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The purpose of this manuscript is to examine the influence of activism in and through college sport during two prominent eras of Black social movements, the Civil Rights movement (CRM) and Black Power movement (BPM) of 1950s-1970s and the Black Lives Matter movement (BLMM) of 2010s-2020s. Using a race- and sport-based analytic framework, distinctive forms of activism are examined to highlight similarities and differences in strategies, focal areas, and outcomes across time, space, and context. College sport is a highly visible feature of the United States (U.S.) and thus has served as an influential space for championing equity and racial justice within and beyond athletic milieu. Yet, there is a dearth of scholarship focusing on the role of activism in and through college sport in redressing anti-Black racism at the institutional and societal levels. The critical examination of intergenerational activism in and through college sport revealed the power and limitations of efforts within this distinctive socio-political space. Recommendations for future efforts are presented.
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The recorded killing and viral social media coverage of the murder of George Floyd of Minneapolis, Minnesota in May 2020 amidst an unprecedented global pandemic created a seismic shift in civil unrest in the United States (U.S.). In response to this gross injustice, an international racial justice movement was reignited with the motto of Black Lives Matter (BLM). Every aspect of society was forced to engage in a critical reflection of their role in combating systemic racism. One aspect of society where activism was highly visible during the Summer of 2020 was within college sports (Keaton & Cooper, 2022; Ofoegbu & Ekpe, 2022). According to a study published by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), 53% of Black college athletes surveyed participated in a boycott, rally, or protest between the Summer of 2020 and Winter of 2021, which was noticeably higher than their student-athlete peers (only 30% of White, 39% of Latinx, and 44% of Other groups reported engaging in the same type of efforts) (NCAA, 2021a).

Given Black college athletes’ unique positionality at these institutions, their efforts have a distinct level of visibility and impact. Dr. Harry Edwards, a pioneer of sport activism, surmised in the late 1960s that the economic and media power of Black college athletes at historically White institutions (HWIs), particularly in football and basketball, was and remains a crucial leveraging tool for stimulating change at the institutional and societal levels (Edwards, 1969, 2016a, 2016b). Over half a century has passed since the famous sport protests of the 1960s, but the resurgence of college athlete activism in the early 21st century signifies racial justice has not yet to be fully achieved. The primary argument presented in this manuscript is that Black college athletes and their allies across multiple generations have strategically activated a range of activist actions to demand change within and beyond athletic spaces; this focus challenges and debunks the prevailing notion that Black college athletes are and have been politically disengaged and less committed to broader social justice struggles. Rather we highlight how they have been and remain integral actors in the struggle for racial justice in intercollegiate athletics, at institutions of higher education, and in society more broadly.

More specifically, the activism during the Summer of 2020 was a part of an intergenerational legacy of Black resistance through sport. Hence, the purpose of this manuscript is to examine the influence of activism in and through college sport during two prominent eras of social justice movements in the U.S., the Civil Rights movement (CRM) and Black Power movement (BPM) of 1950s-1970s and Black Lives Matter movement (BLMM) of 2010s-2020s. Understanding the interplay between broader social movements and activism in and through college sport can inform current and future sport stakeholders on the ways in which equity and racial justice efforts can be optimized at the institutional and societal levels. Historically, college campuses in the U.S. have been fertile ground for mobilization efforts centered on championing civil and human rights for African Americans (Douglas, Shockley, & Toldson, 2020). Despite the abundance of research on college student activism broadly, a glaring omission from current literature is Black college athlete activists’ experiences and influences (George-Williams, 2019).

The focus on anti-Black racism also serves as a nuanced contribution to the literature on activism in college sport whereby the specificity of harms caused, and subsequent responses involve the centralization of the voices of those most disparately impacted. For the purposes of this manuscript, we define activism as social justice efforts that challenge inequitable structures, conditions, and norms and express concrete aims for positive change (Cooper et al., 2019). Since the NCAA has expressed a commitment to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in
college sport (Keaton & Cooper; 2022; NCAA, 2021b), it is important for research to highlight the antecedents, catalysts, limitations, and outcomes of activism in and through college sport particularly when involving one of their primary stakeholders, Black college athletes. Thus, this manuscript reflects a commitment to racial equity in college sport research.

Until recently, research on activism in intercollegiate athletics has primarily focused on athletes’ efforts to change rules related to name, image, and likeness (NIL), the elimination of amateurism logics, gender equity, and increased diversity in athletic leadership (Brooks & Althouse, 2013; Epstein & Kisska-Schulze, 2016; Hoffman, 2020; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998). However, more recent scholarship has captured the prominence of Black athletes’ resistance to socio-political racial violence (Agyemang et al., 2010; Black et al., 2022). Nonetheless there is a dearth of scholarship that has adopted an intergenerational analysis of the role of Black college athletes’ involvement with broader social movements (Cooper, 2021; Edwards, 1969; George-Williams, 2019). Within this manuscript, we chose to focus on the efforts of Black college athletes due the parallels between their distinctive racialized experiences within the system of higher education and Black people’s experiences in the broader U.S. society, which the latter has served as the impetus for U.S. based social movements focused on addressing anti-Black racism (e.g., overt and covert racial discrimination, limited leadership opportunities, physical violence, educational inequities, healthcare disparities, economic exploitation, and broader social injustices) (Brooks & Althouse, 2013; Cooper, 2012).

Anti-Black racism refers to the ecological conditions (ideological, structural, cultural, and interpersonal) that position Blackness and Black people as synonymous with inferiority and thus deserving of second-class citizenship at best and subhuman treatment at worst (Bell, 1992; Patterson, 1982; Wilderson, 2020). In addition, since Black college athletes have been at the center of the exploitation discussions within big-time college sports (Brooks & Althouse, 2013; Hawkins, 2010; Singer, 2020), we deem it appropriate to shift attention towards how this group has utilized their agency, resources, and alliances to challenge racialized systems and norms. This paradigm shift aligns with liberatory scholarship that seeks to transform college sport in general and college sport research more specifically into spaces where equity is centralized and actualized rather than elusive (Carter-Francique, 2018; Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Cooper, Newton, Klein & Jolly, 2020; Hoffman, 2020; Keaton & Cooper, 2022).

To achieve this aim, we first provide an overview of the socio-historical context that informs race-conscious activism in college sport followed a review of literature on the evolution of Black college athlete activism in the U.S. Next, we introduce the theoretical frameworks that guided our analysis, the African American Sport Activism Typology (AASAT) (Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019; Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020). Following this section, we present two sections with examples of Black college athlete activism during the CRM and BPM era (1950s-1970s) and BLMM era (2010s-2020s). The manuscript concludes with a discussion and recommendations for future directions for Black college athlete activism.

### Socio-Historical Contexts for Understanding Race-Conscious Activism in College Sport

The Black liberation struggle in the U.S. dates to the 15th century (Horne, 2020). For the purposes of this manuscript, the social movements of the 1950s-1970s and 2010s-2020s are highlighted given their heightened visibility in U.S. historical recollection and distinct impact on modern day institutional arrangements (e.g., passage of landmark Civil Rights laws, influence on
the implementation of athletic department and university wide DEI efforts, etc.). Following the New Negro era (1900s-1940s) (Early, 2008), the Civil Rights movement (CRM) began to take form. Broader socio-political occurrences such as the international impacts of the Cold War and World War II influenced race relations in the U.S. (Horne, 1985). The CRM was a hallmark period for grassroots, mass mobilization, economic, media, and legal activism (Cooper, 2021). A popular tactic for challenging separate and unequal conditions facing Black Americans was the organization of boycotts at the local, regional, and national levels. Bus and restaurant boycotts were commonplace throughout the southern U.S. in the 1950s and 1960s. All forms of activism were integrally connected to legal activism whereby the court decisions and amendments were viewed as a pathway for securing full citizenship rights (e.g., Sweatt v. Painter (1950), McLaurin v. Oklahoma (1950), Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954), Civil Rights Act of 1964, Voting Rights Act of 1965) (Boyd, 2010; Hine, Hine, & Harrold, 2006).

