

# Chasing Stars: Racial Tasking of Recruiting Responsibilities among Power-5 Football Coaches

Chris Corr<sup>1</sup>, Trevor Bopp<sup>2</sup>, Christopher Atwater<sup>1</sup>, Calvin Nite<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Troy University

<sup>2</sup>University of Alabama

<sup>3</sup>Texas A&M University

During the 2022 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) college football season, eight of the 65 Power-5 head coaches were Black. The racial composition of assistant coaches, however, was nearly 50% Black and 50% White. While the head coach of a Power-5 football team serves as the leader of the program, the 10 assistant coaches permitted by the NCAA oversee a variety of critical roles; the most valuable of which is recruiting. This study extends previous work by examining the racial composition of Power-5 football coaching staffs and recruiting responsibilities through the lens of racial tasking. An analysis of Power-5 football recruiting classes from 2019 and 2020 illustrates that assistant coaches are tasked with recruiting prospective athletes racially similar to themselves 58% of the time. Furthermore, Black assistant coaches are disproportionately tasked with recruiting Black recruits and higher rated recruits (i.e., five- and four-star) compared to their White counterparts. We contend such racialized responsibilities and expectations may affect opportunities for advancement among Black assistant coaches.

*Keywords:* NCAA, Power-5, recruiting, racial tasking

Among National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions, the Power-5 subdivision represents the most established and financially lucrative level of athletics competition. Such establishment and financial viability in the Power-5 is largely attributed to the sport of football. Black athletes comprise the largest racial group among Power-5 football players (46%; NCAA, 2022). Perhaps correspondingly, the Power-5 conferences also feature the largest percentage of Black football coaches (i.e., head, coordinator, assistant) of any NCAA division or subdivision. In 2022, Black coaches comprised nearly 50% of Power-5 assistant coaches; yet only 9 of the 65 Power-5 head coaches were Black (NCAA, 2022). One reason for this disproportionate representation of Black head coaches in Power-5 football



has been attributed to differentiation in *tasks* performed by assistant coaches based on their race. Turick and Bopp (2016) found that recruiting-specific tasks might devalue a coaches' perceived *football intelligence* among athletic administrators. Given that Black football coaches already face impediments to head coaching opportunities (i.e., access discrimination; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005), tasking Black coaches with disproportionate recruiting responsibilities may serve to further inhibit Black coaches' head coaching opportunities.

The Power-5 conferences represent the highest level of competition in college athletics and are composed of the most financially influential NCAA members (Broughton, 2020; NCAA, 2019). Within this setting, Power-5 football is the most prominent facet to generating revenue. As a relationship exists between winning college football games and revenue generation (Caro, 2012), Power-5 institutions place a significant emphasis on football success (Southall et al., 2005). Accordingly, the importance of successful recruiting is indicative of the emphasis placed on *winning* within the Power-5 conferences. While the entirety of a football coaching staff is involved in the recruiting process, assistant coaches are primarily responsible for recruiting (Simmons, 2020; Turick, 2018; Weathersby, 2014). Given the relationship between successful recruiting and winning (Caro, 2012; Mankin et al., 2019), assistant coaches occupy an integral role in a football program's success or failure.

Guided by extant literature examining racial tasking of NCAA football coaches (Turick & Bopp, 2016), this study examined the role of Black coaches tasked as *recruiters* in the Power-5. Given the importance of successful recruiting in relation to winning football games and maintaining a successful program, researchers sought to examine the inherent benefit(s) to Black and White assistant coaches tasked with recruiting responsibilities. Accordingly, this study proposed the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the race of the assistant coach and the players they are tasked with recruiting?
2. Is there a relationship between the race of the assistant coach and the positions (e.g., quarterback, running back, defensive line) of the players they are tasked with recruiting?
3. Is there a relationship between the race of the assistant coach and the rating (e.g., five- or four-star) of the players they are tasked with recruiting?

## Literature Review

### Racial Tasking and Race Matching

A key component of institutionalized racial discrimination is that it is not solely identified by the intentions of the institutional actors, but rather, the outcomes associated with their normalized policies and practices (Braddock, 1981). Likewise, racial tasking is not a postulate that rationalizes or detracts from the actions and behaviors of individuals but conceptualizes how stereotypical and institutionalized

thoughts and norms might influence said actions and behaviors toward the racially disparate assignment of tasks, responsibilities, and expectations (Bopp et al., 2020). The theory of assortative matching has been espoused by the field of economics promoting the consideration and quantification of factors and/or traits to determine the utility of a relationship (Becker, 1973; Hoppe et al., 2009; Mendes et al., 2010); the equilibrium of which, or match, refers to the extent that both parties complement one another and therefore, maximize their effectiveness from pairing themselves and their resources (Shimer & Smith, 2000). As they relate to this study, we are interested in the use of racial tasking and race matching to frame our examination of the potential influence of the racial homo- or heterogeneity of the assistant coach and football student-athlete as antecedents in the recruitment process, as well as the career development/hindrance of the assistant coaches.

