercollegiate athletics has shifted to one that welcomes diversity and inclusiveness. The NCAA and other outside organizations, such as the BCA, can be held largely accountable for this optimistic progress. In 1989, the NCAA implemented the MEP and in 1991, the MOIC; both designed to enhance educational and career opportunities for women and ethnic minorities in intercollegiate athletics administration and coaching. More recently, the NCAA created the ODI in 2005 with the hopes of providing more leadership and support in the creation and fostering of diversity and inclusion initiatives (NCAA, 2010a). The BCA grades institutions on their hiring procedures so as to encourage a more diverse pool of candidates and create a more “open and objective process” (Harrison, 2005, p. iv). Such initiatives are demonstrative of the changing political climate in intercollegiate athletics.

Given that Study 1 revealed Division I institutions employ significantly larger percentages of African-American coaches than do Divisions II and III, and given the popularity and exposure of Division I athletics, in particular football and men’s basketball, it is conceivable that the personnel in these sports could be a catalyst for social change in the political climate. For this to take place, it is the expectations of stakeholders that must also adopt more diversified attitudes toward African-American coaches. Alumni and boosters are stakeholders/power brokers who can be very influential, by way of power and money (i.e., donations) in the hiring and firing of key athletics personnel (Agyemang & DeLorme, 2010). A potential concern with the influential power of these groups is the perception that athletic departments must hire people with whom alumni and boosters can identify (Cunningham, 2010). This could be problematic

given that the most recognized and influential college athletic programs are those of predominately White institutions (PWI). Of the top 10 most powerful boosters, as ranked by ESPN.com, 100% were White and all but one was a male (Fish, 2006). Thus, the impact of said argument might be that institutions and athletic departments looking to appeal to their alumni and boosters will feel pressure to hire White males.

Further contributing to the influence of stakeholders on athletic department decision making favoring White coaches over their African-American counterparts are the perceptions they might have as to what makes a good head coach. It is possible that stereotyped characteristics of African-American coaches contrast with what individuals perceive to be the attributes necessary to hold a head coaching position. Consequently, racial minority coaches have been found to be viewed as less qualified than their White counterparts for head coaching positions (Sartore & Cunningham, 2006). This perceived “lack of fit” (Burgess & Borgida, 1999) may influence and facilitate biased opinions on who a head coach should be and how he should represent the institution. Keep in mind that African Americans are 7.6 times more likely to be seen as a player than as a head coach in college football (Cunningham, 2010). The media also contribute to potential discriminatory actions by stakeholders with depictions that might further stigmas and stereotypes regarding African-American coaches (Buffington, 2005; Cunningham & Bopp, 2010; Dufur & Feinberg, 2009; Woodward, 2004).

Thus, in part due to outside stakeholders and external factors such as the social and political climate, practices that may hinder acceptance of African-American coaches have possibly become institutionalized. Subsequently, this leads to discrimination and potentially the under-representation of African-American coaches. However, findings from Study 1 reveal positive changes taking place in the gap between African-American coaches and their White

counterparts; thus, suggesting promising changes in the attitudes and perceptions of outside stakeholders towards diversity and inclusion.

Meso-level: African-American Student-Athletes and Future Coaching Opportunities

Findings from Study 2 help to interpret the under-representation of African-American coaches through the meso-level factors of prejudice, discrimination, stereotypes, and organizational culture. Such factors help to facilitate and maintain, by way of decision-making policies, procedures, and structures among athletic department and institution constituents, the dearth of African-American coaches in college football (Cunningham, 2010). In particular, Study 2 analyzes the decisions made regarding the play of quarterbacks in DI-FBS and demonstrates how such decisions conceivably impact future coaching intentions and qualifications. Thus, both latent and evident biases of current coaches were found to potentially impact the human and social capital of student-athletes who may intend to enter into coaching following their collegiate career. The following is an explication of how the abovementioned factors possibly affect future coaching opportunities and intentions of African Americans.

