

Race and Class Exploitation: A Study of Black Male Student Athletes (BSAS) on White Campuses

Author(s): Komanduri S. Murty, Julian B. Roebuck, Jimmy D. McCamey and Jr.

Source: *Race, Gender & Class*, Vol. 21, No. 3/4, RGC Intersectionality, Race, Gender, Class, Health, Justice Issues (2014), pp. 156-173

Published by: Jean Ait Belkhir, *Race, Gender & Class Journal*

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43496990>

Accessed: 13-01-2019 18:32 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Jean Ait Belkhir, Race, Gender & Class Journal is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Race, Gender & Class*

Race, Gender & Class: Volume 21, Number 3-4, 2014 (156-173)

Race, Gender & Class Website: www.rgc.uno.edu

RACE AND CLASS EXPLOITATION: A STUDY OF BLACK MALE STUDENT ATHLETES (BSAs) ON WHITE CAMPUSES

Komanduri S. Murty

Fort Valley State University

Julian B. Roebuck

Clark Atlanta University

Jimmy D. McCamey, Jr.

Fort Valley State University

Abstract: The types of exploitation we found and analyzed in this study existed within NCAA governing body and white power structure, whereby all rules and regulations were officially applied to white and black student athletes alike, despite the fact that well over one-half of football and basketball players in NCAA Division I colleges and universities were black and a majority of them were from low socioeconomic family background. Our study findings as well as those in the sports research literature indicate that many BSAs tend to be the victims of race and class exploitation of different kinds: (1) The commercialization and overemphasis of college sports; (2) Racial and class stereotyping and profiling practices; (3) Economic Exploitation; (4) Academic exploitation; (5) Campus Social Isolation; and, (6) Exploitative work place. This study examines each of these types in detail.

Keywords: NCAA; black male student athletes; exploitation; contact sports; sports literature; commercialization of sports; exploitative work place

Komanduri S. Murty is a Professor of Sociology and Chair of the Department of Behavioral Science at Fort Valley State University. He is the author or co-author of five books; over 60 book chapters and articles which have appeared in numerous books and journals, including *Applied Demography* and *Public Health, Crime and Criminal Justice in Disaster, Opportunities and Challenges for Applied Demography in 21st Century, Black America: A State by State*

Encyclopedia, Encyclopedia of American Prisons, Encyclopedia of Anthropology, Encyclopedia of Great Black Migration, Intimate Violence, Criminal Justice Review, The Status of Black Atlanta, Studies in Symbolic Interactionism, Deviant Behavior, International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, Journal of Police Science Administration, Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Victimology; and, presented more than 90 articles at professional meetings—nationally and internationally. He received the 2005 Aldridge McMillan award for Outstanding Overall Achievement at Clark Atlanta University. He was the U.G.C. Visiting Professor of Criminal Justice at Andhra University, India, in 1996. He is a skilled evaluation professional for several criminal justice and international programs.

Address: Department of Behavioral Sciences, Fort Valley State University, 1005 State University Dr., Fort Valley, Georgia 31030. Ph.: (478) 825-6624, Fax: (478) 825-6161, Email: murtyk@fvsu.edu or kmurty2@yahoo.com

Julian B. Roebuck is a retired Professor of Criminal Justice from Clark Atlanta University. He also taught at the University of North Alabama, the University of Maryland, San Jose State University, Arkansas State University, the University of Texas at El Paso, and Mississippi State University. The founding president of the Mid-South Sociological Society, he authored or coauthored several books and numerous journal articles and research reports on various topics including but not limited to deviance, corruption, corrections, and race relations.

Address: 9243 Seminole Road, Jonesboro, Georgia 30236. Ph: (770) 477-8149, Fax: (678)-615-3370, Email: kmurty2@yahoo.com

Jimmy D. McCamey, Jr. is an Associate Professor in the Graduate Counseling Department at Fort Valley State University. Apart from teaching, he has about twenty years experience in clinical practice, mental health counseling, clinical social work services, assessment and treatment of children, adolescents and adults. His publications focused on issues such as adolescent sexual offenders, diversity, and African-American Males. His research interests include minority political participation, mental health assessment, adolescent sexual offenders, adult mental illness, poverty and African-American issues.

Address: Department of Behavioral Sciences, Fort Valley State University, 1005 State University Dr., Fort Valley, Georgia 31030. Ph.: (478) 825-6232, Fax: (478)-825-6161, Email: mccameyj@fvsu.edu

The scholarly sports literature from 1965 through 2013 is replete with a history and analysis of the exploitations that black student athletes experience on PWCs along with plausible racial and social-class theories underlying extensive research findings on this subject. This is evidenced and demonstrated in W. Njororai's recent seminal article entitled "Challenges of Being a Black Student Athlete on U.S. College Campuses," published in the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Journal* (2012), wherein he utilizes, for example, the Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Student Inventory

