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Preface

This document provides an illustrative summary of the 2003 survey results obtained from National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association (NIRA) members located in the Central Plains Region. Figures and tables are used to simplify presentation of the data. All data utilized in this paper were extracted from the 2003 NIRA Membership Survey data set.

2003 NIRA Membership Survey

The 2003 NIRA Membership Survey data were collected via survey questionnaire during the fall of 2003. A survey questionnaire was included with each of the 2003 – 2004 membership application packets administered in the 11 NIRA Regions located within the United States of America (i.e., Big Sky Region, Central Plains Region, Central Rocky Mountain Region, Grand Canyon Region, Great Plains Region, Northwest Region, Ozark Region, Rocky Mountain Region, Southern Region, Southwest Region, and West Coast Region). Survey questionnaires were not included in the membership application packets dispensed in the Canadian Region.

The survey instrument contained 54 questions and required approximately 30 minutes to complete. It was designed to measure the attitudes, opinions, current behaviors, and behavioral intentions of the NIRA membership regarding selected products, services, and name-brand merchandise. In addition, the survey questionnaire collected information on students’ educational status, rodeo background, and general sociodemographics, as well as the rodeo events that respondents regularly enter.
Students were instructed to complete the survey and return it with their membership application to the NIRA National Office. No additional communication regarding completion and return of the survey was made. Overall, 2,303 of the 3,123 NIRA members located within the surveyed regions returned their questionnaires.¹ Eleven of the questionnaires were deemed unusable and excluded from the analysis. In sum, 2,292 useable surveys were received. This resulted in a 73% completion rate.

Central Plains Region

A total of 443 of the 561 NIRA members from the Central Plains Region completed and returned a useable survey (79% completion rate). These figures may be slightly suppressed due to the fact the respondent’s region was not identifiable on nine of the completed and returned surveys.

Note

All materials in this publication may be reproduced without permission of the author. However, a credit line would be appreciated. A suggested citation is: Theodori, Gene L. 2004. *National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association Membership Survey: An Illustrative Summary of the Central Plains Region*. College Station, TX: Rural Sociology and Community Studies Program, Texas A&M University.

¹ In the fall of 2003, student membership in the 11 NIRA Regions located within the United States of America totaled 3,123. Overall, NIRA membership totaled 3,233. This figure includes the 110 student members located in the Canadian Region.
Table 1
Distribution of respondents by College/University
(n = 443)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colby Community College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors State College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City Community College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Scott Community College</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City Community College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Panhandle State University</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Community College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers State University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Distribution of respondents by State/Province where graduated high school

(n = 437)
Table 2

Distribution of respondents by State/Province where graduated high school

(n = 437)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian Province</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Gender

(n = 439)

Female
33.49%
n=147

Male
66.51%
n=292
Figure 3

Age

(n = 438)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 19.64
Standard deviation 1.48
Figure 4
Ethnicity
(n = 431)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 5
Political ideology
(n = 390)

- Moderate: 60.26% (n=235)
- Moderate-Liberal: 3.59% (n=14)
- Moderate-Conservative: 13.08% (n=51)
- Conservative: 17.69% (n=69)
- Liberal: 5.38% (n=21)
Figure 6
Size of place where spent most of childhood
(n = 423)

- In the countryside outside of any city or town: 57.68% (n=244)
- A town or village of 10,000 or fewer people: 23.64% (n=100)
- The suburbs of a city of 10,000 or more: 8.51% (n=36)
- A smaller city of 10,000 to 50,000: 5.67% (n=24)
- A city of 50,000 or more people: 4.49% (n=19)
Figure 7
Family’s 2002 total household income
(n = 384)
Figure 8
Current student status  
(n = 436)

Graduate student  
2.29%  
n = 10

Undergraduate student  
97.71%  
n = 426
Figure 9

Year in college 2003 - 2004 (undergraduates) (n = 426)