The purpose of Study 2 was to ascertain whether or not positional segregation (i.e., stacking) continues at the quarterback position in college football. To determine its existence, the play of White and African-American athletes was examined. Findings revealed a distinction between the average number of pass and rush attempts for racially diverse quarterbacks. African-American quarterbacks rushed the ball a significantly greater number of times than did their White counterparts and had fewer pass attempts on average. Similarly, differences were found in the percentage of rush vs. pass attempts, with the percentage of rush attempts made by African Americans nearly doubling that of White quarterbacks. Conversely, White quarterbacks passed the ball approximately 15% more often than their African-American counterparts. These results

may suggest that the possible discriminatory practices found at the quarterback position in the NCAA's DI-FBS can be attributed to race.

The institutionally discriminant practice of positional segregation seems to have diminished for White and African-American student-athletes, particularly at quarterback, as both races of players are found in a variety of playing positions. However, a new manifestation of positional segregation seems to be occurring through possible racial tasking. Again, I focused not on the various playing positions to which racially different athletes were assigned, but rather the plays carried out by those in the quarterback position to determine if they coincided with stereotypes concerning the mental and physical abilities of African-American and White athletes. This practice was defined as racial tasking.

Racial tasking in sport is a function of one's prejudice towards a minority athlete's capability, both mental and physical, to perform. Such prejudicial and discriminant play calling can be the result of a decision maker's (i.e., coaches) biased organizational culture and stereotypes. As such, the tasks athletes are asked to perform are dependent upon the athlete's race and vary despite holding the same playing position. This form of treatment discrimination may suggest that coaches still manage, likely implicitly, under a biased assertion towards the passing and mental abilities of African-American quarterbacks.

The resultant impact of this potential treatment discrimination is most likely on the human, cultural, and social capital of college quarterbacks; thereby possibly inhibiting future opportunities and resources (i.e., access discrimination) to be head coach. The rationale being that 33 (28.7%) of head coaches in 2010 had playing experience at the quarterback position in college. Thus, the skills and knowledge they learned and social networks they developed as players are arguably those valued in a head coach's pedigree. By way of running more than

passing, African Americans may therefore not be learning the very teachings (e.g., reading defenses, understanding sight lines, calling an audible, clock management, etc.) of the “traditional” quarterback position. That is, African American student-athletes may be taught to rely too much on their running abilities in lieu of learning the traditional role of the quarterback. Such experiences and teachings could defensibly be what make those with quarterback coaching and playing experience such viable head coaching candidates.

The organizational culture of college football seems to be one that supports positional segregation and racial tasking, from the coaches on the field to the fans in the stands and the power brokers of the institutions. The increase of African-American quarterbacks, as well as their perceived success, would seem to signify an end to the negative stereotypes regarding their playing ability and knowledge. Through the quarterback position, African Americans are able to have a more direct impact on the game as well as play in the most vital of decision making positions. This could in turn be facilitating change among the meso-level constituents (i.e., coaches) harboring negative prejudices and stereotypes.

However, the increase in rushing attempts for quarterbacks coinciding with the increase of African-American quarterbacks could also be reinforcing negative stereotypes about the mental and physical capabilities of African Americans to play the position; subsequently, maintaining the under-representation of African-American coaches through implicit discrimination. Regardless, potential prejudices, discrimination, stereotypes, and organizational culture of college coaches and athletic department personnel can play a major role in the decisions made both on and off the playing field. It is reasonable to assume such decisions can impact the opportunities, intentions, and abilities of future coaches. Thus, it is critical that

student-athletes, independent of race, are coached in their respective positions such that current and prospective capital isn't squandered.

Micro-level: The Career Paths of African-American Coaches

Lastly, Study 3 was an analysis of the backgrounds and present status of current coaches in the NCAA's DI-FBS. According to Cunningham (2010), micro-level factors primarily involve psychological and social psychological aspects of the coaches themselves. In examining the past playing and coaching experiences of coaches, I hoped to draw conclusions regarding potential opportunities, expectations, intentions, and the head coaching career viability of African Americans. Specifically, the purpose of Study 3 was to identify potential gains made since 2005 in the coaching representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS football. To help provide further analysis of micro-level factors, the secondary aim of this study was to determine in what ways, if any, African-American coaches are impacted by the coaching career paths of current head coaches and coordinators. Overall, there was found to be a positive shift in the representation of African-American coaches, as well as more diversification among the playing and coaching experiences of current coaches. Below is a rationale for the potential impact these findings have on the psychological and social psychological factors of African-American coaches and players.

Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) found that compared to their White counterparts, African-American managers felt less acceptance, experienced lower levels of career satisfaction, and perceived to have reached a plateau in their careers. These negative outcomes are perhaps the result of disparate treatment (e.g., access and treatment discrimination) within the organization and work environment. Such discriminatory behaviors can also be found in the coaching field (Cunningham & Sagas, 2007) and might contribute to the decrease in

African-Americans' intentions to enter into the college football coaching field. Findings from this study, however, indirectly demonstrate that the potentially negative influence said outcomes might have on psychological and social psychological characteristics of African-American coaches could be diminishing. That is, African-American coaches are entering the college football coaching field at a higher rate than previously recorded, as well as receiving more opportunities for career advancement and success (based on representation). The embodiment of this sentiment lies within the most visible and influential of coaching positions: the head coach.

In 2005, only three programs were under the guise of African Americans (2.6%). At current, five years later, a record 13 African-American men (11.2%) have achieved the highest of coaching positions. Similar increases were seen at the defensive coordinator position and among assistant coaches. It can be advocated from these findings, that African Americans are finding greater acceptance and achievements in the college football coaching field. Thus, the field could potentially be becoming a more inclusive work environment for racially diverse coaches. Subsequently, a decline in the negative impact on the affective psychological factors contributing to the under-representation of African-American coaches could be expected. The diversity in playing and coaching backgrounds of current coaches might also lead to a decrease in negatively impacted psychological and social psychological factors.

With the multiplicity of experiences (playing and coaching) from which coaches are being hired, the field appears to be a more viable career path for African Americans; thereby minimizing the potentially disparaging impact of racial stacking and tasking, and subsequent marginalization of efforts, abilities, and opportunities. Again, such negligible treatment can hinder the social and human capital of African-American coaches (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), as well as their aspirations to persist towards head coaching or other leadership roles

(Cunningham, Bruening, & Straub, 2006). However, the hiring of head coaches from diverse playing and coaching backgrounds provides optimism for increased head coaching intentions and expectations of African Americans as they continue to hold a majority of the peripheral playing and coaching positions from which coaches are now being elevated.

Head coaches in college football have traditionally emerged from the coordinator positions, which in turn have risen from the assistant coach ranks (Anderson, 1993). In the past, this pipeline has served to maintain White dominance and influence over the college football landscape. However, 2010 gave reason for optimism for African Americans as more parity was being discovered among the playing and coaching backgrounds of coaches, and in particular head coaches. Thus, the coaching career paths of current head coaches and coordinators appear to be paving a more equitable path for current assistant and future coaches. The resultant impact is the potential increase of (head) coaching intentions and more positive career opportunities of African Americans. It is hoped that the continued increase in success and acceptance of coaches with diverse racial, playing, and coaching backgrounds will lead to a more welcoming environment in which head coaching and turnover intentions of African-American coaches' regresses towards the standard expectations of all coaches, independent of race.

Multilevel Approach

Taken together, findings from the three previously discussed studies help to explain the under-representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS; each representing factors from the interrelated macro-, meso-, and micro-levels of an athletic department and college football. Again, organizations are comprised of a multitude of people, purposes, policies, and practices that cannot be captured in a single level of analysis (Cunningham, 2010; Slack, 1997). Thus, in order to appreciate the variety of manners in which these entities interact within a sport

