CHAPTER VIII

THE COACH IN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

I. The Training and Selection of Coaches
- A. Origins and Training
- B. The Selection and Appointment of Coaches
  - 1. Authority in the Selection of the Head Football Coach
  - 2. Appointment
  - 3. Summary

II. The Status and Tenure of Coaches
- A. The Status of Coaches
- B. The Tenure of Coaches
  - 1. Length of Tenure
    - a. The Relation between Tenure and Salary
    - b. Tenure, Salary, and Faculty Status
  - 2. Causes Assigned for Termination of Service
    - a. Coöperation as a Factor in the Migration of Coaches
    - b. Tenure in Relation to Victory

III. The Coach's Salary
- A. The Salary of the Head Football Coach in Relation to Other Salaries
- B. The Salaries of Other Coaches
- C. Notes on the Salaries of Coaches

IV. The Work of the Coach
- A. Official and Other Duties
  - 1. Responsibilities
  - 2. The Occupation of the Coach
- B. Notes on Methods of Coaching
  - 1. Discipline and Severity of Method
  - 2. Side-Line Coaching
  - 3. Scouting in Football
- C. One Economic Aspect of the Coach's Calling

V. A Few of the Extramural Relationships of the Coach
- A. With Coaches at Other Colleges
- B. With the Recruiting and Subsidizing of Athletes
- C. With Alumni
- D. With Townsmen
- E. With the Press

VI. Attitude and Influence
- A. Attitude toward Contests
- B. The Coach and Sportsmanship
- C. The Influence of the Coach

BECAUSE over the past thirty-five years no single person connected with athletics has undergone so many changes of function and status as the coach, it is essential to define his fundamental duties. In the present discussion a coach is regarded as a man, or a woman, whose work it is to instruct members of college or university teams and candidates for positions on such teams in the technique and play of one or more branches of athletics.

The definition omits mention of many of the coach's activities which have grown to be regarded in the light of duties, and even qualifications for employment. It disregards questions of his character and influence, his relation to the health and well-being of players, his concern with the finances of athletics, the questions whether he devotes the whole or a part of his time to his work, whether he ought to instruct in more than one branch of athletics, and whether or not he is or should be a member of the faculty. His title, — whether or not he is appointed a director of physical education, or athletics, or intercollegiate contests, — and his salary, are not matters of immediate concern. In short, the definition is stated in its lowest terms.

If it were desirable to classify the coaches from whom information has been sought in the course of the study, it would be possible to divide them into several categories:

The first group would include seasonal coaches whose point of view and, indeed, whose regular occupation are those of the professional athlete and whose employment

exemplifies the notion that games must be won without regard to cost. Second come those whole-year appointees who do not enjoy faculty status and who, after the close of their respective seasons of coaching, find their time practically unoccupied. The third group of coaches includes instructors or directors of physical training or physical education who coach in season, and out of season deliver a few lectures on hygiene and many lectures on athletic coaching, and who, except in their season, have so little to do that they welcome the opportunity to break their ennui by speaking tours away from the college campus and by activities which result in the recruiting of athletes for their teams. A fourth category would be composed of those coaching directors whose first concern is their football squads, but who are expected to direct the activities of a department of physical education and to coach or to supervise the coaching of all branches of athletics. Such men, occupied throughout the college year, truly represent full-time employment.[1] Fifth stands the teacher of academic subjects who in season, whether or not for compensation, coaches and supervises athletic teams. Last come the alumni coaches who, with the apparent exception of a single institution (Dalhousie), are paid for their work with or without appointment to a faculty.

I. The Training and Selection of Coaches

Before the actual appointment of a coach is considered, attention must be briefly directed to the origins of some of the coaches.

A. Origins and Training

The day is long past in American college athletics when the character and education of a coach were either taken for granted or disregarded altogether. The facts that football is essentially a college game and that ten years ago it was even more essentially a college game than it is to-day account for football coaches being almost without exception college men. For example, of one hundred and four head football coaches considered in this study, only eighteen are not college graduates. Of the remaining eighty-six, twenty-five are bachelors of arts, twenty-one bachelors of science, five are masters of arts, and an equal number are bachelors of law. The degrees of doctor of medicine, bachelor of physical education, doctor of philosophy, and master of science are represented by two coaches each. There were also found one bachelor of philosophy, a bachelor of commercial science, a doctor of jurisprudence, and a doctor of dental surgery. Eighteen other coaches are graduates of colleges, although their degrees were not ascertained. Without exception these men received their most influential training in football during college days.

In other branches of athletics coaches acquire their technique sometimes as under-

[1] Some of these and many of the other matters dealt with in the present chapter are treated in Dr. Harry A. Scott's *Personnel Study of Directors of Physical Education for Men in Colleges and Universities*, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education No. 339, 1929. Dr. Scott's approach to his subject differs essentially from that of the present discussion, in that he regards his subject from the point of view of the personnel statistician of physical education, and not from that of the student of college athletics.

graduates, sometimes as employees of amateur athletic clubs and other similar organizations. Indeed, in track and field athletics it is not at all unusual for an intelligent trainer or rubber to advance to the position of a successful coach, whose influence upon young men is decidedly as wholesome as that of his academically trained colleagues. Baseball, however, presents a somewhat different situation. In a great number of cases its coaches, employed on a seasonal basis, are professional players or former professionals whose only relations with colleges have come in the course of their coaching. Despite individual exceptions, this fact explains in part the source of offers to college undergraduates for summer positions as members of professional or semi-professional baseball teams, and likewise tenders from teams in professional leagues. Indeed, some college baseball coaches of teams noted for winning, whose regular faculty status arises from their appointment as members of the teaching staff of the university, play professional baseball during the summer months. The professional influence in the coaching of college and university baseball nines is a powerful factor in undergraduate participation for money in summer baseball.

Some of the more technical aspects of the training of coaches for college posts have not been included in the present study. The number of schools, colleges, and universities that announce courses for the training of coaches or directors of physical education has never been accurately counted, but need not detain us. The work of institutions that pretend to train men for such positions appears to vary widely in quality, nor is it by any means certain that attendance upon a few courses in physical education or coaching offered at a university or at a summer school is earnest of the knowledge and the qualities of character that one who comes into intimate relationships with college undergraduates should possess. On the other hand, the impression was gathered in the course of the enquiry that coaches trained in good schools of physical education have a broader interest in the various branches of athletics than men whose professional preparation has been strictly specialized. The broadly trained man who is put in charge of a department of physical education appears to develop more rapidly a rounded athletic program, whereas the specialist, trained principally as a player, tends to carry specialization into his coaching. None of the dozen outstanding football coaches in the United States to-day has been trained in a school of physical education. It is entirely possible, however, to secure sound graduate training in physical education at a number of universities and colleges (New York University, Oberlin, Rochester, Teachers College Columbia University, Wisconsin, and other institutions). The much-emphasized demand for teachers trained in physical education in high schools and preparatory schools has led to the inauguration of undergraduate courses in the subject at all of the state universities and many privately endowed institutions. Parenthetically, it may be noted that the wisdom of requiring a coach to be a college physician is open to question unless he is more physician than coach.

B. The Selection and Appointment of Coaches

Any vacancy in the coaching staff of an institution that is at all prominent in athletics brings a large number of applications for the position. It is not unusual for as many as forty or fifty applicants to request consideration for appointment as head football coach (Amherst, Beloit, Brown, New York University, Northwestern, Oregon Agricultural College, Wesleyan). No matter whether appointments are to be contractual or seasonal, it is customary for aspirants to point to their records of victory and in some instances to the number of strong athletes whom they can bring with them to their new positions in case they are selected. The instances of this nature that are substantiated by letters available for study have involved principally high school coaches who are endeavoring to enter college athletics, but coaches in college positions are not by any means absent from the general run of such applicants.