The transition from the CRM to the Black Power movement (BPM) occurred at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s. The main difference between the CRM and BPM was the former adopted a largely non-violent and peace seeking integration resolution to racial conflict in the U.S. whereas the latter was more militant, confrontational, and segregationist in nature (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967). Organizations such as the Nation of Islam and Black Panther Party for Self-Defense were thought leaders and organizers for the BPM. Each of the BPM led organizations, albeit the philosophies were not fully uniform, created community programs and utilized international relations to promote transnational Black empowerment (Hine, Hine, & Harrold, 2006). Similar to the CRM, human and civil rights were central, but beyond these basic requests, additional demands for Black collective empowerment were expressed.

Fast forward to the 2010s and 2020s, another Black social justice movement was birthed from the perpetual killings of unarmed Black Americans at the hands of law enforcement and White vigilantes. In 2013, when George Zimmerman was acquitted in the murder of 17-year-old Trayvon Martin, three Black women Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors, and Ayo (formerly Opal) Tometi created the #BlackLivesMatter movement. The #BlackLivesMatter social media hashtag subsequently became the rallying cry for a 21st century international movement for Black human and civil rights in the U.S. (BLM, 2022). Black Lives Matter (BLM) focuses on intervening on state and vigilante violence inflicted on Black communities. Given the cultural currency and influential power of big-time college sports, it is important to understand the conditions under which activism in these spaces emerges and contributes to institutional reform and societal progress (i.e., increased human and civil rights for Black Americans). Moreover, the cultural shift of media activism, specifically social media, by Black college athletes during the BLM era, remains critical to how they organize and demonstrate a united front against issues of racial inclusion and challenge long-standing institutional structures like name, image, and likeness. Next, we will present a brief history of Black college athlete activism during the 20th and early 21st centuries.

**Black College Athletes and Activism**

Due to the prevalence of anti-Black racism in college sport since its founding in the late 19th century (Cooper, 2021; Harris, 2000; Wiggins & Miller, 2003), Black college athletes have resisted this oppression in a myriad of ways. As a result of their racial exclusion from mainstream athletic programs, during the early to mid-20th century the mere presence of these
athletes reflected a level of activism whereby Black inferiority was being resisted. For example, Smith, Harrison, and Clark (2014) highlighted how several Black scholar athletes, as racial outliers, navigated contested terrains at their HWIs in the early 1900s to debunk insidious stereotypes associated with their race, athletic abilities, and academic acumen. The pioneering success of Paul Robeson, Duke Slater, William Henry Lewis, Frederick “Fritz” Douglass Pollard, Jerome “Brud” Holland, William Tecumseh Sherman (T.S.) Jackson, and Meredith Gourdine (Smith, Harrison, & Clark, 2014) served as a foundation for future desegregation efforts in college sport.

Relatedly, Black women sportswomen and agents of racial and gender uplift such as Lucy Diggs Slowe, Alice Coachman, Mary Reeves Allen, Ora Washington, Inez Patterson, Rose Wilson, and Helen “Midge” Davis were influential resisters of intersectional marginalizing norms within sporting spaces and beyond (Carter-Francique & Richardson, 2015; Cooper, 2021; Davis, 2016; Grundy & Shackelford, 2005; 2014). Hence, the activism of these Black sportspersons created conditions for college sport to be more inclusive of Black athletes (e.g., the achievements of the 1960s and 1970s Tennessee State University Tigerbelles Track and Field teams, the success of the 1966 all-Black starting five for the Texas Western College team that won the national men’s basketball championship against the heralded all-White Kentucky Wildcats, the majority of Division I men’s basketball and football teams at Division I HWIs being Black in the early 21st century, etc.) (Cooper, Cavil, & Cheeks, 2014; Landsbury, 2014).

Aside from athletic participation at HWIs, the establishment of athletic programs at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) reflected what Cavil (2016) described as institutional activism. Athletic conferences such as the Colored (now Central) Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) (founded in 1912), Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association (now Conference) (SIAC) (founded in 1913) and Southwestern Athletic Association (now Conference) (SWAC) (founded in 1920) served as spaces where Black athletic prowess was cultivated and celebrated in a culturally safe space during a time when they were outright excluded from historically White athletic conferences (Cavil, 2015; Cooper, Cavil, & Cheeks, 2014; Hodge, Collins, & Bennett, 2013). Men’s teams such as the Tuskegee football teams of 1920s, Morgan State men’s basketball team of the 1930s, Bennett College Belles women’s basketball teams of the 1930s, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial (A&I) College (now State University) men’s basketball teams of the 1950s and women’s track and field teams of the 1950s and 1960s exemplified activism in college sport amidst segregation laws and norms of the day (Cavil, 2015; Cooper, 2021; Cooper, Cavil, & Cheeks, 2014; Hawkins, Cooper, Carter-Francique, & Cavil, 2015; Wiggins & Miller, 2003). In pre-desegregation eras, the existence of Black athletic participation as athletes, coaches, and administrators challenged notions of racial inferiority and contributed to broader efforts for full citizenship rights (Cooper, 2021; Wiggins & Miller, 2003).

After the landmark passage of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954) and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1965, and 1968, U.S. social institutions such as college sports gradually began desegregating. In contrast to pre-desegregation periods (19th century through the mid-20th century), post-1960s, Black athletic absence from sporting spaces signified a form of activism. For example, the most notable examples of this power being activated are the numerous Black football, basketball, and track and field player protests across the U.S. in the late 1960s and early 1970s to convey their discontent with the racial conditions at HWIs and within their athletic departments (these examples are discussed in greater detail later) (Cooper, 2021; Harris, 2000; Henderson, 2013). In each instance, the players expressed specific demands for...
institutional change. These activist efforts provided a blueprint for future resistance such as the Mizzou football boycott in 2015 (Ferguson & Davis, 2019).

More recently, Black college athletes have utilized what Edwards' (2016b) described as the strength of the fourth wave of Black athlete activism, which involves the leveraging of technological resources such as social media to advocate for equity and racial justice. Social media campaigns such as #AllPlayersUnited and #NotNCAAProperty involved Black players activating their individual and collective agency to change the exploitative status quo of big-time college sports. Although tactics vary across time, space, and context (e.g., presence vs. absence as activism, word of mouth vs. social media campaigns, etc.), common themes of Black college sport activism from the early 20th century through the early 21st century include experiences with unjust conditions, consciousness raising through critical analyses of existing systems, and collective action through strategic organizing. In the next section, we outline two theoretical approaches that inform the analysis of activism in and through college sport: The African American Sport Activism Typology (AASAT) (Cooper et al., 2019; Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020). The AASAT centralizes resistance against anti-Black racism at the micro, meso, and macro levels (Cooper et al., 2019; Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020).

