

Academic and Pedagogical Reform of College Coaches

by

Chad Robert Dodds Colwell

Department of Humanities
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Benjamin Ward, Supervisor

David Bell

Greg Dale

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of
Humanities in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2010

ABSTRACT

Academic and Pedagogical Reform of College Coaches

by

Chad Robert Dodds Colwell

Department of Humanities
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Benjamin Ward, Supervisor

David Bell

Greg Dale

An abstract of a thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts in the Department of
Humanities in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2010

Copyright by
Chad Robert Dodds Colwell
2010

Abstract

This paper addresses the role of the college coach in an athletic and academic setting. Recent literature on college athletics and interviews with those involved in the profession is used as background information for this analysis. In the current era of college athletics, the college coach has abandoned the roles of educator and liaison between athletics and academics. The conclusion reached is that the role of the college coach is in dire need of reform, both professionally and pedagogically. For the college coach to justify an existence in academics that is not solely for entertainment, coaches must reform their profession with an adherence to academic values.

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to the coaches who provided me with guidance, motivation, and development throughout my life and set the example for how and why coaches exist as educators:

Tom Hayes, Jim Martin, Bruce Colwell, Ben Welch, and Troy Johnson

Contents

Abstract	iv
List of Figures	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Preface.....	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Role of the Coach.....	2
2. Academic Reform: Sport and Academics	6
2.1 The University and the Role of Athletics	7
2.2 Professional Model of College Athletics	13
2.2.1 Amateurism.....	16
2.2.2 College Arms Race	21
2.3 Professional Reform	26
3. Pedagogical Reform: Coaches as Educators.....	29
3.1 Coach-Athlete Relationship	30
3.2 Issue of Responsibility	33
3.3 Athlete-Centered Coaching.....	38
3.4 Coaches, Athletes and Learning.....	42
4. Conclusion	48

List of Figures

Figure 1: Academic-Entertainment Continuum.	15
--	----

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Benjamin Ward for his patience and guidance in this writing process that began as a discussion, continued as an academic course, and culminated in this thesis. Also, I would like to thank the Ford Family Foundation for granting me an opportunity to continue my education.

Preface

While as a college coach and as a student working towards my master's degree, I began to contemplate the true role and purpose of the college coach. Too often I had witnessed or experienced coaching that failed to honor the fundamental principle of the profession – to develop and instruct the student-athlete. As a result of evaluating poor coaching, I began to examine and appreciate fully the power and responsibility a coach possesses.

The majority of my life has been in some fashion connected to coaching. I am a sports addict and some of my earliest memories are of playing sports. As a result, my identity has largely been attached to the personas of athlete or coach. I began my coaching career while in college after suffering a season-ending injury competing in track and field as a college athlete. I have since coached at most levels of four-year-colleges (NAIA, DI, DII), thus seeing the many aspects and perspectives of college athletics. Because of the aforementioned, professionally speaking, I consider myself as a college coach. However, my recent coaching and educational experiences have affirmed my belief that the coach is more than merely a trainer of sport, the coach also serves as a unique and powerful educator.

1. Introduction

America's fascination with sports is without question. Former college professor and associate commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, John Gerdy, author of *The All-American Addiction*, writes “We become addicted to sport; it is our society’s opiate” (22). In no setting is this statement truer than in college sports. The power and scope of college sport is difficult to match. However, if sports are so important to our culture, shouldn't more scrutiny and evaluation be applied towards those individuals who, perhaps more than any other, influence and control sports? An exploration of sports in the university setting must analyze who coaches are, what their role in higher education is, and what exactly they do.

Setting forth an answer to the above questions, the highly visible role that coaches assume on the sidelines must of course be examined. But to assess fully the coach and all the functions of coaching—those related to sports and those related to education—a wider context of the coach as a sports leader and as an educator within the university must be understood. This paper seeks further to indicate how it is imperative for coaches at the collegiate level to be recognized as educators in a profession dedicated to learning and personal development. In this regard, it is important not to separate athletics from academics, but to view sports as an element of education.

Within higher education and sports the coach will be critiqued as the focal point for reform beginning with defining the role of the coach. Chapter One will focus on the relation of athletics and academics in American higher education. Also examined will be how the emergence of a professional model of college athletics is in conflict with the fundamental values of the university and with the basic amateur nature of college athletics. In addition, a professional assessment of the college coach will be provided. Chapter Two will explore the relationship of the coach as educator and the pedagogical basis for this role along with defining and reviewing a philosophy of coaching known as the athlete-centered method. Finally, as a result of questioning the current relationship of the college coach and the university, a call for reform in the profession will be provided.

1.1 Role of the Coach

Coaching is an intrinsically self-less act. A coach is a figure who leads, motivates, plans, and manages a team or an athlete. The coach's job is to prepare athletes for the best possible opportunity to achieve success and better themselves. Thus, from a philosophical and objective standpoint, coaching is not about the coach; it is about the athlete or team and the value the coach can add to their performance and development (Kidman, 93). The coach serves as a constant observer and evaluator. A coach must monitor an athlete's performance, his reaction to instruction, his relationship

with teammates, and his mental awareness in learning and competition settings.

Subsequently, the constraints of a coach's role are that in both competition and practice the coach is not a direct participant in the sport or activity. But in most sports, the coach serves as a commander of practice and competition, instructing plays and making adjustments, formulating strategy and tactics, selecting the composition of the team, and stopping play to rest the athletes and reinforce coaching tactics (Weiss, 165).

Consequently, the coach functions in sport as an indirect participant, albeit an engaged one.

Removed from the act of competition, the coach teaches skills and to trains the athlete physically for future competition. In this capacity, coaches of yesteryear were often viewed as individuals who exerted tremendous discipline and direction. The training of athletes consists of physical development in stamina, strength, speed, and skill. The dynamics and demands of each sport may require varied emphasis on these physical abilities. Furthermore, coaches within the same sport will often have differing means of achieving physical development, and each coach may use different tactics and training plans for different athletes on her team. However, coaches are not "merely technicians involved in the transfer of knowledge" (Potrac et al, 184) or drill sergeants conducting physical training protocol.

In the world of college athletics, where teams' composition changes on a yearly basis, the coach becomes a permanent fixture in representing the program and the university. The "team" then assumes the identity, ideals, attitude, and actions of the coach. In this light, the coach may seem like a larger-than-life figure, but at the same time, the coach also remains employee of the university with professional duties. From an administrative standpoint, a coach recruits future athletes, hires and manages assistant coaches, sets goals and objectives—both short term and long term—creates a budget, and follows guidelines set forth by the governing bodies of the sport and the university. In this fashion, a coach controls her athletic program similar to a manager operating a business. Yet, as the definition of coach evolves, there is still a misconception about how coaches are to be defined within the academic setting.

College coaches are educators. However, the idea of pedagogy does not adequately describe the coach's entire responsibility. Coaching at the collegiate level, which is the subject of this analysis, is a comprehensive process involving communication, teaching, evaluation, reflection, and planning between a coach and an athlete or team. The coach must "educate athletes, preparing them physically, psychologically and socially" (Kidman, 28). Consequently, coaching demands a breadth of knowledge in the fields of physiology, kinesiology, anatomy, human performance, and educational theory. In addition, most coaches agree that for all the application of

science and skill, there exists an equal degree of the “art” of coaching. The art of coaching consists in making decisions based on past experiences, knowledge of one’s athletes, and even the simple method of reliance on gut instinct.