It has been found that racially similar (re: matching) teachers can be of benefit to racially-minoritized students and “are uniquely positioned to improve [student] performance directly or indirectly, by serving as role models, mentors, advocates, or cultural translators” (Egalite et al., 2015, p. 44). Similarly, Zirkel (2002) concluded the academics and goal-orientation (and achievement) of youth were positively influenced by role-models of matching racial identity. While Blake-Beard et al.’s (2011) student participants did not experience an increase in academic outcomes when racially matched with a mentor, they did indicate it was important to them and that they received more help. The utility of applying assortative (e.g., race) matching in scholarly examinations of sport is not limited to athletic performance; it has also been employed to better understand and assess administrative decision-making and organizational relationships (Peeters et al. 2020; Yang & Goldfarb, 2015). Understanding collegiate coaches’ integral role in the interpersonal and life-skills development of their players (Banwell & Kerr, 2016; Weinberg et al., 2022), it stands to reason that race matching may prove beneficial to the resultant mentorships and performance outcomes of the coach-athlete relationship.

While racial tasking was first conceptualized to examine differentiations in *tasks* (i.e., run vs pass plays) performed by Black and White quarterbacks participating in NCAA Division I football (Bopp & Sagas, 2014), Bopp et al. (2020) defined four tenets to establish the presence of racial tasking within a given institutional field. Fundamentally, for racial tasking to exist racially dissimilar actors must occupy similar organizational positions (e.g., job titles) in which the pursuit of short-term goals is prioritized at the sake of long-term opportunities. Thereby, racial tasking is conceptually differentiated and a theoretical extension of positional segregation and racial stacking, both of which have been used to explain racial discrepancies in playing and coaching positions and career advancement in sport (Day, 2015; Hawkins, 2002; Loy & McElvogue, 1970; Siler, 2019).

In addition, the *interests* of racially dissimilar actors must be considered when individuals in similar positions are assigned differing tasks (Bopp et al., 2020). In the context of college football recruiting, the prioritization of recruiting serves a specific short-term benefit (i.e., winning football games; Caro, 2012; Mankin et al., 2021) while marginalizing long-term opportunities for coaches tabbed as recruiters (Turick

& Bopp, 2016). Such short-term emphasis on recruiting success and winning serves to the primary benefit of institutions and institutional leaders (e.g., administrators, head coaches), the vast majority of which are White men (NCAA, 2022).

### ***Coaching Staff Structure***

Within the context of a Power-5 college football coaching staff, coaches are stratified into specific roles based off coaching title. The NCAA permits Division I football coaching staffs to consist of eleven on-field coaches; one head coach and ten assistants (Johnson, 2017; NCAA, 2021). Typically, a college football coaching staff is comprised of one head coach, two coordinators, and eight position coaches. While head coaches and coordinators often serve as the figureheads of college football programs, position coaches are tasked with various recruiting responsibilities and required to be present during recruiting activities (NCAA, 2021). Position coaches' recruiting responsibilities are often determined by the position group they coach (e.g., quarterback, running back, defensive line; Kulha, 2013) and segmented into geographic regions they are assigned to recruit. While all position coaches are expected to coach their unique position group and recruit, specific *tasks* that position coaches perform related to recruiting responsibilities may illustrate the differences present intra-coaching staff among racially dissimilar coaches with similar titles.

While 53% of Power-5 football coaches are White, 73% of head coaches and coordinators (i.e., those who wield the greatest authority) are White (NCAA, 2022). While a head coach is responsible for overseeing all aspects of a football program, coordinators are tasked with directing the offense or defense (Barnett, 2019; Donovan, 2017). Fundamentally, a coordinator is the *head coach* of one of the three phases in football (e.g., offense, defense, special teams; Kilgore, 2019). Just as a head coach hires coordinators to execute their philosophy, coordinators are very involved in hiring position coaches to implement their offensive, defensive, or special teams' philosophy. In many ways, since coordinators supervise position coaches, a coordinator is an autonomous extension of a head coach (Donovan, 2017).

The job responsibilities of head coaches, coordinators, and position coaches vary, as does perceived pressure. Not surprisingly, pressure – as well as financial compensation – increases as a coach moves up the proverbial coaching ladder (Bender, 2020; Johnson, 2019). Whereas a coordinator is responsible for the entirety of an offense or defense, position coaches coach a select number of players (i.e., individual position group). Accordingly, position coaches hold less coaching responsibility and are deferential to both coordinators and the head coach concerning game-planning (Johnson, 2019). As position coaches have more limited game-planning and on-field coaching responsibilities, they assume an increased recruiting load (Simmons, 2020; Turick, 2018; Weathersby, 2014).