1. Authority in the Selection of the Head Football Coach

Of one hundred and one institutions included in this study, at thirty-five selection of the head football coach entails coöperation between various individuals and groups, while at sixty-six the selection is made independently by a single group of individuals. At those colleges where the choice rests upon coöperation, in thirteen cases the president holds the weight of choice, in ten the director of athletics or graduate manager, in nine the alumni, and in three the faculty. These coöperate variously with the president, trustees, faculty, undergraduates, director or graduate manager, alumni, and athletic committees. At the institutions where no coöperation exists in selecting a head football coach the choice rests with the alumni at twelve colleges, the director or graduate manager at the same number, and with the president and the faculty at eleven each. In ten institutions the board of athletic control chooses the head football coach, in six the athletic council, in two the athletic association, and in one each the trustees and the undergraduates. Under such conditions it is not astonishing that so many coaches proffer applications for positions (or "shop round," as the saying is) when vacancies in coaching staffs appear. One prominent coach during the course of the enquiry wrote: "In most colleges coaches owe their jobs to different groups of alumni who are interested primarily in winning athletic contests for their institution." It is to be doubted if so sweeping a generalization is justified. On the other hand, at six institutions (Brown, Dartmouth, Northwestern, Western Maryland, Penn State, Syracuse) there have been indications that it is reasonably accurate as respects some appointments. In at least two of these instances irregularities of procedure accompanied appointment, while at another institution (Columbia) an attempt to name a coach in an irregular way was thwarted by the protests of the institution the coach was expected to leave.

2. Appointment

Once the duly authorized agency has selected the coach at football, the next step is his formal appointment. Of one hundred institutions studied in this connection the coaches at thirty-six are appointed by the trustees, at twenty-eight by the president,

and at sixteen by the athletic council or similar body, while at seven institutions a committee on athletics, usually composed principally of alumni, has the deciding voice. The matter is more directly handled at four colleges where the alumni alone make the appointment. Three coaches are appointed by athletic directors, two each by the faculty and the athletic association, and one each by the graduate manager and an executive committee. In forty-six cases the appointment of a coach must be approved by the trustees of the institutions. This action is usually formal; recommendation by a president is seldom contravened by his trustees, although examples to the contrary (Centre, Syracuse, Texas) may be found.

3. Summary

It might be supposed that the status to which a prospective coach is to be appointed would be determined by the agency of selection, — in other words, that if a coach is to be a member of the faculty, the person who actually selects him would likewise be a faculty member or a college administrator. The history of a number of appointments, however, demonstrates that such is not the case. Probably in no other aspect of American academic life is the choosing of a member of the faculty so often affected by the decisions of persons not intimately connected with the administration of the institution.

II. The Status and Tenure of Coaches

In the present connection the word "status" connotes the terms upon which the football or other coach is appointed. Tenure involves the length of the period during which the appointment is held, the power of dismissal, and other related matters. More specifically, discussion of the tenure of the coach quickly focuses itself upon the question whether the length of the appointment is dependent upon the number of victories won by the teams coached by the incumbent, and whether, in the event of the team's losing games, pressure is applied for his dismissal or resignation.

A. The Status of Coaches

The single aspect of the status of coaches that has been most discussed in recent years is thus the employment of coaches as full-time members of the regularly appointed teaching staff of a college or university. Here the term "faculty status" is often used indiscriminately. When applied to an athletic coach it probably implies that he is appointed by the same authority as other members of the teaching staff, with or without term, that his rank is comparable with that of heads of academic departments, professors, or instructors, that his reappointment is to be approached on the same basis, that sabbatical leave of absence is accorded to him just as it is to his colleagues in other departments, and that his post carries with it the right of membership in the deliberative or legislative body of the university or college with vote. In short, the

term "faculty status" as used in connection with an athletic coach should mean that no distinctions exist between his status and the status of any academic colleague.[2]

At sixty-three institutions of the present study the head football coach holds a full-time faculty appointment and in respect of the foregoing definitions is to be regarded as possessing faculty status. Of these coaches, fifty-five are members of the department of physical education, while eight are teachers of academic subjects. The difference between the professor of physical education, a part of whose regular duties is the coaching of football and other branches of athletics, and the teacher of an academic subject, like Latin, or economics, or history, who, in addition to his duties, undertakes the coaching of a team or a crew, although obvious, is too often neglected.

A correspondent has enquired, "Is it not true that the past tendency to make specialized coaches over into all-year-round athletic directors is camouflage?" A categorical reply is scarcely warranted by the facts of the enquiry. If the question had dealt with full-time employment in its relation to full-time status and compensation, it could have been in part answered by pointing, on the one hand, to fully occupied coaches at Bowdoin, Coe, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, Ohio State University, and the University of Utah, as contrasted with men at some of the institutions of the Intercollegiate Conference, at certain Southern universities, and at Cornell, University of Missouri, New York University, Oregon Agricultural College, University of Southern California, Stanford, and the Universities of Texas and Washington. It is difficult to understand how coaching in one or two branches of athletics can be regarded as full-time service, especially when a number of coaches employed on a non-academic basis (Carnegie Institute of Technology, Dartmouth, Princeton) carry on intensive activities in business and other fields besides their work as coaches. From many points of view, the substitution of the academic costume for the football suit represents rather a yielding on the part of university authorities to demands made by influential and skilful coaches, whose services they fear to lose, than a desire to recognize physical education, whether or not as embodied in the person of a particular coach, as an appropriate subject for academic instruction and research.

Not all coaches or directors of physical education who are so fortunate as to possess faculty status live up to it. The activities of some in spying out, recruiting, and subsidizing athletes, their attempts to evade or to best both the letter and the spirit of rules, in the past their indulgence in unworthy associations, and the apparent absence

[2] The *Biennial Survey of Higher Education* (1922–24), issued as a Bulletin of the Bureau of Education in 1926, contains the following passage: "Abolition of professional coaches and substitution of faculty coaches in their place has received great impetus from its approval by representatives of twelve New York and New England colleges in 1922. This plan has been adopted by Union, Wesleyan, Bates, Trinity, and Hamilton, and submitted for consideration to Amherst, Bowdoin, Tufts, Middlebury, and Colby." Apparently no distinction is here made between the coach who takes faculty rank as a professor of physical education (Amherst, Bowdoin) and the full-time teacher of academic subjects who, in addition to his regular duties, undertakes also the coaching of athletic teams (Bates, Tufts). The difference between these two types of appointee involves very great distinctions, some of which are pointed out in the course of the present discussion.

of any code of honor among some of them, all combine to qualify the success of the attempt to transform coaching specialists into academic teachers.

On the other hand, the bestowal of academic status upon coaches appears to be a practical result of the essentially sound conviction that a coach should be a man whom the college is ready to welcome as a member of its faculty. Thus the motive behind the formula of faculty status for coaches is good. The practical results of the formula, however, are not always happy, not alone on the grounds of morals and influence, but also with respect to the coach's own comfort and tenure. Faculty status, it will be shown on subsequent pages, seldom carries with it so great a return in money as the coach could secure "elsewhere." It has not assured long tenure, nor has it protected him against the demands of alumni for victory. Finally, it has not guaranteed the coach's impeccability in matters of inducements and subsidizing. The best test of the value of faculty status as a formula to be used in solving the problems of athletic administration is this: Does faculty status assure to an institution scholastic standards and aims in policy and in education in which the institution may take pride? Doubtless at some colleges the answer is in the affirmative. They are to be congratulated. At many others, however, the elevation of the coach to membership in the academic family has resulted merely in covering insincerity and dishonesty with the trappings of scholarship to the detriment of both learning and sport. Not every director of physical education should coach the football team, nor should every football coach be a professor of physical education.

Of the forty-one institutions where the football coach does not enjoy faculty status, seven employ full-time men in this capacity and thirty-four seasonal or part-time men, while five contract with the coach to take charge of other branches of athletics.[3] Divided authority and responsibility in football coaching has not worked well where the experiment has been tried (Oregon Agricultural College, Rutgers). At two institutions (North Carolina, Ohio Wesleyan) it appears that the head football coach has assumed and maintained an authority which was vested theoretically in a director of physical education. Many of these difficulties might be resolved, so far as coaches are concerned, if a line were drawn distinctly between intramural athletics with their concern for health and hygiene on the one hand, and, on the other, intercollegiate athletics with their spectacular and public panoply.

