

1

This chapter provides the numbers and statistics related to the five most popular men's and women's community college sports teams, athletically related scholarship aid, expenses, and other pertinent topics associated with athletics at the community college.

What the Numbers Say About Community Colleges and Athletics

*V. Barbara Bush, Cindy Castañeda, David E. Hardy,
Stephen G. Katsinas*

Evidence clearly points to the presence of intercollegiate athletics at the early junior colleges established prior to World War I (Koos, 1925; Eells, 1931). Moving into more current times, we find among prominent reasons for institutional involvement with athletics giving students a “true college experience,” expanding access (Castañeda, 2004), recruiting a more diverse student body (Bush, Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, in press), and addressing the “missing male phenomenon” (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2008). This chapter uses national data to give an introductory overview regarding the depth and breadth of the involvement of America's community colleges in intercollegiate athletics. It presents more of a snapshot of what is currently occurring than an in-depth analysis of gender equity in intercollegiate athletics at community colleges. Chapters Five and Six of this volume offer more inclusive information specific to the history and impact of gender equity.

Methodology

This chapter draws on a national census of intercollegiate athletics at U.S. community colleges used as a part of a 2004 doctoral dissertation by Cindy Castañeda at the University of North Texas under the direction of Stephen G. Katsinas. Methodologically, the dissertation used U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System or

IPEDS-assigned unique identification numbers (UNITID) to combine data from the 2002–03 and 2003–04 administrations of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, IPEDS, and the 2005 Basic Classifications published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006). The result was a comprehensive overview of athletics at public community colleges, excluding special-use institutions, tribal colleges, and two-year-under-four-year colleges.

Student Involvement in Community College Athletics

In the 2001–02 academic year, a total of 72,558 full-time students at 508 institutions participated in athletic teams fielded by U.S. community colleges, making intercollegiate athletics among the most popular activities found at American community colleges (Castañeda, 2004). With regard to gender, men outnumbered women participating across all college-sponsored sports: 26,698 students, or 37 percent, were women, while 45,860 or 63 percent were men.

There were major differences found in the level and extent of student involvement across specific types of community colleges. Among the 860 identifiable community college districts sending data to IPEDS, 508 (59 percent) chose to field athletic teams (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2006). However, colleges participating in intercollegiate athletics are not spread evenly across the three major geographic classifications under the new 2005 Basic Classifications of Associate's Colleges nomenclature released in February 2006 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Carnegie, 2006). Among the 508 institutions reporting involvement in intercollegiate athletics to IPEDS, 309, or 61 percent, are classified under Carnegie as rural, 129 (25 percent) as suburban, and 70, or 14 percent, as urban (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2006). Rural colleges accounted for 47 percent of all athletes at public community colleges, yet in 2002–03 they accounted for only 39 percent of full-time, degree-seeking students at community colleges. This disparity represents an important comparison baseline; only full-time degree-seeking students who meet academic requirements are eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics. For this reason, analysis of the most popular sports and participants presented in the tables included in this chapter does not use unduplicated headcount; students participating in more than one sport will have multiple counts (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2006).

Table 1.1 presents data on full-time degree-seeking students participating in intercollegiate athletics at U.S. community colleges in the 2002–03 academic year by gender and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classifications categories of Associate's Colleges. A total of 2,928,842 first-time degree-seeking students were enrolled in that year, of which 1,009,815, or 34 percent, were enrolled at rural community colleges, 903,806, or 31 percent, were enrolled at subur-

Table 1.1. Full-Time Degree-Seeking Students Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics at Associate's Colleges in 2002–03, by Gender and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification

