

Appendix C.

Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the

sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. **Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992**

Item	Percent of total
Farmsnumber. .	11.5
Land in farms.....acres. .	6.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹\$1,000. .	4.1
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000. .	4.3
Harvested croplandacres. .	5.6
Corn for grain or seedacres. .	5.2
Wheat for grainacres. .	5.8
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber. .	7.5
Hogs and pigsnumber. .	3.9
Hens and pullets of laying age.....number. .	.1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999	01 All crops	1 to 69
\$1,000 to \$2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
\$2,500 to \$4,999		
\$5,000 to \$9,999		
\$10,000 to \$24,999		
\$25,000 to \$49,999		
\$50,000 to \$99,999		
\$100,000 or more		

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.9
50	4.1
75	3.3
100	2.9
150	2.3
200	2.0
300	1.6
500	1.1
7508
1,0007
1,5004
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	27.8
50	21.4
75	18.8
100	17.3
150	15.7
200	14.8
300	13.9
500	13.2
750	12.7
1,000	12.5
1,500	12.3
2,000	(X)

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms -----number--	62 778	1.1	Total farm production expenses -----farms--	62 772	1.2
Land in farms -----acres--	15 618 831	.9	-----\$1,000--	3 645 379	.7
Average size of farm -----acres--	249	1.4	Average per farm -----dollars--	58 073	1.4
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased -----farms--		
Total sales (see text) -----farms--	62 778	1.1	-----\$1,000--	328 492	1.0
-----\$1,000--	4 633 090	.6	-----farms--	31 571	1.4
Average per farm -----dollars--	73 801	1.3	-----\$1,000--	657 193	.7
Farms by value of sales:			Commercially mixed formula feeds -----farms--	14 180	1.9
Less than \$1,000 (see text) -----farms--	4 880	1.3	-----\$1,000--	384 061	.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----farms--	1 503	1.4	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees -----farms--	45 911	1.4
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----farms--	6 309	1.3	-----\$1,000--	203 920	.9
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----farms--	10 619	1.3	Commercial fertilizer -----farms--	47 406	1.3
\$10,000 to \$19,999 -----farms--	6 848	1.2	-----\$1,000--	420 849	1.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999 -----farms--	24 746	1.2	Agricultural chemicals -----farms--	46 648	1.3
\$25,000 to \$39,999 -----farms--	8 053	1.3	Petroleum products -----farms--	247 300	1.0
\$40,000 to \$49,999 -----farms--	57 864	1.3	-----\$1,000--	59 695	1.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----farms--	8 129	1.6	Electricity -----farms--	205 728	.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----farms--	116 264	1.6	Hired farm labor -----farms--	45 290	1.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----farms--	2 513	1.9	-----\$1,000--	60 628	.9
\$500,000 or more -----farms--	55 989	1.9	Contract labor -----farms--	19 252	1.6
			-----\$1,000--	209 089	.5
			Repair and maintenance -----farms--	4 256	3.2
			-----\$1,000--	16 567	2.3
			Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment -----farms--	52 836	1.3
			-----\$1,000--	243 906	1.0
			Interest expense -----farms--	23 867	1.6
			-----\$1,000--	53 466	1.9
			Secured by real estate -----farms--	32 082	1.5
			-----\$1,000--	290 504	1.1
			Not secured by real estate -----farms--	23 935	1.6
			-----\$1,000--	196 435	1.3
			Cash rent -----farms--	18 104	1.8
			-----\$1,000--	94 068	1.3
			Property taxes -----farms--	17 403	1.7
			-----\$1,000--	289 120	1.1
			All other farm production expenses -----farms--	59 616	1.2
			-----\$1,000--	122 746	1.1
			-----\$1,000--	57 862	1.3
			-----\$1,000--	295 874	.8
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	47 112	1.2	All farms -----number--	62 772	1.2
-----\$1,000--	2 698 335	.7	-----\$1,000--	961 902	1.0
Grains -----farms--	40 493	1.2	Average per farm -----dollars--	15 324	1.6
-----\$1,000--	2 470 434	.7	Farms with net gains ² -----number--	36 058	1.4
Corn for grain -----farms--	32 525	1.2	-----\$1,000--	1 136 197	.9
-----\$1,000--	1 363 146	.7	Average net gain -----dollars--	31 510	1.7
Wheat -----farms--	12 722	1.2	Farms with net losses -----number--	26 714	1.5
-----\$1,000--	74 752	.8	-----\$1,000--	174 296	1.9
Soybeans -----farms--	33 434	1.3	Average net loss -----dollars--	6 525	2.4
-----\$1,000--	998 773	.8			
Sorghum for grain -----farms--	179	1.9	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
-----\$1,000--	2 936	1.0	Government payments -----farms--	22 390	1.2
Barley -----farms--	55	3.4	-----\$1,000--	159 011	.8
-----\$1,000--	110	3.2	Other farm-related income ¹ -----farms--	14 539	1.9
Oats -----farms--	1 004	1.4	-----\$1,000--	76 097	3.0
-----\$1,000--	1 505	1.3	Customwork and other agricultural services -----farms--	5 630	2.7
Other grains -----farms--	725	1.1	-----\$1,000--	31 161	4.8
-----\$1,000--	29 213	.6	Gross cash rent or share payments -----farms--	5 796	3.1
Cotton and cottonseed -----farms--	--	--	-----\$1,000--	33 626	4.4
-----\$1,000--	--	--	Forest products and Christmas trees -----farms--	1 313	6.1
Tobacco -----farms--	2 936	1.4	-----\$1,000--	7 421	7.9
-----\$1,000--	27 705	1.8	Other farm-related income sources -----farms--	3 925	3.2
Hay, silage, and field seeds -----farms--	8 910	1.2	-----\$1,000--	3 889	5.5
-----\$1,000--	35 421	1.3			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons -----farms--	1 301	1.3	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
-----\$1,000--	37 142	.8	Total -----farms--	4 435	1.0
Fruits, nuts, and berries -----farms--	662	1.6	-----\$1,000--	178 159	.5
-----\$1,000--	11 692	1.4			
Nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	824	1.3			
-----\$1,000--	96 016	.3			
Other crops -----farms--	320	1.7			
-----\$1,000--	19 925	.6			
Livestock, poultry, and their products -----farms--	34 235	1.1			
-----\$1,000--	1 934 755	.5			
Poultry and poultry products -----farms--	1 568	1.1			
-----\$1,000--	429 369	.4			
Dairy products -----farms--	3 427	1.4			
-----\$1,000--	258 282	.9			
Cattle and calves -----farms--	24 215	1.1			
-----\$1,000--	401 903	.7			
Hogs and pigs -----farms--	12 559	1.3			
-----\$1,000--	817 506	.6			
Sheep, lambs, and wool -----farms--	2 517	1.2			
-----\$1,000--	3 780	1.6			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) -----farms--	2 876	1.2			
-----\$1,000--	23 915	.8			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) -----farms--	2 820	1.2			
-----\$1,000--	10 893	1.0			

See footnotes at end of table.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 – Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	58 117	1.2	All operators ----- farms ..	62 778	1.1
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	13 366 034	.8	Full owners ----- farms ..	15 618 831	.9
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	54 252	1.2	Part owners ----- farms ..	3 35 868	1.1
10 to 19 acres ----- farms ..	11 834 675	.8	Tenants ----- farms ..	3 775 225	1.2
20 to 29 acres ----- farms ..	6 780	1.2	Land owned ----- farms ..	20 504	1.1
30 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	31 603	1.3	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	10 088 539	.7
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	5 790	1.2	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	6 406	1.9
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	78 674	1.2	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	1 755 067	1.5
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	4 167	1.3	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	97 843	1.3	Land owned ----- farms ..	56 646	1.1
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	6 003	1.3	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	8 464 612	1.0
Cropland:	226 938	1.3	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	56 372	1.1
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	8 315	1.6	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	7 537 646	1.0
Other cropland ----- farms ..	585 716	1.6	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	27 048	1.2
Total woodland ----- farms ..	7 329	1.8	Any ----- farms ..	8 128 429	.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	1 035 980	1.8	200 days or more ----- farms ..	91 176	1.0
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	8 623	1.6	Average age of operator ----- years ..	26 910	1.2
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	2 764 241	1.6	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Acres irrigated:	4 875	.8	Operators by place of residence:		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	3 393 323	.7	On farm operated ----- farms ..	48 049	1.1
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	2 370	—	Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	10 715	1.5
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	3 620 357	—	Not reported ----- farms ..	4 014	1.2
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	11 237	1.1	Operators by principal occupation:		
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	380 995	1.1	Farming ----- farms ..	31 547	1.1
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	42 381	1.1	Other ----- farms ..	31 231	1.2
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	558 209	1.0	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	1 742	1.0	Any ----- farms ..	35 397	1.3
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	240 898	.6	200 days or more ----- farms ..	25 237	1.3
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			Operators by sex:		
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	16 316	1.2	Male ----- farms ..	59 671	1.2
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	253 344	.7	Female ----- farms ..	15 213 260	.9
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	4 843	1.3	Partnership ----- farms ..	3 107	1.3
Acres on which used ----- farms ..	214 051	1.4	Corporation:	405 571	1.3
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	62 772	1.2	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	53 105	1.1
Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	21 731 635	1.0	Partnership ----- farms ..	11 325 570	.9
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	346 199	1.5	Corporation:	6 721	1.6
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	62 671	1.2	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	3 474 495	1.1	150 days or more ----- farms ..	7 516	25.0
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	55 440	1.6	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	14 909	14.5
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	47 314	1.3	Farm-related injuries:		
Acres on which used ----- farms ..	9 303 397	1.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	562	1.7
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	642	1.7
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	269	1.1
			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	547	.6
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	25	5.1
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	25	5.1
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	2	—
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	5 141	1.3	Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	25 974	1.1
----- acres ..	21 706	1.4	----- number ..	1 113 473	.9
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	14 234	1.2	Beef cows ----- farms ..	16 783	1.1
----- acres ..	387 268	1.2	----- number ..	293 836	1.1
50 to 69 acres ----- farms ..	4 517	1.2	Milk cows ----- farms ..	3 958	1.4
----- acres ..	264 473	1.2	----- number ..	144 532	1.0
70 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	6 683	1.3	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	24 215	1.1
----- acres ..	548 834	1.3	----- number ..	763 919	.8
100 to 139 acres ----- farms ..	5 856	1.4	----- \$1,000 ..	401 903	.7
----- acres ..	683 003	1.4	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	11 987	1.3
			----- number ..	4 618 663	.6
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	12 559	1.3
			----- number ..	8 760 626	.6
			----- \$1,000 ..	817 506	.6
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	2 553	1.3
			----- number ..	72 386	1.4
140 to 179 acres ----- farms ..	4 212	1.7	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	2 387	1.3
----- acres ..	662 587	1.7	----- number ..	66 837	1.5
180 to 219 acres ----- farms ..	2 956	1.7	Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	8 391	1.2
----- acres ..	584 162	1.7	----- number ..	48 112	1.3
220 to 259 acres ----- farms ..	2 324	1.8	Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	2 069	1.3
----- acres ..	553 847	1.8	----- number ..	6 706	1.9
260 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	7 648	1.6			
----- acres ..	2 759 632	1.6	POULTRY		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	6 000	1.1	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory ----- farms ..	2 348	1.2
----- acres ..	4 161 562	1.0	----- number ..	22 256 785	.2
			Hens and pullets of laying age ----- farms ..	2 289	1.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms ..	2 687	—	----- number ..	19 288 539	.2
----- acres ..	3 552 444	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ----- farms ..	188	2.3
2,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	520	—	----- number ..	21 081 124	.6
----- acres ..	1 439 313	—			
			CROPS HARVESTED		
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			Corn for grain or seed ----- farms ..	37 005	1.2
			----- acres ..	5 828 308	.8
			----- bushels ..	805 637 216	.7
			Corn for silage or green chop ----- farms ..	4 039	1.3
			----- acres ..	110 919	1.0
			----- tons, green ..	1 944 771	.9
			Wheat for grain ----- farms ..	12 936	1.2
			----- acres ..	542 058	.8
			----- bushels ..	25 048 728	.8
Cash grains (011) ----- farms ..	31 045	1.3	Oats for grain ----- farms ..	2 905	1.3
----- acres ..	11 196 488	.9	----- acres ..	41 538	1.2
Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms ..	4 481	1.3	----- bushels ..	2 603 270	1.1
----- acres ..	408 221	1.4	Tobacco ----- farms ..	2 946	1.4
Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms ..	511	1.7	----- acres ..	9 170	1.8
----- acres ..	67 232	1.0	----- pounds ..	17 288 225	1.7
Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms ..	499	1.8	Soybeans for beans ----- farms ..	33 568	1.3
----- acres ..	26 960	2.2	----- acres ..	4 729 880	.8
Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms ..	655	1.3	----- bushels ..	195 049 717	.8
----- acres ..	29 943	1.4	Irish potatoes ----- farms ..	195	2.2
General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms ..	1 235	1.4	----- acres ..	4 082	.9
----- acres ..	181 650	1.3	----- cwt ..	1 043 505	.7
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms ..	19 200	1.1	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ----- farms ..	24 321	1.1
----- acres ..	2 786 649	.8	----- acres ..	686 707	1.1
Dairy farms (024) ----- farms ..	2 247	1.5	----- tons, dry ..	1 712 613	1.1
----- acres ..	560 232	1.0	Alfalfa hay ----- farms ..	17 060	1.1
Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms ..	711	1.1	----- acres ..	392 455	1.1
----- acres ..	101 341	.4	----- tons, dry ..	1 128 858	1.1
Animal specialties (027) ----- farms ..	1 603	1.5	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ----- farms ..	1 302	1.3
----- acres ..	64 177	1.8	----- acres ..	33 860	1.0
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms ..	591	1.7	Land in orchards ----- farms ..	755	1.5
----- acres ..	195 938	1.3	----- acres ..	6 393	1.4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms ----- number ..	36 688	1.4	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	36 641	1.4
Land in farms ----- acres ..	14 100 157	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	3 499 766	.7
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	384	1.6	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	95 515	1.6
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	36 688	1.4	All farms ----- number ..	36 641	1.4
----- \$1,000 ..	4 538 358	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	1 013 129	1.0
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	123 701	1.5	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	27 650	1.7
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains ² ----- number ..	27 664	1.5
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	8 129	1.6	----- \$1,000 ..	1 120 776	.9
----- \$1,000 ..	116 264	1.6	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	40 514	1.8
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	2 513	1.9	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	8 977	2.5
----- \$1,000 ..	55 989	1.9	----- \$1,000 ..	107 647	2.4
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	4 985	1.9	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	11 991	3.4
----- \$1,000 ..	157 847	1.9	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	2 311	2.0	Government payments ----- farms ..	18 068	1.3
----- \$1,000 ..	103 099	2.0	----- \$1,000 ..	149 637	.7
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	6 694	1.9	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms ..	9 333	2.2
----- \$1,000 ..	480 889	1.8	----- \$1,000 ..	59 004	3.5
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	7 661	1.2	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	4 503	2.9
----- \$1,000 ..	1 213 360	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	28 596	5.1
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	3 089	—	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	2 470	4.4
----- \$1,000 ..	1 058 536	—	----- \$1,000 ..	21 787	5.9
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	1 306	—	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	747	7.7
----- \$1,000 ..	1 352 375	—	----- \$1,000 ..	5 202	9.0
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	3 317	3.3
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	32 307	1.4	----- \$1,000 ..	3 418	5.1
----- \$1,000 ..	2 644 549	.7	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Grains ----- farms ..	30 376	1.4	Total ----- farms ..	4 270	1.0
----- \$1,000 ..	2 431 911	.7	----- \$1,000 ..	177 893	.5
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	26 549	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 345 495	.7			
Wheat ----- farms ..	11 182	1.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	72 731	.8			
Soybeans ----- farms ..	27 209	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	980 180	.8			
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	158	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	2 899	1.0			
Barley ----- farms ..	50	3.5			
----- \$1,000 ..	107	3.3			
Oats ----- farms ..	821	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 363	1.3			
Other grains ----- farms ..	678	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	29 135	.6			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	—	—			
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Tobacco ----- farms ..	1 434	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	22 603	2.0			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	4 868	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	27 981	1.4			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	845	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	36 187	.8			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	306	1.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	11 081	1.4			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	515	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	95 017	.3			
Other crops ----- farms ..	231	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	19 769	.6			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	20 880	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 893 810	.5			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	1 003	1.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	429 053	.1			
Dairy products ----- farms ..	3 249	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	257 646	.9			
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	14 457	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	372 573	.7			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	10 165	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	810 722	.6			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	1 237	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	2 616	1.9			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	1 205	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	21 200	.8			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	1 330	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	8 863	1.1			