organization (i.e., intercollegiate athletics), a multilevel (i.e., macro, meso, and micro) approach was utilized. The following section discusses the potential impact of the aforementioned factors on an accumulated disadvantage for African-American football coaches.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In this dissertation, I sought to examine the potential negative effects of institutional discrimination, manifested through an accumulated disadvantage, that accrue for African Americans as they progress from their playing days and continue into their coaching careers; as well as to demonstrate its potential impact on the under-representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS. The primary findings suggest that there exists an accumulated disadvantage impacting African-American football coaches at the college level, such that their representation on coaching staffs is negligible. Furthermore, it was revealed that potentially discriminate practices (e.g., racial tasking and homologous reproduction) might continue to prosper in intercollegiate athletics; serving to maintain a hegemonic environment in which African-American coaches experience limited opportunities, capital, and resources. Despite the persistence of discriminatory practices and attitudes, it was found that progress has been made towards equitable treatment and representation. Findings reveal the possibility of more accepting attitudes among intercollegiate athletics stakeholders (e.g., administration, alumni, and boosters) regarding coaches of more diversified races, ethnicities, experiences and backgrounds. This seems to bode well for the diversification and inclusion efforts put forth by the NCAA and other intercollegiate athletics constituents. Regardless, an accumulated disadvantage remains and potentially hinders the ability of African-American football coaches to successfully obtain and retain head coaching positions.

An accumulated disadvantage, as it was used in this paper, suggests that individuals and groups holding structurally inferior roles experience limited opportunities and resources as a result of those in structurally advantaged positions attempting to maintain their hegemonic dominance. That is, African Americans intending to coach college football face a number of

obstacles and hindrances from the first day they lace up their cleats and step onto a football field. As players, they may be the victims of positional segregation (i.e., stacking) or racial tasking, and as coaches they may run into the glass ceiling or fall victim to biased practices such as homologous reproduction; thereby limiting their access to opportunities for increased human, cultural, and social capital as they attempt to ascend the coaching ladder. As witnessed in this research, the potentially discriminate impact of such disadvantages can impact a current and future African-American football coach at various times throughout his career.

The breadth of college football's cultural significance (as well as basketball and athletic departments as a whole) is far reaching; influencing the visibility, goodwill, and even prestige of an institution (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). Thus, the capacity of sports to create change among macro-level constituents and stakeholders residing outside the athletic program is greater than ever. While potentially discriminate institutionalized practices remain, diversification of intercollegiate athletics is taking place and altering the manner in which African-American coaches might be viewed. Equal opportunity approaches, such as NCAA initiatives and the BCA's call for inclusive hiring practices, are demonstrative of the concern for equality and rectification for past institutionalized prejudices. The subsequent impact of these actions was witnessed in Study 1, where it was found that increases in African-American head and assistant coaches have taken place within men's NCAA sports, although at a nominal rate.

These findings suggest that the representation of African-American coaches of men's NCAA sports is very slowly taking on a positive shift. While the limited increases can be somewhat disappointing, changes among Division I programs give reason for optimism given their popularity and extensive exposure. Thus it is hoped that as African Americans gain more equal representation the shift will be more socially accepted and promoted by all NCAA member

institutions and stakeholders. Such changes can simultaneously alter the political climate to one of inclusion and diversity, and potentially eliminate the good old boys network. With the dissipation of such biased networks, the current social capital of African-American coaches may no longer be a potential impediment in obtaining a coaching position. However, Study 1 was not without its limitations.

This study only focused on the percentages of African-American head and assistant coaches in football, basketball, and a pooling of all NCAA men's sports. Future studies should be extended to each of the NCAA men's athletic programs. It would also be valuable to understand what factors contribute to the discrepancy between representation at DI and Divisions II and III, possibly continuing into the high school ranks. Equally important would be to understand the intentions and motivations of those coaches who forego intercollegiate athletics for coaching positions at the high school level. As an accumulated advantage can begin as early as a coach's playing days, it might be critical to examine one's experiences at that level of play, from both the coach and player perspectives. Even with programs such as the NCAA's MEP, MOIC, and MCA and the BCA's hiring report card promoting African-American coaching opportunities and resources, representation has been scant and slow to match student-athlete percentages. Future research should consider the effect of such programs and whether the resources being allocated to these programs might be further enhanced and adapted to fit into or revolutionize the institutionalized practices, expectations and climate of each institution.