	<i>All First-Time Students Enrolled</i>		<i>All Full-Time Student Athletes Enrolled</i>					
			<i>All</i>		<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Rural small	184,335	6	36,867	3	16,897	3	19,970	3
Rural medium	303,130	10	242,504	18	105,296	17	137,208	18
Rural large	522,350	18	261,175	19	121,418	20	139,757	19
Rural total	1,009,815	34	540,546	39	243,611	40	296,935	40
Suburban single	492,340	17	246,170	18	113,795	19	132,375	18
Suburban multi	411,466	14	205,733	15	94,800	15	110,933	15
Suburban total	903,806	31	451,903	33	208,595	34	243,308	33
Urban single	292,963	9	78,889	6	35,960	6	42,929	6
Urban multi	752,268	26	301,079	22	127,522	21	173,557	23
Urban total	1,015,231	35	379,968	28	163,482	27	216,486	29
Total	2,928,842	100	1,372,417	100	615,688	100	756,729	100

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Data were compiled by Castañeda in 2006. It is important to note that these side-by-side comparisons were developed using two data years, owing to the timing of data released by the U.S. Department of Education and the derivation of the data from two surveys. Full-time degree-seeking comes from the IPEDS data. The data presented in Table 1.2 are unduplicated athlete headcount and come from the EADA data surveys.

ban community colleges, and 1,015,231, or 35 percent, were enrolled at urban community colleges. Comparing these data to all enrolled first-time student-athletes, we find 39 percent of all first-time student athletes enrolling at rural, 33 percent at suburban, and 28 percent at urban community colleges. As a percentage of all enrolled first-time students, the smaller the college the greater the likelihood of institutional participation in intercollegiate athletics, with student athletes making up 20 percent of all first-time students. This finding is consistent with Moeck (2005), who found serving student athletes to be a prime motivating factor for smaller community colleges to operate on-campus housing.

Table 1.1 indicates that student athletes constitute a higher percentage of all first-time community college students at rural and suburban community colleges than the percentage of all new enrolled first-time students. The table shows the importance of intercollegiate athletics in attracting new first-time students by gender, particularly for men. The third column under men and women in the table reveals that male student athletes are a larger percentage of all first-time students enrolled at every type of rural, suburban, and urban associate's college. Comparing the three types, one sees that

intercollegiate athletics may be used as a tool to attract male first-time students at urban and suburban as well as rural community colleges. Male student athletes account for 6 percent of all first-time students enrolled at multi-campus urban and suburban community colleges, while first-time female student athletes are 2 percent and 3 percent respectively.

Table 1.2 presents data on participation in intercollegiate athletics, comparing those institutions that choose to award and those that choose not to award scholarship aid to student athletes, by Carnegie Associate's College Classification for 2002–03. Institutions that field intercollegiate athletic teams in the National Junior College Athletic Association's Divisions I and II award scholarship aid, while institutions fielding teams in Division III do not. Teams participating in the Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges award only partial scholarships and are thus roughly comparable to the NJCAA's Division II, while the 109 participating members of the Commission on Athletics at California's community colleges award no athletically related scholarship aid at all and for this reason are comparable to the NJCAA's Division III colleges. The first column of Table

Table 1.2. Community Colleges Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics, by Institutions Awarding and Not Awarding Scholarship Aid to Student Athletes and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's College, 2002–03

		Level of Athletic Competition			
		Divisions I and II (with Scholarships)		Division III (w/out Scholarships)	
		Number	%	Number	%
Associate's Colleges with Athletics					
Rural small	52	37	71	15	29
Rural medium	166	134	81	32	19
Rural large	90	68	76	22	24
Rural total	308	239	78	69	22
Suburban single	80	34	43	46	58
Suburban multi	67	29	43	38	57
Suburban total	147	63	43	84	57
Urban single	24	16	67	8	33
Urban multi	88	40	45	48	55
Urban total	112	56	50	56	50
Total	567	358	63	209	7

Note: Institutions in the NJCAA's Divisions I and II award scholarship aid, while institutions in Division III do not. Data were compiled by Castañeda in 2006. The data presented here come from the EADA data surveys.

1.2 lists each type of community college fielding athletic teams, while the next two columns, under the heading “Level of Athletic Competition,” disaggregate that institutional data into Divisions I and II (with scholarships) and Division III (no scholarships). A majority of suburban community colleges do not offer athletically related aid, while the split is even for urban community colleges. In contrast, about four of every five rural community colleges offer athletically related aid, underscoring the importance that intercollegiate athletics may play as a recruitment tool.