Theory (SIT) to analyze the macro and micro challenges and exploitations that black student athletes face on U.S. predominantly white campuses. We postulate that interactions between these two levels of challenges result in different kinds of exploitation within a dynamic process. The review of the literature from 1965 to 2013 discloses that the content encompassed in the definitions of black student athletes' exploitations, and the findings thereto on this subject are frequently mixed in with other significant data and topics on student athletes' race and class. Therefore, from an outline literature review along with observations and interview data from numerous BSAs, we analyze the major kinds of exploitation experienced by BSAs on white campuses within the time frame of the 1960s to 2010. All three of our data sources are guided and organized within a hypothetical five-point processional framework, grounded in a legacy of racial and social-class ideology enmeshed within a linked process—from the beginning of a student player's athletic career to its end (see Gatmen, 2012; Meggyesy, 2000; Njororai, 2012; Singer, 2005a; Singer, 2005b, 2008; Walton & Butryn, 2006): (1) Commercialization and overemphasis of college and university football and basketball sports; (2) Racial and class stereotyping and profiling practices; (3) Economic exploitation; (4) Academic exploitation; and, (5) Exploitative work place. This constructed paradigm, in essence, helps one understand how the interplay between macro and micro elements allows a dominant group (white power structure) take advantage of the strengths and talents of a minority group (by race and class) through and by exploitation.

Methodology

The objective of this study is to analyze race and class exploitation of BSAs on predominantly white campuses within the time frame from the 1960s through 2010: (a) as depicted and analyzed in the scholarly sports research literature (1965-2013); (b) recorded interview data we elicited and abstracted from black and white student athlete football and basketball players; and, (c) our observations of and interactions with these student athletes (1960-2010). Data collection covered the campuses we collectively taught over the 50 years—one in middle Atlantic state universities, one in west coast state universities, four in the southeast state universities, one in southwest state universities; and, two Historically Black Colleges and Universities located in the southeast. Four universities afford intercollegiate football and basketball teams and engaged in big-time play seasons.

Definitions, Rules, and the White Power Structure

Exploitation herein designates the stereotyping, discrimination, unjust treatment, and use of the BSA for ulterior self-serving motives and purposes. Whether he

is naturally better suited physically and/or temperamentally than whites for football or basketball prowess, as many have claimed, is not the issue here, the notion is. Under NCAA rules: (1) it nor its member institutions must not use student athletes for revenue generation without adequately compensating them for their services; (2) must promote and provide for the academic excellence and positive development of all students under its jurisdiction; (3) no student athlete must be recruited primarily for athletic ability (paraphrased). The NCAA, the primary governing body of college sports, is dominated by approximately fifty Division IA “power schools” whose athletic departments field the best college football and men’s basketball teams, and are profit centers for their universities based on their highly successful sports programs; that is, winning games played against other power teams. We focus here on the major kinds of exploitation that exist on the 50 or more power team campuses, and on the additional 50 or more teams that ape them (see Davis, 1996; Branch, 2011; Gatmen, 2012; Hinkel, 2011; Meggyesy, 2000; Njororai, 2012).

This research project centers on the exploitation of BSAs on white campuses that emphasize the production of big-time winning and tournament-type teams in intercollegiate competition (Meggyesy, 2000). The wide range of this phenomenon is imposed by a white power structure, which includes an enmeshment of a web of institutions (within the white and African American communities); e.g., high schools, colleges and universities (along with their administrators, coaches, athletic departments, alumni fans, boosters and recruiters), sectional athletic conferences, national football and basketball professional leagues and owners, the media, NCAA officials, sports writers, business corporations, general public etc. (see Branch, 2011; Daniels, 2010; Gatmen, 2012; JBHE, 2005; Njororai, 2012). Specifically we focus on the major kinds of exploitation as practiced by academic administrators, staff, coaches and athletic department staff, professors, and members of the student body and the NCAA (Bateman, 2011; Davis, 1996; Njororai, 2012).

Major Kinds of Academic Exploitation

(1) The Commercialization and Overemphasis of College Sports (the cradle of all exploitations)

Ever since the mid-1970s, revenue-providing college sports has exploded in football and basketball. For example, NCCA member school sports revenues have increased 8000% since 1976 and NCAA revenues went from \$16.6 million in 1977-78 to \$267 million in 1997-98. Football and basketball programs are now collectively, a multi-million dollar sports entertainment enterprise in which coaches' income (salaries and TV advertisements, etc.) at NCAA Division 1A colleges and universities average \$950,000, and at the highest income level for coaches reaching a salary of \$4 million (or above). TV contracts and multimillion dollar product endorsements have triggered the hidden agendas of

some of these institutions, which often leads to the exploitation of student athletes, many of whom are black males (Bateman, 2011; Gatmen, 2012). With so many people paying for tickets and watching football and basketball on television, these two sports have become very big businesses. Five or six of these big time schools each earn between \$40 to \$50 million, even after paying coaches multimillion dollars (Branch, 2011; Njororai, 2012).

De-emphasis of academic needs

Some studies show that most college and university athletic departments in the U.S. are a net drain on school budgets, and operate in the red. Only a few schools that play big time football and basketball games are exceptions. And most of the time because of the costs of other sports in most institutions, more than outweigh the net gain from football and basketball; and, the losses thereof can be huge even before big variables such as coaches' salaries and aid to student athletes and recruiting (Hinkle, 2011).