Another plausible outcome from the aforementioned programs and policies might be the regression of individual prejudices and stereotypes (meso-level factors), which in turn might increase African-American coaches' and players access (e.g., opportunities) and resources to obtain better coaching positions. Study 2 examined how this potential evolves during a coach's

playing days. The findings revealed that through plays on the field, African Americans may not be enhancing their human capital as well as their White counterparts at the quarterback position. Thus, racial tasking is potentially limiting their prospects for increased access, resources, and opportunities by way of what and how they are learning about the quarterback position. Further research is needed to determine if racial tasking is in fact a conscious discriminatory practice, or just a misunderstood reality of the game. Future research can help to assess this phenomenon.

To help determine this, data from multiple years could be analyzed. While a valid and reliable procedure, the proper coding of a player's race may be addressed through another method. Further, there is no way of knowing for certain whether or not the play called in to the quarterback was originally a pass or run. Lastly, further research is necessary to demonstrate that the potential racial tasking taking place at the college quarterback position contributes directly to the under-representation of African-American head coaches. To rectify this hypothesis, it is necessary to examine the playing history of current coaches to determine if there are indeed any discrepancies between racially different coaches' backgrounds and the positions for which they are hired. A goal of Study 3 was to address this link.

Examining the micro-level (i.e., social and psychosocial) factors that conceivably contribute to the under-representation of African-American football coaches, it was determined that coaching backgrounds and playing experiences of DI-FBS coaches have become more diverse. Thus, it can be proposed that African Americans are finding greater acceptance and achievements in the college football coaching field, subsequently creating a more inclusive work environment for racially diverse coaches. This can subsequently lead to increased career outcomes and intentions, particularly for African-American coaches. As such, the football coaching field appears to be a more viable career path for African Americans, possibly

minimizing the potentially negative impact of institutionalized and discriminate practices such as racial stacking and tasking. However, the link between playing and coaching experience and obtaining head coaching positions for African Americans is a bit clouded. Despite the recent decline in homogeneity of coaching and playing backgrounds, African Americans continue to be underrepresented. With the exception of the 2010 head coach hiring cycle, this diversity has resulted in minimum representative gains for African-American coaches. Thus, future research will need to continue to observe the diversification of playing and coaching backgrounds with regard to the positions for which coaching positions African Americans are hired.

Furthermore, research should provide deeper analysis into the link between the role of a player's centrality and his prospects for a head coaching or coordinator position, the most powerful and visible of positions. A limitation with this type of study is the question of whether or not there remains a definitive link between playing and coaching position. Future research regarding racial tasking will help to strengthen and explain this link. As with Study 2, another limitation is the visual coding of the coaches' races. Perhaps a more thorough method could be established. Lastly, with accumulated disadvantage being an evolving and time-sensitive trend, it would behoove future researchers to replicate this study every few years. Examining playing and coaching backgrounds in a trend analysis (e.g., five year updates) would help to determine if this manifestation of institutionalized discrimination is maintained or on the decline. This suggestion also speaks to the overall aim and potential impact of this dissertation.

Again, the purpose of this dissertation was to examine the potential negative effects of institutional discrimination, manifested through an accumulated disadvantage, that accrue for African Americans and demonstrate its potential contributions to the under-representation of African-American coaches in DI-FBS. By studying the macro-, meso-, and micro-level factors

that can impact the current dearth of African-American college football coaches, the causes of the phenomenon becomes more lucid and the means by which past inequities are rectified can be ascertained. Institutionalized practices, political climates, organizational cultures, stakeholder biases and stereotypes, and psychosocial and social dynamics are all contributing factors to this accumulated disadvantage. Research must continue to examine the manner in which these factors, individually and interrelated, can negatively impact African-American coaches and means by which to eliminate or lessen their harmful repercussions.

