

CHAPTER 5.

Data Collection

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	29
CENSUS MAIL OPERATIONS	29
GENERAL INFORMATION	29
INITIAL MAILOUT	29
FIRST FOLLOWUP (REMINDER CARD)	30
SECOND FOLLOWUP	30
SPECIAL APRIL FOLLOWUP	30
THIRD FOLLOWUP	30
FOURTH FOLLOWUP	31
FIFTH FOLLOWUP	31
SIXTH FOLLOWUP	31
POSTMASTER RETURNS	31
TELEPHONE FOLLOWUP	31
INTRODUCTION	31
TELEPHONE STAFF	32
TELEPHONE OPERATIONS	32
NONRESPONSE SURVEY	33
CITRUS CARETAKERS	33
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	33
1982 ENUMERATION	34
RESULTS	34

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau's Jeffersonville, IN, office carried out most of the data-collection activities associated with the 1982 Census of Agriculture, with the close supervision and assistance of the Agriculture Division. The principal data-collection effort was a mail enumeration, involving an initial mailout in December 1982 to approximately 3.65 million addresses. This was followed by a mailing of reminder cards to nonrespondents at the end of February 1983, and a special mailing in April to addresses in low-response States and counties. Five additional followup mailings were carried out beginning about 3 weeks after the reminder cards were sent and continued at about 4-week intervals thereafter. The initial mailing and two of the followups involved entire census packages—report forms, information sheets, letters, and so forth to nonrespondents, while the remainder were letters requesting response.

Beginning in April 1983, the Bureau carried out a telephone followup of selected large nonrespondent cases (i.e., estimated sales of \$100,000 or more) and a mail survey of selected small nonrespondent cases (i.e., less than \$100,000 in sales). (For details of the telephone operations, see pp. 31-33, and p. 33 for details of the mail survey.)

The primary data-collection effort for the census was made in the spring and summer of 1983, although citrus producers were enumerated in the summer and early fall of 1982 to collect data on the bloom of 1982.

CENSUS MAIL OPERATIONS

General Information

The census mail list was divided, by State, into eight geographic segments for purposes of preparing the followup

address list, addressing followup materials, and mailing. The States in each segment were:

Segment	States
1	Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Vermont
2	Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin
3	Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, and South Dakota
4	Delaware, Kansas, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia
5	Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, and South Carolina
6	Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee
7	Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas
8	Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming

These geographic segments did not correspond to the "regions" established by the Bureau for the design and use of the agriculture census report forms, or to the standard Bureau geographic regions or divisions. Rather, they served as an administrative and processing convenience, with closeout dates and mailing dates staggered among them to ensure a fairly even flow of work.

Initial Mailout

General—The Bureau carried out the initial census mailing during the last week of December 1982. This mailout involved approximately 3.65 million addresses throughout the 50 States. (See ch. 3 for information on the compilation of the mail list and the printing and addressing of the report forms.)

The Jeffersonville office handled the bulk of the mailing operations, except for the packages for abnormal farms, all of which were mailed directly from Suitland headquarters. Labeling was done on a flow basis, but all packages were held and mailed simultaneously by region, using first-class postage. The quantities mailed, by form type, were:

Type	Quantity
Total	3,653,114
Nonsample, forms 82-A0101 to -A0111	2,753,931
Sample (excluding abnormal)	897,507
General sample, forms 82-A0201 to -A0212	732,651
Must cases, forms 82-A0301 to -A0311	164,856
Abnormals, forms 82-A0301 to -A0311	1,676

The initial mail package consisted of:

- Form 82-A01(L) cover letter
- Appropriate report form
- File copy of report form
- Form 82-A01(I) information sheet
- Form 82-A8 return envelope
- Form 82-A01(B) brochure describing why the census of agriculture is important

Special instruction sheets for special operations identified before mailout, such as beekeepers, broiler operators, and nurseries

Multiunits—Agriculture census report forms (82-A0301 to -A0311) for approximately 5,800 multiunit establishments identified as having agricultural operations were included in the multiunit packages for the general economic census mailing carried out late in December 1982 and in its followup program. (For details of the mail followup to the economic censuses, see the *History of the 1982 Economic Censuses*.)