Many U.S. universities claim to be hard up for money, despite the fact that tuition costs for students increase each year. Some governors are currently reducing funding for higher education; and tenured faculty at some institutions could lose jobs, and entire departments could be closed at others should the expense of athletic departments continue. Nevertheless, on many campuses spending on intercollegiate athletics is growing even though sports programs at some institutions roll up millions of dollars a year in annual deficits. This means that many public universities are choosing to use tuition and tax dollars to subsidize big time college sports over spending for classroom instruction purposes (Splitt, 2011). Some citizens have questioned the cost of NCAA division I sports programs, but local business interests, members of governor's boards, high level government officials, affluent boosters, alumni, influential NCAA officials, and their counterparts at sister NCAA colleges and universities continue to support the sports programs. Despite media attention on this subject, scholarly sports journal articles, popular magazine articles, the knowledge of academic administrators, NCAA officials, governors, and the U.S. Department of Education, little of anything has been done to correct the exorbitant spending on college and some university sports programs; or, preventing it from public scrutiny by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Absent governmental intervention, the lure of athletic fame and fortune mania; and, entertainment and athletic cultural values, "the athletic tail will wag the academic dog" (Splitt, 2011).

The special case of the BSAs

BSAs are extremely impacted by academic exploitations of all kinds because they are the most heavily recruited race in college sports; especially in their participation in football and basketball (Gatmen, 2012). The black student athlete shares with his white counterpart some of the academic exploitations ("collateral damages") resulting from the overemphasis and commercialization of intercollegiate sports, particularly football and basketball (see Kihl et al., 2008, Lumpkin, 2008). However, he faces greater challenges and exploitations.

His very creation and attendant academic exploitation on white campuses inheres in the nexus of big-time intercollegiate sport, racial ideology, and discrimination. The prevailing ideology is that dark skinned people excel in particular sports because of innate abilities (Walton & Butryn, 2006). Blacks supposedly are more athletic and skilful for example in field sports and track than whites, but the negative corollary to this is they are at the same time more intellectually deficient than whites (Coakley, 2009).

The commercialization of intercollegiate sport accompanied by intense competition has engendered pressure on academic institutions that overemphasize athletes to push their prejudices aside and recruit the best players available. And there has existed, and now exist, large pools of talented black youth who are anxious to be recruited to play football and basketball. Further the black youth's perceived choices of other than athletic occupational avenues have been and are limited. Racial ideology, the view that blacks are better at athletics than whites, provides entry of many BSAs to college, while at the same time preserving white men's status of supremacy (Bell, 1992). According to NCAA records, blacks made up 10 percent of the student body in Division I universities in 2009; 21 percent of college athletes; 46 percent of football players; 60 percent of men basketball players with athletic scholarships; 70 percent of all black men athletes who play football and basketball, in the top two earning programs (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2009).

This high proportion of student athletes among black college students gives the impression that black males are super athletes, who go to college to play sports, yet 9 out of 10 black men between 18-23 years of age who attend college do not have athletic scholarships (Coakley, 2009). Frequently, many of them come from low economic ladder and only a few come from middle class background.

(2) Racial and Class Stereotyping and Profiling Practices

White academic administrators, coaches and their staff members, fans, boosters, recruiters, members of the white student body, the general public, black community members, and black high school and college administrators as well as black and white football and basketball high school players themselves, think and verbally express their views that black high school students are innately superior physically and/or temperamentally to white high school students in whatever it takes to excel in contact sports—football and basketball in particular (Davis, 1996; Gatmen, 2012; Lapchick, 2006; Njororai, 2012). As one disgruntled middle-class white football student athlete put it to one of us after class one day when discussing his football career in high school and university: “Neither football nor basketball is worth it ... too much grind and time. Let the blacks have it, they're better at it anyway than we are.” As another white basketball student athlete reported to one of us on another day: “They [blacks] are too good, and they got both of them anyway, so why bother. And they are in a different class than us.”

The gifted black athlete is a success symbol in poor black communities, where many, if not most, grow up; and he is frequently pushed into football and basketball sports as a high school youth by his parents, friends, coaches, and associates who think that success in these sports will provide a free and easy access to college, and later the pros where he can get rich. Academic learning to him (as learned from parents and black community members) is a remote white thing. And he is better at athletics (he believes) than whites anyway. Further he sees very few successful role models in occupations other than sports in his economically depressed neighborhood. The pathway to success therefore compels him to hone his athletic skills as his companions are doing—and do what he is expected to do. Some scholars have noted that this stereotyping by him and his community members results from white institutional racism which has limited black access to the full spectrum of prestige occupational opportunities over the years (Edwards, 2000; Gatmen, 1996; Singer, 2005a).

The point that some claim is that black communities do not have educational role models and leaders across the occupational spectrum to follow (Sailes, 1986). In brief, the focus on athletic success by the black community and its gifted athletic youths, some claim, is in response to the systemic by race and class discrimination and devaluation of the African American community by whites over the years (see Comeaux & Jayakumar, 2007). Even some black male youths who have thoughts of taking an academic route in high school and college; that is, in the pursuit of professional or occupational careers other than football or basketball, are pressured by their parents, relatives, friends, high school coaches and future college coaches “to forget white pipe dreams and go into a man's world, at college and later professional sports where the real black world is” (as quoted to us by one black student athlete). Many high school gifted black football and basketball players and their parents see going to college and playing ball practically free is the first step out of poverty (Davis, 1996; Gatmen, 2012; Njororai, 2012).