**African American Sport Activism Typology**

To better understand how different forms of activism are activated and leveraged by African American sportspersons, Cooper, Macaulay, and Rodriguez (2019) developed a sport activism typology. The initial typology included the following five categories: a) symbolic, b) scholarly, c) grassroots, d) sports-based, and e) economic (Cooper et al., 2019). For the purposes of this manuscript, we will focus on symbolic, grassroots, sports-based, and economic activism. Symbolic activism, also referred to as public demonstrative activist actions (PDAAs), refers to disruptive efforts to hegemonic norms that draw increased attention towards social injustices. In 2003, when Toni Smith-Thompson and Deidre Chapman chose to turn their backs to the American Flag during the playing of the National Anthem before basketball games at Manhattanville College and University of Virginia was a poignant example of symbolic activism against U.S. militarism (Cooper, 2021). Grassroots activism refers to collective action for local level social justice. In 1970, nine Black football players at Syracuse University (famously known as the Syracuse 8) organized a protest of their spring practices and signed a petition to express their demands for addressing racial discrimination within the athletic department and on campus (Carr, 2019; Cooper, 2021). Sports-based activism refers to disruptive social justice actions enacted to change a sport organization via policy and/or practice reforms. In the film Schooled: The Price of College Sports (Finkel & Martin, 2013), former college athletes including Jonathan Franklin of University of Los Angeles California, Arian Foster of the University of Tennessee, and Devon Ramsay of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill expressed their grievances against the NCAA and specific recommendations for reform in college sport, they were enacting sport-based activism (Cooper, 2021). Economic activism refers to coordinated efforts to financially divest from oppressive entities and/or invest in culturally empowering entities. The establishment and sustainment of HBCU conferences, classics, rivalries, and athletic competitions reflect economic activism against the hegemony of Power 5 Division I HWIs (Cooper et al., 2019).

Adding to this typology, Cooper, Mallery, and Macaulay (2020) identified five additional categories: a) political, b) legal, c) media, d) music and art, and e) military. For the purposes of
In this manuscript, we will focus on legal and media activism. Legal activism refers to the use of judicial systems and structures to achieve social justice. The *O’Bannon v. NCAA No. 09-3329* (N.D. Cal.) (2009) class action lawsuit is an example of legal activism that eventually led to changes in NIL rights for college athletes (Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020). Media activism refers to the strategic use of communication mediums such as newspapers, radio, television, and Internet to increase awareness of and stimulate concerted action for social justice causes. The #NotNCAAProperty is an example of social media activism. More recently, Cooper (2021) noted how pioneering and mass mobilization can be forms of activism as well. When pioneering efforts are focused on contributing to a collective aim, disrupt hegemonic norms, and include concrete demands, these actions are deemed as activism. The 1966 National Championship of the Texas Western men’s basketball team is an example of pioneering activism. Mass mobilization (also referred to as institutional or organizational activism) refers to interstate and/or international collective action efforts centered on social justice. The creation of the National College Players Association (NCPA) by Ramogi Huma in 2001 is an example of mass mobilization activism (Cooper, 2021).

Despite the benefits of this typology in terms of analyzing different methods and modalities of justice oriented disruptive actions, the AASAT is limited in numerous ways. The AASAT is not exhaustive of all types of activism or social change actions, does not fully account for the dialectical and intersecting nature of different acts of activism, and does not foreground the role of complex relationships between and amongst privileged and disadvantaged groups across diverse milieu. We posit that the collective impact of these activism strategies provides a useful framework for analyzing intergenerational resistance against anti-Black racism in and through college sport.

**College Sport Activism in the Civil Rights Movement and Black Power Movement (1950s-1970s)**

Within this section, we outline select examples of Black college sport activism exhibited by athletes and coaches during the Civil Rights and Black Power movements in the 1960s and 1970s. We start by highlighting the foundational influence of sport activism at HBCUs. Next, we discuss notable examples of Black college sport activism at HWIs including the nationwide boycotts in response to racially hostile campus climates at these institutions. Using the AASAT, we highlight how symbolic, grassroots, media, and economic activism were strategically activated to combat racial discrimination within and beyond athletic milieu.

During the mid-20th century, the establishment of various Black political and social organizations signified progressive steps in terms of coordinated resistance efforts against anti-Black racism in the U.S. Strategies such as protests, boycotts, marches, and petitions were deemed as effective in the broader U.S. and thus these efforts were replicated in college sports. Black athletes and coaches in the CRM and BPM were keenly aware of the power of their presence and absence in sporting spaces. For example, Pearson (2020) highlighted how Coach John B. McLendon of Tennessee A&I secured equitable housing for his HBCU men’s basketball team by using the threat of a boycott of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) Christmas Tip-Off Tournament in Kansas City, Missouri in 1960. The fact that Coach McLendon was a nationally known and the Tennessee A&I Tigers were three-time NAIA National Champions (1957, 1958, 1959) contributed to the effectiveness of this grassroots and threatened economic activism. The threat of (boycott of the tournament would have resulted in
reduced revenues for the NAIA) and strategic use of media activism (the demands were shared through local media outlets) forced the tournament officials to ensure there would be no racial discrimination in lodging for participating HWI and HBCU teams. Although, this grassroots activism victory was only achieved for a single event, it signified the power of threatening economic activism via an athletic boycott to achieve racial justice.

Another example of activism from HBCU athletes occurred in the weeks after the famous 1960 sit-ins in Greensboro, North Carolina led by four Black students at NC A&T State University (Franklin McCain, David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Ezell Blair, Jr. (now Jibreel Khazan). Several NC A&T athletes participated in subsequent protests of the white-owned Woolworth’s restaurant (Cobb, 2016; Cooper, 2021). The sit-ins and subsequent protests reflected symbolic and grassroots activism. A benefit of grassroots activism is the ability to target a specific issue impacting a common group of people (Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019). In the case of the NC A&T protests, all protestors shared a common experience of racial discrimination at segregated restaurants in Greensboro. This shared experience coupled with the proximity of participants and mutual goal of desegregation strengthened the local mobilization efforts (e.g., communications, planning, organizing, and executing activist plans). In addition, local and national media outlets covered these protests (media activism), which not only drew attention to the racist practices in Greensboro, North Carolina, but more importantly inspired mimetic protests across the U.S. (Cooper, 2021).

Leveraging their status as college athletes, NC A&T athletes joined their Black student non-athlete peers in the effort to desegregate restaurants in the city. When grassroots activism involves participation of both athletes and non-athletes, the networks and appeal of each group is optimized compared to instances where activism is pursued separately. Due to their collective efforts, numerous restaurants in Greensboro were desegregated before the end of the calendar (Cobb, 2016). The economic and media pressure associated with negative publicity forced the White owners of these establishments to acquiesce to the Black activists’ demands. Symbolic activism is particularly effective at generating widespread media attention to an issue by disrupting the status quo in a public manner (Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019). Another benefit of symbolic activism is the way in which disruptive actions can be repeated in similar manners across diverse geographical contexts. The strategic usage of the high visibility of their athletic status to change unjust conditions beyond sport embodies what Edwards’ (2016b) referred to as leveraging the power of sport and what Cooper, Macaulay, and Rodriguez (2019) refer to as igniting positive societal change through sport (as opposed to in sport).

Another example of athlete activism emerging from HBCUs was when Wilma Rudolph, 3-time Olympic gold medalist (1960) and Tennessee State University (TSU) alumna (1963) and track and field legend, used her agency and status as international superstar to force desegregation of her hometown in Clarksville, Tennessee (Rudolph, 1977). After returning home from winning three gold Olympic gold medals in Rome, Rudolph (still enrolled as a TSU student) was asked to participate in a parade in her honor in her hometown with the one condition that the event would be segregated. In contempt, Rudolph refused to attend the event unless it was desegregated. As a result of her activism, the city agreed to desegregate the parade. This individual act of symbolic activism was largely effective due to Rudolph’s high-profile status as an Olympian. Thus, this example underscores how the effectiveness of symbolic activism, particularly when enacted by an individual (as opposed to as a group), is contingent upon the profile status of the athlete activist regarding one’s ability to generate interest convergence and a favorable cost-benefit analysis from the opposing entity. A similar strategy
was enacted within the broader CRM when high-profile leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Medgar Evers, and Harry Belafonte would participate in protests to elevate the attention drawn these efforts (Hine, Hine, & Harrold, 2006).