First Followup (Reminder Card)

The transmittal letter included in the census mailing package requested response by February 15, 1983. Between February 22 and March 5, the Bureau mailed form 82-A01(L2) reminder cards requesting response to the census to nonrespondent addresses in each geographic segment after a specified closeout date. The closeout dates by segment were:

Segment	Closeout date
1	2/2/83
2	2/23/83
3	2/28/83
4	3/1/83
5,6	3/2/83
7,8	3/4/83

The Bureau prepared computer tape listings, on a flow basis, of the addresses in each segment still delinquent at each closeout date and transmitted them to Jeffersonville where they were used to address the reminder cards. The four Printronix high-speed printers used to prepare the address labels for the initial mailout this time printed the addresses for nonrespondent cases directly onto the faces of the reminder cards. Mailout began on February 23 to nonrespondent cases in segment 1 and continued on a flow basis through March 5, by which time a total of 1,829,528 form 82-A01(L2) cards had been sent. (Facsimiles of the reminder card and the standard followup letters are included in app. G.)

Second Followup

The second mail followup began in mid-March and continued into the last week of the month. The closeout date for segment 1 was March 15, while segment 8 closed out on March 23. This followup consisted of remailing report forms to most nonrespondents, but included a "variation test" in which a sample of nonrespondents in segments 1-6 were sent followup letters only, in an attempt to measure any differences in response rates achieved using complete packages or letters only. (For details of the mail response variation test, see ch. 9.)

The followup mail packages for each type of report form (must, sample, and nonsample) were similar to those used in the initial mailing, except that the report form file copy and information brochure were eliminated and the followup letter form 82-A01(L3) was substituted for the original transmittal letter. The addresses selected for the mail variation test were sent form 82-A01(L4) letters. The bulk of the packages were preassembled by private contractors and were subjected to the same quality-control procedures as the initial mailing packages.

The quantities of packages mailed, by type of form, for the regular followup, were:

Form	Quantity
Total	1,517,181
Nonsample	1,134,437
Sample	382,744
Must	79,179
Certainty	64,816
Regular	238,749

The quantities of packages mailed in the mail variation test, by type of address, were:

Type	Quantity
Total	41,461
Nonsample	23,714
Sample	17,747

Special April Followup

By April 1 the census had achieved an overall response rate of 64 percent, including postmaster returns (PMR's). Certain States in the South and West, and a number of counties within other States, had response rates well below the average—as much as 17 percent in some cases. Slow overall response for a State, or even for counties within a State, could impede closing out data collection and cause problems not only in tabulating and publishing statistics for the specific jurisdictions involved, but for States and the United States as a whole. Accordingly, the Bureau carried out a special letter followup to all nonrespondent addresses in 10 Southern and Western States—Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Utah—and in a total of 188 low-response counties in Arkansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Private contractors assembled and delivered form 82-A01(L7) or 82-A01(L8) followup letters to Jeffersonville the first week of April. The Bureau used the L7 letter for nonrespondent operations with estimated sales under \$40,000 in South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, and selected counties in Arkansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas. The L8 letter was used for nonrespondents with estimated sales over \$40,000 in these States, in selected counties in Texas, and in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. The two letters were identical in content, although wording differed slightly—the L7 using a simplified text—and both included a toll-free telephone number to call if an addressee wanted assistance or had any questions. A total of 202,261 form 82-A01(L7) letters and 106,445 form 82-A01(L8) letters were mailed during the second week of April.

Third Followup

The third mail followup consisted once again of a regular mailing to nonrespondent addresses, and a followup to addresses in the mail-variation test sample. This time, "regular" nonrespondent addresses received the form 82-A01(L4) followup letter, while variation-test addresses were sent complete census followup packages—with the form 82-A01(L3) transmittal letter substituted for the original cover letter.

Closeout dates and the number of cases in each mailing were:

Third mail followup:

Segment	Closeout date	Quantity
Total		1,038,319
2, 4	4/13/83	273,832
1, 3	4/14/83	221,156
5, 6	4/20/83	239,402
7, 8	4/22/83	303,929

Mail variation test:

Total		32,479
Nonsample	4/15/83	19,563
Sample	4/21/83	12,916

Fourth Followup

By the beginning of May, overall response to the census approached 75 percent. The fourth followup comprised a mailing of followup letters— form 82-AO1(L5) was used in the 48 contiguous States and the form 82-AO2(L5) in Alaska and Hawaii—to cases still nonrespondent after the mail closeout dates for each segment (May 10 for segments 5 and 6, May 11 for segments 3 and 4, May 12 for segments 1 and 2, and segments 7 and 8 on May 17). However, six States had rates of response significantly higher than average, and the Bureau decided to try to close out data collection in these States as early as possible by carrying out a "special" followup as part of the general mailing. Accordingly, the Bureau constructed a file of cases still nonrespondent as of May 5 in Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, and sent them followup census packages containing a form 82-AO1(L3) transmittal letter, information sheet, return envelope, and the appropriate report form.

