

Fans Perceptions of Exploitation in College Sports by George Parham

George Quentin Parham

(Virginia Commonwealth University, USA)

Abstract: College sports, particularly football and basketball have become large sources of revenue and prestige for Colleges. However, with the majority of the participants being African-American males, many of whom if not for athletic prowess would not be able to attend these Colleges, there have been rumblings of exploitation of these athletes who outside of a scholarship do not receive any compensation compared to what the Schools receive. Many studies have been conducted regarding the opinions of players, College Athletic Directors and Coaches but nobody has ever asked the fans, whose support is the Fulcrum of this multibillion-dollar industry. I will conduct a Quantitative study using a convenient and snowball sampling methods due to time constraints, as well as constructing a 10 Question Survey to Measure Fans Perceptions of Exploitation among College Sports with an emphasis on Football and Basketball.

Key words: college sports, race, fans, exploitation

1. Introduction

College athletics is big business, with annual profits exceeding \$15 billion (Bloomberg, 2016). The major goal of capitalism is profit, which according to Marx (1897), for profit extraction to work, capitalists exploit those who provide the labor; and in the case of college sports, the laborers include student athletes. Pursuant a Marxian perspective, exploitation is unfairly taking advantage of another person because of his or her inferior position, giving the exploiter the power (Marx, 1897). Consumers of the product are essential for profit extraction to occur, and as such, are complicit in this exploitation, but do the consumer of college athletics, fans, see themselves as contributing the exploitation of athletes, who, in the most profitable of college athletic programs, are disproportionately men of color — see themselves as contributing to the exploitation of black bodies? Furthermore, are they even aware that exploitation occurs? There has been a growing body of research that has examined exploitation of college athletes mainly from the perspective of athletes themselves, but little to no research has explored the perspective of college sports fans. As such, this project seeks to explore college fans' perspectives of exploitation in college athletics.

The first intercollegiate athletics contest was held in 1852 when Harvard and Yale competed in a rowing race. One remarkable aspect of early college sports is that they were organized and administered by students. That was short lived. Soon older adults entered the arena, bringing with them their own vested interests and the downhill slide away from amateurism has continued ever since (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Feinstein, 2000). By 1883, concerns regarding commercialization, professionalization, and corruption led to the first interinstitutional attempt

George Quentin Parham, Undergraduate Student, Virginia Commonwealth University; research areas/interests: sports and race.
E-mail: parhamgq@vcu.edu.

to reform and control intercollegiate sports (Zimbalist, 1999, p. 7). Since former executive director of the NCAA Walter Byers coined the term *student-athlete* in the 1950s (Sperber, 1999), scholars and educational administrators have weighed in on this controversy, fueling a debate over the commercialization of college sports and a commodification of young men and women (Byers & Hammer et al., 1995). Today universities use the commercialization of their sports programs to generate revenue, increase visibility, recruit students and receive alumni support, which creates a pressure to win (Donnor et al., 2005). College sports are major businesses. For example, the NCAA receives \$771 million annually from the television contract for its Division I Men's Basketball Championship tournament (USA Today, 2011) and 125\$ annually from the television contract for its Football Bowl Championship Series (Sports Business Daily, 2011). Most agree that the revenue-producing sports of football and basketball pose the greatest threat to institutional control and integrity. Not surprisingly, therefore, colleges compete to get the best student-athletes to attend their schools (Brown 1993). The college athletes recruited to compete in these sports pose an institutional dilemma, as they are often the most academically under-prepared relative to other students but are admitted nonetheless (VanRheenen, 2012). Meggyesy (2000) makes a similar argument, noting that "the primary contradictions within the NCAA and, in particular its top revenue producing schools is that, on one hand the amateur rules apply to the athletes and on the other, the rules of the market apply to the school's athletic departments with the big exception being their labor costs". Meanwhile, college athletes, who have become walking billboards for sports apparel corporations and universities, are prohibited by NCAA rules from having a share in the profits (Benford, 2007).

