

include revenues colleges obtain from enrolling students who may come to participate in drill team, band, or cheerleading. Colleges also benefit from having athletes live in the residence halls and take part in the food service plan, thus lowering the marginal cost of these services for all students, full- and part-time.

There is also evidence (Castañeda, 2002; Davis as cited in Thein, 2001) that many student-athletes enroll from out of the community college's state-assigned district or service area. The higher tuition typically charged to out-of-district, out-of-state, and out-of-country students can result in a great economic benefit for the college. While COA restricts community colleges to recruiting students in their own districts, students still enroll from out-of-district and out-of-state (Anderson, 2003; Lewis, 2002). At California's Feather River College, Thein (2001) reports "95% of the student-athletes are from out of the district" (p.10). While California community colleges do not award athletically-related aid, tuition paid above the in-district rate clearly adds to the bottom line. In addition, colleges often choose to divide full-scholarships among two or more students to maximize their scholarship budget (Castañeda, 2002). If an out-of-district student is awarded a half-tuition scholarship, that student likely still pays more tuition for the same number of credit hours than a non-athlete from within the college's district. Thein (2001) estimates the reimbursement community colleges collect in California of approximately \$3,735 per full-time (FTE) student.

What is the proper place of athletics at community colleges?

Professionals at rural-serving community colleges should be aware of the integral role athletics likely play at their campuses. However, no community college president should treat athletics as a panacea for declining enrollments. Rather, they are well advised to heed the advice of Raeppe, Peery and Hohman: "Unless athletics sponsored by the college are truly a part of the college education process and support and promote the goals of the institution, then the entire mission of the institution is in jeopardy and the athletic program has no basis for existence (1982).

Footnotes

¹ The National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) classifies sports as Division I, II or III. Division I or II sports may offer some athletically related aid, while Division III does not. None of the community colleges in the Committee on Athletics (COA) offer scholarships, as it is prohibited by the California State Educational Code. Thus, all sports played in California were classified as Division III. Some sports sponsored by colleges with membership in the Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges (NWAAC) were classified as Division II, because partial scholarships may be awarded to athletes.

² The exception is California, whose separate athletic association prohibits athletic aid awards.

References

- Anderson, D. (2003, October 5). Pula runs through California. The Honolulu Star Bulletin. Retrieved February 13, 2004 from <http://starbulletin.com/>
- California Association of Community Colleges (1983). Athletic code. Sacramento, CA: California Association of Community Colleges.
- Castañeda, C. (2004). A national overview of intercollegiate athletics in public community colleges. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of North Texas.
- Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2003). The American Community College, 4th edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lewis, F. (2002, March 6). UH to study inter-state community college league. The Honolulu Advertiser. Retrieved February 8, 2004, from <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com>
- Palmer, J.C. (2000). Demographics, State Education Reform Policies, and the Enduring Community College Role as an Extension of the Schools. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 27 (4), 93-103.
- Raeppe, R., Peery, D. & Hohman, H. (1982). Athletics in community and junior colleges. In J. Frey, (Ed.), *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics* (pp. 155-167). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.
- Rooney, J. F., Jr. (1974). *A geography of American sport: from Cabin Creek to Anaheim*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Thein, P. J. (2004, April). 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, Minneapolis, MN.
- U.S. Department of Education (2002). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2002*. Table 198: Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by control, level of enrollment, and state: 2000. Retrieved January 27, 2004 from



This policy brief is published by the Rural Community College Alliance as a membership service.