The NCAA states that “Recruiting is not only the lifeblood of any athletics department, but also a benefit to the entire campus” (n.d., para. 1). In this context, position coaches occupy a central *recruiting* role that has been contextualized as institutional work (Corr et al., 2020, 2022). Institutional work is characterized by institutional actors' efforts to maintain or disrupt the pervading logics of a given institutional setting (Nite & Washington, 2017). Inherently, institutional work is a

byproduct of an institutional logic(s) that dictate the operational components and behaviors within an individual setting (Jepperson, 1991). As NCAA bylaws stipulate the presence of position coaches during recruiting activities and place inordinate recruiting responsibilities on position coaches (NCAA, 2021), Power-5 football recruiting serves as a direct mechanism in which institutional work is delineated and performed by institutional actors (i.e., position coaches) (Lawrence et al., 2011). Not only is recruiting a primary responsibility of a position coach (Horne, 2013; Simmons, 2020; Weathersby, 2014), but position coaches are also expected to monitor players once enrolled (Turick, 2018). While the merits of the continued nurturement of the coach-recruit relationship upon enrollment is of note, tasking position coaches in the role of monitor may disproportionately affect their opportunities for advancement within the coaching profession as well (Turick & Bopp, 2016).

The framework of racial tasking has been utilized to explain the paucity of Black intercollegiate football head coaches and offensive coordinators (Turick & Bopp, 2016), as well as racialized discrepancies in the play (i.e., run vs. pass) of NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) quarterbacks (Bopp & Sagas, 2014). Finding that Black quarterbacks run the ball significantly more than their White counterparts, who in turn, throw the ball at a significantly higher rate, Bopp and Sagas (2014) surmised that playing and learning the position in such a manner could lead to a racialized discrepancy in development outcomes, as well as future career playing and coaching opportunities. Accordingly, we purport that racially tasked recruiting responsibilities among Power-5 football coaches may result in similarly disparate development opportunities and outcomes for Black position coaches.

Within this context illustrating the value of position coaches as recruiters, this study sought to examine if racially dissimilar position coaches occupying similar titles were *tasked* with differing recruiting responsibilities.

## Methodology

### Data

#### *Recruiting Data*

Recruiting data for both coaches and recruits were based on rankings by 247Sports. 247Sports, a subsidiary of CBS Sports, is recognized as the industry leader among high school football scouting services, primarily due to their composite ranking system (247Sports, 2012). The 247Sports Composite Ranking considers rankings from multiple online scouting services (e.g., ESPN, Scout, On3) to rank recruits. Accordingly, the 247Sports Composite Ranking mitigates some of the inherent subjectivity of scouting and evaluation. While recruiting rankings are an imperfect measurement tool, the value of a recruit can be determined based on star-rating (e.g., five-star, four-star, three-star). A recruit's star-rating is often correlated to the number of athletic scholarship offers they have received (Next College Student Athlete [NCSA], n.d.; O'Brien, 2022), indicating the competition between football programs in recruiting higher rated recruits. As a positive correlation exists between signing five- and four-star recruits and winning a national championship (Elmasry,

2017; Kercheval, 2016), signing higher rated recruits is an effective measure in determining the value of a position coach with regards to recruiting.

Based on star-rating and recruit ranking, 247Sports calculates Recruiter of the Year rankings. The Recruiter of the Year represents the coach responsible for signing the most valuable recruiting class. To calculate this ranking, 247Sports assigns differing values to coaches based on their status as either a primary or secondary recruiter for specific signees. Accordingly, the primary recruiter represents the coach most responsible for a recruits' signing and enrollment to a particular institution. The primary recruiter designation was integral to determine the recruiting responsibilities and value of position coaches.

### ***Biographical Coach Data***

Coaches' biographical variables were gathered from Power-5 athletic department online directories and media guides. Coaches were classified into three distinct groups based on title: head coach, coordinator (offensive or defensive), or position coach. Position coaches were further classified based on the position group they were primarily responsible for coaching (e.g., quarterback, wide receiver, defensive line). Additional titles (e.g., recruiting coordinator, passing-game coordinator) were gathered for descriptive purposes. Institutional athletic department images were utilized to determine racial classification of coaches while individual 247Sport recruiting profile images were utilized to determine racial classification of recruits. Given the importance of skin color and facial physiognomy to determining racial classification (Stepanova & Strube, 2012), researchers analyzed web images to determine racial classification of coaches and recruits. The researchers individually coded each coach and recruit and compared notes to establish a consensus. All coaches with characteristics determined to be outside of this binary classification ( $n=13$  Other) were removed from the analysis. In corresponding fashion, recruits designated as non-White or Black were also removed ( $n = 90$ ).