(3) Economic Exploitation

Economic exploitation, which obviously drives the academic exploitation of black student athletes, occurs when colleges and universities use them to produce revenue under athletic rules that limit them from receiving fair compensation. Student athletes, over half of whom are black and of lower class, must function as “amateur student athletes” who do not get paid money (or rewarded otherwise) for their athletic labor (Meggyesy, 2000). Because the NCAA athletic “labor market” does not fall under federal or state antitrust laws or state workers’ compensation laws, student athletes as amateurs are ineligible for workers compensation benefits due to injury on the job. In a relationship between the athletes who produce the revenues and the schools who present the games and reap the financial rewards lies an open field of exploitation of athlete student labor on one hand; and on another, an underground black-market economy that trades and competes in young (primarily) black student athletes.

Embedded in the athletic scholarship system is an implied *quid pro quo*; i.e., the student athlete will get a beneficial college education in exchange for four years of athletic service. This is not a fair exchange because the cost of a student athletic scholarship is a mere pittance when compared to the revenues black student athletes generate within an essentially cost free labor pool (Meggyesy, 2000).

Therefore, big-time football and basketball athletic programs are very profitable. The NCAA makes money and enables white universities, colleges, and white corporations to make money from the unpaid labor of black student athletes. A few big-time revenue football schools each earn between \$40 and \$50 million in profits annually (even after paying coaches multimillion dollar yearly salaries; and, millions more from television broadcasting corporations, including multimillion dollar TV contracts). The table below shows how NCAA's TV revenues kept steadily increasing, even when the rest of the nation was going through economic recession:

Table 1: NCAA TV Revenues: 1996-2013

Year	TV Revenue	Year	TV Revenue	Year	TV Revenue
1996	180,970,362	2003	370,885,332	2010	645,691,980
1997	191,186,750	2004	400,790,597	2011	690,314,434
1998	213,551,097	2005	432,567,696	2012	708,860,595
1999	228,082,239	2006	467,315,728	2013	726,391,860
2000	282,692,985	2007	512,026,034		
2001	256,690,303	2008	548,197,570		
2002	273,099,161	2009	589,741,677		

Source: Alesia, M. (2014). NCAA approaching \$1 billion per year amidst challenges by players. *Indstar* [http://www.indystar.com/story/news/2014/03/27/ncaa-approaching-billion-per-year-amid-challenges-players/6973767/]

The TV revenues accounted for 80 percent of total NCAA's annual revenues, whose net assets have grown to \$627 million in 2012-13.

The big economic problem

The crux of this student athlete exploitation problem is the contradiction within the NCAA; that is, amateur rules apply to the athletes, but contrariwise the rules of the market apply to the school's athletic departments, with the exception being their very low labor costs. The NCAA and its member schools are non-profit educational bodies (with their athletic employees categorized as student athletes); but, their athletic departments at the top level are highly profitable commercial enterprises.

The black student athlete is more negatively affected by this system than his white counterparts because in number he dominates both the football and basketball programs though he is poorer, and less well-educated. Yet, he bears the burden of the exploitive system. Further, the revenues he generates goes to fund non-revenue campus athletic programs that exist primarily for white players and white middle-class audiences. Additionally he is much more vulnerable to

the previously mentioned exploitative practices above than white student athletes because of his negative racial and class stereotyping, academic unpreparedness, and low socio-economic class background (Meggyesy, 2000).

Limited economic opportunities

Moreover, black student athletes when graduated do not find many vacant non-playing positions for them in the athletic field beyond that of high school coaches. Few blacks occupy coaching or administrative positions in colleges or white high schools, or the pros which are more frequently occupied by whites. Therefore, for the overwhelming number of blacks who manage to graduate, graduation is the end of their athletic careers. Dropout rates for white student athletes are much lower and white graduation rates are higher. Football and basketball black student athletes have the lowest graduation rates of any black student athletes—49 and 42 percent respectively (Njororai, 2012). The low graduation and high attrition rates of black student athletes (dropouts in 4 years) of NCAA member institutions, NCAA Division 1 African American male student athletes is 62%, 21 percentage points lower than the graduation rates of their white male student counterparts (Cooper, 2012). Estimated probabilities of a student athlete entering a NCAA college following high school is 3.1% for basketball and 6.0% for football; from NCAA school to professional league 1.27% basketball; football 1.7%; high school to professional basketball 0.03% and football 0.08%. The chances for football and basketball careers even for blacks are very slim, but higher than for whites; this despite the fact that black student athletes are four times more likely to be admitted to colleges and universities than are non-athletic blacks. And careers as players in the pros are brief. Therefore, black student athletes should focus on alternative careers other than professional sport (Meggyesy, 2000; Njororai, 2012).

(4) Academic Exploitation

The black student athlete is under the aegis of two conflicting and competing groups: (1) faculty members, many of whom stereotype him as a dumb or disinterested jock, to whom they must impart academic knowledge, and extend special care and privileges; and, (2) coaches who must utilize the student athletes' labor to win intercollegiate games within a very competitive market place. Coaches and members of the athletic department usually arrange his daily schedule, e.g. meals, housing, team activities, and practice time. Athletic interests in these endeavors usually prevail. Further, many coaches who have recruited them frequently leave them for one reason or another, e.g., failure to win enough games; hired by another school that paid a higher salary, etc. (see Edwards, 2010). Further their in-season training program, sometimes adverse peer-group pressure and recreational activities (e.g., drinking and womanizing) may cause physical and emotional fatigue translatable into inattention in class, incomplete assignments, class absences, mental lapses, and poor grades. And those who manage to pass (usually in easy courses) and graduate do not get the

benefit of a rigorous liberal arts program (Fletcher et al., 2003).