1000 Highway 19 North
Meridian, MS 39307
Wendy Cole, Program Director
601.484.0180
www.midsouthpartnership.org

The MidSouth
Partnership
for Rural Community Colleges



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

by Cindy Castañeda, Stephen G. Katsinas, and David E. Hardy

Executive Summary

To provide their students a full college experience, expand access, address gender equity, and to recruit a more diverse student body, community colleges have long been active in intercollegiate athletics. Castañeda's national study in 2004 found:

- Of 860 identifiable U.S. community college districts, 508 (59%) field athletic teams. Of the 508, 309 (61%) were rural, 129 (25%) were suburban, and 70 (14%) were urban.
- In 2001-2002, a total of 72,558 full-time students participated on intercollegiate athletic teams fielded by U.S. community colleges in 2001-2002. More men than women participated across all college-sponsored sports (26,698 or 37% were women and 45,860 or 63% were men). By college type, participation skewed heavily to the rural colleges that accounted for 47% of all athletes at public community colleges. In contrast in 2002-2003, rural colleges accounted for only 39% of full-time, degree seeking students at community colleges. This is an important baseline for comparison, because only full-time degree seeking students who meet academic requirements are eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics. These numbers are not an unduplicated headcount, meaning that students who participate in more than one sport may be counted more than once.
- By number of participants, the top five sports for men at U.S. community colleges are baseball (12,360), football (9,761), basketball (7,349), soccer (5,056), and track and field-all types (4,169). For women, softball (6,575), basketball (5,904), volleyball (4,795), soccer (3,694), and track and field-all types (2,670) had the most participants.
- By number of teams fielded, the five most popular sports for men are basketball (509), baseball (463), golf (256), soccer (237), track and field-all types(167); the five most popular sports for women were basketball (462), softball (419), volleyball (405), soccer (210), and track and field-all types(165). The typical rural-serving college fields three teams each for gender.
- By number of full/partial athletic scholarships offered, the top five sports for men are basketball (317), baseball (294), golf (119), soccer (101), football (65); for women basketball (295), softball (263), volleyball (226), soccer (126), tennis (71) were the top sports.
- A total of \$47,442,588 of aid was awarded to 24,863 student-athletes by U.S. community colleges in 2002-2003, of which 10,338 or 42% was awarded to women, and \$14,525 or 58% was awarded to men. Women athletes had a higher average award, however, receiving an average of \$2,038 compared to \$1,816 for men.
- Seventy-three percent of athletic award recipients and 74% of the athletically-related awards for student-athletes were given by rural-serving community colleges in 2002-2003. This represents about \$35 million of the \$47 million total. The amount of aid awarded by small rural-serving colleges was nearly identical to that awarded by multi-campus urban-serving community college districts, which on average serve 24,000 students.
- Student-athletes represent a significant percentage of total full-time enrollment, up to 22% for all male full-time degree/certificate seeking students at small rural-serving colleges, and 12% and 8% at medium and large rural-serving colleges.

Introduction

This issue brief presents results of a national census of intercollegiate athletics at U.S. community colleges based upon a 2004 doctoral dissertation completed by Cindy Castañeda at the University of North Texas under the direction of Stephen G. Katsinas. This dissertation was recently published by the MidSouth Partnership for Rural Community Colleges and used IPEDS assigned unique identification numbers (UNITID) to combine data from the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 administrations of the Equity in Athletic Disclosure Act, IPEDS, and the 2005 Basic Classifications published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The result was a comprehensive overview of athletics at public community colleges excluding special use institutions, tribal colleges, and two-year under 4-year colleges.

Are intercollegiate athletics important for rural-serving community colleges?

For rural-serving community colleges with athletics, the answer is clearly “yes.” 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 (Cohen and Brawer, 2003). 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, relatively higher coaching salaries, larger awards of athletically-related student aid, and the level of competition sponsored. Reasons for emphasizing athletics may include the drive for or maintenance of enrollment growth, which in turn benefits the college through increased efficiency and economies of scale in housing, food service and student activities. The presence of athletics also results in the enrollment of more full-time students generally, and full-time male students in particular. These additional full-time students bring in more revenue in the form of state reimbursement to the college, reimbursements that have been shown to bring in more income than the college expends on athletics. According to Thein’s 2001 impact study of athletics on California community colleges, “The approximate annual (fall/spring) financial value of an athlete is \$7,470 per academic year.”

What is the level and extent of community colleges with intercollegiate athletics?