The followup packages were assembled at Jeffersonville and mailed from there. The special followup to the six priority States was carried out at the end of the first week of May and comprised some 60,660 packages— approximately 44,430 nonsample, 13,680 sample, and 2,550 "must" cases in all. The regular letter followup to 827,915 nonrespondent addresses in the remaining 44 States was completed on a flow basis during the second and third weeks of May.

Fifth Followup

The Bureau originally planned only five followup mailings to the 1982 census, but decided to insert an additional letter mailout in the followup program prior to the final report-form operation. This became the fifth mail followup, and consisted of a form 82-AO1(L5)A letter, sent to some 790,000 nonrespondent addresses between June 2 and June 10. The mailing packages had been preassembled and address labels were applied at Jeffersonville. The response cutoff date for the "priority States" was May 25, while cutoff dates for other States, by segment, ranged from May 31 to June 7.

Segment	Quantity mailed
Total	789,572
Priority States (see above)	50,448
1, 2	132,530
3, 4	193,533
5, 6	190,234
7, 8	222,827

Sixth Followup

The sixth followup involved mailing complete census packages—the appropriate report form, information sheet, and return envelope—together with a followup letter form 82-AO2(L6) for the 48 contiguous States, and form 82-AO1(L6) for Alaska and Hawaii. The L6 letter requested response to the census, informed addressees that response to the census was required by law, and quoted excerpts from Title 13. A toll-free telephone number also was included for use by respondents who needed assistance in completing their report forms.

The bulk of the mailing packages for the sixth followup had been prestuffed, but the Bureau anticipated a need for more "must" packages and prepared an additional 4,100 at Jeffersonville for the mailout.

The closeout period for response to the sixth followup began on June 21, for segments 1 and 2, and ended on June 28 for segments 7 and 8. Address labels were prepared and affixed in the usual way. The quantities mailed were:

Type	Quantity mailed
Total	716,181
Nonsample	544,238
Sample	171,943
Regular (including certainty)	141,986
Must	29,957

Postmaster Returns

Postmaster returns (PMR's) were mailing packages returned by the Postal Service as undeliverable, for whatever reason. The Bureau identified PMR's during the receipt and check-in phase of the processing operations (see ch. 6), generated address labels for these cases, and affixed the labels to mailing packages for remailing. These packages were identical to those used in the initial mailout for each address, except the form letter 82-AO1(L1A) replaced the standard cover letter, and were mailed on a flow basis to approximately 147,900 "first-time" PMR addresses, beginning January 19. (A "first-time" PMR was a package from a mailing that had been returned as undeliverable and had not previously been checked-in by the Bureau's receipt and check-in operation. "Second-time" PMR's were cases that previously had been checked-in and had been remailed once, but had again been returned as undeliverable.) The computer check-in program identified "second-time" PMR's by comparing their label codes to computerized list of check-in actions and deleted cases previously checked in from the remail file. No second-time PMR's were remailed, although some PMR "must" cases were sent to the technical staff for review or referral for possible telephone followup.

TELEPHONE FOLLOWUP

Introduction

General information—The Bureau established its principal telephone unit at the Jeffersonville office, with a smaller telephone staff at Suitland headquarters. In general, the telephone unit had three major functions: (1) to provide assistance to respondents calling with questions about the report forms; (2) to verify suspect data and obtain missing data for report forms received; and (3) to secure completed report forms for selected nonrespondent cases. In addition, the telephone

staff carried out a test of the computer-assisted telephone-interviewing (CATI) system. (For details of the CATI system test, see ch. 9.) Telephone followup began in January and ended in September 1983.