Understanding the problem can help college sport administrators and individuals to better handle and be aware of the policies, practices, and attitudes that have facilitated and maintained African-American coaches' marginalized positions throughout their playing and coaching careers. However, this is just one step in the process of eliminating an accumulated disadvantage. Being an evolving and constantly changing phenomenon, the experiences of those individuals and groups negatively impacted by the institutionalized discrimination must be persistently analyzed and addressed. The current representation of African-American football coaches is greater now than at any time in the past. Continued research on this topic will help determine if this growth will be a persistent trend or an aberration. The recent progress made towards an equal racial representation of coaches in college football is one of encouragement. The more African-American coaches are able to obtain and visibly hold positions of power and influence (i.e., head coach and coordinator), the greater the chance to irrevocably alter the perceptions of intercollegiate athletics stakeholders who allow these inequities to prosper.

It is my contention that an accumulated disadvantage does indeed exist in college sports. However, recent increases in African-American coaching representation evoke optimism towards minimizing, and possibly eliminating its racially divergent impact. It appears that we are merely

at the beginning of this equitable social change in college football. Progressive changes in institutionalized and discriminate practices must continue, stereotypes and prejudices must be addressed and abolished from all constituents with influence on the college game, and coaches and administrators must work to maintain the recent progress that has been witnessed. The accumulated disadvantage that African-American coaches currently face has evolved over time and history. Thus, it is the present and future in which actions must be taken so as to reverse past inequities. Change is taking place, but only after time will be we able to determine if this positive trend becomes institutionalized and internalized such that African-American coaches are provided the same opportunities for success and sustainability.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Agyemang, K., & DeLorme, J. (2010). Examining the dearth of Black head coaches at the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision level: A critical race theory and social dominance theory analysis. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 35-52.
- Anderson, D. (1993). Cultural diversity on campus: A look at intercollegiate football coaches. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 17(1), 61-66.
- Anshel, M.H. (1990). Perceptions of Black intercollegiate football players: Implications for the sport psychology consult. *The Sport Psychologist*, 4, 235-248.
- Best, C. (1987). Experience and career length in professional football: The effect of positional segregation. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 4, 410-420.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Beyer, J.M., & Hannah, D.R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 105-132.
- Bracken, N.M., & DeHass, D. (2009). *Race and gender demographics: 2007-08 NCAA member institutions' personnel report*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Brown, M.K., & Wellman, D. (2005). Embedding the color line: The accumulation of racial advantage and the disaccumulation of opportunity in post-civil rights America. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 2:2, 187-207.
- Buffington, D. (2005). Contesting race on Sundays: Making meaning out of the rise in the number of Black quarterbacks. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21, 19-37.
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5, 665-692.
- Clark, S.M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 20-43.
- Cunningham, G.B. (2003). Already aware of the glass ceiling: Race-related effects of perceived opportunity on the career choices of college athletes. *Journal of African-American Studies*, 7, 57-71.
- Cunningham, G.B. (2010). Understanding the under-representation of African-American coaches: A multilevel perspective. *Sport Management Review*.

- Cunningham, G.B., & Bopp, T. (2010). Race ideology perpetuated: Media representations of newly hired football coaches. *Journal of Sports Media*, 5, 1-20.
- Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2005). Access discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 29, 148-163.
- Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2007). Perceived treatment discrimination among coaches: The influence of race and sport coached. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 1-20.
- Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2008). Gender and sex diversity in sport organizations: Introduction to a special issue. *Sex Roles*, 58, 3-9.
- Cunningham, G.B., Bruening, J.E., & Straub, T. (2006). The under-representation of African Americans in NCAA Division I-A head coaching positions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 387-413.
- Cunningham, G.B., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F.B. (2001). Occupational commitment and intent to leave the coaching profession: Differences according to race. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 36, 131-148.
- Darity Jr., W.A., & Mason, P.L. (1998) – Evidence on discrimination in employment: Codes of color, codes of gender. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2), 63-90.
- Day, J.C., & McDonald, S. (2010). Not so fast my friend: Social capital and the race disparity in promotions among college football coaches. *Sociological Spectrum*, 30, 138-158.
- DeHass, D. (2003). *2001-02 Race demographics of NCAA member institutions' athletics personnel*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- DeHass, D. (2004). *2003-04 Race and gender demographics of NCAA member institutions' athletics personnel*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- DeHass, D. (2007). *2005-06 Ethnicity and gender demographics of NCAA member institutions' athletics personnel*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- DeHass, D. (2009). *1999-2000-2007-08 NCAA student-athlete ethnicity report: Student-athlete ethnicity*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Dixon, M.A., & Cunningham, G.B. (2006). Data aggregation in multilevel analysis: A review of conceptual and statistical issues. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 10, 85-107.
- Drash, W. (2010, March). 'Vicious cycle': Jobless and black in America. CNN.com. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2010/LIVING/wayoflife/03/24/black.america.study/index.html?hpt=C1>.

