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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 Great 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.

**Great Plains Region**

A total of 138 of the 261 NIRA members from the Great Plains Region completed and returned a useable survey (53% 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 Great 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 = 138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Hills State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Technical Institute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Community College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitanka/Huron University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Platteville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Dakota Technical Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Distribution of respondents by State/Province where graduated high school

(n = 137)
Table 2

Distribution of respondents by State/Province where graduated high school

(n = 137)

<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>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Gender

(n = 135)

Female
41.48%
n=56

Male
58.52%
n=79
Figure 3

Age

(n = 135)

Mean 19.76
Standard deviation 1.34
Figure 4

Ethnicity
(n = 131)

- Caucasian or Anglo American: 93.13% (n=122)
- American Indian: 3.82% (n=5)
- Hispanic: 1.53% (n=2)
- Other: 1.53% (n=2)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 5
Political ideology
(n = 126)

- Liberal: 13.49% (n=17)
- Moderate-Liberal: 3.17% (n=4)
- Moderate: 48.41% (n=61)
- Moderate-Conservative: 17.46% (n=22)
- Conservative: 17.46% (n=22)
Figure 6
Size of place where spent most of childhood
(n = 133)

- 73.68% (n=98) in the countryside outside of any city or town
- 18.80% (n=25) in a town or village of 10,000 or fewer people
- 4.51% (n=6) in the suburbs of a city of 10,000 or more
- 2.26% (n=3) in a smaller city of 10,000 to 50,000
- 0.75% (n=1) in a city of 50,000 or more people
Figure 7

Family’s 2002 total household income
(n = 122)
Figure 8
Current student status
(n = 137)

Graduate student
2.19%
n = 3

Undergraduate student
97.81%
n = 134
Figure 9

Year in college 2003 - 2004 (undergraduates)  
(n = 134)

- 1st yr undergraduate: n=42
- 2nd yr undergraduate: n=38
- 3rd yr undergraduate: n=22
- 4th yr undergraduate: n=22
- 5th yr undergraduate: n=10
Figure 10
Receiving scholarships or monetary awards
(n = 132)

Yes 58.33%
n=77

No 41.67%
n=55
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 = 36); athletic scholarship (n = 5); rodeo club scholarship (n = 34); other scholarships (n = 22).

** A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 12

Year of NIRA eligibility in 2003 - 2004

(n = 134)

- First year: 37.31% (n=50)
- Second year: 27.61% (n=37)
- Third year: 20.15% (n=27)
- Fourth year: 14.93% (n=20)
Figure 13
Money won at NIRA rodeos during 2002 – 2003 season
(n = 77)
Figure 14
Competes in professional rodeo or professional bull riding
(n = 131)

Yes
12.98%
n=17

No
87.02%
n=114
Figure 15
Money won at professional rodeos or professional bull riding in 2002
(n = 15)
Figure 16

Rodeoed in high school as a member of the National High School Rodeo Association
(n = 137)

Yes
78.10%
(n = 107)

No
21.90%
(n = 30)
Figure 17
Planning to rodeo after graduation
(n = 135)

Yes
95.56%
n=129

No
4.44%
n=6
**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 = 39); breakaway roping (n = 37); goat tying (n = 23); team roping (n = 10).*
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 = 8); bull riding (n = 18); saddle bronc riding (n = 11); calf roping (n = 25); steer wrestling (n = 21); team roping (n = 46).
Figure 20

Network most often watch rodeo on television
(n = 118)

* 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 = 135)
Figure 22
Make of vehicle primarily used to travel to NIRA rodeos
(n = 133)

* 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 = 119)
Figure 24

Pulling a horse trailer to NIRA rodeos
(n = 134)

Yes
73.88%
n=99

No
26.12%
n=35
Figure 25

Horse trailer has living quarters

(n = 97)

Yes
37.11%
n=36

No
62.89%
n=61
Figure 26
Type of horse trailer that will primarily be used when traveling to NIRA rodeos
(n = 95)

* 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
\( (n = 94) \)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 28
Own and use a cellular telephone
(n = 136)

Yes 83.82%
n=114

No 16.18%
n=22
Figure 29

Company that provides cellular telephone service

(n = 113)

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

Brand name cellular telephone

(n = 112)

- **Nokia** 30.36% (n=34)
- **Kyocera** 29.46% (n=33)
- **Motorola** 16.96% (n=19)
- **Audiovox** 9.82% (n=11)
- **Other** 13.39% (n=15)