Coaches are directly tied to the educational process of students at the university level. They must ensure that their student-athletes are making academic progress toward the completion of their education. The student-athlete is truly successful if he graduates from school and gains success off the playing field. A good coach, then, is successful if she cultivates an environment for academic and athletic success and nurtures an athlete's quest to develop as a person and as an athlete during his college experience.

2. Academic Reform: Sport and Academics

In order for the academic values of athletics to be clearly recognized and appreciated, we must reevaluate the relationship among academics, coaches, and athletics. To understand the coach's role in academics we must also understand athletics' role in the academic setting. Athletics is an opportunity granted to and governed by the university, not vice versa. The current professional model of college athletics is of grave concern as its overwhelming influence damages every facet of the relationship among academics, amateurism, and coaches. The massive growth of big-time college sports has caused both a physical and figurative separation of athletics and academics in the university. It is crucial that college athletics not operate as a business enterprise with standards and goals in tension with the basic objectives of the university itself.

The coach has garnered a tremendous amount of power, prestige, and influence within colleges and universities. Therefore, it is imperative that the coach act in accordance with the mission of the university. Coaches must return to serving as the conduit between athletics and academics, or else college athletics will continue to detach itself from the academic side of the university. Currently, athletic directors and administrators serve as the liaisons for this task. The university employs coaches to serve in a multi-functional capacity. Coaches are required to coach, but they also must

educate and mentor student-athletes and represent and promote the values of the academic institution. Coaches have these requirements because they serve students, the primary constituents of the university, directly and daily. When coaches neglect these duties, athletics loses its justification within the academy. Likewise, if athletics abandons the values and goals of the host academic institutions, then athletics severely compromises the integrity of the institution as a whole.

2.1 The University and the Role of Athletics

In a commonly observed summary, the purpose of the university is “to transmit and add to the sum of human knowledge” (French, 5). However, the modern university can best be described by the former president of Princeton University, Harold T.

Shapiro:

It is a place where learning, knowledge, skills, and traditions are preserved, reevaluated, and transmitted; where new ideas, scholars, and teachers are born; and where interests and cultural commitments of all kinds meet and inform one another. From a more historical perspective, it is a place where the achievements, hopes, and interests of our recovered past meet and interact with those of the present as we shape our cultural traditions for the future. The contemporary research university, therefore, can also be thought of as holding a continuing conversation with both past and future generations regarding those matters that are truly significant. (Shapiro, 9)

The question then arises: where and how does athletics belong in the university?

When discussing athletics in relation to academics and the primary mission of the university, it is important not to separate the two, but to view sport as an element of

education. In the same context that students learn how to play an instrument, conduct an experiment in science, or form analytical ideas, students learn how to compete in sport. The connection between athletics and academics is first and foremost expressed in the fact that the athlete is a student, and athletics is a learning experience.

The view shared by a majority of universities is that athletics can supplement and enrich the educational process. Athletic departments formally declare their relationship to academics through their mission statements. The Mission Statement for Athletics at Duke University is a good example:

The guiding principle behind Duke's participation in Division I athletics is our belief in its educational value for our students. Intercollegiate athletics promotes character traits of high value to personal development and success in later life. These include the drive to take one's talents to the highest level of performance; embracing the discipline needed to reach high standards; learning to work with others as a team in pursuit of a common goal; and adherence to codes of fairness and respect. Athletics also plays an important role in creating a sense of community in the University....

... The mission of the athletics program ultimately is that of Duke itself: "to engage the mind, to elevate the spirit, and stimulate the best effort of all who are associated with the University." (Duke Athletics)

Duke, like many other major universities, believes in the adage that participation in athletics instills positive character traits in student-athletes, including discipline, hard work, teamwork, and a desire to be successful. Athletics also promotes a sense of community and a source of pride for all those associated with the university. As one educational leader observes, sport bonds students to the university community in a

positive way, "and if they (students) feel good about the school, school will become a better experience for them!" (Jeziorski, 87). As a result, athletics often attempts to serve as a visible and tangible representation of the university's educational mission, just as athletics at Duke seek "to elevate the spirit, and stimulate the best effort for all who are associated with the University." On occasion though, the athletic image of a university can overshadow the university's basic educational mission, placing the balance between the two in jeopardy.

In the United States, unfortunately, sport has largely become synonymous with the university. The identity of a university is now commonly a product of the athletics program. A person is more likely to be able to identify the national championship team in college basketball than recall which school U.S. News and World Report ranked as the number one university, and a college student is more likely to recognize the school's quarterback on campus than the school's president. The perception of the university is now rooted in sport. As author and professor Peter French observes, "Duke University may be a very good academic institution, but its identity in the minds of many Americans is that of the Blue Devil men's basketball team" (88). Thus, the power and popularity of college athletics are not only confined within the individual sports themselves, but also casts a shadow over the entire institution.

Although a sport is rooted in physical activity, it is also an educational experience. The meaningful practice of a sport requires not only physical ability from its participants, but also thought and intelligence. Sports and physical education involve a large degree of practical reasoning and rely heavily on a particular kind of educational methodology embodied in coaching. In addition, both academics and athletics are linked through their participant's desire for achievement in the activity. To supplement Robert Simon's paradigm, "competition in athletics is best thought of as a mutual quest for excellence through [both a physical and mental] challenge" (French, 42). The pursuit of excellence and victory are two of the motives described as reasons student-athletes choose to participate in sports (Gillespie, 307). In this quest for excellence, the coach's role emerges as a distinctive illustration of the teacher-student relationship. Both the coach and the athlete are genuinely invested in the quest for excellence and in the developmental process – often in a particularly intense way. David Carr, an academic and philosopher, provides a useful consideration derived from the concepts of practical knowledge and teaching to explain how the coach, the athlete, and learning are all connected:

Learning to perform a given complex task or coming to know how to do it is essentially a matter of learning to reason practically and teaching someone how to execute a particular purpose is similarly a matter of instructing him in practical reasoning by means of practical directives; of acquainting him with rational procedures and showing him how particular ends are logically related to specific means. (Carr)

Learning is not a process limited to one segment of one's life—it is continuous and pervasive. Life is constantly involved in learning rational procedures and applying them logically. In this sense, a classroom is not just a formal learning environment within a school's walls, it can be wherever instructing or coaching occurs. Ronald Jeziorski, in his book *The Importance of School Sports in American Education and Socialization*, argues in support of this "extended context of education" and portrays the broader scope of the "educational value of athletic programs" by quoting former the great Notre Dame football coach Ara Parseghian:

We seemed to forget that man is a sum total of all his living experience which comes in many ways. We seemed to forget that actual channels of learning differ with each student...and that each student will tend to stress those channels which give expression to his own best talents.

In this whole process, we tended to overlook the great distinction between knowledge and wisdom. We can achieve wisdom only through living experience. The classroom can be anywhere, anytime for anyone. (85)

As a football coach, Parseghian realized that the football field was not only an arena for competition, but also a classroom for students whose talents enabled development of practical reasoning through physical means. This style of practical learning also occurs for students who engage in practical living experiences and channels of learning on the basketball court, on the dance floor, or during a race. Despite the absence of textbooks, learning does occur in sports.

Further support of the argument that athletics is a practical element of education is provided by the reflections of Alfred North Whitehead, the British mathematician and philosopher. Whitehead spoke with regard to the function of educational institutions specifying the often unmentioned but basic purpose of universities:

The justification for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest for life, by uniting the young and the old in the imaginative consideration of learning. The University imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. (139)

Zest for life and imagination are inherent in sports. In playing sports, students are invigorated and energized, and the zest for life is stimulated. Whether they be professional athletes in grand arenas, college students on small fields, or children in playgrounds, sport is the act of play through games. The reason we become enchanted with sport is because of the fun, freedom, and enjoyment of play. The topic of play has been discussed at great length within education literature.¹ If the university is meant to appreciate and promote these two qualities, then it must appreciate and promote sport.