### ***Data Analysis***

Data were analyzed using a mixture of descriptive and inferential statistics. Initial results produced  $n$  counts and percentages by race for recruiting coaches, recruited players, and player positions. Crosstabs were then used to examine the distribution of coach race and player race as well as the distribution of coach race and player position (e.g., quarterback, running back, linebacker). Crosstabs were followed up by Chi-square tests used to examine the relationship between the race of the coach and the race of the player as well as the race of the coach relative to player position. Lastly, a Welch Two Sample t-test was run to explore the relationship between the coach's race and the player's 247Sports star rating (e.g., five-star, four-star).

## **Findings**

To examine the impact of racial characteristics among coaches and recruits in Power-5 football the composition of coaches and recruits from the 2019 and 2020

recruiting classes were examined. Rather than purposefully sampling, researchers chose to examine the entirety of the population of Power-5 coaches and recruits during this two-year period. In total, more than 3,000 recruits were examined along the primary variables race, position, school, conference affiliation, recruiting coach, and recruiting ranking. The aggregate data covers the entirety of recruits from the high school graduating classes of 2019 and 2020 that signed an athletics grant-in-aid (GIA) with a Power-5 football program (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Characteristics of Recruiting Coaches and Recruited Players in the Power 5: 2019-2020*

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Race of recruited player		
Black recruited player	2426	76.7
White recruited player	736	23.3
Race of recruiting coach		
Black recruiting coach	1403	44.4
White recruiting coach	1759	55.6
Position of recruited player		
Athlete	114	3.6
Defensive back	548	17.3
Defensive line	594	18.8
Linebacker	371	11.7
Offensive line	533	16.9
Quarterback	146	4.6
Running back	239	7.6
Special teams	64	2.0
Tight end	138	4.4
Wide receiver	415	13.1

### **Coach and Recruit Race**

To understand the relationship between the race of the recruiting coach and the race of the recruited player, a crosstabulation was performed. Results indicated that while Black and White recruiters across the entirety of Power-5 football are fairly evenly split when it comes to recruiting Black athletes, White recruiting coaches recruit more than 80% of White athletes (see Table 2). Further disparities are witnessed when considering that of the 1403 total athletes recruited by Black coaches, 89.7% ( $n = 1258$ ) were Black, compared to the 66.4% ( $n = 1168$ ) of the total athletes recruited by White coaches.

**Table 2**  
*Relationship of Recruiting Coach's Race and Recruited Player's Race*

Race of recruiting coach	Black recruited player		White recruited player	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Black recruiting coach	1258	51.9	145	19.7
White recruiting coach	1168	48.1	591	80.3

Based on the differences in counts and percentages between the race of the recruiting coach and the race of the recruited player, a Chi-square test was performed. Results indicated a significant relationship between the race of the recruiting coach and the race of the recruited player  $\chi^2(1, N = 3,162) = 235.32, p < .001$ .

### Position-Specific Recruiting

To understand the relationship between the race of the recruiting coach and the position (e.g., quarterback, running back, defensive back, etc.) of the recruit, a crosstabulation was performed. Results indicated that Black recruiting coaches were primarily responsible for recruiting the running back ( $n = 161, 67.4\%$ ) and defensive back ( $n = 344, 62.8\%$ ) positions while White recruiting coaches were primarily responsible for recruiting quarterbacks ( $n = 119, 81.5\%$ ) and offensive linemen ( $n = 424, 79.5\%$ ). The full results of the crosstabulation are presented in Table 3.

Based on the differences in counts and percentages between the race of the recruiting coach and the position of the recruit, a Chi-square test was performed. Results indicated a significant relationship exists between the race of the recruiting coach and the position of the recruit  $\chi^2(9, N = 3,162) = 375.26, p < .001$ . Based on the results, post hoc tests were run to determine which relationships were significant. All positions were significantly related to the race of the recruiting coach, except for Athlete ( $p = .061$ ).

### Star-Rating

Prior to examining the relationship between the race of the recruiting coach and the recruiting ranking of recruits (i.e., 247Sports *Star* Rating), the dataset was prepared by removing players who had received no recruiting ranking ( $n = 88$ ). Data was then aggregated by race of recruiting coach in relation to the recruiting ranking of recruits (see Table 4).



