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INTRODUCTION

Emerging from the constraints of segregation and institutionalized forms of racism, African Americans have excelled in many areas of sport. Consider, for instance, the dominance of African American players. Once denied participation opportunities at major universities and in professional leagues,¹ they now constitute a majority of the players in the National Basketball Association (“NBA”) (77 percent) and National Football League (“NFL”) (67 percent),² while also representing a significant percentage of athletes in the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (“NCAA”) revenue-generating sports of football (34 percent), women’s basketball (31 percent), and men’s basketball (44 percent).³ These advances are also seen off the field, where according to Sports Illustrated, African Americans represented six of the top ten highest paid American
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2. Id. at 9–10.

professional athletes in 2010. The players' incomes are based on both salaries and endorsement revenues, the latter of which frequently topped $15 million in annual earnings. Thus, while I do not wish to dismiss or in any way trivialize the exploitation and prejudice African American athletes still experience today, these data do illustrate the many opportunities and advances athletes of color have made as sport participants.

On the other hand, African American coaches and administrators have made comparatively few inroads in the sport setting. As illustrated in *Diversity in Sport Organizations*, coaches of color are under-represented in every major context. This pattern is evident for both head coaches and their assistants. The same is true for senior administrators: across professional and inter-collegiate ranks, Whites (who are overwhelmingly men) hold more positions (between 77 and 93 percent) than would be expected based on their proportion in the U.S. population (64.7 percent).

Not only do African Americans experience access discrimination, but there is also growing evidence of occupational segregation. This form of discrimination occurs when “individuals of various racial/ethnic backgrounds are disproportionately represented in various occupational groupings.” For instance, examination of U.S. Census Bureau data shows that, across all occupations, Whites are 31.1 percent more likely than African Americans to hold a managerial position. Similar trends are observed in intercollegiate athletics. According to Erin Zgonc, Assistant Director of Research for the NCAA, African Americans
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represent 9.2 percent of all athletic directors, while they comprise 20.4 percent of all persons in academic support services. The differences are even more pronounced when excluding Historically Black Colleges and Universities ("HBCUs"), as African Americans are exponentially more likely to be in academic support services (16.7 percent) relative to holding the position of athletic director (4.0 percent), associate athletic director (7.9 percent), assistant athletic director (6.7 percent), or business manager (6.4 percent). These differences become even more meaningful when considering that opportunities for career advancement (i.e., becoming an athletic director) are truncated for persons in academic support services.

The purpose of this Article is to explore this issue in further depth by offering a rationale for why this form of occupational segregation occurs. Specifically, in adopting a multilevel perspective, I argue that macro-level, meso-level, and micro-level forces all contribute to the occupational segregation of African Americans. Below, I provide an outline of each of these forces, as well as an illustrative summary in Figure 2.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In explaining the occupational segregation of African American athletic administrators, I adopt a multilevel perspective, which holds that influences from various levels are likely to affect a given organizational phenomenon. This recognition is important because a focus on any one level of analysis necessarily neglects the influences from other levels. I specifically concentrate on factors at three levels of analysis: the macro-level, where the emphasis is on societal and sport industry norms and practices; the meso-level, which highlights organizational practices and top
decision makers; and the micro-level, where attention is on individuals and the choices they make.15 And, while I present each factor individually, I recognize the interaction among factors at all three levels—a position consistent with the systems approach and illustrated in Figure 2.

MACRO-LEVEL FACTORS

I argue that two primary macro-level factors contribute to the occupational segregation of African American athletic administrators: institutional racism and isomorphic pressures.

Institutional racism. Both systemic racism theory16 and critical race theory17 suggest that racism is deeply rooted in society, engrained into the social institutions, culture, and laws. Sport, as one of the major institutions in the United States, has not escaped racism’s grasp. This prejudice serves to cast Whites as the ideal standard to which others are compared while simultaneously categorizing African Americans as “others.”18 At the same time, racial stereotypes have been developed, legitimated, and maintained. These stereotypes depict Whites as “natural” leaders with superior intellectual ability while portraying African Americans as possessing “natural” athletic skills, but as intellectually deficient.19 This prevailing racial ideology is conveyed through sports media, language, and socialization.20

Institutional racism also influences the opportunities African Americans have in sport. For instance, a study by researchers Allen Sack, Parbudyal Singh, and Robert Thiel found that even after accounting for physical ability, African Americans
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were more likely to play in peripheral positions that lacked key decision-making duties. Researchers have also observed these trends among coaches and administrators. Furthermore, the article, *The Prevalence of Occupational Segregation in Athletic Administrative Positions*, by Jacqueline McDowell and I, is of particular interest here, as the studies presented in the article focused on persons in athletic support services. In both of the studies, participants specifically identified racial discrimination as a key factor contributing to African Americans holding tangential administrative positions. Collectively, these findings strongly suggest that institutional racism contributes to the prevalence of occupational segregation.