Sport also is intrinsically imaginative. Sport's relationship with imagination begins with the children on the playground who create their own games or pretend to play by taking a last second shot or throwing a pass, even when they are by themselves. Games of sport and skill involve tremendous creativity in body movement, tactical

¹ Literature on the topic includes Johan Huizinga's *Homo Ludens*, William Pole's *The Philosophy of Whilst*, and Friedrich Schiller's *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Play is also included in many contemporary works on adolescent pedagogical teaching.

action, and response to one's opponent. Imagination inspired the bicycle kick in soccer, the Fosbury flop in track and field's high jump, and the Statue-of-Liberty play in football. As with any other artistic or musical performance, passion and imagination are ingrained components of sport. Over the past thirty years, however, athletic and academic administrators have focused less on what the performance means for the student-athlete and more on what the performance can do for the university.

2.2 Professional Model of College Athletics

College athletics is no longer about the purity of the game or the ideals of school pride and amateur competition, now it is about popularity and profit. It has grown into a cultural obsession and has become, in the words of John Gerdy, an "entertainment spectacle" (*Addiction*, 29). The current era of collegiate athletics is plagued by commercialization and revenue generation, which have changed the amateur landscape of college athletics and have threatened the integrity of institutions of higher education. College athletics are now defined by millionaire coaches, massive stadiums, television contracts, and the most professional athletes amateurism has to offer. Peter and Laura Finley offer a powerful summation of the overall situation: "As it stands, [collegiate] sports today is a monster with distorted values" (161).

In many colleges and universities across the country, college athletics still upholds the traditions and values of higher education and maintains the delicate balance

of students as athletes. Unfortunately, an increasingly apparent professional model of “big-time” college football and men’s basketball has depreciated those ideals at almost all academic institutions that sponsor these two sports. The professional approach to college athletics involves emphasizing the entertainment value rather than the educational value of athletics, regarding student-athletes as employees rather than students, providing coaches power and salaries in blatant contrast to those received by college professors and even presidents, and incorporating a business revenue approach to dictating success in amateur athletics.

How athletics is viewed in relation to academics at a university can be understood through a model conceptualized by Dr. Kevin White, Athletic Director of Duke University. White’s academic-entertainment continuum depicts a university’s philosophy based on the importance placed on athletics as entertainment (figure 1). A school’s academic standards, athletic conference, athletic budget, coaching salaries, and revenue-driven decisions for athletics influence its position along the continuum. A school like the University of South Carolina, a member of the football-prominent Southeastern Conference (SEC) and a school with relatively weak academic standards, would place on the high end of the entertainment continuum and the low end of the academic side. Whereas Harvard University, a member of the non-athletic-scholarship

granting Ivy League with a small athletics budget and rigorous academic standards, would be on the low end of the entertainment continuum and the high end of the academic importance. Other Ivy League schools, a few Division-I institutions of academic excellence (Stanford, Duke, Vanderbilt, Georgetown), and the



Figure 1: Academic-Entertainment Continuum

majority of small liberal arts colleges and universities at the Division-III level, which still maintain the balance of academics and athletics, the value of amateurism, and the concept of students as athletes, would have similar placements along the continuum. The entertainment value of athletics is a direct product of how football and basketball are regarded by the athletic and academic departments. As a result, colleges and universities in the United States no longer specialize solely in education, but now also specialize in the business of sports. Thus, the effects of big-time college football and

basketball are at the center of the issue of reform in college athletics in order to preserve the integrity of institutions of higher learning.

This shift in fundamental values has stirred debate within the higher education community. Nobel Laureate economist Milton Friedman commented on the relationship of higher education and collegiate athletics:

Universities exist to transmit knowledge and understanding of intellectual ideas and values to students and to add to the body of intellectual knowledge, not to provide entertainment for spectators or employment for athletes. (Putler and Wolfe, 306)

Friedman's statement concisely addresses the role of the university and also touches on an increasingly discussed topic of whether college athletes, specifically football and basketball players, are really student-athletes or, more accurately, semi-professionals performing under the guise of college athletics.

2.2.1 Amateurism

College athletics in the U.S. began with a boat race between Harvard and Yale in 1852 (Knight, *College Sports*, 6). Baseball, football, and basketball competitions soon followed, and college athletics gained governance with the formation of the NCAA in 1906 (6). College athletics was purposely designed, and has for the most part remained, as amateur competition. That is to say, professional, paid athletes are not allowed to compete in college athletics. Today, this standard remains intact, but over the last thirty years, the popularity and level of competition of football and basketball have dominated

and diminished the nature and integrity of major college sports and called into question its purely amateur status. As of 2009, nearly all of the 1,075 NCAA and 287 NAIA (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics) institutions field men's basketball teams, and 238 of the 336 Division I schools sponsor football (Knight, *College Sports*, 6). These two sports are considered the cash cows of athletics in that they operate with the largest budgets and produce the largest revenues. As a result of America's infatuation with college football and basketball, the once amateur landscape of college athletics is now a vast and professionalized business sector.

Currently, sports television is dominated by the popularity and commercialism of college amateur athletics. ESPN recently purchased the rights to broadcast three of college football's Bowl Championship Series games for four years at the cost of \$500 million (Pucin). CBS is currently approaching the end of an eleven-year deal with the NCAA worth \$6 billion for the rights to college basketball's NCAA tournament (Steel)—a price tag that will undoubtedly increase value for the NCAA in the next contract agreement. Television contracts and corporate sponsorships are vital for the NCAA's existence. The Knight Commission reports that "television accounts for nearly 80 percent of the NCAA's revenue" (Knight, *Call to Action*, 19).

The popularity of these two sports evidently comes with a hefty price, but it also involves economics and politics. John Gerdy insists that athletics serves no longer as an

educational resource, but as an entertainment resource: "College sports is packaged, marketed, and projected as purely entertainment with the opportunity to communicate with the public about education an afterthought, at best" (*Addiction*, 224). College football, a once hallowed Saturday afternoon tradition, now fights to be seen on television Thursday through Sunday, and the once prestigious "bowl" games that signaled an end to the season are now approaching thirty in number and lasting nearly a month. Furthermore, television ratings and commercial dollars have now been blamed in fairness issues in college sports, such as preventing an undefeated, but small-market and un-TV-friendly, Boise State football team from playing in the BCS national championship game. In addition, national columnists have recently accused the NCAA of favoring a popular Duke's men's basketball team, which "sports fans love and love to hate," in this year's basketball tournament. For the same reason Duke basketball is on television, Boise State football is not. Ratings drive revenues, and revenues drive sports. "Duke is television gold," claims *Kansas City Star* sports writer Jason Whitlock, who goes on to say, "the NCAA is desperate for television ratings." To which Whitlock concludes, "This is the price of television being in total control of the sports world."

As media and money increase their presence and control of college athletics, the question emerges whether or not the concept and integrity of amateurism is in jeopardy. To this, the late Myles Brand, the former president of the NCAA, responds:

Amateurism is not about how much; it is about why. It is not about money; it is about the motivation. The collegiate model—with amateurism as only part of it—is based on the idea that students come to college to get an education, and some of them—the most gifted and most determined—play sports under the banner of the university for the love of the game...

