STATISTICS FOR THE STATE

State Table 22.–CASH RENT PAID BY CASH TENANTS AND SHARE-CASH TENANTS BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM: CENSUS OF 1959 [Data

					-	-	~ .			-	•		
аго	based	on	rep	orta	for	only	18	sam	ple	ol	farms,	See	text

Item (For definitions and explanations, see text)	Total	Commercial farms Other farms		Item (For definitions and explanations, see text)	Total	Commercial farms	Other farms
CASH TENANTS				SHARE-CASH TENANTS			
All cash tenants,number Land owned	917 5 615 917 154,911	752 5 615 752 144,081	165 165 10,830	All share-cash tenants	261 10 295 261 64,890	251 5 15 251 63,940	10 5 280 10 950
acros	1,935	1,935		acres	545	265	280
Land in farms of cash tenants	153,591 167.5	142,761 189.8	10,830 65.6	Land in farms of share-cash tenantsacres Average size of farm	64,640 247.7	63,690 253.7	950 95.0
Average per farm	60,576 364.73	64,375 340,37	45,519 609.02	Average per fam	76,782 326.16	79,769 329.31	15,250 160.53
reporting value	73.1 852 82,220	71.1 727 78,980	81.8 125 3,240	reporting value	82.8 256 39,793	82.1 246 39,563	100.0 10 230
Cash tenants reporting both value of land and buildings and amount of cash rent paid, number Proportion of all cash tenants, percent All land rented from others, acres Average per operator, acres Value of land and buildings: Average per operator, dollars	620 67.6 105,915 170.8 63,200 269.95	495 	125 75.8 10,030 80.2 49,128	Share-cash tenants reporting both value of land and buildings and amount of cash rent paid	201 77.0 48,945 243.5 77,351 317.65	196 78.1 48,195 245.9 79,184 322,03	5 50.0 750 150.0 5,500 36.67
Average per Stoto of value of land and buildings	1,900 11.12 3.01	344.61 2,251 11.62 3.37	512.26 511 6.37 1.04	Cash rent paid: Average per operator Average per scre Average per \$100 of value of land and buildings dollars	1,218 5.00 1.58	1,242 5.05 1.57	300 2.00 5.45

State Table 23.-SAMPLING RELIABILITY OF ESTIMATED TOTALS FOR COUNTY AND STATE BY NUMBER OF FARMS REPORTING, BY LEVELS

If the estimated number of farms reporting is-	Then the chann would diffe of the iter	ces are about 2 er from the resu ns for all farmu	in 3 that the d ilts of a comple s by less than-	estimated total te tabulation	If the estimated number of farms reporting is	Then the chances are about 2 in 3 that the estimated total would differ from the results of a complete tabulation of the items for all farms by less than—				
	Level l ¹	Level 2	Level · 3	Level 4		Level l ¹	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
25	Percent 40	Percent 53	Percent 71	Percent 96	5.000	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	
50	28 20 13 8.9 6.3 4.0	37 26 17 12 8.4 5.3	50 35 22 16 11 7.1	68 48 30 21 15 9.6	10,000. 25,000. 50,000. 100,000. 250,000.	2.0 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.4	2.6 1.7 1.2 0.8 0.5	3.5 2.2 1.6 1.1 0.7	4.8 3.0 2.1 1.5 1.0	

¹Level 1 should be used in determining the sampling reliability of estimated number of farms and farms reporting. The level for all other items should be obtained from State Table 24. If the estimated number of farms or farms reporting constitutes more than 75 percent of all farms in the universe, a better approximation to the sampling reliability may be obtained by multiplying the percent given in the table as follows: 1. When the number of farms or farms reporting is 75 percent of all farms, multiply the percent error by 0.50. 2. When the number of farms or farms reporting is 90 percent of all farms, multiply the percent error by 0.30. 3. When the number of farms or farms reporting is 95 percent of all farms, multiply the percent error by 0.20.

.