**Table 3**  
*Relationship between Coach's Race and Recruit's Position*

Position	Black Recruiting Coach		White Recruiting Coach	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Athlete	66	57.9	48	42.1
Defensive Back	344	62.8	204	37.2
Defensive Line	302	50.8	292	49.2
Linebacker	116	31.3	255	68.7
Offensive Line	109	20.5	424	79.5
Quarterback	27	18.5	119	81.5
Running Back	161	67.4	78	32.6
Special Teams	15	23.4	49	76.6
Tight End	39	28.3	99	71.7
Wide Receiver	224	54.0	191	46.0

**Table 4**  
*Comparison of Recruiting Rankings by Recruiting Coach's Race*

Race of Recruiting Coach	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Black Recruiting Coach	1,380	3.42	0.56
White Recruiting Coach	1,694	3.32	0.53

Based on differences in mean recruiting ranking of recruits among Black and White recruiting coaches, a Welch Two Sample t-test was run. The results were significant when examining the relationship between recruiting ranking of recruits and the race of the recruiting coach,  $t(3127) = 5.92, p < .001$ . It is important to note that the differentiation in the relationship between coach race and recruit star-rating is measured on a three-point scale (five-, four-, or three-star).

## Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate the presence of race matching and racial tasking of recruiting responsibilities among position coaches in Power-5 football. Within the 2019 and 2020 Power-5 football recruiting classes, Black coaches were disproportionately responsible for recruiting Black recruits (52%) and White coaches for recruiting White recruits (80%). Given that Black football players comprise the largest racial group in Power-5 football (NCAA, 2022), the attention of Black position coaches appears to be focused (re: tasked) on securing predominantly Black recruits. Based on previous literature identifying coaches' social effectiveness as a key component to successful recruiting (Magnusen et al., 2011, 2014; Treadway et al., 2014), dispatching coaches to recruit similar raced recruits may indeed be of strategic value. However, such strategic action may be disproportionately detrimental to Black coaches as 77% of Power-5 recruits in the classes of 2019 and 2020 were Black. This increase of recruiting responsibility may serve to marginalize Black coaches seeking to advance in the coaching profession by tabbing them as recruiters, delegitimizing their on-field coaching acumen and leadership ability (Turick & Bopp, 2016).

Furthermore, Black coaches were disproportionately responsible for recruiting position groups (see Table 3) that have been historically populated (i.e., stacked) by Black players (e.g., running back, wide receiver, defensive back) (Hawkins, 2002; Pitts & Yost, 2013; Schneider & Eitzen, 1986; Siler, 2019). Conversely, White coaches were relied on to secure recruits at the historically White position of quarterback (82%). In accordance with previous literature (Cunningham & Bopp, 2010; Turick & Bopp, 2016), the disparate recruiting responsibilities of Black and White coaches related to position-specific recruiting may serve as a hindrance to Black coaches seeking advancement in the coaching profession. That is, the centrality of White players and coaches to the decision-making and key play-calling positions (Anderson, 1993; Edwards, 1973; Grusky, 1963) might afford them opportunities to develop and hone skills that ultimately prove more beneficial to their individual development and overall success of the team.

While this study did not find that Black coaches are tasked with a greater recruiting responsibility with regards to volume of recruited players, the findings exemplify the role that Black coaches hold in recruiting higher rated players. A significant relationship between coach race and recruit star rating indicates that Black coaches are more heavily burdened with securing five- and four-star recruits). As there is a correlation between signing five- and four-star recruits and winning a national cham-

pionship in college football (Caro, 2012; Elmasry, 2017; Kercheval, 2016; Mankin et al., 2019), the value of Black coaches in recruiting higher rated players cannot be understated in the context of Power-5 football. The prioritization of revenue generation – achieved through football programmatic success (i.e., winning football games) – permeated throughout the Power-5 conferences (Nite et al., 2019; Nite & Washington, 2017; Southall & Nagel, 2009) is reinforced within the recruiting process itself given the prioritization of higher rated recruits. Within an institutional setting that places a premium on winning football games, Black coaches responsible for securing these higher rated recruits do not experience the same tangible benefits and development opportunities as White coaches with regards to advancement to coordinator or head coach. The disproportionate opportunities awarded to Black and White position coaches is evidenced by the minimal number of Black coordinators and head coaches in the Power-5.

Given the *intercentricity* of race and racism within an institutional context (Bell, 1992, 1995; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Lawrence, 1995), college football recruiting at the Power-5 level appears to be *racialized* institutional work (Corr et al., 2020, 2022; Nite et al., 2019; Nite & Washington, 2017; Southall & Weiler, 2014) in which Black coaches are relied upon to secure top-recruits for the primary benefit of predominantly White head coaches at NCAA member institutions. In addition, Black coaches provide predominantly White head coaches access to Black recruits and are disproportionately tasked to recruit similarly raced recruits. The presence and prevalence of race matching and racial tasking within the findings of this study provide an addition measure to examine the roles of Black and White coaches and the maintenance of responsibilities within the Power-5 coaching profession. The current regulatory structure (i.e., NCAA) and coaching hierarchy places the bulk of recruiting responsibilities on position coaches. As Black position coaches are disproportionately responsible for securing higher rated recruits, and Black recruits in general, predominantly White head coaches and coordinators benefit from the maintenance of present and historical distributions of coaching responsibilities. As such, access discrimination (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005) in which White head coaches are more likely to hire and promote White coordinators and position coaches may also be explained by White head coaches seeking to maintain a distribution of recruiting responsibilities that places overt value on Black coaches in their roles as position coaches (i.e., recruiters). Given that institutional actors benefitting from institutional work seek to maintain their favorable positions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Nite & Washington, 2017), such racialized hiring practices may be occurring consciously or subconsciously.