Table 1.3 applies the new 2005 Carnegie Associate’s College classifications to 2002–03 EADA data to show community colleges with intercollegiate athletics both in terms of the number of teams and average number of teams fielded by gender. It is important to note that, because some colleges may choose to field more men’s teams than women’s teams and vice versa, the total number of teams fielded in the first column (“All Community Colleges with Athletics”) may not equal the total number of teams fielded by gender in the two columns that follow. Table 1.3 shows that the number of teams fielded is roughly equal across all college types, with a slightly higher average number of teams fielded for men than women at each type of college.

Table 1.3. Number of Teams by Gender and Average Number of Teams by Gender and by College Classification, 2002–03

	<i>Associate’s Colleges with Athletics</i>	<i>Total Number of Teams Fielded</i>		<i>Average Number of Teams Fielded</i>	
		<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Rural small	52	58	48	3.1	2.8
Rural medium	166	166	168	3.2	3.1
Rural large	90	88	90	4.0	3.9
Rural total	308	306	301	3.4	3.3
Suburban single	80	80	78	5.0	4.7
Suburban multi	67	67	67	4.8	4.6
Suburban total	147	147	145	4.9	4.6
Urban single	24	24	24	4.0	3.7
Urban multi	88	88	88	4.3	4.2
Urban total	112	112	112	4.2	4.1
Total	567	565	558	4.0	3.8

Note: Some colleges may field more men’s teams than women’s teams, and vice versa, so the total number of teams fielded in the first column may not equal the breakdowns by gender in the next two columns. Data were analyzed by Castañeda (2006). It is important to note that these side-by-side comparisons were developed using two data years, because of the timing of data released by the U.S. Department of Education and the derivation of the data from two surveys. Full-time degree-seeking comes from the IPEDS data.

Table 1.4 presents men’s and women’s team sports at community colleges ranked by the number of athletic scholarships awarded and by expenses for 2002–03 according to Carnegie Associate’s College type. When sports are ranked by the number of full and partial athletic scholarships awarded, basketball emerges with the largest number of students. A total of 317 scholarships are awarded to men and 295 to women. Baseball, with 294 scholarships awarded to men, and softball, with 263 scholarships to women, are the second most popular sports. For men, basketball and baseball are followed by golf (119 scholarships), soccer (101), and football (65). For women, basketball and softball are followed by volleyball (226), soccer (128), and tennis (71).

When the sports are ranked by expenses incurred at the institutions (as reported by the institutions to the federal government through the EADA Survey), football is far and away the most expensive sport to operate. Football, with an average expense of \$99,705, average annual expense of \$99,705 per team, is more than twice as expensive as the second- and

Table 1.4. Men’s and Women’s Team Sports Ranked by Scholarships Awarded and Expenses Incurred, 2002–03

<i>Ranked by Number of Full and Partial Scholarships Awarded</i>		<i>Ranked by Expenses Incurred by Colleges</i>			
	<i>Sport</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Sport</i>	<i>Number of Teams</i>	<i>Annual Expense per Team</i>
Men’s teams	Basketball	317	Football	129	\$99,705
	Baseball	294	Baseball	438	\$48,511
	Golf	119	Basketball	484	\$43,354
	Soccer	101	Rodeo	37	\$38,516
	Football	65	Ice hockey	7	\$36,798
Women’s teams	Basketball	295	Basketball	444	\$39,703
	Softball	263	Softball	382	\$34,388
	Volleyball	226	Volleyball	358	\$25,810
	Soccer	28	Track and field,	34	\$22,211
	Tennis	71	cross-country		
			Rodeo	34	\$19,689

Notes: Data were analyzed by Castañeda (2006) from the publications of the National Junior College Athletic Association and the Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges.