One of the alleged negative consequences of the relationship between the athletic and educational institutions is the exploitation of student athletes (Donnor, 2005). Some sports sociologists such as Georgia Professor and former Drake Executive Committee Member Billy Hawkins (2000) call the current system of intercollegiate athletics the "new plantation". In the high-profile sports such as football and basketball, athletes perform for a relatively small compensation (Benford, 2007). Critics argue that American college sports represent a form of systematic exploitation, perpetuated by the NCAA and its member institutions against college athletes, particularly black athletes, who are promised an education in exchange for their intercollegiate sports participation (Branch et al., 2011). Specifically, the exploitation is especially significant to African-Americans in revenue-generating sports because they often create "enough revenue to financially underwrite the non-revenue producing athletic sports such as crew, swimming, tennis and golf that are overwhelmingly populated by white middle and upper-class students" (Donnor, 2005, p. 48).

In terms of African-American male student-athletes, there are two opposing perspectives that are employed in the educational development of the group: (a) athletics may provide the educational opportunities to African-Americans from underprivileged backgrounds that would not otherwise be available, and (b) sports have exploited the majority of African-American athletes (Sellers, 2000). The impoverished conditions a large percentage of Black student athletes come from in some ways force them to use their athletic talents in hopes of improving their immediate condition and the conditions of their families and communities (Hawkins, 2000). Although participation in athletics is considered a golden opportunity for African-Americans, compelling evidence to the contrary has been presented for decades (Beamon & Bell et al., 2006). In fact, serious involvement in athletics has hampered the development of African American males in several areas including academic and occupational achievement (Lomax, 2000).

Edwards (2000) suggested that the overemphasis on sports participation has drained Black talent away from

the other areas of cultural success and argues that the push toward athletics as seen within Black families is hindering the social and cognitive growth of African-American youth (Edwards, 1983, 1988, 2000). Furthermore, the mass media constantly deluges society with images glorifying African-American men who are successful by employing avenues connected with sports and reinforce the stereotype of African-American males as exclusively athletically talented (Hall, 2001).

As a result of overrepresentation of African-Americans in revenue-generating sports, it is estimated that these student-athletes have earned more than a quarter of a trillion dollars over a 40-year period; and even if 100% of African-American athletes earned degrees, the economic value of those degrees would be only 5% of the total value of their athletic contribution (Watkins study as cited in Salome, 2005). Studies that have highlighted the different structural positions Black student athletes occupy in relation to their counterparts include the stereotypical belief regarding their intellectual inferiority and athletic superiority, the differences in their demographic and academic background, overall college experiences, mental health issues, and social support (Sailes et al., 1993), and studies that illustrate how the academic performance of Black athletes is lower than that of White Student athletes once they are on campus (Purdy et al., 1982).

The different backgrounds and experiences of Black and White student athletes, despite the common experience of labor exploitation, will enable black athletes to be viewed as class fractions, thus allowing us to analyze their experiences at predominately white institutions as more complex than their counterparts (Hawkins, 1999). Black students do not see the benefits of their labor by playing professionally or earning a degree. Of those who graduate, many graduate in less marketable majors “riddled with keep ‘em eligible’ less competitive ‘jock courses’ of dubious educational value and occupational relevance” (Edwards, 1988, p. 138). Meggysey (2000) stated that the NCAA and its member institutions “exploit the talent of Black athletes and deny these same athletes access to a quality education” as well as limiting “employment opportunities of Black athletes after their career ends” (p. 27).

The idea that a college education is payment would have to assume that college degree pays off in the long run. In reality, the glut of bachelor degrees entering the workforce is lessening their value (Povich Center, 2013). The educational attainment of student-athletes is frequently hindered by athletic training and travel; and student athletes often find it difficult to balance athletics, academics, and social roles (Beamon, 2008). Additionally, some universities do little to endorse an academic lifestyle among student-athletes (Gerdy, 2000). Additionally, due to psychological and physical fatigue from sports participation, student-athletes have decreased levels of motivation to study and diminished abilities to benefit from institutional programs such as tutorial programs and counseling (Beamon et al., 2002). Student-athletes work under numerous constraints.