Thus, appointment as a member of a faculty as contrasted with employment on a part-time or seasonal basis confers no mystical assurance that the work of any coach shall "succeed" in developing habits of honesty, uprightness, courage, or self-reliance among the young men entrusted to his care. Of all the field of higher education, physical education shows the largest number of members with the rank of professor who have

[3] The late Dr. Frank A. March of Lafayette expressed the opinion that it is impossible to secure a satisfactory all-year-round coach for a number of branches of athletics, because a man who can coach football seldom succeeds as coach in other branches.

only the bachelor's degree or no degree whatever. In short, faculty status of itself guarantees to the institution nothing whatsoever with respect to the ability and character of the coach.

B. The Tenure of Coaches

In the present connection the word "tenure" is used to refer to the length of time during which a coach holds his position at one institution. In the Midwest, Southwest, and South the tenure of the head coach at football is approaching the permanent. There are indications also that in track athletics and in other branches tenure of coaches the country over is becoming longer. Owing principally to the employment of professional league players as baseball coaches, the tenure in this branch of athletics was at one time the least permanent of all. The changes which recent years have wrought are illustrated at the University of Chicago, Columbia, Holy Cross College, Princeton, University of Texas, and Yale. Two elements of tenure are important for both coach and institution: its length, and the causes assigned for termination of service.

1. Length of Tenure

All told, the enquiry has dealt with 272 coaches whose service has totaled 948 years in separate institutions. On the average the stay amounted to 3.49 years, while the median tenure was two years. Of the 82 head football coaches who held their positions at institutions of the study, the total service years at these institutions were 387, with an average of 4.72 years and a median of three years. Such facts as these, and others to follow, indicate that the length of the tenure of the coach, and especially of the head coach at football, is increasing.

Among these 82 coaches one had a tenure of thirty years, two of twenty-five years, three of ten years, one of eight years, three of seven, thirteen of three, nineteen of two years, and twenty-two of one year.

From sixty-four colleges and universities data were gathered concerning the number of head football coaches who had served the individual institutions during the past ten years. Thirteen institutions had one coach during that period, while eight had two coaches, sixteen had three, twelve had four, and one each had employed eight and nine coaches respectively. The average number of coaches so employed during the ten years was 3.34.

a. *The Relation between Tenure and Salary*

No very clear relationship exists between length of tenure and the salary received by head football coaches, although in the higher salary groups a few tendencies become fairly well defined. Seven coaches of the study received $10,000 or more as annual salary. Of these, three, at the time of the field visit, had been in office two years or less, while the other four had enjoyed tenures respectively of three, three and one-half, ten, and fifteen years. Thus the coaches who at the time of the field visits were enjoying the highest salaries for their services at football had had an average tenure of 5.23

years. The two men with the longest service averaged 12.5 years, while the five with the shortest service averaged 2.45 years.

The average salary of the fourteen coaches who, at the time of the visits to their respective institutions, had had ten or more years of tenure was $5,928. In this group the highest salary was $10,000, the lowest $3,500. Of these fourteen men, five had served twenty years or more in the same position. Their average salary was $6,900. The average salary of the remainder of the group, who, having discharged their present duties during from ten to fifteen years, had an average service of 12.1 years (the median service being twelve years), was $6,389, with their median salary $6,000. All of the salaries of $10,000 or more were paid by institutions having more than one thousand students eligible for participation in intercollegiate contests.

These facts disclose no special relation between coaches' salaries and length of their tenure. The size of the university or college is a more important factor in determining the salary paid.

b. *Tenure, Salary, and Faculty Status*

Among the group of fourteen coaches having to their credit ten or more years of service in the same position, eight enjoyed faculty status. Of the remaining six who were not members of faculties, three were seasonal appointees without formal duties after the football season, although the services of one or two were utilized in checking the academic standing of football players. Two were full-time appointees and one was a part-time appointee who, however, coached another branch of athletics in season. Thus, even with respect to those fourteen coaches who have filled the same position for upwards of ten years, no significant relation exists between tenure, salary, and status as a member of a faculty. For men of shorter tenure, the fact that the notion of faculty status has been in widespread operation for a comparatively short period of years has rendered inconclusive any attempts to generalize.

2. Causes Assigned for Termination of Service

In twenty-two instances of recent years in which head coaches at football have terminated their service at one institution to go to another, each migration involved the receipt of a higher salary. A number of such transfers were studied in detail. The causes assigned varied widely; indeed, in not a few cases it was impossible to verify or coördinate the reasons given by the two parties to the change. An attempt to classify the causes of migration beyond the offer of a higher salary has resulted in discovering only two specific reasons: first, lack of coöperation, and secondly, the loss of games.

a. *Coöperation as a Factor in the Migration of Coaches*

In a number of instances the principal factors which combined to end the tenure of a coach may be grouped together in the single statement, "He did not fit." The verdict implies an element of injustice to all coaches, inasmuch as further enquiry revealed the fact that in a few instances it was employed to cloak specific breaches of manners or morals. At two institutions coaches who were plainly unsuited to their positions were dispensed with after long and devious negotiations and intrigue. It is not too much to

say that tenure frequently depends upon coöperation between the coach and other authorities. One prominent coach even went so far as to express his coöperative attitude in respect of certain abuses with which he claimed to be out of sympathy by stating that he did not wish to "bat out his own brains" by leading a reform. A beneficent compromise of a policy with the facts of a situation in football coaching is well illustrated by the coöperation existing at McGill University. By and large, the reason most commonly alleged for the resignation or dismissal of football coaches has been stated somewhat vaguely to be "temperament," the fact that they have not fitted the requirements of their positions, or that they could not handle their men successfully.

b. *Tenure in Relation to Victory*

At eighty-three different institutions of the study various coaches, presidents, deans, faculty members, and others were asked the question: "Is the tenure of the coach dependent here upon his producing winning teams?" When recent football history at any institution clearly led to the conclusion that victory was or was not essential to tenure, the facts of the case were given more weight in the study than the replies of officers, students, and alumni.

Of the replies, those at thirty-three institutions were affirmative and forty-six were negative, while conflicting opinions were expressed at four institutions. Six coaches, four presidents, four directors of physical education, and one faculty member were among those who replied in the affirmative. In nine instances action promptly following losing seasons at football proved conclusively that the tenure of the coach depended upon victory.

As regards the forty-six negative replies, six came from faculty members, nine from presidents or deans, five from coaches, and eight from directors or graduate managers, while six others were corroborated or inferred unmistakably from the evidences of recent official action. In four cases reservations accompanied answers in the negative. There were conflicts of opinion: in two instances coaches believed that tenure depended upon producing a victorious eleven, while their presidents denied it. In one instance the situation was reversed. In another, the alumni regarded tenure as dependent upon victory, while the college president did not. The athletic authorities at Cornell, Harvard, and Iowa have proved through action that victory is not essential to tenure. In a number of other cases of coaches' dismissal after losing seasons at football it is difficult to be certain that in any one instance a coach is dismissed or not reappointed on these grounds. Certainly, losing teams have been factors in not a few cases. One coach went so far as to state frankly that the subsidizing of athletes is essential if a coach's tenure depends upon victory. In the South it is not uncommonly regarded as unfair to coaches to check up on the scholastic standing of football players in mid-season because of the possibility of interfering with combinations for play through the removal of ineligible

players and thus impairing the chances of the team and hence the tenure of the coach.

Comparing the foregoing evidence with what could be learned of conditions in the past, we believe that the tenure of the football coach is coming less and less to depend upon victory. The standard desired at present appears to be a "fair winning average" over a period of from five to ten years. Such an aggregate is being achieved through the operation of forces working from two directions: coaches, on their side, are demanding longer contracts, and institutions, on the other, are becoming less and less subject to the pressure for victory from a few rabid enthusiasts. And yet one striking injustice to the coach remains: Even though victory be not so essential to tenure as it was in the past, nevertheless if a coach believes it to be thus essential, the result of defeat upon his peace of mind is equally detrimental.

In any case, from the point of view of the coach, academic status and appointment to membership in a faculty, — not to mention even a professorship of physical education, — do not protect a coach's tenure when teams cease to win and the college administrator charged with the shaping of the institution's athletic policy wavers in his support. Nor, from the point of view of the institution, is "a seat on the faculty" a guarantee of the good character of the coach, his contentment with his post and its duties, or satisfactory teaching. Some time ago it was suggested that an endowment from the income of which a football or other coach might be paid would offer the best solution of all questions touching tenure and salary of coaches.