The specific cases referred to the telephone units included data referrals from the technical review staff, large nonrespondent cases (i.e., those with estimated total value of annual sales of agricultural products of \$100,000 or more, or whose acreage met the criteria of a "must" case regardless of sales value), a sample of the general nonrespondent list, and, after June 1983, nonrespondents in low-response counties. The Jeffersonville unit carried out most of the telephone followup activities, while the Suitland unit handled the CATI test sample cases.

Adaptation of the census report form for telephone interviewing—The Bureau had developed the standard report forms as self-administered questionnaires, hence use by telephone interviewers required rewording items as questions asked by an interviewer of a respondent. For example, the implied question of "All land owned" had to be changed to "How many acres of land did you own?"

The Bureau used the general sample report form as the basis for the one used for nonrespondent telephone enumeration, reverting to the general crop and livestock listings used for "nonregionalized" reporting, with more space for write-in information. Sections also were added to record on each form the outcome of each attempted call to the nonrespondent and for callback scheduling. The new form 82-AO313, Telephone Enumeration Report Form, was used for telephone cases in all 50 States.

Telephone Staff

The Bureau's Jeffersonville office included a staff and facilities for conducting a variety of telephone operations. The telephone unit for the 1982 Census of Agriculture was established in December 1982, first to handle incoming calls for assistance from respondents, then, from April 1983, to carry out telephone followup of selected nonrespondent cases.

The telephone staff began operations in January, when six interviewers were assigned to handle incoming calls. The bulk of the interviewers did not join the staff until April, when telephone followup began. By that time, the telephone unit included 94 persons, including supervisors and lead clerks, and reached its maximum of 115 in June. Initial training for the telephone interviewers was carried out in the last week of March and the first week of April, each interviewer attending a 3-day course in telephone operations and census enumeration.

The staff was divided into two nonoverlapping shifts of approximately equal size. Calls were made between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., local time (i.e., in the nonrespondent's time zone).

Telephone Operations

Work assignments—The primary functions of the telephone unit were (1) resolution of problem referrals from the correspondence and technical review units, and (2) followup of large nonrespondent cases. "Problem referrals," i.e., cases with inconsistent, incomplete, or obviously wrong information, began to arrive at the telephone unit in early January 1983, while nonresponse cases for telephone followup were selected early in April, after the second mail followup. Candidates for telephone followup

included any nonrespondent with an estimated total value of products sold of \$100,000 or more, or with estimated acreage of 2,000 or more. In June, lists of delinquent cases, regardless of size, in 80 counties with response rates below 75 percent also were referred to the telephone staff.

Subject-matter specialists from the Agriculture Division and the Jeffersonville staff reviewed all completed reports during the interviewers' first weeks of work. After the initial "break-in" period, this review function shifted to the lead telephone interview clerks assigned to each shift (at least four per shift), who checked completed report forms on a 100-percent basis to verify that the data collected were consistent and reasonable.

The telephone unit was divided into several subunits, according to function. These subunits (1) obtained telephone numbers for nonrespondent cases, (2) interviewed nonrespondents and respondents for problem referrals, (3) handled incoming calls, and (4) called secondary sources for data for nonrespondents who could not be contacted. Personnel generally were assigned to a single subunit for the duration of their service with the telephone unit.

The telephone staff used the regular central exchange (CENTREX) telephone system serving the Jeffersonville office, which included 37 Federal Telecommunications System (FTS) lines and 23 Wide Area Telecommunications System (WATS) lines. The CENTREX system automatically would use an FTS line or, if none was available, a WATS line for the call. The telephone staff had 70 reserved instruments, of which 6 were used exclusively for incoming calls, while the remainder were used for interviews and telephone numbers research.

Procedures for telephone followup—The Bureau compiled the initial telephone followup file after the second mail followup and prepared a set of adhesive address labels. Each label was applied mechanically to a form 82-AO313, Telephone Enumeration Report Form, as part of the general labeling operation before the followup file was referred to the telephone unit. Referral cases came from agricultural analysts in the problem-solving and coverage units. Form EC-59 Referral Sheets, attached to the standard report form, described any problem with the case and specified the questions to ask. Most problem referral cases had telephone numbers; cases without telephone numbers were referred to the telephone research unit.