**Isomorphic pressures.** The second macro-level factor focuses on influences from athletic departments’ institutional environments. From an institutional theory perspective, various forces in the external environment constrain the choices managers make and the forms organizations take, resulting in those entities coming to resemble one another. This process is known as isomorphism. The first of these forces is coercive in nature and is observed when external agencies or laws dictate (implicitly or explicitly) an organization’s activities. The second pressure is normative in nature and comes about because of similarities in managers’ backgrounds, degrees, and sources of information. Finally, mimetic pressures occur when
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organizations copy or take on the forms of other organizations perceived to be more successful.\textsuperscript{30}

In drawing from institutional theory, I argue that both normative and mimetic pressures contribute to the occupational segregation of African American administrators. Athletic directors and other personnel decision-makers are a largely homogeneous group, as they have similar educational training and work experiences,\textsuperscript{31} attend the same professional conferences, and engage in largely the same activities.\textsuperscript{32} These normative pressures are likely to shape their beliefs about personnel decisions, including who should oversee academic support services. Similarly, mimetic pressures are also likely present, such that athletic departments mimic and follow the practices of other departments. Both of these pressures might serve to place African Americans in some areas (such as academic support services), but not others, thereby producing an occupational segregation effect.

**Meso-Level Factors**

Meso-level factors, or those operating at the organizational level of analysis, are also likely to influence the occupational segregation of African American administrators. I outline two such factors here: leadership categorization and diversity mindset.

*Leadership categorization.* According to leadership categorization theory, people have developed stereotypes about the characteristics of leaders and who encompasses those traits.\textsuperscript{33} They then engage in recognition-based processes whereby they use these beliefs to contrast potential leaders with the prototypes they have developed.\textsuperscript{34} A match between the potential leader and leadership characteristics results in positive attitudes toward and evaluations of the applicant.\textsuperscript{35}
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Leadership categorization influences the current analysis, as Whiteness and leadership ability are closely linked together. Furthermore, even when considering different leadership possibilities, people are more likely to associate Whites with central, power-holding positions and African Americans with more peripheral leadership roles. In the case of athletics administration, this means that African Americans are likely to be perceived as better suited for positions such as academic advisor rather than more central roles, such as business manager or associate athletic director. These perceptions are based on the historical precedent of whom people have seen in these jobs and who is considered most capable of handling certain situations. Thus, the leadership categorization process shapes people’s perceptions about who can and who cannot hold particular athletic administration positions and ultimately contributes to occupational segregation.

Diversity mindset. An athletic department’s diversity mindset, or the prevailing beliefs about the merits and influence of diversity, should also influence the prevalence of occupational segregation. Researchers have shown that most NCAA athletic departments fail to fully embrace the value diversity can bring and will only engage in diversity-related efforts required of them by university, state, or federal mandates. This perspective is consistent with what Harvard Business School professors Robin Ely and David Thomas have termed a discrimination and fairness perspective toward diversity. On the other hand, other athletic departments, albeit fewer in number, adopt a more inclusive diversity belief system, seeing differences among people as a source of learning and competitive advantage. This is what Ely and Thomas have termed an integration and learning
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perspective. Ceteris paribus, African Americans would likely have greater access to key leadership positions and experience less discrimination in athletic departments with a more progressive and inclusive diversity mindset.