Academic guidance and special treatment

Frequently student athletes are guided by some student-athlete academic advisors and by some coaches into Mickey Mouse courses, courses taught by “sports-friendly” professors; courses in independent studies; courses requiring little homework, laboratory time, or much out-of-class presentation; and, advised to major in non-technical programs such as education, religion, physical education, communications, sociology or in one of the social sciences, where academic measurement is not easy—and where they can slide by without much academic-rigor or outside class preparation (e.g., recent football scandal at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Department of African and Afro-American Studies controversy). This occurs despite the fact that some might prefer to take other more rigorous courses, and/or courses in line with a non-sports career, translatable into a more rewarding and interesting occupational or professional career. Such counseling and guidelines are exploitative because athletic departments thereby take advantage of the student athlete’s academic opportunities for the purpose of his play-time eligibility. Therefore as student athletes are less able to make mature educational and career plans than their non-athlete peers, academic exploitation occurs (Bateman, 2011). Many schools also offer remedial courses and special tutoring services whereby term papers, take home examinations, and other coursework papers are prepared for student athletes. And at some schools “ringers” may take classroom tests for them; and test papers may be purloined for their needs. In most schools they attend, special reports to the athletic department on their course progress are required from professors. Some schools also provide special tutoring to keep them eligible to play, or to help them retain eligibility after losing it. Many big-time football and basketball schools provide a combination of the preceding measures (Davis, 1996). It is revealing to note that many of these big-time sports institutions are referred to by students and the media as “party schools.”

Should student athletes lose eligibility for any reason, some coaches and/or administrators may use various direct and/or indirect pressures on professors and heads of academic departments to help them in restoring eligibility. In some cases, should a professor resist or protest this and similar athletic pressure (for example, passing grades to student athletes), he or she might be castigated, sued, and/or fired in some cases (Davis, 1996; Hawkins, 2010).

In summary, however, the sports literature discloses that African American students athletes do not achieve the level of academic success parallel to white student athletes because they are less able to utilize the academic resources available to them due to their inability to perform as a student first and athlete second. They are products more frequently of less economically secure homes without highly educated parents than white student athletes; and, many have attended more inadequate secondary schools than have their counterparts. Therefore, in comparison to white students, they are less academically prepared; have less economic resources; are less sophisticated and knowledgeable; have

less verbal and literary communication skills; face race and social class prejudices and discrimination; and, face constant time constraints to focus on academic matters due to athletic schedules and activities (see Bateman, 2011; Daniels, 2010; Davis, 1996; Gatmen, 2012; Meggyesy, 2000; Njororai, 2012; Sailes, 2010; and authors' observations).

(5) Campus Social Isolation

Black student athletes even more so than other black students feel themselves apart from non-athletic campus happenings. Apart from going to class, their other interactions are usually limited, e.g. library usage, participation in student activities, doing group research, attending various student group discussions, meetings with faculty after class, etc.—for one reason or the other. Therefore, they create their own peer groups of other black student athletes (Sanders & Hildenbrand, 2010). Moreover, they find that campus racism and class prejudice abounds, and that many white students see them as inferior special admits; and, look upon them as aliens who do not belong because they are not deserving of their special presence on campus; and consider them to be strangers who create social tension and undermine academic interaction. At the best, they think they are viewed by whites as “our team players who win games for us,” i.e., they are our gladiators, entertainers, or our best servants (quoted to us by one black student athlete). Here, we see class as well as race social discrimination along the categories of Leslie Picca and Joe Feagin, who noted in their book entitled *Two-Faced Racism: Whites in the Backstage and Front Stage* (2007) that white students in public setting or “front stage” display a range of behavior toward racial minorities such as acting overly nice; avoiding contact with racial minorities when possible (e.g., crossing a street or not going to a particular bar or club); trying to mimic “black mannerisms and speech” when among themselves; avoiding the use of racial labels, but using code words to speak negatively about minorities in surroundings where minority members may be present; and, occasionally violence. On the other hand, while they are in a private or “back stage” setting, they often use ethnic humor to reinforce racial and class stereotypes about minorities, particularly lower-class black Americans, and engage themselves in occasional blatant racist speeches. By the way, when it comes to racial remarks, although lower-class black American student athletes are more vulnerable, at times even prominent professional athletes are not spared. For a recent example, the Los Angeles Clippers owner Donald Sterling used racist remarks in a CNN interview against ex-NBA star Magic Johnson, what the NBA commissioner Adam Silver considered as “a malicious and personal attack” (Amick, 2014).

In summary, many black student athletes recruited to play on white campuses as reported to us feel lonely, unwelcome, isolated, and socially discriminated against (see also Hillman, 1995). The above reports demonstrate that the social and academic situations on white campuses do not contribute positively to the black student athlete's social adjustment, academic learning

experience, or self-image.

(7) Student Athletes' Work Place

As the foregoing indicates, the student athlete is more of an athlete than a student. The amount of time student athletes are purportedly permitted to spend in athletic activities by the NCAA is limited to four hours per day, twenty fours per week, though studies disclose that Division I football student athlete players devote more than forty hours per week in such pursuits. Actually any time spent in practicing intercollegiate football or basketball detracts from the amount of time and energy a student could (and should) spend in academic study. The effort and time spent in this amusing and preparatory industry (for the pros) could be utilized for academic purposes; therefore required athletic practice and play denotes student athletes exploitation (Gatmen, 2012).