## Conclusion and Future Research

Within the context of current conference realignment, institutional actors must consider if Power-5 conference level *logics* align with that of their own. As illustrated by this study, Power-5 coaches perform institutional work that prioritizes – and places a premium on – recruiting top-rated recruits. Such work, performed dispropo-

portionately by Black position coaches, may be differentiated inter-conference. Accordingly, conference-specific examination of recruiting practices with regards to racial tasking and race matching would be valuable in determining if conference specific logics exist (e.g., SEC logic, Big Ten logic).

Furthermore, this study indicates that the racial tasking of Black position coaches as recruiters may be a function of the greater NCAA and Power-5 dominant institutional logics. Further research is needed to uncover the relationship between the prioritization of revenue generation and success in football with regards to the disproportionate opportunities for Black coaches to advance within the coaching profession. As indicated by previous scholars in the field of sport management (Frisby, 2005; Hylton, 2010; 2012; Singer, 2005; Singer et al., 2010), the authors call on the greater use of critical paradigms to uncover the role of institutional logics – and the corresponding institutional work designed to ensure maintenance of institutional logics – to examine racially disparate opportunities for advancement and outcomes in college football coaching hirings.

## References

- Anderson, D. (1993). Cultural diversity on campus: A look at intercollegiate football coaches. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 17(1), 61-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F019372359301700108>
- Banwell, J., & Kerr, G. (2016). Coaches' perspectives on their roles in the facilitating the personal development of student-athletes. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 46(1), 1-18.
- Barnett, Z. (2019, November 12). You don't have to be a coordinator to be a successful headcoach. These coaches are proof. *Football Scoop*. <https://footballscoop.com/news/you-dont-have-to-be-a-coordinator-to-be-a-successful-head-coach-these-coaches-are-proof/>
- Becker, G. S. (1973). A theory of marriage: Part 1. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(4), 813-846. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260084>
- Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Bell, D. A. (1995). Racial realism. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas(Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 302–312). The New Press.
- Bender, B. (2020, June 22). College football coaches facing hottest seats, most pressure in 2020. *Sporting News*. <https://www.sportingnews.com/us/ncaa-football/news/college-football-hot-seat-coaches-most-pressure-2020/17jh39t-dlezcb14t8ejq70phb4> <https://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/salaries/football/assistant>
- Blake-Beard, S., Bayne, M. L., Crosby, F. J., & Muller, C. B. (2011). Matching by race and gender in mentoring relationships: Keeping our eyes on the prize. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(3), 622-642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01717.x>

- Bopp, T., & Sagas, M. (2014). Racial tasking and the college quarterback: Redefining the stacking phenomenon. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28, 136-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jism.2012-0296>
- Bopp, T., Vadeboncoeur, J. D., & Turick, R. (2020). The conceptualization of racial-tasking: Uncovering the (un) intended consequences. *Sport Management Review*, 23(4), 601-614. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.08.005>
- Braddock II, J. H. (1981). Race and leadership in professional sports. A Study of institutional discrimination in the National Football League. *Arena Review*, 5(2), 16-25.
- Broughton, D. (2020, August 17). Power Five: An \$8.3 billion revenue powerhouse. *Sports Business Journal*. <https://www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/Journal/Issues/2020/08/17/Colleges/Revenue.aspx>
- Caro, C. A. (2012). College football success: The relationship between recruiting and winning. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 7(1), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1260%2F1747-9541.7.1.139>
- Corr, C., Southall, R. M., & Nagel, M. S. (2020). Southeastern Conference recruiting and the maintenance of power-5 college sport. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 13, 252-272.
- Corr, C., Atwater, C., & Hall, P. (2022). Athlete first, student second: The thematic emphasis of Power-5 official visits and fostered athletic role engulfment. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 15, 714-733.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Bopp, T. (2010). Race ideology perpetuated: Media representations of newly hired football coaches. *Journal of Sports Media*, 5(1), 1-19. <http://doi.org/10.1353/jsm.0.0048>
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2005). Access discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 29(2), 148-163. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0193723504271706>
- Day, J. C. (2015). Transitions to the top: Race, segregation, and promotions to executive positions in the college football coaching profession. *Work and Occupations*, 42(4), 408-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888415580651>
- DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26-31. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X033005026>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2000). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Temple University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Donovan, T. (2017, May 16). Why coordinators and position coaches need to communicate the same message. *USA Football*. <https://blogs.usafootball.com/blog/3577/why-coordinators-and-position-coaches-need-to-communicate-the-same-message>
- Edwards, H. (1973). *Sociology of sport*. Dorsey Press.