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

Own a desktop computer
(n = 135)

Yes
35.56%
n=48

No
64.44%
n=87
Figure 32
Brand name desktop computer
(n = 48)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 33

Own a laptop computer
(n = 133)

Yes
23.31%
n=31

No
76.69%
n=102
Figure 34

Brand name laptop computer

(n = 30)

- Dell: 26.67% (n=8)
- Gateway: 30.00% (n=9)
- Hewlett Packard: 6.67% (n=2)
- IBM: 3.33% (n=1)
- Macintosh: 13.33% (n=4)
- Toshiba: 10.00% (n=3)
- Compaq: 10.00% (n=3)
Figure 35

Eat at Arby’s

(n = 123)
Figure 36
Eat at Burger King
(n = 123)

More than once a week: n=6
Once a week: n=6
A few times a month: n=20
Once a month: n=28
A few times a year: n=45
Never: n=18
Figure 37
Eat at Chick-Fil-A
(n = 118)
Figure 38

Eat at Dairy Queen

(n = 122)
Figure 39
Eat at Hardee’s
(n = 125)

- More than once a week: n=8
- Once a week: n=6
- A few times a month: n=17
- Once a month: n=21
- A few times a year: n=55
- Never: n=18
Figure 40

Eat at Jack in the Box

(n = 121)
Figure 41
Eat at McDonalds
(n = 124)
Figure 42
Eat at Sonic Drive-In
(n = 120)

More than once a week: n=2
A few times a month: n=1
Once a month: n=4
A few times a year: n=14
Never: n=99
Figure 43
Eat at Taco Bell
(n = 122)
Figure 44
Eat at Taco Bueno
(n = 120)

- Never: n=113
- A few times a year: n=3
- Once a month: n=1
- A few times a month: n=3
- Once a week: n=3
- More than once a week: n=3
Figure 45

Eat at Wendys

(n = 123)
Figure 46
Eat at Whataburger
(n = 119)
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 = 1.61; Burger King = 1.75; Chick-Fil-A = 0.25; Dairy Queen = 1.85; Hardee’s = 1.70; Jack in the Box = 0.21; McDonalds = 2.51; Sonic Drive-In = 0.29; Taco Bell = 1.63; Taco Bueno = 0.17; Wendys = 1.50; Whataburger = 0.21.
Figure 48

Favorite fast food restaurant

(n = 132)
Figure 49
Favorite brand of pizza
(n = 135)

- Dominos: n=26
- Little Caesars: n=1
- Papa Johns: n=35
- Pizza Hut: n=71
- Pizza Inn: n=2
- I do not eat pizza: n=2
Figure 50

Favorite deli/sub shop

(n = 133)

- Subway: n=114
- Quiznos: n=10
- Blimpie’s: n=3
- Schlotzsky’s: n=1
- I do not eat at deli/sub shops: n=5
Figure 51

Favorite fast food chicken restaurant

(n = 135)

- KFC: n=108
- Church's Fried Chicken: n=1
- Popeye's Famous Fried Chicken: n=3
- I do not eat at fast food chicken restaurants: n=23
Figure 52
Favorite soft drink
(n = 126)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 53

Brand of cowboy boots most often purchased
(n = 136)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Ariat (n = 62); Justin (n = 33); Olathe (n = 10); Tony Lama (n = 14); Other (n = 17).

** 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 = 55; males, n = 79)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Ariat (n = 30); Justin (n = 15); Olathe (n = 0); Tony Lama (n = 3); Other (n = 7). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Ariat (n = 30); Justin (n = 18); Olathe (n = 10); Tony Lama (n = 11); Other (n = 10).

** 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, \(n = 55\); males, \(n = 79\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$166.44</td>
<td>$136.73</td>
<td>$187.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$118.82</td>
<td>$116.69</td>
<td>$116.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td>(n = 17)</td>
<td>(n = 18)</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 = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Indicates a statistically significant difference \((p < 0.05)\) between females and males.
Figure 55

Brand of cowboy hats most often purchased
(n = 108)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Bailey (n = 17); Resistol (n = 36); Rodeo King (n = 15); Wrangler (n = 14); Other (n = 26).