These constraints include the inability to change majors or drop courses because of eligibility requirements or choose majors that may offer courses during times set aside for sports participation (Beamon, 2008). In order to remain eligible, student athletes are often pushed into choosing majors that are most compatible with athletic participation, even if they are uninterested or unprepared for those majors (Adler & Adler, 1987; Corneilus, 1995). While the NCAA (2010c) reports that college athletes graduate at higher rates than the general student body across member institutions, the numbers are less impressive when broken down by division, type of institution, sport, gender, and race. While Black Student athletes tend to graduate at higher rates than their peers at non-historically Black schools generally (NCAA, 2010c), only 20 out of 50 flagship state universities post a higher graduation rate for Black athletes relative to African-American students generally. It has been noted that

some student athletes are academically unprepared for college and a gap exists in the graduation rates of African-American student-athletes compared to White student athletes (Benson et al., 2000).

To explore the exploitation of student athletes, I am grounding my paper theoretically, in Giroux's Social Reproduction Theory, which is based on the concept that social institutions such as the institution of education, work to reproduce dominant ideology and structures of knowledge (Giroux, 1983). The interrelationship of the institutions of sport and education has created a situation in which structural components (e.g., the NCAA, athletic departments, economy) and individual actors (e.g., coaches, teammates, family members) work together to reproduce the current stratification seen in the labor force (Singer, 2002). As James Duderstat (2000), former college football player and President of the University of Michigan notes, "some universities take advantage of their student-athletes, exploiting their athletic talents for financial gain and public visibility, and tolerating low graduation rates and meaningless degrees in majors like general studies or recreational life" (pp. 5–6).

The financial imbalances between revenue athletes and their institutions have led critics to highlight the surplus value and financial gains expropriated by colleges and universities on the backs of these young men (Edwards et. al., 1970) and the corresponding alienation, isolation and powerlessness experienced by college athletes (Coakley et al., 2009). The fact that a disproportionate number of recruited student athletes in the revenue-producing sports of football and basketball are African-American has further ignited charges of institutionalized racism, comparing the college and professional playing fields to the antebellum plantation and the historical legacy of American slavery (Deford et al., 2005).

Hawkins compared African-American student athletes with Oscillating migrant workers based on their shared experiences with institutional powerlessness, required relocation to capitalize on skills, double consciousness, and a system of labor exploitation wherein the employer bears a nominal cost of labor production when compared with the massive profits reaped from labor. And yet defining college athletes as amateurs serves multiple purposes for educational institutions: (a) it maximizes profits for schools; (b) as amateurs, these athletes are not considered employees and thus receive no workers' compensation or other benefits; (c) viewing college-athletes as non-employees means that the NCAA escapes scrutiny as an illegal business cartel; and (d) none of the money generated by amateurs for the NCAA and its member institutions is taxable because it is part of an educational program (VanRheenen, 2012). This leads Eitzen (2001, p. 29) to argue that "in effect, university administrators are using the ideal of amateurism as an exploitive ideology".

2. Methods

Current Literature does not include the Perceptions of Exploitation from the view of Fans of College Football and Men's Basketball, whose viewership and attendance of games is the impetus of this trillion-dollar enterprise known as Revenue-Generating College Sports. The current literature only speaks about the exploitation of college athletes through the voices of researchers and athletes. My study will be quantitative in nature, use a convenient and snowball sampling methods. The sample size will consist of classmates from my SOCY 402 (Contemporary Theory) class, and friends from Social Media Sites LinkedIN and Facebook, 4 friends who were teachers who promised to forward it to colleagues giving me a potential sample size of 893 participants (740 Facebook, 141 LinkedIn, 4 personal friends, 8 classmates). A 10 question survey was created on Google Documents to Measure the Perception of Exploitation in College Sports (Football/Men's Basketball) from the viewpoint of Fans.