Later in 1963, Rudolph participated in grassroots activism at a local Shoney’s restaurant in Clarksville, Tennessee to force the restaurant to end racial discrimination against African Americans. As a TSU student and later alumna, Rudolph was an “active engaged protestor” and her actions signified her politics as a Black woman and a conscious American and global citizen committed to eradicating racism through her sporting status (Davis, 2016, p.183). This grassroots activism was a success and resulted in the desegregation of the restaurant as well as other local public recreational spaces (e.g., parks, swimming pools, etc.) (Davis, 2016). Similar to the effort at NC A&T, the local mobilization of like-minded social justice champions and the ability to centralize a specific and tangible demand (desegregation of Shoney’s) illustrated the benefit of well-organized and executed grassroots activist efforts (Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019).

In a related vein, Davis (2016) emphasized the important role of collaborative advocacy efforts with Black women athletes and Black Greek Sororities. More specifically, Davis (2016) highlighted how Lucy Slowe Diggs’ racial advocacy efforts were cultivated at a HBCU when she said: “Black institutions were invested in molding black girls into race women and used athletics as a major tool in this endeavor” (p. 57). HBCU athletic scholars have noted how these institutions serve a unique purpose in developing critical consciousness among Black students including college athletes and promoting their engagement in sociopolitical change (Hawkins, Cooper, Carter-Francique, & Cavil, 2015). Cavil (2015) surmised HBCUs embody institutional activism against anti-Black racism by virtue of their existence and purpose and thus these spaces have traditionally nurtured activism as evidence in the fact that numerous CRM organizations were established at these institutions (i.e., Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)) (Cobb, 2016; Hine, Hine, & Harrold, 2006).

Wyomia Tyus, another standout TSU alumna and track and field star, also leveraged her athletic status during a protest at the 1968 Olympics. Tyus wore Black shorts (instead of the U.S. issued uniform) and raised her fist as she won her historic 100M event (she was the first athlete to win the event in consecutive Olympics – pioneering resistance (Cooper, 2021)) to symbolize her solidarity with Tommie Smith and John Carlos’ Black power salutes (Cooper, 2021; Davis, 2016). At the same Olympics, Wyomia Tyus, Barbara Ann Ferrell, Margaret Johnson Bailes, and Mildrette Netter dedicated their 4 x 100M relay gold medals to Tommie Smith and John Carlos (Davis, 2016; Landsbury, 2014). These instances of symbolic activism and agentic resistance on the international stage amplified the message of the CRM and BPM to audiences beyond the U.S. and demonstrated how resistance can be exhibited in a multitude of ways (i.e., hybrid resistance via highly disruptive (wearing of black shorts as a violation of International Olympic Committee (IOC) rules during a historic performance) and less disruptive ways (dedication of gold medals)) (Cooper, 2021). It is also important to note HBCUs were progressive in comparison to their HWI counterparts in terms of providing athletic opportunities for women during the mid-20th century (Carter-Francique & Richardson, 2015; Davis, 2016). Thus, the opportunities and racial and sociopolitical socialization at HBCUs created athlete activists such

---

1 Lucy Slowe Diggs was a founder of Alpha Kappa Alpha (AKA) Sorority, Incorporated (Davis, 2016) and Wilma Rudolph was member of Delta Sigma Theta (DST) Sorority, Incorporated (Rudolph, 1977). Black Greek organizations have played an integral role on Black advancement in the U.S.
as Rudolph and Tyus who utilized their platform to advocate for intersectional change both within and beyond sporting spaces.

Aside from sport activism at HBCUs, Black college athletes at HWIs were also actively engaged in multiple types of activism to stimulate change at their respective institutions. For example, in 1964, star running back for the University of Kansas Jayhawks, Gayle Sayers, performed an individual sit-in at a local restaurant in Lawrence, Kansas to protest racial segregation (Moore, 2017). His courageous activism did not result in immediate racial desegregation at restaurants in Lawrence, Kansas. Even though the success of each sit-in effort varied, the collective empowerment to disrupt White hegemonic norms in public venues was amplified during the CRM and BPM. In addition, the macro and meso level changes in the U.S. because of the broader CRM efforts (e.g., post-World War II political conditions, the breaking of the color barrier in Major League Baseball (MLB) in 1947, the success of the Montgomery Bus Boycott with Browder v. Gayle (1956) decision, etc.) created a context whereby there were favorable conditions for Black college athletes to challenge racial discrimination in public spaces (Cooper, 2021). In other words, the societal context created by the CRM and BPM provided Black college athletes with ontological security to engage in their activism at their respective campuses.

During the latter part of the 1960s, there were a multitude of Black college athletes at HWIs who began leveraging their agency, status, and resources to engage in symbolic, grassroots, economic, and media activism. For example, in 1967, at SJSU, Dr. Harry Edwards organized a group of Black college athletes and students who were non-athletes (United Black Students for Action (UBSA)) to boycott (symbolic, grassroots, and economic activism) a football game against University of Texas El Paso to change the racial campus climate at the university (Edwards, 1969, 2016a). The group outlined eight demands for the university administrators via various media outlets (e.g., student newspaper, local news, etc.) (media activism). These demands focused on changes to academic curriculum and support, housing and student organization policies, financial aid assistance, and student recruitment and employee practices. After learning about the boycott, members of the UTEP football team agreed to join the SJSU players. The architect of the boycott (and later the OPHR protests of the New York Athletic Club and Olympics in Mexico City, Mexico in 1968) explained how his activist skills and approaches were heavily influenced by the BPM. Learning from the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense and their Ten Point Program provided the framework for articulating concrete demands for change (Hine, Hine, & Harrold, 2006). The boycott resulted in a series of short-lived victories including institutional commitments for increasing racial diversity in academic and athletic leadership, financial support for students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, desegregated student housing and fraternity and sorority organizations, and staff positions for reducing interpersonal conflict on campus (Cooper, 2021; Edwards, 1969, 2016b). However, the real victory of the SJSU boycott was the widespread media coverage it generated to inspire Black college athletes at other HWIs to leverage their power to ignite change at the local level (Cooper, 2021; Edwards, 1969, 2016b).

Following the SJSU boycott, over the next three years, similar efforts were organized at schools across the U.S. including at UTEP, University of Wyoming, Syracuse University, University of Kansas, Marquette University, Michigan State University, San Francisco State University, University of California Berkeley, University of Oklahoma, Oregon State University, Michigan State University, University of Arizona, and Oklahoma City University (Cooper, 2021; Edwards, 2016a; Ferguson & Davis, 2019; Harris, 2000; Henderson, 2013; Moore, 2017). The
grassroots activism among these Black athletes focused on issues on their campuses as well as racism at other institutions. In 1968, Black athletes at Marquette University collaborated with a student organization called Respond (previously known as Students United for Racial Equality (SURE)) to demand for increased financial support for Black students from local Milwaukee neighborhoods, more Black history courses, a review of campus police actions, and increased racial diversity in administration roles on campus (Henderson, 2013). At Michigan State, in 1968, Black football players boycotted team practices to demand improvements in academic support for athletes in general and more concerted efforts towards addressing the unique challenges facing Black athletes more specifically (Moore, 2017). At the University of California Berkeley, Black football and men’s basketball players mobilized a proposed boycott to call attention to racially discriminatory practices in athletic department (e.g., racial stacking (positional assignments based on race rather than ability), differential treatment for Black and White athletes regarding disciplinary actions, and an underrepresentation of Black coaches) (Moore, 2017). In each of these instances, only nominal changes were achieved, which highlighted both the strength and limitations of grassroots activism when not continued over an extended period of time.