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992—Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	35 271	1.4	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	29 267	1.4
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	12 532 832	.8	Partnership ----- farms ..	9 968 180	.9
Cropland:			Corporation:		
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	11 693	1.4	Family held ----- farms ..	2 175	.9
----- acres ..	487 631	1.3	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	1 602 979	.4
Total woodland ----- farms ..	18 657	1.3	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	41	2.5
----- acres ..	902 240	1.1	Other than family held ----- farms ..	2 134	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	5 814	1.3	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	152	2.0
----- acres ..	250 993	1.1	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	62 026	1.2
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	24 292	1.3	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	24	3.9
----- acres ..	414 092	1.0	----- acres ..	128	2.2
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 405	1.0			
----- acres ..	238 864	.6			
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	1 385	1.0			
----- acres ..	238 206	.6			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	42	3.2			
----- acres ..	658	7.3			
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:					
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	15 164	1.2			
----- acres ..	250 970	.7			
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	2 939	1.4			
----- acres ..	132 416	1.3			
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹			HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	36 641	1.4	Hired workers by days worked:		
----- \$1,000 ..	19 151 304	1.0	150 days or more ----- farms ..	6 111	23.2
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	522 674	1.7	----- workers ..	13 465	12.6
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	1 363	1.3	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	12 930	39.1
			----- workers ..	40 654	30.0
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	36 631	1.4	Farm-related injuries:		
----- \$1,000 ..	2 987 990	1.1	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	442	1.7
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	81 570	1.8	----- number ..	498	1.8
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	244	.9
			----- number ..	520	.5
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹			FARM-RELATED DEATHS:		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	32 645	1.5	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	22	5.4
----- acres on which used ..	8 992 610	.9	----- (D) ..	(D)	(D)
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	2	—
			----- (D) ..	(D)	(D)
TENURE OF OPERATOR			FARMS BY SIZE		
All operators ----- farms ..	36 688	1.4	1 to 9 acres -----	1 382	1.9
----- acres ..	14 100 157	.9	10 to 49 acres -----	2 436	1.7
Full owners ----- farms ..	14 447	1.5	50 to 69 acres -----	1 502	1.7
----- acres ..	2 550 627	1.3	70 to 99 acres -----	3 455	1.6
Part owners ----- farms ..	17 583	1.1	100 to 139 acres -----	3 780	1.7
----- acres ..	9 867 991	.6	140 to 179 acres -----	3 232	1.8
Tenants ----- farms ..	4 658	2.3	180 to 219 acres -----	2 482	1.8
----- acres ..	1 681 539	1.6	220 to 259 acres -----	2 058	1.9
			260 to 499 acres -----	7 230	1.6
			500 to 999 acres -----	5 937	1.1
			1,000 to 1,999 acres -----	2 674	—
			2,000 acres or more -----	520	—
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
Land owned ----- farms ..	32 221	1.3	Cash grains (011) -----	22 613	1.4
----- acres ..	6 757 977	1.0	Field crops, except cash grains (013) -----	1 079	1.9
Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	32 030	1.3	Vegetables and melons (016) -----	253	2.1
----- acres ..	6 199 304	1.0	Fruits and tree nuts (017) -----	141	2.5
Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	22 304	1.3	Horticultural specialties (018) -----	416	1.3
----- acres ..	7 936 693	.8	General farms, primarily crop (019) -----	403	1.9
----- landlords ..	83 632	1.0	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) -----	8 586	1.4
Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	22 241	1.3	Dairy farms (024) -----	2 136	1.5
----- acres ..	7 900 853	.8	Poultry and eggs (025) -----	564	1.0
			Animal specialties (027) -----	173	2.6
			General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) -----	324	1.8
Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	4 251	1.4			
----- acres ..	594 513	1.4			
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			LIVESTOCK		
Operators by place of residence:			Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	14 649	1.3
On farm operated -----	28 654	1.3	----- number ..	935 989	1.0
Not on farm operated -----	6 005	2.0	Beef cows ----- farms ..	8 324	1.4
Not reported -----	2 029	1.3	----- number ..	209 871	1.2
Operators by principal occupation:			Milk cows ----- farms ..	3 439	1.5
Farming -----	24 717	1.2	----- number ..	143 159	1.0
Other -----	11 971	1.8			
Operators by days worked off farm:			Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	14 457	1.3
Any -----	17 305	1.7	----- number ..	691 098	.8
200 days or more -----	10 562	1.8	----- \$1,000 ..	372 573	.7
			Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	9 692	1.3
			----- number ..	4 544 116	.6
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	10 165	1.3
			----- number ..	8 654 663	.6
			----- \$1,000 ..	810 722	.6
Operators by sex:			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	1 258	1.6
Male -----	35 506	1.4	----- number ..	44 547	1.8
Female -----	1 182	1.7	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	1 181	1.6
Average age of operator ----- years ..	50.6	1.9	----- number ..	44 331	2.0
			Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	3 451	1.6
			----- number ..	23 978	1.7
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	927	1.7
			----- number ..	4 020	2.7

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992—Con.**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory -----farms ..	1 048	1.5	Oats for grain -----farms ..	2 415	1.3
number..	22 218 572	.2	acres..	37 379	1.2
Hens and pullets of laying age -----farms ..	1 005	1.5	bushels..	2 395 652	1.1
number..	19 256 573	.2	Tobacco -----farms ..	1 437	1.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----farms ..	129	2.6	acres..	70 359	2.1
number..	21 074 949	.6	pounds..	13 963 852	2.0
CROPS HARVESTED			Soybeans for beans -----farms ..	27 251	1.4
Corn for grain or seed -----farms ..	29 982	1.4	acres..	4 602 613	.8
acres..	5 713 094	.8	bushels..	190 984 613	.8
bushels..	793 787 931	.7	Irish potatoes -----farms ..	120	2.6
Corn for silage or green chop -----farms ..	3 718	1.3	acres..	3 983	.9
acres..	107 666	1.0	cwt..	1 032 450	.7
tons, green..	1 895 998	.9	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) -----farms ..	13 872	1.3
Wheat for grain -----farms ..	11 297	1.2	acres..	513 799	1.2
acres..	520 806	.8	tons, dry..	1 405 441	1.1
bushels..	24 292 951	.8	farms ..	10 620	1.3
			acres..	309 574	1.2
			tons, dry..	961 073	1.2
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) -----farms ..	846	1.6
			acres..	32 632	1.0
			farms ..	220	1.9
			acres..	4 846	1.7

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farms..... number..	-11.0	1.2	-9.4	1.4
Land in farms..... acres..	-3.4	.9	-1.9	.9
Average size of farm..... acres..	8.7	1.8	8.2	1.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars..	30.4	2.3	29.9	2.6
Average per acre.....dollars..	20.5	1.9	20.2	1.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars..	24.6	2.3	20.6	2.5
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres.....	-5.6	1.6	-8.1	2.0
10 to 49 acres.....	-5.2	1.4	11.8	2.1
50 to 179 acres.....	-14.6	1.3	-7.7	1.7
180 to 499 acres.....	-18.7	1.5	-19.6	1.5
500 to 999 acres.....	-10.0	1.0	-10.2	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres.....	17.3	-	17.1	-
2,000 acres or more.....	75.1	-	75.1	-
Total cropland..... farms..	-11.3	1.2	-9.4	1.4
Harvested cropland..... acres..	-1.7	.9	-2	.9
Irrigated land..... farms..	-12.1	1.1	-9.8	1.4
..... acres..	10.5	1.0	12.6	1.0
Market value of agricultural products sold.....\$1,000..	13.9	.8	14.7	.8
Average per farm.....dollars..	27.9	1.9	26.6	2.1
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....\$1,000..	26.9	1.0	28.3	1.0
Livestock, poultry, and their products.....\$1,000..	-3	.6	-	.6
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500.....	-10.0	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	-15.2	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	-15.4	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	-17.0	1.5	-17.0	1.5
\$25,000 to \$49,999.....	-16.0	1.7	-16.0	1.7
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	-16.6	1.7	-16.6	1.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	-1.9	1.2	-1.9	1.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	33.5	(L)	33.5	(L)
\$500,000 or more.....	57.9	-	57.9	-
Total farm production expenses ¹\$1,000..	14.7	1.4	15.7	1.7
Average per farm.....dollars..	28.8	2.0	27.6	2.3
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹farms..	-11.0	1.2	-9.4	1.4
.....\$1,000..	8.9	1.4	9.7	1.3
Average per farm.....dollars..	22.3	2.2	21.0	2.4
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming.....	-13.9	1.1	-12.8	1.2
Other.....	-7.7	1.3	-1.4	1.9
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any.....	-13.0	4.5	-11.0	4.7
200 days or more.....	-10.4	4.6	-4.9	5.1
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory.....farms..	-14.4	1.1	-14.0	1.3
.....number..	-9.9	.9	-10.2	1.0
Beef cows.....farms..	-12.4	1.1	-9.4	1.4
.....number..	-7.0	1.2	-6.3	1.3
Milk cows.....farms..	-23.9	1.2	-21.3	1.3
.....number..	-11.8	1.0	-11.1	1.0
Cattle and calves sold.....farms..	-16.2	1.1	-14.9	1.2
.....number..	-13.4	.7	-12.5	.7
Hogs and pigs inventory.....farms..	-19.2	1.1	-19.1	1.2
.....number..	5.6	.7	5.7	.7
Hogs and pigs sold.....farms..	-18.8	1.1	-19.0	1.2
.....number..	9.2	.8	9.3	.8
Sheep and lambs inventory.....farms..	-15.1	1.3	-17.7	1.5
.....number..	-12.5	1.5	-10.5	2.0
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory.....farms..	-36.8	.9	-40.1	1.0
.....number..	-16.9	.2	-16.9	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold.....farms..	-39.5	1.7	-30.6	2.2
.....number..	-5.5	.8	-5.4	.8
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.....farms..	-18.5	1.1	-13.1	1.3
.....acres..	19.3	1.0	21.3	1.0
.....bushels..	30.1	1.1	31.8	1.1
Corn for silage or green chop.....farms..	-14.2	1.2	-15.3	1.2
.....acres..	-1.7	1.1	-1.7	1.1
.....tons, green..	-8	1.0	-9	1.0
Wheat for grain.....farms..	-29.3	.9	-26.2	1.0
.....acres..	-8.3	.9	-8.2	.9
.....bushels..	-18.6	.7	-16.9	.8
Oats for grain.....farms..	-41.7	.8	-40.2	.9
.....acres..	-39.9	.8	-37.3	.9
.....bushels..	-39.7	.8	-37.9	.8
Soybeans for beans.....farms..	-16.2	1.2	-11.7	1.3
.....acres..	7.6	1.0	9.5	1.0
.....bushels..	14.9	1.0	16.5	1.0
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text).....farms..	-10.1	1.1	-10.7	1.3
.....acres..	-4.7	1.2	-4.8	1.2
.....tons, dry..	-9.5	1.1	-9.2	1.1
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text).....farms..	8.2	1.7	10.2	2.0
.....acres..	2.8	1.3	4.0	1.3