Amateurism has never been about the size of budgets or salaries. It isn't about facility expansions, or skyboxes or commercialism. Amateurism is about why student-athletes play sports. And that we should never change. (Brand)

College athletics, however, is no longer home to the student-athlete, as Brand would like to think, because big-time college football and basketball programs are now played by athletes who are acquired and trained in a manner comparable to the professional athlete. In most situations, the recruiting process for college athletics involves a high school athlete signing a letter of intent committing the athlete to attend and compete for a university. For the athlete, the incentive to sign is a scholarship guarantee granted by the coach. If the athlete decides to change his mind, he then faces NCAA-sanctioned consequences affecting his athletic eligibility. The athlete-scholarship-coach relationship mimics that of the employee-contract-employer relationship of the professional world. The scholarship represents payment for performance, much like a professional athlete. The university then becomes an employer. The service the athlete provides is entertainment through his athletic performance, and the university generates revenue through selling access to the entertainment. The student-athlete persona then becomes a student-employee identity

with a purpose to serve the ends of the university. The college athlete in this scenario is a contracted athlete first and foremost and a student only in the minimalist sense—as a means to justify the student-athlete moniker.

The image of the college athlete as a professional employee becomes more vivid when understanding how economic incentives dictate and control the athlete's existence in the university. Since the athlete's performances in games generate revenue for the university, the university seeks ways to maximize these revenues. Games are scheduled based on television schedules rather than athletes' class schedules. In addition, jerseys of star athletes are sold in the university bookstore alongside pens and notebooks, even though the athlete is unable to reap any of the profits. At this point, college amateurism becomes college professionalism.

The NCAA attempts to cash in on the action too. There are currently discussions to expand the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament from 65 teams to 96 teams in order to generate more revenue (Wieberg). The NCAA is in a conundrum, it tries to be both the "policemen and promoter of college athletics" (Finley and Finley, 94) and constantly is at battle with regulating the myth of amateurism. The NCAA has more than 4,000 rules for athletes and coaches, backed by 10,000 interpretations of such rules. College athletic departments now have to employ full-time administrators to interpret and maintain compliance with the NCAA's manual of rules. For example, Duke University,

a medium sized athletics department, has five full-time compliance employees, not counting the athletic director and assistant athletic directors (Booher, 44).

However, NCAA rules are commonly bent or broken. Under the professional model of college athletics, athletes are literally paid to choose a college, and then paid to stay in college, while paid professionals are assigned to fulfill the athlete's academic obligations. In 1996, University of California-Berkeley basketball coach Todd Bozeman resigned after it was revealed that he paid the parents of one of his athletes \$30,000 (Finley and Finley, 86). Murray Sperber, in his book entitled *Beer and Circus*, reports that a former tutor for the University of Minnesota wrote more than 400 papers for the players of the men's basketball team during the mid 1990s (131). And former University of Michigan basketball player Chris Webber admitted to receiving \$40,000 from a booster while a player, and it is alleged that Webber and his teammates received up to \$600,000 total from the same booster (Sack, 126). Stories of star athletes receiving money from university boosters and stories of paid university officials doing athletes' assignments and doctoring their grades are rampant.

2.2.2 College Arms Race

When college athletic departments decide to play the professional sports game, they must also finance sports like professional organizations do. This involves paying coaches multi-million dollar salaries, asking the university to spend millions of student

and taxpayer dollars to build sports stadiums and other facilities, and supporting athletic departments with enormous budgets. Coaching salaries now account for the largest expense in athletic departments surpassing the cost of scholarships for student-athletes (Gillum, 2A). The average pay for basketball coaches in the 2009 NCAA tournament was nearly \$1.3 million not including benefits or incentives. This figure was led by Duke University's Coach Krzyzewski who receives \$4 million in guaranteed income (Upton et al, 2A). Also in 2009, John Calipari signed an eight-year \$31.5 million dollar contract to coach basketball at the University of Kentucky, and football coaches Bob Stoops (University of Oklahoma) and Urban Meyer (University of Florida) received pay raises pushing their annual salaries to \$3.7 and \$4 million, respectively. These coaches are not alone in the absurdly paid category; Nick Saban (University of Alabama), Les Miles (Louisiana State University), and Jim Tressel (Ohio State University) are all paid more than \$3 million annually to coach football at state universities (Knight, *College Sport*, 11). The average salary for head football coaches at 99 big-time public state universities rose to \$1.4 million, up 46%, from 2006 to 2009 (Upton et al, 2A). In fact, Alabama paid its entire football coaching staff nearly \$6.6 million this last season (Knight, *College Sports*, 12).

University values are called into question when college coaches are the highest paid employees of the university, more than doubling the salary of university presidents

and earning upwards of ten times the pay of a professor. At some major sports oriented universities, even the assistant football and basketball coaches earn double the amount of their teaching colleagues. As one college provost notes, “his school spent more money hiring the head football coach than it did hiring five department heads – combined” (Knight, *Call to Action*, 18). It is difficult to justify a college athletic department’s hiring and increasing salaries of coaches while the rest of the university is under spending freezes and faculty and staff are being forced to take furloughs. Coaching salaries appear to be one of the few areas of growth in the national economy during this time of recession.

Coaching salaries are not the only exorbitant expense of college athletics. The past two decades can be described as the “arms race” era of college athletics. Athletics departments are spending millions to have the newest and finest arenas, practice facilities, weight rooms, and locker rooms. Another often overlooked critique of athletics financing is the disproportionate spending per student-athlete compared to spending across the university. Athletic departments’ annual budgets at major state universities run upwards of \$100 million dollars. For example, Duke University, a medium-sized private school with a big-time college basketball program and an emerging football program, has a \$60 million dollar budget in support of its 620 student-athletes (White, interview). This can be viewed as a very unbalanced spending figure

considering the fact that those 620 student-athletes represent less than five percent of the total student body. Athletic departments have attempted to defend these outrageous costs arguing that big-time athletics are necessary for the generation of revenue. However, the myth that the business model of big-time college football and basketball is financially successful or even self-sufficient is false. An NCAA study of athletic departments for 2007-08 found that 94 of the 119 FBS schools ran a financial deficit, averaging losses of \$9.9 million (Knight, *College Sports*, 11). Furthermore, *USA Today* reports that only seven schools (Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana State, Michigan, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas) generated more revenue than incurred expenses between 2005 and 2009 (Gillum, 2A).

This contradiction between the alleged amateur athlete and the million dollar business surrounding the amateur athlete is emphasized by Myles Brand's claim that as a title, "amateur defines the participants, not the enterprise" (Turner and Wharton). Yet, to the objective eye, there does not appear to be a clear line separating the two. College athletics must treat athletes not as "apprentice professionals" but rather as students both of life and sport (Weiss, 207). Universities must abandon the professional sports model or, as former Harvard University President Derek Bok states, the current model of college athletics will collapse:

Intercollegiate athletics cannot attract large revenues without sustaining the perception, valid or not, that the players really *are* students...Before long, the

system would collapse, and university officials would have to acknowledge an uncomfortable truth. Educational institutions have absolutely no business operating farm systems for the benefit of the National Football League and the National Basketball Association. (124-125)

Universities are in the business of educating—clearly that is their purpose. But when universities engage in the professional model of college athletics, they not only endanger academic integrity, but also exploit student-athletes for financial and entertainment purposes.