Beyond addressing on-campus issues, Black athletes also organized to change conditions at other institutions beyond their own. For example, in 1968, Black athletes at the University of Texas El Paso (UTEP) boycotted a track and field contest against Brigham Young University (BYU) to draw attention to the racist Mormon Church policy of priesthood requirements (Moore, 2017). Similarly, in 1969, Black football players at Wyoming University joined a student organization called the Black Student Alliance (BSA) and wore black armbands to signify their protest of the Mormon Church and their racist priesthood policies (Henderson, 2013). The players were removed from the team for their courageous symbolic and grassroots activism, which illustrates the risk and sacrifice that accompany being committed to social and racial justice. The demands in each instance were like those expressed by the SJSU activists, which illuminated the widespread nature of anti-Black racism throughout the U.S. These Black college athletes were concerned with the conditions at their respective schools that signaled to them that Blacks were only valued as athletic commodities and their communities’ holistic needs were insignificant. Some of the boycott or protest efforts involved threats to withhold participation from practices, others from games, and in a few instances, athletes withdrew from school altogether (i.e., Marquette University protest in 1968) (Henderson, 2013). Most instances focused on changes at a specific institution while others involved changes at other institutions (i.e., Wyoming 14 protest of Mormon Church racist priesthood policy) (Henderson, 2013). The mimetic effect of symbolic and grassroots activism creates pressure on institutions to reflect on how other institutions are responding to similar demands and helps amplify the message that issues of anti-Black racism are not isolated. In nearly all these efforts, Black college athletes coalesced with their non-athletic peers (often following the lead of the latter) to leverage their status through college sport to increase the likelihood for change.

Beyond college campuses and athletic contests, the success of Black college athletes at international sporting events (i.e., Olympics and World Trials) during the CRM and Cold War periods served as an important platform for racial justice empowerment. For example, the success of the Tennessee Tiger Belles track and field athletes (Isabelle Daniels, Mae Faggs, Margaret Matthews, Wilma Rudolph, Willie White, and Lucinda Williams) among numerous other Black college athletes who were Olympians at the 1960 Olympics proved how African Americans were not only great representatives of the U.S., but deserving of equal treatment
(Cooper, 2021; Davis, 2016; Moore, 2017). Dating back to the achievements of Jesse Owens in the 1936 Olympics, the philosophy of muscular assimilationism posited that Black athletic excellence would constitute a critical leverage point for Black people to secure better treatment in other aspects of society (Cooper, 2021; Davis, 2016; Henderson, 1968). The Black sports press celebrated the accomplishments of these Black athletes on the international stage to draw attention to the hypocrisy of U.S. domestic and international policies (see Carroll (2006) for an extensive discussion on the Double V (victory at home against racial discrimination and victory abroad against fascism) campaign). Thus, Black college athletes’ presence, performance, and expressiveness in local, national, and international sporting spaces served as a vital means of resistance against racial oppression during the CRM and BPM.

In summary, Black activism in and through college sport in the CRM and BPM focused on grassroots efforts, strategic use of symbolic protests, controlling media narratives, and threats of economic divestment in the form of athlete boycotts from sporting events. Each of these tactics were initially performed by non-athletic racial justice organizations such as the SNCC, SCLC, Black Panther Party for Self-Defense (BPP), and NAACP and subsequently reenacted by Black college athletes and coaches. Learning from and in some instances partnering with organizations that centralized dismantling anti-Black racism within their missions underscores how Black college athletes of this era were integrally connected with the broader struggle for racial justice. A common outcome of each of these efforts was partial demands being met, which reveals an important limitation of activism that is not sustained over extended periods of time such as the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955-1956 as well as those coordinated on multiple fronts (i.e., hybrid resistance involving the activation of different forms of activism concurrently or sequentially to achieve a common aim – an example of this type of effort would involve simultaneous usage of legal, media, grassroots, mass mobilization, and economic activism). Relatedly, this analysis also highlights the limits of the activism in and through college sport as a consistent influencer of institutional and/or societal change and thus reinforcing the necessity of multi-level coordinated efforts and sustained alliances beyond sport.

**College Sport Activism in the Black Lives Matter (BLM) Movement (2010s-2020s)**

Building on the legacy of the Black college sport activism of the mid-20th century, another wave of Black college athlete activism emerged in the early 21st century during the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement. In this section, we examine different forms of Black college athlete activism that occurred during the BLM movement and delineate these actions from those that were explicitly in alignment with the movement. More recently, there was another distinct uptick in Black college athlete activism during the Summer of 2020 and we highlight select examples during this period as well. In this section, we focus on instances of legal, grassroots, symbolic, economic, and media activism.

As previously mentioned, athlete activism did occur during the era of BLM but these efforts during the early years of the movement (2013-2016) did not lead to major disruption across the organizational field and many efforts were not stated as directly influenced with or by the BLM movement. Hence, it is important to note that some activism efforts occurred during the BLM movement, while some activism efforts were proclaimed as aligning with prescriptions of the movement. It is imperative that we are attuned to activism efforts during the BLM movement that fall into three major categories: a) Activism efforts occurring during the BLM movement, b)
activism efforts explicitly connected to BLM movement prescriptions, and c) activism induced by the Summer 2020 racial violence.

**Concurrent Activism During the BLM Movement**

Black athletes during the BLM movement became more vocal and conscious of their social, academic, and economic plight. Black athletes began to question the amateurism logics of the NCAA and rather than asking questions via interviews and press conferences (i.e., the infamous Michigan Fab 5). Black athletes during this era formed their questions into lawsuits and unionization efforts. For example, in 2014 Cain Colter, former Northwestern University quarterback, and other Northwestern football players partnered with Ramogi Huma, president of the National College Players Association (NCPA), to file for union employee status to engage in collective bargaining and earn legally protected labor rights (legal activism and grassroots activism). Although their petition was denied by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), their activism was a historic effort signaling that active college athletes can use their agency to question logics and permanence of exploitative NCAA structures. Later in 2018, Nigel Hayes, former University of Wisconsin basketball player, revealed in an interview that he and his teammates discussed boycotting athletic contests during the 2016-2017 season to bring attention to the unjust economic restrictions associated with the NCAA’s amateurism principle. Although Nigel and his peers did not follow through on their boycotting efforts, the mere possibility of this effort captures how Black athletes have consistently considered ways in which they can exercise their agency to engage in economic activism.

In 2014, Shabazz Napier, former University of Connecticut (UConn) standout guard, used media activism after winning an NCAA national championship to bring attention to the economic inequities of NCAA amateurism. During a post championship interview Napier shared, “I don’t feel student-athletes should get hundreds of thousands of dollars, but like I said, there are hungry nights that I go to bed and I’m staring” (Ganim, 2014, para. 6). Napier’s commentary was picturesque of NCAA inequities – How is this successful athlete at a basketball powerhouse institution going to bed hungry? His media activism caught the attention of Connecticut Senator Matthew Lesser, who vowed to investigate state legislation to deter such a reality from occurring. Hence, Napier’s media activism caught the attention of government officials and can be argued that it was the spark that positioned Connecticut government officials such as U.S. Senator Chris Murphy to author a college athlete name, image, and likeness (NIL) legislation. This example reveals how all forms of activism are intended to generate another type of activism to achieve an aim. In this instance, Napier’s media activism resulted in substantive political and legal activism being enacted which transformed the landscape of intercollegiate athletics and secured unprecedented levels of athlete empowerment with the NCAA.