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	62 778	1.1	15 618 831	.9	249	1.4	346 199	1.5	3 474 495	1.1
Adams	1 102	1.4	197 724	1.1	179	1.8	319 426	3.9	58 666	4.7
Allen	1 463	1.4	285 730	1.2	195	1.8	369 693	4.2	84 201	4.4
Bartholomew	645	1.0	165 091	1.0	256	1.4	423 504	3.8	33 023	4.5
Benton	500	1.5	270 618	1.1	541	1.9	907 086	3.2	52 779	5.7
Blackford	273	1.2	87 329	1.3	320	1.7	303 323	2.9	14 873	4.7
Boone	711	1.0	223 429	.7	314	1.2	580 331	3.2	45 438	5.6
Brown	168	.9	22 555	2.0	134	2.1	149 032	8.9	3 045	10.6
Carroll	659	1.0	220 057	.7	334	1.2	582 289	3.3	59 331	6.7
Cass	804	1.1	227 711	.8	283	1.4	405 118	3.5	57 259	3.6
Clark	641	.9	105 658	1.0	165	1.3	210 530	3.6	22 647	7.7
Clay	568	1.4	162 433	1.4	286	2.0	318 388	4.7	35 270	7.6
Clinton	675	1.0	236 073	.7	350	1.3	551 078	2.9	53 737	2.9
Crawford	382	1.0	59 734	1.5	156	1.8	135 992	9.3	9 526	6.7
Daviess	1 181	1.3	222 435	1.1	188	1.7	261 766	3.7	55 494	4.3
Dearborn	738	.8	86 236	1.2	117	1.5	169 215	7.8	16 765	8.5
Decatur	731	1.4	202 429	1.1	277	1.8	427 658	3.3	48 087	4.2
De Kalb	671	1.1	153 213	1.0	228	1.5	257 222	4.5	32 866	4.5
Delaware	688	.9	169 265	.9	246	1.3	324 408	3.8	36 262	4.8
Dubois	923	1.0	193 381	.9	210	1.3	273 979	4.5	50 020	3.3
Elkhart	1 447	1.3	192 311	1.3	133	1.8	274 829	5.9	57 873	5.5
Fayette	456	1.7	111 500	1.9	245	2.5	297 015	7.2	20 401	8.7
Floyd	336	.7	29 837	1.8	89	1.9	169 661	7.1	5 766	10.3
Fountain	633	1.4	229 097	1.2	362	1.9	477 249	4.9	39 061	6.5
Franklin	849	.9	148 662	1.2	175	1.5	215 571	6.3	26 948	5.5
Fulton	690	1.9	194 312	1.3	282	2.3	303 298	3.1	44 297	5.5
Gibson	720	1.0	241 049	.8	335	1.3	497 443	4.5	61 551	6.9
Grant	630	1.0	196 537	.8	312	1.3	468 602	2.7	49 356	3.7
Greene	958	1.0	207 766	1.2	217	1.6	246 842	4.6	34 385	4.4
Hamilton	648	1.2	162 670	1.1	251	1.6	532 188	4.5	37 737	5.0
Hancock	625	1.4	163 248	1.0	261	1.7	461 584	4.2	41 360	4.6
Harrison	1 167	.9	161 745	1.1	139	1.4	169 976	5.0	36 054	4.8
Hendricks	792	1.3	187 079	1.2	236	1.8	425 318	3.8	36 216	3.7
Henry	848	1.2	190 798	1.3	225	1.8	280 470	3.9	39 961	4.3
Howard	566	1.1	148 609	1.0	263	1.5	499 054	5.2	40 499	4.9
Huntington	704	.9	187 955	1.0	267	1.3	409 608	4.9	51 766	7.6
Jackson	851	1.3	202 896	1.2	238	1.8	325 206	5.3	47 175	4.7
Jasper	716	1.3	301 962	1.0	422	1.7	501 386	3.0	61 549	4.0
Jay	852	1.4	182 836	1.3	215	1.8	255 920	5.1	41 137	4.5
Jefferson	914	1.7	130 826	1.8	143	2.5	147 448	4.5	27 284	6.6
Jennings	658	1.3	124 694	1.4	190	2.0	231 119	6.0	25 404	5.1
Johnson	586	1.3	139 638	1.1	238	1.7	419 365	4.2	32 967	4.7
Knox	688	1.2	305 634	.7	444	1.4	533 969	2.8	56 991	4.3
Kosciusko	1 123	.8	251 603	.7	224	1.1	303 002	4.6	72 973	3.2
Lagrange	1 391	1.0	187 549	.9	135	1.4	214 776	4.2	53 600	5.6
Lake	482	1.0	144 305	1.0	299	1.4	443 124	4.0	32 019	6.3
La Porte	826	1.2	267 695	.9	324	1.5	426 676	3.1	58 963	4.6
Lawrence	849	1.1	158 788	1.3	187	1.7	154 213	5.8	26 612	7.0
Madison	848	.8	223 328	.7	263	1.1	429 855	3.8	54 938	4.6
Marion	276	1.1	38 783	2.2	141	2.5	406 518	10.3	14 387	10.3
Marshall	956	1.4	219 402	1.2	230	1.9	259 993	3.9	53 224	5.2
Martin	375	1.6	71 596	1.7	191	2.3	195 235	7.8	15 141	9.5
Miami	771	1.2	188 843	1.1	245	1.6	337 370	3.6	48 887	6.7
Monroe	508	1.0	59 282	1.6	117	1.9	178 717	7.5	9 736	9.3
Montgomery	762	.9	282 764	.7	371	1.2	494 844	2.7	58 690	4.8
Morgan	647	1.3	139 523	1.2	216	1.8	311 038	5.0	28 555	5.6
Newton	390	1.1	206 885	.7	530	1.3	690 687	3.7	42 191	5.4
Noble	993	1.3	184 118	1.6	185	2.1	209 142	3.6	43 266	4.9
Ohio	267	1.3	32 318	1.8	121	2.2	131 652	9.0	5 726	9.8
Orange	524	1.3	116 068	1.7	222	2.1	185 018	5.7	16 977	5.5
Owen	622	1.1	113 129	1.5	182	1.8	195 950	8.3	16 215	9.8
Parke	491	1.4	181 653	.9	370	1.7	404 656	3.2	32 302	6.7
Perry	486	.8	80 078	1.2	165	1.5	175 500	11.0	14 951	7.4
Pike	309	.9	85 366	1.1	276	1.4	246 413	9.7	13 813	11.3
Porter	496	1.3	142 482	1.4	287	1.9	457 425	4.4	32 321	5.9
Posey	491	1.0	220 959	.7	450	1.2	614 087	3.5	53 386	5.9
Pulaski	630	1.0	242 777	.8	385	1.3	477 271	3.9	50 961	3.2
Putnam	826	1.0	204 165	.9	247	1.3	295 796	4.5	34 371	4.2
Randolph	936	1.3	236 436	1.2	253	1.7	275 881	4.2	51 981	5.4
Ripley	963	1.2	164 025	1.3	170	1.8	190 475	4.3	35 183	5.0
Rush	761	2.2	233 183	1.7	306	2.7	445 245	4.2	54 502	4.3
St. Joseph	768	1.1	172 348	1.0	224	1.5	374 128	6.3	42 992	4.6
Scott	357	.9	63 332	1.3	177	1.6	178 603	7.9	9 179	11.1
Shelby	749	1.3	217 288	1.1	290	1.7	480 015	2.9	54 502	4.7
Spencer	730	1.4	175 124	1.3	240	1.9	272 489	4.9	40 093	6.6
Starke	387	1.5	134 960	1.2	349	1.9	332 948	4.6	23 841	7.8
Steuben	500	1.5	121 710	1.6	243	2.2	258 837	4.8	23 979	9.3
Sullivan	544	1.2	181 020	1.0	333	1.6	387 549	4.3	41 160	4.5
Switzerland	654	1.4	79 235	1.8	121	2.3	157 804	10.3	19 299	8.0
Tippecanoe	790	1.0	257 351	.7	326	1.2	551 669	3.5	52 048	4.6
Tipton	449	.9	160 930	.7	358	1.1	722 824	3.2	39 394	2.8
Union	268	1.4	80 069	1.5	299	2.1	483 906	6.5	17 749	9.8
Vanderburgh	305	1.0	80 958	1.2	265	1.6	458 642	5.8	20 739	4.6
Vermillion	307	.9	119 318	.8	389	1.2	463 718	4.7	20 839	6.4
Vigo	536	.9	144 722	.9	270	1.3	315 318	4.0	28 255	6.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wabash.....	810	1.1	197 947	.8	244	1.3	344 933	4.3	57 870	4.5
Warren.....	435	.9	201 739	.7	464	1.1	616 619	3.0	33 144	4.4
Warrick.....	392	1.1	96 219	1.4	245	1.8	353 196	7.2	20 393	13.5
Washington.....	937	1.2	189 136	1.3	202	1.8	199 069	6.6	29 389	4.6
Wayne.....	828	1.2	189 467	1.1	229	1.7	243 169	4.6	39 531	6.2
Wells.....	722	.9	198 680	1.0	275	1.3	419 380	5.7	46 824	4.2
White.....	695	1.3	285 169	.9	410	1.6	632 478	3.4	60 927	3.1
Whitley.....	759	1.1	162 244	.9	214	1.5	258 234	4.0	41 450	6.8
	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana.....	55 440	1.6	4 633 090	.6	73 801	1.3	62 772	1.2	3 645 379	.7
Adams.....	53 381	5.0	80 632	.9	73 169	1.7	1 099	1.7	65 996	1.5
Allen.....	57 870	4.7	79 764	1.0	54 521	1.7	1 462	1.6	57 530	2.2
Bartholomew.....	51 278	4.7	44 691	.9	69 288	1.3	644	1.2	33 893	3.7
Benton.....	105 981	6.0	63 019	1.1	126 038	1.8	498	1.9	44 798	2.9
Blackford.....	54 681	4.8	22 696	1.0	83 135	1.5	273	1.2	18 246	2.1
Boone.....	63 998	5.7	72 814	.6	102 411	1.1	710	1.1	55 917	1.6
Brown.....	18 234	10.7	2 377	2.2	14 152	2.4	167	1.4	1 454	9.3
Carroll.....	90 443	6.8	103 275	.4	156 715	1.1	659	1.1	82 368	1.0
Cass.....	71 843	3.8	71 874	.7	89 395	1.3	803	1.1	55 162	1.7
Clark.....	35 221	7.8	17 733	.9	27 665	1.3	643	.9	15 882	2.8
Clay.....	62 204	7.8	37 921	1.2	66 762	1.8	567	1.6	27 699	3.0
Clinton.....	79 492	3.1	86 210	.6	127 719	1.1	676	1.2	65 344	1.3
Crawford.....	24 937	6.8	14 206	.6	37 188	1.2	382	1.2	12 230	2.3
Daviess.....	46 870	4.5	106 108	.7	89 846	1.5	1 184	1.4	85 121	1.7
Dearborn.....	22 686	8.5	9 230	1.5	12 507	1.7	739	1.2	8 562	6.4
Decatur.....	65 692	4.5	74 141	.8	101 424	1.6	732	1.6	58 945	1.9
De Kalb.....	49 054	4.6	33 539	.9	49 984	1.4	670	1.2	26 503	2.7
Delaware.....	52 706	4.9	42 898	.8	62 352	1.2	688	1.1	36 490	2.1
Dubois.....	54 134	3.5	138 390	.3	149 935	1.0	924	1.0	119 564	.9
Elkhart.....	40 050	5.6	96 859	1.1	66 938	1.7	1 445	1.4	77 944	2.3
Fayette.....	45 035	9.0	27 583	1.8	60 489	2.4	457	2.0	19 470	3.3
Floyd.....	17 212	10.4	4 106	3.0	12 220	3.1	335	1.1	2 508	7.8
Fountain.....	61 805	6.7	50 364	1.1	79 564	1.8	632	1.8	35 703	3.3
Franklin.....	31 667	5.6	34 640	1.2	40 801	1.6	851	1.1	24 587	2.7
Fulton.....	64 105	5.8	49 604	1.0	71 890	2.1	691	1.8	40 978	1.9
Gibson.....	85 606	7.0	65 951	.7	91 599	1.2	719	1.1	47 180	2.2
Grant.....	78 344	3.8	56 970	.7	90 428	1.2	632	1.1	44 571	1.6
Greene.....	35 930	4.5	41 026	1.0	42 825	1.5	957	1.2	32 995	3.4
Hamilton.....	60 477	5.3	50 258	.8	77 559	1.4	648	1.1	39 074	2.4
Hancock.....	65 966	4.7	46 137	.9	73 819	1.6	627	1.3	34 308	2.2
Harrison.....	31 135	4.9	45 507	.7	38 995	1.1	1 166	1.0	41 218	1.9
Hendricks.....	45 843	3.9	48 389	1.0	61 097	1.7	790	1.2	37 100	2.5
Henry.....	47 068	4.6	53 298	1.1	62 852	1.6	849	1.4	43 303	2.7
Howard.....	71 680	5.1	56 428	.7	99 696	1.3	565	1.2	41 899	2.3
Huntington.....	73 846	7.7	52 517	.8	74 599	1.2	701	1.0	40 573	2.0
Jackson.....	55 566	4.9	73 460	.7	86 322	1.4	849	1.5	60 771	1.4
Jasper.....	85 485	4.3	98 065	.6	136 962	1.5	720	1.4	76 115	1.1
Jay.....	48 798	4.8	63 949	.8	75 058	1.6	852	1.3	54 081	2.2
Jefferson.....	29 851	6.8	22 672	1.7	24 805	2.4	914	1.9	18 606	4.5
Jennings.....	38 608	5.4	35 568	.8	54 055	1.6	658	1.6	30 290	2.5
Johnson.....	56 161	4.9	43 132	.8	73 604	1.5	587	1.4	31 138	2.7
Knox.....	82 715	4.5	99 303	.6	144 336	1.3	689	1.3	71 971	1.2
Kosciusko.....	64 922	3.3	125 454	.4	111 713	.9	1 124	.9	111 101	1.3
Lagrange.....	38 953	5.7	98 309	.8	70 675	1.3	1 391	1.0	76 721	1.5
Lake.....	66 429	6.4	33 570	.9	69 647	1.4	482	1.2	25 500	3.0
La Porte.....	71 211	4.8	76 616	.6	82 755	1.4	828	1.3	62 352	1.3
Lawrence.....	31 272	7.1	17 167	1.4	20 220	1.8	851	1.2	15 300	4.0
Madison.....	64 862	4.7	65 728	.6	77 510	1.0	847	.9	51 792	2.8
Marion.....	52 507	10.4	20 709	1.1	75 034	1.6	274	1.8	15 055	5.9
Marshall.....	55 557	5.4	58 118	1.1	60 793	1.8	958	1.1	44 713	1.7
Martin.....	40 484	9.7	28 472	.8	75 926	1.8	374	1.9	23 030	2.5
Miami.....	63 407	6.8	64 642	.8	83 842	1.4	771	1.0	52 461	1.9
Monroe.....	19 165	9.4	10 275	1.2	20 227	1.6	508	1.1	7 041	6.2
Montgomery.....	76 921	4.9	91 485	.5	120 059	1.0	763	1.0	68 031	1.8
Morgan.....	44 135	5.8	30 545	1.1	47 210	1.7	647	1.5	24 445	3.1
Newton.....	107 630	5.6	66 862	.5	171 441	1.2	392	1.5	49 516	1.7
Noble.....	43 484	5.2	49 302	1.2	49 650	1.8	995	1.5	38 467	2.0
Ohio.....	21 447	10.0	4 396	2.3	16 465	2.7	267	1.7	3 526	11.1
Orange.....	32 462	5.7	19 953	1.1	38 078	1.7	523	1.6	18 166	5.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 – Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Owen	26 026	10.0	13 735	1.5	22 081	1.8	623	1.6	12 327	9.0
Parke	65 789	6.8	35 926	.9	73 169	1.6	491	1.2	27 026	2.1
Perry	30 827	7.5	11 080	1.7	22 799	1.9	485	1.1	9 984	9.0
Pike	44 414	11.4	20 147	1.0	65 201	1.3	311	1.4	16 178	5.4
Porter	65 163	6.1	34 689	1.3	69 938	1.8	496	1.7	27 916	4.2
Posey	109 173	6.1	62 257	.6	126 797	1.2	489	1.5	42 504	2.1
Pulaski	80 890	3.4	75 282	.6	119 495	1.2	630	1.2	62 280	1.1
Putnam	41 662	4.5	44 313	.7	53 647	1.3	825	1.6	36 872	2.1
Randolph	55 476	5.7	65 951	1.0	70 460	1.6	937	2.0	52 506	2.6
Ripley	36 573	5.1	37 468	1.3	38 908	1.8	962	1.2	32 355	2.6
Rush	71 618	5.0	73 882	1.4	97 085	2.6	761	2.5	59 206	2.7
St. Joseph	56 052	4.8	49 799	.8	64 843	1.4	767	1.3	43 518	3.0
Scott	26 225	11.4	9 933	1.5	27 823	1.7	358	1.4	8 234	6.8
Shelby	72 961	4.8	63 318	1.0	84 536	1.6	747	1.3	44 968	2.0
Spencer	55 149	6.8	45 607	1.0	62 476	1.8	727	1.5	34 429	2.5
Starke	61 925	8.2	28 321	.9	73 181	1.7	385	2.2	21 294	3.6
Steuben	48 540	9.5	25 042	1.6	50 084	2.2	500	1.2	22 878	5.5
Sullivan	75 662	4.7	43 106	.8	79 239	1.5	544	1.5	29 407	2.5
Switzerland	29 554	8.2	13 184	2.2	20 159	2.6	653	1.7	11 213	4.9
Tippecanoe	65 800	4.7	72 470	.6	91 734	1.1	791	1.1	55 479	1.9
Tipton	87 738	3.0	58 285	.5	129 810	1.0	449	1.2	45 974	1.7
Union	66 476	10.0	23 510	1.4	87 725	2.0	267	1.7	18 164	4.5
Vanderburgh	68 219	4.8	22 279	1.1	73 044	1.5	304	1.2	14 675	3.9
Vermillion	67 659	6.5	27 078	.8	88 203	1.2	308	1.1	19 543	2.5
Vigo	52 715	7.0	30 316	.8	56 560	1.2	536	1.0	22 161	3.4
Wabash	71 444	4.7	97 188	.4	119 986	1.1	810	1.3	82 496	1.3
Warren	76 194	4.6	43 406	.7	99 783	1.1	435	1.4	30 169	1.6
Warrick	52 157	13.5	19 773	1.4	50 442	1.8	391	1.4	15 787	7.0
Washington	31 399	4.7	43 534	.9	46 461	1.5	936	1.3	37 951	2.3
Wayne	47 743	6.4	58 527	.7	70 685	1.4	828	1.2	46 978	2.0
Wells	64 853	4.3	55 290	.8	76 579	1.3	722	1.1	42 127	1.9
White	87 539	3.5	104 630	.6	150 547	1.4	697	1.6	77 505	1.4
Whitley	55 192	7.0	44 854	.8	59 096	1.4	758	1.1	35 969	1.9