Should the title of the college coach be synonymous with millionaire or educator? Are college athletes hired commodities or students with athletic abilities? These are major philosophical concerns for higher education, because as John Gerdy claims, “Educational institutions have no business being in the business of professional sports” (*For True Reform*, B6). Academic reform of college athletics must begin with control and values—control of budgets, salaries, and values of amateurism and academic priorities. Since coaches are a prominent and visible connection between athletics and academics, reform must begin with them. Coaches need to have salaries commensurate with their duties and values mimicking the responsibility of educators. Universities that adhere to these beliefs will value athletics as an element of education, not as an investment in entertainment.

2.3 Professional Reform

Coaches must embrace the fact that the correlation between educational background and one's credibility as a teacher, and thus influence and effectiveness in promoting education and character, is very direct. Expecting that a college coach possess a master's degree is an important and reasonable standard.

If coaches are to rebuild their credibility as educators, their level of degree attainment becomes important. In the academic community, educational attainment is respected and carries influence; it is the currency of the higher education community. Whether such an attitude is right or wrong is not the issue. What is significant is that athletics departments must function within this environment. (Gerdy, *Airball*, 214)

If athletics exist in a university because they provide educational benefit, then coaches who thus function as educators must themselves be educated. One of the most peculiar aspects of the coaching profession is that there is not a formal process for becoming a coach. Conversely, a college professor attains a level of education in a field of study deemed necessary to teach that topic, thus receiving a master's or PhD degree. Yet it is not uncommon for a coach at a major university to only hold a bachelor's degree or no degree at all. The recent trend in college athletics is that coaches must have a college degree, and most schools prefer candidates with a master's in order to be hired. Interestingly though, there are not many "coaching" degrees offered at universities. The closest related fields are sports management and exercise science. Each sport's governing body has educational certifications which their coaches can earn, but coaches are not mandated by the NCAA to do so. Even more unusual is that the NCAA, the

largest governing body of collegiate athletics, does not have an educational requirement for coaches. Consequently, the lack of educational requirements hinders coaches from a professional and pedagogical standpoint.

The college coaching profession mimics college professors because it almost exclusively creates its future employees from its current or former pupils. At the collegiate level, the most basic commonality amongst coaches is that they were at one time athletes of the sport they now coach. However, by lacking a formal process for becoming a coach, college athletics is in danger of improperly guiding its athletes and at risk of having coaches amongst its ranks who fail to possess the skills and knowledge needed for the profession. Kidman notes that "many coaches practice coaching without really understanding its process" (18). One way to solve this problem is for the NCAA to mandate that head coaches attain at least a master's degree and for individual universities to place greater importance on a coach's educational responsibilities than a coach's ability to win or recruit athletes or fill the stands with spectators. Currently, in big-time college athletics, "coaches are not hired or evaluated based on their commitment to education" (Finley and Finley, 89). A coach earning a master's degree does not automatically mean that she will be a better coach or educator, but it does provide her with some credibility within the higher education community. Even though collegiate athletics has adopted the professional sports mentality that winning is

everything, universities still need to view coaching as an academic profession. If universities begin to enforce a mentality promoting the value of education rather than the value of winning, coaches will subtly be forced to soon follow suit. Given that college coaches work within the academic realm, it is difficult to avoid such educational standards.

3. Pedagogical Reform: Coaches as Educators

If college coaches are to remain under the umbrella of the university, then coaches must assume their role and responsibility as educators. This chapter will show how college coaching replicates some of the most basic pedagogical methods of education. College coaches and college professors will be compared and contrasted, and the defining characteristics of a coach as an educator will be explored. In arguing that coaches are educators and that coaching is teaching, it is important to set the framework for ideas and concepts to be used in this discussion. The dictionary definition of the term pedagogy is as follows: the art or science of teaching, education, instructional methods. Coaching pedagogy entails the multidimensional connections among coaches, learners, types of knowledge, and learning environment (Jones, Armour, Potrac, 97). Within coaching pedagogy, two philosophies will be compared: athlete-centered and coach-centered or authoritarian. Viewing coaches as educators, I will support a philosophical method of coaching that emphasizes the student-athletes' best interests and personal goals. As a point of reference, the overriding theme of this chapter can be expressed through a principle envisioned by Deborah O'Neil and Margaret Hopkins:

Our vision of the teacher as coach is a dedicated educator who combines the best methodologies of pedagogy with the best practices of coaching to provide an individual, personalized approach to each student's growth, learning, and development. (413)

3.1 Coach-Athlete Relationship

One of the most important traits of the coach-athlete relationship is the total time of interaction and the intensity of the bond formed. The coach-athlete relationship is an incredible investment and can be very dynamic. Depending on the sport, a coach meets with her athletes five to six days a week, during most of the school year, all four years the student is in college. Sometimes this relationship starts before the college experience begins, during the recruiting process, and continues through summers of the school year, then remains intact after graduation. A coach possesses a tremendous knowledge of her athletes, is largely responsible for their development and well being, and interacts with the athlete in a maternal manner. The coach's knowledge of her athletes consists in knowing their attitudes and personal traits, likes and dislikes, personal history and future goals.

The coach-athlete relationship is unmatched by any traditional relationship a professor or educator has with a student. A professor, in our current college educational system, rarely interacts with students on a consistent individual level. Professors provide teaching in a group setting where there is a minimal amount of one-on-one interaction with the student or understanding of who the student is as an individual and as a learner. Students may engage a professor during or after class but it is uncommon for a student to have a truly personal relationship with a professor as an athlete would

with a coach. Hence the unique function of the coach as an educator in the collegiate setting.

The coach-athlete relationship in this context is an extremely personal development and educational opportunity akin to a parent raising a child. As the Knight Foundation Commission states, “coaches are the closest to the athletes and have the most influence on the quality of their collegiate experiences” (Knight, *Call to Action*, 25). Coaches can become viewed as parental figures especially at the high school and collegiate level where there is a longer amount of time for the coach-athlete relationship to develop. Coaches worry about their athletes. Although this is experienced by professors as well, it is more common for teachers in high school, middle school, or elementary schools than for college professors. This is because students in universities are thought of as young adults, independent and mature.

Student-athletes in universities are of course viewed in the same manner, but because the coach has more of an invested relationship, she is more emotionally affected by the relationship with her athletes. Coaches take on the added role as therapist, but to a large extent professors do not want to hear about a student’s non-class related individual problems. A concern that arises, however, is at what point the coach-athlete relationship becomes too intrusive or unprofessional? Is it acceptable for the coach to criticize an athlete’s relationship with his girlfriend due to its impact on the athlete’s

performance? Or should an athlete seek refuge and stay the night at the coach's house in times of crisis in the athlete's life? A coach must enter these gray areas of the coach-athlete relationship with caution, because her effectiveness as a coach and as a respected educator may become jeopardized.

Lynn Kidman argues that this relationship investment is justified because "coaches need to understand athletes and their behaviors, as well as to have the empathy for their individual situations and needs" (212). This concept of the highly developed coach-athlete relationship is even more profound in individual performance sports such as swimming, track and field, golf, and tennis. In these sports the nature of coaching is more athlete specific because the athlete's competition is individual, not team oriented as in basketball or football. However, the highly developed teacher-student relationship is not as widely practical in the one-on-one teaching environment of the arts or music. A violin teacher, for example, does not have to have empathy for her students needs, because the violin teacher's role is restricted to developing proficiency in performance. It is likely that the violin teacher only meets with the student for one hour once a week, thus the intensity of their one-on-one relationship differs in time and intensity to that between the coach and the athlete.

