

Pay or not to pay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

College athletics is an important topic for many writers. However, there are many different sides to each problem addressed. One popular topic for many writers is whether college athletes should be paid. Rod Gilmore's, "College Football Players Deserve Pay for Play" is an article about why athletes deserve payment for playing time. This article is written in a way that will persuade readers into believing how he feels about this important topic. The other side of the argument is expressed in Nick Kapur's article, "Should College Athletes Be Paid to Play?"

This article explains why athletes should not be paid for playing time. Similar to Gilmore's article, this article also is written in a way that persuades readers to agree with the problem addressed. In my opinion, college athletes should not receive payment for play because college is a place for learning and players are already paid to play. First, Rod Gilmore writes for the argument of whether college athletes should be paid for play. Gilmore starts off by stating, college athletics are becoming indifferent from professional sports (Gilmore 1).

College sports have risen in entrainment than they were a couple years ago. Since college athletics are becoming more popular with today's media, more money is available for the schools to use how they please. However, most of this money is given to coaches and facilities (Gilmore 1). It makes sense to some people to give a little of this money to players, but it is illegal. Rod Gilmore writes his article in a way that appeals to the reader. He does this by writing in a direct way. The reader can tell by the way he writes that he feels strong about his position on the topic.

Since he writes this way, Rod Gilmore makes the reader think about what he has written. Therefore, the reader creates his or her opinions based on the way they feel. Also, writing in a direct tone also can cause the reader to get upset, or angry about what Gilmore has written about. Second, Nick Kapur believes that college athletes should not be paid. His main reasons for believing this way are college athletes are already paid for playing sports, college is for learning and not for payment to play, and college programs loss too much money to pay athletes.

He defends his argument by explaining that athletes already receive money, scholarships, to go to school. Also, these athletes are receiving attention from many professional teams. Kapur also explains that many athletic programs already loss too much money to pay players. He uses many examples of college programs and the revenue received to add support to his opinion. Kapur, similar to Gilmore, writes in a direct way. This type of writing allows the reader to create an opinion from what Kapur has written.

I agree with Nick Kapur that college athletes should not be paid for their playing time. I believe that college is a place for learning and not a job. Kapur states, “ most college sports are a lot more about what a player gives up to participate versus what he can expect in return” (Kapur 1). Apart from learning in school, the athlete learns on the field. Students do not get paid to major in a particular field, and athletes should not either during college. However, by learning how to play, an athlete has the opportunity to be successful after college.

Likewise, if an athlete values sports over school, which will happen if they were paid, he or she will not have an education to fall back on. Many players

get injured or are not drafted to play professional sports. This can create a problem with getting a job after school. It makes the job finding process a lot easier if an athlete has an education. Therefore, by paying players to play takes the focus of school away from the athlete. I also agree with Nick Kapur that athletes are already paid to play.

Nick Kapur writes, “ In return, they [athletes] receive scholarships, top coaching, alumni support and various other opportunities” (1). Almost every athlete receives a scholarship to go play at a University. Although each scholarship varies, each one gives the athlete money for school. These scholarships help the families of the athletes out by allowing them to save money by not paying “ full” tuition. Apart from scholarships, athletes also receive attention on a national level (Kapur 1).

By trying hard at sports, an athlete has the possibility to make as much money as he or she wants. The harder a player tries, the more attention he or she receives from professionals. Apart from just playing time, athletes also receive some of the top coaching available for free. One of my high school friends, who is on the golf team at a SEC school, was telling me that one of the members received \$500, 000 in a five week period due to sponsors. If I were to receive this amount of money to play golf I would not be asking for any money from the University.

If Universities were to start paying players to play, college sports would turn into a job instead of an experience. In conclusion, college athletes do not need to be paid for playing time. If athletes were to be paid, college sports would become centered around money and not an experience. Also, athletes would be more concerned with money and not concerned with getting an

education. There is no logical reason to pay players, because players are already paid to play in the form of scholarships.

Therefore, I agree with Nick Kapur that college athletes should not be paid to play. I agree with Kapur because his reasons why athletes should not be paid are more logical than Rod Gilmore's arguments on why athletes should be paid. Nick Kapur's article is more convincing than Rod Gilmore's which also persuades me into agreeing with Kapur. Do you believe college sports should turn into a game of who pays players more, or should sports stay the way they have always been?