

MISSISSIPPI'S LEASE HUNTERS



Forest and Wildlife Research Center
Mississippi State University
Research Bulletin

The Forest and Wildlife Research Center at Mississippi State University was established by the Mississippi Legislature with the passage of the Renewable Natural Resources Research Act of 1994. The mission of the Center is to conduct research and technical assistance programs relevant to the efficient management and utilization of the forest, wildlife, and fisheries of the state and region, and the protection and enhancement of the natural environment associated with these resources. FWRC scientists conduct research in laboratories and forests administered by the University and cooperating agencies and industries throughout the country. Research results are made available to potential users through the University's educational program and through Center publications such as this, which are directed as appropriate to forest landowners and managers, manufacturers and users of forest products, leaders of government and industry, the scientific community, and the general public. Dr. George M. Hopper is director of the Forest and Wildlife Research Center.

Authors

Anwar Hussain is an assistant research professor in the department of forestry. Ian A. Munn is a professor in the department of forestry. Their research interest is forest economics. Kathy Jacobs is a design and marketing consultant. Ben C. West is an associate extension professor in the department of wildlife, fisheries, and aquaculture. His research interests include human dimensions and wildlife damage management. Darren Hudson is a former professor in the department of agricultural economics.

Citation

Hussain, A., I.A. Munn, K. Jacobs, B.C. West, D. Hudson. 2010. Mississippi's Lease Hunters. Forest and Wildlife Research Center, Research Bulletin FO398, Mississippi State University. 15 pp.

To Order Copies

Copies of this and other Forest and Wildlife Research Center publications are available from:

Publications Office
Forest and Wildlife Research Center
Box 9680
Mississippi State, MS 39762-9680

Please indicate author(s), title and publication number if known.

Publications are also available at the web site at www.fwrc.msstate.edu



Mississippi State University™

College of Forest Resources

Forest and Wildlife Research Center

MISSISSIPPI'S LEASE HUNTERS

by

Anwar Hussain

Ian A. Munn

Kathy Jacobs

Ben C. West

Darren Hudson

Forest and Wildlife Research Center

Mississippi State University

Research Bulletin

Introduction

Many Mississippi hunters lease hunting rights from private landowners throughout the state. Numerous other Mississippi hunters rely on public or private lands available without fees. How and why leasing and nonleasing hunters differ has not previously been investigated, yet these differences are important for a number of reasons. First, understanding Mississippi's lease hunters and how they differ from other hunters can help landowners that lease hunting rights identify niche markets, target marketing, and tailor leases to hunter preferences. Additionally, public land managers and other natural resource managers can use this information to target educational campaigns, tailor hunting leases, and set management goals to improve hunter experiences and incorporate hunter preferences into their larger management objectives. Finally, policy makers and legislators can fine tune hunting regulations to better serve these two distinct hunting constituencies.

Scientists in Mississippi State University's Forest and Wildlife Research Center conducted

a study of Mississippi hunters to assess what percentage of Mississippi hunters lease hunting land and to explore differences between hunters that lease hunting land and those that do not. The questionnaire consisted of questions about hunter socioeconomic characteristics (age, sex, household income, education, and number of dependents); characteristics of their hunting activities (experience, hunting frequency, species hunted, and sources of lands hunted); and hunting preferences and perceptions (preferred hunting companions and perceptions of game quantity, game quality and crowding on public and private lands). The questionnaire also included a series of questions about the characteristics of the leases such as size, access, location, game species present, management activities, and costs. Questionnaires were sent to 2,000 hunters in 2007 to gather information on their 2006 hunting activities; 726 individuals submitted completed surveys.

Results

A large majority of Mississippi hunters do not lease hunting rights on private lands. Sixty-six percent of the respondents hunted exclusively

on free private or public land. Only 34 percent leased at least some hunting land during 2006.

Hunter Socioeconomic Characteristics - Tables 1-9

In general, Mississippi hunters that leased hunting land (lessees) were very similar to hunters that did not lease (non-lessees). The two groups did not differ statistically with regards to gender (93 percent male), residency (85 percent were from in-state), location of residence (67 percent lived in rural areas) or total number of dependents (5 dependents). There were small, but statistically significant differences in age and number of dependents under 16 between the two groups. Lessees were slightly older, on average, than non-lessees (45 versus 43 years old). Lessees had fewer dependents under the age of sixteen, averaging 1.4 minor dependents, than did non-lessees (1.8 dependents).