The foregoing is doubly the case with black student athletes many of whom have had little if any prior foundation in academics in the first place due to their negative social backgrounds; and, who have probably not developed good study habits in inferior secondary schools. Athletic practice also limits the time they could spend in some campus social life, and out-of-class cultural pursuits such as concerts, visitor lectures, theater, etc. Further in-season trips to other campuses (to play in intercollegiate games) is lost time which usually entails the missing of many classes and tests, which can really never be made up, even under lenient professors. Also when injured in playing (cuts, bruises, sprains, broken bones, concussions, etc.) one frequently misses some classes. Often one plays when hurt ("man-up" as some athletes say) and in pain; and, the resulting injuries (particularly concussions) may impair one physically and/or mentally for life; that is, knowingly or unknowingly for years after leaving college. Moreover, many so-called ordinary injuries may persist and hamper functioning long after college. That is, many injuries may be hidden, overlooked, or discounted; for example, concussion seems to be the major injury which may not show up until later in life (Splitt, 2011).

Relationships with coaches

The traditional prevailing helpful and personal relationships between student athletes and their coaches have been exaggerated; that is, as we gleaned from the literature and our interview conversations with numerous black and white student athletes. Coaches frequently move from one school to another leaving behind many of those they recruited. Further, the role of the coach is complicated and difficult in that he is supposed to be a mentor, administrator, and a sports manager who must win games. Many BSAs perceived their coaches as good counselors as well for the fact that they were advised to stay out of trouble by avoiding bars and risky public neighborhoods; alcohol and drug abuse; violence and weapons; and, aggressive sex life with females. Further coaches reportedly urged them to study hard, behave in class, and meet class requirements to the extent possible. Coaches also, according to them, saw to it

that tutorial services, remedial courses, and make-up coursework was provided when needed. When declared ineligible to play, their coaches interceded with professors and influential others at times to help them become reinstated.

Interestingly, these student athletes were given the impression that although they were required to maintain strict discipline on the football field and basketball court—which was rather demanding physically, emotionally, and time-wise; these expectations were somewhat relaxed elsewhere so long as they did not get into serious trouble (e.g., criminal conduct).

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

The findings of this research demonstrate how and why African American male student athletes, who play intercollegiate football or basketball on predominantly white campuses that overemphasize these two sports are exploited. The major kinds of exploitation are found to occur within an eight step-by-step hypothesized ongoing process, beginning with the commercialization of college sports (particularly in the case of football and basketball), and ending (usually) with a negative career and personality development. We also found that though we have categorized different types of BSA exploitation on white campuses, all types are rooted in negative race and class ideology and discriminations.

Our findings are also in agreement with those of many eminent sports scholars who have documented the fact that the overemphasis of football and basketball on college and university campuses has proven to be detrimental to the academic goals and standards of higher education, the academic prestige and educational proficiency of many academic institutions, and the wellbeing of the individual student athletes. We speculate that our theoretical modal explicated herein will be of some use to researchers engaged in further study of black student athletes, as well as of other black students on predominantly white campuses; that is, within a similar theoretical frame of reference, organization, and data classification.

We suggest that the African American youth who chooses to pursue a football or basketball career should consider attending an HBCU institution rather than a PWC for the following reasons: (1) Any HBCU institution (from our teaching experience and contact with BSAs) would accept and treat him as a normally admitted student (as opposed to any special admit on a predominantly white campus) from the beginning of his matriculation—i.e., on the basis of who he is as an individual; and secondarily on the basis of who he is as an athlete; that is, his prowess as a football or basketball player; (2) As a student athlete no HBCU would subject him, in kind or degree, to the exploitation and prejudice he would probably receive on a predominantly white campus; (3) The demonstrations of his athletic skills on an HBCU campus would probably be appreciated far beyond that of any monetary return they might be provided at white institutions; (4) Some would suggest that he owes some demonstration of his athletic prowess before his "own people," and for the benefit of the HBCUs,

whose mission is to help educate minority and low income students; (5) HBCUs do not produce big-time football and basketball teams, and they do not overemphasize these contact sports to the detriment of their academic programs. Further, the relationships between coaches and student athletes are reportedly warmer and more like the relationships between students and professors, than is the case on PWCs.

Additionally, we suggest that the NCAA should increase its support of HBCU's beyond the current level to strengthen their athletic programs to enable them to be comparable with those of PWCs. For example, on December 12, 2012, the NCAA announced it would award around four million dollars in grants "to kick start student-athlete academic success at six under-resourced Division I member institutions" (HBCU Digest, 2012). Of these six schools, four are HBCUs: Coppin State, Jackson State, Tennessee State and Norfolk State. According to the NCAA, "[T]he grant program pilot is designed to assist limited-resource institutions in further developing systems and enhancements that help schools meet the requirements of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP), including increasing the graduation rates and academic success of student-athletes" (Lawrence, 2012). The program was to give \$300,000 per year for three years to each school. However, as HBCU Digest shrewdly points out, the seemingly generous grant comes with a serious burden-shifting caveat, "As part of the request, [institutions] are required to match grant dollars each year of the program with either direct funds or in-kind contributions. In the first year the institution must commit a 25 percent match, 50 percent in year two and 75 percent in year three." Essentially, this means that the schools must have a serious fundraising campaign through alumni, corporate sponsors and other donors to come up with \$75,000 in 2013, \$150K in 2014, and \$225,000 in 2015 to satisfy grant requirements. While any institution would certainly benefit from an increase of nearly \$400,000 annually, it is undeniable that in current times, four million dollars spread out over six institutions is merely a drop in the bucket. This is a band-aid for a bullet wound. Further, in the unfortunate but likely event that a school is not able to raise the requisite match-portion in order to keep the grant, it could end up hurting students in the long run. The necessary enhancements that HBCU's, specifically, need and hope to make to their institutions would cost much more than \$300,000 a year. The NCAA needs to make a stronger commitment to protect the quality of student-athletes' matriculation at HBCUs, especially considering the extreme profit it makes off of their talents.