Intercollegiate athletics are a vital part of more than 58% of all public community college campuses across the United States, as Table 1 shows. Athletics can be found at 58% of the 860 community college districts and single campus institutions. In 2002-2003, 567 colleges sponsored competition in more than 30 sports, fielding 4,277 separate teams in which an unduplicated 72,558 student-athletes participated (Table 5). In 2001-2002, a total of 72,558 full-time students participated in intercollegiate athletic teams fielded by U.S. community colleges in 2001-2002 (Table 4). More men than women participated across all college-sponsored sports (26,698 or 37% were women and 45,860 or 63% were men). By college type, participation skewed heavily to the rural colleges that accounted for 47% of all athletes at public community colleges. In contrast in 2002-2003, rural colleges accounted for only 39% of full-time, degree seeking students at community colleges. This is an important baseline for comparison, because only full-time degree seeking students, who meet academic requirements are eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics. These numbers are not an unduplicated headcount, meaning that students who participate in more than one sport may be counted more than once. The larger the college, the greater the number of teams sponsored. As population density decreases, the likelihood that intercollegiate athletics are offered decreases. The highest percentage of colleges with intercollegiate athletics are large rural-serving colleges, a percentage higher than urban-serving or suburban-serving colleges, despite these latter two groups’ higher average unduplicated enrollment, which indicates the key role athletics play at rural-serving community college campuses (Castañeda, 2004).

Table 1
Intercollegiate Athletics at Public Community Colleges in the United States by 2005 Carnegie Basic Institution Classification, 2002-2003

College Classification	Number in Population		IPEDS Identifiable Campuses	Districts with Intercollegiate Athletics	Campuses with Intercollegiate Athletics
	Districts/Single Campuses	Individual Campuses			
Rural					
Small	140	206	167	52	54
Medium	303	499	330	170	170
Large	110	217	116	87	94
Rural Subtotal	553	922	613	309	318
Suburban					
Single Campus	122	122	122	78	84
Multicampus	73	206	94	51	67
Suburban Subtotal	195	328	216	129	151
Urban					
Single Campus	44	44	44	24	25
Multicampus	68	258	143	46	91
Urban Subtotal	112	302	187	70	116
Grand Total	860	1,552	1,016	508	585

Table 7
Average Number of Students Receiving Athletically-Related Aid,, Average Total Dollars Spent on Athletically-Related Aid, and Average Award Per Athlete, by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification, 2003-2004.

INSTITUTION TYPE	Average Number Receiving Athletically-Related Aid			Average Total Dollars Spent on Athletically-Related Aid			Average Award per Athlete	
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men
Rural								
Small	26	45	71	\$ 47,196	\$ 64,777	\$ 110,585	\$ 1,734	\$ 1,448
Medium	32	50	82	59,649	84,532	143,064	1,854	1,665
Large	35	46	81	91,632	109,355	199,555	2,565	2,393
All Rural							\$ 2,059	\$ 1,829
Suburban								
Single Campus	29	30	58	\$ 43,481	\$ 40,941	\$ 84,422	\$ 1,503	\$ 1,388
Multi-campus	36	42	77	87,805	102,047	189,852	2,464	2,441
All Suburban							\$ 1,990	\$ 1,938
Urban								
Single Campus	25	34	59	\$ 43,259	\$ 48,888	\$ 92,147	\$ 1,717	\$ 1,435
Multi-Campus	27	33	59	57,397	52,664	108,421	2,092	1,618
All Urban							\$ 1,984	\$ 1,562
Grand Total:	31	44	75	\$ 64,224	\$ 79,689	\$ 142,899	\$ 2,038	\$ 1,816

Notes

1. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding
2. The amount of aid was extracted from the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) survey
3. The number of aid recipients was extracted from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Survey
4. Classifications were obtained from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's 2005 Basic Classifications.
5. The mean award per athlete was computed by dividing the total aid in dollars by the total number of participants in athletics.

How are athletic associations organized at community colleges?