Despite this general trend, it is also possible that African Americans would be over-represented in academic support services even in an athletic department that valued diversity. Recent research suggests that some athletic departments seek a racially diverse workforce because doing so is believed to help them attract African American athletes. For instance, in my earlier qualitative analysis, one administrator indicated that “[b]y having a more diverse staff, we are better able to mentor our diverse student-athlete population.” In another of my studies, conducted with Jacqueline McDowell and John Singer, this point was further illustrated in our interviews with athletic academic advisors. The advisors in our study “expressed that the racial minorities sometimes were placed in a ‘dog and pony show’ or ‘paraded out.’” In fact, in one example from the study, athletic department officials flew an African American advisor to campus, prior to his start date, so that he could assist with the recruiting visit of an African American athlete. These findings suggest that even with a seemingly progressive diversity mindset, athletic departments might value African Americans principally for their ability to relate to and help recruit racial minority athletes. Outside of coaches and recruiting coordinators, the persons in most contact with the athlete are the academic support staff. Thus, athletic administrators might intentionally seek administrators of color for these positions in order to improve their athlete recruiting and retention efforts.

**Micro-Level Factors**

In addition to the macro- and meso-level factors, micro-level factors, or those factors which specifically relate to African
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American athletic administrators, also contribute to occupational segregation. In discussing the impact of individual differences, it is important to note one theoretical explanation that has continually not received support: human capital theory. From this perspective, racial differences in career attainment are a function of corresponding differences in knowledge, skills, and abilities.\textsuperscript{47} Across multiple studies focusing on various sport roles, such as athletes,\textsuperscript{48} coaches,\textsuperscript{49} and athletic administrators,\textsuperscript{50} researchers have shown that such explanations do not hold merit. Thus, occupational segregation is not due to deficiencies in African Americans’ knowledge, skills, and abilities. While human capital does not help explain occupational segregation, two other factors might: social capital and vocational interests.

\textit{Social capital}. From a social capital theory perspective, the size and strength of one’s social network is likely to influence her or his career success.\textsuperscript{51} This rationale is consistent with the notion that “it is not what you know, but who you know” that allows for career advancement. When people possess strong social networks, they have access to information, people speak on their behalf, and they benefit from mentoring functions. Without such connections, administrators might not be aware of job openings, have others in the profession support their efforts for promotion, or be a part of the informal conversations oftentimes so pivotal in securing a powerful position. A number of researchers have pointed to the importance of social networks in achieving career success, both for coaches\textsuperscript{52} and administrators.\textsuperscript{53}

The primacy of social networks is further accentuated when considering the interactive effects of race. Specifically, the
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segregation between African American and White workers, coupled with the predominance of Whites in leadership positions, serves to create what Duke University Sociology Professor Eduardo Bonilla-Silva termed a “white habitus.” In this type of social network, Whites form racially homogeneous ties to promote racial solidarity and ensure that their “whiteness” remains the power standard. McDowell, Singer, and I demonstrated these effects in our qualitative analysis: when managers relied on formal recruitment methods, such as public notice, a racially diverse group of administrators were selected for the openings; however, when managers relied on informal recruiting practices and their social networks to select athletic administrators, predominantly White administrators were selected. These findings suggest that African Americans and Whites have different types of social capital and these differences might explain variations in access to key leadership positions within athletics administration.

Vocational interests. Finally, vocational interests might explain the over-representation of African Americans in academic support services. Our previous qualitative analysis suggests that, for some African Americans, their primary vocational interest resides in working in academic support services, and they do not desire to move into other areas of athletic administration.

There are two potential reasons for this trend, the first of which is the desire to remain working closely with student-athletes. One academic advisor in our study commented on why he chose his profession:

[I enjoy w]orking with student athletes in general, because I remember when I was in school, I wasn’t a 3.0 student or anything like that. I was a student that could have benefited from a lot of the services that are offered in this particular profession that we do. . . . And so from my experience of being a student athlete, I realize that I could have benefited from having someone similar to myself. And so I
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think that's also why I like it—to keep student-athletes pointed in the right direction.\footnote{Id. at 440.}

Indeed, given that many persons working in academic support services were once athletes, these connections are understandable. This linkage is also not lost on senior level administrators, some of whom have argued that African Americans working in academic support services do not seek higher-level positions because of their desire to maintain contact with athletes.\footnote{Id.} These arguments seemingly point the finger at African Americans themselves when seeking explanations for occupational segregation.