There were small but important differences in education, employment status, occupation, and household income. More lessees had a Bachelor's degrees or higher (30 percent) compared to non-leasers (25 percent). Eighty-seven percent of lessees were employed full-time compared to 83 percent of non-lessees. Although hunters in both categories were engaged in a wide variety of occupations, more lessees classified their jobs as managerial

(26 percent) than did non-lessees (20 percent). Mean household income for lessees was significantly greater than non-lessees (\$76,181 versus \$70,707).

Hunting Characteristics - Tables 10-13

In addition to the characteristics of the hunters themselves, the study investigated differences in the characteristics of lessees' and non-lessees' hunting activities. Hunting characteristics considered included experience, enthusiasm, species hunted, and types of lands hunted.

Hunter experience and enthusiasm were measured using the number of years hunted and the number of trips taken during 2006. Overall, Mississippi hunters surveyed were very experienced, avid hunters. Surveyed hunters averaged 30 years of hunting experience and took 24 hunting trips in 2006. Hunters that leased land had slightly more years of experience and took more hunting trips than those that hunt exclusively on public or free private lands. On average, lessees had been hunting two years longer than non-lessees (31 years vs. 29 years). Although this difference is statistically significant, it is small, and can most likely be attributed to the fact that lessees were, on average, two years older than non-lessees. Most Mississippi hunters started hunting in their early teens, based on the difference between their mean age (44 years old) and number of years hunting (30 years). Lessees took significantly more hunting trips in 2006 than did non-lessees. Lessees averaged 32 trips for the year; 70 percent more than non-lessees, who averaged only 19 trips.

Deer was the game of choice for Mississippi hunters. Ninety-six percent of all hunters surveyed hunted deer. At least half of Mississippi hunters also targeted dove (55 percent) and turkey (50 percent). Only 20 percent of those surveyed hunted waterfowl. Thirty-five percent also hunted "other" species such as wild hogs, rabbit, squirrel, and quail. There was an interesting difference between lessees and non-lessees regarding species hunted. A greater percentage of lessees targeted each species than did non-lessees. For example, 98 percent of lessees hunted deer compared to 95 percent of non-lessees. For all other species, the differences were even greater: turkey (58 percent vs. 44 percent), dove (60 percent vs. 53 percent), waterfowl (24 percent vs. 19 percent) and other (41 percent vs. 32 percent). These differences were statistically significant for all species.

To assess differences in the sources of lands available to Mississippi hunters, hunters were asked to report whether or not they hunted their own (family) land, friends' lands (without a fee), other private lands (without a fee), public land, land leased from non-industrial private forest (NIPF) landowners, or land leased from forest industry in 2006. Eighty-one percent of all hunters hunted private, non-fee lands (family land, friends' lands, or other private lands). The percentage of non-lessees utilizing private non-fee lands (89 percent) was much greater than lessees (66 percent). Within this broad category, use by specific ownership category varied considerably. Roughly the same percentage of lessees and non-lessees (~ 45 percent) utilized family land. Significantly more non-lessees accessed friends' lands (47 percent) and other private lands (54 percent) than lessees (35 percent and 32 percent, respectively). Less than 29 percent of all hunters hunted public lands in 2006; however, a greater percentage of non-lessees (31 percent) utilized these lands than did lessees (25 percent). Eleven percent of non-lessees hunted public lands exclusively. Among lessees, 62 percent leased non-industrial private lands and 50 percent leased industry lands.

Hunter Preferences and Perceptions – Tables 14-15

Mississippi hunters were asked to assess their preference for friends, family, hunting club members and guides as hunting companions. Not surprisingly, both groups ranked family highest with about 80 percent of both lessees and non-lessees ranking family as very important hunting companions. Both groups ranked friends highly as well, with over 50 percent of respondents ranking friends as very important and an additional 35 percent ranking friends as important. Lessees and non-lessees were also in agreement that guides were not important as hunting companions. Only with regards to club members did the two groups significantly disagree. Seventy-eight percent of lessees ranked club members as important or very important hunting companions in contrast to only 42 percent of non-lessees. Given that the overwhelming majority of non-lessees likely do not belong to clubs, this result was expected. Although some clubs own rather than lease hunting land, the percentage is very small.

