

Paying College Athletes

Posted on September 19, 2018

Abstract

It is continually developing discussions identified with college Athletes, regardless of whether it is worth paying them by experts or being novices; this paper presents arguments. It has been perceived this is a touch of “old school” with regards to actualizing achievement methodologies so our youngsters don’t swing to progress. The paper contends that researchers complete arrangement of activity for understudies to wind up as well as can be expected, which centers around the proven customs of diligent work, objective setting, devotion and uplifting mentality; these, together with the individual beneficial experience of the university understudy Athlete help them to have a viewpoint from a wide range of perspectives concerning this discussion. Athletes are fascinating and known just to our social orders. Since when the vast majority of the best level Athletes are in the fourth or third place, fifth grade, they have just been characterized as having extraordinary open doors in the realm of sports. Around then, they progress toward becoming fishers, spoiled and “cared for” as the normal individual can just envision. Ordinarily, Athletes with full athletic potential don’t have similar academic expectations that have ascended on them since they are in secondary school and completely through college. Most by far of college Athletes will presumably play in the secondary school team, university sports teams and altogether less in proficient positions. It was said that it is less demanding to wind up a cerebrum specialist and that he is an expert Athlete.

Research Paper

Introduction

Many people do not get a chance to have the experience of being an athlete in college. Some have an interest in getting the experience, while others do not even dream of it. The majority of the students who are athletes are respected so much either way due to their hard work and also because of what they offer to the entire university (Karaim, 2014). Campus athletes make the university popular, which makes the college receive more students as a result of its successful team. Therefore, there is no doubt that all athletes need to deserve something great; all their hard work should be appreciated. They should be paid not just the scholarship money but also through cash for their use.

Controversy

As school athletic projects keep on generating a large number of dollars in income for their schools,

advocates for understudy competitors have started pushing for schools to pay their players, while rivals say that remunerating competitors can demolish school sports. Many people, especially parents, think that paying college athletes will discourage them from the usual learning, thus lagging them behind. They argue that less attention should be paid to athletics and more attention to normal studies. They forget that this is the best opportunity for the campus athletes to showcase their talents in competitions both at the national and local levels. Those who reject this point of paying college athletes argue that the athletes commit themselves to the game to a gauge practically identical to the expert level. Paying the competitors could be considered as they play a central point in the notoriety of their schools and additionally support their schools. However, most schools do not have productive athletics groups. Along these lines, paying competitors would turn out to be an exceptionally troublesome undertaking, and this could wreck the school funds (Karaim, 2014). Also, many people talk about how stressful it is and how time-consuming, but one cannot realize it until they get the experience in it. It is time-consuming and stressful because it is quite competitive, and there has to be enough practice and participation. The majority of the time goes to practice throughout the day or even a week.

The pro side of the controversy

University athletes hazard their lives to play these games. They have rushed existences juggling scholastic, training, and competitions. It's just right that they are given pay for their commitment to their schools. Top players will go ahead to play proficient games later on. By paying college athletes, schools are treating them like experts, urging them to proceed with the sort of devotion and steadiness when they progress toward becoming experts. Paying school athletes enables these students to manufacture an establishment of budgetary literacy (Sanderson & Siegfried, 2015). They are also able to cater to their financial needs because several of them can only depend on this money.

The con side of the controversy

Those who are already competent tend not to play hard because they think they have already made it to the highest level, and therefore, they would not like to harm themselves if the game is not at the national level. Compensating campus athletes could take away from their energy and make them less roused to work hard in classes (Sanderson & Siegfried, 2015). Colleges should treat competitors with an equal lack of interest from some other understudy with squashing loan commitments.

Tentative thesis statement

Paying college athletes should be encouraged in universities as this encourages students to showcase their talents. It also helps them get a source for generating income. However, it should also be balanced with other college students who are financially unstable.

Restatement of the Controversy (one to two sentences)

Debate and discussions, reminiscent generally, is that they pay university college Athletes a portion of the immense measures of pay that they produce for the collegiums sport. At long last, the number of incomes produced by the university sports of the NCAA realized \$ 10,000,000,000 yearly for different schools and colleges that play major sports benefits, identified football and ball. This is a lot of cash, and this demonstrates college sports are more prevalent than at any other time in recent memory. For the most recent few decades, current football stadiums, ball fields, sports fields, baseball fields and so forth have shown up on the glade fields.