Like Black college athletes at HWIs, Black athletes at HBCUs also had questions regarding their social plight as NCAA athletes. Rather than questioning the logics of the NCAA structure, Naquan Smith and his Grambling State University football teammates boycotted playing due to illegitimate conditions of their facilities (ESPN, 2013). Grambling State football players boycotted two days of practice, protested the removal of their head coach, and wanted better workplace conditions, which included limiting long travel bus rides and addressing the issue of unsafe and outdated equipment. These efforts reflected grassroots and economic activism. Economic activism was reflected in their proposed boycott of the upcoming game, which would have resulted in six figure fine and loss of pay due to forfeiting a game at Jackson.
State University. Grassroots activism was present in the fact that the demands expressed were focused on improving conditions at GSU alone rather than at multiple institutions.

Moreover, Black athletes using the judicial system to bring about social change was also prevalent during the BLM era. Although many of these efforts have yet to be publicly associated with the BLM movement (i.e., Wadley et al v. University of Iowa), Black athletes leading this charge is noteworthy given how the NCAA structure has disproportionally hindered their academic and athletic prowess, (Cooper, 2016; Cooper, Cavil, & Cheeks, 2014; Keaton & Cooper, 2022). For example, in 2014, former Clemson football player, Martin Jenkins, utilized legal activism when he sued the NCAA over education-related expenses. His historic lawsuit victory changed NCAA rules and forced universities to cover the cost of college attendance of athletes, which resulted in increased financial means for athletes to navigate everyday college related expenses. Furthermore, Jenkin’s legal activism laid the groundwork for Alston v. NCAA. Shawne Alston, former West Virginia University football player, was the face of the landmark Alston decision that found that the NCAA’s restriction on educational related expenses for college athletes was a violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act. This legal decision established that the NCAA cannot put a cap on educational-related benefits of college athletes. More importantly, Alston lessened the longstanding precedent power of the NCAA v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, a court decision that upheld increased benefits for college athletes would undermine the sanctity of collegiate athletics. In 2020, a group of former HBCU athletes convened to sue the NCAA for racial discrimination with Academic Progress Rates (APR). The faces of Manassa v. NCAA are former HBCU basketball athletes from Savannah State University, Troyce Manassa and Austin Dasent, who allege the NCAA’s Academic Performance Program (APP) was comprised of academic standards that disproportionately penalize HBCUs from postseason play and discriminate against these institutions due to their academic mission statements, admissions policies, and lack of economic resources as a result of systemic racism. Since the APP’s inception, over one-third of the penalties issued have been placed on HBCU athletic programs even though these schools constituted less than 6 percent of all NCAA members (Cooper, Cavil, & Cheeks, 2014). Despite the fact that the APR and APP standards have yet to be altered substantially, the legal activism of Manassa and Dasent demonstrate how Black college athletes are willing to take drastic measures to pursue racial justice in college sports and force current judges to review and decide if draconian and de facto race neutral (as opposed to race conscious or race equitable) NCAA policies are meritorious or not.

Moreover, a critical development of activism during the BLM era has been Black athletes leading, participating, and strategizing in mass mobilization activism through social media. Some of these efforts include #NotNCAAProperty, #WeWantToPlay, and #WeAreUnited which became trending social media hashtags primarily on Twitter. Although these athletes used social media as their platform, their activism can be characterized as mass mobilization, as they sought to organize and challenge structures that hinder their agentic capabilities. During the fall of 2020, amidst grave uncertainty due to the Covid-19 virus, athletes across the Power 5 conferences came together to advocate for their safety during a pandemic, forming the coalitions of “#WeWantToPlay” and “#WeAreUnited”, a coalition protesting the lack of racial justice in NCAA athletics amongst many other issues (Black, Ofoegbu, & Foster, 2022). The Pac-12 athletes who led the #WeAreUnited mass mobilization effort declared their stance in The Players’ Tribune, an athlete led news outlet, and their hashtag then transcended to Twitter:
In rejecting the NCAA’s claim that #BlackLivesMatter while also systematically exploiting Black athletes nationwide, #WeAreUnited. Because we are being asked to play college sports in a pandemic in a system without enforced health and safety standards, and without transparency about COVID cases on our teams, the risks to ourselves, our families, and our communities, #WeAreUnited.

According to Black et al (2022), only 2% of Power 5 conference football players tweeted #WeAreUnited, while 8% of these athletes tweeted “#WeWantToPlay”. Given the timing of the mass mobilizing efforts, the coalitions joined forces, which lead to Trevor Lawrence, a white athlete, and two Black athletes, Justin Fields, and Najee Harris, becoming prominent faces of the movements. Fields and Harris participating and being perceived as instrumental to elevating the mass mobilization effort was an important symbol, as it illuminated that even prominent Black athletes of major (read: wealthy and athletically successful) football programs, The Ohio State University and University of Alabama respectively, did not innately trust that college sport structures inherently had their best interests, in terms of racial justice and safety measures.

Lastly, the mass mobilization effort of #NotNCAAProperty was led by Geo Baker, Jordan Bohannon, and Isaiah Livers, basketball athletes respectively at Rutgers University, University of Iowa, and University of Michigan (Wamsley, 2021). Their activism effort occurred during the 2021 March Madness tournament; hence, they strategically used the media attention of March Madness to bring attention to the economic inequities of the NCAA controlling the name, image, and likeness (NIL) of college athletes. As of June 2022, Baker’s tweet that ignited the coalition of “#NotNCAAProperty” garnished 5,475 retweets, 656 quoted retweets, and 32,000 likes:

The NCAA OWNS my name image and likeness. Someone on music scholarship can profit from an album. Someone on academic scholarship can have a tutor service. For ppl who say “an athletic scholarship is enough.” Anything less than equal rights is never enough. I am #NotNCAAProperty

Through the hashtag #NotNCAAProperty, Black athletes ignited sustained conversations of college athlete’s rights, humanity, and economic restrictions (Cooper & Cooper, 2015; Hawkins, 2010; Keaton & Cooper, 2022; Staurowsky, 2014).

In 2013, before social media became a prominent platform for activism in society, Black athletes organized a mass mobilization effort, “All Player’s United”. Black football players from varying athletic departments wrote “APU”, an acronym for “All Players United”, on their wrist to bring attention to their frustrations with NCAA structures. They intentionally wrote the acronym on their athletic gear, so “APU” would be visible while their games were broadcasted nationally. This mass mobilizing effort was backed by National College Players Association (NCPA) and its president, a former college athlete, Ramogi Huma. A major aspect of the APU movement was to create a coalition of athletes that would support their peers who joined a concussion lawsuit against the NCAA and to bring attention to inequities in the athlete experience.
Activism Aligning with Prescriptions of the BLM Movement

While not specifically protesting with the BLM movement, there was activism from college athletes that aligned with the prescription of BLM, protesting state and vigilante violence against Black people. Violence against Black people is not limited to murder. Racist and discriminatory policies, practices, and symbols, along with racist, bigoted, and prejudiced actions are all forms of violence. During the BLM era, college athletes individually and collectively contributed to the public outcry of Black violence, utilizing their athletic status to illuminate murder, racism and discrimination that were occurring nationally and at their institutions.