III. The Coach's Salary

During the enquiry many requests were received for information concerning the salaries paid to coaches. Doubtless these questions reflected not alone a common curiosity and a desire on the part of college administrators to conform to general practice, but also the notion that no coach ought to receive a higher salary than a full professor at the same institution. Accordingly, data were collected from about one hundred universities and colleges concerning the salaries paid to deans, the maximum salaries paid to full professors, the compensation of the head football coach, and the pay of the next highest paid coach. A few inferences concerning the maximum salaries of professors have appeared in the Twenty-third Annual Report of this Foundation (1928). All of the figures represent maximum salaries being paid at the time of the field visits to the respective institutions.

A. The Salary of the Head Football Coach in Relation to Other Salaries

At over one hundred universities and colleges the highest salary paid to a dean was $15,000, the median $6,000, the average $6,409. The highest-paid full professor received a salary of $12,000, while the median salary among such professors was $5,000 and the average $5,158. Among eighty-three directors of physical education or gradu-

ate managers, the highest salary was $14,000, the lowest $1,000 for part-time work, the median $4,800, and the average $5,095. Of ninety-six head football coaches, the highest paid drew a salary of $14,000, and the lowest $1,800, while the median salary was $6,000 and the average $6,107.

At ten colleges the salary of the head coach in football was paid partly by the athletic association or department and partly by the institution. Under these circumstances the highest pay was $14,000, the lowest $3,500, the median $7,500, and the average $7,700. The highest amount paid by an athletic association as its share of the total compensation of the head football coach was $9,500, the lowest amount $700, the median $3,151, and the average $4,115. The highest amount contributed by a college to such a divided salary was $5,000, the lowest $2,500, the median $3,449, the average $3,544. It appears, therefore, to be the general rule that, on the average, when the salary of the head football coach is paid partly by the athletic department or the athletic association and partly by the college, the athletic association or department bears the brunt of the burden. Apparently, in some instances the college has found the divided salary a somewhat inexpensive means of securing a high-priced coach for a comparatively small expenditure of the institution's own funds.

A further division of head football coaches' salaries on the basis of full-time or seasonal appointment involves fifty-nine coaches employed on a full-time basis and twenty-six on a seasonal basis. Of the fifty-nine full-time coaches the athletic association, which is the employer in nineteen cases, paid to the highest-paid $12,000, to the lowest-paid $1,800, to the median man $6,000, and on the average $6,468. In forty cases the institution paid the full-time football coach, and almost universally he enjoyed faculty status; the highest salary was $12,000, the lowest $2,300, the median $4,778, the average $5,058. A comparison of these average salaries of full-time coaches, — $6,466 when paid by the athletic association and $5,058 when paid by the college, — affords to the statistically minded an opportunity to infer that to the full-time football coach academic status costs, on the average, about $1,400 a year, or about 27.6 per cent of the salary that he receives from his college.

With respect to twenty-six seasonal head coaches at football, twenty-one were paid by the athletic association or department and five out of institutional funds. Among the twenty-one individuals of the first group, the highest salary was $12,000, the lowest $2,500, the median $6,667, and the average $6,822. That college administrations drive closer bargains with seasonal coaches than athletic associations may be inferred from the five salaries of men paid from institutional funds; of which the highest is $8,000, the lowest $3,500, the median $6,000, and the average $5,500. Thus the seasonal coach at football appears to be appreciably better paid than the full-time man, although if employed by the athletic association his maximum salary is the same as that of his full-time colleague. His minimum salary is the larger by nearly 50 per cent, his median salary by about 40 per cent, and the average salary for his group by perhaps 15 per cent. The athletic department or association pays about 24 per cent more for a seasonal coach than the college administration pays, and about 28 per cent more for a full-time man. From the point of view of expenditure, the institution is apparently the more economical employer.

In a consideration of the salaries of head football coaches as compared with the maximum salaries paid to full professors, a division suggests itself on the basis of the

"large" and the "small" college. The number of institutions to be considered is reduced to ninety, all told, by the omission of Catholic institutions not employing lay teachers in one or more of the posts under observation and institutions for which any one of the sets of figures were uncertain or incomplete. For this comparison, then, the "small" college was defined as a university or a college in which the students eligible to compete in intercollegiate athletics numbered fewer than one thousand; a "large" college, as a college or a university in which those eligible for intercollegiate competition were more than one thousand in number.

At the thirty-two small colleges, then, the highest-paid professor received a salary of $6,000, while the lowest-paid received a maximum of $1,800. The median maximum salary was $3,700 and the average maximum salary $3,840. Although the minimum salary paid to a head football coach at an institution of this group was the same as the lowest maximum compensation received by a full professor, namely, $1,800, the highest paid football coach received $8,000, or $2,000 more than the highest-paid full professor, which exceeds the maximum salary for a dean at a small college by about $500. On the average, the head coach for football received $4,163, or $383 more than the highest-paid full professor, while the coaches' median salary was $3,600, as contrasted with the median maximum salary of $3,700 paid to a full professor.

At fifty-eight large colleges, the head football coach was still more highly paid. His highest maximum salary was $14,000, or $2,000 more than the maximum paid to a full professor, but his lowest minimum salary, — at a Southern institution where the head football coach engages in business and regards coaching as an avocation, — was only $2,000, or $1,000 less than the minimum salary of the full professors in the highest-paid group. The median and average salaries presented even more significant contrasts. For the professors the median maximum salary was $6,000; for the coaches, $6,500. The average maximum salary of the highest-paid full professors at these large colleges was $6,315; of the head football coaches, $6,926, — a difference in favor of the coaches averaging $611.

It is possible that, in general, the smaller colleges have been more successful than the larger in limiting the salaries of their head football coaches. Certainly, on the whole, the head football coach at a small college appears to be paid on a scale more nearly comparable to that of a professor than he is at a large college. Again it should be emphasized that the salaries of professors here dealt with are maxima. Consequently the average salary for all full professors at all of the institutions from which data were obtained would be much lower than figures herein set forth. Possibly also college administrators at smaller institutions are able to keep a steadier hand upon athletic expenditures, while larger institutions have a greater income from which to pay larger salaries to the men who create it. Elsewhere in the study it is indicated that the larger the sums that are available for athletics, the more will be spent upon athletics. Thus extravagance has grown by what it fed on.

B. The Salaries of Other Coaches

The salary of the head football coach touches only one phase of the matter; the

salaries of coaches in other branches received consideration. Attention was directed principally to the coach to whom the second highest salary was paid. Upon this subject data were available for eighty colleges. For convenience, the coach who drew the second highest salary for coaching another branch of intercollegiate athletics than football will be referred to as the "second" coach.

The highest salary paid to such a coach, in rowing, was $10,000, the lowest $225, the median $3,500, and the average $4,609. These salaries, as a group, are considerably below the corresponding figures for maximum compensation paid to professors. When the institutions are divided into two groups, "small" colleges and "large" colleges, the results obtained are as follows:

At twenty-five "small" colleges, the highest salary paid to a "second" coach was $5,000, which was paid to a coach in track and field athletics. The lowest was $275, which represents a part-time appointment. If it be supposed that the part-time basis on which this salary was paid invalidates the figures, it must be recalled that this compensation represents the whole sum paid at the institution for coaching all work in one branch of intercollegiate athletics; the fact that the post does not involve sufficient work to justify a higher salary or a full-time appointment is somewhat beside the point. Of these salaries, the median is $2,800 and the average is $2,563. One "second" coach received a higher salary than the head football coach at the same institution, and one the same salary.

At fifty-five "large" colleges, three "second" coaches received a larger salary than the head football coaches at their respective institutions, and four received the same compensation. The highest salary of a "second" coach was $10,000, paid to a rowing coach. The lowest was $225, paid to a part-time football coach. The median salary was $3,756, and the average of eighty such salaries is $5,539. Thus, the "second" coaches at "large" colleges are much the more highly paid, — indeed, they receive on the average much more than double the salaries of their colleagues in the "smaller" colleges. The relations of their salaries to those of full professors may be understood by comparing the foregoing figures with those set down in the preceding section.