3. Survey Design

I used Google Documents to create a 10-question multiple choice survey where Respondents were asked about their Race/Ethnicity (Caucasian/Non-Hispanic, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Non-White, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Other/Do not wish to Identify). Given the diversity of people within my social circle I believed that these choices would encompass every potential Race and Ethnicity of respondents and I feel that race will play a major part in Fans Perceptions of Exploitation in College Sports, and I made a choice for people who did not wish to disclose their race for Personal Reasons. The Next Question asked about Gender of the Respondent (Male/Female/Prefer Not to Say), again, I took into account that there were people within my social circle who are members of the LGBTQ community and they do not ascribe to the Male/Female binary. The Third Question of the Survey asked Did the respondent attend College (Yes/No/Some College (Less than 4 years), I included the Some College answer as I myself have taken an extended period from college and also not everyone who starts college completes it in 4 years or at all due to a myriad of circumstances, also I believe that even people who attended college but did not watch college sports still harbored an opinion about athletes as they had to interact with them either directly through being classmates with them or seeing them out around campus or indirectly, as dealing with parking issues due to sporting events on campus, closures of portions of campus on game days, etc. The Fourth question was Did you play sports in college (Yes/No/Yes, but it was club/intramurals), as having played club/intramural sports as well as recreationally in adult leagues, I know that there is a time commitment that even though it is not as large as that of a college athlete, but their experience of playing on a competitive team also in college gives them some insight to what the athletes in Revenue sports go through, even though it is only on a smaller scale. The Fifth question is Do You Watch College Football and Men's Basketball (Yes/No), this was a fairly straightforward question that asked whether they watch College Football and Basketball. The Sixth Question asked "On a Scale of 1 to 5 (With 1 being not at all and 5 being a super fan) how avid of a college sports fan are you. I felt that a scale of 1–5 was appropriate because there are varying levels of college sports fandom, some people consume every college game that is on while some may support the school that they attended and watch causally and some may not show much interest at all, but I felt this question was too nuanced for a simple "Yes or No". The Seventh Question asked Do you feel that there is exploitation by colleges and Universities of Football and basketball players (Yes/No), this too is another straightforward question that does not need to have multiple responses as opinions regarding exploitation in college sports are rather defined. The Eighth Question asked Are the benefits of a Full Athletic Scholarship (Tuition/ Room & Board/Monthly Stipend) adequate Compensation for College Athletes in Revenue-Generating Sports (Yes/No), this like the previous question I believe that respondents did not need more than a Yes or No Response. The Ninth Question asked Do you believe that College Athletes (Football/Men's Basketball Players) are not exploited because they receive advantages that Regular College Students do not Receive (Yes/No), I believe this question is a good follow up for Question 8 as it digs deeper into whether college athletes are properly compensated. The Final Question asks Do you believe that the Revenue that is received by Colleges and Universities from Sports Networks and other Media Companies is evenly distributed among Athletes/Coaches/Administrators (Yes/No), this question was asked to gauge whether people thought regardless of their opinion of whether athletes were exploited if they felt that the money was distributed evenly among the main people who are supposed to benefit (Students, Coaches, Administrators).

4. Distribution Method

On the morning of June 22, 2017, after creating the survey I sent the link to the survey out on my Social Media platforms (Facebook and LinkedIn), as well as through my VCU email to the students and instructor of my SOCY 402 class, and I also sent out emails to 4 of my friends who were teachers, who had reviewed my literature review and had planned on filling out the survey and forwarding it to colleagues and friends. The Survey will be taken down on the morning of Monday June 26, 2017, as by then I should have an adequate amount of respondents being that the survey will be up for 5 days to include a weekend, where Social Media Activity is higher than during the week (Mon.-Fri.).

5. Results

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the respondents who completed the 10-Question survey online by race and gender. 85% of respondents were Non-Hispanic, White, with 75% of these respondents being female, the largest demographic of respondents. 7% were Non-Hispanic, Black/African-American, 4% were Hispanic, and 4% were Asian/Pacific Islander. 86% of all respondents went to college, 60% did not play college sports and 16% played Club/intramurals. 65% watched College Football and Basketball and 63% of respondents reported their level of fandom as Somewhat (Casual) fans. 56% believed that college athletes in the revenue-generating sports of Football and Basketball are being exploited by Colleges and Universities, even though 77% of respondents believed that the Benefits afforded by a Full Athletic Scholarship (Free Room and Board/Free Tuition/Monthly Stipend) was adequate compensation for participation in Collegiate Athletics. 53% believed that College Football and Basketball players received advantages that regular college students do not receive, 89% of respondents did not believe that the Revenue Colleges and Universities receive from Sports Networks and other Media companies is evenly distributed among Athletes, Administrators and Coaches.