Finally, HBCUs, in order to make themselves attractive to talented student athletes, need to increase their current efforts. This includes, but is not limited to, upgrading their football stadiums and basketball courts, expanding fan-base, advertising events, involving corporate sponsors, and putting together attractive student athletic scholarship packages. In turn, this will help HBCUs increase student enrollment, retention, and lead to more effective alumni fundraising.

References

- Acaín, M.P. (1998). Revenue sharing: A simple cure for the exploitation of college athletes. *Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Review*, (18):307.
- Alesia, M. (2014). NCAA approaching \$1 billion per year amidst challenges by players. *Indstar*. <http://www.indystar.com/story/news/2014/03/27/ncaa-approaching-billion-per-year-amid-challenges-players/6973767/>
- Amick, S. (2014). Donald Sterling stirs new dispute with Magic Johnson-HIV remarks. *USA Today*. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/nba/2014/05/13/sterling-stirs-new-dispute-with-magic-hiv-remarks/9026979/>
- Bateman, J. (2011). The new plantation: Black athletes, college sports, and predominantly white NCAA institutions. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, (21):793-99.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Best, C. (1987). Experience and career length in professional football: The effect of positional segregation. *Sociology of Sports Journal*, (4):410-20.
- Branch, T. (2011). The shame of college sports. *Atlantic Magazine*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2011/10/the-shame-of-college-sports/308643/>
- Camara, W.J. & Schmidt, A.E. (1999). Group differences in standardizing testing and social stratification. *College Board Report, No.99-5*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Coakley, J. (2009). *Sports in Society: Issues and Controversies*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Comeaux, E. & Harrison, C.K. (2007). Faculty and male student athletes: Racial differences in the environment predictors of academic achievement. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, (10):199-214.
- Comeaux, E. & Jayakumar, U.M. (2007). Education in the United States: Is it a black problem. *The Urban Review*, (39):93-104.
- Cooper, J.N. (2012). Personal troubles and public issues: A sociological imagination of black athletes' experiences at predominantly white institutions in the United States. *Sociology Mind*, (2):261-71.
- Daniels, A.M. (2010). The postmodern plantation system: The NCAA and black male student-athletes. *Revolutionary Paideia*. <http://revolutionarypaideia.com/2010/12/28/the-postmodern-plantation-system-the-ncaa-and-black-male-student-athletes/>
- Davis, T. (1996). African-American student-athletes: Marginalizing the NCAA Structure? *Marquette Sports Law Review*, (6):199-227.
- Edwards, H. (2000). Crisis of black athletes on the eve of the 21st century. *Society*, (37):9-13.
- _____. (2010). Social change and popular culture: Seminal developments at the interface of race, sport, and society. *Sport in Society*, (13):59-71.
- Fleming, J. (2002). Who will succeed in college? When the SAT predicts black student's performance. *The Review of Higher Education*, (25):281-296.
- Fletcher, T.B., Benshoff, J.M., & Richburg, M.J. (2003). A systems approach to understanding and counseling college student-athletes. *Journal of College Counseling*, (6): 35-45.
- Friedman, B.J. (2012). The oligarchy in America today. *The New York Review of Books*. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2012/oct/11/oligarchy-america-today/?pagination=false>
- Gatmen, E.J.P. (2012). Academic exploitation: The adverse impact of college athletics