Your thesis (one sentence)

Paying college Athletes should be encouraged in universities as this encourages students to showcase their talents. It also helps them get a source for generating income.

Reasons (three to four sentences)

The vibrant war for college Athletes who can enable you to make a triumphant sports program is remorseless. Schools attempt to inspire college Athletes when he/she goes to the grounds on a selection trip, make current weight rooms, sports residences, containers and substantially more. Likewise, there are private planes, inns, cash under the table (and cash on the table), and in addition, new companions who “attach”, who hurry to the boot. I would not go so far as to state that any of these things are “wrong” while colleges conform to NCAA enlistment rules, yet you additionally need to remember that college Athletes are 17/18-year-old defenseless youngsters who have a tremendous weight on all sides of the nave.

Conclusion sentence (one sentence)

Making the best win-win situation, in which the two sides (college and college Athletes) are occupied with intrigue, it would be better to [pay college athletes](#). Customarily, the “payment” the understudy Athlete gets for being a grant Athlete is a “full athletic grant, which incorporates preparing, food and lodging.” Most college Athletes additionally get a month-to-month grant, which can go from \$ 500 to \$ 1,000 for fundamental costs (sustenance and gas). The yearly cost of the grant in most real colleges is normally \$ 10,000 to \$ 50,000 every year. It is a reasonable exchange, and students are glad to get a full athletic grant. Students comprehend that circumstances are different, and this is a totally extraordinary world, that they live in their days. It, therefore, proposed that colleges set up this payment in trust finance or an annuity that is normal for the understudy Athlete to complete after graduation. The college will, in any case, produce an enormous measure of its gain from its sports programs and the interest of its college Athletes. The understudy Athlete will be remunerated by the

“full athletic grant” (at a cost maybe from \$ 10 to \$ 50,000 every year); in addition to this measure of the grant will be set in the put stock in store or annuity and will be there sitting tight for the understudy Athlete when the understudy graduate Athlete with a degree from the college.

References

Thelin, J. (2016, March 1). *Here's Why We Shouldn't Pay College Athletes*. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from Time: <http://time.com/money/4241077/why-we-shouldnt-pay-college-athletes/>

In this article, Thelin compares two different scenarios: a college athlete getting a salary of 100,000 dollars and a college athlete getting 65,000 dollars in scholarships. Thelin shows how it is a disadvantage for both the student and the school to have a \$100,000 salary rather than a scholarship because so much of the salary would be taken out from taxes, and the student would still have to pay for education. The author presented a good example of why paying college athletes a salary would not work, and the numbers he plays with show how it would not benefit either side. Thelin's article can be effectively used to present a logical example to the reader of why college athletes should not be paid. His research is reliable, and it will be used to show the real reason why colleges do not pay them in the first place.

Lemmons, M. (2017, March 29). College Athletes Getting Paid? Here Are Some Pros And Cons. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/college-athletes-getting-paid-here-are-some-pros-cons_us_58cfcee0e4b07112b6472f9a

Lemmons' article first describes how the issue of paying college athletes could be a race issue. He shows the percentages of black and white people who support paying college athletes. To illustrate how college athletes are not being paid enough, Lemmons explains the lawsuit in 2014 involving Ed O'Bannon and others. These athletes sued the NCAA for violating the United States antitrust laws by not allowing them a share of their rightful revenues. Then, the article lists the basic pros and cons of paying college athletes, such as longer stays for players or unfair compensation between players. Lemmons makes it clear that he does not stand on a certain side with this issue but questions whether it is unfair, racial, or unnecessary to pay college athletes. It is a very excellent reading to get both sides of the argument. This article can be used as an example to show some history with this argument. It lays out and lists the advantages and the disadvantages of paying athletes and not paying them, and it would be very convenient to see how different they are.