C. Notes on the Salaries of Coaches

Although a degree of caution is necessary in making or accepting the statement, nevertheless the tendency to increase the salaries of head football coaches is well defined. Probably the notion, expressed by President Kinley of Illinois, President von KleinSmid of Southern California, and Professor Charles W. Kennedy of Princeton, that such salaries must be governed by laws of supply and demand is responsible for the tendency. Expressions of contrary opinion embodied in the Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement, in the rules of the Rocky Mountain Conference, and convention in the Intercollegiate Conference, — not to place too much stress upon the practice at Dartmouth, — serve but to test the general rule. It is noteworthy that the salary of one head football coach (Utah) was increased partly because of a desire to retain his services and thus to hold the interest of a public with whom he was popular during a

campaign for a new stadium. Moreover, in three instances business men who consider football coaching as their avocation are not above accepting or even demanding increases of salary as head football coach.

From detailed study of the incidents that have led to the migration of coaches and from many other trustworthy facts, the inference is inescapable that the responsibility for the size of the salaries paid to football coaches rests finally with the college president. He it is who has bid, or through his permissive attitude has allowed others to bid, for the services of expert coaches. On the other hand, a football coach who is at once a gentleman, an expert in his calling, and a wholesome influence among his players is worthy of his hire. The problem is not so much to diminish coaches' salaries as to diminish the need for paying high salaries to coaches.

A word must be said concerning the annual sums lavished upon coaching and training at numerous institutions. Selected figures for such expenditures at eight universities (Harvard, Iowa, Ohio State, New York University, Pennsylvania, University of Washington, Wisconsin, Yale) have run as high as $84,600 for all branches and $41,800 for 'varsity and freshman football. In the group the lowest figure for football coaching alone is $15,000; for all branches, $35,400. At an interest rate of 4.75 per cent, $84,600 represents the income from about $1,700,000, and $41,800 the return from $880,000. These capital sums are greater than the endowments of many American colleges. Certainly $84,600, or $41,800, or $35,400 is in excess of the annual amounts spent for instruction in a great number of university and college departments. Such expenditures for coaching and training clearly reflect a distorted scale of academic and athletic values.

IV. The Work of the Coach

The reader who desires a complete discussion of the duties and activities of the coach is referred to some of the excellent treatises on such matters respecting numerous branches of athletics. The present section is concerned with few of the technical aspects of coaching. A coach is in every sense of the term a specialist, and, moreover, a specialist upon whose shoulders, willing or reluctant as the case may be, the past thirty years have placed an increasingly complicated burden. His duties and responsibilities are first to be examined, and then a few notes will be set forth concerning methods of coaching.

A. Official and Other Duties

Upon whatever basis a coach may be retained, the variety of his duties, official and otherwise, is comparable in the field of university education only with that of the college president.

1. Responsibilities

Inasmuch as the functions of the coach are rarely defined with clarity in his own

mind or in that of his employer, except in so far as they are indicated by numerous clichés that have grown threadbare from overuse, it will be fruitful to examine only a few of the responsibilities that cluster about him. Professor Coleman R. Griffith was not the first to note that in most branches of athletics coaches now control the games and contests. It is seldom the duty of the coach to arouse interest in athletics, intercollegiate or intramural, unless he serves also as director of physical education. So far as the game itself is concerned, the principal work of the coach relates almost universally to strategy. Indeed, college football, baseball, and, not infrequently, basketball teams are acknowledged to be highly trained groups of automata that execute the will of their coaches. For example, the captain of the football team at a large Eastern university stated that he regarded the captaincy merely as an honor and himself as a figurehead with respect to the leadership of the team. At another Eastern institution it was indicated that in baseball the captain is of even less importance than in football because of the intricacy of both strategy and tactics. At a third institution (Princeton), however, the captain of the football team has such part in the direction of play as the team desires. At colleges like Amherst and Oberlin, the purpose of the coaches has been to train undergraduates not alone in strategy but in the initiative of tactics and judgment. Although at one Canadian university (McGill) the football coach occupies a spectator's seat at contests, a telephone connects him with the players' bench on the side lines.

The fact of the matter seems to be that, the country over, a college football or baseball player has opportunity to exhibit little more initiative than a chessman. The exigencies of the game forbid original thinking. Not many coaches understand what it means to let their men work out their own plays and conduct their own teams accordingly. It is a commonplace of adverse criticism of present-day coaching methods that many coaches tend to occupy too much of their men's time with fundamentals, too little with playing the game under conditions of contest. In general, college football players grumble at weekday games; they live through drill and "skull practice" and save their energies, both physical and nervous, for the Saturday contest. Yet, if athletics 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. As matters now stand, no branch owes even a vestige of its strategy to the undergraduates engaged. Such matters are the affair of the coach.

Aside from the strategy and most of the tactics of the branches of athletics, the coach has other responsibilities. In the fields of student health and physical development he has few, unless his duties are combined with those of the director of physical education. He is usually concerned with the use of equipment and accommodations for his teams, seldom with their provision. A Southern coach, who undeniably pampers

his athletes, has objected more than once to attempts of the director of athletics to check expenditure upon luxuries of travel; the possibility that any member of this particular football team should occupy an upper berth was to this coach both abhorrent and pathetic. In general, the notion seems to be that no device that may contribute to the protection and the comfort of players should be withheld. The tenet is often carried rather far in securing specially fitted and individually made braces, pads, and other pieces of equipment, especially for football players in the backfield. Indeed, a well-known seller of athletic equipment stated that he was shocked at the extravagance in the use of football supplies at one large Eastern university.

With schedules of games the coach usually is not directly or initially concerned, although that institution is rare at which he is not consulted during the period when schedules are in the making. Most coaches naturally desire that members of their teams or squad shall stand well scholastically, — because high standing implies eligible players. After an athlete has played his allotted number of years, his academic standing fails to interest the coach. At a number of universities (Cornell, Harvard, New York University, Princeton, Purdue) the coaches have been praised for their efforts during off seasons, sometimes at the behest of college administrators, to spur athletes to better scholastic performance. On the other hand, in at least one instance the duties of football coaches appear to include something very like recruiting. Men who are wisely employed upon a full-time basis for physical education have little opportunity for such activities as these.

With respect to the inculcation of moral principles and qualities, most coaches, when questioned concerning the matter, place upon it a very strong emphasis, although doubt has frequently been expressed if the coach in any sport thinks so seriously of this phase of his work as a dean, to whom rather than to the teacher of academic subjects his responsibility relates him. In this connection it may well be noted that at Harvard and Yale members of the coaching staffs meet periodically for luncheon at a club, to the mutual advantage not alone of themselves but apparently of all concerned in their work. The unostentatious nature of the qualities of sportsmanship at these two institutions is due in part to the relations thus established. Discussion of the coach's responsibility in securing candidates for athletic teams and in other extramural relationships is for the present postponed. The president of one college commended his football coach because of his ability to establish and maintain the friendly interest of the alumni in the institution. At three larger universities, the activities of single coaches or of whole staffs have earned the gratitude of administrators in this particular. At most of the institutions of the Intercollegiate Conference the duties of the head football coach, after the conclusion of his season, embrace speaking at luncheons, high school assemblies, clubs of many kinds, and other engagements of a similar nature.

In short, the responsibility of the coach is much divided. A third of a century ago

it was far simpler than it is to-day. Then he was concerned only with the specifically technical aspects of his duties; now academic administrators are requiring of him a far wider activity and interest.

2. The Occupation of the Coach

It has been noted that at baseball the coach not infrequently is a professional player hired for a season to coach a college team. Instruction in basketball and in track and field athletics is often secured from members of departments of physical education or from others employed upon a full-time basis. In football, however, where a contrary condition exists, it is due principally to the notion that status as a member of a faculty is desirable from the point of view of both coach and institution.

An examination of the occupations of one hundred and four head football coaches, aside from their regular coaching duties, showed that sixty-seven (64 per cent) had no vocation other than football coaching, although eight others (7 per cent) taught academic subjects. Not a few of the sixty-seven coaches enjoyed teaching assignments in courses or schools that deal with football coaching during the regular or summer sessions (Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin), and many others instructed in other branches of athletics or served as directors of physical education.