Table 2 illustrates the relationships between the Sample Characteristics and their belief in player exploitation. 56% of respondents believed that College Football and Basketball Players were being exploited by their Colleges and Universities compared to 44% who did not. Of those who believed in exploitation, 71% were Female, 76% were Non-Hispanic White and 89% attended college. Among those who believed in exploitation, 71% watched both college football and basketball, 71% also reported their level of fandom as Somewhat (Casual), but believed that the benefits of a full athletic scholarship are adequate compensation for collegiate athletic participation (62%). These respondents did not believe that Football and Basketball players had any advantages compared to regular students (73%), and unanimously these respondents believed that the Revenue received from Sports Networks and other Media Companies was evenly distributed among Athletes, Administrators and Coaches (98%). 1 Female Respondent who believed that players were exploited did not identify her race when answering the survey and it has been noted in the Table.

Those who did not believe that College Football and Basketball Players were exploited (44%), 71% were Female, 94% were Non-Hispanic/White, and 83% attended College. 71% did not play college sports, while 20% played Club/Intramurals, 57% watched College Football and Basketball and 52% reported their level of Fandom as Somewhat (Casual). 97% of these respondents did believe that the benefits of a full athletic scholarship was adequate compensation for collegiate athletic participation and similar to those who believed that players were exploited, 77% of those who thought players were not exploited, did not believe that college athletes had any advantages compared

to regular college students, and in a lesser majority those who did not believe that players were being exploited did believe that the Revenue that Colleges and Universities were receiving from Sports Networks and other Media Companies was not being evenly distributed among Athletes, Administrators and Coaches (77%).

Table 1 Characteristics of Sample by Race and Gender (N = 80) N (%).

| | Total Sample | Non-Hispanic White 67 (85) | | Non-Hispanic Black/ African American 6 (7) | | Hispanic 3 (4) | | Asian/Pacific Islander 3 (4) | |
|--|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| | N (%) | Male 17 (25) | Female 50 (75) | Male 4 (67) | Female 2 (33) | Male 1 (33) | Female 2 (67) | Male 1 (33) | Female 2 (67) |
| College Attendance | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 69 (86) | 15 (88) | 44 (88) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 1 (50) |
| No | 5 (6) | 1 (6) | 4 (8) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (50) |
| Some College | 6 (8) | 1 (6) | 2 (4) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| Did you play college sports | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 7 (9) | 3 (18) | 2 (4) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| Intramural/club | 13 (16) | 6 (35) | 6 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (50) |
| No | 60 (75) | 8 (47) | 42 (84) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 1 (50) |
| Do you watch college BB/FB | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 52 (65) | 14 (82) | 29 (58) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 1 (50) |
| No | 28 (35) | 3 (18) | 21 (42) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1(100) | 1 (50) |
| Fan Scale (1-5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Not at all (1) | 18 (23) | 2 (12) | 13 (26) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) |
| Somewhat (2-4) | 50 (63) | 10 (59) | 30 (60) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| Super fan (5) | 11 (14) | 4 (29) | 7 (14) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Belief that college athletes are exploited | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 45 (56) | 9 (53) | 25 (50) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) |
| No | 35 (44) | 8 (47) | 25 (50) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| Belief that full scholarship is adequate compensation for student athletes | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 62 (77) | 11 (65) | 45 (90) | 2 (50) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| No | 18 (23) | 6 (35) | 5 (10) | 2 (50) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) |
| Belief that student athletes have certain advantages over non-athletes | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 42 (53) | 8 (47) | 31 (62) | 3 (75) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| No | 38 (47) | 9 (53) | 19 (38) | 1 (25) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) |
| Belief in equal distribution of college sports revenue | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 9 (11) | 3 (18) | 4 (8) | 3 (75) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (100) | 0 (0) |
| No | 71 (89) | 14 (82) | 46 (92) | 1 (25) | 2 (100) | 1 (100) | 2 (100) | 0 (0) | 2 (100) |