Farm production expenses¹—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	19 087	1.7	328 492	1.0	31 571	1.4	657 193	.7	45 911	1.4	203 920	.9
Adams	447	6.9	8 012	3.4	573	4.7	17 900	2.8	889	3.4	2 787	3.8
Allen	321	11.0	6 707	9.1	460	9.0	6 233	6.9	1 258	2.6	4 257	4.9
Bartholomew	183	13.7	1 565	7.7	311	9.0	3 925	15.3	467	4.6	2 377	5.0
Benton	64	17.9	711	2.5	110	16.9	1 027	6.4	455	3.2	3 848	3.0
Blackford	81	20.1	1 397	4.9	144	11.0	2 734	4.0	180	8.5	1 071	3.1
Boone	180	14.0	2 287	10.8	338	7.9	9 370	2.7	527	3.6	3 189	3.4
Brown	32	30.8	52	18.4	94	15.9	302	18.7	75	20.1	68	20.9
Carroll	228	10.8	9 243	2.5	352	7.7	19 515	2.9	529	3.5	3 562	2.8
Cass	262	10.1	4 681	8.8	377	8.0	7 223	3.9	670	3.6	3 486	4.3
Clark	170	14.9	886	18.2	374	8.0	1 243	9.7	409	6.8	1 105	4.8
Clay	166	13.7	1 844	22.8	307	8.7	2 749	17.3	426	5.4	2 076	6.8
Clinton	193	11.8	3 364	12.1	312	8.1	12 309	2.6	582	3.2	3 482	1.9
Crawford	110	18.8	1 587	6.7	235	8.8	(D)	(D)	118	18.8	85	19.0
Daviess	557	6.0	9 281	4.7	746	5.1	34 024	4.2	856	3.3	2 856	3.3
Dearborn	201	13.0	840	14.5	437	6.2	1 019	11.1	389	6.6	528	30.8
Decatur	299	10.0	9 032	5.1	437	6.4	10 025	4.8	616	4.2	2 712	2.7
De Kalb	170	14.4	1 692	5.9	276	9.7	3 905	6.8	574	3.9	1 805	4.4
Delaware	170	15.1	2 376	9.5	258	11.1	2 667	9.9	520	4.8	2 410	3.9
Dubois	402	7.7	16 023	3.3	693	4.8	59 726	1.1	589	5.2	2 242	3.5
Elkhart	784	6.0	9 823	7.5	1 039	4.1	21 170	5.1	960	3.5	2 958	5.7
Fayette	164	12.5	2 109	5.0	221	10.6	2 704	6.7	349	5.8	1 195	5.0
Floyd	66	28.5	91	39.1	145	18.3	198	34.6	208	10.9	164	13.4
Fountain	171	16.1	1 994	4.1	328	9.0	2 357	4.5	469	4.7	3 130	3.7
Franklin	241	12.4	2 547	8.9	425	8.1	4 978	8.4	648	4.5	1 244	7.8
Fulton	178	12.4	2 825	13.5	310	10.1	5 008	4.1	594	3.8	2 539	3.1
Gibson	142	14.7	1 483	15.1	272	10.7	4 885	7.2	599	3.2	4 014	3.6
Grant	145	12.6	3 328	8.9	253	9.6	4 347	6.6	518	3.7	2 793	3.1
Greene	244	11.8	3 011	6.4	517	6.0	7 484	6.8	477	5.2	1 727	11.2
Hamilton	187	14.3	2 485	6.7	285	10.7	3 549	13.5	500	3.7	2 877	3.8
Hancock	194	14.5	2 469	17.3	307	9.9	3 769	7.5	503	4.7	2 258	3.5
Harrison	307	10.3	6 451	4.4	649	5.7	10 082	3.0	621	6.1	1 194	11.7
Hendricks	240	14.0	1 476	9.6	373	10.1	3 420	8.8	535	5.6	2 652	4.0
Henry	254	11.8	4 165	9.3	407	7.9	3 442	8.2	646	3.8	2 957	3.7
Howard	187	13.4	3 114	7.2	303	7.6	6 920	5.6	475	3.9	2 176	5.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Huntington	165	14.3	3 138	9.0	332	8.8	6 158	4.1	550	3.9	2 676	9.1
Jackson	271	10.5	9 594	4.9	449	6.8	15 378	1.2	598	4.4	2 634	3.8
Jasper	178	12.1	10 271	9.9	230	10.2	12 620	2.2	628	3.4	4 339	2.5
Jay	276	10.7	6 629	7.2	395	7.8	15 973	3.6	638	4.6	2 135	3.7
Jefferson	176	15.2	836	16.0	420	8.9	1 375	10.1	654	5.3	1 066	6.5
Jennings	176	14.3	3 203	8.1	384	7.7	9 102	3.2	391	6.2	1 145	6.1
Johnson	162	14.3	2 305	14.7	292	9.8	2 727	8.1	435	4.4	1 990	3.4
Knox	199	13.3	7 979	5.2	262	11.2	7 607	6.4	581	4.0	4 836	2.1
Kosciusko	424	8.5	15 362	2.7	623	6.6	34 964	2.7	818	3.7	3 735	4.0
Lagrange	877	4.6	11 754	5.6	1 096	2.9	20 773	3.7	986	3.1	2 092	4.6
Lake	87	18.3	528	8.2	159	11.9	869	6.8	358	4.7	2 365	3.4
La Porte	182	12.8	4 411	2.6	290	9.0	6 710	2.5	704	3.1	3 893	2.9
Lawrence	200	14.3	1 291	9.8	580	6.0	2 511	18.1	381	8.4	718	9.8
Madison	225	13.1	4 607	19.6	325	9.6	2 510	7.8	677	3.5	3 848	3.2
Marion	81	21.4	880	16.3	111	17.1	1 127	6.3	149	11.5	1 598	5.5
Marshall	291	11.1	3 291	11.0	442	8.0	5 869	5.2	751	4.0	2 849	3.1
Martin	183	13.2	3 430	5.9	303	6.7	10 619	2.3	204	12.0	445	6.3
Miami	262	11.0	7 131	2.6	384	8.4	7 836	3.7	660	3.7	3 369	3.0
Monroe	209	12.6	794	23.8	392	6.1	738	11.2	180	10.8	232	26.4
Montgomery	228	12.1	3 524	3.0	368	8.6	12 923	3.9	583	4.0	4 098	3.0
Morgan	158	13.5	1 477	5.1	378	6.9	2 437	6.1	421	5.4	1 789	4.7
Newton	108	14.5	3 383	3.3	146	11.7	10 363	4.5	333	4.6	2 917	3.2
Noble	256	11.3	4 400	5.9	405	8.7	5 234	4.8	722	4.2	2 125	4.6
Ohio	72	25.3	355	40.7	139	15.7	428	26.7	154	13.9	129	14.9
Orange	152	17.6	1 909	10.5	297	9.1	(D)	(D)	269	9.0	726	7.9
Owen	196	12.2	637	7.4	347	8.2	1 239	7.6	323	7.5	865	15.0
Parke	119	16.3	1 320	12.2	230	10.5	1 944	5.0	402	4.8	2 061	3.6
Perry	168	14.4	834	8.8	344	6.7	2 926	18.8	209	9.2	372	9.9
Pike	74	24.5	1 010	17.3	146	14.0	3 197	4.6	280	6.4	1 111	9.8
Porter	97	20.7	873	15.1	157	14.3	2 157	8.8	404	5.1	2 270	5.9
Posey	92	21.7	1 469	2.6	181	13.4	4 853	4.5	414	3.5	3 337	3.4
Pulaski	195	11.6	4 121	3.4	278	8.8	12 776	2.0	524	3.7	3 135	2.1
Putnam	334	9.5	3 452	17.0	531	6.1	4 903	6.3	482	5.8	2 086	4.1
Randolph	269	12.4	3 199	6.2	459	7.2	9 465	3.7	760	3.2	3 347	4.1
Ripley	292	11.8	2 503	12.9	509	7.0	5 705	5.6	728	3.8	1 731	7.6
Rush	333	8.8	5 423	11.4	422	7.1	8 330	5.9	674	4.1	3 503	3.2
St. Joseph	158	17.6	1 962	3.2	257	11.8	5 929	8.6	632	3.9	2 566	4.2
Scott	76	24.8	112	19.1	160	13.6	695	27.2	265	7.5	490	7.9
Shelby	191	12.8	2 314	8.9	385	8.2	3 369	6.8	593	3.0	3 430	4.6
Spencer	210	12.4	2 272	17.0	410	7.0	6 790	5.0	501	5.7	2 144	6.2
Starke	87	28.1	1 230	43.8	156	14.9	1 031	14.0	271	8.1	1 389	3.1
Steuben	145	13.9	1 780	16.6	244	9.6	3 684	8.3	377	5.6	1 413	8.4
Sullivan	151	15.0	1 710	18.6	262	9.3	1 824	6.1	371	5.0	2 313	3.3
Switzerland	154	20.4	459	23.9	280	12.6	2 046	6.9	477	6.2	497	15.9
Tippecanoe	235	11.9	3 452	5.7	367	8.6	7 374	4.4	566	4.2	3 420	3.1
Tipton	117	12.6	3 530	1.2	165	10.7	5 444	5.4	391	2.6	2 348	4.9
Union	93	17.2	1 498	12.9	184	8.3	2 302	5.7	226	5.0	1 364	8.0
Vanderburgh	70	24.2	477	24.7	152	13.3	792	13.1	222	7.3	1 302	12.6
Vermillion	80	19.9	1 165	3.4	158	11.7	1 089	9.3	266	4.3	1 427	2.5
Vigo	90	21.8	882	9.5	213	11.0	1 247	11.2	359	5.7	1 894	5.9
Wabash	329	9.1	16 205	3.4	466	7.0	20 403	1.6	607	3.5	2 831	4.9
Warren	82	18.4	644	15.6	158	12.3	926	8.2	342	4.6	2 783	4.2
Warrick	74	24.5	373	29.8	166	13.8	1 548	22.9	280	6.6	1 062	10.1
Washington	283	10.1	3 772	7.0	540	5.8	12 088	3.2	539	6.1	1 353	5.9
Wayne	277	9.9	3 662	5.7	439	7.2	5 873	4.8	623	4.4	2 119	3.9
Wells	186	12.6	3 802	5.0	249	10.9	4 837	8.6	632	3.3	2 674	2.9
White	224	10.7	6 277	1.8	330	8.6	15 881	3.2	566	3.8	3 765	2.8
Whitley	268	9.7	4 645	10.8	356	7.9	5 744	6.5	569	3.4	1 943	3.8