Institutions participating in NJCAA’s Division I may award full scholarships including tuition, fees, room, board, and limited travel costs for student athletes, while NJCAA’s Division II colleges can award partial scholarships not to exceed tuition and fees. NWAACC can award up to a maximum of \$1,200 in work-study and are counted as awarding athletic aid. Athletically related expense data were compiled by Castañeda from the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) 2003 survey. Average expenses may not necessarily include in-kind contributions such as equipment and so on.

third-ranked men's sports, baseball (\$48,511) and basketball (\$43,354), and the most expensive women's sport, basketball (\$39,703). As Table 1.4 indicates, the average reported expenses are much higher for men's sports than for women's, with the range for men between \$99,705 for the most expensive sport (football) to \$36,798 for the fifth most expensive (ice hockey). In contrast, the range of average expenses for women's sports at community colleges is far lower, from \$39,703 for the most expensive sport (basketball) to just \$19,689 for the fifth-ranked women's (sport rodeo).

Discussion

Intercollegiate athletics are clearly a popular student activity at community colleges. This is particularly true for rural community colleges. As Cohen and Brawer (2008) have noted, responsive community colleges tailor the range and scope of their academic and vocational curricula, offerings in developmental education, workforce training, and continuing education to needs in their service regions. The evidence is compelling that community-based strategies also guide sponsorship of intercollegiate athletics at community colleges.

Rural-serving colleges make the greatest commitment to intercollegiate athletics, as seen in student participation (see Table 1.1), relatively higher coaching salaries (Castañeda, 2004), larger awards of athletically related student aid (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2008), and the level of competition sponsored (see Table 1.2). One likely reason that rural community colleges emphasize athletics is the drive to maintain enrollment growth, which in turn benefits the college through increased efficiency and economies of scale in housing, food service, and student activities. It appears that the presence of athletics results in enrollment of more full-time students generally and more full-time male students in particular. These additional full-time students yield revenue in the form of increased state reimbursement to the college reimbursements that have been shown to bring in more income than the college expends on athletics (Castañeda, 2004). In an impact study of sports programs at California community colleges, Thein (2002) found that an athlete was valued at approximately \$7,470 per academic year.

Intercollegiate athletics are a vital part of more than 58 percent of the 860 public community college districts across the United States (Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, 2008). In 2002–03, 567 colleges sponsored competition in more than thirty sports, fielding 4,277 teams in which an unduplicated 72,558 student athletes participated (Castañeda, 2004). Ranked by the number of scholarships awarded, the top five men's sports in 2002–03 were basketball, baseball, golf, soccer, and football, and the top five women's sports were basketball, softball, volleyball, soccer, and tennis. By reported

expenses, the top five men's sports were football, baseball, basketball, rodeo, and ice hockey, while the top five women's sports were basketball, softball, volleyball, track and field and cross-country, and rodeo. It should be noted that sports such as rodeo may receive a large volume of in-kind donations of equipment and support of animal maintenance that are not reported to the federal government. Large in-kind donations also may not be reported for football. We further note that these data do not incorporate well the large number of California's community colleges in football, which are prohibited from awarding full or partial athletic scholarships under Commission on Athletics guidelines.

Gender equity remains an important challenge in intercollegiate athletics at community colleges. The challenge is represented in Table 1.4, which shows that football is more than twice as expensive as the second-ranked men's sport or top-ranked women's sport. The presence of football challenges the institutions that sponsor it to achieve gender equity in aid to intercollegiate athletics, whether represented by proportional participation by sport or total number of participants. What is clear is that many more men than women participated across all college-sponsored sports (Bush, Castañeda, Katsinas, and Hardy, in press). By college type, participation is skewed heavily to the rural colleges, which accounted for 47 percent of all athletes at rural community colleges. In 2002–03, rural colleges accounted for only 39 percent of full-time degree-seeking students at community colleges. This percentage of full-time students provides an important baseline for comparison, because only full-time degree-seeking students who meet academic requirements can participate in intercollegiate athletics (Castañeda, 2004).