- 1st yr undergraduate: n=167
- 2nd yr undergraduate: n=107
- 3rd yr undergraduate: n=76
- 4th yr undergraduate: n=56
- 5th yr undergraduate: n=19
- 6th yr undergraduate: n=1
Figure 10

Receiving scholarships or monetary awards
(n = 426)

Yes 84.04%
n=358

No 15.96%
n=68
Figure 11
Types of scholarships or monetary awards

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The breakdown for each type of scholarship or monetary award is as follows: academic scholarship (n = 97); athletic scholarship (n = 50); rodeo club scholarship (n = 258); other scholarships (n = 40).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 12
Year of NIRA eligibility in 2003 - 2004
(n = 435)

First year 43.68%
(n = 190)
Second year 25.52%
(n = 111)
Third year 16.32%
(n = 71)
Fourth year 14.48%
(n = 63)
Figure 13
Money won at NIRA rodeos during 2002 – 2003 season
(n = 224)
Figure 14

Competes in professional rodeo or professional bull riding
(n = 426)

Yes
23.47%
n=100

No
76.53%
n=326
Figure 15
Money won at professional rodeos or professional bull riding in 2002
(n = 94)
Figure 16
Rodeoed in high school as a member of the National High School Rodeo Association
(n = 440)

Yes 74.77%
n=329

No 25.23%
n=111
Figure 17
Planning to rodeo after graduation
(n = 433)

Yes
98.38%
n=426

No
1.62%
n=7
Figure 18

Events planning to regularly enter during the 2003 – 2004 college rodeo season (Females)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they plan to regularly enter each event is as follows: barrel racing (n = 111); breakaway roping (n = 96); goat tying (n = 55); team roping (n = 9).
Figure 19

Events planning to regularly enter during the 2003 – 2004 college rodeo season (Males)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they plan to regularly enter each event is as follows: bareback riding (n = 23); bull riding (n = 54); saddle bronc riding (n = 32); calf roping (n = 101); steer wrestling (n = 70); team roping (n = 175).
Figure 20

Network most often watch rodeo on television

\[ n = 350 \]

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 21
Type of vehicle primarily used to travel to NIRA rodeos
(n = 438)

- Diesel powered truck: n=290
- Gasoline powered truck: n=125
- Car: n=19
- SUV: n=1
- Van: n=2
- Recreational vehicle: n=1
Figure 22

Make of vehicle primarily used to travel to NIRA rodeos
(n = 434)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 23
Year of vehicle primarily used to travel to NIRA rodeos
(n = 411)
Figure 24
Pulling a horse trailer to NIRA rodeos
(n = 428)

Yes 81.31%
n=348

No 18.69%
n=80
Figure 25
Horse trailer has living quarters
(n = 345)

No
53.04%
n=183

Yes
46.96%
n=162
Figure 26

Type of horse trailer that will primarily be used when traveling to NIRA rodeos
(n = 344)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 27

Make of horse trailer that will primarily be used when traveling to NIRA rodeos
(n = 326)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 28

Own and use a cellular telephone

(n = 441)

Yes 90.70%  
n=400

No 9.30%  
n=41
Figure 29
Company that provides cellular telephone service
(n = 394)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 30

Brand name cellular telephone

(n = 375)

- **Nokia**: 52.80% (n = 198)
- **Motorola**: 26.13% (n = 98)
- **Sony Ericsson**: 3.47% (n = 13)
- **Kyocera**: 5.07% (n = 19)
- **Other**: 12.53% (n = 47)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 31

Own a desktop computer

(n = 438)

Yes
31.96%
n=140

No
68.04%
n=298
Figure 32

Brand name desktop computer
(n = 125)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Own a laptop computer
(n = 420)

Yes
14.52%
n=61

No
85.48%
n=359
Figure 34
Brand name laptop computer
(n = 55)

- Compaq: 25.45%, n=14
- Dell: 40.00%, n=22
- Toshiba: 9.09%, n=5
- Hewlett Packard: 5.45%, n=3
- Other: 20.00%, n=11