Of the remaining thirty-seven coaches who had other occupations than football, fifteen engaged in business. Three of the business men were connected with manufacturing, two with retail merchandizing, two with selling insurance, and one each with real estate, the sale of coal, publishing, and the activities of a local chamber of commerce. In seven instances the branch of business was not ascertained. In addition, three coaches were occupied with the law, as practitioner or judge, one with medicine, one with school teaching, one with dentistry and dental teaching, and one as a clergyman and social worker. For all of these thirty-seven men presumably the coaching of football was an avocation. Yet partisans of victory (Ohio State) have objected to one head football coach's instructing in a medical school, on the ground that his duties as teacher left him insufficient time to devote to the game and to his men. A second head coach (New York University) is engaged on an all-year-round basis with no other assignments than football, so that he may not be distracted from the duties which his position involves.

B. Notes on Methods of Coaching

Although the following notes on a few of the most discussed aspects of coaching deal principally with football, it is probable that not dissimilar situations and problems arise with respect to other branches of athletics. It is possible to commend, as regards individual branches, coaching systems at certain universities and colleges where academic instructors coach teams: Amherst, Bates, Colorado, Hobart, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Queen's, Tufts.

1. Discipline and Severity of Method

An enquiry into the severity of discipline and method of most of the one hundred

and four football coaches of the study prompts to observations concerning the amount of time that is spent upon football and the way in which that time is used.

The Intercollegiate Conference limits the duration of daily football practice to two hours. At one member institution (Wisconsin) athletes expressed gratitude to the Conference for this limitation and stated that they spent from three to four hours upon practice, if dressing be included. Comparable conditions were found at a rather large number of universities and colleges. At the height of the football season Colgate players have been required to devote as much as eight hours a day, namely, from one o'clock in the afternoon until nine o'clock in the evening to practice and drill.[4] At Cornell, however, stringent program requirements in the past materially reduced the amount of time that could be devoted by undergraduates to athletic exercise, including football. Indeed, at a number of technical and scientific institutions the amount of time allowed for organized athletics was minimal.

The ways in which the coach may choose to allot the time of his men during practice hours has even more importance. Often coaches overwork their players in drills and games. There is ample testimony to the effect that many an undergraduate is unable to compose himself for mental work during the two or three days succeeding an especially hard practice or contest. At one Eastern university students openly protested against excessive overwork on the football field. At another an assistant coach resigned because his objections to the overworking of men proved vain. For such conditions and for their results in individual cases and in respect of victory and defeat, some coaches blame the athletes for not having brought themselves into better physical condition. Occasionally men are kept in games much longer than is necessary.

Concerning this matter, the published testimony of two deservedly successful coaches is significant. Professor Stagg writes of "the necessity for a military obedience on the football field. A player must obey orders like a soldier where orders have been given, and, like a good soldier, act swiftly and surely on his own in an unforeseen contingency."[5] The character and appropriateness of the analogy need not at the moment detain us. "But a team cannot be clocked at full speed," wrote Mr. T. A. D. Jones,[6] "at every afternoon's practice and expect to derive much pleasure from their play. On the other hand, if they are not driven at full speed for the entire hour of practice which is at their disposal, then it is impossible to attain precision in the execution of plays either offensively or defensively."

The preference for the "driving" coach is not by any means confined to alumni. Mr. H. L. Mencken has told in detail of the care exercised in the selection of a Mid-Western football coach and of the dissatisfaction of undergraduates with his gentle methods. At a number of institutions, the names of which are omitted out of justice to the coaches concerned, athletes have expressed preference for the "driver," whose teams win, over the gentler man whose efforts end in defeat or mediocrity. In this connection enquiry was made into the charges of brutality which had been made both openly and covertly concerning the use of certain equipment by a coach at an Eastern

[4] Mr. W. A. Reid, Graduate Manager, letter of April 23, 1929: "Daily football practice is not in excess of four hours on any given day."
[5] A. A. Stagg and W. W. Stout, *Touchdown*, 1927, page 213.
[6] "How a Head Coach Looks at Football," reprinted in the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, November 17, 1927, from the *Outlook*.

institution. Assuredly, at the time of the field visit there was no basis for the rumor, if indeed it had ever been grounded in fact. From one passage in a discussion of coaching [7] it would appear that only two courses are open to coaches: weeks of study of the rules in order to map out the strategy of contests, or "cursing their men into a state of raving madness." Conversation with undergraduate athletes in comparatively large numbers over the United States and Canada leads to the conclusion that younger players usually prefer the coach who, although cursing them into "raving madness," makes their victory inevitable. With older players such is not the case. Their attitude suggests boredom over the eruptions of their mentor; having heard them many times, the sophisticated regard them as interesting phenomena that are not to be taken too seriously. Considering the tendency of youth to glory in Spartan self-sacrifice for Alma Mater, it is perhaps not unnatural to find these young players preferring as coach the hard-bitten, driving martinet to the softer-spoken teacher of football in proportions of about two to one, provided always that the methods employed result in the winning of contests. The soft-spoken coach whose teams win is always popular.

2. Side-Line Coaching

Coaching from the side lines or from the players' bench is commonly discussed from the point of view of football. The practice obtains, however, in baseball, basketball, and other branches of athletics as well.

In football, side-line coaching is so common that its existence needs no proof. Its universality and the distrust that it engenders are attested by the suspicion directed at the field physician when his duties call him out upon the football field. Indeed, a former captain (Virginia) stated that after his team had advanced to an opponent's twenty-five-yard line their signals always issued from the coach on the bench. One novel expedient in side-line coaching deserves special mention. It so happened that on the football team of an Eastern university there played two brothers, Hawaiians, who were used by the coach to transmit signals to the team in action. One brother would be on the field; the other would sit beside the coach on the bench. At the instance of the coach, the player on the bench shouted, in Hawaiian, to his brother with the team indications of the tactics that the coach desired the team to employ at critical moments.

Many persons who are interested in college athletics admit freely that side-line coaching is an abuse that should be ended, but few have attempted to mitigate it. The best authenticated case of a coach's ending the practice concerns a Western university (Southern California) where the coach has refused repeatedly to send by ingoing substitutes information or directions to players during a game. It is not to be denied that side-line coaching has robbed the undergraduate of many of the benefits that the game of football might without it confer.

3. Scouting in Football

In recent years no single phase of college football has been more argued than scout-

[7] Coleman R. Griffith, *Psychology of Coaching*, 1926, page 89.

ing, which may be defined as an organized attempt on the part of a coach or a coaching staff to ascertain in advance the principles, methods, and details of play to be employed by opponents. Not all of the tales concerning devious expedients bent to this use need be credited in forming an opinion concerning it. In favor of scouting the arguments run about as follows: It gives the better team a better opportunity of winning. With it fewer victories are the results of chance advantage. Scouting relieves the almost unbearable strain that a football season imposes upon the coach, and it makes the occupation of coaching more interesting to those engaged in it. The abolition of scouting would encourage in the mind of the coach at any institution suspicion and distrust of other coaches. Moreover, attempts by college presidents to enforce non-scouting agreements upon coaches have resulted in dissatisfaction to all concerned. Finally, it is argued, a head coach at football cannot avoid receiving information concerning opposing teams and plays. Agreements to abolish scouting are complicated by interested alumni who, after attending a game in which the team of a future opponent of their own institution participates, write to their coach concerning it. The effectiveness of newspaper reporting to-day makes it almost impossible for any coach to remain long in ignorance of his opponent's strategy and tactics.

Those who oppose scouting at football attack it upon several grounds: They cite the testimony of certain coaches who state that scouting by enthusiastic but inexpert alumni has proved to be one of the most harmful attempts to aid in the development of a team. Respecting the cost of scouting, they refer to expenditure at a Catholic university of $800 a season for each scout employed. An expenditure of $2,500 for scouting is not uncommon, and occasionally the figure may reach $3,500. They point to an occasion upon which a coach at a New England college scouted a game so effectually with a stenographer that a contest resulted in overwhelming defeat for the scouted team, and that later, some of this information falling into the hands of another coach, a second contest resulted in a score of 43–0. Finally, they indicate that the elaborateness of the records of scouts and of outlines of games and plays, the pictures, both still and moving, now being taken of the teams of future opponents (Columbia, Dartmouth), and the highly technical nature of scouting lead directly to open professionalism in this activity.