There is no single organization that governs community college athletics. The largest organization, the National Junior College Athletic Association, counts 419 members as of 2002-2003, or 72% of all colleges with athletics, while the Commission on Athletics (California) and the Northwest Athletic Association of Community Colleges (Idaho, Oregon, and Washington) count 104 members or 18%, and 35 members or 6%, respectively. Another 27 colleges, or 5%, report offering athletics but not belonging to the NJCAA, COA, or NWAACC. Only 17 of the 259 rural-serving community colleges with athletics do not belong to one of the three athletic associations, with colleges in New England less likely to belong to an association than elsewhere.

The athletic association in which a sport is recognized can determine the extent of scholarship availability. Lacrosse, bowling, and ice hockey have low participation levels but high levels of potential scholarship availability because they are Division I sports in the NJCAA. In a similar vein, women’s bowling and lacrosse both competed exclusively as Division I NJCAA teams, and had a nearly 100% rate of potential scholarship availability. Conversely, if a sport was only played in California, such as men’s volleyball or water polo, scholarship availability was nonexistent. Scholarships were completely unavailable for the women’s sports of badminton and water polo for the same reason. Seven sports are not governed by the NJCAA, the NWAACC, or the COA, the most popular of which is rodeo, with 39 community colleges sponsoring men’s teams and 28 colleges sponsoring women’s teams. Rodeo has its own governing body for both two- and four-year colleges—the National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association (NIRA). Community colleges account for 44% of NIRA’s membership. No determination on the availability of athletically related aid could be made for rodeo, archery, skiing, field hockey, and the other sports not played under the aegis of the three major community college athletic associations.

Are athletics profitable for the community colleges that offer them?

Overall, athletics are likely a net income producer for community colleges. On the surface, they appear to result in a small net financial loss, as expenses exceed revenues. When state reimbursement per full-time student is considered, however, the total income per student athlete nationwide exceeds the cost by \$376 per student. This net benefit does not

parts—and use these dollars to increase the numbers and percentages of full-time male students. The total dollars in athletically related aid awarded in 2002-2003 by the smallest enrollment sub-category, small rural-serving community colleges, is virtually equal to the total dollars awarded by urban-serving multi-campus districts that enroll an average unduplicated headcount enrollment of more than 24,000 students! Taken together, it is clear that rural-serving community colleges use athletics as a strategy for enrollment growth.²

How much money is awarded to men and to women by community colleges for athletics?

Table 6 shows the number, gender, and percentages of athletic aid awarded by type of community college, while Table 7 shows the average number of student-athletes by college type who receive athletically-related aid, the average dollars spent by college type, and average award per student-athlete by college type at U.S. community colleges. Table 6 shows that of the 24,863 students who received athletically-related aid in 2002-2003, 10,338 or 42% were women, and 14,525 or 58% were men. The total dollars awarded by all community colleges was \$47.4 million, of which \$34.9 million or 74% was awarded by rural-serving colleges. The average number of athletic scholarships awarded by U.S. community colleges, as Table 7 (next page) shows, is 74, with 31 on average to women and 44 to men. The average of total dollars spent on athletics nationwide was \$142,899 in 2002-2003, with a high for large rural-serving colleges at just under \$200,000, and a low of \$84,422 for suburban-serving single campus colleges. The average award for women athletes was \$2,038 and \$1,816 nationally, with very limited variation by community college type.

A total of 24,863 student-athletes received aid at community colleges in 2002-2003, of whom 10,338 or 42% were women and 14,528 or 58% were men. That women accounted for 42% of all athletes receiving athletic-related aid, and had a higher average scholarship amount than men by nearly \$300, provides strong evidence of attempts by community colleges to comply with Title IX, as the proportion of women receiving athletic aid was higher than their representation of 37% in the population of all athletes. Rural-serving colleges generally, and small rural-serving colleges in particular, have a high level of commitment to athletics as evidenced by the provision of higher average amounts of athletically related aid for men and women. The emphasis on trying to recruit women athletes could explain why, in all seven types of community colleges classified, average awarded aid was greater for female than for male athletes.

Table 6
Athletic Aid Recipients and Average Amount in Athletic Aid Awarded at US Community Colleges, by Gender, and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification, 2003-2004.