Social cognitive career theory provides an alternative explanation for these findings. From this theoretical perspective, people’s career choices are shaped by a host of factors, including: self-efficacy, expected outcomes from the work put in, and perceived barriers and supports in that particular line of work.\footnote{Robert W. Lent, Steven D. Brown & Gail Hackett, *Toward a Unifying Social Cognitive Theory of Career and Academic Interest, Choice, and Performance*, 45 J. VOCATIONAL BEHAV. 79, 93–94 (1994).} Of particular interest is the role of barriers in shaping administrators’ vocational interests; here researchers have demonstrated that people are unlikely to pursue a particular career if they anticipate considerable barriers or limited advancement opportunities.\footnote{Robert W. Lent, Steven D. Brown & Gail Hackett, *Contextual Supports and Barriers to Career Choice*, 47 J. COUNSELING PSYCHOL. 36, 46 (2000); Lent et al., *Relation of Contextual Supports and Barriers to Choice Behavior in Engineering Majors*, 50 J. COUNSELING PSYCHOL. 458, 462–64 (2003).} These dynamics are also likely at work in how athletic administrations have become segregated. Research suggests that racial minorities are keenly aware of the social injustices and oppression they may face in the professions which they might enter,\footnote{See George B. Cunningham & John N. Singer, “You’ll Face Discrimination Wherever You Go”: Student Athletes’ Intentions to Enter the Coaching Profession, 40 J. APPLIED SOC. PSYCHOL. 1708, 1720 (2010) (providing personal testimony of minority employees).} and this landscape has the potential to shape their vocational choices. In the current analysis, seeing that an African American is almost three times more likely to be in academic support services than business management, for example, provides feedback about where opportunities for
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minorities *are* and where opportunities *are not*. These perceived opportunities not only influence one’s immediate interests, but also her or his aspirations, my previous research with McDowell and Singer suggests.

**CONCLUSION**

Though African Americans have made many strides in sport, there are still cases of prejudice and discrimination. One of the most prevalent is the occupational segregation of players, coaches, and administrators—a practice that casts African Americans to the periphery and restricts their access to key leadership positions. The purpose of this theoretical Article was to develop a multilevel explanation for why this occurs. In all, I suggested that societal norms and industry-level trends (e.g., institutional racism and isomorphic pressures), organizational practices (e.g., leadership categorization and diversity mindset), and individual agency (e.g., social capital and vocational interests) all contribute to African Americans being more likely to hold jobs at the periphery rather than in key decision-making areas.

The framework also has several implications. As I have argued elsewhere, “[F]rom a multilevel, systems perspective . . . change efforts cannot focus on a single level, but instead, need to recognize and take into account the intersectionality of macro-, meso-, and micro-level factors.” Thus, organizations such as the NCAA, the Black Coaches and Administrators (also known as the BCA), or progressively-minded athletic departments cannot have a singular focus, such as providing networking opportunities for athletic administrators (i.e., micro-level strategies); instead, they need to couple these efforts with tactics focused on changing organizational activities (i.e., meso-level strategies) and industry norms related to hiring (i.e., macro-level strategies).
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Of course, strategies for change can also come from the administrators themselves, representing a bottom-up approach. However, compared to their counterparts in the 1960s and 1970s, African Americans working in sports today are unlikely to engage in protests or other mobilization efforts.65 This does not mean, though, that such efforts do not exist. African American athletes, such as Etan Thomas66 and Craig Hodges,67 and coaches, such as John Thompson,68 have taken stands against social injustices, some of which directly affected the sport industry and others which had a broader focus. Administrators can engage in similar efforts to bring attention to and help eradicate the occupational segregation so prevalent in athletics departments today.

Though the prospects for effectuating change seem daunting at times, change is possible. However, it will take concerted, systematic efforts to transform sport and athletics administration into a place where all persons, irrespective of their individual backgrounds and characteristics, have access to jobs and the possibility for advancement. Such endeavors are necessary not only to ensure equal opportunity for African American athletic administrators, but to ensure that sport is characterized by diversity and inclusion.


66. POWELL, supra note 65, at 32 (noting that Etan Thomas protested presidential policies, spoke at an antiwar rally, and published a book of poetry).

67. Id. at 37 (noting that Craig Hodges spoke out against racism, preached self-help to black communities, and presented the President with a list of social grievances).

68. Id. at 221 (noting that John Thompson opened the door wider for African American coaches when his Georgetown University team won an NCAA national basketball championship).
Figure 1: Representation of African Americans in Intercollegiate Athletics Administration.  
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Figure 2: Multi-Level Explanation of the Occupational Segregation of African Americans in Intercollegiate Athletics Administration.
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