An essential part of the coach-athlete relationship is that the coach will have knowledge of her athlete's goals in sport and in life. Sport, just like education, is based

on achievements, whether it be winning on the playing field or succeeding in the classroom. But the argument can be made that a professor will not be aware of his student's educational goals because of a minimal relationship with his students. One of the differences between goals in sport and goals in education is in the guidance one receives. An athlete has a coach to monitor and motivate towards the achievement of goals, because in sport, work toward the achievement of goals almost always necessitates motivation, sometimes instigated personally or by a coach. But a professor is not mandated or responsible for motivating a student. At times, a professor's act of monitoring progress is merely grading the student's in class performance. As a result of this highly invested and sometimes paternalistic relationship, not only does a coach mold the athlete from a physical perspective, the coach also mentors the athlete in a holistic manner.

3.2 Issue of Responsibility

Another major difference between coaches and professors is the idea of responsibility with regard to the educational development of the students. The student and the athlete are both actively involved as recipients in the learning process and thus largely responsible for their individual growth. Yet the coach and the professor share different levels of responsibility for the amount of development and success of their pupils. A professor provides the opportunity for a student to learn and improve, but the

professor is not responsible for that student's fundamental educational development. A coach, however, is held accountable for her athlete's improvement and performance. From an employment perspective this is a critical feature of the coaching profession. It is the responsibility of the coach to develop successful athletes, and a coach's job is dependent upon the fruition of that development. A coach's responsibility for athlete and team success is a product of the professional model of athletics that is "win" driven. The desire to win is culturally influenced. Notes Finley and Finley, "Americans demand winners in school, business, politics, and sports, coaches are fired if they are not successful..." (78). Thus, college athletic administrations are prone to hiring and firing coaches based on success in winning, not success in developing and educating the student-athlete.

As a result of a coach's job being partially reliant upon the success of the athlete, the coach has a professional investment in the athlete. Therefore, an indirect responsibility and need exist for the coach to regulate and supervise the off-the-field actions and lifestyle of the student athlete. Student-athletes' "lives are the most regulated and supervised" in comparison to their fellow students (French, 44). This regulation and supervision primarily comes under the watchful eye of the coach, and this represents an unofficial part of the coach's job. An example of this responsibility is that a coach will endure scrutiny and evaluation if one or more of her athletes is arrested

for alcohol related offenses, but the math professor will not receive the same attention if those athletes are also students in his class. This role is not part of the professor's job in relation to students, because the student is indirectly granted a level of responsibility to monitor his or her own education and needs.

The responsibility of the student to earn an education lies primarily with the student, but the responsibility of the athlete to earn success is shared between the athlete and the coach. The professor provides the opportunity for improvement in learning, but does not demand that the student improve. Nor will the professor, if tenured, lose his job if his students do not improve or gain success as students. The coach actively seeks ways to provide improvement and demands that the athlete also seek to improve. As a result, the boundaries within the coach-athlete relationship are much broader than those of a professor-student relationship. It is acceptable for a coach to scold an athlete, console an athlete, provide personal attention to an athlete, and demand personal performance from an athlete. But these actions are not commonly acceptable for the math professor.

In college coaching, the professional boundaries tend to be pushed to the limits. The profession has been plagued with an abundance of coaches who chose to coach by yelling, screaming, belittling, and insulting their athletes. Unprofessional actions like these stem from the belief that coaches "are not doing their job properly if they are not

telling people what to do” (Kidman, 15). Even worse are the coaches who have resorted to physical means of motivating and teaching athletes. Bob Knight, former Indiana University and Texas Tech University basketball coach, is probably the most famous coach to represent this infamous group. Knight’s on court tirades, which involve yelling at officials and throwing chairs, were matched by his verbal rants directed at his players in practice, such as the following:

You don’t work, you don’t sprint back. Look at that! You never push yourself. You know what you are Daryl? You are the worst fucking pussy I’ve ever seen play basketball at this school. The absolutely worst pussy ever. You have more goddamn ability than 95 percent of the players we’ve had here but you are a pussy from the top of your head to the bottom of your feet. An absolute fucking pussy. (French, 32)

Imagine if the math professor were to demonstrate such behavior to a student who incorrectly answered a question in class, verbally berating the student for his incompetence and failure in front of the student’s peers. The professor would likely be reprimanded or fired or at the very least lose the respect of the students—resulting in fewer students taking his class and thus making the professor ineffective. However, such actions and “coaching styles” are commonplace on the football fields and basketball courts of college campuses.

Another component of the responsibility issue that coaches have and professors do not have is recruiting. A major element of the collegiate coach’s job is recruiting athletes to the university, whereas a professor at the undergraduate level is rarely if ever

responsible for recruiting students. That duty is conducted through an admissions department acting on predetermined academic standards of the university. Yet recruiting in athletics can be a very subjective process based upon the coach's evaluation of and speculation about an athlete. The recruiting process is primarily defined by acquiring the best available talent, but also consists in finding athletes who are the best fit for the team, the coach, and the university. In the professional model of college athletics these three components may not always be in sync, and many times an athlete who is best for the team is the priority. However, this too is a subjective decision. The athlete may not be the best "team player" in the sense that he contributes to team chemistry and does not cause problems for the team off the court, but more so that he substantially enhances team success.

Current University of Kentucky basketball freshman athlete John Wall is a perfect example. It is widely speculated, and has been ever since he was recruited in high school, that Wall is a one-and-done player, meaning that after his freshman year of college he will leave the team and the university and enter the National Basketball Association (NBA) draft. If this is true, what is and will be his impact for the Kentucky basketball team, Coach Calipari, and the University of Kentucky? The short answer is that Wall benefits all three parties. The team earned tremendous success this season, Coach Calipari thus increased his professional stock from the team's and Wall's success,

and the University of Kentucky reaped financial revenues -- from ticket and apparel sales, media contracts and immeasurable amounts of marketing and brand exposure. Hence the importance of recruiting in college athletics, a burden the math professor is fortunate to escape, but one that is ingrained in the coach's responsibilities.

3.3 Athlete-Centered Coaching

From a philosophical standpoint, athlete-centered coaching can best be thought of as an application of the athlete as the active subject of coaching, not an object to which physical training is applied. Lynn Kidman has contributed numerous valuable and insightful ideas to the concept and defines athlete-centered coaching as the process when "athletes take ownership of their learning, thus increasing their opportunities and strengthening their abilities to retain important skills and ideas" (9). Athlete-centered coaching places individual focus on athletes and grants athletes the ability to assist in the direction of their development. Athlete-centered coaching is the philosophy of student-centered teaching for sports.

Since coaching is an act performed by the coach, it is important to understand the coach's actions and role in athlete-centered coaching. Kidman addresses these concerns, saying "...the key to the athlete-centred approach is a leadership style that caters to athletes' needs and understandings where athletes are enabled to learn and have control of their participation in sport" (16). The "coach as educator" philosophy enables a coach

to cater to “athletes’ needs and understandings” because the coach has established a time-intensive and responsible relationship with the student-athlete. Because coaching is relationship-based, the methods of coaching must adhere to these qualities of coach-athlete development, trust, and responsibility.

Another defining component of athlete-centered coaching in the context of team or group sports is the acceptance and use of change in the coaching process. Athlete-centered coaching is athlete specific coaching. One successful coach asserts that “being able to adapt your coaching style to suit the needs of your athletes is the fundamental principle in being an athlete centered coach” (Kidman, 37). The one-size-fits-all philosophy does not apply to athlete-centered coaching, because certain styles and techniques may work for one athlete but not another. Therefore knowing the athlete and catering to his specific needs and understandings are necessary in coaching and often more effective. New Zealand sports psychologist Dave Hadfield views this element of coaching with high importance: “Change is central to the coach’s job. All coaching can be considered as the facilitation of behavioral change” (Kidman, 36). Athlete-centered coaching also implies assessing the athlete's personal willingness and capacity to consider or embrace change. If a coach has a strong awareness of her athletes and their training, then change can be a commonly used and positive element of coaching.