INSTITUTION TYPE	Athletic Aid Recipients				ALL Athletes	Athletic Aid Awarded					
	Women		Men			Women		Men		ALL Athletes	
	Number	%	Number	%	Dollars	%	Dollars	%	Dollars	%	
Rural											
Small	898	37%	1,521	63%	2,419	\$ 1,557,472	7%	\$ 2,202,420	8%	\$ 3,759,890	8%
Medium	4,119	39	6,499	61	10,618	7,635,129	36	10,820,096	41	18,455,225	39
Large	2,251	43	2,925	57	4,913	5,772,811	27	6,998,733	27	12,771,545	27
All Rural	7,268	40%	10,945	60%	18,213	\$ 14,965,412	71%	\$ 20,021,249	76%	\$ 34,986,660	74%
Suburban											
Single Campus	868	50%	885	50%	1,753	\$ 1,304,438	6%	\$ 1,228,233	5%	\$ 2,532,671	5%
Multi-campus	891	46	1,045	54	1,936	2,195,117	10	2,551,180	10	4,746,298	10
All Suburban	1,759	48%	1,930	52%	3,689	\$ 3,499,555	17%	\$ 3,779,413	14%	\$ 7,278,969	15%
Urban											
Single Campus	378	43%	511	57%	889	\$ 648,889	3%	\$ 733,316	3%	\$ 1,382,207	3%
Multi-Campus	933	45	1,139	55	2,072	1,951,510	9	1,843,243	7	3,794,752	8
All Urban	1,311	44%	1,650	56%	2,961	\$ 2,600,399	12%	\$ 2,576,561	10%	\$ 5,176,959	11%
Grand Total:	10,338	42%	14,525	58%	24,863	\$ 21,065,366	44%	\$26,377,223	56%	\$ 47,442,588	100%

Notes on sources of data:

1. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding
2. The amount of aid was extracted from the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) survey
3. The number of aid recipients was extracted from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) survey
4. Community college classifications were obtained from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's 2005 Basic Classifications.

Why do fewer small rural-serving colleges offer intercollegiate athletics?

It is likely that a critical mass of full-time students is needed in order for athletic programs to be feasible and smaller colleges have trouble achieving that mass. This same challenge may be extended to many of the medium rural-serving colleges, which the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classifications categorize as enrolling an annual unduplicated headcount of between 2,500 and 7,500 students. In 2002-2003, the average unduplicated enrollment for the medium rural-serving community colleges offering intercollegiate athletics was only 2,819, well to the lower end of the enrollment range for all medium rural-serving community colleges. The number of sports fielded maps directly onto average size of each Carnegie type of college, as Table 2 shows, with large rural-serving colleges offering nearly one entire sport more for men and women than smaller colleges.

In which states are community colleges more likely to offer intercollegiate athletics?

Community college participation in intercollegiate athletics is significant, ongoing, but not evenly distributed across the 50 states. California has by far the highest participation level in intercollegiate athletics of any state at 94%. Only 6 of California's 107 community colleges do not sponsor intercollegiate athletics (*Commission on Athletics, 2004a*). As Rooney noted in 1974, "California is the citadel of junior college football" (p. 95), as 72 (41%) of the nation's 176 community college football teams in the U.S. are at California institutions. Thirty years later, 137 community colleges fielded football teams, and 71 of them (52%) are in California. Any decline in community colleges fielding football teams has occurred outside the Golden State.

Some states, such as Alaska and Hawaii, do not offer intercollegiate athletics. For them, the cost may be prohibitive, requiring air travel for virtually every contest. For other states in which two-year colleges have primarily filled the role of technical colleges, such as Louisiana, Kentucky, Delaware, and South Carolina, the sponsorship of intercollegiate athletics is also limited. These states may not view athletics as a vital student activity that adds to campus life. Conversely, states with a stronger general education emphasis for their community colleges might enroll more traditional aged students, the very group that most often participates in athletics.

How important are intercollegiate athletics among student activities at community colleges?