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	47 406	1.3	420 849	1.0	46 648	1.3	247 300	1.0	59 695	1.2	205 728	.9
Adams	843	3.8	5 399	3.4	849	4.0	3 224	4.0	1 053	2.3	3 226	2.9
Allen	1 252	2.8	6 772	4.8	1 136	3.3	5 158	6.0	1 428	1.8	3 877	3.5
Bartholomew	465	4.6	5 285	4.0	496	4.7	3 095	5.7	613	2.5	2 162	4.3
Benton	453	3.5	7 390	3.8	458	3.5	5 161	3.9	489	2.3	3 087	5.1
Blackford	197	7.3	2 324	9.9	184	7.7	1 399	3.5	266	2.6	1 117	4.5
Boone	519	4.5	6 229	3.6	484	5.3	3 921	4.0	669	2.3	3 253	3.7
Brown	111	14.0	135	22.3	63	22.5	46	15.7	146	8.2	108	17.4
Carroll	538	3.9	7 638	3.3	551	3.5	4 379	7.9	586	3.4	3 486	4.3
Cass	658	3.6	6 560	3.6	673	3.3	4 002	2.4	781	1.7	3 391	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 – Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Tipton	325	6.4	471	3.1	158	9.0	4 062	2.8	25	21.6	759	2.8
Union	254	3.1	401	3.9	107	15.3	574	9.9	6	4.5	13	3.2
Vanderburgh	244	6.9	292	6.1	93	18.2	1 223	9.5	31	35.2	90	7.4
Vermillion	261	5.1	243	5.7	101	15.0	1 189	1.8	26	35.2	78	64.7
Vigo	367	6.0	346	5.6	133	14.2	2 525	13.5	10	2.2	94	5.8
Wabash	610	4.3	1 467	2.8	250	9.5	5 463	.6	63	22.5	237	11.6
Warren	361	4.2	500	3.3	148	11.2	1 712	2.8	38	27.5	84	27.2
Warrick	277	8.6	256	11.1	67	19.6	844	2.3	34	38.8	43	16.1
Washington	634	4.9	651	4.8	334	9.6	1 685	4.8	75	23.3	135	29.9
Wayne	611	4.4	824	3.5	252	10.9	4 989	2.1	63	28.8	147	35.7
Wells	533	5.0	550	4.8	199	11.2	1 333	8.9	28	29.2	50	14.8
White	528	4.2	1 364	3.3	307	8.6	4 351	3.9	41	29.2	182	18.2
Whitley	628	3.3	688	5.6	178	13.6	1 407	5.1	14	41.6	88	4.2

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	52 836	1.3	243 906	1.0	23 867	1.6	53 466	1.9	32 082	1.5	290 504	1.1
Adams	941	3.0	3 929	4.1	561	6.3	1 089	9.0	572	6.2	4 924	6.2
Allen	1 247	3.0	5 192	6.4	555	8.1	978	9.2	662	7.0	4 758	7.0
Bartholomew	535	4.5	2 823	6.0	241	10.5	414	15.4	342	6.6	3 134	7.9
Benton	462	3.9	3 323	6.4	278	8.1	1 014	14.6	320	7.1	4 819	10.2
Blackford	252	3.7	1 163	5.9	105	14.5	267	9.8	186	8.7	1 781	7.5
Boone	601	3.6	3 335	4.0	296	8.9	878	12.9	331	6.8	4 876	6.8
Brown	138	9.1	126	13.7	25	45.2	7	51.1	36	29.6	57	22.1
Carroll	541	4.7	4 475	4.4	238	10.7	1 028	4.4	342	7.4	5 922	5.4
Cass	684	3.3	3 670	4.0	326	9.5	1 125	8.8	482	6.4	4 223	5.4
Clark	551	4.4	1 539	6.6	188	14.5	195	11.6	207	11.3	1 189	8.2
Clay	523	3.5	2 188	5.4	238	11.0	381	10.7	353	5.5	2 417	7.5
Clinton	568	3.6	4 368	2.9	239	11.0	1 219	7.3	413	5.9	5 585	4.5
Crawford	276	7.7	473	19.4	72	25.0	310	5.2	134	16.5	348	22.2
Daviess	922	3.7	4 070	4.3	408	8.7	660	10.7	584	6.9	5 016	4.8
Dearborn	612	3.8	1 196	12.2	203	12.4	158	30.1	191	14.2	645	21.1
Decatur	606	4.7	3 407	3.3	344	9.3	1 172	14.6	425	7.9	4 775	8.2
De Kalb	517	4.4	2 223	6.8	283	11.1	489	11.8	342	8.5	2 440	10.0
Delaware	570	4.8	2 523	5.0	309	8.7	836	9.3	401	7.9	3 668	5.1
Dubois	796	3.5	4 812	2.9	426	8.7	1 243	8.5	429	6.8	4 701	3.3
Elkhart	1 206	2.8	5 278	4.5	617	6.9	1 016	11.7	817	5.3	5 627	6.5
Fayette	402	4.1	1 342	6.9	209	10.0	297	10.2	245	9.3	1 827	9.5
Floyd	249	8.6	236	8.4	85	23.3	67	64.4	78	24.9	205	24.7
Fountain	545	3.9	3 118	6.3	251	11.8	907	22.6	337	8.1	3 473	9.9
Franklin	694	4.0	2 012	6.6	255	13.0	248	25.2	345	10.4	2 067	14.1
Fulton	572	5.1	2 637	4.9	321	10.3	804	8.4	434	7.2	4 630	6.1
Gibson	588	4.0	3 763	5.4	212	12.2	600	13.4	387	7.4	3 904	6.4
Grant	536	3.7	3 137	4.6	266	9.3	553	7.4	347	6.9	4 860	4.0
Greene	800	3.3	2 128	6.6	336	9.9	639	26.5	348	9.4	1 983	10.4
Hamilton	525	5.1	2 969	3.9	319	9.4	900	8.3	174	10.8	2 508	6.6
Hancock	520	4.7	2 577	7.0	266	12.1	314	11.1	280	10.3	2 710	4.4
Harrison	947	3.3	2 404	4.0	299	10.8	493	20.3	528	6.9	2 508	7.4
Hendricks	674	3.4	2 698	5.1	318	11.2	492	11.1	399	8.7	3 336	5.4
Henry	721	3.5	3 184	4.2	388	8.2	1 026	13.1	416	7.7	3 359	5.8
Howard	495	3.4	2 865	5.7	300	8.0	613	7.5	314	6.2	3 265	7.1
Huntington	606	3.3	2 946	3.5	340	8.8	752	16.1	403	7.0	4 364	7.7
Jackson	690	3.8	3 184	4.3	237	11.3	457	11.9	395	8.7	3 276	7.5
Jasper	635	3.1	4 122	3.3	321	8.2	1 293	4.1	441	4.6	5 844	3.8
Jay	693	4.1	3 568	6.6	377	9.6	588	9.5	543	6.1	4 570	9.4
Jefferson	809	3.7	1 832	12.2	272	12.9	370	11.0	410	8.9	2 327	9.9
Jennings	558	3.7	1 882	8.7	194	13.0	240	18.4	268	9.3	1 849	8.0
Johnson	443	5.6	2 235	5.0	256	10.7	559	11.1	271	8.4	2 940	7.9
Knox	628	3.0	4 632	3.2	201	11.8	783	9.8	397	7.7	5 591	3.2
Kosciusko	982	2.5	5 720	4.3	511	7.9	1 015	12.2	619	5.8	5 699	5.0
Lagrange	1 130	3.1	3 764	3.9	502	8.0	807	9.0	793	5.2	5 539	5.7
Lake	407	4.5	1 813	4.0	127	15.3	568	6.0	191	11.4	1 810	7.2
La Porte	734	3.2	4 540	4.4	275	9.4	817	11.8	407	7.2	4 264	4.8
Lawrence	737	3.6	1 224	7.0	286	10.5	326	17.2	394	8.9	1 669	14.1
Madison	734	3.2	3 459	4.2	358	8.7	579	13.3	473	6.3	4 923	4.9
Marion	226	6.8	934	8.6	75	20.2	178	15.0	91	16.7	789	15.6
Marshall	804	3.3	3 605	5.2	345	10.5	778	19.6	506	7.5	3 931	5.6
Martin	292	7.6	975	7.3	120	18.6	143	14.6	151	16.0	1 559	9.1
Miami	675	3.8	3 278	4.7	348	9.0	872	39.8	440	7.5	4 461	5.6
Monroe	381	6.6	697	13.7	99	19.2	80	22.9	145	15.6	739	15.6
Montgomery	713	2.4	4 416	3.5	322	9.3	1 182	15.9	444	6.4	5 988	7.4

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Morgan	489	5.2	1 816	5.3	210	12.7	329	15.8	261	10.2	1 629	7.1
Newton	330	4.1	2 616	3.6	177	10.8	932	7.4	245	7.4	2 770	6.1
Noble	834	3.6	3 008	4.6	358	9.5	764	12.9	483	7.2	3 076	7.0
Ohio	203	8.9	339	9.8	136	13.5	121	23.2	113	17.9	358	22.7
Orange	444	4.5	1 166	9.4	191	15.3	173	13.8	237	11.6	1 426	13.3
Owen	489	5.2	1 122	15.1	209	13.6	241	18.2	278	11.4	1 262	20.7
Parke	410	4.6	1 982	5.1	155	13.7	230	10.1	240	8.2	2 961	6.1
Perry	412	4.7	950	11.0	171	13.5	133	15.6	178	13.2	703	26.4
Pike	271	5.9	1 180	7.4	97	19.0	171	20.1	171	11.1	1 105	14.9
Porter	451	3.7	2 270	4.1	188	12.4	383	16.9	255	8.9	2 711	8.2
Posey	437	3.3	3 068	5.7	193	12.4	388	26.2	289	6.4	3 186	6.1
Pulaski	549	2.8	3 775	3.5	251	9.1	1 060	4.7	391	6.1	5 063	6.6
Putnam	644	4.2	2 500	3.9	308	10.1	546	10.0	499	6.4	3 267	4.8
Randolph	729	4.2	3 451	7.8	391	9.5	1 344	20.5	537	6.6	5 297	7.7
Ripley	838	3.2	2 484	4.9	346	9.4	367	12.1	517	6.7	2 946	7.4
Rush	699	3.7	4 333	2.9	297	10.8	790	13.2	447	7.4	5 856	6.7
St. Joseph	629	4.5	3 651	6.6	228	13.8	331	10.9	325	9.1	3 303	7.4
Scott	284	6.3	516	11.4	141	15.4	248	20.8	150	13.8	1 147	12.0
Shelby	618	4.0	3 731	5.0	303	10.1	470	8.6	377	7.7	3 456	4.7
Spencer	639	3.7	2 619	4.9	269	10.0	394	10.4	391	6.5	2 770	7.0
Starke	307	6.6	1 537	4.1	118	21.1	439	17.9	165	15.5	1 695	7.5
Steuben	429	4.7	1 930	8.2	176	14.8	321	14.9	294	9.6	1 953	8.3
Sullivan	468	4.6	2 533	4.3	165	13.0	342	15.6	316	7.8	3 010	6.2
Switzerland	560	4.7	1 188	6.6	154	18.1	137	21.1	289	10.4	1 200	13.0
Tippecanoe	612	4.2	4 015	3.6	273	11.0	774	7.6	425	7.2	4 549	7.1
Tipton	386	4.4	2 906	3.5	213	10.0	993	6.8	282	7.3	3 858	7.0
Union	261	2.5	1 233	10.5	124	14.5	399	36.3	185	8.7	1 335	8.0
Vanderburgh	278	3.8	1 462	7.0	101	18.3	174	19.6	163	11.6	1 220	6.8
Vermillion	259	5.3	1 591	5.4	125	13.9	508	5.1	138	11.8	1 663	12.1
Vigo	467	4.3	2 169	3.7	114	18.2	141	11.9	238	10.9	1 877	12.1
Wabash	665	3.8	4 165	4.5	334	9.2	923	7.2	507	5.2	5 060	3.9
Warren	363	5.0	2 183	4.7	171	11.4	523	16.5	270	8.0	3 247	5.5
Warrick	336	5.2	1 113	9.3	189	13.3	325	20.3	183	12.3	1 250	13.1
Washington	814	3.0	2 289	5.0	333	9.9	478	24.3	505	6.9	2 709	6.3
Wayne	692	3.8	3 350	7.8	426	7.6	760	14.3	431	6.8	3 416	7.9
Wells	583	4.1	2 734	6.3	292	9.4	480	12.2	446	6.1	4 595	7.5
White	629	3.1	4 542	5.9	356	7.6	1 085	10.8	449	6.7	6 244	2.6
Whitley	635	3.2	2 378	4.1	241	10.9	425	8.1	429	6.8	3 657	6.3