All delinquent nonresponse cases were reviewed periodically for check-in status by matching their CFN's to the receipts file, using interactive terminals. All cases with a check-in status indicating mail receipt were removed from the followup. The remaining cases were sorted by State and sent to the telephone number research unit. After research, cases were batched into work units of approximately 20 report forms each, with a Telephone Unit Enumerator's Daily Tally Sheet and Work Unit Control Record attached, and sent to an interviewer. The interviewer entered his or her own identification number on the daily tally sheet and a tally of cases completed or not completed as calls were made. At the end of each shift the telephone enumerators entered the count of completed cases and non-completed cases for the work unit by type of case (i.e., in scope, out of scope, refusal, will file, and so on). All cases assigned to each work unit had to be accounted for on the tally sheet and returned to the supervisor at the end of the shift for disposition. Completed followup cases were disposed as:

Mail receipt—Delinquent cases received by mail prior to telephone followup were deleted from the followup.

In scope, completed report form—Report forms for cases completed by telephone enumeration were batched for check-in and forwarded to the agriculture data-keying unit.

Out of scope—Out-of-scope cases were batched together for check-in and subsequent forwarding to the agriculture coverage analysts.

Nonresponse sample—The telephone interviewer tried to obtain information to complete a form 82-A46 (which asked for a few items to determine whether any agricultural production had taken place). Cases then were batched for check-in and forwarded to the agriculture coverage research unit.

Respondent promised to file (will file)—The date of the call and nature of the conversation were noted on the telephone record label and the case was placed in the suspense file. If, after 2 weeks, the interactive terminal check-in status indicated the case still was unsatisfied, it was recycled through the telephone unit.

Respondent refuses to provide information—A second attempt was made to obtain information from respondents who refused to provide any data. Once a respondent refused a second time the dates of the refusals, the name(s) of the person(s) contacted, and the initials of the interviewer(s) involved were noted on the record label; and the case was referred for completion from secondary sources.

No answer when called—After four attempts to make contact (two on each of two work days), the telephone number was researched again; if it was correct, the case was referred for completion from secondary sources.

No listing—Cases for which no telephone number could be found were referred for completion from secondary sources.

Call back—When respondents requested the Bureau to call back, the interviewer attempted to make an appointment for a convenient time.

The telephone interview staff returned problem-referral cases resolved by telephone to the originating unit. Referral cases that could not be resolved by telephone also were returned to the originating unit, but for an analyst's review.

The lead clerks batched and sent completed "nonresponse" cases to the check-in unit, after which the telephone cases followed the normal processing program. Cases referred for completion from secondary sources were edited by analysts using information obtained from one or more sources *outside* the subject operation itself. The most important of these sources was USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), which had offices in every State, and over 2,700 county and consolidated county offices as well. Other USDA offices, notably the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), the Extension Service (ES), and the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) also served as major sources of information about nonrespondent farms.

NONRESPONSE SURVEY

The nonresponse survey was needed to enable the Census Bureau to impute data for nonrespondent farms with estimated

annual sales of less than \$100,000. The eligible universe of nonrespondent addresses was stratified based on source and estimated sales, as follows:

Stratum	Source	Estimated sales
2	1978 Census inscope	\$10,000-99,999
3	1978 Census inscope	\$0-9,999
4	Other sources	\$10,000-99,999
5	Other sources	\$0-9,999
6	NA	Unknown

A single-stage systematic sample of the eligible nonrespondents was used to select a total of 13,489 addresses for the survey. Selection rates varied by stratum and State so that the Bureau could estimate the number of nonrespondent census farms at the State level with an error rate of plus or minus 6 percent. The Bureau prepared and printed a short questionnaire—form 82-A46—consisting of a letter to the addressee requesting that he or she complete the form; excerpts from Title 13, United States Code describing the Census Bureau's authority to conduct the census and the legal requirement for response; and a few questions on production, tenure, organization, and sales. The headquarters staff in Suitland prepared mailing packages consisting of the A46 form and a return envelope, and mailed them to the sample addresses on a flow basis.

The sample had been selected in three successive phases, for groups of States nearing mail-enumeration closeout. The initial mailing to sample cases in 6 States was done on April 26-28, 1983; mailout to 15 more States was completed a month later on May 25-26; and the A46 forms were sent to sample cases in the remaining States on July 14-15 (mailout to cases in Hawaii was actually done on August 1). A single followup mailing, consisting of an A46 form and return envelope, was made to the nonrespondent sample addresses—again in three phases—about 2 weeks after the initial mailout for each group of States.