- Egalite, A. J., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. A. (2015). Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 45, 44-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.007>
- Elmasry, T. (2017). History shows national titles without elite recruiting over 4 years is rare. *Saturday Down South*. <https://www.saturdaydownsouth.com/sec-football/history-shows-national-titles-require-great-not-just-good-recruiting-over-4-years/>
- Frisby, W. (2005). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Critical sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 1-12. DOI: 10.1123/jsm.19.1.1
- Grusky, O. (1963). The effects of formal structure on managerial recruitment: A study of baseball organization. *Sociometry*, 26(3), 345-353. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786074>
- Hawkins, B. (2002). Is stacking dead? A case study of the stacking hypothesis at a Southeastern Conference (SEC) football program. *International Sports Journal*, 6(2), 146.
- Hoppe, H. C., Moldovanu, B., & Sela, A. (2009). The theory of assortative matching based on costly signals. *Review of Economic Studies*, 76, 253-281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2008.00517.x>
- Horne, L. (2013, April 4). Recruiting coordinators are the most underappreciated men in college football. *Bleacher Report*. <https://syndication.bleacherreport.com/amp/1592647-recruiting-coordinators-are-the-most-underappreciated-men-in-college-football.amp.html>
- Hylton, K. (2010). How a turn to critical race theory can contribute to our understanding of 'race', racism and anti-racism in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(3), 335-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1012690210371045>
- Hylton, K. (2012). Talk the talk, walk the walk: Defining critical race theory in research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 15(1), 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.638862>
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 143-163). University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, G. (2017, October 4). DI council introduces football staff size change. *NCAA.com*. <https://www.ncaa.com/news/football/article/2017-10-04/di-council-introduces-football-staff-size-change>
- Johnson, R. (2019, February 27). College football coach job titles, explained: Which one is right for you? *SBNation*. <https://www.sbnation.com/college-football/2019/2/27/18239958/coach-job-titles>
- Kercheval, B. (2016, February 2). Do top 10 recruiting classes really equal championships? *Bleacher Report*. <https://bleacherreport.com/articles/2613145-do-top-10-recruiting-classes-really-equal-championships>
- Kilgore, A. (2019, September 25). The NFL's search for the next Sean McVay has created a new role: Head coach of the defense. *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/2019/09/25/nfls-search-next-sean-mcvay-has-created-new-role-head-coach-defense/>

- Kulha, A. (2013, April 17). Assistant coaches whose recruiting skills could lead to future head coaching job. *Bleacher Report*. <https://bleacherreport.com/articles/1608197-assistant-coaches-whose-recruiting-skills-could-lead-to-future-head-coaching-job>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education?. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Lawrence, C. R. (1995). The id, the ego, and equal protection: Reckoning with unconscious racism. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, 235–257. The New Press.
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), 52-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1056492610387222>
- Loy, J. W., & McElvogue, J. F. (1970). Racial segregation in American sport. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 5, 5-23
- Magnusen, M. J., Kim, Y., Perrewé, P. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2014). A critical review and synthesis of student-athlete college choice factors: Recruiting effectiveness in NCAA sports. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 9(6), 1265-1286. <https://doi.org/10.1260%2F1747-9541.9.6.1265>
- Magnusen, M. J., Mondello, M., Kim, Y. K., & Ferris, G. R. (2011). Roles of recruiter political skill, influence strategy, and organization reputation in recruitment effectiveness in college sports. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 53(6), 687-700. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.20445>
- Mankin, J., Rivas, J., & Jewell, J. (2021). The effectiveness of college football recruiting ratings in predicting team success: A longitudinal study. *Research in Business and Economics Journal*, 14, 4-22.
- Mendes, R., van den Berg, G. J., & Lindeboom, M. (2010). An empirical assessment of assortative matching in the labor market. *Labour Economics*, 17(6), 919-929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2010.05.001>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (n.d.). Recruiting (Article 13). *NCAA*. <http://www.ncaa.org/recruiting-article-13>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2019). 15-year trends in Division I athletics finances. *NCAA Research*. [https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/Finances/2020RES\\_D1-RevExp\\_Report.pdf](https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/Finances/2020RES_D1-RevExp_Report.pdf)
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2021). NCAA 2021-2022 Division I manual. *NCAA*. <https://web3.ncaa.org/lsdbi/reports/getReport/90008>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2022). NCAA demographics database. <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/ncaa-demographics-database>
- Next College Student Athlete. (n.d.). Football recruiting rankings. *NCSA*. <https://www.ncsasports.org/articles-1/football-recruiting-rankings>
- Nite, C., & Washington, M. (2017). Institutional adaptation to technological innovation: Lessons from the NCAA's regulation of football television broadcasts (1938–1984). *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(6), 575-590. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2017-0159>