Intercollegiate athletics are a very important student activity for public community colleges in the United States generally, and for rural-serving community colleges specifically. Table 5 shows that 72,558 student-athletes participated in community college-sponsored intercollegiate athletics in 2002-2003. Castaneda estimates an average of 5.3% and 10.9% of full-time degree/certificate seeking women and men at public community colleges were student-athletes, respectively. Athletics may well be the most popular student activity on community college campuses. With U.S. demographics indicating an increase in the

Table 2

Average Number of Athletic Teams Sponsored at Public Community Colleges by Gender and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Institutional Classification, 2002-2003

INSTITUTION TYPE	Number of Teams		Average Number of Teams	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Rural				
Small	52	48	3.1	2.8
Medium	166	163	3.2	3.1
Large	88	90	4.0	3.9
Rural Subtotal	306	301	3.4	3.3
Suburban				
Single Campus	80	78	5.0	4.7
Multicampus	67	67	4.8	4.6
Suburban Subtotal	147	145	4.9	4.6
Urban				
Single Campus	24	24	4.0	3.7
Multicampus	88	88	4.3	4.2
Urban Subtotal	112	112	4.2	4.1
Grand Total	565	558	4.0	3.8

Source: Equity in Athletic Disclosure Act (EADA) 2002 Survey.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Table 3

Athletes as a Percent of All Full-time Degree/Certificate Seeking Students Enrolled at US Public Community Colleges, by 2005 Carnegie Basic Institutional Classification, 2002-2003

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	Number of Colleges Reporting			Percent		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Rural						
Small	51	47	51	22%	11%	16%
Medium	166	163	166	12%	6%	9%
Large	87	89	89	8%	4%	6%
Suburban						
Single Campus	80	78	80	8%	4%	6%
Multicampus	67	67	67	9%	4%	6%
Urban						
Single Campus	24	23	24	6%	3%	4%
Multicampus	88	88	88	10%	5%	7%
Grand Total	563	555	565	11%	5%	8%

Notes: Full-time students in this table includes only those reported as degree or certificate seeking students in the Institutional Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) 2002 Enrollment Survey.
Source: Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) 2002 Survey. Classification from Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

population of 17-24 year olds (Palmer, 2000), community colleges will need to be responsive to this younger group via expanded student activities, including athletics.

Athletes accounted for a higher percentage of full-time students at rural- than at suburban- or urban-serving colleges. Table 3 shows that, at the high end, athletes accounted for 16% of full-time degree-seeking students at small rural-serving colleges, and a low of only 4% of students at urban-serving single campus colleges. Here, the effect of college size accentuated the key role that athletes have played in rural-serving colleges' student body composition. The smaller the college, the higher the percentage of athletes among full-time students. These findings corroborate the report from Feather River College, a small rural-serving community college in northern California, where 26% of full-time students are athletes (Thein, 2001).

What are the most popular sports offered at community colleges?

Basketball, softball, and volleyball had the most teams at Divisions I and II for women. For men, basketball, baseball, and golf offered more teams in Divisions I and II.¹ Sports able to take advantage of shared facilities were most popular. Volleyball and basketball, for example, can both be played in the same gym. Baseball and softball each require fields, while golf requires no on-campus space, as matches and practices occur at off-campus golf courses.

Is gender equity an issue at community colleges with athletics?

Gender equity is an issue at community colleges with intercollegiate athletics, especially for those fielding football teams. Nationally, women accounted for 55% of full-time enrollment at U.S. community colleges in the Fall 2000 term (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), yet only 37% of student-athletes, as measured by unduplicated headcount, were women, as Table 4 shows. Whether the disparity in athletic participation was reflective of student interest, age distribution, or opportunity to participate in intercollegiate teams is unclear.

In light of how Title IX requirements have been interpreted in recent decades, it is interesting to observe that the presence of intercollegiate athletics positively impacts full-time male student enrollment. The problem of the "missing male" on many community college campuses is well known. Athletics increases the enrollment of full-time male students on community college campuses. This is especially true if a college sponsors football, a sport with rosters of 60 or more players. However football exacerbates gender inequity due to roster size.