Table 2 Sample Characteristics by Player Exploitation Belief (N = 80. N (%))

| | | Yes, players exploited 45 (56) | No, players are not exploited 35 (44) |
|--|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Gender | Male | 13 (29) | 10 (29) |
| | Female | 32 (71) (1 Female Respondent did not identify race) | 25 (71) |
| Race | Non-Hispanic White | 34 (76) | 33 (94) |
| | Black/African American | 5 (11) | 1 (3) |
| | Hispanic | 3 (7) | 0 |
| | Asian/Pacific Islander | 2 (4) (1 Female Respondent who did not identify race) (2) | 1 (3) |
| College Attendance | Yes | 40 (89) | 29 (83) |
| | Some College | 4 (9) | 2 (6) |
| | No | 1 (2) | 4 (11) |
| Did you play college sports | | | |
| Yes | | 4 (9) | 3 (9) |
| Club/Intramural | | 6 (13) | 7 (20) |
| No | | 35 (78) | 25 (71) |
| Do you watch college BB/FB | | | |
| Yes | | 32 (71) | 20 (57) |
| No | | 13 (29) | 15 (43) |
| Fan Scale (1-5) | | | |
| Not at all (1) | | 5 (11) | 13 (37) |
| Somewhat (2-4) | | 32 (71) | 18 (52) |
| Super fan (5) | | 7 (16) (1 Non-Respondent) (2) | 4 (11) |
| Belief that full scholarship is adequate compensation for student athletes | | | |
| Yes | | 28 (62) | 34 (97) |
| No | | 17 (38) | 1 (3) |
| Belief that student athletes have certain advantages over non-athletes | | | |
| Yes | | 12 (27) | 8 (23) |
| No | | 33 (73) | 27 (77) |
| Belief in equal distribution of college sports revenue | | | |
| Yes | | 1 (2) | 8 (23) |
| No | | 44 (98) | 27 (77) |

6. Discussion/Conclusion

Responses to The Perception of Exploitation of College Football and Basketball players by Sports Fan was largely based by race according to the Survey that I conducted and is displayed in Tables 1 & 2. Of Black Respondents (n = 6), 83% believed that College Football and Basketball Players are being exploited by their Colleges and Universities. However, of White Respondents (n = 67), their responses were essentially even with 51% believing that players are exploited, while 49% did not believe in any exploitation. A deeper dive into White Respondents shows that even within their subgroups the responses were pretty even. White Women, the largest group of all respondents (n = 50), 50% responded **YES** that players are exploited and 50% responded **NO** that players are not exploited. White Males (n = 17), had similar results with 9 saying that **YES** athletes are exploited and 8 saying that there is **NO** exploitation. There is no previous research done about sports fans opinions of athletes, but it is obvious that race played a pivotal role of the Fans Perceptions, given the 2 sports that were used to measure Exploitation by Colleges and Universities are populated disproportionately by African-Americans, it seems as though perhaps Whites do not see exploitation by the Institutions because these athletes are given a

scholarship, academic assistance that is not available to regular students, and an opportunity to play professionally and earn life-changing money, or at least graduate college without being burdened by student loans and also having established a powerful social network that can allow them to get jobs that they may not be privy too. Black respondents may emphasize more athletes in that they may share similarities in their upbringing. As being a member of a marginalized group of people, Blacks are already aware that in all fields of work they are being exploited to some extent as they are never compensated equally what their white counterparts may make, and they are not very well represented in the positions of power of Athletics (Coaches, Athletic Directors) and Academics. Given our nation's history of exploiting Black Labor to enrich White Institutions and Businesses, Blacks are less likely to believe that these Athletes are adequately compensated through a scholarship when these Athletes are forced into choosing Majors that do not translate well into the Workforce, must schedule classes around practices and games, and often due to the rigors of their sports they do not have the desire to fully dedicate themselves to their studies.