Implications

Because community colleges are active participants in intercollegiate athletics, they take on many of the issues facing four-year colleges and universities. This chapter has outlined access, gender equity, financial stability, and recruitment as four areas of concern. Later chapters in this volume by Ellen Staurowsky as well as Heather Lawrence and others will promote a more detailed discussion of these topics individually. Perhaps these concerns will raise questions in the future about the alignment of intercollegiate athletics with the mission of the community college. Do two-year institutions, in their focus on access, continue to view athletics as a way of recruiting students (especially males) who may not otherwise pursue higher education? If so, might institutions without intercollegiate athletics wish to consider adding them for recruitment purposes?

For those institutions considering the fielding of athletic teams, the issue of gender equity is somewhat more easily addressed by avoiding football altogether. We believe it is possible that some institutions already par-

ticipating in intercollegiate athletics in the NJCAA's Division III, which does not award athletically related scholarship aid, may choose to shift to Divisions I or II, which do, in order to accomplish the purposes outlined here. Those institutions adding athletically related aid should consider participation in baseball or softball and basketball, for both cost and gender equity reasons. Because the nation is in recession, finances will surely dictate certain choices, and we would not recommend that intercollegiate athletics be initiated at the expense of academic endeavors. Still, we recognize that as an engagement tool, community colleges generally and urban community colleges specifically may consider following the lead of rural and suburban community colleges engaged in intercollegiate athletics and initiate additional programs. In particular, those colleges that are considering initiating or adding sports should appraise sports that are popular in their feeder high schools, including but not limited to basketball, baseball and softball, women's volleyball, and soccer.

References

- Bush, V. B., Castañeda, C., Hardy, D. E., and Katsinas, S. G. "Athletics in Community Colleges: A Primer." In M. T. Miller and D. B. Kissinger (eds.), *Community College Student Athletes*. Charlotte, N.C.: Greenwood/Information Age, in press
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 2006. *2005 Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791> (accessed Aug. 31, 2008).
- Castañeda, C. "A National Overview of Intercollegiate Athletics in Public Community Colleges." (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 2004, 65/08, 2915A.
- Castañeda, C., Katsinas, S. G., and Hardy, D. E. "The Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics at Rural-Serving Community Colleges: A Policy Brief by the Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama for the MidSouth Partnership for Rural Community Colleges." 2006. <http://www.ruralcommunitycolleges.org/docs/MSPBRIEFATHLETICS.pdf> (accessed Aug. 14, 2008).
- Castañeda, C., Katsinas, S. G., and Hardy, D. E. *Meeting the Challenge of Gender Equity in Community College Athletics*. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 142. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. *The American Community College* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Eells, W. C. *The Junior College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
- Koos, L. V. *The Junior College Movement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1925.
- Moeck, P. G. "An Analysis of On-Campus Housing at Public Rural Community Colleges in the United States." (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 2005, 66/06, 2079.
- National Junior College Athletic Association. *NJCAA Handbook and Casebook 2002–2003*. Denver: NJCAA, 2002.
- Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges. "Member Schools." 2004a. <http://www.nwaacc.org/memberSchools.php> (accessed Feb. 7, 2004).
- Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges. "NWAACC History." 2004b. <http://www.nwacc.org/history/htm> (accessed Jan. 27, 2004).

Thein, P. J. "Feather River College Original Feasibility Study for Additional Sports Programs with Follow-up Data." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Community Colleges, Apr. 3–6, 2002, in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

U.S. Department of Education. *Equity in Athletic Disclosure Act Survey 2003–2004*. [Data file]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2003.

U.S. Department of Education. "The Athletic Disclosure Web Site." 2004. <http://surveys.ope.ed.gov/athletics/> (accessed Feb. 29, 2004).

V. BARBARA BUSH is an associate professor in the Department of Counseling and Higher Education at the University of North Texas.

CINDY CASTAÑEDA currently serves as the executive dean of the School of Ethnic Studies, Social Studies, and Physical Education at Richland College (Texas).

DAVID E. HARDY is an assistant professor of higher education and director of research of the Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama.

STEVE G. KATSINAS has served since 2005 as professor of higher education administration and the director of the Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama.

Copyright of New Directions for Community Colleges is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. / Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.