- Nite, C., Ige, A., & Washington, M. (2019). The evolving institutional work of the National Collegiate Athletic Association to maintain dominance in a fragmented field. *Sport Management Review*, 22(3), 379-394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2018.05.002>
- O'Brien, E. (2022, February 21). CFB scout on how football recruits can earn stars. *GMTM*. <https://gmtm.com>
- Peeters, T. L. P. R., Salaga, S., & Juravich, M. (2020). Matching and winning? The impact of upper and middle managers on firm performance in Major League Baseball. *Management Science* 66(6), 2735-2751. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2019.3323>
- Pitts, J. D., & Yost, D. M. (2013). Racial position segregation in intercollegiate football: Do players become more racially segregated as they transition from high school to college? *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 40(2), 207-230. <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs12114-012-9149-z>
- Shimer, R., & Smith, L. (2000). Assortative matching and search. *Econometrics*, 68(2), 343-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00112>
- Siler, K.. (2019). Pipelines on the gridiron: Player backgrounds, opportunity structures and racial stratification in American college football. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 36(1), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2017-0125>
- Simmons, B. (2020, February 12). College football recruiting: Ranking the top 10 recruiters that hauled in the class of 2020. *CBS Sports*. <https://www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/college-football-recruiting-ranking-the-top-10-recruiters-that-hauled-in-the-class-of-2020/amp/>
- Singer, J. N. (2005). Addressing epistemological racism in sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(4), 464-479. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.19.4.464>
- Singer, J. N., Harrison, C. K., & Bukstein, S. J. (2010). A critical race analysis of the hiring process for head coaches in NCAA college football. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 3(2), 270-296. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.3.2.270>
- Snyder, E. E. (1985). A theoretical analysis of academic and athletic roles. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2(3), 210-217. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2.3.210>
- Southall, R. M., & Nagel, M. S. (2009, December 17). Big-time college sport's contested terrain: Jock capitalism, educational values, and social good. *Human Kinetics Sport Management News*. <https://us.humankinetics.com/blogs/articles/big-time-college-sports-contested-terrain-jock-capitalism-educational-values-and-social-good>
- Southall, R. M., & Weiler, J. D. (2014). NCAA Division-I athletic departments: 21<sup>st</sup> century athletic company towns. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 7, 161-186.
- Southall, R. M., Wells, D. E., & Nagel, M. S. (2005). Organizational culture perceptions of intercollegiate athletic department members. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 20, 65-93.
- Stefanova, E. V., & Strube, M. J. (2012). The role of skin color and facial physiognomy in racial categorization: Moderation by implicit racial attitudes. *Journal*



- of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 867-878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.019>
- Treadway, D. C., Adams, G., Hanes, T. J., Perrewé, P. L., Magnusen, M. J., & Ferris, G. R. (2014). The roles of recruiter political skill and performance resource leveraging in NCAA football recruitment effectiveness. *Journal of Management*, 40(6), 1607-1626. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206312441836>
- Turick, R. (2018). *Persistence in the face of career obstacles: The coaching experiences of African American college football coaches*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida).
- Turick, R., & Bopp, T. (2016). A current analysis of black head football coaches and offensive coordinators at the NCAA DI-FBS level. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 9, 282-302. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2016-0012> 247Sports. (2012, July 20). 247Sports rating explanation. *247Sports*. <https://247sports.com/Article/247Sports-Rating-Explanation-81574/>
- Weathersby, E. (2014, March 6). Power ranking the 10 best recruiting coordinators in college football. *Bleacher Report*. <https://bleacherreport.com/articles/1984028-power-ranking-the-10-best-recruiting-coordinators-in-college-football>
- Weinberg, R., Freysinger, V., Vealey, R., & Block, C. (2022) What does it mean to be “mentally tough” as a NCAA division I collegiate coach? *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 34(2), 342-362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2020.1791277>
- Yang, Y., & Goldfarb, A. (2015). Banning controversial sponsors: Understanding equilibrium outcomes when sports sponsorships are viewed as two-sided matches. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(5), 593-615. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmr.14.0225>
- Zirkel, S. (2002). Is there a place for me? Role models and academic identity among White students and students of color. *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 357-376. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-9620.00166>