Applying change as a tool of coaching is especially relevant in individual performance sports where different physical training plans and techniques produce varying results for different athletes. An example of athlete-centered coaching in Track and Field may consist of a coach having an intensive workout planned for the entire team, but knowing that one athlete has asthma, and one athlete is a freshman having very little experience with hard workouts, and another athlete has not been getting adequate sleep due to school work. The coach decides to alter the workout for these three athletes to ensure their health and that they not fail in the workout. Thus, by changing the workout, the athletes in question still receive quality training without unaccounted for consequences.

Athlete-centered coaching also values the athlete as capable of understanding and applying ownership of his own athletic development. Ownership enables learning by empowering the student or athlete. Kidman comments that, “athletes who take ownership of the content of their learning will remember, understand and apply it more effectively than those who are told what to do, when to do it and how to do it” (20). Coaches must not alienate athletes from the decision-making process, thus treating the athletes as objects of training (Freire, 85). When a coach acknowledges that the athlete’s understanding and ownership of her development is a crucial aspect of the coaching process, then the coach will provide the athlete with choice and control “over the

decisions affecting their lives” (Kidman, 16). Such an action by the coach empowers the athlete. Kidman remarks that “a coach who empowers athletes facilitates their learning but does not control it” (17). This athlete can exist in the athlete-centered coaching model, but is oppressed in the authoritarian model.

The athlete-centered coach is the antithesis of an authoritarian coach.

Authoritarian coaches employ a "command and control" style of leadership. Duke University sports psychologist Greg Dale and his colleague Jeff Janssen observe that “command and control” coaching is coercive because coaches believe that respect must be demanded. Consequently, athletes react not by desire, but by fear of reprimand from the coach (Janssen and Dale, 16). In this setting the athletes are not autonomous participants, but rather mechanical performers, and coaches are similar to military drill sergeants in how they direct cadets. The athlete is commonly treated as an object and commanded what to do, what not to do, and when to do it. The objective of this style of coaching is winning as an end in itself, not as the means of developing athletes to be winners (Kidman, 14). Authoritarian coaching negates the educational aspects of inquiry, learning by the athlete, and personal development (Freire, 82). However, as the next section will show, empowerment, inquiry, and learning are critical to an athlete’s success.

3.4 Coaches, Athletes and Learning

It is my belief that coaches would benefit from adhering to the idea that “contemporary views of learning reject the division between learner and learnt and the view of knowledge as an object” (Light and Dixon, 162). If the coach’s goal is to teach athletes skills or reasoning, then the coach must be aware of teaching methods and theories. To understand the coaching process, it is important to recognize the connections among an athlete’s desire to learn, empowerment of an athlete, an athlete’s awareness of learning, and the ability of an athlete to make corrections or changes. As a result, coaches must also be familiar with a broad array of educational and coaching theories that exist in the coaching process.

Educational theory has many hypotheses about what factors best influence learning. However, sport provides a simple but valid answer of its own. The driving force behind success in sports, and possibly success in education, is the *desire* to achieve success. Alfred North Whitehead makes the claim that there can be “no mental development without interest” (31). This idea is illustrated by recalling one’s own educational experiences. The subject matters that were of the most interest in our lives were also the ones from which we gained the most knowledge. With regard to sport, an athlete must truly want to learn or succeed at the activity before he or she will begin to gain a detailed understanding of the activity. An important consideration to educational

and sport pedagogy is that interest and learning can be enhanced through ownership of the activity.

In his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire examines the inadequacies of the authoritarian-esque teacher-student relationship and the development of the student as a learner. The ideas and illustrations that Freire uses are entirely applicable to the coach-athlete relationship and the overall development of the athlete. After all, an athlete in the collegiate setting is also a student of sport. Freire argues, "Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students" (72). The coach must be willing and able to learn from the athlete's performances in order to apply continual and relevant coaching. Also, the athlete must be capable of making his or her own decisions. In relation to the student-athlete, Freire's view is modified by French, who says the following:

If athletes are to be 'educational,' the player must be taught to do his own thinking. In every branch of athletics the strategy of the game should not be beyond the capacity of the alertly-minded undergraduate (52).

Cassidy, Jones, and Potrac allude to a similar idea:

[If] coaches consider coaching to be a holistic practice that develops the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of athletes, they are more likely to treat athletes as knowledgeable and creative beings who are able to think for themselves. (32)

In this view, coaching is a means of preparing students as active, independent learners rather than passive receivers of knowledge (Light and Dixon, 160). As a coach, I stress the reasoning for why I coach in a certain manner, even if athletes are not yet able to understand fully how or why they are being trained, so that the athlete begins to understand the process. This is similar to the coaching concept of “laying the foundation” for physical training – where attaining fitness is a precursor to competing. But instead of conditioning the body for further physical efforts, I am trying to prep the mind for the ability to grasp the principles of what the athlete will learn to do. The college athlete is competent enough to understand what is being taught or asked, but learning in sport, like learning in the classroom, tends to require experience and analysis in order to benefit from the instruction.

Communication is the means by which an athlete-centered coach and an empowered athlete create an environment of learning and development. Through communication the atmosphere of the coach contradiction dissolves and both the athlete and the coach are involved in the coaching process. Freire claims that the student and the teacher “become jointly responsible for a process” in which both benefit and grow (80). A coaching relationship built around communication enables an athlete to understand why he is being coached and the coach to understand what the athlete is learning, feeling and gaining from the coaching process.

Freire's shared student-teacher model of educational learning has been incorporated into recent educational theories. Most notable is the concept of co-inquiry argued by O'Neil and Hopkins:

The concept of cooperative inquiry in humanistic psychology proposes that people are to a significant degree self-determining and that open and authentic communication can help facilitate their growth and development...This process acknowledges that both the student and teacher are co-inquirers whose thinking contributes to generating ideas, exploring knowledge, and drawing conclusions from their experience. (405)

The idea that both the student and teacher or athlete and coach can learn from each other's experiences and ideas in order to produce an efficient and qualitatively based educational development is rather simple, but unfortunately, not commonly practiced by coaches. Teachers and coaches may be aware of this concept, but they fail to incorporate it within their teachings due to what O'Neil and Hopkins call a barrier in "open and authentic communication." As a coach, the daily decisions I make with regard to coaching are directly influenced by the communications and knowledge I receive from my athletes, about my athletes. I expect my athletes to give honest assessments, and my athletes are aware that my coaching involves this exchange of information. As a result, my athletes gain an understanding of how their individual needs and situations affect their training and development.

The coach's awareness that athletes are active learners and have ownership of their own athletic development is the critical precursor for a coach to utilize

communication within the coaching process. The authoritarian coach will demand a correction of a problem without explaining how or why. This manner of coaching can be very inefficient and can leave the authoritarian coach frustrated and doubtful of the athlete's abilities. The authoritarian coach does not understand that the athlete is not fully aware of what he is doing wrong, and that is why the athlete is unable to make the needed correction. Dave Hadfield addresses this point and offers a solution that "true self-awareness is a critical precursor to change" (Kidman 31).