Mississippi hunters were also asked about their perception of the quantity and quality of game and the level of crowding on public and private lands. Less than half of all hunters felt the quality (42 percent) and quantity (38 percent) of game on public lands was satisfactory. Lessees and non-lessees alike shared this opinion. In contrast, 82 percent of all hunters felt the abundance of game on private lands was satisfactory and 74 percent of all hunters felt the quality of game on private lands was satisfactory. In general, more lessees felt game abundance (86 percent) and game quality (76 percent) were satisfactory on private lands than did non-lessees (79 percent and 73 percent, respectively). Their perception of better game quantity and quality, although only slightly more prevalent than non-lessees, was statistically significant and may contribute to lessees' willingness to lease private lands.

Sixty-one percent of all hunters viewed public lands in Mississippi as moderately to very crowded. In contrast, only 33 percent of all hunters viewed private lands in the same vein. More lessees (64 percent) than non-lessees (60 percent) viewed public lands as moderately to very crowded. Similarly, more lessees (42 percent) than non-lessees (28 percent) viewed private lands as crowded. The differences in opinion between lessees and non-lessees concerning the level of crowding on public and private lands were statistically significant. Greater perceived crowding by lessees may also contribute to their willingness to lease private lands.

Lease Characteristics – Table 16

Lessees were asked to report characteristics of their leases such as the size, rate per acre, duration of the lease agreement, the distance from the lease to their residence, and whether they leased the property as a member of a hunting club or as an individual. Eighty-five percent leased as a member of one or more clubs. Twenty-six percent leased one or more properties as individuals; however, there was some overlap in these groups as 11 percent leased both as members of clubs and as individuals. Twenty-one percent of lessees had more than one lease. The number of leases purchased by a given hunter ranged from 1 to 5.

Of the 218 hunters that purchased leases as members of a club, 31 hunters (14 percent) were members of at least two clubs and seven (3.2 percent) of these were members of three clubs for a total of 256 club leases. Averaged across all club leases, a typical club lease was 1,760 acres (median 995 acres), cost \$7.12 per acre (median \$6.00), had a 4.7 year lease duration (median 1 year) and was about 49 miles (median 29) from the hunter's residence.

Individual leases were less common, representing only 22 percent of the leases reported. Of the 66 Mississippi hunters that purchased leases as individuals; five purchased two leases and, of these, one individual purchased three leases, for a total of 72 reported leases that were purchased by individuals. The average individual lease was 250 acres (median 155 acres), cost \$7.95 per acre (median \$5.00), was 2.9 years in duration (median 1 year) and was 32 miles (median 12 miles) from the hunter's residence.

Club and individual leases were distinctly different. Individual leases were substantially smaller, shorter term, and closer to home than club leases; however, the rate per acre was not significantly different regardless of the type of lease.

Hunters were asked a series of additional questions about their most expensive lease, i.e., the one they paid the highest rate per acre. The most expensive leases averaged 1,439 acres (median 700 acres), cost \$7.69 (median \$6.00), lasted 3.8 years (median 1 year) and were 48 miles from the hunter's residence. The most expensive leases fell between club and individual leases with respect to size and lease duration but were similar to club leases regarding distance to residence. Of these leases, 98 percent had deer, 84 percent had turkey and 14 percent had waterfowl available for hunting. Thirty-one percent of hunters described the on-site access as all-weather, e.g., gravel roads. Another 31 percent of hunters described the on-site access as dry-weather, e.g., dirt roads. The remaining 38 percent of hunters described on-site access possible by ATVs only. Most hunters implemented a number of management practices to improve hunting on their lease. Ninety-five percent installed food plots for deer. Disking and supplemental feeding were utilized on a majority of the leases. Only 6 percent planted for waterfowl.

Discussion

In most regards, Mississippi's lease hunters were very similar to those that did not lease. Their socioeconomic characteristics were almost identical. Where there were statistically significant differences, the differences were small and not meaningful. There were slight differences in age, education, employment status, and occupation. These differences undoubtedly contributed to the significantly greater mean household income for lessees than non-lessees. Even this difference, however, was not great, with lessees' household income averaging less than eight percent more than non-lessees. Thus, income and other socioeconomic characteristics are not the primary determinants of hunters' willingness to purchase hunting leases. Indeed, lease holders span all income levels reported in the survey, suggesting that affordable leases are available for interested hunters, regardless of income level.