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 35

Eat at Arby’s

(n = 397)
Figure 36

Eat at Burger King

(n = 388)
Figure 37

Eat at Chick-Fil-A

(n = 376)
Figure 38

Eat at Dairy Queen

(n = 389)
Figure 39
Eat at Hardee’s
(n = 380)
Figure 40

Eat at Jack in the Box
(n = 375)
Figure 41

Eat at McDonalds

(n = 404)
Figure 42

Eat at Sonic Drive-In

(n = 398)
Figure 43
Eat at Taco Bell
(n = 394)
Figure 44

Eat at Taco Bueno

(n = 376)
Figure 45

Eat at Wendy's

(n = 387)
Figure 46
Eat at Whataburger
(n = 379)
Figure 47
Average fast food restaurant visitation

* Coded using the following scale: 0 = never; 1 = a few times a year; 2 = once a month; 3 = a few times a month; 4 = once a week; 5 = more than once a week.
Mean values:  Arby’s = 1.97; Burger King = 1.65; Chick-Fil-A = 0.55; Dairy Queen = 1.70; Hardee’s = 1.05; Jack in the Box = 0.57; McDonalds = 3.00; Sonic Drive-In = 3.13; Taco Bell = 2.45; Taco Bueno = 0.80; Wendys = 2.04; Whataburger = 0.66.
Figure 48
Favorite fast food restaurant
(n = 413)
Figure 49

Favorite brand of pizza
(n = 412)

- Dominos: n=34
- Little Caesars: n=16
- Papa Johns: n=70
- Pizza Hut: n=274
- Pizza Inn: n=6
- I do not eat pizza: n=12
Figure 50

Favorite deli/sub shop

(n = 425)

![Bar Chart]

- Subway: n=338
- Quiznos: n=48
- Schlotzsky’s: n=20
- Blimpie’s: n=3
- I do not eat at deli/sub shops: n=16
Figure 51
Favorite fast food chicken restaurant
(n = 433)
Figure 52

Favorite soft drink

(n = 407)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 53
Brand of cowboy boots most often purchased
(n = 414)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Anderson Bean (n = 31); Ariat (n = 133); Justin (n = 112); Olathe (n = 20); Tony Lama (n = 41); Other (n = 77).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 54

Brand of cowboy boots most often purchased by gender
(females, n = 135; males, n = 277)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Anderson Bean (n = 11); Ariat (n = 55); Justin (n = 42); Olathe (n = 0); Tony Lama (n = 5); Other (n = 22). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Anderson Bean (n = 20); Ariat (n = 77); Justin (n = 70); Olathe (n = 20); Tony Lama (n = 35); Other (n = 55).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Table 3

Amount of money spent on cowboy boots in a typical year\(^a\)
(females, \(n = 136\); males, \(n = 283\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females(^b)</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>$226.76</td>
<td>$186.88 **</td>
<td>$245.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>$167.55</td>
<td>$143.80</td>
<td>$174.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 109)</td>
<td>(n = 27)</td>
<td>(n = 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 18)</td>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
<td>(n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 6)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.
\(^b\) Multiple modes exist. Both values are shown.

** Indicates a statistically significant difference \((p < 0.01)\) between females and males.
Figure 55
Brand of cowboy hats most often purchased
(n = 371)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: American Hat Co. (n = 13); Bailey (n = 48); Resistol (n = 171); Stetson (n = 39); Wrangler (n = 17); Other (n = 83).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 56

Brand of cowboy hats most often purchased by gender
(females, n = 109; males, n = 260)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: American Hat Co. (n = 5); Bailey (n = 17); Resistol (n = 43); Stetson (n = 15); Wrangler (n = 5); Other (n = 24). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: American Hat Co. (n = 8); Bailey (n = 31); Resistol (n = 127); Stetson (n = 23); Wrangler (n = 12); Other (n = 59).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Table 4

Amount of money spent on cowboy hats in a typical year\(^a\)
(females, \(n = 134\); males, \(n = 282\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$149.81</td>
<td>$117.13</td>
<td>*** $164.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$128.91</td>
<td>$102.43</td>
<td>$136.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 101)</td>
<td>(n = 41)</td>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td>(n = 20)</td>
<td>(n = 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.