** 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 = 39; males, n = 68)

* The total percentage exceeds 100% due to multiple responses. The number of female respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Bailey (n = 8); Resistol (n = 9); Rodeo King (n = 5); Wrangler (n = 9); Other (n = 8). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Bailey (n = 8); Resistol (n = 27); Rodeo King (n = 10); Wrangler (n = 5); Other (n = 18).

** 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\textsuperscript{a}
(females, n = 54; males, n = 76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>$127.52</td>
<td>$101.11 *</td>
<td>$146.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>$105.70</td>
<td>$91.76</td>
<td>$111.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>$100.00 (n = 32)</td>
<td>$100.00 (n = 15)</td>
<td>$100.00 (n = 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td>$0.00 (n = 19)</td>
<td>$0.00 (n = 12)</td>
<td>$0.00 (n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>$500.00 (n = 2)</td>
<td>$400.00 (n = 2)</td>
<td>$500.00 (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.

* Indicates a statistically significant difference (\(p < 0.05\)) between females and males.
Figure 57

Brand of jeans most often purchased

(n = 155)

* 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 = 31); Cruel Girl (n = 15); Lucky (n = 8); Wrangler/20X (n = 94); Other (n = 7).

** 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 = 62; males, n = 91)

* 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 = 3); Cruel Girl (n = 15); Lucky (n = 7); Wrangler/20X (n = 31); Other (n = 6). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 28); Cruel Girl (n = 0); Lucky (n = 1); Wrangler/20X (n = 62); Other (n = 0).

** 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 = 55; males, n = 78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$180.91</td>
<td>$182.09</td>
<td>$179.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$101.99</td>
<td>$94.29</td>
<td>$108.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$200.00 (n = 37)</td>
<td>$200.00 (n = 16)</td>
<td>$200.00 (n = 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00 (n = 2)</td>
<td>$45.00 (n = 1)</td>
<td>$0.00 (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$500.00 (n = 4)</td>
<td>$500.00 (n = 1)</td>
<td>$500.00 (n = 3)</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 = 128)

* 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 = 38); Cruel Girl (n = 14); Wrangler/20X (n = 66); Other (n = 10).

** 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 = 51; males, n = 77)

* 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 = 4); Cruel Girl (n = 14); Wrangler/20X (n = 29); Other (n = 4). The number of male respondents who indicated that they purchased each brand is as follows: Cinch (n = 34); Cruel Girl (n = 0); Wrangler/20X (n = 37); Other (n = 6).

** 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\textsuperscript{a}
(females, \(n = 55\); males, \(n = 76\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$130.34</td>
<td>$113.82</td>
<td>$142.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$108.35</td>
<td>$99.13</td>
<td>$114.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 42)</td>
<td>(n = 16)</td>
<td>(n = 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Reported dollar figures exceeding $1000.00 were treated as missing values.
Figure 61

Overnight accommodation most often used when traveling to rodeos

(n = 134)

- **Hotel or motel**: 66.42% (n=89)
- **Horse trailer with living quarters**: 23.13% (n=31)
- **Camper**: 2.24% (n=3)
- **Other**: 8.21% (n=11)

* A complete list of “Other” responses is available upon request from the author.
Figure 62
Preference of major national hotels/motels
(n = 108)

* 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 = 17); Holiday Inn (n = 22); Super 8 (n = 43); Other (n = 26).

** 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 = 43; males, n = 65)

* 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 = 8); Holiday Inn (n = 11); Super 8 (n = 16); Other (n = 8). The number of male respondents who indicated that they preferred each hotel/motel is as follows: Best Western (n = 9); Holiday Inn (n = 11); Super 8 (n = 27); Other (n = 18).

** 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\(^a\)

(females, \(n = 44\); males, \(n = 72\))

<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>$624.96</td>
<td>$588.18</td>
<td>$649.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>$696.95</td>
<td>$797.72</td>
<td>$637.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 15)</td>
<td>(n = 6)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 6)</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 = 6)</td>
<td>(n = 3)</td>
<td>(n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>$3600.00</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$3600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reported dollar figures exceeding $6000.00 were treated as missing values.

\(^b\) Multiple modes exist. Both values are shown.
Figure 64
Made a purchase because of advertisement seen in Collegiate Arena
(n = 136)
Figure 65
Would purchase a product from NIRA’s national sponsor even if product was more expensive
(n = 135)

Yes
74.07%
n=100

No
25.93%
n=35