Mr. Glenn Warner writes,[8] "Nearly every football coach has a competent and trustworthy football man who makes it a point to see each of the strongest rival teams play in at least one game, in order to note the opponents' style of offense and defense, and general style of play." "It was the scout's special duty to see just how the strongest plays were run off. Individual defects were also noted. With all this information in the hands of the head football coach he knew just how to attack his opponents and how to circumvent their strongest plays." "In the inner circles of school and college athletics it is not considered unethical or unsportsmanlike to scout opposing teams to the extent

[8]Glenn Scobey Warner, *Football for Coaches and Players*, 1927, pages 124, 125.

of seeing them play their games. It is perfectly legitimate to do that, but in some cases the practice is carried too far."

After an experiment lasting one year it was decided by the Yale Board of Athletic Control that non-scouting should be adopted as a permanent policy of football at Yale. Four of the institutions that Yale meets at football agreed to this convention. Yale, however, will scout no opponent regardless of that opponent's attitude toward scouting. The experimental period of abstention from scouting at Yale included an agreement between Mr. T. A. D. Jones and Captain L. McC. Jones of the United States Military Academy, which produced some difficulties of conscientious application but was honorably kept on both sides. Yale athletic officials, coaches, and athletes appear to be unanimous in their conviction that the absence of scouting decreases the importance of victory at football and augments the attractiveness of the game as a diversion.

The most practical argument against football scouting is the large expenditure that it involves. Yet with one or two exceptions those who have to do with athletic expenditures regard the cost of scouting as almost negligible. At only a few institutions is the cost considered significant. Whether or not the Canadian attitude be due to the influence of English university tradition, at the Dominion universities (McGill, Queen's, Toronto) scouting is considered unsportsmanlike and the athletic authorities of these institutions have agreed not to make use of it.

C. One Economic Aspect of the Coach's Calling

In any discussion of coaching the fact must never be ignored that the coach, and particularly the football coach, is a specialist whose income has been made to depend upon producing "results." Moreover, in many instances the producing of "results" is a direct consideration in employment and reappointment. The loss of a few games, the jealousy of prominent players, an unintentional affront on the part of a coach may lead to dire consequences, affecting not only his own tenure but the food and shelter of his wife and children.

The results which the coach is expected to "produce" depend upon the ideals of the university or college with which he is connected. At best he must acknowledge many masters, — far more, indeed, than his academic colleagues. It is this hope of freedom from divided responsibility which induces him to sacrifice a fourth of his possible earnings at his occupation in exchange for a tenure which, he trusts, will provide him with a salary sufficient for the needs of himself and those dependent upon him.

V. A Few of the Extramural Relationships of the Coach

It is manifestly impossible to discuss in detail all of the relationships which the college athletic coach enjoys. All that can be ventured, therefore, is to select some five or

six phases of the extramural contacts that apparently are common to most of the coaches, and to proffer a few notes upon each.

A. With Coaches at Other Colleges

In spite of rumors, printed or oral, it does not appear that antipathies between college coaches at the same or at different institutions are greater or more numerous than those that inevitably affect human relationships in other walks of life. Hence, the "temperamental" characteristics of the coach, to whatever results they may lead when a change in the personnel of a coaching staff becomes desirable, are not worthy of more serious administrative consideration than those of college teachers of academic subjects. Strained athletic relationships between institutions in the past have grown in a few instances from personal differences between instructors of teams; three well-substantiated cases have come to the attention of the study. A critic has remarked that in one respect football coaches appear to resemble the Indians of fiction; they never forget the offenses of a rival. To at least one other unfriendly relationship the passage of years has wrought for the two coaches involved a mutual tolerance and respect that is worthy of note.

B. With the Recruiting and Subsidizing of Athletes

The part played by some coaches in the recruiting and subsidizing of college athletes is discussed in Chapter X. For the moment only brief general observations are attempted. In the South and Middle West the restriction that coaches shall not initiate correspondence with candidates for admission to colleges, who have displayed promise as athletes, is evaded by two well-established procedures: In the first place, frequently contacts are initiated through personal interviews between coach and candidate which, although they are not literally classifiable as correspondence, nevertheless lead in the course of time to situations which it was the intent of the rules to obviate. In the second place, certain coaches secure the names of promising schoolboy athletes from newspapers. They then dispatch letters to alumni requesting them urgently to interview the boys and to ask them to write to the coaches. This procedure assuredly is equivalent to the initiation of correspondence. The sanctimonious attitude of the coach who thus violates the spirit of regulations would be despicable if it were not comic.

Although many coaches maintain that they do not desire the athlete who is on the lookout for perquisites and although several coaches, when interviewed, have stated emphatically that they had no room on their squads for men who had been recruited or subsidized, nevertheless the letters of coaches to such athletes show no discernible disaffection from them, even when prominent players, from knowledge in the possession of the coach or from suspicion which even he cannot escape, inevitably are re-

garded as hirelings. The experience of this study leads emphatically to the conclusion that any coach can end the subsidizing of athletes if it exists at the institution with which he is connected. Moreover, a gesture or a tone of voice would be sufficient to discontinue or considerably to modify the practice of local merchants in offering rewards to players who accomplish noteworthy individual feats.[9]

Journeys undertaken by the coach for the purpose of addressing high school assemblies and the ready conversion of such jaunts into recruiting tours are discussed in other pages.

C. With Alumni

From information gained in the present study it is clear that when a coach depends for salary or tenure upon the will of alumni, conditions unsatisfactory to the coach are most difficult to remedy. In such instances the power exercised by former students in certain aspects of athletics, always on the intercollegiate side, is likely to be great. Seldom is such a situation ideally comfortable. Occasionally, also, a coach is led to form such connections by the private hope that a summer camp which he conducts may prosper through favorable graduate opinion and an access of boys influenced by it. Unfortunately for the calling of the coach, in not a few instances the alumni appear to be an Olympian group to be placated at almost any sacrifice.

D. With Townsmen

Many a coach has found to his discomfort that friendship with individual members or small groups of townsmen can lead to an undue controlling interest on the part of fundamentally well-disposed individuals in the affairs of a university or college. The coach who, at the end of a victorious season, is the idol of the town is likely after a less fortunate schedule to find himself regarded less highly and even with suspicion. Those instances in which college administrators have attempted to capitalize for purposes of soliciting funds the friendly regard in which a coach is held by a local community have been fraught with the possibility of injustice to both the coaches and the institutions.

E. With the Press

Since the connection of newspapers and periodicals with college athletics is examined at length in a subsequent chapter, for the moment our concern is with a very limited portion of this subject. During the early days of this enquiry the statement was frequently made to members of the staff that the newspaper publicity accorded to many coaches was bought and paid for in cash or in kind. In view of the seriousness of the charge, special steps were taken to study it and the events which gave it rise. No such accusation was clearly substantiated. Although a statement to the effect that a coach's

[9] Cf. the article by Myles Lane in the *Dartmouth Literary Magazine*, May, 1928.

publicity is never paid for might be too sweeping, several test cases upon scrutiny proved to be motivated partly by sincere and intense admiration on the part of a sports writer for a coach, partly by the newspaper man's need for copy. It is, of course, possible that in some sections of the country newspaper writers on college athletics have been bribed by cash payments or by free tickets to discuss favorably the work of certain coaches. At the same time, in connection with such a wide distribution of complimentary tickets as takes place at certain California universities and at the University of Wisconsin, it has not been established that passes to games exert tangible influence upon reporters or sports editors.

With regard to interviews with newspaper reporters a former Eastern football coach has this to say: [10] "If we talked less in the press and more among ourselves we should get along better." A similar attitude on the part of responsible coaches would do much to diminish the notoriety achieved through newspaper stories concerning college athletes, the use of the names of young men in connection with the advertising of portable typewriters, clothing, sweaters, and other merchandise, and the publicity which attends the purchasing of the names and photographs of coaches and players for advertising cigarettes.

VI. Attitude and Influence

Athletic coaches, in spite of the notoriety that newspaper writers have bestowed upon them, differ not a whit from the generality of mankind. As with other men, the deepest tragedy among coaches is found where exigencies of the calling or of a situation have given rise to an increasing series of compromises with ideals which, starting in a coöperative yielding to comparatively innocuous practical considerations, increases with repetition until the life and influence of the man have come to be an almost perpetual negation of the verities. Happy is the coach to whom years and experience bring knowledge of the true relation of sport to education. Thrice happy is the college with which such a man is connected.