*** Indicates a statistically significant difference \((p < 0.001)\) between females and males.
* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 97); Cruel Girl (n = 53); Lucky (n = 47); Wrangler/20X (n = 256); Other (n = 26).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 58
Brand of jeans most often purchased by gender
(females, n = 167; males, n = 309)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 9); Cruel Girl (n = 53); Lucky (n = 36); Wrangler/20X (n = 54); Other (n = 15). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 86); Cruel Girl (n = 0); Lucky (n = 11); Wrangler/20X (n = 201); Other (n = 11).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Table 5
Amount of money spent on jeans in a typical year\(^a\)
(females, \(n = 139\); males, \(n = 282\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$226.22</td>
<td>$240.14</td>
<td>$218.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$175.66</td>
<td>$177.98</td>
<td>$174.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 130)</td>
<td>(n = 41)</td>
<td>(n = 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 7)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 9)</td>
<td>(n = 3)</td>
<td>(n = 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.
Figure 59

Brand of western shirts most often purchased

(n = 414)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 125); Cruel Girl (n = 68); Wrangler/20X (n = 164); Other (n = 57).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 60
Brand of western shirts most often purchased by gender
(females, n = 136; males, n = 275)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 7); Cruel Girl (n = 68); Wrangler/20X (n = 38); Other (n = 23). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 116); Cruel Girl (n = 0); Wrangler/20X (n = 125); Other (n = 34).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Table 6

Amount of money spent on western shirts in a typical year\(^a\)
(females, \(n = 140\); males, \(n = 279\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$157.19</td>
<td>$144.20</td>
<td>$163.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$127.68</td>
<td>$105.88</td>
<td>$137.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 130)</td>
<td>(n = 53)</td>
<td>(n = 77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 21)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.
Figure 61

Overnight accommodation most often used when traveling to rodeos
(n = 416)

- Horse trailer with living quarters: 43.99% (n=183)
- Hotel or motel: 39.18% (n=163)
- Camper: 8.65% (n=36)
- Other: 8.17% (n=34)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 62
Preference of major national hotels/motels
(n = 336)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they preferred each hotel/motel is as follows: Best Western (n = 103); Holiday Inn (n = 85); Motel 6 (n = 42); Super 8 (n = 60); Other (n = 46).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 63
Preference of major national hotels/motels by gender
(females, n = 116; males, n = 217)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they preferred each hotel/motel is as follows: Best Western (n = 46); Holiday Inn (n = 32); Motel 6 (n = 6); Super 8 (n = 15); Other (n = 17). The number of male respondents who indicated that they preferred each hotel/motel is as follows: Best Western (n = 56); Holiday Inn (n = 53); Motel 6 (n = 36); Super 8 (n = 44); Other (n = 28).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Table 7
Amount of money spent in either hotels or motels in a typical year\textsuperscript{a}
(females, n = 118; males, n = 251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$591.00</td>
<td>$541.63</td>
<td>$614.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$804.33</td>
<td>$704.32</td>
<td>$849.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 58)</td>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 58)</td>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$6000.00</td>
<td>$5000.00</td>
<td>$6000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Reported dollar figures exceeding $6000.00 were treated as missing values.
Figure 64
Made a purchase because of advertisement seen in *Collegiate Arena*
(n = 435)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>15.86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=69</td>
<td>n=366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 65

Would purchase a product from NIRA’s national sponsor even if product was more expensive

(n = 427)

Yes: 59.95%  
   n = 256

No: 40.05%  
    n = 171