As mentioned earlier, college athletes displayed symbolic activism through aligning with BLM activists by wearing hoodies, using hashtags, and using their bodies to amplify “I Can’t Breathe” and “Hands Up, Don’t Shoot” messaging. Ariyana Smith, a Knox College basketball player, protested in response to the death of Michael Brown in 2014 (Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019). Before a game at Fontbonne University (in Missouri), she laid on the court for four and half minutes, representing the number of hours Michael Brown laid outside on the ground in Ferguson, Missouri. Ariyana Smith became one of the first college athletes during this era to protest the murders of Black individuals. In 2015, the University of Missouri (Mizzou) Black football players supported the Concerned Student 1950 movement of students that demanded their president resign due to lack of addressing racial issues on campus (Ferguson & Davis, 2019). The Mizzou football players announced that they would not participate in any football activities until the president resigned (grassroots, economic, and symbolic activism). The proximity of Fontbonne University and the University of Missouri to Ferguson, Missouri, the city where Michael Brown was killed, influenced both Ariyana Smith’s and the Mizzou football players’ protests. The outcome of Smith’s symbolic activism was largely increased media coverage of the situation in Ferguson as opposed to any concrete changes in local policing or influence on the verdict in Michael Brown’s case. Whereas the results of the Mizzou football team hybrid activism included the resignations of both the University of Missouri President and Athletic Director and subsequent changes to campus policies to improve Black student experiences (Ferguson & Davis, 2019). The difference in results in these two instances illustrate how symbolic activism is most effective when combined with another form of activism. For example, the threatened boycott of the Mizzou football game as a form of economic activism would have resulted in over a $1 million loss in revenue for the university and local economy in Columbia, Missouri and this fact created enough pressure to force high level officials to acquiesce to some of the activists’ demands. Yet, since Smith’s symbolic activism was not directly connected to another form of activism (e.g., economic or legal), it yielded a less substantive impact compared to the Mizzou football player protests. Hence, all forms of activism are counter-hegemonic and meaningful, but it is important to better understand how, when, where, why, and how some forms of activism are more effective than others.

Between 2016 and 2017, numerous college athletes would protest while the national anthem was played at games in lieu of Colin Kaepernick’s symbolic activism during the 2016-2017 National Football League (NFL) season. These mimetic efforts included Howard University cheerleaders, University of Arkansas women’s basketball players, and volleyball players at University of Maryland, Florida State University, and West Virginia Tech University to name a few (Cooper, 2021). College football players at the University of Nebraska took a knee, Michigan State University and University of Michigan players raised their fists, and Amherst College players engaged in the take a knee and raise fists demonstrations. During the
BLM era, college athletes were taking a risk protest during the national anthem because many athletic departments and coaches did not support these actions as they saw it as a sign of disrespect towards the military and the U.S. overall. Interestingly, after the summer of 2020, we witnessed athletic departments refrain from hindering these symbolic displays of activism and pivot to providing a platform and resources for Black college athletes due to issues of perceived legitimacy (Keaton, 2020; Keaton & Cooper, 2022).

College athletes continued to engage in media and symbolic activism during the BLM era via their social media platforms to speak out against injustices, especially to those that seemed to only care for what they do on the court and field. For example, former University of Oklahoma (now at Louisiana State University) volleyball player Sanaá Dotson held signs with the message of “I hear you when I score but…do you hear me? #BLM.” Along the same lines, in response to the death of George Floyd, University of Oklahoma volleyball and women’s basketball player Ashlynn Dunbar tweeted two photos of herself. One image of her at a protest and the other of her on the court with the following caption, “If you do not support me here, then do NOT and I can’t stress this enough…support me here.” Dunbar’s tweet addressing her fans went viral, receiving over 40,000 likes. As Black women, both Dotson and Dunbar highlighted the lack of support and respect they received beyond their athletic performances, which illustrates the extent of their intersectional marginalization at these institutions (Carter-Francique, 2018; Cooper & Newton, 2021).

More recently, Coach Dawn Staley exercised her agency as a high-profile women’s coach to draw attention to both racial and social inequalities in sport and society. For example, Coach Staley engaged in what Cooper (2021) described as hybrid resistance, whereby she activated multiple forms of resistance to champion social justice. One, she has been vocal critique of the NCAA’s gender inequity and lobbied for policy and legal changes (i.e., changes to the unit structure of television broadcasting rights deals for women’s basketball games). Two, she along with her coaching peers across the country have demanded increased representation of Black women in athletic leadership and increased respect and media coverage of Black women players (i.e., Staley’s social media post ostracizing ESPN’s neglect of inviting Aliyah Boston to the 2022 ESPY Awards until shortly before the event was scheduled to begin). Three, she expressed her advocacy for legendary Black men’s head basketball coach the late John Thompson II (another outspoken critic of the NCAA’s exploitative system) by wearing a t-shirt in his honor. Four, she routinely wears t-shirts that reflect a commitment to women’s basketball as well as challenges the fashion status quo of women’s head basketball coaches. Five, as a pioneer in 2019 she became the first person to win an Olympic gold medal as a player and coach and win a collegiate national championship as a coach. Lastly, in 2021, as a pioneer she signed a 7-year deal worth $22.4 million, which made her the highest paid women’s college basketball coach (Associated Press, 2022; Clarke, 2022; The Player’s Tribune, 2019). Through her pioneering, advocacy, and activism (agency, pioneering, mass mobilization, and social media), Staley has advanced racial and gender equity efforts in college sports.

Activism Induced by Summer of 2020 Racial Violence

During the 2010s of the Black Lives Matter Movement, the most common typologies displayed among college athletes were symbolic activism and media activism, where athletes used social media to highlight racial injustices, violence, and antiracism and be in solidarity with BLM. While there were instances of legal activism, those efforts were typically led by former
colleges. The 2020s of BLM, where the summer of racial reckoning of 2020 occurred, made it easier for college athletes not only to continue symbolic and social media activism, but also participate in other typologies such as sports-based activism, legal activism, grassroots activism, and mass mobilization (Cooper, 2021; Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019; Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020). The activism of college athletes during the 2010s of BLM primarily centered on illuminating Black murders at the hands of state and vigilante violence (Keaton & Cooper, 2022; Ofoegbu & Ekpe, 2022). These symbolic and media activism efforts paved the way for college athletes to expand protest of racial injustices. They were demanding institutional change at universities and their athletic departments including mandated changes in policies and practices that make the environments safer for Black students and other marginalized communities. The increase of activism efforts from college athletes in the 2010s versus the 2020s of BLM is influenced by societal and organizational shifts.

Much of the activism efforts during the BLM movement were athlete-led and devoid of athletic department influence until the summer of 2020. The murder of George Floyd seemed to awaken collegiate athletic departments to the sustained reality that Black communities are historically and systemically mistreated in U.S. social systems. Consequently, athletic department participation in demonstrations that were spurred by the racial violence of the summer of 2020 is complex. For example, Nick Saban, head football coach at University of Alabama, led athletes on a march to protest racial injustice and many other coaches engaged in similar actions (Associated Press, 2020). However, Saban is the pinnacle of what the intersection of race and economic injustice looks like in collegiate athletes and is an example of the core issue the #WeAreUnited coalition sought to spotlight.

Hence, do sport leaders and athletic departments desire to authentically support Black athletes or was their support of Black athletes an issue of legitimacy (Keaton, 2020)? It is difficult to make sense out of the hundreds of unity walks, panels, and campaigns that occurred after Mr. Floyd’s murder because where was this “support” from these leaders after the murder of Trayvon Martin, Sandra Bland, Mike Brown, and too many others? Given collegiate sport is a racialized organizational field, what does it mean to have coaches and administrators enjoin or rather co-opt the activism of Black athletes, while not dismantling the policies, structures, and practices that have hindered Black athletes academically, socially, and economically (Keaton & Cooper, 2020)? While we are in an era of increased Black college athlete activism, we hope their fervor can be matched (and out done) via structural changes that their activism brought attention to and centered. For example, how will decision-makers who claim they support athlete activism respond to the legal activism of HBCU athletes litigating NCAA academic bylaws as racially discriminatory? Culturally, symbolic displays of activism, including wearing BLM shirts and taking a knee, have transitioned from controversial actions to accepted and comfortable terrain for college sport leaders. As scholar activists, we once reveled in such a display, but now, we charge sport leaders to meet activism efforts with policy enactment.