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	17 403	1.7	289 120	1.1	59 616	1.2	122 746	1.1	57 862	1.3	295 874	.8
Adams	293	9.5	4 756	4.8	1 065	2.1	2 311	3.8	1 037	2.3	4 214	2.7
Allen	263	12.5	3 322	7.7	1 352	2.3	2 421	4.3	1 316	2.6	4 044	4.0
Bartholomew	217	10.7	3 573	13.5	600	2.6	1 112	6.5	582	3.0	2 679	3.6
Benton	204	11.0	6 297	7.1	474	3.2	1 315	7.3	498	1.9	4 493	9.6
Blackford	78	14.9	1 508	5.5	265	2.7	707	5.0	266	2.6	1 548	3.3
Boone	247	9.1	7 705	5.0	685	2.0	1 994	5.7	640	2.6	4 464	6.5
Brown	27	32.0	67	18.3	167	1.4	86	13.2	159	4.1	213	13.5
Carroll	256	6.5	8 996	3.9	628	2.1	2 020	3.8	611	2.8	6 386	1.9
Cass	301	8.1	6 894	3.7	775	2.1	1 842	5.5	766	2.0	3 532	4.1
Clark	140	14.8	1 204	10.2	602	2.6	1 100	5.9	585	2.7	1 529	5.2
Clay	92	19.2	1 832	16.4	538	2.9	1 012	5.5	524	2.7	2 505	8.5
Clinton	284	8.4	6 745	4.2	622	2.4	1 982	3.3	624	2.6	5 214	2.6
Crawford	10	60.2	18	30.0	378	1.5	411	9.0	315	5.2	716	8.7
Daviess	202	10.8	2 138	3.0	1 153	1.6	1 891	4.0	1 131	2.0	5 369	3.5
Dearborn	138	13.9	292	18.6	720	1.7	791	5.9	688	2.4	746	6.8
Decatur	225	8.1	6 274	6.2	675	2.8	1 171	4.0	683	3.1	3 524	4.3
De Kalb	114	14.8	1 261	8.3	659	1.6	1 474	4.8	624	2.6	2 158	5.7
Delaware	222	11.3	4 954	6.7	663	2.2	1 397	5.5	630	3.3	3 079	3.7
Dubois	193	12.4	1 632	7.4	895	2.0	2 147	2.9	892	1.9	6 797	2.6
Elkhart	450	8.6	4 733	11.9	1 393	1.8	2 443	3.4	1 290	2.4	6 364	6.5
Fayette	108	16.3	1 375	10.0	452	2.0	887	6.7	434	3.1	1 486	5.6
Floyd	61	28.4	135	16.4	335	1.1	346	9.6	306	4.9	329	17.9
Fountain	185	11.3	3 743	9.8	588	3.1	1 200	6.3	572	3.5	3 421	9.8
Franklin	223	12.1	1 442	13.9	772	3.0	1 100	5.7	813	2.2	1 959	5.8
Fulton	235	9.9	3 947	4.4	668	2.6	1 640	4.2	652	3.3	3 153	2.7
Gibson	157	11.7	3 843	6.5	679	2.3	1 518	5.4	673	2.3	3 550	4.4
Grant	294	7.2	5 343	4.2	569	3.1	1 709	5.9	562	3.2	3 027	2.6
Greene	114	17.0	913	23.8	926	1.8	1 379	5.6	872	2.4	2 103	6.9
Hamilton	206	11.5	4 233	6.4	588	3.2	1 665	6.1	568	3.3	2 834	4.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Hancock	238	11.0	4 974	4.3	569	3.8	1 133	7.3	547	3.9	2 517	3.1
Harrison	192	12.9	1 278	16.9	1 136	1.5	1 339	4.8	1 038	2.6	4 432	2.0
Hendricks	243	12.4	4 773	4.4	738	2.6	1 326	5.3	690	3.1	3 227	3.2
Henry	278	9.1	4 934	7.0	833	1.8	1 526	5.9	806	2.3	3 399	4.5
Howard	251	10.1	5 292	12.1	521	2.9	1 344	5.2	516	2.7	3 473	4.4
Huntington	190	9.9	3 321	7.2	654	2.0	1 364	5.3	644	2.8	2 974	3.3
Jackson	260	11.2	2 323	8.5	821	2.4	1 346	7.3	795	2.6	5 974	1.7
Jasper	276	7.7	6 666	4.2	669	2.5	1 603	4.1	652	2.9	6 413	1.6
Jay	209	13.3	2 558	9.1	815	2.3	1 667	4.9	777	2.8	4 148	2.8
Jefferson	152	12.8	1 194	11.6	866	2.6	1 110	5.7	833	3.0	1 750	7.1
Jennings	163	13.9	1 607	10.6	642	2.3	1 062	14.9	578	3.5	3 368	2.4
Johnson	231	8.9	3 793	6.8	521	3.7	924	5.1	517	3.6	2 202	2.9
Knox	266	10.4	5 214	7.0	637	2.9	1 990	3.5	651	2.5	7 068	1.5
Kosciusko	347	9.5	4 485	6.0	1 113	1.1	2 715	3.9	1 043	2.2	11 536	2.4
Lagrange	324	10.0	3 050	7.9	1 337	1.6	2 300	3.8	1 314	1.7	5 611	2.3
Lake	170	13.5	3 958	15.0	434	3.7	1 355	6.2	449	3.0	2 127	3.0
La Porte	303	8.6	6 786	4.6	775	2.3	2 189	4.7	767	2.4	4 560	2.8
Lawrence	92	21.2	456	10.7	837	1.6	1 086	5.6	744	3.6	1 442	5.8
Madison	305	7.5	5 919	7.7	805	1.9	1 997	6.1	796	2.2	5 308	2.9
Marion	63	18.1	1 604	14.8	257	3.8	450	8.7	243	5.6	1 761	3.0
Marshall	336	8.4	3 662	5.2	906	2.4	2 199	5.3	893	2.3	3 295	3.1
Martin	61	25.0	439	10.8	357	3.4	598	9.2	339	4.7	1 238	4.4
Miami	239	10.8	4 416	5.3	754	1.9	1 780	4.8	719	2.8	3 811	3.3
Monroe	52	29.0	88	24.6	508	1.1	575	7.9	475	3.3	1 134	7.6
Montgomery	238	10.1	6 112	3.4	718	2.3	2 309	4.8	753	1.4	4 722	4.2
Morgan	162	13.4	2 004	4.1	616	2.5	872	6.7	588	3.3	2 097	4.9
Newton	136	13.7	3 809	9.5	365	3.0	1 209	11.0	378	2.6	6 127	2.4
Noble	193	12.0	2 377	9.9	960	2.1	1 685	4.3	932	2.3	3 119	4.5
Ohio	18	38.9	135	8.9	262	2.4	215	11.3	242	5.8	390	30.5
Orange	48	19.5	355	13.9	513	2.5	600	5.8	490	3.3	1 118	6.7
Owen	48	35.5	457	25.9	617	1.8	782	9.7	556	3.5	977	9.7
Parke	151	7.2	2 285	5.0	472	2.3	1 180	4.3	432	4.0	1 749	3.9
Perry	73	22.8	347	6.7	464	2.6	625	13.4	419	4.4	912	11.6
Pike	114	18.1	710	16.8	288	4.1	360	8.6	290	4.3	1 172	6.6
Porter	197	13.1	3 479	16.7	468	3.4	1 069	5.3	466	2.8	2 122	4.5
Posey	163	12.2	2 876	10.6	435	3.9	1 178	6.3	462	2.4	3 143	2.1
Pulaski	245	8.4	5 825	3.7	574	2.9	1 879	6.5	581	2.5	5 853	2.7
Putnam	214	11.9	3 271	4.8	784	2.8	1 623	5.0	759	3.1	2 562	3.8
Randolph	256	9.7	3 297	10.6	860	2.9	1 708	6.1	903	2.3	4 014	3.2
Ripley	271	10.3	2 132	7.8	951	1.3	1 328	4.0	881	2.4	2 289	5.7
Rush	283	9.7	5 920	6.1	727	3.2	1 834	5.0	742	3.0	3 744	3.1
St. Joseph	309	9.7	4 052	6.5	730	2.4	2 231	8.3	682	3.5	3 830	7.6
Scott	73	19.0	550	20.2	338	3.3	505	6.3	335	3.7	701	8.7
Shelby	356	7.9	6 384	6.5	666	3.4	1 240	4.5	677	3.0	2 867	3.5
Spencer	158	13.4	1 709	12.0	693	2.5	1 091	7.8	698	2.3	2 458	3.6
Starke	123	17.7	1 692	7.9	362	4.4	1 000	7.8	350	4.6	1 833	3.0
Steuben	180	11.3	1 436	14.8	461	3.7	844	6.2	457	3.6	1 933	6.9
Sullivan	140	11.9	1 542	10.8	504	3.0	1 390	5.4	526	2.6	2 346	3.1
Switzerland	75	24.1	480	17.8	633	2.6	645	9.0	525	5.6	1 117	7.6
Tippecanoe	249	10.0	4 406	6.9	740	2.3	1 714	6.5	710	3.0	5 554	2.1
Tipton	224	8.2	5 903	4.9	426	2.4	1 309	5.6	411	3.0	3 417	1.9
Union	82	17.7	1 934	20.4	260	2.3	466	4.0	267	1.7	1 535	26.1
Vanderburgh	99	16.1	992	5.9	294	2.5	662	7.3	295	2.5	981	7.5
Vermillion	68	18.0	2 893	3.2	298	2.4	719	4.5	296	2.6	1 734	4.1
Vigo	84	18.0	789	6.5	517	2.1	1 053	5.9	497	3.3	2 004	2.2
Wabash	212	10.2	4 201	8.0	766	2.4	1 797	3.1	769	2.3	7 127	1.3
Warren	146	10.3	3 279	8.3	404	3.2	968	5.2	411	2.3	2 738	4.6
Warrick	151	15.8	1 169	17.2	343	4.7	707	8.4	346	4.2	1 047	11.9
Washington	136	11.5	1 332	10.4	897	2.1	1 340	4.4	860	2.5	3 382	8.0
Wayne	236	11.5	3 361	10.0	746	3.3	1 615	4.9	762	2.9	6 208	6.3
Wells	257	8.4	4 692	9.7	690	2.1	1 489	5.8	646	2.7	3 137	5.1
White	226	10.2	6 383	6.4	647	3.3	1 904	4.6	673	2.3	7 050	3.7
Whitley	229	9.3	2 601	10.1	736	1.8	1 558	4.4	656	2.9	2 565	4.5
Indiana	62 772	1.2	961 902	1.0	58 117	1.2	13 366 034	.8	54 252	1.2	11 834 675	.8
Adams	1 099	1.7	15 470	5.3	1 012	1.4	181 238	1.1	961	1.4	165 650	1.1
Allen	1 462	1.6	20 315	6.0	1 374	1.4	257 177	1.2	1 312	1.4	236 106	1.2
Bartholomew	644	1.2	12 672	8.0	596	1.0	146 410	1.0	554	1.1	132 676	1.1
Benton	498	1.9	16 926	7.6	480	1.5	259 306	1.1	477	1.6	242 088	1.1
Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wabash.....	810	1.3	13 808	6.2	728	1.1	174 436	.8	690	1.1	156 217	.8
Warren.....	435	1.4	13 287	5.2	400	1.0	181 299	.7	379	1.0	163 621	.8
Warrick.....	391	1.4	2 615	36.9	365	1.2	80 728	1.6	340	1.3	71 863	1.7
Washington.....	936	1.3	4 740	15.9	870	1.2	127 766	1.3	780	1.3	86 062	1.3
Wayne.....	828	1.2	10 762	4.1	771	1.2	159 224	1.1	692	1.3	135 819	1.1
Wells.....	722	1.1	11 870	5.1	689	1.0	184 093	1.0	672	1.0	173 751	1.0
White.....	697	1.6	26 303	3.3	635	1.3	264 337	.9	612	1.4	243 928	.9
Whitley.....	758	1.1	6 228	10.1	705	1.2	141 351	1.0	660	1.2	120 380	.9
Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry								
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	1 742	1.0	240 898	.6	25 974	1.1	1 113 473	.9	16 783	1.1	293 836	1.1
Adams.....	11	8.5	90	5.7	435	1.8	18 855	1.7	41	4.7	333	6.1
Allen.....	34	4.9	1 716	1.6	423	1.9	18 682	2.3	109	2.9	1 330	4.6
Bartholomew.....	24	3.8	3 397	.6	262	1.6	8 334	1.6	189	2.0	2 706	2.1
Benton.....	1	—	(D)	(D)	86	3.1	3 944	2.6	73	3.5	1 900	3.5
Blackford.....	1	31.6	(D)	(D)	59	3.7	2 039	3.0	39	4.6	540	3.9
Boone.....	11	8.2	26	11.9	221	1.9	7 636	2.3	153	2.3	2 559	3.3
Brown.....	—	—	—	—	87	2.3	2 436	3.2	78	2.5	(D)	(D)
Carroll.....	9	7.9	333	1.2	181	2.0	7 562	1.4	109	2.6	1 731	2.5
Cass.....	25	4.8	3 320	3.8	260	1.8	12 891	1.8	174	2.3	2 997	2.8
Clark.....	20	5.4	519	10.2	350	1.3	14 190	1.3	313	1.5	6 435	1.6
Clay.....	5	11.3	35	17.1	225	2.1	7 887	2.5	178	2.4	2 665	2.9
Clinton.....	1	—	(D)	(D)	154	2.1	5 570	3.9	114	2.5	2 048	6.3
Crawford.....	6	11.9	(D)	(D)	288	1.3	9 454	2.1	234	1.5	4 628	3.1
Daviess.....	16	6.8	1 506	15.1	621	1.6	25 393	2.4	269	2.0	4 995	2.6
Dearborn.....	7	9.1	23	13.6	485	1.1	12 315	1.8	411	1.3	5 192	1.7
Decatur.....	4	13.5	9	21.3	324	1.7	20 550	1.2	184	2.4	3 978	2.2
De Kalb.....	8	10.5	119	23.2	187	2.0	10 426	1.7	69	3.5	564	5.0
Delaware.....	9	7.8	125	12.1	204	1.9	6 164	2.0	124	2.5	1 398	3.4
Dubois.....	15	5.4	526	1.6	502	1.2	26 862	1.3	390	1.5	8 868	1.7
Elkhart.....	124	2.2	20 830	1.9	798	1.5	45 988	1.5	126	2.6	1 430	3.1
Fayette.....	4	16.1	44	22.6	245	2.1	10 158	2.7	187	2.3	3 812	3.2
Floyd.....	12	7.6	39	13.9	196	1.4	4 608	3.0	173	1.6	2 102	2.8
Fountain.....	7	10.9	584	11.9	271	1.9	11 224	2.0	224	2.1	4 334	2.6
Franklin.....	7	11.8	27	18.3	500	1.2	18 078	1.8	371	1.5	5 223	2.3
Fulton.....	45	2.6	12 003	1.3	260	2.2	12 173	2.2	134	3.1	2 444	4.9
Gibson.....	21	5.0	686	4.9	193	1.9	7 420	1.9	143	2.3	2 379	2.8
Grant.....	3	17.7	3	17.7	153	2.1	6 000	1.4	91	3.0	921	3.4
Greene.....	5	13.6	57	7.3	561	1.2	22 214	1.4	466	1.4	9 077	1.7
Hamilton.....	18	6.7	248	3.5	182	2.0	5 780	1.7	128	2.4	1 803	2.7
Hancock.....	16	7.4	118	12.1	169	2.7	4 683	4.1	127	3.0	1 710	5.1
Harrison.....	18	7.5	119	10.9	748	1.2	25 505	1.5	624	1.3	10 397	1.9
Hendricks.....	5	12.2	11	13.8	292	1.9	7 743	2.0	215	2.3	3 042	2.4
Henry.....	11	8.3	235	7.4	372	1.6	14 626	1.3	256	1.9	4 243	2.0
Howard.....	9	9.1	12	10.8	162	2.5	8 218	1.8	92	3.1	1 735	2.6
Huntington.....	6	7.4	(D)	(D)	183	2.0	7 550	1.7	112	2.6	1 792	4.6
Jackson.....	13	7.0	377	1.8	437	1.5	21 726	1.5	318	1.7	5 324	2.2
Jasper.....	61	2.9	14 616	2.0	166	2.3	13 040	1.0	125	2.8	2 470	3.0
Jay.....	8	8.6	195	17.6	280	1.9	11 122	2.3	112	2.7	1 138	3.3
Jefferson.....	11	9.8	228	1.5	442	2.0	13 212	2.2	376	2.1	5 538	2.4
Jennings.....	5	14.3	5	14.3	351	1.6	10 404	2.1	280	1.9	4 246	2.8
Johnson.....	9	11.0	807	3.4	227	1.8	10 059	1.4	154	2.3	2 392	2.6
Knox.....	62	2.7	9 278	1.8	229	1.8	13 295	1.6	158	2.2	4 188	2.1
Kosciusko.....	61	2.5	13 384	2.1	425	1.2	32 121	.8	178	2.0	3 624	2.1
Lagrange.....	97	2.2	26 023	1.1	967	1.2	41 933	1.3	93	2.8	1 148	3.2
Lake.....	36	3.8	6 881	1.8	116	2.5	3 965	2.8	65	3.5	768	4.4
La Porte.....	113	2.1	25 922	1.5	244	2.0	21 146	.9	114	3.2	2 530	2.4
Lawrence.....	5	9.2	(D)	(D)	591	1.3	26 499	1.7	509	1.4	12 716	1.8
Madison.....	12	6.7	443	1.7	249	1.6	9 366	1.6	186	1.8	2 783	2.3
Marion.....	39	3.4	370	2.3	70	3.8	2 214	3.8	53	4.5	(D)	(D)
Marshall.....	40	3.2	7 006	2.0	362	1.9	20 384	1.8	140	2.8	2 522	2.9
Martin.....	—	—	—	—	246	2.0	9 578	2.7	203	2.1	3 758	2.9
Miami.....	23	5.0	2 806	6.6	263	1.7	15 322	1.4	132	2.6	1 820	3.0
Monroe.....	11	7.2	118	15.0	323	1.5	9 819	2.4	279	1.6	4 459	2.4
Montgomery.....	5	8.9	(D)	(D)	267	1.6	12 894	1.5	209	1.8	4 534	2.1
Morgan.....	8	13.4	63	15.0	297	1.8	10 904	2.2	260	1.9	4 744	2.8
Newton.....	19	—	6 386	—	119	2.4	8 698	1.7	99	2.7	(D)	(D)
Noble.....	27	5.0	5 114	2.0	366	1.8	14 655	1.9	135	2.8	1 488	3.0
Ohio.....	8	11.8	15	16.0	152	2.2	4 574	2.8	140	2.3	2 194	3.0
Orange.....	2	18.3	(D)	(D)	324	1.7	13 016	2.2	273	1.8	5 605	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Owen	6	11.1	31	24.1	360	1.4	12 766	1.4	295	1.5	6 109	1.4
Parke	8	11.8	125	12.8	208	2.0	7 658	1.7	175	2.2	3 382	1.8
Perry	2	25.6	(D)	(D)	356	1.1	10 846	1.4	315	1.2	5 012	1.5
Pike	1	—	(D)	(D)	114	2.1	3 903	2.6	96	2.4	(D)	(D)
Porter	44	3.8	6 625	2.2	155	2.2	4 680	3.0	105	2.8	1 300	3.7
Posey	7	—	1 262	—	111	2.7	5 168	3.3	73	3.3	1 392	2.9
Pulaski	58	2.5	15 237	1.8	167	2.1	7 105	2.1	107	2.7	1 742	3.3
Putnam	8	12.2	58	17.0	445	1.4	15 203	1.2	368	1.5	6 146	1.5
Randolph	6	15.2	35	16.4	303	1.7	11 531	1.7	180	2.1	2 283	2.4
Ripley	12	7.7	247	12.6	453	1.5	16 618	2.1	347	1.7	5 638	2.8
Rush	2	15.5	(D)	(D)	293	2.3	15 351	2.3	151	2.9	3 253	3.6
St. Joseph	85	2.8	18 295	1.3	215	2.0	8 771	1.9	83	3.3	993	3.3
Scott	3	16.7	5	15.4	197	1.7	5 375	2.3	175	1.9	2 639	2.5
Shelby	18	5.4	1 606	2.0	252	1.9	9 266	2.0	167	2.4	2 540	2.8
Spencer	7	9.5	(D)	(D)	370	1.7	16 784	1.9	306	1.9	7 120	2.2
Starke	55	3.3	12 238	1.2	65	3.4	2 924	2.4	32	5.2	658	4.3
Steuben	18	5.8	1 661	4.8	216	2.3	11 020	2.4	89	3.5	1 132	3.6
Sullivan	24	4.8	3 603	2.9	177	2.1	6 118	1.8	143	2.4	2 362	2.8
Switzerland	14	9.3	71	14.6	324	1.9	8 944	2.8	265	2.0	4 076	3.0
Tippecanoe	33	4.2	2 294	1.9	255	1.7	9 490	1.6	193	2.0	4 189	1.6
Tipton	3	22.0	(D)	(D)	71	2.9	3 835	1.8	40	4.0	(D)	(D)
Union	3	15.4	3	15.4	139	2.0	6 962	2.6	95	2.6	2 055	3.0
Vanderburgh	12	6.9	(D)	(D)	87	2.9	2 639	3.3	48	4.2	714	3.5
Vermillion	5	12.1	316	1.5	120	2.1	4 726	2.7	100	2.5	1 889	2.4
Vigo	16	5.6	1 245	2.9	172	2.1	3 818	2.8	140	2.3	1 438	2.7
Wabash	23	4.3	1 169	2.5	244	1.6	28 052	.7	86	3.0	1 801	2.3
Warren	5	10.3	(D)	(D)	146	1.8	6 189	1.9	131	1.9	3 389	2.0
Warrick	7	10.3	48	17.4	142	2.1	4 647	2.7	112	2.5	1 896	3.3
Washington	9	10.5	155	22.1	618	1.4	30 124	1.4	494	1.5	11 025	1.8
Wayne	16	5.6	303	2.7	440	1.5	19 831	1.7	288	1.9	5 116	2.2
Wells	7	9.6	67	26.6	144	2.1	9 514	1.6	43	3.8	586	6.7
White	21	4.4	3 322	3.1	200	2.0	8 636	1.9	147	2.3	2 962	2.1
Whitley	11	7.9	873	1.0	263	1.8	11 875	1.5	83	3.0	1 080	2.6