Lack of available free hunting sites may contribute to some hunters' decision to lease; however, the overwhelming majority of non-lessees (89.1 percent) had at least some private land available to them, in addition to the state's public lands. Also, the fact that 66 percent of Mississippi's hunters elected not to lease hunting lands in 2006 and took, on average, 19 hunting trips during the year, further suggests that availability of hunting lands is not a severe limiting problem.

What then sets lessees apart from non-lessees, if not the availability and affordability of lease lands? This study suggests that the differences are largely attitudinal. Mississippi's lease hunters are more avid hunters than their non-leasing counterparts. They go hunting far more frequently during the year, averaging almost 70 percent more trips. In addition, they hunt a greater diversity of game than non-

lessees. Perhaps that level of enthusiasm for hunting that entices hunters to take more trips and hunt more species makes having a lease a more attractive proposition, i.e., many leases offer the opportunity to hunt more often or hunt multiple species. Mississippi's lease hunters also differ from their non-leasing counterparts in their perception of game quantity, game quality, and degree of crowding on Mississippi's public and private lands. Leases offer the opportunity to control all three of these factors. Thus, for hunters who are dissatisfied with the quality of hunting experiences available on public or free private lands, leases are an attractive option.

This study has several implications for landowners interested in leasing their lands for hunting. First and foremost, landowners wishing to maximize revenues from their leased lands should tailor their marketing to emphasize the opportunities their properties offer, better quality game, less crowded conditions, greater species diversity and season long hunting opportunities. Next, to the extent possible, landowners should modify their management to improve habitat, increase species diversity, and maximize the available hunting opportunities (e.g., if access is limited during wet weather, road improvements may be in order). Finally, landowners should consider leasing to individuals instead of clubs. Individuals leasing land have more specific needs than those in club leases and thus often have leases written to address specific concerns. Landowners that cater to these specific needs can garner a higher rate per acre as compared to leasing

land to a hunting club, where the lease is more generic. Although individual leases are not common in Mississippi, the opportunity for greater returns for the landowner is appealing. Where circumstances permit, this is an option landowners should explore.

Public land managers and other natural resource managers seeking to improve hunter satisfaction should consider tailoring hunting regulations to reduce crowding and improve game quality (e.g., trophy buck management). Their habitat management should follow suit. Educational programs should emphasize the particular strengths of the various management areas (e.g., species present, greater game abundance, better game quality, or reduced crowding) so that hunters will be directed to those areas that best meet their needs, thereby increasing hunter satisfaction.

In summary, hunters leasing lands have different needs and landowners looking to maximize revenue for their land should be aware of these needs and cater to them with management goals and lease construction. Public land managers should take into account the preferences and experiences of Mississippi hunters when developing management goals and constructing leases and to better target educational campaigns. Knowing the social and economic characteristics of hunters as well as their hunting preferences and experiences can guide private and public land managers towards cultivating management goals and writing leases that maximize lease revenue and/or help meet hunter expectations.

Appendix I – Mississippi Lease Hunter Characteristics

Table 1. Mississippi hunters classified by gender and lease membership status

| Gender* | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Male | 92.98% | 93.36% | 93.11% |
| Female | 7.02% | 6.64% | 6.89% |

* Not significantly different at the 0.10 level.

Table 2. Mississippi hunters classified by age class and lease membership status

| Age class (years) | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| less than 20 | 4.89% | 1.95% | 3.86% |
| 21-30 | 14.89% | 14.06% | 14.60% |
| 31-40 | 20.00% | 22.66% | 20.94% |
| 41-50 | 28.09% | 25.78% | 27.27% |
| 51-60 | 24.89% | 26.56% | 25.48% |
| 61 or more [max 78] | 7.23% | 8.98% | 7.85 % |
| Mean age* | 43.1 years | 44.6 years | 43.6 years |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 3. Mississippi hunters classified by location of residence and lease membership status

| Location of residence* | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Rural | 66.81% | 67.19% | 66.94% |
| Urban | 32.13% | 30.47% | 31.54% |
| No response | 1.06% | 2.34% | 1.52% |

* Not significantly different at the 0.10 level.

Table 4. Mississippi hunters classified by in-state/out-of-state residency and lease membership status

| Residency* | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| In state | 85.96% | 83.59% | 85.12% |
| Out of state | 14.04% | 16.41% | 14.88% |

*Not significantly different at the 0.10 level.