One question that was agreed upon by most respondents was their perceptions of the distribution of Revenue that is received from Sports Networks and Other Media Companies. Of those who believe that there is exploitation of College Athletes ($n = 45$), 98% believed that the Revenue generated by these athletes is not distributed fairly between the Administrators, Athletes and Coaches. Those who did not believe that College Athletes were exploited ($n = 35$), 77% also believed that the Revenue generated is not evenly distributed. This is fascinating because even though the responses were split about Exploitation of athletes by Colleges and Universities 89% of all respondents do not believe that the Revenue generated is evenly distributed. As per a 2016 ESPN report, of the 50 states, a college football or Men's Basketball Coach is the highest paid state employee (ESPN, 2017). Due to the high salaries commanded by Basketball and Football Coaches and the constant "arms race" to build bigger, better and more modern facilities, the repercussions of this is felt through increased fees and tuition.

Given the lack of research done from a Fans Perspective regarding exploitation of College Athletes and College Sports, there is much more future work to be conducted. Due to time constraints of being in a summer class I was forced to conduct a simple survey and my sample group was people within my social circles, who chose to conduct an online survey that was available for 5 days, this resulted in the sample of respondents, even though it was large with 80 people responding there was very little diversity among Gender and Race of people who responded. The Racial Make-Up of Sports fans and their attitudes towards Exploitation in College Sports is a great starting point for future research regarding this topic as even the responses on my Survey were largely based by the races of the respondents. Future Research should be conducted a longer period and use a more random sample group. Sending out the survey through my own personal social media accounts is another limitation that must be accounted for as well. Including other Races and Ethnicities may also not be necessary since the primary viewers of College Sports are Whites and African Americans, so perhaps a sample of just Black and White Respondents is appropriate. Some of the questions within my survey were redundant and could have been reworded or omitted completely. Question 8 of my Survey "Are the benefits of a full scholarship adequate compensation for College Athletes in Revenue-Generating Sports?" is like Question 9 "Do you believe that college athletes are not exploited because they receive advantages that Regular College Students Don't?" A survey with fewer questions also could be used as 10 questions is more than enough to garner a good idea of what a fans perception is about this topic and perhaps qualitative interviews could also be used as a future research method for this topic as well. This survey was a good starting point but there are many different directions that future research

could dive into such as the Perceptions by Race and Unequal Distribution of Revenue that is Generated.

References

- Adler P. A. and Adler P. (1987). "Role conflict and identity salience: College athletics and the academic role", *Social Science Journal*, Vol. 24, pp. 443–455.
- Beamon K. and Bell P. (2002). "Going pro: The differential effects of high aspirations for a professional sports career on African-American student-athletes and White student-athletes", *Race and Society*, Vol. 5, pp. 179–191.
- Beamon K. and Bell P. (2006). "Academics versus athletics: An examination of the effects of background and socialization on African-American male student-athletes", *The Social Science Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 393–403.
- Beamon K. (2008). "Used goods: Former African-American College student athletes perceptions of exploitation by division I universities", *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 77, No. 4, pp. 352–364.
- Benford R. D. (2007). "The college sports reform movement: Reframing the 'edutainment' industry", *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 48, pp. 1–28.
- Benson K. F. (2000). "Constructing academic inadequacy: African-American athletes' stories of schooling", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 71, pp. 223–246.
- Branch T. (2011). "The shame of college sports", *The Atlantic Magazine*, Vol. 308, No. 3, pp. 80–110.
- Brown R. W. (1993). "An estimate of the rent generated by a premium college football player", *Economic Inquiry*, Vol. 31, pp. 671–684.
- Byers W. and Hammer C. H. (1995). *Unsportsmanlike conduct: Exploiting College Athletes*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Coakley J. J. (2009). *Sport in Society: Issues & Controversies* (10th ed.), Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Deford F. (2005). "America's modem peculiar institution", in: R. Hersch & J. Merrow (Eds.), *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*, New York, NY: Paigrave Macmillan, pp. 145–154.
- Donnor J. (2005). "Toward and interest-convergence in the education of African-American football student-athletes in major college sports", *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, Vol. 8, pp. 45–67.
- Duderstadt James J. (2000). *Intercollegiate Athletics and the American University: A University President's Perspective*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Edwards H. (1970). *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Edwards H. (1983). "The exploitation of Black athletes", *AGB (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges) Reports*, Vol. 28, pp. 37–48.
- Edwards H. (1988). "The single-minded pursuit of sports fame and fortune is approaching an institutionalized triple tragedy in Black society", *Ebony*, Vol. 43, pp. 138–140.
- Edwards H. (2000). "Crisis of Black athletes on the eve of the 21st century", *Society*, Vol. 37, pp. 9–13.
- Eitzen D. S. (2001). "Big-time college sports: Contradictions, crises and consequences", in: Eitzen D. S. (Ed.), *Sport in Contemporary Society* (6th ed.), New York: Worth Publishers, pp. 201–212.
- Feinstein John (2000). *The Last Amateurs: Playing for Glory and Honor in Division I College Basketball*, Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Gerdy J. R. (2000). *Sports in School: The Future of an Institution*, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gibson C. (Mar 30, 2017). "Who's the highest paid employee in every State?", available online at: http://www.espn.com/espn/feature/story/_id/19019077/highest-paid-us-employees-dominated-college-football-college-basketball-coaches.
- Giroux H. A. (1983). "Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 53, pp. 257–293
- Hall R. (2001). "The ball curve: Calculated racism and the stereotype of African-American men", *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 32, pp. 104–119.
- Hawkins B. (1999). "Black student athletes at predominantly White, National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Institutions and the pattern of oscillating migrant laborers", *Western Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 1–9.
- Hawkins B. (2000). *The New Plantation: The Internal Colonization of Black Student Athletes*, Winterville, GA: Sadiki Publishing.
- Lomax M. E. (2000). "Athletics vs. education: Dilemmas of Black youth", *Society*, Vol. 37, pp. 21–23.
- Marx K. (1897). "Das Kapital", available online at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>.
- Meggysey D. (2000). "Athletes in big-time college sport", *Society*, Vol. 37, pp. 24–29.