Livestock and poultry — Con.

Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	3 958	1.4	144 532	1.0	11 987	1.3	4 618 663	.6	2 553	1.3	72 386	1.4
Adams	285	2.2	6 613	1.9	359	1.9	102 537	1.3	45	4.5	1 905	4.6
Allen	158	2.5	3 195	2.0	282	2.1	77 313	1.8	64	4.0	1 356	6.3
Bartholomew	19	4.5	791	3.5	127	2.2	39 780	1.5	31	4.5	668	5.8
Benton	6	8.7	136	3.0	42	4.3	17 393	4.3	9	11.4	825	15.6
Blackford	5	11.6	146	9.6	49	3.6	30 690	1.3	18	7.1	243	8.0
Boone	15	6.7	767	5.8	150	1.9	72 907	.7	38	5.1	667	10.8
Brown	3	13.0	(D)	(D)	21	5.3	2 529	6.4	5	13.5	156	18.9
Carroll	11	9.1	291	12.3	227	1.5	228 612	.5	45	4.7	1 311	6.7
Cass	26	5.4	1 429	2.9	193	1.9	93 437	1.0	52	4.2	1 829	5.9
Clark	20	4.5	899	2.5	50	3.2	6 936	2.4	19	7.2	397	9.0
Clay	20	6.3	939	4.1	87	3.2	23 505	2.8	13	8.7	390	11.3
Clinton	7	10.2	58	9.1	179	1.6	176 978	.5	48	4.6	1 183	6.5
Crawford	25	5.5	399	5.6	31	5.6	1 790	7.3	8	11.2	185	16.6
Daviess	255	2.2	2 866	2.5	427	1.8	153 672	1.5	40	5.5	603	11.4
Dearborn	17	5.4	550	3.0	50	3.5	3 823	4.8	14	7.3	262	9.3
Decatur	28	4.4	1 635	3.0	239	1.9	139 946	1.0	26	6.0	877	5.6
De Kalb	49	3.2	3 312	1.8	97	3.3	22 790	2.5	23	6.6	784	10.9
Delaware	18	6.3	750	4.5	79	2.8	32 499	1.2	36	4.6	737	6.5
Dubois	36	3.3	3 030	1.7	303	1.5	141 019	.8	22	6.9	592	8.6
Elkhart	404	2.0	17 476	1.5	331	2.1	75 212	2.0	73	4.0	1 446	6.3
Fayette	17	8.1	795	8.2	138	2.9	57 491	2.3	24	7.1	451	7.8
Floyd	7	10.7	162	15.5	25	5.2	995	4.2	4	16.3	107	18.8
Fountain	10	8.9	159	13.3	82	3.6	27 395	2.1	24	6.2	562	8.2
Franklin	44	3.7	2 235	3.2	214	1.9	71 563	1.9	32	4.9	598	5.9
Fulton	45	3.9	2 406	3.2	164	2.3	48 331	1.5	35	5.5	1 118	7.3
Gibson	23	4.3	1 077	2.8	100	2.5	40 612	1.3	10	10.3	306	17.7
Grant	15	6.2	1 008	2.5	129	2.0	51 106	1.2	24	5.1	492	7.8
Greene	34	4.5	1 592	2.8	112	3.0	27 742	2.3	24	6.2	1 298	8.6
Hamilton	12	5.1	462	2.1	104	2.4	39 524	1.8	50	3.7	940	4.9
Hancock	5	14.6	89	15.9	115	3.0	52 884	1.3	52	4.4	3 289	7.8
Harrison	57	3.7	2 218	3.5	115	2.6	18 771	2.5	19	6.2	975	15.5
Hendricks	20	6.0	557	4.7	95	2.9	38 486	1.1	36	5.6	327	7.0
Henry	17	7.1	655	6.1	137	2.5	38 614	1.7	42	4.4	827	5.8
Howard	21	6.3	1 146	4.9	155	2.0	95 148	.8	16	8.2	234	13.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 – Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry – Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Huntington	21	4.1	1 232	2.2	152	2.2	70 635	1.0	45	4.5	1 076	6.6
Jackson	37	3.8	2 350	2.4	142	2.4	38 197	1.6	21	6.0	2 991	2.3
Jasper	4	13.4	229	8.5	142	2.1	113 661	.7	31	5.2	822	8.8
Jay	82	3.2	2 699	2.5	205	2.2	56 335	1.8	53	4.0	1 215	7.9
Jefferson	30	5.3	1 006	4.1	58	4.3	7 763	4.6	27	6.9	547	8.0
Jennings	12	7.3	535	6.5	120	2.9	17 528	3.8	10	10.0	225	11.0
Johnson	12	5.9	1 110	2.4	77	3.3	26 151	1.5	17	8.5	785	14.0
Knox	12	8.1	462	4.0	154	2.0	63 015	1.2	15	8.5	346	12.2
Kosciusko	99	2.4	4 607	1.8	233	1.6	120 643	.8	68	3.2	2 217	5.3
Lagrange	606	1.5	10 889	1.6	584	1.5	107 954	1.6	77	3.0	1 512	6.6
Lake	24	5.2	1 216	5.0	36	4.3	8 628	5.6	20	7.2	411	9.5
La Porte	58	3.2	4 409	1.5	89	3.2	29 122	1.5	32	5.8	1 000	7.8
Lawrence	27	5.9	825	5.5	89	3.2	13 385	3.3	22	6.4	272	7.7
Madison	15	7.6	619	8.2	110	2.2	37 066	1.3	32	4.8	931	7.3
Marion	3	20.8	(D)	(D)	14	8.7	7 513	5.5	11	11.0	313	11.6
Marshall	113	2.8	6 155	1.9	160	2.8	38 250	2.3	45	4.6	1 908	4.8
Martin	21	8.4	186	8.0	113	3.3	43 316	1.8	8	14.6	128	27.2
Miami	46	3.8	2 855	2.9	209	2.0	107 813	.8	31	5.7	784	8.1
Monroe	14	8.9	480	9.0	45	4.5	2 665	4.0	21	6.9	327	9.3
Montgomery	7	9.3	111	10.6	182	1.8	161 597	.6	45	4.2	2 478	9.3
Morgan	11	9.1	316	7.7	79	3.4	16 850	2.6	34	5.5	1 036	7.4
Newton	2	13.4	(D)	(D)	56	3.1	29 267	.8	22	5.7	419	5.8
Noble	123	2.8	4 262	2.6	167	2.6	47 444	1.4	41	5.0	1 498	10.8
Ohio	4	11.8	140	1.9	19	6.4	3 042	4.0	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Orange	20	4.5	883	1.7	85	3.3	23 844	2.0	23	6.6	485	8.0
Owen	24	7.1	642	5.7	68	3.5	9 234	2.3	33	5.3	785	5.6
Parke	10	10.6	429	5.5	102	3.2	27 803	2.0	22	6.6	529	11.1
Perry	17	6.0	493	5.2	94	2.6	24 008	2.8	12	7.2	145	8.4
Pike	5	11.7	(D)	(D)	53	3.3	14 417	4.0	3	15.8	25	15.7
Porter	16	5.5	723	5.0	65	3.3	20 520	2.2	23	6.1	385	7.8
Posey	22	6.6	1 161	7.0	65	3.0	27 674	1.2	10	9.7	229	12.5
Pulaski	24	4.6	1 413	3.8	167	2.1	70 215	1.0	21	6.9	493	10.9
Putnam	20	6.0	689	1.8	168	2.3	57 061	1.2	52	4.2	2 261	8.0
Randolph	34	4.4	1 312	4.6	221	2.0	70 528	1.1	46	4.0	1 117	5.6
Ripley	29	4.7	1 590	2.2	177	2.4	50 354	1.9	30	5.7	695	9.1
Rush	53	4.3	2 043	3.1	272	2.6	120 183	1.6	33	5.6	708	6.3
St. Joseph	63	3.1	2 730	2.3	96	2.8	26 682	1.3	28	5.5	490	3.8
Scott	5	11.7	254	9.8	30	5.0	3 883	4.6	8	10.0	148	10.9
Shelby	25	5.3	1 228	4.1	103	2.5	40 462	1.4	34	5.2	1 088	4.2
Spencer	30	5.3	1 321	4.4	155	2.7	55 202	1.8	19	7.4	384	10.6
Starke	7	9.0	192	6.8	78	3.5	12 939	3.0	12	8.0	510	12.1
Steuben	73	3.4	3 502	3.1	78	3.7	13 185	3.9	21	6.5	506	4.9
Sullivan	7	13.5	172	8.5	80	3.1	18 636	3.0	20	6.6	632	8.6
Switzerland	37	6.0	1 242	6.6	32	5.8	11 225	.4	4	12.3	104	10.8
Tippecanoe	12	9.0	321	4.9	133	2.0	80 525	.9	42	4.6	2 064	5.2
Tipton	2	19.1	(D)	(D)	106	2.2	58 204	.6	27	5.5	602	7.0
Union	9	7.6	552	5.2	92	2.8	39 028	2.0	14	7.4	329	11.6
Vanderburgh	10	7.8	534	6.8	30	5.3	6 161	5.2	5	13.6	(D)	(D)
Vermillion	4	13.9	48	15.6	34	4.4	16 678	.8	8	9.1	298	14.4
Vigo	11	9.0	451	6.7	52	3.5	12 860	1.4	6	13.6	166	13.3
Wabash	45	3.7	2 168	3.2	203	1.7	132 584	.7	38	4.7	1 122	10.9
Warren	6	13.9	62	20.4	37	4.6	12 490	3.8	12	6.7	256	10.6
Warrick	8	8.5	417	6.8	67	3.4	15 762	2.9	8	9.7	114	11.4
Washington	67	3.4	3 596	2.3	146	2.8	38 388	1.8	27	6.1	918	9.3
Wayne	48	3.5	2 434	2.7	154	2.2	53 583	1.2	45	4.8	995	4.3
Wells	31	4.8	1 720	3.9	136	2.0	47 408	1.3	20	5.8	424	8.0
White	8	8.3	450	6.8	197	1.8	130 073	.8	47	4.3	872	5.1
Whitley	59	3.4	2 524	2.3	168	2.2	56 994	1.2	49	4.2	1 213	5.3