**A Path Towards Eliminating Anti-Black Racism in College Sport**

Black intergenerational activism in and through college sports has led to several concrete changes including NIL reform, the establishment of ADIOs, and an eagerness from athletic departments to desire more diverse and inclusive organizations (Keaton, 2020). Despite these gains, amateurism remains in the NCAA’s bylaws, Black college athletes continue to graduate at lower rates compared to their non-Black peers, Black college athletes continue to experience
unhealthy educational and labor (read: athletic) environments, and Black professionals continue to be significantly underrepresented across all levels of sport leadership (Cooper, Newton, Klein, & Jolly, 2020; Keaton & Cooper, 2022). This intergenerational analysis reveals areas of convergence and divergence regarding focal issues and strategies among Black athletes and their comrades in the struggle for justice and equality. Convergent issues across eras include challenging prevailing systemic anti-Black racism, underrepresentation of Black people in leadership positions, inattentiveness to distinct challenges facing Black athletes, continued exploitation of Black athletes at the expense of their holistic development, and perpetual disregard for the connection between Black athletes and the broader Black community from White controlled institutions. Divergent issues across generations include different emphasis on access and inclusion (during the CRM and BPM) versus economic and political rights (during the BPM) as well as more of a focus on campus climate issues during the CRM and BPM compared to pressure on institutional accountability for improving societal conditions in the BLMM (at least among college sport activism).

Regarding convergent strategies, grassroots, mass mobilization, symbolic, media, legal, and economic activism were present across both eras. Divergent strategies across eras are reflected in the prominent usage of technology via social media activism in the BLMM compared to the use of newspaper and television media sources during the CRM and BPM and the use of legal activism among Black college athletes for economic rights was more pronounced and widespread during the BLMM compared to the CRM and BPM eras. As such, the struggle for eradicating anti-Black racism and related inequities in college sport and society at large continues (Edwards, 1969, 2016a, 2016b). The current analysis of activism in and through college sport during two prominent eras of social movements in the U.S. provides useful insights into the ways future efforts can be pursued more successfully.

One takeaway from the Black intergenerational analysis of activism in and through college sport is the benefit of collaborative efforts with non-sport social justice organizations. Comparing the activist efforts of the two eras, it is clear there was a stronger connection between non-sport racial justice organizations and Black college athletes during the CRM and BPM when compared to the BLMM. This connection enabled the mobilization efforts to be more effective at initiating grassroots changes particularly those that transcended sport (e.g., campus climate policies and conditions, municipal ordinances, and norms, etc.). In many instances, Black college athletes followed the lead of their peers, which underscores how leadership does not always require initiating the effort, but rather maximizing one’s sphere of influence given your respective positionality/status.

Another takeaway from the analysis of the two eras is that athletic departments were less amenable to activist efforts of the CRM and BPM era compared to the BLMM era. Perhaps, this difference could be attributed to the first takeaway whereby the stronger connections to non-sport racial justice organizations in the CRM and BPM meant the threat for sustained structural changes was stronger in the past compared to the BLMM efforts. During the BLMM era, athletic departments, the NCAA, and university and colleges more broadly were more open to working with and supporting college athlete activism albeit in a way that could be argued as a co-optation of messaging and nominal (as opposed to transformative) reform ideas (i.e., establishment of ADIOs or sponsoring of diversity workshops without concrete structural or cultural changes such as resource reallocation, absence of commitment to deep-level diversity policies and practices, etc.).
While many athletic departments celebrate their contemporary support of Black athlete activism, athletic administrators must be reflective of why this support is popular in this juncture? Many of these sport organizations, like their non-sport counterparts, were very resistant to activism and subsequently penalized and chastised college athletes who engage in this type of activism (i.e., Bluefield College men’s basketball team was forced to forfeit a game in 2021 against Reinhardt University because players refused to stand during the national anthem). Our analysis demonstrates that Black college athletes have a rich history of activism efforts, while also illuminating the resistance to their activism. Athletic administrators and Black athletes must critically reflect on how this support for athlete activism translates to athletic departments addressing structural and policy issues of inequity.

We encourage Black college athletes participating in activism to be attentive to the willingness of their athletic department to support symbolic activism (i.e., BLM shirts, marches), with little to no attention being paid to the structures that remain intact to continue Black college athlete marginalization (Keaton & Cooper, 2022). For example, how many athletic departments who held racial justice marches in the summer of 2020, considered supporting the legal activism of Black HBCU athletes in the Manassa v. NCAA suit? Doing so, signals a commitment to racial equity in a structural manner that extends beyond the symbolic activism that athletic departments appear to swiftly support. Consequently, those participating and studying Black college athlete activism must be attuned to which activism typologies are deemed appropriate (read: legitimate) and question how this alters (if at all) the activism efforts of athletes. Keaton (2020) discussed how athletic departments could engage in demonstrations of racial inclusion (i.e., BLM shirts and marches) to enhance their recruiting efforts. Thus, we encourage Black college athlete activists to remain diligent to using varying forms of activism to decipher if the institutional field truly values activism, or only certain types of activism efforts.

The use of social media was also more pronounced in the BLMM given the technological advances of the era. However, when comparing the outcomes of the activism across both eras, the lack of social media did not result in less effective efforts during the CRM and BPM era. This reality suggests strategy, coalition building, execution, and concrete demands are more important than increased visibility via social media platforms. In other words, more awareness does not always translate to increased engagement and sustained impact. Activism during both eras yielded notable gains while also revealing the limitations of achieving full racial justice in and through college sport.

Conclusion

The current manuscript examined the interplay between broader social movements (CRM, BPM, and BLMM) and concurrent activism in and through college sport. Black athletes have been the center of big-time college sports since the early 1970s due to their performance in their uniforms. However, this manuscript reveals how Black college athletes have also been more than just talented athletic performers. They have been and remain conscious and active agents of positive change for social justice. Through the activation of symbolic, grassroots, mass mobilization, legal, media, and economic activism, Black college athletes have contributed to racial equity in college sport and beyond. Recommendations for future activist efforts include the need for formal athlete activist socialization whereby younger athletes can learn from their predecessors on effective ways to strategize, mobilize, and execute resistance efforts. Along with the AASAT (Cooper, 2021; Cooper et al., 2019; Cooper, Mallery, & Macaulay, 2020), we
recommend Black college athletes review and utilize Dr. Gyasmine George-Williams’ (2019) Activist Growth Model (AGM) and the San José State University (SJSU) Institute for the Study of Sports, Society, and Social Change framework and resources (SJSU ISSSC, 2021). We also recommend future sport activist efforts include collaboration with non-sport social and racial justice organizations to optimize resource mobilization and overall effectiveness. Adopting anti-racist frameworks such as The Continuum of Becoming an Anti-Racist Multicultural Organization (Crossroads Ministry, n.d.) is recommended to ensure organizational actions and results are reflective of espoused values.

In terms of research, future inquiries could explore the differences in socialization, attitudes, and beliefs between college athlete activists and college athletes who are non-activists. Qualitative studies on previous and current Black college athlete activists could provide a deeper understanding of the antecedents and catalysts for activist engagement. Future studies could also compare college athlete activists across racial, gender, and sport type backgrounds to determine if and what factors enhance and/or limit activist engagement. This manuscript focused on Black college athletes and Black social justice movements and thus future explorations could explore the interplay of other social movements with activist efforts in college sports such as Women’s Rights Movement, Transgender Rights Movement, Immigration Rights Movement, Labor Rights Movement, Human Rights Movement, etc. Additional examinations of different activist strategies and corresponding outcomes could also yield important insights into how, when, why, and where substantive change manifests. In closing, as long as racial injustice persists in society, we must continue to foster the activist spirit in all of us. Using college sport as a platform to ignite positive change in society has a long rich legacy and if our future is to be better than our past it behooves us to learn from and build upon it. We hope this manuscript contributes to this collective effort.
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