Table 5. Mississippi hunters characterized by educational qualification and lease membership status.

| Education level | Non-Lesseees (n= 470) | Lesseees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| High school | 47.02% | 42.19% | 45.32% |
| Jr. College | 27.45% | 26.95% | 27.27% |
| Bachelor's degree | 17.02% | 20.70% | 18.32% |
| Master's | 4.47% | 4.30% | 4.41% |
| Doctoral | 0.64% | 0.78% | 0.69% |
| Professional | 3.40% | 5.08% | 3.99% |

Table 6. Mississippi hunters classified by employment status and lease membership status

| Employment status | Non-Lesseees (n= 470) | Lesseees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Full-time | 83.19% | 86.72% | 84.44% |
| Retired | 5.74% | 7.42% | 6.34% |
| Part-time | 0.21% | 0.00% | 0.14% |
| Other | 8.72% | 5.47% | 7.58% |

Table 7. Mississippi hunters classified by occupation and lease membership status

| Occupation | Non-Lesseees (n= 470) | Lesseees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Seasonal worker | 0.43% | 0.00% | 0.28% |
| Education | 5.32% | 5.08% | 5.23% |
| Unemployed | 6.17% | 5.08% | 5.79% |
| Retail | 5.96% | 7.03% | 6.34% |
| Construction | 28.09% | 25.00% | 27.00% |
| Self-employed | 8.51% | 9.38% | 8.82% |
| Law enforcement | 4.68% | 3.52% | 4.27% |
| Medical | 4.04% | 4.30% | 4.13% |
| Managerial | 19.79% | 25.78% | 21.90% |
| Civic | 0.64% | 1.56% | 0.96% |
| Natural resources | 1.70% | 0.78% | 1.38% |
| Computer engineering | 4.04% | 3.52% | 3.86% |
| Real estate | 4.47% | 7.03% | 5.37% |
| Ministry | 0.85% | 0.00% | 0.55% |
| No response | 5.32% | 1.95% | 4.13% |

Table 8. Mississippi hunters characterized by number of dependents and lease membership status

| Type of dependent | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| All dependents | 5.4 | 4.2 | 5.0 |
| Dependents under 16* | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.7 |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 9. Distribution of Mississippi hunters by household income and lease membership status

| Income class (\$000) | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Less than35 | 15.96% | 13.28% | 15.01% |
| 35+ to 50 | 17.45% | 13.67% | 16.12% |
| 50+ to 70 | 24.26% | 21.09% | 23.14% |
| 70+ to 100 | 23.19% | 31.25% | 26.03% |
| 100+ to 150 | 12.13% | 12.11% | 12.12% |
| 150+ | 7.02% | 8.59% | 7.58% |
| Mean Income* | \$70.7 | \$76.2 | \$72.6 |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Appendix II. Hunting Characteristics of Mississippi's Lease Hunters

Table 10. Years of hunting experience of Mississippi hunters by lease membership status

| Hunting experience (years) | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Less than 10 | 11.70% | 10.94% | 11.43% |
| 11-20' | 18.72% | 14.84% | 17.36% |
| 21-30' | 24.68% | 30.08% | 26.58% |
| 31-40' | 27.23% | 18.36% | 24.10% |
| 41-50' | 13.62% | 20.70% | 16.12% |
| 51 or more | 4.04% | 5.08% | 4.41% |
| Mean experience (years)* | 29.0 | 30.9 | 29.7 |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 11. Number of hunting trips taken in 2006 by Mississippi hunters by lease membership status

| # of hunting trips taken | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Up to 10 | 44.26% | 14.06% | 33.61% |
| 11-20' | 24.68% | 25.39% | 24.93% |
| 21-30' | 16.60% | 24.22% | 19.28% |
| 31-40' | 5.53% | 13.67% | 8.40% |
| 41-50' | 4.47% | 11.33% | 6.89% |
| 51 or more | 4.47% | 11.33% | 6.89% |
| Mean # of trips* | 19.0 | 32.3 | 23.7 |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 12. Game species hunted by Mississippi hunters by lease membership status

| Species | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Deer* | 95.11% | 98.44% | 96.28% |
| Dove* | 52.55% | 60.16% | 55.23% |
| Turkey* | 43.83% | 57.81% | 48.76% |
| Waterfowl* | 18.94% | 23.44% | 20.52% |
| Other* | 31.70% | 40.63% | 34.85% |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 13. Types of hunting land accessed by Mississippi hunters in 2006