While participation among men and women was skewed, the total number of opportunities for men and women to compete was more balanced. Men's teams accounted for 51.3% of all teams, and women's teams for the remaining 48.7% at U.S. community colleges in 2002-2003. The emphasis on balance in men's and women's teams reflects American community colleges' attempts to promote equity in athletics. Achieving gender equity in student participation is a challenge for all college types involved in intercollegiate athletics and in particular with football.

Table 4
Full-Time Degree-Seeking Students at US Community Colleges by Gender in 2002-2003, classified according to the 2005 Carnegie Basic Institutional Classifications

Rural	Female Students		Male Students		ALL Student	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rural Small	19,970	3%	16,897	3%	36,867	3%
Rural Medium	137,208	18	105,296	17	242,504	18
Rural Large	139,757	19	121,418	20	261,175	19
Rural Total	296,935	39%	243,611	40%	540,546	39%
Suburban						
Suburban Single	132,375	18%	113,795	19%	246,170	18%
Suburban Multi-	110,933	15	94,800	15	205,733	15
Suburban Total	243,308	32%	208,595	34%	451,903	33%
Urban						
Urban Single	42,929	6%	35,960	6%	78,889	6%
Urban Multi	173,557	23	127,522	21	301,079	28
Urban Total	216,486	29%	163,482	27%	379,968	28%
Grand Total	756,729	100%	615,588	100%	1,372,417	100%

Notes:

1. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
2. Data were analyzed by Castañeda, 2006 from US Department of Education IPEDS Survey Data. This is an important baseline for comparison, because only full-time degree seeking students, who meet academic requirements are eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics. The data presented in Table 5, below, are Unduplicated Athlete Headcount, and come from the EADA data surveys.

Do rural-serving community colleges use athletic aid as a student recruitment device?

The answer to this question is clearly "yes." Community colleges participating in Division III do not offer scholarship aid. Yet more than half of all intercollegiate athletic teams compete at the Divisions I or II levels, which may offer aid. This may signal a desire for tougher level of competition, or a lack of availability of Division III competition (bowling, lacrosse, ice hockey).

More likely, though, is the use of athletic aid as a device to increase student enrollments. The higher percentage of women's sports in Divisions I and II levels shows commitment to attract women through athletic aid. The higher rates of sponsorship by rural-serving colleges of Divisions I and II teams, 77% compared to 43% for suburban-serving and 50% for urban-serving community colleges, also supports this thesis. Table 5 shows that rural-serving community colleges offer far greater dollar amounts of athletic aid—about \$34 of the \$47 million total nationwide than their suburban-serving or urban-serving counter-

Table 5
Unduplicated Headcount of Students Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics at US Community Colleges in 2001-2002, by Gender and by 2005 Carnegie Basic Institutional Classification

Rural	Female Student Athletes		Male Student Athletes		ALL Student Athletes	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rural Small	1,661	6%	3,249	7%	4,910	7%
Rural Medium	6,262	24	10,856	24	17,118	24
Rural Large	4,588	17	7,245	16	11,833	16
Rural Total	12,511	47%	21,350	47%	33,861	47%
Suburban						
Suburban Single	4,584	17%	7,843	17%	12,427	17%
Suburban Multi-	3,948	15	6,760	15	10,708	15
Suburban Total	8,532	32%	14,603	32%	23,135	32%
Urban						
Urban Single	1,015	4%	1,765	4%	2,780	4%
Urban Multi	4,640	17	8,142	18	12,782	18
Urban Total	5,655	21%	9,907	22%	15,562	21%
Grand Total	26,698	100%	45,860	100%	72,558	100%

Notes:

1. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
2. Table 1 includes students who do not receive athletically-related aid, which is why the number of participants in this table is lower.
3. Data were analyzed by Castañeda, 2006. It is important to note that these side by side comparisons were developed using two different data years, due to the timing of data released by the US 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 2, below, are Unduplicated Athlete Headcount, and come from the EADA data surveys.