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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.
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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,
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*

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

**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.
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 $X^2(1, N = 3,162) = 235.32, p < .001$.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race of recruiting coach</th>
<th>Black recruited player</th>
<th>White recruited player</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black recruiting coach</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White recruiting coach</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 $X^2(9, N = 3,162) = 375.26, p < .001$. 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

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

Table 4

Comparison of Recruiting Rankings by Recruiting Coach’s Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race of Recruiting Coach</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Recruiting Coach</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Recruiting Coach</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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-
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 dispro-
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.
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