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry – Con.							
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Indiana	2 289	1.2	19 288 539	.2	188	2.3	21 081 124	.6
Adams	69	3.6	809 838	1.8	18	6.5	473 282	11.7
Allen	49	4.3	30 201	16.0	5	12.2	712	15.5
Bartholomew	15	7.4	395	10.3	–	–	–	–
Benton	2	18.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Blackford	12	9.3	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Boone	16	7.7	620	15.1	1	24.8	(D)	(D)
Brown	10	8.4	215	9.3	–	–	–	–
Carroll	31	4.6	579 303	.1	5	14.3	1 047	16.9
Cass	22	7.1	(D)	(D)	2	25.0	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry — Con.							
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Clark	19	7.1	448	8.3	2	15.2	(D)	(D)
Clay	13	7.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Clinton	20	6.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Crawford	28	6.0	570	6.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Daviess	68	4.1	(D)	(D)	6	14.7	246	17.8
Dearborn	28	5.2	1 771	6.3	1	30.6	(D)	(D)
Decatur	21	8.0	522	9.2	1	31.1	(D)	(D)
De Kalb	11	9.2	271	12.1	2	29.7	(D)	(D)
Delaware	18	7.3	463	8.7	1	32.3	(D)	(D)
Dubois	54	3.2	2 586 356	.1	—	—	—	—
Elkhart	104	3.2	207 828	9.1	29	5.2	1 595 332	2.8
Fayette	12	9.6	314	13.2	—	—	—	—
Floyd	15	6.7	263	7.2	1	29.6	(D)	(D)
Fountain	17	7.4	390	10.2	—	—	—	—
Franklin	25	5.8	528	7.8	—	—	—	—
Fulton	17	8.4	(D)	(D)	2	20.8	(D)	(D)
Gibson	23	6.0	2 802	.8	—	—	—	—
Grant	22	5.5	86 835	.1	2	18.9	(D)	(D)
Greene	33	5.4	926	7.9	1	—	(D)	(D)
Hamilton	20	6.5	1 080	7.5	1	35.8	(D)	(D)
Hancock	8	14.2	102	22.3	—	—	—	—
Harrison	34	4.8	123 260	(L)	6	7.3	(D)	(D)
Hendricks	29	6.1	786	7.9	—	—	—	—
Henry	29	6.4	821	11.1	1	25.6	(D)	(D)
Howard	27	6.3	1 499	9.1	3	19.0	1 500	18.6
Huntington	16	7.4	(D)	(D)	1	27.0	(D)	(D)
Jackson	22	6.4	(D)	(D)	1	26.6	(D)	(D)
Jasper	10	10.3	(D)	(D)	2	15.4	(D)	(D)
Jay	50	3.2	920 626	.5	1	27.0	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	27	6.9	808	8.4	—	—	—	—
Jennings	29	6.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Johnson	16	8.2	357	17.6	—	—	—	—
Knox	22	6.8	486	7.6	—	—	—	—
Kosciusko	43	4.1	2 017 427	.3	4	16.8	(D)	(D)
Lagrange	238	1.9	398 639	1.3	32	4.7	1 057 164	4.5
Lake	18	6.9	3 142	21.1	1	34.1	(D)	(D)
La Porte	29	6.5	874	9.4	4	18.3	104	33.1
Lawrence	28	6.0	722	9.0	—	—	—	—
Madison	27	5.8	3 968	36.9	—	—	—	—
Marion	8	11.7	428	17.4	1	38.6	(D)	(D)
Marshall	42	4.9	73 241	.2	10	9.2	1 055	17.3
Martin	17	7.9	274 716	(D)	1	(D)	(D)	(D)
Miami	17	7.9	547	9.0	2	24.0	(D)	(D)
Monroe	16	7.8	308	9.1	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	15	8.0	259	15.0	—	—	—	—
Morgan	16	8.5	356	13.7	—	—	—	—
Newton	3	14.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Noble	51	4.4	(D)	(D)	5	12.2	(D)	(D)
Ohio	6	13.8	110	16.5	—	—	—	—
Orange	17	8.1	289	9.8	—	—	—	—
Owen	29	5.7	418	6.5	1	29.8	(D)	(D)
Parke	10	9.6	241	10.1	—	—	—	—
Perry	26	5.5	574	7.0	—	—	—	—
Pike	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Porter	26	5.9	647	7.1	—	—	—	—
Posey	11	9.5	280	12.4	—	—	—	—
Pulaski	19	7.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Putnam	26	6.2	474	10.1	—	—	—	—
Randolph	31	5.2	497 894	.5	5	14.8	(D)	(D)
Ripley	38	4.9	1 222	7.0	—	—	—	—
Rush	19	8.8	735	23.3	—	—	—	—
St. Joseph	33	4.7	(D)	(D)	7	10.7	503	17.3
Scott	15	8.0	290	9.7	—	—	—	—
Shelby	21	6.8	1 099	11.1	—	—	—	—
Spencer	13	8.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Starke	4	16.9	186	19.8	1	38.2	(D)	(D)
Steuben	17	7.7	395	8.9	—	—	—	—
Sullivan	9	12.0	254	19.3	—	—	—	—
Switzerland	19	7.2	333	9.6	—	—	—	—
Tippecanoe	32	5.5	(D)	(D)	4	11.3	(D)	(D)
Tipton	10	9.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Union	5	15.4	299	18.4	—	—	—	—
Vanderburgh	9	10.2	550	16.7	—	—	—	—
Vermillion	3	18.5	76	20.3	—	—	—	—
Vigo	16	8.5	332	12.0	1	—	(D)	(D)
Wabash	24	5.8	1 187 655	(L)	1	38.2	(D)	(D)
Warren	8	9.5	131	10.1	—	—	—	—
Warrick	9	11.4	221	14.6	—	—	—	—
Washington	33	5.3	(D)	(D)	9	6.4	1 854 520	2.9
Wayne	18	7.5	391	10.4	1	—	(D)	(D)
Wells	20	5.4	79 865	3.7	1	32.2	(D)	(D)
White	16	7.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Whitley	15	7.9	117 232	(L)	1	40.4	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 — Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.				
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				
	Farms		Acres		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Blackford	4	14.3	(D)	(D)	
Boone	5	12.0	20	15.6	
Brown	4	11.6	54	12.6	
Carroll	8	10.1	62	14.8	
Cass	18	6.5	1 187	1.3	
Clark	34	4.5	814	3.6	
Clay	5	10.7	13	8.7	
Clinton	5	9.4	180	6.0	
Crawford	11	7.9	19	10.1	
Daviess	34	4.9	714	7.5	
Dearborn	10	9.5	69	16.8	
Decatur	9	10.1	107	16.9	
De Kalb	13	7.8	93	12.9	
Delaware	15	5.5	642	1.4	
Dubois	1	25.6	(D)	(D)	
Elkhart	56	3.9	1 034	4.1	
Fayette	4	17.4	39	29.9	
Floyd	29	4.9	304	7.3	
Fountain	3	20.3	(D)	(D)	
Franklin	11	9.6	80	13.5	
Fulton	4	10.4	53	14.3	
Gibson	38	3.9	1 140	4.4	
Grant	8	7.6	610	.1	
Greene	9	11.1	18	17.0	
Hamilton	17	8.0	128	10.3	
Hancock	16	8.4	74	10.0	
Harrison	18	6.4	66	14.1	
Hendricks	12	9.9	66	6.0	
Henry	16	6.5	486	1.2	
Howard	17	6.7	908	.6	
Huntington	6	7.6	(D)	(D)	
Jackson	53	4.6	1 480	6.4	
Jasper	17	7.1	709	12.3	
Jay	8	10.3	(D)	(D)	
Jefferson	16	7.6	137	3.3	
Jennings	6	13.9	11	15.4	
Johnson	21	7.5	187	13.5	
Knox	83	3.0	4 899	2.4	
Kosciusko	21	4.1	944	.9	
Lagrange	22	6.0	262	4.0	
Lake	34	5.2	1 347	5.3	
La Porte	29	5.3	1 684	.5	
Lawrence	10	8.9	(D)	(D)	
Madison	22	5.4	1 617	.3	
Marion	26	5.9	466	4.9	
Marshall	21	6.7	168	7.1	
Martin	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	
Miami	4	12.0	8	9.5	
Monroe	9	10.6	18	15.0	
Montgomery	5	15.6	23	24.6	
Morgan	11	9.5	108	15.1	
Newton	11	7.7	687	4.2	
Noble	20	6.8	147	4.9	
Ohio	2	18.8	(D)	(D)	
Orange	11	9.6	27	12.9	
Owen	6	12.5	18	14.1	
Parke	7	11.1	29	15.6	
Perry	1	33.3	(D)	(D)	
Pike	4	8.8	40	15.5	
Porter	14	6.3	758	3.6	
Posey	8	8.7	120	2.8	
Pulaski	3	19.0	6	19.6	
Putnam	11	8.8	95	16.6	
Randolph	10	10.2	262	7.7	
Ripley	14	8.4	54	10.4	
Rush	5	12.1	(D)	(D)	
St. Joseph	31	5.5	931	1.8	
Scott	9	9.5	31	14.7	
Shelby	5	14.2	(D)	(D)	
Spencer	6	11.0	14	12.6	
Starke	12	9.2	240	4.5	
Steuben	9	10.4	135	13.8	
Sullivan	39	5.0	1 646	6.5	
Switzerland	2	19.8	(D)	(D)	
Tippecanoe	12	8.6	74	8.3	
Tipton	7	10.8	794	1.2	
Union	1	29.4	(D)	(D)	
Vanderburgh	12	8.2	138	20.5	
Vermillion	2	15.8	(D)	(D)	
Vigo	13	8.0	82	8.9	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.				
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				
	Farms			Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wabash.....	12	6.4	112	10.6	
Warren.....	11	7.2	288	6.3	
Warrick.....	4	7.0	(D)	(D)	
Washington.....	16	9.0	116	11.8	
Wayne.....	12	9.2	53	16.8	
Wells.....	6	7.2	249	.1	
White.....	7	9.9	46	14.1	
Whitley.....	6	13.7	16	16.4	

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list ¹		Percent not on mail list ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ----- number--	62 778	1.1	5 658	23.4	8.3	1.7
Land in farms ----- acres --	15 618 831	.9	199 142	23.2	1.3	.3
Average size of farm ----- acres --	248.8	.4	35.2	18.7	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	5 141	1.3	1 153	39.9	18.3	6.0
10 to 49 acres -----	14 234	1.2	3 260	33.5	18.6	4.9
Less than 50 acres -----	19 375	1.2	4 413	28.2	18.6	4.2
50 acres or more -----	43 403	1.3	1 245	31.3	2.8	.9
50 to 99 acres -----	11 200	1.2	947	37.2	7.8	2.7
100 to 179 acres -----	10 068	1.5	172	85.1	1.7	1.4
180 acres or more -----	22 135	1.2	126	58.2	.6	.3
Harvested cropland ----- farms --	54 252	1.2	3 995	26.5	6.9	1.7
----- acres--	11 834 675	.8	87 729	31.7	.7	.2
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	4 880	1.3	2 312	40.9	32.1	8.9
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	6 309	1.3	1 805	33.7	22.2	5.8
Less than \$2,500 -----	11 189	1.3	4 117	29.8	26.9	5.8
\$2,500 or more -----	51 589	1.2	1 541	27.1	2.9	.8
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	14 901	1.2	1 044	32.9	6.5	2.0
\$10,000 or more -----	36 688	1.4	497	46.8	1.3	.6
Market value of agricultural products sold -----\$1,000 --	4 633 090	.6	34 811	45.0	.7	.3
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	38 426	1.2	3 585	28.8	8.5	2.2
Livestock (02) -----	24 352	1.1	2 074	28.5	7.8	2.1
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	53 105	1.1	5 350	24.4	9.2	2.0
Partnership or corporation -----	9 343	1.4	243	57.6	2.5	1.4
Other -----	330	2.0	65	101.6	16.5	13.9
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	35 868	1.1	4 349	23.3	10.8	2.3
Part owners and tenants -----	26 910	1.2	1 309	56.0	4.6	2.4
Part owners -----	20 504	1.1	1 120	64.4	5.2	3.1
Tenants -----	6 406	1.9	190	73.4	2.9	2.1
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	48 049	1.1	4 858	25.2	9.2	2.1
Not on farm operated -----	10 715	1.5	623	42.6	5.5	2.2
Not reported -----	4 014	1.2	177	70.9	4.2	2.9
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	31 547	1.1	720	40.4	2.2	.9
Other -----	31 231	1.2	4 503	26.3	12.6	2.9
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	59 671	1.2	5 204	24.0	8.0	1.7
Female -----	3 107	1.3	454	65.8	12.8	7.3
Operators by race:						
White -----	62 625	1.1	5 223	24.3	7.7	1.7
Black and other races -----	153	2.9	-	(X)	-	(X)
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	6 714	1.9	2 759	33.3	29.1	6.8
5 years or more -----	45 952	1.1	1 939	33.7	4.0	1.3
Average years on present farm -----	20.6	1.5	6.9	33.4	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	10 112	1.2	960	36.9	8.7	2.9
Average age of operator -----	51.6	.1	42.9	21.8	(X)	(X)

NOTE: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.