- National Collegiate Athletic Association (July 15, 2006). "NCAA report on federal graduation rates data — Division I", available online at: http://webl.ncaa.org/app_data/instAggr2006/1_0.pdf.
- NCAA (2010, October 27). "Grad rates hit high marks Football and basketball improve", *NCAA News Release*, available online at: http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/Media+and+Events/Press+RoomjNews+Release+Archive/2010/1/Academic+Reform/2010/027+GSR+RIs.
- Novy-Williams E. (May 9, 2017). "Challenging the NCAA", available online at: <https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/college-sports-ncaa>.
- Purdy D. (1982). "Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of College Athletes", *Social Problems*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 439–448.
- Sack Allen L. and Ellen J. Staurowsky (1998). *College Athletes for Hire: The Evolution and Legacy of the NCAA's Amateur Myth*, Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sailes G. (1993). "An investigation of campus stereotypes: The myth of black athletic superiority and the dumb jock stereotype", *Sociology of Sport Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 88–97.
- Salome K. (2005). "Lost wealth: The economic value of Black male college athletes", *Network Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 32.
- Sellers R. (2000). "African-American student-athletes: Opportunity or exploitation", in: D. Brooks & R. Althouse (Eds.), *Racism in College Athletics: The African-American Athlete's Experience*, Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc., pp. 133–154.
- Singer J. N. (2002). "Let Us Make Man: The development of Black male (student) athletes in a big time college sport program", doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 63, p. 1299.
- Smith M. (Jan. 24, 2011). "TV fee boosts BCS payout 22 percent", available online at: <https://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2011/01/20110124/Colleges/BCS-payout.aspx>.
- Sperber M. (1999). "In praise of 'student-athletes': The NCAA is haunted by its past", *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A76.
- Van Rheenen Derek. (2012). "Exploitation in college sports: Race, revenue, and educational reward." *Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 48, No. 5, pp. 550–571.
- Weiberg Steve (30 Mar. 2011). "NCAA President: Time to discuss players getting sliver of Revenue Pie", available online at: https://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/mensbasketball/2011-03-29-ncaa-pay-for-play-final-four_N.htm.
- Zimbalist A. (1999). *Unpaid Professionals: Commercialism and Conflict in Big-Time College Sports*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, get link from ESPN Article and Povich Center 2013.