

Issues on paying college athletes

[Sport & Tourism](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

For several years amateurism has posed a big controversy in college sports. Being a professional athlete is making the final cut, this is when athletes get paid for their talents for the use of entertainment. The athletes are given contracts due to their level of skill and performance. College is for students to get an education and prepare for a career. Most athletes attend college to get an education just in case they don't make it to a professional sport level. College athleticism could be considered a stepping stone, it is a preparation stage for student athletes hoping to move on to the professional level.

Many athletes attend college and play sports, but when they get to the professional level, they still aren't capable of performing as well as expected. This is not the case with every athlete though, some of these young amateurs hit the professional league and explode and achieve beyond their expectations. Some of the collegiate athletes hit the professionals and perform better than experienced veterans. In the light of these facts, the question: "Should college players be paid?" is often posed.

This question has been tossed around for a good number of years. It has probably been discussed since before college basketball players began to leave school early to become pro. As a college athlete I often feel that I deserve something extra, but every time I feel this way I always end up re-evaluating the situation. Once I've actually thought through the situation, I usually come to the conclusion that college athletes are already being paid. The education we receive and the experience of earning a college degree has no price value.

This is the same thing South Florida coach Seth Greenberg stated when he was asked: " should college basketball players be paid? " in a series of questions asked by The Tampa Tribune (available at tampabayonline.net/final4/q&a.htm). It is a fact that college athletes generate millions of dollars of revenue for universities, but despite the question, there are very important facts that are overlooked when it comes to discussing this issue. As I stated earlier, it is fact that college athletic programs produce a large sum of money.

This money usually comes through television rights fees, bowl games, ticket sales and other means. In light of these facts, many believe that student athletes deserve more than just a scholarship or grant for their efforts. These facts could bring one to conclusion that the financial arrangements between universities and student-athletes are unfairly balanced in the favor of the college institutions. There are many hidden facts that explain the impossibilities to pay our student athletes. At Notre Dame, for example, grants-in-aid to student-athletes are worth about \$5 million a annually.

Add that to the millions of dollars spent on travel, housing, equipment, healthcare and several other cost and pretty soon, you are talking about big time money. So, while athletes generate millions of dollars for universities, there are also millions of dollars in expenses, most of which directly assist the student-athletes. Even at smaller colleges that do not generate as much money as the universities, the money generated through the sporting events usually invested in equipment and other necessities for the student-athletes.

In other words, it is a two-way street, college athletes are well compensated, in other words well paid already. Without college most of America's young athletes wouldn't even get the exposure needed to make an impression on for the professional leagues. The system has been around and working for many years now, the thought of changing the rules to enable college athletes to be paid seems to me as a total act of greed. As stated by Mark (net) in an article found at [www. mhoops. com](http://www.mhoops.com): " the whole stinking show is rift of greed in my opinion.

It is a fact that CBS forks over \$3 billion, this is proof (in their minds) that they don't need to change anything. I feel that if this money were cut, they would change things as quickly as possible. I see athletes being paid in college as a disadvantage, not only to the less wealthy schools who wouldn't be able to afford the better players, but to the student/athletes as well. I feel that the colleges with the most money, and the wealthiest alumni's will always have the very best teams in college sports if this happens, this will leave the less wealthy colleges with the bottom of the barrel players.

How could you expect the less wealthy schools to ever win? How fair could this rule transition be? Paying players to attend a school is cheating them of the education they would have gotten better at another school to give them a better chance at winning a game of football, basketball, or what ever kind of sport they play. Sports are not promising, any athlete could have a career ending injury at anytime; however, the education they receive will always be able to open doors for them. Another reason why I feel that college athletes shouldn't be paid is because it is too expensive.

Many colleges are not on the best budget. Some barely make enough money to support their team sports. CBS college basketball analyst Bill Packer, in the same Tampa Tribune question series listed above states: " It" s a moot question (Should college athletes be paid?). Under Title IX, what colleges do for one sport it has to do for all. Because of that, the funds aren" t available to pay students from each of a school" s athletic programs. Paying [basketball players] is thrown out a lot in discussion, but if people understood the process of Title IX, they would realize paying players would be an impossibility.

This is something easily understandable, if colleges could afford this kind of money then they should be able to afford more and better scholarships. College is a place for education. Many people look at the money generated by college sports and start to imply that the athletes bringing this money in should benefit from it. These same people never seem to see that the college athletes already are. If these students were never given scholarships to attend these colleges then they probably wouldn" t be there.

The same athletes you see playing the many different sports they play in college, would more than likely be playing these same sports back home in the neighborhood just for fun if they weren" t attending college. This makes you wonder: " why can" t they play sports in college without being paid? " there isn" t much of a difference. The opportunity to get an education should be enough, too many people get caught up in the money though. The world of sports has changed enormously because of greed. Professionalism is the level when athletes get paid. Paying college players would completely eliminate amateurism.

<https://assignbuster.com/issues-on-paying-college-athletes/>

That would make college players professional, but professionals are supposed to be the best of the best, the cream of the crop and all college athletes are not amongst the best: " so why should they be paid? " Under the article of Title IX, paying one player means paying them all, and paying one sport means paying all sports in an institution, since all collegiate athletes aren" t the best players it seems to be a waist of money. The idea of paying college athletes is very demeaning. Since it is a known fact that many athletes do not go to class, and stay involved in many mix-ups, the idea would only bring forth more comodity.

I think paying college athletes would bring in more students who have no purpose in college besides playing sports. This would also affect the population at many schools. I also feel that this would be asking for more incidents and to occur. As many athletes get involved in violations at universities with partying, drinking, and drugs, one would think that these rates would rise with several students who have no intentions on becoming educated on campus. This matter could be stereotypical, but at the same time it is a fact that several athletes drop out, flunk out, or are kicked out of school.

My position is to keep them out, and not paying college athletes is one of the major ways to do so. If college athletes begin to get paid everyone will want to attend and for many that would be the only reason. This is not what college is designed for. College is a task, an opportunity, not a job, but it will prepare you for one in the future, if you prove yourself there then you will be paid. The principle is that the only way to eliminate this question would be to

pay the college athletes, but that would produce a great decline in the population of education.

To perform a task such as; colleges would have to drop all "scholarship" college sports and allow colleges either to run Division III programs or own minor league teams where the players are paid (under some salary cap) but they wouldn't need to be college students. That would bring forth the problem of distinguishing: getting the best students in a college and getting the best players. . I think that would take away from our society and economics, leaving us with fewer professionals. College athletes should not be paid, this would eliminate the sole purpose of attending college. Who would attend class.