Awareness is vital element of learning for the learner in this case the athlete. This is a simple coaching principle commonly overlooked. But the importance of understanding an athlete's level of self-awareness is a critical component of his learning ability. Hadfield goes on to state, "I now believe the learning process starts with self-awareness, which leads to the ability to self-analyze, which promotes self-understanding and self-improvement" (Kidman 31). In coaching, we use terms like "student of the game," "kinesthetic awareness," "learning curve" and "game IQ" to describe athletes who possess the cognitive skills to which Hadfield is referring. These athletes are learners by nature. Therefore these athletes must be coached in a manner that supports learning and supports their ability and desire to learn.

As coaches and as educators, our concept and understanding of the process of learning needs to be reexamined because "unfortunately, a majority of pupils define

learning as something being provided for them by the teacher and an activity in which they themselves are on the receiving end...it is strange that we expect students to learn yet seldom teach them about learning" (Luke and Hardy, 176). Learning is not merely 'provided'—it is earned. But if students do not understand what learning is, how can we expect them actively to pursue it? Along similar lines, coaching must not only be commanded—it must be instructed in a manner in which the athlete *is* learning and is aware of the fact that she is learning.

4. Conclusion

College coaches must realize their power and role as educators. Coaches who wish to be millionaires and entrepreneurs need to relocate to the professional ranks so that college athletics remains an arena for athletic and academic success and coaches who honor this philosophy. Once coaches accept their role as educators, they then must set educational standards within their profession to legitimize its place in the academic setting. And as educators coaches need to conceptualize their practice as bound to pedagogical relationships defined by an intense time investment with dynamic levels of responsibility and development.

The first steps toward change for college coaches and college athletics must be institutional. Universities, specifically university presidents, need to more actively manage college athletics so that the mission and values of the university are truly reflected in athletics. With regard to the professional model of sports, reform can occur within the hiring procedures for coaches by athletic departments. Instead of paying multi-million dollar contracts for popular coaches, athletic departments could instead hire successful coaches from the Division II ranks or Division I assistant coaches for salaries that are much more reasonable. Along with requiring coaches to earn a master's degree, coaches should also be formally engaged in the educational process either by teaching courses at the university or publishing articles on sport and coaching.

Big-time college athletics need not be eliminated, their value to the university and the education experience is too valuable to forego: "Athletic success brings in revenue, pleases alumni, attracts potential students, and gives the university a reputation in the world" (Gillespie, 311). However, universities must abandon the professional model and the use of "professional apprentices" and return to a true amateur model of college athletics. In the words of John Gerdy: "The professional model of intercollegiate athletics must be dismantled and rebuilt, not as a mirror of professional sports but in the image of an educational institution" (*Airball*, 79). College athletics need not be for athletes who are only athletically motivated and not academically motivated, because there will always exist student-athletes who wish to achieve an education and still participate in sports. Coaches, therefore, must reform their practice to cater to the duality of the student-athlete.

References

- Bok, Derek. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Booher, Bridget. "Playing by the Rules." Duke Magazine Mar. 2010: 43-49.
- Brand, Myles. "The Myths of College Sports: Debunking the Four Great Commonly Held Misperceptions About Intercollegiate Athletics." NCAA State of the Association Address. Dallas, TX. January 8, 2005.
- Carr, David. "Knowledge in Practice." American Philosophical Quarterly 18 (1980): 58-61.
- Cassidy, Tania, Robyn Jones, and Paul Potrac. *Understanding Sport Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- "College Sports 101: A Primer on Money, Athletics, and Higher Education in the 21st Century." Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics 2009. Ed. Amy Perko. 13 March 2010
<http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=344&Itemid=84>.
- Finley, Peter and Laura Finley. *The Sports Industry's War on Athletes*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2006.
- French, Peter A. *Ethics and College Sports: Ethics, Sports, and the University*. Oxford, U.K.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004.
- Gerdy, John. *Air Ball: American Education's Failed Experiment with Elite Athletics*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2006.
- Gerdy, John. *The All-American Addiction*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2002.
- Gerdy, John. "For True Reform, Athletics Scholarships Must Go." The Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review 52 (2006): B6.

- Gillespie, Michael A. "Players and Spectators: Sports and Ethical Training in the American University." In *Debating Moral Education*. ed. Elizabeth Kiss and J. Peter Euben. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Gillum, Jack. "Subsidies Prop Up College Sports." USA TODAY 2 April 2010: A2.
- Janssen, Jeff and Greg Dale. *Seven Secrets of Successful Coaches: How to Unlock and Unleash Your Team's Full Potential*. Cary, N.C.: Winning the Mental Game, 2006.
- Jeziorski, Ronald M. *The Importance of School Sports in American Education and Socialization*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1994.
- Jones, Robyn, Kathleen Armour, and Paul Potrac. *Sports Coaching Cultures: From Practice to Theory*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Kidman, Lynn. *Athlete-centred Coaching: Developing Inspired and Inspiring People*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Innovative Print Communication Ltd., 2005.
- Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. *A Call to Action: Reconnecting College Sport and Higher Education*. Miami: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, 2001.
- Light, Richard and Marlene A. Dixon. "Contemporary Developments in Sport Pedagogy and their Implications for Sport Management Education." Sport Management Review 10 (2007): 159-175.
- Luke, Ian and Colin A. Hardy. "Appreciating The Complexity of Learning in Physical Education: The Utilization of A Metacognitive Ability Conceptual Framework." Sport, Education & Society 4 (1999): 175-192.
- "Mission Statement for Athletics at Duke." Duke University Athletics 3 March 2010 <http://www.goduke.com/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=4200&ATCLID=15223>.
- O'Neil, Deborah A. and Margaret M. Hopkins. "The Teacher As Coach Approach: Pedagogical Choices for Management Educators." Journal of Management Education 26 (2002): 402-414.

- Pucin, Diane. "BCS headed to ESPN." LA Times 18 November 2008. 16 March 2010
<<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/18/sports/sp-espn18>>.
- Putler, Daniel S., Richard A. Wolfe. "Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletic Programs: Priorities and Tradeoffs." Sociology of Sports Journal 16 (1999): 301-325.
- Sperber, Murray. *Beer and Circus: How Big-Time College Sports Is Crippling Undergraduate Education*. New York: Henry Holt, 2002.
- Sack, Allen. L. *Counterfeit Amateurs: An Athlete's Journey Through the Sixties to the Age of Academic Capitalism*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.
- Shapiro, Harold T. *A Larger Sense of Purpose: Higher Education and Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Steel, Emily. "CBS's \$6 Billion NCAA Wager Isn't Dead Yet." Wall Street Journal Online 9 March 2009. 16 March 2010
<<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123655728118166231.html>>.
- Turner, Gerald R., and Clifton R. Wharton Jr. "Keep 'Pro' Out of College Sports." The Indianapolis Star 2 April 2006. 16 March 2010
<http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=18&Itemid=27>.
- Upton, Jodi, Jack Gillum, and Steve Berkowitz. "Schools Seek Budget Patch." USA TODAY 2 April 2010: A1.
- Weiss, Paul. *Sport: A Philosophic Inquiry*. Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1969.
- White, Kevin. Personal Interview. 21 March 2010.
- Whitehead, Alfred N. *The Aims of Education & Other Essays*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Whitlock, Jason. "NCAA Caves to TV Pressure by Going Easy on Duke." Kansas City Star 14 March 2010. 16 March 2010

<<http://www.kansascity.com/2010/03/13/1813273/ncaa-caves-to-tv-pressure-by-going.html>>.

Wieberg, Steve. "NCAA Test Tourney Expansion Waters, Defends Possible Plan." USA TODAY 1 April 2010. 2 April 2010
<http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/mensbasketball/2010-04-01-ncaa-tournament-expansion_N.htm>.