| Ownership | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Family land | 47.02% | 43.75% | 45.87% |
| Friends' lands(non-fee)* | 47.23% | 35.94% | 43.25% |
| Other private lands (non-fee)* | 53.62% | 31.64% | 45.87% |
| Any private land (non-fee)* | 89.15% | 66.41% | 81.27% |
| Public lands* | 30.64% | 25.00% | 25.00% |
| NIPF leased lands | NA | 62.50% | NA |
| Industry leased lands | NA | 49.61% | NA |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Appendix III. Mississippi Hunters' Preferences and Perceptions

Table 14. Hunting preferences of Mississippi hunters for hunting companions by lease membership status

| Importance/Category | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Friends | | | |
| Not important | 5.53% | 4.30% | 5.10% |
| Important | 36.17% | 33.98% | 34.40% |
| Very important | 54.89% | 60.16% | 56.75% |
| No response | 3.40% | 1.56% | 2.75% |
| Family | | | |
| Not important | 3.83% | 2.73% | 3.44% |
| Important | 16.17% | 14.45% | 15.56% |
| Very important | 78.09% | 82.42% | 79.61% |
| No response | 1.91% | 0.39% | 1.38% |
| Club Members* | | | |
| Not important | 41.91% | 18.36% | 33.61% |
| Important | 29.36% | 44.53% | 34.71% |
| Very important | 12.98% | 33.20 | 20.11% |
| No response | 15.74% | 3.91% | 11.57% |
| Guides | | | |
| Not important | 309% | 73.44% | 68.46% |
| Important | 41% | 7.81% | 8.40% |
| Very important | 35% | 5.47% | 6.75% |
| No response | 85% | 13.28% | 16.39% |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Table 15. Mississippi hunters' opinion of game abundance, game quality, and crowding on public and private lands

| Attribute / Satisfaction level | Non-Lessees (n= 470) | Lessees (n = 256) | All Hunters (n = 726) |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Game abundance on public land | | | |
| Satisfactory | 41.91% | 42.58% | 42.15% |
| Not satisfactory | 24.26% | 25.78% | 24.79% |
| No opinion | 33.83% | 31.64% | 33.06% |
| Game abundance on private land* | | | |
| Satisfactory | 79.15% | 85.94% | 81.54% |
| Not satisfactory | 11.70% | 12.50% | 11.98% |
| No opinion | 9.15% | 1.56% | 6.47% |
| Game quality on public land | | | |
| Satisfactory | 40.43% | 33.98% | 38.15% |
| Not satisfactory | 24.68% | 30.86% | 26.86% |
| No opinion | 34.89% | 35.16% | 34.99% |
| Game quality on private land* | | | |
| Satisfactory | 73.40% | 75.78% | 74.24% |
| Not satisfactory | 17.45% | 22.66% | 19.28% |
| No opinion | 9.15% | 1.56% | 6.47% |
| Crowding on public land* | | | |
| Not crowded | 10.85% | 4.69% | 8.68% |
| Moderately crowded | 36.81% | 37.50% | 37.05% |
| Very crowded | 22.55% | 26.17% | 23.83% |
| No opinion | 29.79% | 31.64% | 30.44% |
| Crowding on private land* | | | |
| Not crowded | 59.57% | 53.91% | 57.58% |
| Moderately crowded | 24.26% | 36.33% | 28.51% |
| Very crowded | 3.40% | 5.47% | 4.13% |
| No opinion | 12.77% | 4.30% | 9.78% |

* Significantly different at the 0.10 level

Appendix IV. Mississippi Lease Characteristics

Table 16. Mean lease characteristics for hunting leases contracted by Mississippi hunters in 2006

| Lease Type | Acres | Rate /acre | Contract Length (years) | Distance to Residence (miles) |
|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Club (n=256) | 1,760 | \$7.12 | 4.7 | 48.7 |
| Individual (n=72) | 250 | \$7.95 | 2.94 | 31.94 |
| Highest rate (n=256) | 1,439 | \$7.69 | 3.77 | 48.12 |
| All leases (n=328) | 1,427 | \$7.30 | 4.32 | 45.02 |

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITYTM



Mississippi State UniversityTM

College of Forest Resources
Forest and Wildlife Research Center