- Dufur, M. (1997). Race logic and “Being like Mike”: Representations of athletes in advertising, 1985-1994. *Sociological Focus*, 30, 345-356.
- Dufur, M., & Feinberg, S.L. (2009). Race and the NFL draft: Views from the auction block. *Qualitative Sociology*, 32, 53-73.
- Dupre, M.E. (2008). Educational differences in health risks and illness over the life course: A test of cumulative disadvantage theory. *Social Science Research*, 37, 1253-1266.
- Edwards, H. (1973). *Sociology of Sport*, Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Edwards, H. (2000). Crisis of Black athletes on the eve of the 21st century. *Society*, 37(3), 9-13.
- Eitle, T.M., & Eitle, D. (2002). Race, cultural capital, and the educational effects of participation in sport. *Sociology of Education*, 75, 123-146.
- Evans, Jr., A. S. (1997). Blacks as key functionaries: A study of racial stratification in professional sport. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28, 43-59.
- Everhart, C.B., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 188-200.
- Finch, B., McDowell, J., & Sagas, M. (2010). An examination of racial diversity in collegiate football: A 15 year update. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 4, 47-57.
- Fink, J.S., & Pastore, D.L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest*, 51, 310-327.
- Fish, M. (2006). *Most powerful boosters*. ESPN.com Retrieved May 20, 2010 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/nfl/news/story?id=2285986>
- Forde, P. (2009). *Evolution threatening storied positions*. ESPN.com. Retrieved August 31, 2009 from http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/columns/story?columnist=forde_pat&id=4431152&sportCat=nfl.
- Gonzalez, G.L. (1996). The stacking of Latinos in Major League Baseball: A forgotten minority? *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 20, 134-160.
- Grusky, O. (1963). The effects of formal structure on managerial recruitment: A study of baseball organization. *Sociometry*, 26, 345-353.
- Harley, D.A. (2008). Maids of academe: African-American women faculty at predominantly white institutions. *Journal of African-American Studies*, 12, 19-36.

- Harrison, C.K. (2005). *"The Score:" A hiring report card for NCAA Division IA and IAA football head coaching positions in American higher education*. Indianapolis, IN: Black Coaches and Administrators.
- Harrison, C.K., & Yee, S. (2009). *Protecting their turf: The head football coach hiring process, and the practices of FBS & FCS colleges and universities*. Indianapolis, IN: Black Coaches and Administrators.
- Hawkins, B. (2002). Is stacking dead? A case study of the stacking hypothesis at a Southeastern Conference (SEC) football program. *International Sports Journal*, 6, 146-160.
- Heilman, M.E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 657-674.
- Holt, D.B. (1998). Does cultural capital structure American consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25, 1-25.
- Johnson, B.D., & Johnson, N.R. (1995). Stacking and "stoppers": A test of the outcome control hypothesis. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 105-112.
- Keith, F.A. (2009). Diversity comes to NCAA football coaching ranks. *Black Coaches and Administrators*. Retrieved December 23, 2009 from <http://bcasports.cstv.com/genrel/122209aaa.html>
- Lapchick, R. (2007). *The buck stops here: Assessing diversity among campus and conference leaders for Division IA schools in 2007-08*. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida, The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport.
- Lapchick, R., & McMechan, D. (2009). *The buck stops here: Assessing diversity among campus and conference leaders for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools in the 2009-10 academic year*. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida, The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport.
- Lapchick, R., Little, E., Lerner, C., & Mathew, R. (2009). *The 2008 racial and gender report card: College sport*. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida, The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport.
- Lewis, W.A. (1979). The dual economy revisited. *The Manchester School*, 47(3), 211-229.
- Lovett, D.J., & Lowry, C.D. (1994). "Good old boys" and "good old girls" clubs: Myth or reality? *Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 27-35.
- Loy, J.W., & Elvogue, J.F. (1970). Racial segregation in American sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 5, 5-24.
- McCrudden, C. (1982). Institutional discrimination. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 2, 303-367.