McCauley, K. (n.d.). College athletes shouldn't be paid. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from <http://www.dailylocal.com/article/DL/20150428/SPORTS/150429826>

McCauley first states that players should not be paid but should definitely be compensated in some manner. He thinks that free education is sufficient compensation because college athletes do not go into debt. He states that almost 71 percent of the students quit their education due to massive debts, while athletes do not have to worry about that. It is argued that scholarships for athletes, who are the representation of a school in a sporting event, are a fair trade. He goes on to explain how it would not be fair to pay athletes of certain sports and not the others. The reality is that basketball and football are the biggest markets in college sports, but you cannot just pay them and not the other sports or women's leagues, which do not have nearly as big of a market. This source supports the argument that free education is enough compensation for playing a sport. The facts in this article paint the image that the compensation that college athletes get is more than fair enough and that it is a privilege to be granted a scholarship and the opportunity to play.

McKee, C. (2017, September 19). Americans don't want to pay college athletes. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from <https://www.aseaofblue.com/2017/9/19/16309802/americans-dont-want-pay-college-athletes>

McKee presents a recent study conducted by UMass Lowell and The Washington Post that surveyed people on whether or not college football and basketball players should be paid. McKee's analysis is written on a page for the Kentucky Wildcats, a huge market for college sports. They found that 52 percent of the people questioned think that college athletes are adequately compensated through scholarships for their sports activities. 54 percent of the African Americans questioned believe they should be paid, which is 23 percent higher than the percentage of white respondents. Lastly, 66 percent of Americans think students should be paid only if their name is used on television or other products. McKee then goes on about what the solution to this argument might be: an equal amount of compensation for graduated student-athletes. This article would prove to be very useful because it gives the reader some information on what side the majority of people might be on. The split might be pretty even, but the author offers some layers to the study. The information from this source can also be used to talk about what people think the solution could be.

Jackson, S. (2013, September 13). *Pay for play isn't answer for college athletics*. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from ESPN:

http://www.espn.in/college-sports/story/_/id/9666004/pay-play-answer-college-athletics

The fifth source starts with Johnny Manziel, a former football star of Texas A&M, stating that college athletes should be paid. The author of the article, Jackson, goes on to explain why the idea presented by Manziel would not work. Jackson understands why some think student-athletes should be paid, but he looks at it from a business standpoint. He mentions how schools are making a lot of money from these players, but it can be said that this exploitation is just a part of the business and is quite normal, even though it can be unfair. Then he explains how if colleges did pay their athletes, it would be even more unfair, especially for the schools that cannot afford to pay their athletes. The article is a good point of view of why college student-athletes should not be paid. It explains things in detail. The ideas presented in the article can be utilized to assess the reasons why it would not work to pay these athletes. It is because it is more of a business. Moreover, the ideas presented by the author demonstrate why the system will never change even though there is a demand to change it.

Scott, V. A. and L. (n.d.). College athletes are being educated, not exploited. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from <https://www.cnn.com/2016/03/30/opinions/college-athletes-not-exploited-ackerman-scott/index.html>

This article explains why education is enough compensation for college athletes by debunking the idea that college athletes are exploited. Instead, athletes receive tremendous benefits that include basic needs. Additionally, the author explains how graduation rates are 67 percent higher in Division I athletes as compared to the people not involved in athletics. Because of society's positive outlook on student-athletes, these graduates will become more successful in life. Another argument that Scott refuted was that student-athletes should be paid at a similar rate to professionals as they will become one in the future. However, only 3.9 percent of Division I athletes went on to become NBA players. The author's overall argument is that athletes are being educated, not exploited, which should be a payment in itself. One reason why people think college athletes should be paid is that they think players are being exploited. Scott's article proves how and why they are not being exploited and why education and all other benefits are sufficient compensation for playing. The information in this article is very useful in explaining why people think these athletes should be paid.

Mitchell, H. (2014, January 6). *Students Are Not Professional Athletes*. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from U.S. News: <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2014/01/06/ncaa-athletes->

should-not-be-paid

According to Mitchell, it is a misconception that colleges make enough money from their sports teams to support paying their athletes. However, only a fraction of the schools make that kind of profit. Furthermore, students are compensated enough for their education, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Student Assistance Fund is put in place to help with any student's unusual needs. The article explains that some college athletes struggle to earn income or part-take in college experiences, which could be solved by students receiving more financial aid. This is a very useful article to explain why it would not make sense to start paying college athletes because of the small number of schools that have that kind of market. It also brings up a good point that maybe the issue should not be whether we should pay college athletes for playing or not, but the real issue should be that they are getting enough financial aid to improve their student life.