

GENERAL EXPLANATION Continued

total misclassified units. The reasons for misclassification are shown in table 2.

Other Results

One of the objectives of the 1974 coverage check was to evaluate the quality and characteristics of sources for the census mailing list. Table 3 shows some estimates for the United States by mailing list source or source combination and by number of matched records. The coverage units matched to the census is slightly higher than farms included in census due to inclusion of those units matched to the census mail file but not qualifying as farms.

The table gives the mailing list sources and source combinations for coverage units matched to the census. It is apparent that no one source was adequate for determining the mailing list. The largest con-

tributor of names and addresses was the combination of IRS sources. These accounted for about 70 percent of the total matched records. However, some of the sources providing relatively small numbers of matched records account for a disproportionately high share of the total value of products.

Since several sources were used in compiling the mailing list and some respondents used alternate addresses not identified as representing the same operation, more than one report form was inadvertently mailed to some respondents. Table 3 also gives estimates by mailing list source of the number of times a census farm appeared on the mailing list after unduplication. Instructions were given to each respondent to complete only one of the forms and return the others blank. In most cases this instruction was followed; however, to the small extent that farm operators sub-

mitted more than one completed report without the duplication being discovered during processing, duplication exists in the data file.

The master mailing list for the 1974 Census of Agriculture contained the names and addresses of persons and organizations known to be associated with agriculture operations. To facilitate processing and nonresponse followup, each name on the master list was assigned a size code (usually from the administrative record source) indicating an estimate of value of sales. Subsequent to the census, these size codes were compared with the actual value of sales reported by the respondent. Results of this comparison indicated about 40 percent of total farms were erroneously classified, i.e., did not fall within the size class predicted by value of sales. For specific value groups, the highest misclassification (56 percent) were those with sales of

Table 2. Farms Misclassified as Nonfarms During Census Processing

	Missed farms	Percent
Total.....	108,560	100.0
Entries to screening questions.....	57,832	53.3
No longer farming.....	9,583	8.8
Did not meet farm criteria, computer rejected.....	3,977	3.7
Returned, because of insufficient address.....	3,535	3.3
Reported as landlord only.....	2,983	2.7
Retired from farming.....	1,776	1.6
Correspondence information only, no census questionnaire.....	1,400	1.3
Deceased.....	1,332	1.2
Respondent claims filed, unable to find questionnaire.....	782	.7
Other reasons.....	25,360	23.4

Table 3. Coverage Units Matched to the Census by Source

	Total coverage units matched in census		Matched to 1 census record		Matched to 2 census records		Matched to 3 or more census records	
	Number	Percent of all farms	Number	Percent of all farms	Number	Percent of all farms	Number	Percent of all farms
All coverage units	2,594,641	100.0	2,195,984	100.0	287,036	100.0	111,621	100.0
1040 only.....	317,979	12.3	313,801	14.3	3,836	1.3	342	.3
1040 and ASCS.....	1,210,491	46.7	1,109,644	50.6	100,664	35.1	183	.2
1040 and 943.....	26,898	1.0	22,008	1.0	4,890	1.7	-	-
1040, ASCS, and 943...	223,156	8.6	178,677	8.1	43,990	15.3	489	.4
ASCS only.....	467,815	18.0	448,155	20.4	17,632	6.1	2,028	1.8
ASCS and 943.....	44,563	1.7	18,131	.8	24,368	8.5	2,064	1.8
943 only.....	21,819	.8	19,863	.9	1,782	.6	174	.2
Special list only.....	9,161	.4	8,462	.4	144	.1	555	.5
1065 only.....	6,306	.2	6,158	.3	148	.1	-	-
Other.....	266,453	10.3	71,085	3.2	89,582	31.2	105,786	94.8

Section 2 FARMING, RANCHING, OR OTHER AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN 1974

1. At any time in 1974 did you raise, produce, or sell ANY amount of any of the items listed below? 1 YES 2 NO

- Crops
- Hay, pasture, sod
- Vegetables, melons, mushrooms
- Fruits, nuts, berries, and citrus
- Cattle (including feedlots)
- Hogs, sheep, goats, horses
- Poultry, eggs
- Dairy products
- Forest products on farms
- Greenhouse and nursery products
- Fish in captivity
- Fur-bearing animals in captivity
- Other animal specialties

2. Did you at any time in 1974 raise or produce any agricultural products for contractors such as feed companies, processors, or packers? 1 YES 2 NO

3. Did you raise or produce any agricultural products for others or with others under a partnership, share arrangement, or other rental agreement in 1974? 1 YES 2 NO

4. Did you own any land that was used by someone else for agricultural purposes in 1974? 1 YES 2 NO

5. Did you own any livestock or poultry that was cared for by someone else under a share agreement or custom arrangement in 1974? 1 YES 2 NO

► If you answered YES to ANY of these questions, go to Section 3.
 ► If you answered NO to ALL five of these questions, tear off this front cover and mail it back to us in the envelope provided.