- on educational success of minority student-athletes. *Seattle Journal of Social Justice*, (10):509-83.
- Grafton, A. (2011). Our universities: Why are they failing? *The New York Review of Books*. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2011/nov/24/our-universities-why-are-they-failing/?pagination=false0>
- Gregory, S. (2013, September 16). TIME Cover Story: It's Time to Pay College Athletes. *Time*. <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/magazine/article/0,9171,2151167,00.html>
- Hacker, A. (2012). The White plight. *The New York Review of Books*. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2012/may/10/white-plight?pagination=false>
- Harris, S. (2011). *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Harrison, C.K. (2000). Black athletes at the Millennium. *Society*. March/April, 35-39.
- Hawkins, B.J. (2010). *The New Plantation: Black Athletes, College Sports, and Predominantly White NCAA Institutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- HBCU Digest. (2012). CAA Athletic Support Grant Set New HBCU Alumni Giving Agenda. <http://hbcudigest.com/ncaa-athletic-support-grant-sets-new-hbcu-alumni-giving-agenda/#more-77129>
- Hillman, J. (1995). Warren Moon November 18, 1956-. In D.L. Porter (Ed.), *African American sports greats: A biographical dictionary*, pp.214-217. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Hinkle, A.B. (2011). Stop funding college sports. *Reason.com*. <http://reason.com/archives/2011/10/14/stop-funding-college-sports>
- Hoffman, J.L. & Lowitzki, K.E. (2005). Predicting college success with high school grades and test scores: Limitations for minority students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28:455-474.
- JBHE. (2005). Are flagship state universities exploiting black athletes? *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*. http://www.jbhe.com/news_views/48_blacks_stateuniversities.html
- Jencks, C. & Phillips, M. (1998). *The black-white test score gap*. New York: Brookings Institute Press.
- Kihl, L.A., Richardson, T., & Campisi, C. (2008). Toward a grounded theory of student-athlete suffering and dealing with academic corruption. *Journal of Sport Management*, (22):273-302.
- Knobler, M. (2008). AJC investigation: Many athletes lag far behind on SAT scores. *The Atlanta Journal of Constitution*, December 28.
- Lapchick, R.E. (2006). Race in college sport. In: R.E. Lapchick (Ed.), *New game plan for college sport*, pp. 91-110. Praeger: American Council on Education.
- _____. (2012). Sport in America: The new racial stereotypes. In C.A. Gallagher (Ed.), *Rethinking the Color Line: Readings in race and ethnicity*, 5th edition, pp. 311-318. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lawrence, M. (2012). Six schools selected for grant program pilot. *National Collegiate Athletic Association*. <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/resources/latest+news/2012/december/six+institutions+selected+for+limited-resource+institutions+grant+program+pilot>
- Le Crom, C.L., Warren, B.J., Clark, H.T., Marolla, J., & Gerber, P. (2009). Factors contributing to student athletic retention. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 14-24.
- Leonardo, G. (2010). Kinesiology professor's research shows black athletes exploited physically, neglected academically. *COE News, University of Georgia College of*

- Education*. http://www.coe.uga.edu/news-archives/press_releases/printer_1003hawkins_pr.html
- Lumpkin, A. (2008). A call to action for faculty regarding intercollegiate athletics. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, (88):21-24.
- Markus, D. (2012). Morgan State suspends men's basketball coach Todd Bozeman indefinitely. *The Baltimore Sun*. http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-01-09/sports/bs-sp-morgan-todd-bozeman-suspension-0109-20120108_1_todd-bozeman-morgan-state-tanya-rush
- Martin, G.M. (2009). *A comparison of African-American athletes' nurturing experiences at Historically Black and Historically White Colleges/Universities*. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/Martin_uncg_0154D_10102.pdf
- Mayer, J.G. (2011). *As bad as they say? Three decades of teaching in the Bronx*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Meggyesy, D. (2000). Athletes in big-time college sport. *Society*, (37):24-28.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2009). Eight-year trends in federal graduation rates and graduation success rates at NCAA Division I Institutions. *NCAA Research*, p.10.
- Njororai, W.W.S. (2012). Challenges of being black student athlete on U.S. college campuses. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, (5):40-63.
- Noah, T. (2012). *The great divergence, America's growing inequality crisis and what we can do about it*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Picca, L. & Feagin, J. (2007). *Two-faced racism: Whites in the backstage and front stage*. New York: Routledge.
- Roebuck, J.B. & Murty, K.S. (1993). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sack, A. & Staurowsky, E. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The Evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from Educational change in Finland?* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Sailes, G. (1986). Guest editorial: The exploitation of the black athletes: Some alternative solutions. *Journal of Negro Education*, (55):439-442.
- _____. (2010). The African American athlete: Social myths and stereotypes. In G. Sailes (Ed.), *Modern sport and the African American athlete experience*, pp.55-68. San Diego, CA: Cognella.
- Sanders, J.P. & Hildenbrand, K. (2010). Major concerns? A longitudinal analysis of student-athletes' academic majors in comparative perspective. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, (3):213-233.
- Sellers, R.M. & Kuperminc, G.P. (1997). Goal discrepancy in African-American male student athletes' unrealistic expectations for careers in professional sports. *Journal of Black Psychology*, (23):6-23.
- Sheldon, W.H. (1940). *The varieties of human physique: An introduction to constitutional psychology*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Simon, R.L. (2008). Does athletics undermine academics? Examining some issues, *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, (2):40-58.
- Singer, J.N. (2005a). Addressing epistemological racism in sport management research. *Journal of Sports Management*, (19):464-479.
- _____. (2005b). Understanding racism through the eyes of African American male student athletes. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, (8):365-386.
- _____. (2008). Benefits and detriments of African American male athletes' participation in a big time college football program. *International Review for the*

- Sociology of Sport*, (43):399-408.
- Splitt, F.G. (2011). Collegiate athletics reform: A lesson learned. http://www.thedrakegroup.org/Splitt_A_Lesson_Learned.pdf
- Smith, E. (2009). *Race, sport and the American dream*. 2nd edition. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Smith, H. (2012). *Who stole the American dream?* New York: Random House.
- Sperber, M.A. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports has crippled undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Walton, T.A. & T.M. Butryn. (2006). Policing on race: U.S. men's distance running and the crisis of Whiteness. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, (23):1-28.
- Wiggins, D.K. (2012). Strange mix of entitlement and exploitation: The African American experience in predominantly white college sport. *Wake Forest Journal of Law and Policy*, 95-107.