A. Attitude toward Contests

One of the great difficulties that beset the paid coach in any branch of athletics arises from the fact that having received, whether by his own choice or through the will of others, certain responsibilities, he must justify them publicly through the matches in which his teams or crews engage. In considering the resemblances that coaching bears to academic instruction, the fact is seldom noted that the responsibility of the coach for the "success" of his men, — however "success" be defined, — is tested by outside agencies frequently and immediately after he has imparted his instruction; whereas the college professor of Latin or economics or engineering, under the American

[10] T. A. D. Jones, "How a Head Coach Looks at Football," reprinted in the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, November 17, 1927, from the *Outlook*.

system of examination, himself sets his immediate tests for his own pupils, and any larger ultimate tests of them as scholars or engineers or men of affairs are long deferred, in many cases until years after graduation. From the immediacy and the publicity of the tests to which athletes are subjected arises, on the part of those interested in college athletics, a scrutiny of methods and results which no coach can escape.

Careful consideration of individual instances leads to the conclusion that nowadays the coach who openly teaches his men to win by unfair means is very exceptional. Mr. T. A. D. Jones has well summarized the situation when he writes: "I do not believe that many men in football encourage this kind of thing; but I am convinced that there are still a very few not above turning a trick when they can do it handily. But, generally speaking, I am thoroughly sold on the men who are handling football." The statements of many athletes leave an inescapable impression that certain players, at the behest of their coaches, keep the rules when the rules do not stand in the way of gaining a point. It must be acknowledged with reluctance that the primitive fear of penalty or of loss is still in college athletics a powerful preventive of unfair play. If one could feel assured that all coaches were in this regard as conscientious as some coaches, there would be little question concerning the moral values to be gained from games and contests. At a meeting of coaches and football officials held in the spring of 1928, indications were not lacking that not all coaches desire to see the rules strictly and accurately enforced at all times. Hence their representation upon the Football Rules Committee by men whose livelihood is gained from college football is to be justified only by its results. The best of Canadian football coaches express in word and in deed an attitude toward their calling far different from that of their American colleagues.

B. The Coach and Sportsmanship

Effort has been made to ascertain the extent to which magnanimity, good manners, and friendliness in contests can be ascribed directly to the precepts or the example of coaches. The conclusion of this enquiry is stated with some reluctance. There is a series of striking instances in which much good feeling among players on opposing teams is traceable to the influence of coaches. But very few American coaches are consistently, actively, and practically concerned with the sportsmanship of their athletes. Some, indeed, preach it loudly but practice it only in restricted fashion. Some insist upon it occasionally. A few exemplify it quietly, earnestly, and thoroughly. These men, whether their salaries be high or low, whether their teams win or lose, are without price.

In this connection three observations have importance: First, it seems to be a fact of coaching practice that in the West athletes, especially football players, are coached to be more aggressive than in the East. Moreover, certain teams which meet Western or Mid-Western opponents have been so coached for specific games. Secondly, one

prominent coach expressed the opinion that football is essentially a training, a laboratory period, and that it is not in reality a sport at all. Numerous instances, among them cases where football squads are composed of men engaged in the study of physical education and where large proportions of 'varsity teams are made up of subsidized athletes, bear widespread testimony to the growth of this notion. Thirdly, few coaches in the midst of their manifold technical duties and responsibilities are able, even if they were disposed, to give attention to ways and means of turning football players into good sportsmen.

Manifestly, it is absurd to expect a coach who himself is without the instincts of a sportsman to develop teams or crews who have those instincts. It is equally absurd to suppose that good may come from methods of a coach who says, in effect, "You men must be sportsmen, or I 'll cut you off the squad." Youth has too much of the comic spirit to suffer such priggishness. Yet in so far as the character of a man, its making and its modification, are within his own control and the control of others, just so far also is the development of a spirit of magnanimous rivalry, whether between individuals or between institutions, within the power of those who bear the heat and burden of that rivalry. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that here, at any rate, men may add cubits to the spiritual stature of themselves and their fellows merely by taking thought.

C. The Influence of the Coach

More or less intimate contacts with many coaches prompt to the belief that even the most advertised among them are not the evil geniuses they are supposed to be. During the study a certain football coach was stigmatized as a teacher of rough and unfair football and in support of the accusation the coach's own words were cited. Yet this is a summary of what an administrative officer at the college in question told a member of our staff: "We admire this coach, the boys admire him, and he was a good influence here. From a careful examination of the boys and from being present on the field, we have been unable to find evidence of instructions to cheat, or foul, or slug, but his oratory gets the upper hand. He talks too much. What he said was colored by those who repeated it, and he thereby injured not ourselves but our reputation." No matter what their status, coaches, having elected to wrest a living from athletics, must, like all others of their group, please their public. Doubtless a very great compensation lies in the esteem in which practically all of the coaches of this study are held upon their respective campuses, especially by the undergraduates. Yet, upon occasion, this popularity may be purchased at high cost. The coach who boldly demands monetary concessions for football men and at the same time permits misrepresentation of amounts paid to them as set down in eligibility blanks sent to other institutions of a conference is playing a double game, which profits neither his university nor his men. Through pressure for victory coaches have been known to pamper athletes in two respects:

First, young men have been led to value highly their own powers and to attempt to assure themselves of scholarships or aids or even direct financial payments before competing for teams (Ohio Wesleyan, various Pennsylvania colleges); and secondly, the scholastic pampering of athletes appears to be the chief responsibility of many football coaches after the close of their season. At three institutions partisanship for and against coaches has divided the respective student bodies to the extent that undergraduates are losing much of their zest for athletics. These cases are as exceptional as that of a young coach who, although he suffered from an unenviable reputation beyond the campus on which he worked, was there regarded as an exemplar of piety. Of this matter the important facts are two: Many coaches have earned the high opinion of college administrators, alumni, and undergraduates as wholesome influences in campus life. Not a few coaches, whether of this or of other types, sincerely enjoy working with young men and influencing their ideals and their conduct for good.

Conclusion

"The paid coach," remarked an Oxford don much respected for his interest and influence in college and university sports, "is at the bottom of all difficulties in American college athletics." From the British point of view the statement is entirely just. In English Rugby there is no such thing as a professional coach. The professional oarsman passed from British amateur rowing nearly a century ago. Paid coaches for university track and field athletics and association football at Oxford and Cambridge are employees solely. At the older and at most of the newer English universities coaching in intramural or in 'varsity sports rests upon a universally sincere regard for the status of the amateur.

To infer that British practice in this particular furnishes a model to be followed indiscriminately in the United States would be absurd. But it would be even more absurd to ignore British practice altogether. Between the two extremes of English and American coaching custom stands the Canadian, which has preserved, by the operation of the British sports tradition, more than a little of the English ideal of amateur coaching. It must not be forgotten that Englishmen have had in this particular far more and sharper experience than we. We should be guilty of wasting our opportunities if we neglected or disregarded what this experience has taught English and Canadian university sportsmen.

In coaching, as in other phases of college athletics, the American demands "the best"; his innate idealism makes him discontented with halfway measures. He believes that in coaching, as in other matters, he can procure the best by purchase and that the higher the price, the better the quality. Here his idealism may be and some-

times is misapplied. He fails to reckon with the devotion which a task commands and which in his business and commercial relationships he well knows has no price.

Doubtless at an ideal university professional coaching would find no place. It would be indeed a courageous college that abolished the paid coach. Yet among a group of colleges and universities a sincere coöperative effort, shorn of special pleading and the consideration of exceptional cases as if they were typical of all, to arrive at a common understanding of the place and function of the coach, paid or unpaid, in American college life would benefit not alone the institutions concerned in it but the very coaches whose situation would thereby be clarified.

Obviously, the position of a coach whose tenure depends upon victory is both unfortunate and unfair. The situation is deleterious to sport but especially to education, however it be defined. A coach who trusts to faculty status and fair words for safety in the hour of disapproval leans upon a broken reed. When the new ideals now stirring public and private school athletics reach their inevitable fruition in college and university sport, a change will come over the attitude of the coach toward his own calling. It remains to be seen whether coaches, through conviction, sound business judgment, or mere prudential shrewdness, will anticipate and hasten that change through their own efforts.