- McKindra, L. (February 24, 2010). Finally, progress: Coaching carousel becomes more multi-colored. *Black Coaches and Administrators*. Retrieved from <http://bcasports.cstv.com/genrel/022410aaa.html>
- McPherson, B.D. (1976). The Black athlete: An overview and analysis. In D.M. Landers (Ed.) *Social problems in athletics* (pp.122-150). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Madison, D.R., & Landers, D.M. (1976). Racial discrimination in football: A test of the “stacking” of playing positions hypothesis. In D.M. Landers (Ed.) *Social problems in athletics* (pp. 151-156). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Merton, R.K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered. *Science*, 159, 56-63.
- Mikkelson, B., & Mikkelson, D.P. (2005). Quarterback speak. Retrieved June 26, 2009, from <http://www.snopes.com/sports/football/williams.asp>.
- Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C.E. (2005). Education, cumulative advantage, and health. *Aging International*, 30, 27-62.
- Mixon, Jr., F.G., & Trevino, L.J. (2004). How race affects dismissals of college football coaches. *Journal of Labor Research*, 25, pp. 645-656.
- National Urban League (2010, February). Is the dream fulfilled? *Time*, 175(7), S1-S14.
- NCAA (2010a). NCAA diversity and inclusion. Retrieved February 15, 2010 from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/diversity+and+inclusion.
- NCAA (2010b). NCAA football coaches academy. Retrieved February 15, 2010 from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/About+The+NCAA/Diversity+and+Inclusion/Diversity+Programs/Men_s+Coaches+Academy/index.html
- Pacheco, J.S., & Plutzer, E. (2008). Political participation and cumulative disadvantage: The impact of economic and social hardship on young citizens. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 571-593.
- Perkins, L.M. (1983). The impact of the “cult of womanhood” on the education of black women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39(3), 17-28.
- Piven, F.F., & Cloward, R.A. (1989). *Why Americans don't vote*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sack, A.L., Singh, P., & Thiel, R. (2005). Occupational segregation on the playing field: The case of Major League Baseball. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 300-318.

- Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G.B. (2004). Treatment discrimination in college coaching: Its prevalence and impact on the career success of assistant basketball coaches. *International Sports Journal*, 8, 76-88.
- Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G.B. (2005). Racial differences in the career success of assistant football coaches: The role of discrimination, human capital, and social capital. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 773-797.
- Sagas, M., Cunningham, G.B., & Pastore, D. (2006). Predicting head coaching intentions of male and female assistant coaches: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Sex Roles*, 54, 695-705.
- Sartore, M.L., & Cunningham, G.B. (2006). Stereotypes, race, and coaching. *Journal of African American Studies*, 10, 69-83.
- Seibert, S.E., Kraimer, M.L., & Liden, R.C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 219-237.
- Slack, T. (1997). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organizational theory*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sosa, J., & Sagas, M. (2008). Country of origin and centrality: A positional segregation analysis of Major League Baseball. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 363-378.
- Stiener, A. (2000). *1999-00 Race demographics of NCAA member institutions' athletics personnel*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Toutkoushian, R.K., & Conley, V.M. (2005). Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF: 99. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 1-28.
- Woodward, J.R. (2004). Professional football scouts: An investigation of racial stacking. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21, 356-375.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Trevor attended Mary Washington College where he received his BS in psychology in 1994. He earned an MS in business technology from Marymount University in 2001 and an MS in exercise and sport science from the University of Florida in 2003. He earned his PhD in sport management from the University of Florida in 2010.