Responses to the survey were mailed directly to the Bureau's Suitland headquarters, where members of the Agriculture Division staff checked in and processed the report forms. Sample addresses were matched to the census check-in "alert" lists weekly and addresses from which a census report form had been received (about 2,400 in all, or 18 percent of the total sample) were deleted from the sample file.

When mail enumeration was closed out early in September 1983, 7,057 completed A46 report forms had been received, for a response rate (excluding cases matched to census returns) of 64 percent. Of the total receipts, 2,941 were from inscope addresses—i.e., addresses qualifying as farms under the census definition—while the remaining 4,116 were out of scope. All 7,057 responses were used to develop the imputation estimates. (For more information on imputation for nonresponse see ch. 6.)

CITRUS CARETAKERS

Background Information

The Census Bureau obtained reports by direct field enumeration from selected citrus caretakers in Arizona, Florida, and Texas for the 1982 census. This procedure has been used in recent censuses because of the difficulty in identifying and enumerating absentee grove owners, who frequently did not have the information available to complete the report form. Owners often employed "caretakers" for their groves (a citrus caretaker is an

organization or individual caring for, supervising, or managing citrus groves for owners), and these caretakers generally were the most reliable sources of census information. Individual caretakers' operations could vary considerably; some were responsible for the entire management and care of the groves, while others performed only selected grove work; many did not do the harvesting.

The 1964 Census of Agriculture was the first to include a special field operation to collect data from citrus caretakers in Florida to improve coverage of the groves. A report form was completed for each caretaker, who also was asked to provide a list of the grove owners' names and addresses and the number of acres owned by each. The names and addresses of the grove owners were matched to the file of completed census report forms to eliminate possible duplication. For the 1969 census, direct canvassing of the citrus caretakers was continued, despite the change to a mailout/mailback procedure for the general census. In the 1974 census, the direct enumeration technique was extended to citrus operation in Texas; while in the 1978 census it was further expanded to cover some caretakers in Arizona.

1982 Enumeration

Personnel from the Bureau's Suitland and Jeffersonville offices carried out the direct enumeration of Texas citrus caretakers in June 1982, while Florida caretakers were visited in September and October, and those in Arizona in November 1982. These were the periods when the caretakers' workload was lightest and information from the 1981-82 harvest season was available. A version of the standard report form was developed—form 82-A0214—which excluded the crop and livestock sections except for a special section for reporting citrus trees, acres, and production. A write-in section was provided for reporting livestock and crops other than citrus. Caretakers that reported livestock and/or other crops were contacted by telephone in January 1983 for complete data. The form included the data sections employed in the "sample" forms used in the mail census.

To prevent duplication of reporting, each caretaker was given a "caretaker number" and was asked to inform his or her grove

owners that they should mark "citrus reported by caretaker # _____" on any report form they might receive, but to be sure to supply the data requested for any other agricultural operations they might have. The list of owners' names and addresses supplied by each caretaker was matched to the "status report list" of the regular census; where duplicate reports were identified, the owners' citrus data were deleted from the file.

The number of citrus caretakers, the approximate number of grove owners they served, and the approximate acreage involved in their operations, by State, were:

State	Caretakers	Grove owners	Acreage
Total	128	7,610	293,000
Florida	99	5,900	250,000
Texas	21	1,500	30,000
Arizona	8	210	13,000

Grove owners not associated with these selected caretakers were enumerated in the regular data-collection effort beginning in December 1982.

RESULTS

The 1982 Census of Agriculture achieved an overall response rate of approximately 85.7 percent (including PMR's), obtaining responses from 3,131,342 addresses from a total mailout of nearly 3.7 million. The Bureau handled some 3 million cases, including 147,900 first-time PMR's, by mail. (Approximately 128,000 second-time PMR's were received, but the Bureau did not mail them a second time.) Telephone followup accounted for 126,334 completed cases—84,492 from interviews with respondents, including some 4,380 cases enumerated as part of the CATI test, and 41,842 from secondary sources.

Response to the census included 2,240,976 agricultural operations that met the census definition of a farm. These represented over 987 million acres of land in farms, and nearly \$132 billion in total value of sales of agricultural products.